

Documento de Trabajo 2016-02

Facultad de Economía y Empresa

Universidad de Zaragoza

Depósito Legal Z-1411-2010. ISSN 2171-6668

Human resource management practices and organizational performance. The mediator role of immaterial satisfaction in Italian Social Cooperatives

Silvia Sacchetti
University of Stirling

Ermanno C. Tortia
University of Trento

Francisco J. López Arceiz (*)
University of Zaragoza
C/ Gran Vía, nº2
Zaragoza (50005)- Spain
Email: larceiz@unizar.es

(*) Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with the mediating role of immaterial satisfaction between substantive human resources (HR) features and organizational performance. We address this relationship in the Italian social service sector using a survey dataset that includes 4134 workers and 320 not-for-profit social cooperatives. The obtained results show that human resource management (HRM) practices influence immaterial satisfaction and, satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance. However, the impact of the different HRM practices is not the same. In this sense, worker involvement and workload pressure have a positive impact on firm performance; but task autonomy or collaborative teamwork do not have impact on organizational performance.

Key words: Immaterial satisfaction; workload pressure; autonomy; involvement; teamwork; firm performance.

JEL classification: J28, J81, L15, L25, L84, M54

Acknowledgments: We thank “The Third Sector’s Social and Economic Studies Group” (GESES-S64) and European Research Institute on Cooperatives and Social Enterprise (EURCISE) for their suggestions in the elaboration of this paper, FPU Financial Program (FPU 13/02481), and research program Ibercaja-CAI.

Human resource management practices and organizational performance. The mediator role of immaterial satisfaction in Italian Social Cooperatives

ABSTRACT

The paper deals with the mediating role of immaterial satisfaction between substantive human resources (HR) features and organizational performance. We address this relationship in the Italian social service sector using a survey dataset that includes 4134 workers and 320 not-for-profit social cooperatives. The obtained results show that human resource management (HRM) practices influence immaterial satisfaction and, satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance. However, the impact of the different HRM practices is not the same. In this sense, worker involvement and workload pressure have a positive impact on firm performance; but task autonomy or collaborative teamwork do not have impact on organizational performance.

Key words: Immaterial satisfaction; workload pressure; autonomy; involvement; teamwork; firm performance.

JEL classification: J28, J81, L15, L25, L84, M54

INTRODUCTION

Research on the relationship between structural HRM practices and firm performance is wide and established. In general, HRM practices have been functional to enhancing employees' skills, commitment and effort, with a view to enhance, in turn, organizational performance (Takeuchi, Lepak, Wang, & Takeuchi, 2007: 1069). Complementary, research has addressed also the impact of structural HRM practices on satisfaction (Takeuchi, Chen, & Lepak, 2009), but only seldom satisfaction has been considered as a factor influencing performance (Ostroff, 1992) and as a mediator between structural HRM practices and performance (Guest, 2002; Messersmith et al., 2011) and further research is called for concerning the triangulation between structural HRM practices, worker satisfaction, and organizational performance (Böckerman & Ilmakunnas, 2012).

The aim of this paper is to analyze the mediating role of immaterial satisfaction between HR dimensions and performance and to distinguish the impacts of HRM practices on the welfare of workers at the individual level, and on performance at the organizational level. We rely on last national Survey on Italian Social Cooperatives (SISC). Data include information about 4134 salaried workers in 320 Italian social cooperatives. Our results show that HRM practices influence immaterial satisfaction and satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance; but the impact of HRM practices is not the same. In this sense, worker involvement and workload pressure have a positive impact on firm performance.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. The second section reviews the existing literature on the subject and lays out the different hypotheses. The third section introduces data, variables, descriptive statistics and statistical techniques to test the proposed hypotheses. The last section presents the main conclusions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Economic literature has analyzed the relationship between HRM practices and organizational performance for decades. The paradigmatic paper of Dewey (1917) established that human satisfaction is achieved when individuals can express creativity and critical thought. These aspects are merged in his notion of "creative intelligence," or the capacity of individuals to challenge existing beliefs and habits of thought by assessing and shaping action (Dewey, 1922, 1930). In the context of organizations, the use of creative intelligence (CI) takes the form of a meaningful interaction between the individual and the organizational environment,

as the individual strives to satisfy particular aspirations. The exercise of CI is a potential that, as argued by Dewey and consistently with the later work by Amabile (1983), can be developed from HRM features. In this sense, HRM practices can be considered like a domain where workers can apply CI and achieve immaterial satisfaction, thus impacting on firm performance.

The study of the nexus between HRM practices and performance has been tested in several papers (Combs, Yongmei, Hall, & Ketchen, 2006). However, findings are not always univocal (Wood & Wall, 2007), leaving a question mark on what conditions make specific organizational features (un)effective. Particularly, the role of worker satisfaction has not received sufficient attention until recently (Messersmith et al., 2011). In an organization, the immaterial satisfaction like part of creative intelligence could be higher: (a) when organizational context favors inclusion as a way to promote sense-making, critical enquiry, learning and compatibility between individual and organizational objectives; (b) when individuals have or can develop the skills to meaningfully engage in both autonomous and collaborative work. Therefore, according to this idea, it is possible to define this working hypothesis,

Hypothesis 1. HRM practices positively influence immaterial satisfaction.

The rejection of H1 would imply that HRM practices cannot influence immaterial satisfaction. In other words, they are not a way to develop the individual CI and achieve human fulfillment. In contrast, if we do not reject H1, this result will imply that HRM practices are an element that can be used by the HR management to define the laboral climate of an organization. Moreover, the laboral climate can influence the firm performance. Economic literature has explored the effects of laboral climate on firm performance (Kehoe & Wright, 2010; Li, Frenkel, & Sanders 2011; Takeuchi, Lepak, Wang, & Takeuchi, 2009), sharing the view that satisfaction can represent an important *trait d'union* between HR policies and organizational outcomes (Messersmith et al., 2011). As consequence, we can postulate this hypothesis,

Hypothesis 2. Immaterial satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance.

The rejection of H2 would disagree with the previous papers, immaterial satisfaction not being an element able to improve organizational performance. However, if we do not reject H2, the immaterial satisfaction and the laboral climate could influence the firm outcomes. In this case, it will be necessary to study the HRM practices than can be applied in an

organization like a tool to improve satisfaction and firm performance. In this paper, we consider four HRM practices: task autonomy, collaborative teamwork, involvement, workload pressure.

