ASSESSING EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION REGARDING e-HRM IN SERVICE ORGANISATIONS

Authors:

1. Anjali Gupta
Research scholar
Haryana School of Business
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology
Hisar (Haryana) 125001
Email: singhal.anjali1@gmail.com
M. no. 09896994597
Fax no. 01662-276240

2. Shabnam Saxena
Associate Professor
Haryana School of Business
Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology
Hisar (Haryana) 125001
Email: shabnamsaxena@gmail.com
M. no. 09215558777
Fax no. 01662-276240

ABSTRACT

Electronic human resource management (e-HRM) provides the information required to manage HR processes. These may be core employee database and payroll systems but can be extended to include such systems as e-recruitment, e-learning, performance management and reward system. The system may be web-based, enabling access to remote or online and at any time. This paper aims at finding out the perception level of employees regarding e-HRM in service organizations. For this purpose, 400 employees of IT and Banking organizations are targeted. Employees' responses have been collected through a structured questionnaire consisting of demographic variables and statements regarding perception. Factor analysis, ANOVA and t-test are applied for finding out the perception of employees.

ASSESSING EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION REGARDING e-HRM IN SERVICE ORGANISATIONS

INTRODUCTION

e-HRM is a way of implementing HR strategies, policies and practices in organisations through a conscious and directed support of and with the full use of web-technology based channels. The term e-HRM is used to describe technology's role in enabling the transformation of solely HR activity. Instead of a centralized personnel team handling everyday tasks such as approving pay rises, sorting out training and checking holiday entitlements, these can be handled by the employees themselves or their line manager. The adoption of e-HR seeks to minimize or eliminate intervention from HR staff, allowing managers and employees to perform HR tasks directly with the self service tools. These can contrast with the shared service enter environment, where the service would normally be expected to be delivered by a customer service operator or other category of HR staff.

Employees' perception is basically a combination of two words: employees and perception. Without employees an organisation does not exist. They are the real assets of an organisation. Without them any technology can't be applied to the organisations. Perception is basically the thinking about anything. So to introduce a new technology it is must to know about the employees' perception. As e-HRM is relatively a new term or new technology, that is why it is necessary to have employees' perception on it.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

As stated by Doughty (2000), today, within the HR software market there are a myriad of HR systems, payroll, training administration, 360 degree feedback, psychological testing and competency software tools operating in their own software features. Evidence suggests that most organisations fail to recognize that nearly all software on the market today is at the foundation level of e-HR. In the views of McMaham, Snell, Gerhart and Wright (2001), HR functions can become critical partners in driving success, but to do so requires HR changes its focus, its role and its delivery systems. e-HRM (electronic human resource management) refers to the

processing and transmission of digitized information used in HRM, including text, sound and visual images, from one computer to another electronic device. e-HRM has the potential to change all traditional human resource management functions. The human resource management function has changed dramatically over time evolving.

Walker (2001) states that if HR technology is to be considered successful, it must change the work performed by the Human Resources Personnel by dramatically improving their level of service, allowing more time for work of higher value and reducing their costs. Many systems have been implemented by cutting HR staff, outsourcing and imposing new technology. Globetronics Multimedia Technology Sdn. Bhd. (2003) stated that the leading solution for e-HRM is System Manager, HR Manager, Time Manager, Payroll Manager, and Report Manager. According to Prasad (2003), the concept of computerized HRIS is derived as an organized method of providing information about human resources, their functioning, external factors relevant to managing human resources. Large organisations generally install e-HR because it enables them to collect, store, process and manipulate large amount of data inputs, reduce costs of maintaining human resource data and provide accurate information about human resources anytime and anywhere.

In the view of Armstrong (2003), e-HR provides the information required to manage HR processes. These may be core employee database and payroll systems but can be extended to include such systems as recruitment, e-learning, performance management and reward. The system may be web-based, enabling access to remote or online and at any time. The information provided by the e-HR process can be communicated across organisations. Kettley and Reiley (2003) states that a computerized human resource information system consists of "a fully integrated, organisation wide-network of HR-related data, information, services, databases, tools and transactions. Technology has only recently developed in a way that enables e-HR to make its mark, especially the introduction of corporate intranets and web-enabled HRIS. The nature of the development path, however, varies considerably from organisation to organisation.

Foster, Hawking and Stein (2004) describe that the application of the internet to the Human Resource function (e-HR) combines two elements: one is the use of electronic media while the other is the active participation of employees in the process. These two elements drive the technology that helps organisations lower administration costs improve employee

communication and satisfaction, provide real-time access to information while at the same time reducing processing time. This technology holds out the promise of challenging the past role of HR as one of payroll processing and manual administrative process to one where cost efficiencies can be gained, enabling more time and energy to be devoted to strategic business issues.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The primary objective of this paper is to study the employee's perceptions towards e-HRM in service organizations.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study is an exploratory cum descriptive research. In order to achieve the aforesaid objectives, following research methodology is used in the study described in these sections:
  i) Sample and sample profile
  ii) Instruments for data collection
  iii) Tabulation and codification of data
  iv) Statistical analysis

SAMPLE

The sample included in the study is drawn from whole INDIA. The sample size of the research consisted of 400 employees of service organisations. These 400 employees are from IT and Banking sector and 25 employees are taken from each organisation. To study the employees' perception regarding e-HRM, demographic variables (organisation name, age, sector, experience, income, type of organisation and gender) are included in the study. Convenient Sampling Technique is adopted in order to choose the ultimate unit i.e. the respondents.

