# The Human Resource Information System Productiveness in Organization Culture and Its Importance

**Dr. Shine David**
Assistant professor
Institute Of Management Studies
Devi Ahilya Vishwa Vidyalaya Indore
shinelavi77@gmail.com

**Naina Chopra**
Institute Of Management Studies
Devi Ahilya Vishwa Vidyalaya Indore
nainachopra90@gmail.com

**Sachin Batham**
Institute Of Management Studies
Devi Ahilya Vishwa Vidyalaya Indore
sachinbatham19@yahoo.com

**Lekhram Vishwakarma**
Institute Of Management Studies
Devi Ahilya Vishwa Vidyalaya Indore
lekhvishwa91@gmail.com

## Abstract

*With the changing market, globalization and technical updates, we move ahead in direction of utilizing information system in each and every department of any organization. Human Resource Information System foster in various ventures like determining employee probable capacity, maintaining records of employees and helping in performance evaluation. HRIS system is very helpful in finding out what are the requirements of the employees of the company. Whether it is requirement of training and development to understand different new*

*technological updates emerging on day to day basis or any other technical, financial, operational aspect.*

*Human resource is very supportive in various HR practices such as monitoring, analyzing recruiting selecting  providing compensation, better working environment, pay remittance benefits, salary related decisions and budgets allotment.*

*The reason behind this study is to examine whether "Human Resource Information System  is productive in the organization culture " . A questionnaire was made after seeing  important aspects from previous studies on this topic. The major findings of this research disclosed that the fast response and easy retrieval of information ,disciplinary actions were the main benefits of HRIS enactment.*
*While, the insufficient funds; resistance in change acceptance  and lack of*
*Support from top management was the main causes of HRIS implementation barriers.*

*The survey covered 100 employees from different sectors. Through this analytical procedure we find a strong positive relationship between productiveness and factors affecting HRIS implementation in organization culture.*

## Introduction

An HRIS is technology constructed system that is used to
- Acquires,
- stores,
- manipulate,
- analyze,
- retrieve and
- spread information regarding an organization's human resources.
- A system which  entreats to merge the activities related with Human Resource Management (HRM) and Information Technology (IT) into one common data structure through the use of enterprise resource planning (ERP) software.

HRIS is a concept which combines Information Technology and essentials of Human Resource Management functions . It is a planned way of collecting storing maintaining and recovering data required by organization for stakeholders who have say in the organization.

Kovach and Cathcart(1999) squabble that HRIS differs as per different organization in relation to their size; it can be informal like payroll records etc. In big organizations achievement totally bestowed on effective co-ordination of Strategic Management and integration of HR and IT.

Information System is fastest reshaping processions as it is amongst the most widely used tools for achieving goals and objectives of the organization. In mid 1950s, all the work was regulated through paper records which were costly, less eco friendly, time consuming and complicated. But with the latest development and IT access it has become the most successful way to cope up with different internal and external aspects of business

## Management Information System

An organization is composed of various departments. Each department has to co-ordinate with other so as to maintain a cordial and a perfect balance as an organization. The hierarchical system of any organization is formulated of 3 levels – top, middle and lower management. Each level has its own needs and requirements. So Management Information System is developed in manner that it fulfils need of levels and provides the disseminated information as per the needs of the management.MIS is mainly use for decision making planning and monitoring activities.

## Human Resource Information System

After 1980s HR function rigorously started using human resource information system .Previously it was identified as a subset of Management Information System which supported human resource management features of designing, controlling, analyzing ,decision making and control activities. But after 1990s it utilized more sophisticated enhanced information expert systems featuring analytical tools etc which played a major role in decision making process.