In conventional HR approaches, autonomy implies that the individual can enjoy substantial freedom, independence, and discretion in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, we could say that autonomy implies more than the degree of discretionality exerted in the implementation of day-to-day activities. More fundamentally, autonomy directs to the use of CI to problematize situations, find appropriate ways of acting and set objectives that reflect desired outcomes. This means that the worker not only can select routines which are relevant to the solution of particular problems, or appropriate to habitual circumstances: individuals able to discover new situations are also more likely to act creatively, intelligently and morally when the organizational context allows them to do so (Amabile, 1983; Dewey, 1927; Fesmire, 2003; Gioia & Poole, 1984). Existing results point at the positive impact of autonomy on satisfaction (Biron & Bamberger, 2010; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Sprigg, Jackson & Parker, 2000) and on firm performance (Amabile et al., 1996). However, a negative impact can be observed in economic literature in relation to satisfaction (Castanheira & Chambel, 2010) and firm performance (Hodson, 2002; Mukherjee & Malhotra, 2006; Langfred, 2004). These differences allow us to postulate our hypothesis,

Hypothesis 2a. Task autonomy positively impacts on firm performance.

Other HRM practice that can be considered is the collaborative teamwork. Collaborative teamwork can substantially enlarge the amount and quality of resources available to workers, mainly in terms of supporting relations, reciprocal trust, and knowledge sharing. Through these resources, the team defines a domain where commitment and participation favor the transposition of CI into new action in general, therefore possibly impacting on satisfaction. This supports the possibility of a positive relation between teamwork and immaterial satisfaction. As for performance, in general, a positive relationship is observed. For example, using managerial evaluations of leader support, teamwork cohesion, and organizational performance, Montes, Moreno & Morales (2005) find a strong positive link between teamwork cohesion, organizational learning, and technical and administrative innovation as measures of organizational performance. Lee, Lee & Wu (2010) find a positive impact of HR practices, including teamwork, on firm performance (measured as production efficiency), but the

specific effect of teamwork is not worked out. We hypothesize that the effect on performance is positive,

Hypothesis 2b. Teamwork has a positive impact on firm performance.

Additionally, in this paper, we consider involvement like a HRM practice. Involvement provides a behavioral framework where people are encouraged to articulate and communicate their views, share knowledge on the consequences of previous decisions and reflect on feedbacks, thus influencing each other's perspectives and preferences (Dewey, 1927). A "social" process aimed at understanding problems and situations gets activated, and engagement with decision-making becomes an act of CI which can be expected to increase individual sense of control (self-determination) and accomplishment, not least because it gives voice to intuitions and ideas which can then be verified and reflected into further action (Dewey, 1927; Habermas, 1992; Ford, 1996; Joas, 1996). Consistently, involvement has been regarded as a determinant of workers' satisfaction (Wood & Wal, 2007; Richardson, Danford, Stewart, & Pulignano, 2010). Research results, however, are not unequivocal on this aspect (Cox, Zagelmeyer, & Marchington, 2006; Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2011; Holland, Pyman, Cooper, & Teicher, 2011; Zatzik & Iverson, 2011). In relation to organizational performance, Lawler (1986) and Arthur (1994) identify worker involvement as a key element among the determinants of performance (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, & Kalleberg, 2000; Guest, 2011; McMahan, Bell, & Virick, 1998; Wood & Wall, 2007). So, in this case we can detect a positive effect related to the performance and an inconclusive effect resulting from the immaterial satisfaction. As consequence, we formulate this hypothesis,

Hypothesis 2c. Worker involvement has a positive impact on firm performance.

Finally, we take into account the workload pressure in the organization. Workload pressure provides an indication of the demands that organizations pose to workers (Bakker et al., 2008; Schaufeli et al., 2009). In field research, workload pressure beyond a certain threshold has been argued to represent an impediment to team (Amabile et al., 1996). However, Kaya, Koc, & Topcu (2010), and Robinson, Roth & Brown (1993) find a positive connection between workload and worker satisfaction, which is taken as an index of job performance. Overall, the relation between workload and performance is expected to be positive, but further testing is needed,

Hypothesis 2d. Workload pressure has a positive impact on firm performance.

The rejection of H2i can be caused by two reasons: (a) the existence of a significant indirect effect through immaterial satisfaction and, (b) the presence of a significant direct effect of the HRM practice on the firm performance. If the signs are different, the total effect of the HRM practices could be non-significant or negative. In contrast, if we do not reject the H2i, the HR manager should promote the HR practice because the firm will improve its performance.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

In this study, we have used the national Survey on Italian Social Cooperatives (SISC, 2006), conducted by the Universities of Brescia, Milan, Naples, Reggio Calabria, and Trento. The survey was composed by different questionnaires addressed to workers (on several aspects of their job and on specific organizational practices) and organizations (on the organization as a whole). We resort to diverse sources of data to contrast the problems connected with common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003)¹. The questionnaires were based on validated multiple-item questions, most of which were measured on 1 to 7 or 1 to 5 Likert scales, and were administered by trained staff that supported the respondents on site.

Our final sample was made of 320 organizations including 4,134 salaried workers². The composition of the sample is shown in table 1.

Table 1 Description of the sample

Variable	Description	%
Region	North-west	40.2
	North-east	21.8
	Centre	21.9
	South	16.1
Size	Lower than 15	25.5
	Between 16 and 50	31.5
	Higher than 50	43.0
Legal Form	Type A	78.2
	Type B	21.8

(*) Total number of observations is 320 organizations

As we can see, the social cooperatives under study were located in different regions (40.2% in the North-west, 21.8% in the North-east, 22.0% in the Centre, and 16.0 % in the South of the

¹ The results presented heretofore are based on worker's perceptions concerning substantive practices and satisfaction, and on directors' evaluation of organizational performance. Common method bias (CMB) can significantly impact on these results, most of all when worker perceptions only are involved, hence in the relation between HRM practices and immaterial satisfaction. Insofar as this relation enters in the indirect impact of HRM practices on performance, it can bias results (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Following Bharadwaj, Bharadwaj, and Kossynski (1999) and Podsakoff et al. (2003) we controlled the CMB.

² The initial population was estimated 6,168 active cooperatives at the national level with at least one employee (ISTAT, 2003).

country). In relation to the size of the cooperative, we can observe like 25.5% were small cooperatives, 31.5% were medium-sized cooperatives and 43.0% could be considered large cooperatives, taking into account the number of employees. Finally, we can find two typologies of social cooperatives defined by Italian legal framework: Type A (78.0%) delivers social services, while Type B (22.0%) is configured as an enterprise that reintegrates weak individuals such as disabled, ex-drug addicted, ex-convicted, the mentally ill, and long term unemployed into the labor market.

Main variables

Due to the structure of the database, we could study two levels of variables. In the within level, we studied the HRM practices and immaterial satisfaction; while in the between level we analyzed the organizational performance.

The HRM practices were defined by four elements: Task autonomy, collaborative teamwork, workload pressure, and involvement. To measure the degree of autonomy perceived by individual workers, we used three indicators related to the day-to-day job tasks, handling relations with customers and users, and problem solving. The measurement of collaborative teamwork took into account the amount and resources available to workers, mainly in terms of supporting relations and quality, reciprocal trust, and knowledge sharing. Workload pressure considered pace and intensity of work (difficult objectives and involvement in different activities), meeting stringent deadlines, and responsibilities towards clients and users. Finally, the perceived intensity of involvement in decision-making was measured, basically, through the level of development of interpersonal relations and the participation in the mission and decision making.