INSTRUMENTS FOR DATA COLLECTION

To achieve the objective taken up in the study, primary data is used. For primary data collection, structured questionnaire is developed consisting of 23 items.

SAMPLE PROFILE

Table-1- Distribution of employees sample on the basis of demographic variables.

Demographic Variables		Nos. of Respondents	Percent
Organisation Name	SAP Labs	25	6.3
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	6.3
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	6.3
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	6.3
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	6.3
	Wipro Ltd.	25	6.3
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	6.3
	IBM	25	6.3
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	6.3
	HDFC Bank	25	6.3
	AXIS Bank	25	6.3
	IndusInd Bank	25	6.3
	IDBI Bank	25	6.3
	SBI	25	6.3
	PNB	25	6.3
	Union Bank of India	25	6.3
	Total	400	100.0
Age (Years)	Below 25	117	29.3
	25-30	209	52.3
	31-35	53	13.3
	Above35	21	5.3
	Total	400	100.0
Sector	IT	200	50.0
	Banking	200	50.0
	Total	400	100.0
Experience (Years)	Below5	247	61.8
	5-10	120	30.0
	11-15	22	5.5
	Above15	11	2.8
	Total	400	100.0
Income (Lakhs)	Below2	50	12.5
	2-5	236	59.0
	6-8	80	20.0
	Above8	34	8.5
	Total	400	100.0
Area	Urban	318	79.5
	Rural	82	20.5
	Total	400	100.0
Type Of Organisation	MNC	175	43.8
	Domestic	25	6.3
	Public Bank	100	25.0
	Private Bank	100	25.0
	Total	400	100.0
Gender	Male	257	64.3
	Female	143	35.8
	Total	400	100.0

TABULATION AND CODIFICATION OF DATA

To achieve the objective of employees' perception regarding e-HRM in INDIA, a 5-point scale (strongly agree, agree, indifferent, disagree, strongly disagree) is used. A score of 1 for the response 'strongly disagree', 2 for 'disagree', 3 for 'indifferent', 4 for 'agree', 5 for 'strongly agree' is assigned. Initially factor analysis is applied to the raw data of employees' perception. Then for each factor a combined score is obtained. Finally ANOVA and t-test is applied to test the significance of the study. Organisation-wise analysis { Sap labs (1),Infosys Technologies Ltd.(2), NIIT Technologies Ltd.(3), Tata Consultancy Services(4), Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.(5), Wipro Ltd.(6), Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.(7), IBM(8), ICICI Bank Ltd.(9), HDFC

Bank(10), AXIS Bank(11),IndusInd Bank(12),IDBI Bank(13), SBI(14), PNB(15), Union Bank of India(16)}, age-wise analysis {below 25(1), 25-30(2), 31-35(3), above 35(4)}, sector-wise analysis{ IT(1), Banking(2)}, experience-wise analysis{ below 5(1), 5-10(2), 11-15(3),15 above(4)}, income-wise analysis{ below 2(1), 2-5(2), 6-8(3), 8 above(4)}, type of organisation-wise analysis{ foreign bank(1), MNC(2), Domestic(3), public bank(4), private bank(5)}, gender-wise analysis{ male(1), female(2)}.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistical inferences emphasis on Mean, Standard Deviation, ANOVA and t-test based on Factor Analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSSION

In order to understand the employees' perception, certain statements are developed. These statements are discussed below:

P1: It tells that e-HRM is connected with the process of Globalization

P2: It says that e-HRM is connected with the aims of the companies.

P3: It tells that e-HRM establishes a common HR information infrastructure across the whole world.

P4: It tells that e-HRM tries to harmonize & standardize HR Processes.

P5: It tells that e-HRM involves large investments in the beginning.

P6: It tells that employees choose their career path easily.

P7: It tells that e-HRM makes HR specialists.

P8: It tells that difference in culture & language are a hurdle in the acceptance of well- based HR facilities in the world.

P9: It tells that employees are willing to accept web-based full responsibility for their personal career development.

P10: It tells that e-HRM is first & foremost a change in the mindsets and behavior.

P11: It tells that e-HRM is easily implemented in your org.

P12: It tells that e-HRM is technical in use.

P13: It tells that e-HRM is not affected by people's age, gender, knowledge, or IT or job experience.

P14: It tells that employees think that e-HRM is a trigger for HR transformation.

P15: It tells that people are having negative attitude towards e-HRM.

P16: It tells that employees can easily use e-HRM.

P17: It tells that it provides HR responsibility in the hands of line management.

P18: It tells that it acts as push factor for changing HRM within an organisation.

P19: It tells that e-HRM centralizes HR policy responsibility at the co- headquarters.

P20: It tells that e-HRM provides more possibilities to the organisation.

P21: It tells that e-HRM does Talent Management.

P22: It tells that e-HRM is connected with the client's oriented information system.

P23: It tells that e-HRM acts as a user friendly interface.