Starting from payroll formulating activities now HRIS is associated with all function of HR. Whether it be recruiting, selecting, hiring, motivating maintaining . HRIS can support long-range planning with information for labor force planning and supply and demand forecast; staffing with information on employment, separations, retention or redeployment qualifications; and development with information entraining programs, salary forecasts, pay budgets and labor/employee relations with information on contract negotiations and employee assistance needs (shilby 2011)

HRIS is defined as "integrated system used to gather, store analyze information regarding organization's human resources' comprising of databases, computer administration, hardware and software necessary to collect,record,store,manage,deliver manage present and manipulate data for human resource function"(Hendrickson 2003)

## Review of Literature

Businesses are usually prepared to undertake changes provided that they see a competitive advantage to doing so. However, many companies have problems bringing new technologies, including HRIS, due to a dearth of sufficient capital and skills. Therefore, companies are unwilling to implement HRIS unless they are induced of the benefits that this would bring to their organizations. The positive aspects of HRIS normally cited in studies included better exactness, the provision of timely and fact access to data & information, and increasing returns (Lederer, 1984; Tetz, 1973;Wille and Hammond, 1981). Lederer (1984) discussed why the accuracy and timeliness of HRIS is very important in terms of  analyzing, enacting and designing and controlling activities in HR.

In addition, Kovach et al. (2002) provided several managerial and decisive benefits for using HRIS. In a similar way Beckers and Bsat (2002) indicate some reasons as to why companies should utilize HRIS.

These were that HRIS can:
(1) Produce an extra number and variety in HR-related reports;
(2) move in direction of processing hr work towards strategic HRM ;
(3) Make employees part of HRIS; and
(4) Complete changeover in Hr functions
Broderick and Boudreau (1992) examined how it contributed towards  reduction of cost and modification. Sadri and Chatterjee (2003) stated that when the HRIS function was associated with IT Technology, quicker decision making can be carried out on the progression, designing, and administration of HR because data can be much easier to maintain, rediscover, classify, and analyze. In addition, they noted that HRIS can strengthen an organization's character.

## Barriers to the implementation of HRIS

Beckers and Bsat (2002) stated that the cost of setting up and maintaining a HRIS can be major barrier in the implementation of a HRIS. Similarly,Kovach and Cathcart (1999) pointed out that a lack of money and support from top management were the biggest barriers to achieving the full potential of HRIS. They also tried to indicate other problems which  were a lack of HR knowledge by people who designed the system and the shortfall of applications/solutions for HR users. A survey conducted by the Institute of Management and Administration (2002) indicated that the biggest problems or obstacles to managing a HRIS include:
. The lack of staff;
. The lack of a budget;
. Problems with time management;

. The need to work with other departments; and
. The lack of information technology (IT) support.

## Empirical studies in HRIS

A number of studies related to HRIS can be discovered in various HR magazines and journals. However most of them are theoretical or non-empirical studies. Based on a thorough research of the literature, in a relevant format, previous empirical studies used qualitative or quantitative approach. The primitive study that was discovered was conducted by Mathys and LaVan (1982). They made a survey to recognize stages in the development of HRIS. Round about 38-40% of the Organizations who were surveyed did not have a IT maintained HRIS. Other survey similarly revealed a relatively low implementation of HRIS (Murdick Schuster). DeSanctis in 1986 also revealed the status of HRIS and assessed its operation and relationships to the management information system (MIS) function. In a another research Ball (2001) conducted a survey of the use of HRIS in smaller organizations. Her study and others such as of Martisons revealed that smaller organizations are less likely to use HRIS. It is noted that the most of researches have focused on the status of the use of HRIS and on the HR applications/features that have been integrated as part of HRIS. Very less or meagre research has been done to see the perceived benefits and potential barriers to the implementation of HRIS.

## Objective of the Study

- To find out whether HRIS is productive in organization culture
- To identify which factor influence the HRIS productivity in an organization
- To identify importance of HRIS in organization culture

## Methodology

The current research is Quantitative in its nature. In Quantitative Research Survey is performed & sample of population is measured. Questionnaire containing twenty questions were distributed to employees of different private organization.

The collected data analysis checked in SPSS to find out information from the data collected.