Immaterial satisfaction took into account as the variety and creativity of work as the level of personal fulfillment and growth achieved by the worker.

Finally, we measured organizational performance on the basis of directors' self-reports concerning whether the organization had improved service quality and introduced technological and organizational innovations over a three year period.

Methodology

Given the objective of this study, we started by carrying out a descriptive analysis of the observed variables in terms of their position measures and used exploratory analysis techniques to evaluate their covariance matrix. We then used confirmatory factor analysis to

examine the dimensional structure of the theoretical constructs involved in our hypothesis (Bagozzi, 1980, 2010; Fornell & Larcker, 1981; McDonald, 1985).

In order to test our working hypothesis, we evaluated the results of a multilevel model. This methodology is indicated when there are participants that are organized at more than one level. In the database we had workers (first level) in different organizations (second level). The multilevel model was based on two sets of equations that specify the worker-level and organization-level effects on organizational performance (Preacher, Zypher & Zhang, 2010).

At the worker or within level, we are interested in to analyze the relation between HRM practices and immaterial satisfaction [1]:

$$S_{ij} = \alpha_{1j} + \beta_{1j}HRM_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad [1]$$

the immaterial satisfaction of the i_{th} worker in the j_{th} organization, S_{ij} , is determined by the HRM processes (HRM_{ij}). The coefficients of the model are represented by the intercept (α) and the slopes (β), being the slopes interpreted like the direct effects of the model in the within level.

On the organization or between level, we were able to model the slopes (β) to vary according to the main characteristics of the organization [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &= \alpha + \beta_1 HRM_j + \mu_j \\ P_j &= \alpha + \beta_2 S_j + \beta_3 HRM_j + \omega_j \end{aligned} \quad [2]$$

Equation [2] is also a regression model, being S_j the immaterial satisfaction, HRM_j the HRM practices, P_j the organizational performance of the j_{th} organization. These expressions [2] suggested that the slopes of the model varied from organization to organization, and the changes could be explained by certain characteristics, like HRM practices or immaterial satisfaction. The coefficients of the model are represented by the intercept (α) and the slopes (β), being the slopes interpreted like the direct effects of the model in the between level.

The estimation method was Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR), obtained by using the TYPE=GENERAL TWOLEVEL option (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). MLR estimator is based on maximum likelihood parameter estimates with standard errors that are robust to non-normality (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012). This statistical approach enabled us to obtain, test and estimate measurement and/or structural models based on robust statistics with multivariate non-normality and non-independence of observations (Bentler, 2006; Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012; Satorra & Bentler, 1994; Satorra & Bentler, 2001). At the same time, in order to evaluate the global fit of these models, we present different goodness of fit statistics and indices. To be specific, as well as robust statistic χ^2 , we used the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) (Bollen, 1998; Browne et al, 1993; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). This study made use of the MPLUS 7.4 and Stata 14.0 software.

RESULTS

The descriptive statistics are a first approximation to our database. Annex I shows the descriptive statistics related to the indicators specified in the previous section. From the point of view of HRM practices, we find entities that have developed a high degree of task autonomy [4.25-4.70], team work [5.49-5.85] and workload pressure [4.32-5.17]. The lowest value can be observed in relation to involvement [2.88-3.27]. These organizations reach important level of immaterial satisfaction [4.64-5.20] and performance [3.78-4.31]. In any case, we observe high standard deviations that justified the use of robust estimators.

Annex I also presents the correlations matrix between the different indicators. The table shows how the 6 indicators are strongly related among each other. For this reason, we conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) separately on all the six latent dimensions to provide evidence of convergent validity of our measures.

Table 2 presents the results of the estimated CFA model. The statistics show a reasonable fit ($\chi^2[13] = 1,831.76$, RMSEA = 0.039, SRMR = 0.047 and CFI = 0.901). Internal consistency given by reliability analysis is reasonable (Cronbach's alpha > 0.7; CRC > 0.7 and AVE > 0.5) for all the dimensions and this also points at a *prima-facie* confirmation of construct-identification validity.

Table 2. Measurement model

Latent Dimension	Indicators	Factor Loading	Cronbach's Alfa	CRC	AVE	Goodness-of -fit
Task autonomy (TA)	Autonomy in organizing job tasks	0.727***	0.770	0.709	0.503	$\chi^2_{(432)}:1,831.76$ RMSEA:0.039 CFI: 0.901 SRMR: 0.047
	Autonomy in relations with clients and users	0.710***				
	Autonomy in problem-solving	0.691***				
Collaborative teamwork (CT)	Cooperation	0.698***	0.800	0.702	0.500	
	Support by the management	0.562***				
	The quality of results	0.554***				
	Widespread feelings of trust and respect	0.870***				
	Sharing of knowledge and experience	0.810***				
Workload pressure (WP)	Involvement in different activities	0.658***	0.720	0.703	0.500	
	High responsibilities	0.664***				
	Reaching difficult objectives	0.802***				
	Working at a fast pace	0.687***				
Involvement (I)	Development of interpersonal relations	0.518***	0.770	0.739	0.546	
	Involvement in the mission	0.869***				
	Involvement in decision making	0.830***				
Satisfaction (S)	Variety and creativity of work	0.569***	0.770	0.655	0.428	
	Personal fulfilment	0.650***				
	Personal growth	0.685***				
	On-the-job autonomy	0.714***				
Performance (P)	Service quality	0.927***	0.770	0.884	0.781	
	Service innovation	0.903***				
	Technological Innovation	0.856***				
	Organizational innovation	0.850***				

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Moreover, the analysed structure offers sufficient evidence discriminant validity due to the factor loadings exceed the correlations observed between the dimensions on the validity of multidimensional constructs (Bagozzi 1980; 1982a, 1982b, 1984).

Once we tested the measurement model, we tested our working hypotheses. Table 3 shows the results of the multilevel model for each HRM practice.