Interpretation of factor analysis for Employees' Perception

The analysis will investigate linear combination of some latent factors (underlying factors) with the help of factor analysis. **Table 2** comprises, the rotated factor matrix comprising all 23 variables, the Eigen values 1 or more than 1 for all extracted factors, the percent of variance and cumulative percent of variance. Total 7 factors are extracted out of 23 original variables with Eigen values 3.872, 3.145, 2.044, 1.814, 1.462, 1.120, 1.069. 4.687, 3.005, 2.280, 1.338, 1.207, 1.076 and 0.941.these 7 extracted factors together account for 63.157 percent of cumulative variance. It means information is able to economize as more than half of the information is retained to us and only 36.843 percent of information is lost. It is noticed that variables p3, p4, p19, p20 have loading of 0.704, 0.701, 0.781 and 0.712 on Factor 1 (**Standardization**). This suggests that Factor 1 is combination of these 4 original variables (p3, p4, p19, p20). Therefore the name can be given as Standardization. It can be seen that variables p9, p16, p17, p18 have loading of 0.720, 0.647, 0.816, 0.666 on Factor 2 (**Career Development**).

Table-2-Rotated Factor Matrix

Variables	Standardization	Career Development	Difficulties	Globalization	Specialization	Indifferent	Easily Implementation
P1	0.303	-0.06	0.028	0.67	-0.33	-0.006	-0.012
P2	0.007	-0.06	0.054	0.751	0.301	0.093	-0.295
P3	0.704	0.134	-0.197	0.279	-0.033	-0.121	-0.023
P4	0.701	0.015	0.011	0.254	-0.008	-0.032	0.258
P5	-0.099	-0.15	0.432	0.549	0.259	0.117	0.117
P6	-0.022	0.263	0.119	0.52	-0.044	0.112	0.268
P7	0.001	-0.12	0.135	0.006	0.626	-0.421	0.197
P8	0.222	-0.039	0.619	0.121	-0.035	-0.41	0.051
P9	0.138	0.72	-0.074	0.077	0.035	-0.208	0.016
P10	0.057	-0.156	0.563	0.15	0.181	-0.052	0.048
P11	0.242	0.07	0.071	-0.033	-0.006	0.046	0.836
P12	0.011	0.1	0.736	-0.072	0.147	0.206	-0.144
P13	0.094	0.065	-0.006	0.205	-0.164	0.734	0.224
P14	0.005	0.056	0.178	0.076	0.854	0.016	-0.129
P15	-0.064	-0.225	0.502	0.358	0.163	-0.18	0.236
P16	-0.014	0.647	-0.078	0.004	0.053	0.283	0.426
P17	0.025	0.816	-0.068	-0.14	0.024	0.043	-0.004
P18	0.044	0.666	0.151	0.084	-0.217	0.425	-0.102
P19	0.781	-0.058	0.242	-0.137	0.127	0.029	0.05
P20	0.712	0.164	0.057	-0.187	-0.06	0.039	0.018
P21	0.31	0.484	0.053	0.013	-0.15	-0.455	0.12
P22	0.086	0.326	0.54	0.008	-0.337	0.014	0.241
P23	0.475	0.091	0.309	0.198	-0.196	0.152	0.374
Eigen values	3.872	3.145	2.044	1.814	1.462	1.12	1.069
Percentage of Variance	16.835	13.672	8.885	7.889	6.357	4.87	4.648
Cumulative Percent	16.835	30.507	39.393	47.281	53.639	58.509	63.157

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
A Rotation converged in 10 iterations.

This says that Factor 2 is combination of these 4 original variables (p9, p16, p17, p18). For this reason the name for this factor is **Career Development**. The Factor 3 is combination of p8, p10, p12, p15, p22 have loading of 0.619, 0.563, 0.736, 0.502, 0.540. That's why the name can be given as **Hurdles**. The Factor 4 comprises the variables p1, p2, p5, p6 have a loading of 0.670, 0.751, 0.549, 0.520 and the name is **Globalization** for this. The Factor 5 comprises of original variables p7, p14 with a loading of 0.626, 0.854. Hence, the name can be given as **Specialization**. The Factor 6 is combination of only p13 variable having loading of 0.734. This statement says that e-HRM is not affected by demographic variables. That's why the name can be suggested as **Indifferent**. The Factor 7 comprises of only original variable p11 having loading of 0.836. This statement says that e-HRM is easily implemented in your organisation. Hence the name is **Easily Implementation**. P21 and p23 variable do not favor any of the factor.

One-way ANOVA for Oganisation–wise Analysis of Employees

Table 3 depicts that mean value for respondents of various organisations for **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.20, 4.41, 4.28, 4.10, 4.19, 3.88, 3.92, 4.06, 4.56, 4.81, 4.69, 4.85, 4.00, 3.99, 4.08, 4.75 with value of S.D. 0.462, 0.359, 0.300, 0.353, 0.458, 0.535, 0.412, 0.434, 0.600, 0.416, 0.355, 0.279, 0.216, 0.785, 0.213, 0.000. The value of F is 15.577 at 0.000 significant levels. To sum up it is concluded that there is significant difference (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 4.070, 4.22, 3.53, 4.01, 3.95, 3.90, 4.00, 4.00, 4.64, 3.64, 3.61, 4.27, 3.95, 4.04, 4.02, 5.00 with value of S.D. 0.378, 0.511, 0.220, 0.318, 0.360, 0.426, 0.330, 0.467, 0.462, 1.274, 1.053, 0.534, 0.306, 0.406, 0.160, 0.000. The value of F is 11.368 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.20,3.24, 3.21, 3.55, 3.66, 3.60, 3.58, 3.40, 4.36, 4.21, 3.92, 3.24, 3.77, 3.59, 2.94, 3.20 with value of S.D. 0.567, 0.401, 0.550, 0.510, 0.298, 0.360, 0.416, 0.508, 0.529, 0.711, 0.759, 0.870, 0.401, 1.057, 0.212, 0.000. The value of F is 11.580 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 4.03, 4.06, 4.01, 4.19, 3.97, 3.99, 4.01, 4.02, 4.24, 3.79, 3.93, 3.83, 4.00,3.86, 3.57, 4.00 with value of S.D. 0.397, 0.546, 0.342, 0.308, 0.428, 0.481, 0.342, 0.467, 0.730, 0.792, 0.798, 1.300, 0.314, 0.661, 0.255, 0.000. The value of F is 1.773 at .037 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 3.74, 3.98, 4.18, 3.90, 3.72, 3.92, 4.04, 3.74, 4.08, 4.38, 4.12, 4.08, 4.00, 4.36, 3.24, 2.00 with value of S.D. 0.522, 0.809, 0.497, 0.520, 0.630, 0.449, 0.538, 0.751, 0.897, 1.073, 1.101, 0.759, 0.433, 0.884, 0.435, 0.000.