1. *Respondents Details:*
   Out of 100 responses 77 were male and 23 were females.
2. *Research Design:*

- Data is collected from the means of questionnaire by employees working in different organization.
- To measure the satisfaction a five point scale was used which ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3. *Sampling frame:*
   - Sampling unit- Employees belonging to different sectors
   - Sample size: 100

4. *Tools used for analysis:*

   Data analysis was conducted using statistical package for social science. The collected data is encrypted, formulated into table and finally analyzed with the help of SPSS using Kaiser Meyer Olkin sampling adequacy and factor analysis with varimax rotation.

## Data Analysis and Findings:

Reliability test was first tried and tested on the given data. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient on 20 items has been found as .847, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal cohesion.

**Table 1 Case Processing Summary**

### Case Processing Summary

|        |         | N   | %     |
|--------|---------|-----|-------|
| Cases  | Valid   | 100 | 100.0 |
|        | Excluded[a] | 0   | .0    |
|        | Total   | 100 | 100.0 |

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Table2  Reliability Statistics**

**Reliability Statistics**

| Cronbach's Alpha | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
|---|---|---|
| .843 | .847 | 20 |

## Factor Analysis

100 years ago  Pearson and spearman while working on various research and studies gave the term term "factor analysis". It is a very innovative and helpful tool for measuring the relationship of variable in  complicated form. This is a powerful data technique.

## Requirement of factor analysis

- To ascertain the correlation among the variables
- To identify smaller set of uncorrelated variables to replace the original one for subsequent analysis (regression, discriminate analysis).
- To identify and evaluate validity of scale test or instrument.

## Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy

Several tests should be used to requisite the suitability of the data given by respondent for factor analysis. These tests include KMO which measures adequacy of collected sample. KMO index ranges from 0 - 1 where .8 and above are very good, .7 as good, .6 middle level, and .5 and above are admissible and less than .5 is unacceptable. In our case value of KMO measure of sampling adequacy is 0.766 which is acceptable and useful for factor analysis.

## Bartlett's Test of Sphericity

Bartlett's test of sphericity is a statistical test which try to accost the hypothesis that is the correlation matrix is an indentify matrix. As the test of sphericity is ( $p<.5$ ) so the factor analysis is suitable.

## KMO and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | .757 |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 652.030 |
| | df | 190 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

**Factor Extration**

According to fundamental theorem of factor analysis, factors are taken which encapsulates that every mentioned value can be stated as a linear combination of hypothetical factors. To evaluate the initial factors we utilized Principle Components Analysis. To watch out for  how many factors two statistical criteria are used that is Eigen value and screen plot

# International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
## Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigen values | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 5.282 | 26.41 | 26.41 | 5.282 | 26.41 | 26.41 | 3.544 | 17.719 | 17.719 |
| 2 | 2.787 | 13.937 | 40.347 | 2.787 | 13.937 | 40.347 | 2.587 | 12.937 | 30.656 |
| 3 | 1.325 | 6.624 | 46.971 | 1.325 | 6.624 | 46.971 | 2.144 | 10.72 | 41.375 |
| 4 | 1.123 | 5.616 | 52.587 | 1.123 | 5.616 | 52.587 | 1.735 | 8.675 | 50.05 |
| 5 | 1.082 | 5.409 | 57.996 | 1.082 | 5.409 | 57.996 | 1.589 | 7.946 | 57.996 |
| 6 | 0.984 | 4.918 | 62.914 | | | | | | |
| 7 | 0.919 | 4.595 | 67.51 | | | | | | |
| 8 | 0.853 | 4.265 | 71.775 | | | | | | |
| 9 | 0.761 | 3.806 | 75.58 | | | | | | |
| 10 | 0.693 | 3.463 | 79.044 | | | | | | |
| 11 | 0.631 | 3.154 | 82.198 | | | | | | |
| 12 | 0.625 | 3.126 | 85.324 | | | | | | |
| 13 | 0.568 | 2.84 | 88.164 | | | | | | |
| 14 | 0.489 | 2.446 | 90.61 | | | | | | |
| 15 | 0.436 | 2.179 | 92.789 | | | | | | |
| 16 | 0.382 | 1.909 | 94.698 | | | | | | |
| 17 | 0.332 | 1.662 | 96.36 | | | | | | |
| 18 | 0.296 | 1.482 | 97.842 | | | | | | |
| 19 | 0.227 | 1.136 | 98.979 | | | | | | |
| 20 | 0.204 | 1.021 | 100 | | | | | | |

