University of Nebraska at Omaha
DigitalCommons@UNO

Student Work

4-1-2006

A Case Study of Success Factors Associated with a Global Implementation of ERP/HRMS Software

Deanna House
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork

Recommended Citation
House, Deanna, "A Case Study of Success Factors Associated with a Global Implementation of ERP/HRMS Software" (2006). *Student Work*. 1321.
https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/1321

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

A Case Study of Success Factors Associated with a Global Implementation of ERP/HRMS Software

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Information Systems and Quantitative Analysis

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Deanna House

April 2006

UMI Number: EP73461

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI
Dissertation Publishing

UMI EP73461
Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Acceptance Page

Thesis Acceptance

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Management of Information Systems, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Peter Wolcott

Chairperson

Date 4/17/6.

A Case Study of Success Factors Associated with a Global Implementation of ERP/HRMS Software

Deanna House, MS

University of Nebraska, 2006

Advisor: Dr. Gert-Jan de Vreede

This research observes a global implementation of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)/Human Resources Management System (HRMS) software at an International company in Omaha, Nebraska. The software was implemented in sixteen countries. Variables such as cultural differences, communication-distance, management support, trust, and fear of change were evaluated in the literature review. These variables have an impact on implementation success during global HRMS implementation. Further analyses on specific success factors faced with global implementations were evaluated using semi-structured interviews. The author prepared a questionnaire to further explore the data. Respondents rated questions related to management support the highest overall. An interesting find was that the semi-structured interview results indicated that the software chosen was not a perfect fit for the global community. The mean for Global HRMS Success was higher for respondents located in the United States than those located in other locations.

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION **1**

BACKGROUND **3**

LITERATURE REVIEW **7**

CULTURAL DIFFERENCES 9
COMMUNICATION – DISTANCE 13
FEAR OF CHANGE 15
MANAGEMENT SUPPORT 18
TRUST 19

PURPOSE OF RESEARCH **21**

RESEARCH MODEL/APPROACH **21**

RESEARCH RESULTS **24**

COMMUNICATION - DISTANCE 29
Time Zones *29*
Globally Distributed Locations *31*
CULTURAL ISSUES 32
Language *35*
EXECUTIVE SUPPORT 37
FEAR OF CHANGE 38
Training *38*
ADDITIONAL ISSUES 40
IMPLEMENTATION SUCCESS 41

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS **42**

CONCLUSIONS **44**

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS **47**

FUTURE AREAS OF RESEARCH **47**

BIBLIOGRAPHY **49**

APPENDIX A: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS **52**

APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW RESPONSES **54**

APPENDIX C: QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER **63**

APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE **64**

APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE DETAILED RESULTS **69**

Introduction

The implementation of global Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) software has different considerations than U.S.-based implementations. This research was conducted to seek out issues that influenced the global implementation of ERP/HRMS systems. Human Resources Management Systems or HRMS are a group of the modules of ERP software. These modules typically house employee data – which includes benefits, payroll, and compensation. The terms ERP and HRMS will be used interchangeably for the purpose of this research.

Companies are beginning to realize the value in storing global data using ERP software. It is important to have personal and work related information about employees available for reporting and informative purposes. Typically HR is the driving force behind the transformation to a global system. This is in line with Rothwell & Prescott (1999) that stated, "If HR managers make it a top priority to link their systems on a global basis it will automatically elevate their role in expansion. HR departments must transform their operations in order to deal with the new global landscape" (page 7). In addition, Donelly (2005) wrote that "with a multicountry view, companies can leverage payroll systems to access data they might not otherwise have access to. This data can provide a foundation for integrating the management of hiring, learning, compensation, employee performance, career development, and internal mobility – and for ensuring that the workforce has the knowledge, resources, and agility the

company requires" (23). Having access to global employee data gives companies the ability to quickly get information regarding the company as a whole.

That being said, companies must understand the legal implications of storing global data. For example, companies that are in a non-European Union nation that have employees that are located in a European Union (EU) nation must be Safe Harbor compliant before personal data can be transferred (electronically or otherwise). The key is identifiable personal information – without Safe Harbor compliance, information cannot be transferred if there is an identifiable number or name included. Additionally, if personal information is to be transmitted to non-EU countries, a signed consent must be received from the person whose information is being transmitted. (http://www.export.gov/safeharbor/sh_workbook.html) It is important to get legal advice from an experienced counsel to ensure compliance with all countries laws and regulations that the company has dealings with.