Table-3-One-way ANOVA for Organisation-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Organisation Name	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
Standardization	SAP Labs	25	4.20	0.462	15.577	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	4.41	0.360		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	4.28	0.300		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	4.10	0.354		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.19	0.458		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.88	0.536		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.92	0.413		
	IBM	25	4.06	0.435		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.56	0.601		
	HDFC Bank	25	4.81	0.416		
	AXIS Bank	25	4.69	0.356		
	IndusInd Bank	25	4.85	0.280		
	IDBI Bank	25	4.00	0.217		
	SBI	25	3.99	0.786		
	PNB	25	4.08	0.213		
	Union Bank of India	25	4.75	0.000		
Career Development	SAP Labs	25	4.07	0.379	11.368	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	4.22	0.512		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	3.53	0.220		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	4.01	0.319		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.95	0.361		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.90	0.427		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.00	0.331		
	IBM	25	4.00	0.468		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.64	0.463		
	HDFC Bank	25	3.64	1.275		
	AXIS Bank	25	3.61	1.053		
	IndusInd Bank	25	4.27	0.535		
	IDBI Bank	25	3.95	0.306		
	SBI	25	4.04	0.406		
	PNB	25	4.02	0.160		
	Union Bank of India	25	5.00	0.000		
Difficulties	SAP Labs	25	3.21	0.567	11.580	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	3.25	0.401		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	3.22	0.551		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	3.55	0.511		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.66	0.298		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.60	0.361		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.58	0.416		
	IBM	25	3.41	0.508		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.36	0.529		
	HDFC Bank	25	4.22	0.712		
	AXIS Bank	25	3.93	0.759		
	IndusInd Bank	25	3.25	0.870		
	IDBI Bank	25	3.78	0.401		
	SBI	25	3.59	1.057		
	PNB	25	2.94	0.212		
	Union Bank of India	25	3.20	0.000		
Globalization	SAP Labs	25	4.03	0.397	1.773	0.037
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	4.06	0.546		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	4.01	0.342		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	4.19	0.309		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.97	0.429		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.99	0.481		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.01	0.342		
	IBM	25	4.02	0.467		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.24	0.731		
	HDFC Bank	25	3.79	0.793		
	AXIS Bank	25	3.93	0.799		
	IndusInd Bank	25	3.83	1.300		
	IDBI Bank	25	4.00	0.315		
	SBI	25	3.86	0.662		
	PNB	25	3.57	0.255		
	Union Bank of India	25	4.00	0.000		
Specialization	SAP Labs	25	3.74	0.523	16.208	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	3.98	0.810		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	4.18	0.497		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	3.90	0.520		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.72	0.630		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.92	0.449		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.04	0.539		
	IBM	25	3.74	0.752		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.08	0.898		
	HDFC Bank	25	4.38	1.073		
	AXIS Bank	25	4.12	1.102		
	IndusInd Bank	25	4.08	0.759		
	IDBI Bank	25	4.00	0.433		
	SBI	25	4.36	0.884		
	PNB	25	3.24	0.436		
	Union Bank of India	25	2.00	0.000		
Indifferent	SAP Labs	25	4.12	0.526	7.512	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	4.36	0.490		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	4.64	0.490		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	3.92	0.640		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.12	0.526		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.68	0.802		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.92	0.909		
	IBM	25	4.00	0.577		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.64	0.638		
	HDFC Bank	25	3.76	1.268		
	AXIS Bank	25	3.88	1.201		
	IndusInd Bank	25	3.16	1.434		
	IDBI Bank	25	3.88	0.666		
	SBI	25	3.36	1.551		
	PNB	25	4.04	0.200		
	Union Bank of India	25	5.00	0.000		
Easily Implementation	SAP Labs	25	3.72	0.678	13.003	0.000
	Infosys Technologies Ltd.	25	4.40	0.500		
	NIIT Technologies Ltd.	25	4.12	0.666		
	Tata Consultancy Services	25	3.96	0.735		
	Aricent Technologies Pvt. Ltd.	25	3.80	0.646		
	Wipro Ltd.	25	3.96	0.735		
	Metacube Software Pvt. Ltd.	25	4.16	0.688		
	IBM	25	3.88	0.726		
	ICICI Bank Ltd.	25	4.44	0.712		
	HDFC Bank	25	4.76	0.597		
	AXIS Bank	25	4.80	0.408		
	IndusInd Bank	25	4.64	0.995		
	IDBI Bank	25	3.88	0.600		
	SBI	25	2.80	1.607		
	PNB	25	4.12	0.332		
	Union Bank of India	25	5.00	0.000		