Table 3. Results of multilevel model

Model	Est.	R ²	Goodness-of-fit
Task autonomy			
Workers level			
Task Autonomy → Satisfaction	0.226***	0.051	
Organizational level			
Task Autonomy → Satisfaction	-0.126	0.004	$\chi^2_{(54)}:213.75$ RMSEA:0.033 CFI: 0.956 SRMR: 0.036
Satisfaction → Performance	0.055	0.018	
Task Autonomy → Performance	0.065		
Indirect	0.003		
Total	-0.091		
Collaborative teamwork			
Workers level			
Collaborative teamwork → Satisfaction	0.377***	0.142	
Organizational level			
Collaborative teamwork → Satisfaction	0.383**	0.147	$\chi^2_{(88)}:314.662$ RMSEA:0.034 CFI: 0.948 SRMR: 0.035
Satisfaction → Performance	0.054	0.008	
Collaborative teamwork → Performance	0.055		
Indirect	0.036		
Total	0.130		
Workload pressure			
Workers level			
Workload pressure → Satisfaction	-0.033	0.001	
Organizational level			
Workload pressure → Satisfaction	-0.337***	0.113	$\chi^2_{(88)}:355.85$ RMSEA:0.033 CFI: 0.939 SRMR: 0.032
Satisfaction → Performance	0.170*	0.096	
Workload pressure → Performance	0.322***		
Indirect	-0.243		
Total	0.265***		
Involvement			
Workers level			
Involvement → Satisfaction	0.335***	0.112	
Organizational level			
Involvement → Satisfaction	0.154	0.024	$\chi^2_{(54)}:157.55$ RMSEA:0.026 CFI: 0.975 SRMR: 0.032
Satisfaction → Performance	0.014	0.048	
Involvement → Performance	0.217**		
Indirect	0.004		
Total	0.384**		

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Our models consider the relationship between HRM practices and satisfaction at the within level. As we can observe, the models show a strong positive impact of these practices on satisfaction [Task Autonomy → Satisfaction: 0.226; Collaborative teamwork → Satisfaction: 0.377; Involvement → Satisfaction: 0.335]. If compared with autonomy, job features that show a high degree of relationality such as teamwork and involvement have the golden share in influencing satisfaction. However, there is no relationship between a specific HRM

practice, workload pressure, and immaterial satisfaction [Workload pressure \rightarrow Satisfaction: -0.033]. So, if an organization wants to improve the satisfaction between workers, it should not design practices related to workload pressure. In any case, we cannot reject H1 due to HRM practices that support collaborative work, worker involvement and autonomy positively influence immaterial satisfaction.

When we analyze the between level, we can observe the relationship between HRM practices at organizational level and the firm performance, taking into account the mediator role of immaterial satisfaction. Table 3 shows the total effects. These effects are the sum of direct and indirect effects. Direct effects directly flow from HRM practices to performance and indirect effects can be thought as the product of the impacts of HRM practices on satisfaction and of satisfaction on performance.

The overall relation between task autonomy and performance is not significant [Total: -0.091] due to direct and indirect effects are close to zero. This result points at a possible detrimental role of autonomy with respect to knowledge exchange and learning from peers, diffusion of information, diverging objectives and coordination of activities. This result may be also connected with the specific governance structure of social cooperatives, where most workers are members and may enjoy a high degree of discretion in task accomplishment.

Collaborative teamwork shows a positive, but negligible and insignificant impact on performance [Total: 0.130], while the impact of involvement is positive and statistically significant [Total: 0.384]. So, the primary function of teamwork appears more relevant in increasing worker wellbeing and in empowering worker skills than in fostering firm performance directly [Collaborative teamwork \rightarrow Satisfaction: 0.383]. The result related to involvement would imply that involvement processes significantly influence product quality and innovation only when they improve satisfaction [Involvement \rightarrow Performance: 0.217].

Workload pressure shows a positive and large significant impact on organizational performance [Total: 0.265]. This does not contradict the importance of job demands coming from the organization in determining performance. The direct impact of workload on performance [Direct: 0.322], however, is partially compensated for the one of satisfaction [Indirect: -0.243],

Finally, it is possible to evidence an impact of immaterial satisfaction on performance in the case of workload pressure [Direct: 0.170]. As consequence, a higher level of immaterial satisfaction limited by an policy of worked pressure will promote a higher performance. However, there is no relationship between task autonomy, collaborative teamwork or

involvement [Direct: 0.014-0.055]. This result can be caused by the influence of some characteristics of the organization. In this sense, aspects like region, legal form or size could determine the role of satisfaction on performance and introduce a moderator element in the proposed model.

Table 4 show the conclusions in terms of our working hypothesis.

Table 4. Results in terms of working hypothesis

H	Hypothesis	Expected sign	Result
H_1	HRM practices positively influence immaterial satisfaction.	+	Non-reject
H_2	Satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance	+	Non-reject
H_{2a}	Task autonomy positively impacts on firm performance	+	Reject
H_{2b}	Teamwork has a positive impact on firm performance	+	Reject
H_{2c}	Worker involvement has a positive impact on firm performance	+	Non-reject
H_{2d}	Workload pressure has a positive impact on firm performance	+	Non-reject

As we can observe, HRM practices influence immaterial satisfaction and satisfaction positively impacts on firm performance; but the impact of HRM practices is not the same. In this sense, worker involvement and workload pressure have a positive impact on firm performance; but task autonomy or collaborative teamwork do not have impact on organizational performance. However, this result could be influenced by the environment and characteristics of the organization.

CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this paper was to analyze the mediating role of immaterial satisfaction between HR dimensions and performance. In the light of our results, there is a positive relationship between HRM practices and immaterial satisfaction and between satisfaction and firm performance. In line with existing research (Ostroff, 1992), we show that satisfaction with intrinsic aspects of the job is relevant in improving performance. These results are highly coherent with the ones by Messersmith et al. (2011: 1107), who measure the mediating effects of workers' attitudes and behaviors in the HRM practices-performance nexus by using structural equation modeling. However, our contribution differs from theirs in terms of practices considered, sector of the economy (nonprofit vs public sector) and measures used (self-reported vs administrative). Moreover, our results show that the role of different HRM practices is not the same. In this sense, worker involvement and workload pressure have a positive impact on firm performance; but task autonomy or collaborative teamwork do not have impact on organizational performance.

The obtained results have important implications. First, we identify specific domains, like cooperatives, on which action can be taken in order to improve, at the same time, workers satisfaction and the quality of services that users receive. Second, we theorize that the relationship between substantive practices (defined by workers' involvement, quality of teamwork, task autonomy, workload) is mediated by immaterial elements of satisfaction. Eventually, we show that the dimensions of individual satisfaction that are most conducive to improved service quality at the organizational level are the immaterial ones, connected with creativity, fulfillment and involvement.

There are some limitations in our study. The measurement of organizational performance is based on the service quality. It would be interesting to take into account financial or accounting criteria that could complement the measurement of organizational performance. Methodologically, we are not able to establish causation because we do not carry out fully controlled and randomized experiments, and the cross-section design of our study does not allow to single out unobservable fixed effects, possible endogeneity problems and time dynamics. Finally, we have been dealing with one sector only (social services), and one organizational form (the not-for-profit social cooperative). Future research may improve this limitations and envisage a more in-depth study of the interaction between workers' and users' wellbeing.