This research will focus on the success factors associated with implementing global HRMS software. Issues that are looked at are management support, fear of change, communication-distance, trust, and cultural differences and how the issues influence the success of the implementation. Research is conducted initially in the form of a literature review. Additionally, a global implementation of an ERP/HRMS system is studied. The company is introduced below. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with key implementation

team personnel. After the interview data is evaluated, questionnaires were distributed to the entire global implementation team.

Background

Global Software Inc. is a software company that provides customer care and billing solutions for communications companies all over the world. Global Software Inc. provides services to over 1900 client sites – touching over 40 million households worldwide. Global Software Inc.'s headquarters are located in Denver, Colorado. The company has over 265 customers in more than 40 countries. Global Software Inc. is a publicly traded company with around 2600 employees (http://www.csgsystems.com).

Global Software Inc. has offices in locations throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, France, United Kingdom, Spain, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Singapore, Japan, Malaysia, Australia, India, and China. Global Software Inc. acquired a large company in 2002. This acquisition forced Global Software Inc. to evaluate its current business processes. Global Software Inc. quickly went from a mainly US-based company to one that had offices in multiple locations worldwide. The corporate organization, which includes Human Resources, was very involved in ensuring that the new employees were brought on in a timely manner.

The HR tool that was in place before (and during) the acquisition was mainly a payroll tool and did not meet global business needs. The company

needed a system that would efficiently store global data and in turn, be able to format that data to make strategic decisions. "Having accessible data enables HR planning and managerial decision making to be based to a greater degree on information rather than relying on managerial perception and intuition" (Mathis & Jackson, 2000, p. 56). To make all of this happen, the executive management of the company knew that the current HRMS system must be reevaluated from a global perspective. The executive management was the main driving force behind the core global data requirements.

Global Software Inc. implemented a global HRMS so that all employee data could be located in the same system and available to HR for use to make organizational decisions/evaluations. This is in line with Rothwell & Prescott (1999), "If HR managers make it a top priority to link their systems on a global basis it will automatically elevate their role in expansion. HR departments must transform their operations in order to deal with the new global landscape" (page 7). In addition, Donelly (2005) wrote that "with a multicountry view, companies can leverage payroll systems to access data they might not otherwise have access to. This data can provide a foundation for integrating the management of hiring, learning, compensation, employee performance, career development, and internal mobility – and for ensuring that the workforce has the knowledge, resources, and agility the company requires" (p. 23). Requirements were gathered from each of the regions and vendor Lawson Software was chosen. Project teams were set up for the United States, Europe, Asia, and South

America (which included both Mexico and Canada). All HR functional areas had input to both the system requirements and the system setup. All employees in the U.S. locations are paid by payroll that is run in-house. Payroll is outsourced for all locations outside of the U.S. The payroll vendors are not consolidated at all. Employee payroll information had to be collected from a different vendor for each country. At times, this proved to be difficult because it was not easy for the regions to understand what kind of data was needed. It was also difficult for the vendors to understand the data requirements for the employee data uploads of global payroll data into the system.

The Human Resources module, which consisted of Payroll, Benefits Administration, Personnel Administration, and Employee and Manager Self Service, was implemented in one year's time. There was a strict go-live deadline of January 1, 2005, because for tax purposes U.S. employees had to be paid out of the new system beginning with the New Year. Additionally, the licenses for the previous Human Resources Management system would expire at the end of the year. As of January 1, 2005, the international locations had employee data loaded and some self-service functionality. International benefit and payroll data were planned to go-live at milestones throughout 2005.

The HRIS team had the responsibilities of learning all aspects of the software, project management, and user guidance (including training for the international groups). HRIS was able to travel occasionally to the regions, but budget constraints prevented the team from traveling frequently. HRIS

conducted meetings by conference call and made the commitment to be on call during implementation and post implementation. The combination of global travel and the commitment to support have helped HRIS build a strong relationship with the international locations.