Source: Field Survey

The value of F is 16.208 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.12, 4.36, 4.64, 3.92, 4.12, 3.68, 3.92, 4.00, 4.64, 3.76, 3.88, 3.16, 3.88, 3.36, 4.04, 5.00 with value of S.D. 0.525, 0.489, 0.489, 0.640, 0.525, 0.802, 0.909, 0.577, 0.637, 1.267, 1.201, 1.434, 0.665, 1.551, 0.200 0.000. The value of F is 7.512 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 3.72, 4.40, 4.12, 3.96, 3.80, 3.96, 4.16, 3.88, 4.44, 4.76, 4.80, 4.64, 3.88, 2.80, 4.12, 5.00 with value of S.D. 0.678, 0.500, 0.665, 0.734, 0.645, 0.734, 0.645, 0.734, 0.687, 0.725, 0.711, 0.597, 0.408, 0.994, 0.600, 1.607, 0.331, 0.000. The value of F is 13.003 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have different opinion regarding all the Factors Standardization, Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization, Specialization, Indifferent and Easily Implementation.

One-way ANOVA for Age-wise Analysis of Employees

Table 4 depicts that mean value for respondents of various organisations of **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.33, 4.31, 4.21, 4.14 with value of S.D. 0.524, 0.550, 0.488 and 0.321. The value of F is 1.326 at 0.265 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 4.15, 4.00, 4.02, 4.05 with value of S.D. 0.538, 0.763, 0.340, 0.175. The value of F is 1.553 at 0.200 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

Table-4-One-way ANOVA for Age-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Age (Years)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
Standardization	below 25	117	4.33	0.524	1.326	0.265
	25-30	209	4.32	0.551		
	31-35	53	4.21	0.489		
	above35	21	4.14	0.322		
Career Development	below 25	117	4.16	0.539	1.553	0.200
	25-30	209	4.00	0.763		
	31-35	53	4.02	0.341		
	above35	21	4.06	0.175		
Hurdles	below 25	117	3.63	0.774	6.605	0.000
	25-30	209	3.61	0.619		
	31-35	53	3.24	0.568		
	above35	21	3.24	0.488		
Globalization	below 25	117	4.02	0.707	5.317	0.001
	25-30	209	4.03	0.529		
	31-35	53	3.70	0.557		
	above35	21	3.77	0.418		
Specialization	below 25	117	4.06	0.751	6.644	0.000
	25-30	209	3.74	0.986		
	31-35	53	3.99	0.592		
	above35	21	3.31	0.536		
Indifferent	below 25	117	4.01	1.110	0.707	0.548
	25-30	209	4.09	0.921		
	31-35	53	3.89	0.847		
	above35	21	3.95	0.384		
Easily Implementation	below 25	117	3.92	1.115	4.154	0.006
	25-30	209	4.27	0.794		
	31-35	53	4.25	0.648		
	above35	21	4.05	0.669		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.63, 3.60, 3.24, and 3.23 with value of S.D. 0.774, 0.618, 0.567 and 0.488. The value of F is 6.605 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 4.01, 4.02, 3.70 and 3.77 with value of S.D. 0.707, 0.529, 0.556 and 0.417. The value of F is 5.317 at 0.001 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 4.05, 3.73, 3.99 and 3.30 with value of S.D. 0.750, 0.985, 0.592 and 0.535. The value of F is 6.644 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.00, 4.08, 3.88, 3.95 with value of S.D. 1.110, 0.921, 0.847, 0.384. The value of F is 0.707 at 0.548 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 3.92, 4.26, 4.24, 4.04 with value of S.D. 1.115, 0.793, 0.647, 0.669. The value of F is 4.154 at 0.006 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Standardization, Career Development and Indifferent while they don't have same opinion regarding Hurdles, Globalization, Specialization and Easily Implementation.

T-test For Sector-wise Analysis of Employees

From **table 5,** it is interpreted that the mean value for IT and Banking sector respondents regarding **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.13, 4.46 with value of S.D. 0.445, 0.547. The value of t is -6.735 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 3.96, 4.14 with value of S.D. 0.422, 0.790. The value of t is-2.938 at 0.003 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

Table-5-T-test For Sector-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Sector	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Standardization	IT	200	4.13	0.446	-6.735	0.000
	Banking	200	4.47	0.548		
Career Development	IT	200	3.96	0.423	-2.938	0.003
	Banking	200	4.15	0.791		
Hurdles	IT	200	3.44	0.486	-3.370	0.001
	Banking	200	3.66	0.800		
Globalization	IT	200	4.04	0.419	2.236	0.026
	Banking	200	3.90	0.726		
Specialization	IT	200	3.90	0.611	1.372	0.171
	Banking	200	3.78	1.076		
Indifferent	IT	200	4.10	0.684	1.367	0.172
	Banking	200	3.97	1.158		
Easily Implementation	IT	200	4.00	0.695	-3.476	0.001
	Banking	200	4.31	1.028		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.43, 3.65 with value of S.D. 0.485, 0.799. The value of t is -3.370 at 0.001 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less

than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 4.03, 3.90 with value of S.D. 0.418, 0.725. The value of t is 2.236 at 0.026 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 3.90, 3.78 with value of S.D. 0.611, 1.075. The value of t is 1.372 at 0.171 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.09, 3.96 with value of S.D. 0.684, 1,157. The value of t is 1.367 at 0.172 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 4.00, 4.30 with value of S.D. 0.049, 0.072. The value of t is -3.476 at 0.001 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Specialization and Indifferent while they have different opinion regarding Standardization, Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization and Easily Implementation.