Principal Component Analysis Method – The Extraction Method utilized.

From the above table generated one can say there are 20 factors out of which 5 were having Eigen value which were higher than 1. The percentage of variability in 5 factors is equal to 57.996

**Round Component Matrix**

| | Component | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| VAR00008 | .777 | | | | |
| VAR00019 | .733 | | | | |
| VAR00015 | .665 | | | | |
| VAR00003 | .641 | | | | |
| VAR00018 | .604 | | | | |
| VAR00013 | .581 | | | | |
| VAR00020 | | | | | |
| VAR00001 | | | | | |
| VAR00010 | | .744 | | | |
| VAR00011 | | .699 | | | |
| VAR00004 | | .681 | | | |
| VAR00016 | | .622 | | | |
| VAR00017 | | | | | |
| VAR00007 | | | .742 | | |
| VAR00002 | | | .660 | | |
| VAR00012 | | | .506 | | |
| VAR00006 | | | | | |
| VAR00005 | | | | .754 | |
| VAR00009 | | | | .662 | |
| VAR00014 | | | | .822 | |

ComponentAnalysis.
 Rotation Method was utilized: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation coincided in 12 iterations.

TABLE 3

| Major Factors | |
|---|---|
| 1.**Influencing factors** | 3.544 of 17.719% |
| Technical Knowledge | 0.777 |
| Absentism Turnover | 0.733 |
| Technical Assistance | 0.665 |
| Long Hours of Training | 0.641 |
| Opportunity For Individual growth | 0.604 |
| Market Competition | 0.581 |
| | |
| | |
| **2.Employee Maintenance** | 2.587 of 12.937% |
| Employee Friendly | 0.744 |
| Increase Transparency | 0.699 |
| Easy Adaptability | 0.681 |
| Formulating Payroll | 0.622 |
| | |
| | |
| **3.Positive Working Environment** | 2.144 of 10.720% |
| Provide Facilities | 0.742 |
| Create Satisfaction | 0.660 |
| Create Discipline | 0.506 |

| | |
|---|---|
| **4.Accountability** | 1.735 of 8.675% |
| Highly Expensive | 0.754 |
| Revenue Generator | 0.662 |
| | |
| **5.Performance Appraisal** | 1.589 of 7.946% |
| Easy Performance evaluation | 0.822 |

## Limitation of Study

☐ Study was carried on age group between 20 -40 so same cannot be categorized to higher age group.
☐ Study had a  small sample size, which could have been expanded.
☐ Personal perceptions were not given due importance.

## One Way ANOVA Test

SPSS Statistics generate different tables in its one-way ANOVA analysis.