Go-live was on time – January 1, 2005. A few snags were encountered, and the international locations used email and telephone to inform the support team of issues. Front line support was provided by the HRIS team. Any issues that needed to be escalated were forwarded on to the MIS team. The MIS team was responsible for security, hardware support, and general HRIS administrative functions (backups, server issues, etc...).

Due to the fact that the HRIS team was located in the United States, the time change differences for training and support issues varied quite a bit. The HRIS team had conference calls early in the morning or late at night. It was important for the other locations to have input regarding the system. These calls were typically informal so that the international locations could feel comfortable with the new system.

A large portion of the research found for the literature review regarding global Human Research Management System implementations focuses on Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) implementations as a whole. HRMS software is one of the modules within an ERP system. For the purpose of this research, ERP implementation research is considered to include HRMS implementations.

It should be noted that the global division of Global Software Inc. was sold to another company in December 2005. The bulk of the interview and questionnaire data were collected in early 2006. The researcher/author attempted to contact as many former global employees as possible to ensure that the opinions of the global areas was documented.

Literature Review

Companies are globalizing by increasing business around the world, which in turn means locations with employees distributed in many different global locations. Hustad (2004) gives the definition of the term globalization as "having several meanings and definitions; but it certainly reflects the increasing interconnection of societies in terms of their economic, political, and cultural aspects." He goes on the say that "globalization means that borders become less relevant to everyday behavior." (p. 55). In light of this, it is important for these companies to have access to organizational data not only for the potential to make strategic decisions about the company, but also to have information about individual employees. As noted by Loeb et al. (1998) global systems assist in consolidating data all in one place, which makes the availability of consistent, accurate, and reliable data much faster to process (p. 305). When decisions need to be made, it is not feasible for companies (and their executives) to wait days or even weeks for consolidated data. Companies that have the

ability to report on the entire employee population quickly and effectively are able to save both time and expense.

Research varies as to what the challenges of a global implementation are, and what factors make an implementation successful. According to Laudon & Laudon (2004), management challenges faced when developing global systems are: agreeing on common user requirements, introducing changes in business processes, coordinating applications development, coordinating software releases, and encouraging local users to support global systems. (p. 491). It should also be noted that "global rollouts present unique issues with timing because dealing with multiple labor markets and economic conditions around the globe is much more challenging than planning around one labor market or one economy" (Wiechmann et al., 2003, p. 73).

Risk analysis is something that should be performed when implementing software globally. After risks are identified and documented, risk analysis is initially performed using Qualitative Risk Analysis, according to the Project Management Institute. Qualitative Risk Analysis will assist in the prioritization of risks and assessing those risks for further action. Identifying risks is iterative in nature, with risks identified throughout the project. Some of the ways a project risk can affect a project is in regards to cost, time, or even the organization's environment. It is necessary to be prepared to deal with items that are perceived threats to the project success. (*A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge*, 2004).

The research within this section will explore some of the most common issues associated with global implementations of a HRMS; cultural differences, communication – distance, fear of change, management support, and trust.

Cultural differences

Culture is something that cannot necessarily be defined in one specific way – each person has his or her own type of culture. Many different interpretations were found for culture. Mathis & Jackson (2000) stated that, "culture is composed of societal forces affecting the values, beliefs, and actions of a distinct group of people" (p. 116). "Our own culture conditions us, consciously and unconsciously, to the way things are done. In a thousand different situations every day, culture smoothes human performance – we know what is expected of us and what we can expect from others." (Elashmawi & Harris, 1993, 14). Elashmawi & Harris (1993) also go on to state that our cultural values are based experiences from childhood and beyond. The values that each individual has differ not only from country to country, but also within countries. (p.53). Hofstede (1983) defines culture as "collective mental programming: it is that part of our conditioning that we share with other members of our nation, region, or group but not with members of other nations, regions, or groups" (p.76). Therefore, when several different cultures are participating on the same team, it is important to remain flexible and understanding of other cultures. It is

also important to recognize that global implementations have potential for cultural differences.