One-way ANOVA for Experience-wise Analysis of Employees

Table 6 depicts that mean value for respondents of various organisations of **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.37, 4.18, 4.18, 4.18 with value of S.D. 0.549, 0.476, 0.489, 0.297. The value of F is 4.161 at 0.006 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1. The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 4.06, 4.02, 4.00 and 4.09

with value of S.D. 0.745, 0.453, 0.278, 0.168. The value of F is 0.196 at 0.899 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.65, 3.44, 3.18 and 3.03 with value of S.D. 0.717, 0.566, 0.453 and 0.233. The value of F is 7.505 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 4.05, 3.87, 3.70 and 3.56 with value of S.D. 0.606, 0.580, 0.447 and 0.196. The value of F is 6.164 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

Table-6-One-way ANOVA for Experience-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Experience (Years)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
Standardization	below5	247	4.37	0.549	4.161	0.006
	5-10	120	4.18	0.476		
	10-15	22	4.18	0.489		
	above15	11	4.18	0.298		
Career Development	below5	247	4.07	0.746	0.196	0.899
	5-10	120	4.03	0.453		
	10-15	22	4.00	0.278		
	above15	11	4.09	0.169		
Hurdles	below5	247	3.65	0.717	7.505	0.000
	5-10	120	3.45	0.567		
	10-15	22	3.18	0.453		
	above15	11	3.04	0.234		
Globalization	below5	247	4.06	0.606	6.164	0.000
	5-10	120	3.87	0.581		
	10-15	22	3.70	0.447		
	above15	11	3.57	0.197		
Specialization	below5	247	3.78	0.984	4.385	0.005
	5-10	120	4.04	0.612		
	10-15	22	3.84	0.730		
	above15	11	3.23	0.467		
Indifferent	below5	247	4.12	0.955	2.281	0.079
	5-10	120	3.88	0.980		
	10-15	22	3.77	0.869		
	above15	11	4.09	0.302		
Easily Implementation	below5	247	4.17	0.985	0.336	0.799
	5-10	120	4.09	0.745		
	10-15	22	4.23	0.612		
	above15	11	4.27	0.467		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 3.77, 4.03, 3.84, 3.22 with value of S.D. 0.984, 0.612, 0.730, 0.467. The value of F is 4.385 at 0.005 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.12, 3.88, 3.77, 4.09 with value of S.D. 0.955, 0.980, 0.869,

0.301. The value of F is 2.281 at 0.079 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 4.17, 4.09, 4.22, 4.27 with value of S.D. 0.985, 0.744, 0.611, 0.467. The value of F is 0.336 at 0.799 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Career Development, Indifferent and Easily Implementation while they don't have same opinion regarding Standardization, Hurdles, Globalization and Specialization.

One-way ANOVA for income-wise Analysis of Employees

Table 7 depicts that mean value for respondents of various organisations of **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.33, 4.36, 4.13, 4.19 with value of S.D. 0.711, 0.500, 0.456, 0.452. The value of F is 4.517 at 0.004 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 4.21, 4.04, 3.95, 4.12 with value of S.D. 0.520, 0.736, 0.450, 0.365. The value of F is 1.825 at 0.142 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.62, 3.56, 3.49, 3.42 with value of S.D. 0.989, 0.643, 0.509, 0.610. The value of F is 0.884 at 0.449 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 3.91, 3.99, 3.86, 4.12 with value of S.D. 0.941, 0.545, 0.517, 0.385. The value of F is 1.892 at 0.130 significant values. It means there is no significant

difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

Table-7-One-way ANOVA for Income-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Income (Lakhs)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
Standardization	below2	50	4.34	0.712	4.517	0.004
	2-5	236	4.36	0.500		
	6-8	80	4.13	0.457		
	above8	34	4.19	0.453		
Career Development	below2	50	4.21	0.521	1.825	0.142
	2-5	236	4.04	0.737		
	6-8	80	3.95	0.450		
	above8	34	4.13	0.365		
Hurdles	below2	50	3.63	0.990	0.884	0.449
	2-5	236	3.57	0.643		
	6-8	80	3.49	0.509		
	above8	34	3.42	0.611		
Globalization	below2	50	3.91	0.942	1.892	0.130
	2-5	236	3.99	0.546		
	6-8	80	3.87	0.517		
	above8	34	4.13	0.386		
Specialization	below2	50	4.12	0.849	2.453	0.063
	2-5	236	3.77	0.901		
	6-8	80	3.82	0.904		
	above8	34	3.97	0.550		
Indifferent	below2	50	3.68	1.463	2.778	0.041
	2-5	236	4.09	0.885		
	6-8	80	4.09	0.799		
	above8	34	3.97	0.674		
Easily Implementation	below2	50	3.68	1.518	7.868	0.000
	2-5	236	4.28	0.755		
	6-8	80	4.18	0.591		
	above8	34	3.88	0.844		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 4.12, 3.77, 3.81, 3.97 with value of S.D. 0.848, 0.900, 0.549, 0.875. The value of F is 2.453 at 0.063 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 3.68, 4.09, 4.08, 3.97 with value of S.D. 1.463, 0.884, 0.798, 0.673. The value of F is 2.778 at 0.041 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 3.68, 4.28, 4.17, 3.88 with value of S.D. 1.517, 0.755, 0.590, 0.844. The value of F is 7.868 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization and Indifferent while they don't have same opinion regarding Standardization, indifferent and Easily Implementation.