Descriptive Table

**Descriptives**

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | 95% Confidence Interval for Mean | | Minimum | Maximum |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound | | |
| VAR00002 | Male | 77 | 1.7532 | .65204 | .07431 | 1.6053 | 1.9012 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.0000 | .60302 | .12574 | 1.7392 | 2.2608 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8100 | .64659 | .06466 | 1.6817 | 1.9383 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00003 | Male | 77 | 2.3506 | .95650 | .10900 | 2.1335 | 2.5677 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.5652 | .72777 | .15175 | 2.2505 | 2.8799 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.4000 | .91010 | .09101 | 2.2194 | 2.5806 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00004 | Male | 77 | 1.9481 | .74155 | .08451 | 1.7797 | 2.1164 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.4348 | .58977 | .12298 | 2.1797 | 2.6898 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.0600 | .73608 | .07361 | 1.9139 | 2.2061 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00005 | Male | 77 | 2.5844 | .95077 | .10835 | 2.3686 | 2.8002 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.4783 | .84582 | .17637 | 2.1125 | 2.8440 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.5600 | .92463 | .09246 | 2.3765 | 2.7435 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00007 | Male | 77 | 1.8312 | .78477 | .08943 | 1.6530 | 2.0093 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 1.8696 | .45770 | .09544 | 1.6716 | 2.0675 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8400 | .72083 | .07208 | 1.6970 | 1.9830 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| VAR00008 | Male | 77 | 2.5974 | 1.12694 | .12843 | 2.3416 | 2.8532 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.6087 | .89133 | .18585 | 2.2233 | 2.9941 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.6000 | 1.07309 | .10731 | 2.3871 | 2.8129 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| VAR00009 | Male | 77 | 2.2468 | .93409 | .10645 | 2.0347 | 2.4588 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.3478 | .77511 | .16162 | 2.0126 | 2.6830 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.2700 | .89730 | .08973 | 2.0920 | 2.4480 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| VAR00010 | Male | 77 | 1.7922 | .56980 | .06494 | 1.6629 | 1.9215 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.2174 | .59974 | .12505 | 1.9580 | 2.4767 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8900 | .60126 | .06013 | 1.7707 | 2.0093 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| VAR00011 | Male | 77 | 1.8052 | .70783 | .08066 | 1.6445 | 1.9659 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.0000 | .42640 | .08891 | 1.8156 | 2.1844 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8500 | .65713 | .06571 | 1.7196 | 1.9804 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00012 | Male | 77 | 1.8182 | .72051 | .08211 | 1.6546 | 1.9817 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.0870 | .59643 | .12436 | 1.8290 | 2.3449 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8800 | .70036 | .07004 | 1.7410 | 2.0190 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| VAR00013 | Male | 77 | 1.8961 | .82053 | .09351 | 1.7099 | 2.0823 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.1739 | .65033 | .13560 | 1.8927 | 2.4551 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.9600 | .79035 | .07903 | 1.8032 | 2.1168 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00014 | Male | 77 | 1.7532 | .79730 | .09086 | 1.5723 | 1.9342 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.1304 | .45770 | .09544 | 1.9325 | 2.3284 | 1.00 | 3.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8400 | .74833 | .07483 | 1.6915 | 1.9885 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| VAR00015 | Male | 77 | 2.2208 | .88293 | .10062 | 2.0204 | 2.4212 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.4783 | .59311 | .12367 | 2.2218 | 2.7347 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.2800 | .82975 | .08297 | 2.1154 | 2.4446 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00016 | Male | 77 | 1.7792 | .66141 | .07537 | 1.6291 | 1.9293 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.1739 | .71682 | .14947 | 1.8639 | 2.4839 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 1.8700 | .69129 | .06913 | 1.7328 | 2.0072 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00018 | Male | 77 | 2.0260 | .76044 | .08666 | 1.8534 | 2.1986 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.4348 | .72777 | .15175 | 2.1201 | 2.7495 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.1200 | .76910 | .07691 | 1.9674 | 2.2726 | 1.00 | 4.00 |
| VAR00019 | Male | 77 | 2.2857 | .97140 | .11070 | 2.0652 | 2.5062 | 1.00 | 5.00 |
| | Female | 23 | 2.8696 | .75705 | .15786 | 2.5422 | 3.1969 | 2.00 | 4.00 |
| | Total | 100 | 2.4200 | .95537 | .09554 | 2.2304 | 2.6096 | 1.00 | 5.00 |

The descriptive table provides some very useful descriptive statistics, which is inclusive the mean, standard deviation and 95% confidence intervals for the dependent variable (Gender) for each separate group (Male, Female), as well as when all groups are combined (Total).