REFERENCES

- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization, *J. of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 357-376.
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *The Academy of Management J.*, 39, 1154-1184.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Kalleberg, A.L. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage. Why high performance work systems pay-off.* Ithaca, MA: Cornell University Press.
- Arthur, J.B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *The Academy of Management J.*, 37, 670-687.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22, 187-200.

- Bagozzi, R. P. 1980. *Causal Models in Marketing (Theories in Marketing Series)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bagozzi, R. P. 1982a. "An examination of the validity of two models of attitude." In *A second generation of multivariate analysis, Vol. 2: Measurement and Evaluation*, edited by C. Fornell. New York: Praeger Publishers: 145-184.
- Bagozzi, R. P. 1982b. "The role of measurement in theory construction and hypothesis testing: toward a holistic model." In *A second generation of multivariate analysis, Vol. 2: Measurement and Evaluation*, edited by C. Fornell. New York: Praeger Publishers: 5-23.
- Bagozzi, R. P. 1984. "A prospectus for theory construction in marketing." *Journal of Marketing* 48 (1): 11-29.
- Bagozzi, R. P. (2010). Structural equation models are modelling tools with many ambiguities: Comments acknowledging the need for caution and humility in their use. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 20(2), 208-214.
- Bentler, P. M. (2006). EQS 6.1 [Computer software]. Encino, CA: Multivariate Software.
- Bharadwaj, A., Bharadwaj, S., & Konsynski, B. (1999). Information technology effects on firm performance as measured by Tobin's q. *Management Science*, 45,1008–1024.
- Biron, M., & Bamberger, P. (2010). The impact of structural empowerment on individual well-being and performance: Taking agent preferences, self-efficacy and operational constraints into account. *Human Relations*, 63, 163-191.
- Böckerman, P., & Ilmakunnas, P. (2012). The job-satisfaction-productivity nexus: A study using matched survey and register data. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 65, 244-262.
- Bollen, K. A. 1989. *Structural equation models with Latent variables*. John Wiley and Sons Online Library.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. *Sage focus editions*, 154, 136-136.
- Castanheira, F. & Chambel, M. J. (2010). Reducing burnout in call-centers through HR practices. *Human Resource Management*, 49, 1047 – 1065.

- Combs, J., Yongmei, L., Hall, A., & Ketchen, D. (2006). How much do high-performance work practices matter? A meta-analysis of their effects on organizational performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 501-528.
- Cox, A., Zagelmeyer, S., & Marchington, M. (2006). Embedding employee involvement and participation at work. *Human Resource Management J.*, 16, 250–267.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Dewey, J. (1917). *Creative intelligence: essays in the pragmatic attitude*. Reproduced in D. Sidorsky, (Ed.) (1977). John Dewey. New York, N.Y.: Harper.
- Dewey, J. (1922). Human nature and conduct. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.) *The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, Vol. 14, 1984. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Dewey, J. (1927). The Public and its problems. In L.A. Hickman and & T.M. Alexander 1998. *The Essential Dewey*, Vol. 1: 293-307. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1930). Individualism old and new. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.) *The Later Works, 1925-1953*, Vol. 5, 1984. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Diamantidis, A. D., & Chatzoglou, P. D. (2011). Human resource involvement, job-related factors, and their relation with firm performance: experiences from Greece. *International J. of HRM*, 22, 1531-1553.
- Fesmire, S (2003). *John Dewey and moral imagination: Pragmatism in ethics*. Bloomington (IN) Indiana University Press.
- Ford, C. M. (1996). A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains. *Academy of Management R.*, 21, 1112-1142.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics. *Journal of marketing research*, 382-388.
- Gioia, D.A., & Poole, P.P. (1984). Scripts in organizational behavior. *Academy of Management R.*, 9, 449-459.

- Guest, D.E. (2002). Human resource management, corporate performance and employee wellbeing: Building the worker into HRM. *The J. of Industrial Relations*, 44, 335-358.
- Guest, D.E. (2011). Human resource management and performance: Still searching for some answers. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21, 3-13.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *Autonomy and solidarity* (Dews, P., Ed.). London, UK: Verso.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hodson, R. (2002). Worker participation and teams: New evidence from analyzing organizational ethnographies. *Economic & Industrial Democracy*, 23, 491-528.
- Holland, P., Pyman, A., Cooper, B. K., & Teicher, J. (2011). Employee voice and job satisfaction in Australia: The centrality of direct voice. *Human Resource Management*, 50, 95-111.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal*, 6(1), 1-55.
- ISTAT (2003). *Rapporto sulle cooperative sociali*. Rome: Istituto Nazionale di Statistica.
- Joas, H. (1996). *The creativity of action*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jöreskog, K. G., & D. Sörbom. 1996. *LISREL 8: User's reference guide: Scientific Software International*.
- Kaya, N., Koc, E., & Topcu, D. (2010). An exploratory analysis of the influence of human resource management activities and organizational climate on job satisfaction in Turkish banks. *International J. of HRM*, 21, 2031-2051.
- Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. (2010). The impact of high performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 39, 366-391.
- Langfred, C. W. (2004). Too much of a good thing? Negative effects of high trust and individual autonomy in self-managing teams. *Academy of Management J.*, 47, 3, 385-399.
- Lawler, E.E. (1986). *High involvement management*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

- Lee, F.H., Lee, T.Z., & Wu, W.Y. (2010). The relationship between human resource management practices, business strategy and firm performance: evidence from steel industry in Taiwan. *International J. of HRM*, 21, 1351–1372.
- Li, X., Frenkel, S., & Sanders, K. (2011). How do perceptions of the HRM system affect employee attitudes? A multi-level study of Chinese employees. *International J. of HRM*, 22, 1823-1840.
- MacDonald, K. I. 1981. "On the formulation of a structural model of the mobility table." *Social Forces*: 557-571.
- McMahan, G.C., Bell, M.P., & Virick, M. (1998). Strategic human resource management: Employee involvement, diversity and international issues. *Human Resource Management R.*, 8, 193-214.
- Messersmith, J.K., Lepak, D.P., Patel, P.C., & Gould-Williams, J.S. (2011), Unlocking the black box: Exploring the link between high-performance work systems and performance. *J. of Applied Psychology*, 96, 1105-1118.
- Montes, F. J. L., Moreno, A.R., & Morales, V.G. (2005). Influence of support leadership and teamwork cohesion on organizational learning, innovation and performance: an empirical examination. *Technovation*, 25, 1159-1172.
- Mukherjee, A., & Malhotra, N. (2006). Does role clarity explain employee-perceived service quality? A study of antecedents and consequences in call centres. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 17, 444- 473.
- Muthén, L. K., and B. O. Muthén. (1998-2013). *Mplus User's Guide*. Seventh Edition. Los Angeles: CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Ostroff, C. (1992), The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis. *J. of Applied Psychology*, 77, 963-974.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *J. of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879–903.
- Preacher, K. J., Zypher, M. J., & Zhang, Z. (2010). A general multilevel SEM framework for assessing multilevel mediation. *Psychological Methods*, 15, 209-233.