One-way ANOVA for Type of Organisation-wise Analysis of Employees

Table 8 depicts that mean value for MNC, Domestic, public bank and private bank respondents regarding **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.16, 3.92, 4.20, 4.72 with value of S.D. 0.442, 0.412, 0.522, 0.438. The value of F is 41.054 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 3.95, 4.00, 4.25, 4.04 with value of S.D. 0.434, 0.330, 0.508, 0.987. The value of F is 4.833 at 0.003 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

Table-8-One-way ANOVA for Type of Organisation-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Type of Organisation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F Value	Sig. Level
Standardization	MNC	175	4.16	0.443	41.054	0.000
	Domestic	25	3.92	0.413		
	public bank	100	4.21	0.523		
	private bank	100	4.73	0.438		
Career Development	MNC	175	3.95	0.435	4.833	0.003
	Domestic	25	4.00	0.331		
	public bank	100	4.25	0.508		
	private bank	100	4.04	0.988		
Hurdles	MNC	175	3.41	0.493	17.792	0.000
	Domestic	25	3.58	0.416		
	public bank	100	3.38	0.654		
	private bank	100	3.94	0.836		
Globalization	MNC	175	4.04	0.429	2.064	0.104
	Domestic	25	4.01	0.342		
	public bank	100	3.86	0.421		
	private bank	100	3.95	0.937		
Specialization	MNC	175	3.88	0.620	15.005	0.000
	Domestic	25	4.04	0.539		
	public bank	100	3.40	1.052		
	private bank	100	4.17	0.962		
Indifferent	MNC	175	4.12	0.645	1.764	0.153
	Domestic	25	3.92	0.909		
	public bank	100	4.07	1.027		
	private bank	100	3.86	1.271		
Easily Implementation	MNC	175	3.98	0.694	16.585	0.000
	Domestic	25	4.16	0.688		
	public bank	100	3.95	1.167		
	private bank	100	4.66	0.714		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.41, 3.58, 3.37, 3.93 with value of S.D. 0.492, 0.416, 0.654, 0.835. The value of F is 17.792 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various

organisations regarding Factor 3.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 4.03, 4.01, 3.85, 3.94 with value of S.D. 0.429, 0.342, 0.420, 0.936. The value of F is 2.064 at 0.104 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 3.88, 4.04, 3.40, and 4.16 with value of S.D. 0.619, 0.538, 1.051, 0.961. The value of F is 15.005 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.12, 3.92, 4.07, 3.86 with value of S.D. 0.645, 0.909, 1.027, 1.271. The value of F is 1.764 at 0.153 significant values. It means there is no significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 3.97, 4.16, 3.95, and 4.66 with value of S.D. 0.694, 0.687, 1.166, 0.737. The value of F is 16.585 at 0.000 significant values. It means there is significant difference exists (the value of significant level for F-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Globalization, Indifferent and while they don't have same opinion regarding Career Development, Standardization, Hurdles, Easily Implementation and Specialization.

T-test for Gender-wise Analysis of Employees

From **table 9**, it is interpreted that the mean value for male and female respondents regarding **Standardization** (Factor 1) are 4.33, 4.23 with value of S.D. 0.462, 0.620. The value of t is 1.916 at 0.056 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is greater than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 1.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Career Development** (Factor 2) is 4.12, 3.92 with value of S.D. 0.591, 0.702. The

value of t is 3.105 at 0.002 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 2.

Table-9-T-test For Gender-wise Analysis of Employees

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t Value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Standardization	Male	257	4.3356	0.46295	1.916	0.056
	Female	143	4.2308	0.62028		
Career Development	Male	257	4.1265	0.59133	3.105	0.002
	Female	143	3.9213	0.70237		
Hurdles	Male	257	3.4568	0.5834	-3.643	0
	Female	143	3.7077	0.77959		
Globalization	Male	257	3.9368	0.56694	-1.442	0.15
	Female	143	4.0262	0.64165		
Specialization	Male	257	3.716	0.94013	-3.944	0
	Female	143	4.0699	0.69354		
Indifferent	Male	257	4.035	1.04337	0.141	0.888
	Female	143	4.021	0.76424		
Easily Implementation	Male	257	4.1518	0.82225	-0.023	0.982
	Female	143	4.1538	1.00216		

Source: Field Survey

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Hurdles** (Factor 3) is 3.45, 3.70 with value of S.D. 0.583, 0.779. The value of t is -3.643 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 3.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Globalization** (Factor 4) is 3.93, 4.02 with value of S.D. 0.566, 0.641. The value of t is -1.442 at 0.142 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 4.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Specialization** (Factor 5) is 3.71, 4.06 with value of S.D. 0.940, 0.693. The value of t is -3.944 at 0.000 significant levels. It means there is significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is less than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 5.The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Indifferent** (Factor 6) is 4.03, 4.02 with value of S.D. 1.043, 0.764. The value of t is 0.141 at 0.888 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of significant level for t-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 6.