**ANOVA**

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VAR00002 | Between Groups | 1.078 | 1 | 1.078 | 2.621 | .109 |
| | Within Groups | 40.312 | 98 | .411 | | |
| | Total | 41.390 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00003 | Between Groups | .815 | 1 | .815 | .984 | .324 |
| | Within Groups | 81.185 | 98 | .828 | | |
| | Total | 82.000 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00004 | Between Groups | 4.196 | 1 | 4.196 | 8.316 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | 49.444 | 98 | .505 | | |
| | Total | 53.640 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00005 | Between Groups | .200 | 1 | .200 | .232 | .631 |
| | Within Groups | 84.440 | 98 | .862 | | |
| | Total | 84.640 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00007 | Between Groups | .026 | 1 | .026 | .050 | .824 |
| | Within Groups | 51.414 | 98 | .525 | | |
| | Total | 51.440 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00008 | Between Groups | .002 | 1 | .002 | .002 | .965 |
| | Within Groups | 113.998 | 98 | 1.163 | | |
| | Total | 114.000 | 99 | | | |
| VAR00009 | Between Groups | .181 | 1 | .181 | .223 | .638 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 79.529 | 98 | .812 | | |
| VAR00010 | Total | 79.710 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 3.202 | 1 | 3.202 | 9.628 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 32.588 | 98 | .333 | | |
| VAR00011 | Total | 35.790 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | .672 | 1 | .672 | 1.565 | .214 |
| | Within Groups | 42.078 | 98 | .429 | | |
| VAR00012 | Total | 42.750 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 1.279 | 1 | 1.279 | 2.652 | .107 |
| | Within Groups | 47.281 | 98 | .482 | | |
| VAR00013 | Total | 48.560 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 1.367 | 1 | 1.367 | 2.215 | .140 |
| | Within Groups | 60.473 | 98 | .617 | | |
| VAR00014 | Total | 61.840 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 2.520 | 1 | 2.520 | 4.666 | .033 |
| | Within Groups | 52.920 | 98 | .540 | | |
| VAR00015 | Total | 55.440 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 1.174 | 1 | 1.174 | 1.718 | .193 |
| | Within Groups | 66.986 | 98 | .684 | | |
| VAR00016 | Total | 68.160 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 2.759 | 1 | 2.759 | 6.069 | .016 |
| | Within Groups | 44.551 | 98 | .455 | | |
| VAR00018 | Total | 47.310 | 99 | | | |
| | Between Groups | 2.960 | 1 | 2.960 | 5.217 | .025 |
| | Within Groups | 55.600 | 98 | .567 | | |
| | Total | 58.560 | 99 | | | |

| VAR00019 | Between Groups | 6.037 | 1 | 6.037 | 7.016 | .009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 84.323 | 98 | .860 | | |
| | Total | 90.360 | 99 | | | |

This is the table that shows the result of the annova analysis and finds out whether there have been a statistically significant difference between means of group defined . Through analysis we can conclude that significance level is 0.109 ($p = .109$), which needs to be above 0.05. and, therefore, there is a no statistically significant difference in the mean

## Result of Hypothesis'

Null Hypothesis = No Significant Difference and is rejected or disapproved

Alternate Hypothesis = Significant difference in mean and hypothesis accepted

P = Sig = Significant Value

If p< .05 = Reject Null Hypothesis

    = Accept = There is significant relation in mean

If p> .05 = Keep Null Hypothesis

    = Reject = There is no significance difference in mean.