- Richardson, M., Danford, A., Stewart, P., & Pulignano, V. (2010). Employee participation and involvement: Experiences of aerospace and automobile workers in the UK and Italy. *European J. of Industrial Relations*, 16, 21-37.
- Robinson, S. E., Roth, S. L., & Brown, L.L. (1993). Morale and job satisfaction among nurses: What can hospitals do? *J. of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 244-251.
- Satorra, A. B., & Bentler, P. M. (1994). Corrections to test statistics and standard errors in covariance structure analysis. *Latent variables analysis: Applications for developmental research*, 399-419.
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika*, 66(4), 507-514.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *J. of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 893-917.
- Sprigg, C. A., Jackson, P. R., & Parker, S. K. (2000). Production teamworking: The importance of interdependence and autonomy for employee strain and satisfaction. *Human Relations*, 53, 1519-1543.
- Takeuchi, R., Chen, G., & Lepak, D.P. (2009). Through the looking glass of a social system. Cross-level effects of high performance work systems on employees' attitudes. *Personnel Psychology*, 62, 1-29.
- Takeuchi, R., Lepak, D. P., Wang, H., & Takeuchi, K. (2007). An empirical examination of the mechanisms mediating between highperformance work systems and the performance of Japanese organizations. *J. of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1069-1083.
- Wood, S. J. & Wall, T. D. (2007). Work enrichment and employee voice in human resource management-performance studies. *International J. of HRM*, 18, 1335-1372.
- Zatzick, C. D., & Iverson, R. D. (2011). Putting employee involvement in context: a cross-level model examining job satisfaction and absenteeism in high-involvement work systems. *International Journal of HRM*, 22, 3462-3476.

Annex I. Descriptive statistics and correlation Matrix

		Mean	Std.Dev	Task	Users	P. Solv	Coop	Support	Quality	Trust	KShar	Involv	Respon	Diffic	WPace	Relation	Mission	Mission	PersDev	Auton	SelfFul	Creativ	ProdQual	InnoServ	InnoServ	
AT	Task	4.70	1.96																							
	Users	4.68	1.88	0.53																						
	P. Solv	4.25	1.95	0.52	0.51																					
TW	Coop	5.49	1.56	0.12	0.09	0.03																				
	Support	5.72	1.48	0.13	0.12	0.05	0.36																			
	Quality	5.85	1.46	0.14	0.09	0.05	0.39	0.42																		
	Trust	5.55	1.43	0.20	0.13	0.08	0.55	0.38	0.40																	
	KShar.	5.61	1.40	0.18	0.14	0.06	0.56	0.43	0.43	0.68																
WP	Involv	4.92	1.90	0.09	0.04	0.03	0.16	0.17	0.21	0.17	0.19															
	Respon	5.17	2.04	-0.01	0.00	-0.06	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.40														
	Diffic	4.32	1.85	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.02	0.33	0.45													
	WPace	4.62	1.80	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.39	0.28	0.45												
I	Relation	3.27	1.09	0.17	0.09	0.09	0.22	0.30	0.21	0.29	0.27	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.02											
	Mission	3.13	1.24	0.19	0.05	0.11	0.12	0.21	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.45										
	Decision	2.88	1.26	0.21	0.09	0.13	0.12	0.22	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.41	0.74									
S	PersDev	5.20	1.67	0.21	0.14	0.12	0.24	0.32	0.26	0.28	0.30	0.10	0.08	0.03	0.02	0.37	0.37	0.36								
	Auton	4.92	1.49	0.46	0.32	0.31	0.22	0.26	0.22	0.31	0.30	0.12	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.30	0.28	0.30	0.51							
	SelfFul	4.64	1.59	0.23	0.13	0.13	0.25	0.33	0.25	0.29	0.31	0.16	0.11	0.06	0.07	0.31	0.29	0.29	0.54	0.52						
	Creativ	5.07	1.48	0.23	0.12	0.11	0.25	0.27	0.25	0.32	0.32	0.25	0.18	0.16	0.10	0.27	0.25	0.25	0.37	0.37	0.44					
P	ProdQual	4.31	0.75	-0.04	-0.04	-0.05	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.07	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00				
	InnoServ	4.23	0.73	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.07	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.03	0.07	0.06	0.51			
	InnoTech	3.98	0.80	-0.04	-0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.12	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.06	0.33	0.50		
	InnOrg	3.78	0.80	-0.04	-0.06	-0.03	-0.04	0.02	-0.08	-0.02	-0.02	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.08	0.06	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.41	0.44	0.54	

Source: Authors' calculations on SISC 2007 (Survey on Italian Social Cooperatives 2006)

DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO

Facultad de Economía y Empresa

Universidad de Zaragoza

Depósito Legal Z-1411-2010. ISSN 2171-6668

2002-01: “Evolution of Spanish Urban Structure During the Twentieth Century”. Luis Lanaspá, Fernando Pueyo y Fernando Sanz. Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza.

2002-02: “Una Nueva Perspectiva en la Medición del Capital Humano”. Gregorio Giménez y Blanca Simón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2002-03: “A Practical Evaluation of Employee Productivity Using a Professional Data Base”. Raquel Ortega. Department of Business, University of Zaragoza.

2002-04: “La Información Financiera de las Entidades No Lucrativas: Una Perspectiva Internacional”. Isabel Brusca y Caridad Martí. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2003-01: “Las Opciones Reales y su Influencia en la Valoración de Empresas”. Manuel Espitia y Gema Pastor. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2003-02: “The Valuation of Earnings Components by the Capital Markets. An International Comparison”. Susana Callao, Beatriz Cuellar, José Ignacio Jarne and José Antonio Laínez. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-03: “Selection of the Informative Base in ARMA-GARCH Models”. Laura Muñoz, Pilar Olave and Manuel Salvador. Department of Statistics Methods, University of Zaragoza.

2003-04: “Structural Change and Productive Blocks in the Spanish Economy: An Input-Output Analysis for 1980-1994”. Julio Sánchez Chóliz and Rosa Duarte. Department of Economic Analysis, University of Zaragoza.

2003-05: “Automatic Monitoring and Intervention in Linear Gaussian State-Space Models: A Bayesian Approach”. Manuel Salvador and Pilar Gargallo. Department of Statistics Methods, University of Zaragoza.

2003-06: “An Application of the Data Envelopment Analysis Methodology in the Performance Assessment of the Zaragoza University Departments”. Emilio Martín. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-07: “Harmonisation at the European Union: a difficult but needed task”. Ana Yetano Sánchez. Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Zaragoza.

2003-08: “The investment activity of spanish firms with tangible and intangible assets”. Manuel Espitia and Gema Pastor. Department of Business, University of Zaragoza.