The mean value for the respondents of various organisations regarding **Easily Implementation** (Factor 7) is 4.15, 4.15 with value of S.D. 0.822, 1.002. The value of t is -0.023 at 0.982 significant levels. It means there is no significant difference exists (the level of

21

significant level for t-test is more than 0.05) between the opinions of respondents of various organisations regarding Factor 7.

To sum up, respondents have same opinion regarding Specialization, Globalization, Indifferent and Easily Implementation while they have different opinion regarding Career Development, Hurdles and Specialization.

CONCLUSION

From the analysis it can be concluded that respondents from different organisations have different opinion regarding all the Factors Standardization, Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization, Specialization, Indifferent and Easily Implementation. Respondents of different age groups have same opinion regarding Standardization, Career Development and Indifferent while they don't have same opinion regarding Hurdles, Globalization, Specialization and Easily Implementation. Respondents of different experience have same opinion regarding Career Development, Indifferent and Easily Implementation while they don't have same opinion regarding Standardization, Hurdles, Globalization and Specialization. Respondents of different income have same opinion regarding Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization and Indifferent while they don't have same opinion regarding Standardization, indifferent and Implementation.

Respondents of different type of organisation have same opinion regarding Globalization, Indifferent and while they don't have same opinion regarding Career Development, Standardization, Hurdles, Easily Implementation and Specialization. Respondents of different sector have same opinion regarding Specialization and Indifferent while they have different opinion regarding Standardization, Career Development, Hurdles, Globalization and Easily Implementation. Respondents of different gender have same opinion regarding Specialization, Globalization, Indifferent and Easily Implementation while they have different opinion regarding Career Development, Hurdles and Specialization.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Proper training should be given to employees of all levels so that their phobia of using e-HRM should be removed.

2. A proper training program should be conducted for old employees so that they will be more comfortable with the system.

3. Culture & language should not be considered as a hurdle in the acceptance of e-HRM.

4. Employees should not have negative attitude towards e-HRM.

5. e-HRM provides so many benefits to the employees so employees should not resist it.

6. Every human being resists changes but if this change is successfully and effectively implemented in the organisation then these changes become irresistible.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, Michael (2006). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*. New Delhi: Kogan Page, 10th ed.

- Ashwathappa K. (2007). *Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill, 5 ed.

- Bhatia, S.K. (2006). *Human Resource Management-A Competitive Advantage*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd.

- Bondarouk, T. and Loosie, J.K. (2005). HR contribution to IT innovation implementation results of three case studies. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 14, 2, 160-168.

- Bondarouk, T & Ruel, H.J.H. (2006, Nov 4-5). Quantitative Study in a Dutch Ministry, paper presented at 4th international conference of the Dutch HRM network. Enshede, the Netherlands.

- Doughty, M. (2000). The role of e-HR and organisation. www.Brite-HR.com

- Gardner, S.D., Lepak, D.P. and Bartol, K.M. (2003). Virtual HR: the impact of information technology on the human resource professional. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 63, 159-79.

- Globetronics Multimedia Technology Sdn. Bhd., 2003.Gupta, A.K. (2008). *Management Information Systems*. New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.

- Gupta, S.C. (2008). *Advanced Human Resource Management*. New Delhi: Ane Books India.

- Hahn, Judith Kaye, CPP, VHR, Vice President of HR, GHG CORPORATION, 2008.

- Hawking, P., Stein, A. Victoria, A. & Foster (2004). E-HR and Employee self service: A Case Study of a Victorian public sector organisation. www.google.com

- Kettley, P. & Reiley, P. (2003). E-HR: An introduction. *IES Report.* 398.

- Lepak, D.P., & Snell, S.A. (1998). Virtual HR: strategic human resource management in the 21st century. *Human Resource Management Review.* 8, 3, 215–234.

- Prasad, L.M. (2003). *Human Resource Management.* New Delhi: Sultan Chand & Sons.

- Ruel, H.J.M., Bondarouk, T.V., & Loosie, J.C. (2004). *e-HRM: innovation or irritation. An exploration of web-based Human Resource Management in large companies.* Lemma Publishers: Utrecht.

- Second European workshop on e-HRM. (2008, May 29-30).

- The first European academic workshop:" The Future of Electronic HRM (e-HRM) research", Twente university, Netherlands. (2006, Oct 25-26).

- Torres, Teresa & Mario, Arias (2007). *Encyclopedia of Human Resource Information Systems: challenges in e-HRM.*

- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M.G., Davis, G.B. and Davis, F.D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: toward a unified view. *MIS Quarterly.* 27, 3, 425-78.

- Voemans, M. & Veldhoven, M.V. (2007). Empirical Study at Philips. *Emarald Group Journal.* 36, 6, 887-902.

- Walker, A.J. (2001). *Web-Based Human Resources: The Technologies and Trends That Are Transforming HR.* New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.

- Wright, P.M., McMaham, G.C., Snell, S.A., & Gerhart, B. (2001). Comparing line and HR executives' perceptions of HR effectiveness: services, roles, and contributions. *Human Resource Management.* 40, 2, 111–123.

- www.personneltoday.com

- www.indianmba.com

- www.e-HRMresearch.org

- www.ideas.repec.org

- www.icfaipress.org