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VAR00002 | Between Groups | 1.078 | 1 | 1.078 | 2.621 | .109 |
| | Within Groups | 40.312 | 98 | .411 | | |
| | Total | 41.390 | 99 | | | |

VAR00002 = HRIS Satisfaction

"There was no significant effect of HRIS satisfaction on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 2.621, p = 0.109]"

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VAR00003 | Between Groups | .815 | 1 | .815 | .984 | .324 |
| | Within Groups | 81.185 | 98 | .828 | | |
| | Total | 82.000 | 99 | | | |

VAR00003 = Long Hours Of Training

"There was no significant effect of long hours of training on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 0.984, p = 0.324]"

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VAR00004 | Between Groups | 4.196 | 1 | 4.196 | 8.316 | .005 |
| | Within Groups | 49.444 | 98 | .505 | | |
| | Total | 53.640 | 99 | | | |

VAR00004 = Easy Adaptability

"There was a significant effect of adaptability on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 8.316, p = 0.005]"

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VAR00005 | Between Groups | .200 | 1 | .200 | .232 | .631 |
| | Within Groups | 84.440 | 98 | .862 | | |

| | Total | 84.640 | 99 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

VAR00005 = High expenses

"There was no significant effect of high expenses on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 0.232, p = 0.631]"

| VAR00007 | Between Groups | .026 | 1 | .026 | .050 | .824 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 51.414 | 98 | .525 | | |
| | Total | 51.440 | 99 | | | |

VAR00007 = HRIS Facilities

"There was no significant effect of HRIS Facilities on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 0.050, p = 0.824]"

| VAR00008 | Between Groups | .002 | 1 | .002 | .002 | .965 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 113.998 | 98 | 1.163 | | |
| | Total | 114.000 | 99 | | | |

VAR00008 = Technical Knowledge

"There was no significant effect of technical knowledge on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 0.002, p = 0.965]"

| VAR00009 | Between Groups | .181 | 1 | .181 | .223 | .638 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 79.529 | 98 | .812 | | |
| | Total | 79.710 | 99 | | | |

VAR00009 = Revenue Generator

"There was no significant effect of relation of revenue generator on productivity at the $p < .05$ level for the two conditions$(F(1,98) = 0.223, p = 0.638]$"

| VAR00010 | Between Groups | 3.202 | 1 | 3.202 | 9.628 | .003 |
|----------|----------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 32.588 | 98  | .333   |        |      |
|          | Total          | 35.790 | 99  |        |        |      |

VAR00010 = Employee Friendly

"There was a significant effect of employee maintenance on productivity at the $p < .05$ level for the two conditions$(F(1,98) = 9.628, p = 0.003]$"

| VAR00011 | Between Groups | .672   | 1   | .672   | 1.565 | .214 |
|----------|----------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 42.078 | 98  | .429   |        |      |
|          | Total          | 42.750 | 99  |        |        |      |

VAR00011 = Transparency

"There was no significant effect of transparency on productivity at the $p < .05$ level for the two conditions$(F(1,98) = 1.565, p = 0.214]$"

| VAR00012 | Between Groups | 1.279  | 1   | 1.279  | 2.652 | .107 |
|----------|----------------|--------|-----|--------|--------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 47.281 | 98  | .482   |        |      |
|          | Total          | 48.560 | 99  |        |        |      |

VAR00012 = Disciplined Working environment

"There was no significant effect of disciplined working environment on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 2.652, p = 0.107]"

| VAR00013 | Between Groups | 1.367 | 1 | 1.367 | 2.215 | .140 |
|----------|----------------|-------|---|-------|-------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 60.473 | 98 | .617 |       |      |
|          | Total          | 61.840 | 99 |      |       |      |

VAR00013 = Marketing Competition

"There was no significant effect of market competition on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 2.215, p = 0.140]"

| VAR00014 | Between Groups | 2.520 | 1 | 2.520 | 4.666 | .033 |
|----------|----------------|-------|---|-------|-------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 52.920 | 98 | .540 |       |      |
|          | Total          | 55.440 | 99 |      |       |      |

VAR00014 = Performance Appraisal

"There was a significant effect of performance appraisal on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 4.666, p = 0.033]"

| VAR00015 | Between Groups | 1.174 | 1 | 1.174 | 1.718 | .193 |
|----------|----------------|-------|---|-------|-------|------|
|          | Within Groups  | 66.986 | 98 | .684 |       |      |
|          | Total          | 68.160 | 99 |      |       |      |