2004-01: “Persistencia en la performance de los fondos de inversión españoles de renta variable nacional (1994-2002)”. Luis Ferruz y María S. Vargas. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-02: “Calidad institucional y factores político-culturales: un panorama internacional por niveles de renta”. José Aixalá, Gema Fabro y Blanca Simón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-03: “La utilización de las nuevas tecnologías en la contratación pública”. José M^a Gimeno Feliú. Departamento de Derecho Público, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-04: “Valoración económica y financiera de los trasvases previstos en el Plan Hidrológico Nacional español”. Pedro Arrojo Agudo. Departamento de Análisis Económico, Universidad de Zaragoza. Laura Sánchez Gallardo. Fundación Nueva Cultura del Agua.

2004-05: “Impacto de las tecnologías de la información en la productividad de las empresas españolas”. Carmen Galve Gorriz y Ana Gargallo Castel. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2004-06: “National and International Income Dispersion and Aggregate Expenditures”. Carmen Fillat. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History, University of Zaragoza. Joseph Francois. Tinbergen Institute Rotterdam and Center for Economic Policy Research-CEPR.

2004-07: “Targeted Advertising with Vertically Differentiated Products”. Lola Esteban and José M. Hernández. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2004-08: “Returns to education and to experience within the EU: are there differences between wage earners and the self-employed?”. Inmaculada García Mainar. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza. Víctor M. Montuenga Gómez. Department of Business. University of La Rioja

2005-01: “E-government and the transformation of public administrations in EU countries: Beyond NPM or just a second wave of reforms?”. Lourdes Torres, Vicente Pina and Sonia Royo. Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Zaragoza

2005-02: “Externalidades tecnológicas internacionales y productividad de la manufactura: un análisis sectorial”. Carmen López Pueyo, Jaime Sanau y Sara Barcenilla. Departamento de Economía Aplicada. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2005-03: “Detecting Determinism Using Recurrence Quantification Analysis: Three Test Procedures”. María Teresa Aparicio, Eduardo Fernández Pozo and Dulce Saura. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-04: “Evaluating Organizational Design Through Efficiency Values: An Application To The Spanish First Division Soccer Teams”. Manuel Espitia Escuer and Lucía Isabel García Cebrián. Department of Business. University of Zaragoza.

2005-05: “From Locational Fundamentals to Increasing Returns: The Spatial Concentration of Population in Spain, 1787-2000”. María Isabel Ayuda. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza. Fernando Collantes and Vicente Pinilla. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History. University of Zaragoza.

2005-06: “Model selection strategies in a spatial context”. Jesús Mur and Ana Angulo. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-07: “Conciertos educativos y selección académica y social del alumnado”. María Jesús Mancebón Torrubia. Departamento de Estructura e Historia Económica y Economía Pública. Universidad de Zaragoza. Domingo Pérez Ximénez de Embún. Departamento de Análisis Económico. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2005-08: “Product differentiation in a mixed duopoly”. Agustín Gil. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-09: “Migration dynamics, growth and convergence”. Gemma Larramona and Marcos Sanso. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2005-10: “Endogenous longevity, biological deterioration and economic growth”. Marcos Sanso and Rosa María Aísa. Department of Economic Analysis. University of Zaragoza.

2006-01: “Good or bad? - The influence of FDI on output growth. An industry-level analysis“. Carmen Fillat Castejón. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History. University of Zaragoza. Julia Woerz. The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies and Tinbergen Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

2006-02: “Performance and capital structure of privatized firms in the European Union”. Patricia Bachiller y M^a José Arcas. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

- 2006-03:** “Factors explaining the rating of Microfinance Institutions”. Begoña Gutiérrez Nieto and Carlos Serrano Cinca. Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Saragossa, Spain.
- 2006-04:** “Libertad económica y convergencia en argentina: 1875-2000”. Isabel Sanz Villarroya. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública. Universidad de Zaragoza. Leandro Prados de la Escosura. Departamento de Hª e Instituciones Ec. Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.
- 2006-05:** “How Satisfied are Spouses with their Leisure Time? Evidence from Europe*”. Inmaculada García, José Alberto Molina y María Navarro. University of Zaragoza.
- 2006-06:** “Una estimación macroeconómica de los determinantes salariales en España (1980-2000)”. José Aixalá Pastó y Carmen Pelet Redón. Departamento de Estructura, Historia Económica y Economía Pública. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2006-07:** “Causes of World Trade Growth in Agricultural and Food Products, 1951 – 2000”. Raúl Serrano and Vicente Pinilla. Department of Applied Economics and Economic History, University of Zaragoza, Gran Via 4, 50005 Zaragoza (Spain).
- 2006-08:** “Prioritisation of patients on waiting lists: a community workshop approach”. Angelina Lázaro Alquézar. Facultad de Derecho, Facultad de Económicas. University of Zaragoza. Zaragoza, Spain. Begoña Álvarez-Farizo. C.I.T.A.- Unidad de Economía. Zaragoza, Spain
- 2007-01:** “Determinantes del comportamiento variado del consumidor en el escenario de Compra”. Carmén Berné Manero y Noemí Martínez Carballo. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2007-02:** “Alternative measures for trade restrictiveness. A gravity approach”. Carmen Fillat & Eva Pardos. University of Zaragoza.
- 2007-03:** “Entrepreneurship, Management Services and Economic Growth”. Vicente Salas Fumás & J. Javier Sánchez Asín. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. University of Zaragoza.
- 2007-04:** “Equality versus Equity based pay systems and their effects on rational altruism motivation in teams: Wicked masked altruism”. Javier García Bernal & Marisa Ramírez Alerón. University of Zaragoza.
- 2007-05:** “Macroeconomic outcomes and the relative position of Argentina’s Economy: 1875-2000”. Isabel Sanz Villarroya. University of Zaragoza.
- 2008-01:** “Vertical product differentiation with subcontracting”. Joaquín Andaluz Funcia. University of Zaragoza.

- 2008-02:** “The motherwood wage penalty in a mediterranean country: The case of Spain” Jose Alberto Molina Chueca & Victor Manuel Montuenga Gómez. University of Zaragoza.
- 2008-03:** “Factors influencing e-disclosure in local public administrations”. Carlos Serrano Cinca, Mar Rueda Tomás & Pilar Portillo Tarragona. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2008-04:** “La evaluación de la producción científica: hacia un factor de impacto neutral”. José María Gómez-Sancho y María Jesús Mancebón-Torrubia. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2008-05:** “The single monetary policy and domestic macro-fundamentals: Evidence from Spain“. Michael G. Arghyrou, Cardiff Business School and Maria Dolores Gadea, University of Zaragoza.
- 2008-06:** “Trade through fdi: investing in services“. Carmen Fillat-Castejón, University of Zaragoza, Spain; Joseph F. Francois. University of Linz, Austria; and CEPR, London & Julia Woerz, The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies, Austria.
- 2008-07:** “Teoría de crecimiento semi-endógeno vs Teoría de crecimiento completamente endógeno: una valoración sectorial”. Sara Barcenilla Visús, Carmen López Pueyo, Jaime Sanaú. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2008-08:** “Beating fiscal dominance. The case of Spain, 1874-1998”. M. D. Gadea, M. Sabaté & R. Escario. University of Zaragoza.
- 2009-01:** “Detecting Intentional Herding: What lies beneath intraday data in the Spanish stock market” Blasco, Natividad, Ferreruella, Sandra (Department of Accounting and Finance. University of Zaragoza. Spain); Corredor, Pilar (Department of Business Administration. Public University of Navarre, Spain).
- 2009-02:** “What is driving the increasing presence of citizen participation initiatives?”. Ana Yetano, Sonia Royo & Basilio Acerete. Departamento de Contabilidad y Finanzas. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2009-03:** “Estilos de vida y “reflexividad” en el estudio del consumo: algunas propuestas”. Pablo García Ruiz. Departamento de Psicología y Sociología. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2009-04:** “Sources of Productivity Growth and Convergence in ICT Industries: An Intertemporal Non-parametric Frontier Approach”. Carmen López-Pueyo and M^a Jesús Mancebón Torrubia. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2009-05: “Análisis de los efectos medioambientales en una economía regional: una aplicación para la economía aragonesa”. Mónica Flores García y Alfredo J. Mainar Causapé. Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2009-06: “The relationship between trade openness and public expenditure. The Spanish case, 1960-2000”. M^a Dolores Gadea, Marcela Sabate y Estela Saenz. Department of Applied Economics. School of Economics. University of Economics.

2009-07: “Government solvency or just pseudo-sustainability? A long-run multicointegration approach for Spain”. Regina Escario, María Dolores Gadea, Marcela Sabaté. Applied Economics Department. University of Zaragoza.

2010-01: “Una nueva aproximación a la medición de la producción científica en revistas JCR y su aplicación a las universidades públicas españolas”. José María Gómez-Sancho, María Jesús Mancebón Torrubia. Universidad de Zaragoza

2010-02: “Unemployment and Time Use: Evidence from the Spanish Time Use Survey”. José Ignacio Gimenez-Nadal, University of Zaragoza, José Alberto Molina, University of Zaragoza and IZA, Raquel Ortega, University of Zaragoza.

2011-01: “Universidad y Desarrollo sostenible. Análisis de la rendición de cuentas de las universidades del G9 desde un enfoque de responsabilidad social”. Dr. José Mariano Moneva y Dr. Emilio Martín Vallespín, Universidad de Zaragoza.

2011-02: “Análisis Municipal de los Determinantes de la Deforestación en Bolivia.” Javier Aliaga Lordeman, Horacio Villegas Quino, Daniel Leguía (Instituto de Investigaciones Socio-Económicas. Universidad Católica Boliviana), y Jesús Mur (Departamento de Análisis Económico. Universidad de Zaragoza)

2011-03: “Imitations, economic activity and welfare”. Gregorio Giménez. Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2012-01: “Selection Criteria for Overlapping Binary Models”. M. T Aparicio and I. Villanúa. Department of Economic Analysis, Faculty of Economics, University of Zaragoza

2012-02: “Sociedad cooperativa y socio cooperativo: propuesta de sus funciones objetivo”. Carmen Marcuello y Pablo Nachar-Calderón. Universidad de Zaragoza

2012-03: “Is there an environmental Kuznets curve for water use? A panel smooth transition regression approach”. Rosa Duarte (Department of Economic Analysis), Vicente Pinilla (Department of Applied Economics and Economic History) and Ana Serrano (Department of Economic Analysis). Faculty of Economics and Business Studies, Universidad de Zaragoza

- 2012-04:** “Análisis Coste-Beneficio de la introducción de dispositivos ahorradores de agua. Estudio de un caso en el sector hotelero”. Barberán Ramón, Egea Pilar, Gracia-de-Rentería Pilar y Manuel Salvador. Facultad de Economía y Empresa. Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2013-01:** “The efficiency of Spanish mutual funds companies: A slacks – based measure approach”. Carlos Sánchez González, José Luis Sarto and Luis Vicente. Department of Accounting and Finance. Faculty of Economics and Business Studies, University of Zaragoza.
- 2013-02:** “New directions of trade for the agri-food industry: a disaggregated approach for different income countries, 1963-2000”. Raúl Serrano (Department of Business Administration) and Vicente Pinilla (Department of Applied Economics and Economic History). Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2013-03:** “Socio-demographic determinants of planning suicide and marijuana use among youths: are these patterns of behavior causally related?”. Rosa Duarte, José Julián Escario and José Alberto Molina. Department of Economic Analysis, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2014-01:** “Análisis del comportamiento imitador intradía en el mercado de valores español durante el periodo de crisis 2008-2009”. Alicia Marín Solano y Sandra Ferreruela Garcés. Facultad de Economía y Empresa, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2015-01:** “International diversification and performance in agri-food firms”. Raúl Serrano, Marta Fernández-Olmos and Vicente Pinilla. Facultad de Economía y Empresa, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2015-02:** “Estimating income elasticities of leisure activities using cross-sectional categorized data”. Jorge González Chapela. Centro Universitario de la Defensa de Zaragoza.
- 2015-03:** “Global water in a global world a long term study on agricultural virtual water flows in the world”. Rosa Duarte, Vicente Pinilla and Ana Serrano. Facultad de Economía y Empresa, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2015-04:** “Activismo local y parsimonia regional frente a la despoblación en Aragón: una explicación desde la economía política”. Luis Antonio Sáez Pérez, María Isabel Ayuda y Vicente Pinilla. Facultad de Economía y Empresa, Universidad de Zaragoza.
- 2015-05:** “What determines entrepreneurial failure: taking advantage of the institutional context”. Lucio Fuentelsaz, Consuelo González-Gil y Juan P. Maicas. University of Zaragoza.

2015-06: “Factores macroeconómicos que estimulan el emprendimiento. Un análisis para los países desarrollados y no desarrollados”. Beatriz Barrado y José Alberto Molina. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2015-07: “Emprendedores y asalariados en España: efectos de la situación financiera familiar y diferencias en salarios”. Jorge Velilla y José Alberto Molina. Universidad de Zaragoza.

2016-01: “Time spent on cultural activities at home in Spain: Differences between wage-earners and the self-employed”. José Alberto Molina, Juan Carlos Campaña and Raquel Ortega. University of Zaragoza.

2016-02: “Human resource management practices and organizational performance. The mediator role of immaterial satisfaction in Italian Social Cooperatives”. Silvia Sacchetti (University of Stirling), Ermanno C. Tortia (University of Trento) and Francisco J. López Arceiz (University of Zaragoza).