VAR00015 = Technical assistance

"There was no significant effect of technical assistance on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 1.718, p = 0.193]"

| VAR00016 | Between Groups | 2.759 | 1 | 2.759 | 6.069 | .016 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 44.551 | 98 | .455 | | |
| | Total | 47.310 | 99 | | | |

VAR00016 = Payroll formulation

"There was a significant effect of payroll formulation on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 6.069, p = 0.016]"

| VAR00018 | Between Groups | 2.960 | 1 | 2.960 | 5.217 | .025 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 55.600 | 98 | .567 | | |
| | Total | 58.560 | 99 | | | |

VAR00018 = Individual Growth

"There was a significant effect of individual growth on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 5.217, p = 0.025]"

| VAR00019 | Between Groups | 6.037 | 1 | 6.037 | 7.016 | .009 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Within Groups | 84.323 | 98 | .860 | | |
| | Total | 90.360 | 99 | | | |

VAR00019 = Absenteeism Turnover

"There was a significant effect of absenteeism turnover on productivity at the p <.05 level for the two conditions(F(1,98) = 7.016, p = 0.009]"

## Result

| Hypothesis | P- Value | Result |
|---|---|---|
| HRIS System Creates Satisfaction | .109 | REJECTED |
| HRIS System requires long hour of training | .324 | REJECTED |
| HIRS System is easy to understand and get adapted to it | .005 | ACCEPTED |
| HRIS system involves huge expenses and is costly affairs | .631 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system provides facilities which makes life comfortable | .824 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system requires high technical knowledge | .965 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system is a revenue generator | .638 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system is Employee friendly | .003 | ACCEPTED |
| | | |

# International Journal Of Core Engineering & Management (IJCEM)
## Volume 2, Issue 1, April 2015

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| HRIS system increase transparency | .214 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system creates discipline in working environment of the company | .107 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system helps in facing market competition | .140 | REJECTED |
| Performance Evaluation gets easier tasks using HRIS system | .033 | ACCEPTED |
| HRIS system requires regular technical assistance | .193 | REJECTED |
| HRIS system helps in formulating payroll for the employee | .016 | ACCEPTED |
| HRIS system gives opportunity for individual growth | .025 | ACCEPTED |
| HRIS system Decrease absenteeism turnover | .009 | ACCEPTED |

## Conclusion

HRIS is an integrated system which is formulated to extract gather, save and analyze information regarding an organization which comprises of databases which collect information, applications, hardware and software highly required to gather, save, manage, process, provide and manipulate data for human resources function

- . The HRIS system utilization in organizations has various positive aspects for personnel managers especially in decision making processes.
- In this research, it was revealed that HRIS increases productivity.
- According to the various surveys and researches conducted it was seen there was high frequency in a positive way among various dimensions HRIS and factors which influence it production in organization.
- It was discovered that HRIS helps in creating employee friendly working environment.
- It makes work more enjoyable, challenging and leads to career growth of employees.

The results of the research which we performed provide for, that HR employees feel HRIS very useful and they gain satisfaction with the system.

## Reference

1. Dr.Nisha Aggrwal,Mona Kapoor," Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS) - Its role and importance in Business Competitiveness" GIAN JYOTI E-JOURNAL, Volume 1, Issue 2 (Jan – Mar 2012).
2. Yasemin Bal, Serdar Bozkurt Esin Ertemsir," The Importance Of Using Human Resources Information Systems (HRIS) And A Research On Determining The Success Of HRIS"Management knowledge learning, International Conference 2012.
3. Dr.Shikha N.Khera, Ms Karishma Gulati," Human Resource Information System and its Impact On Human Resource Planning: A perceptual analysis of Information Technology companies" IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSRJBM) ISSN: 2278-487X Volume 3, Issue 6 (Sep,-Oct. 2012)