Hofstede has conducted much research on culture and the five dimensions and their differences among countries. The four that Hofstede initially identified are: individualism vs. collectivism, large or small power distance, strong or weak uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity (Hofstede, 1983). Hofstede later identified a fifth dimension after his 1983 research which is low versus high long term orientation. Hofstede studied the dimension differences among 50 different countries. He found that there was a direct correlation between individualist nations and a country's wealth. The power distance of nations looks at the issue that people are unequal. Countries that are collective typically have a large power distance. The power distance of individualist countries ranges between low and high – sometimes based on wealth of the country. Weak uncertainty avoidance is prevalent in countries where people naturally feel relatively insecure. Nations with strong power distance strive to create security with low risk. Masculinity vs. femininity looks at the division of the social sex role. Those countries with a small division are considered feminine, those with a large division are considered masculine (Hofstede, 1983). Hofstede was a pioneer in the field of cultural differences, and his works are still widely used today. It should be noted, however, that these findings are perceived differences, and that not every person in the country is necessarily this way. However, organizations can research these differences to help identify and avoid

potential conflict. This is especially important during global implementations when many different geographical locations are involved.

One of the suggestions for handling culture is to have the implementation team model business processes, the national and organizational cultures that influence these, and how these factors influence the solutions. (Krumbholz et al., 2000). Another suggestion for dealing with teams that consist of different cultures is to work on teambuilding activities. According to Fisher & Fisher (2001), teams that are separated by distance can participate in activities to get to know each other on a more personal level. However, keep in mind that whichever activity is chosen should be appropriate for all cultures participating (p. 79). Another useful tip from Fisher & Fisher (2001) is to demonstrate how to give and receive feedback. Again, the method for eliciting feedback must be considerate of the participating cultures. It is necessary to select the best time and place and make sure to keep self-esteem of the receiver of feedback (p.80). By being able to give and receive feedback, the team is allowed to express opinions in a controlled and inoffensive manner.

It is important to keep culture in mind when implementing software globally. Cultural differences can cause noteworthy issues among global implementations. Being aware of these issues and potential solutions can keep detrimental happenings from throwing the project off.

Culture plays a large part in the success of a global software implementation. For example, Scott & Vessey (2002) noted that organizational

culture can also be a factor in successful implementations. Open and honest communication engages employees in the system and creates loyalty for the product. Ives & Jarvenpaa (1991), found key issues involving the cultural environment and global IT. For instance, mangers should be sensitized to cultural, religious, and political differences and seek to agree on solutions that are the most mutually acceptable.

Gross & Wingerup (1999) suggest a strong global culture should be in place. A global corporate culture means "global planning, leadership, and governance that encourage multinational and cross-cultural collaboration. It means fostering global competencies and mobility of employees and managers. It means equipping people with a global mindset, social skills and business skills" (p.26). When values are initially created, the organization founder can greatly influence these values. It is important not to devalue local cultures when this organizational culture is set. Hofstede found that even if an organizational founder is creating the culture, his/her national culture is typically reflected in the organizational culture, and passed on internationally (Hofstede, 1985). It is important for the founder to ensure that values are in place for business reasons, not strictly because of his/her own beliefs.

"Cultural and social changes should accompany and complement technological changes for sustained and effective organizational change" (Newell et al., 2001, p. 76). Allowing individuals from each culture to participate on the implementation team can help ensure that all of the different views and

backgrounds are taken into consideration. It is imperative that organizations evaluate and resolve any potential cultural issues during project implementations so that these issues do not prevent the project from being successful.

Communication – distance

"Communication on a project involves the exchange of information, ideas and status between the core and extended project teams" (Purba & Shah, 2000, p. 9). When the team members are not in the same location or even the same country, this can be difficult. Care must be taken to ensure that each team member feels that he/she is able to speak his/her mind.

It is extremely important for project teams to be able to communicate effectively when distributed around the world. "People in scattered locations must have reliable channels of communication and equal access to resources to avoid duplication of effort and redundant costs. Employees need to be able to collaborate with each other across great distances. And, to be competitive, companies need a technological infrastructure that helps them maximize productivity." (Solomon, 1998, p. 13). Time zone differences can sometimes be an advantage. It is always a work-day at one of the locations. When one day is ending, another is beginning.

Distance among team members does not have to be a negative for the team. According to Bagchi et al. (2004), "ITs have provided a means for the complex, changing patterns of interdependence in individualistic societies to be

managed. IT is commonly used to promote the strengths and overcome the limitations of these characteristics of individualistic societies. It does so by allowing people to work more independently from one another in the sense that they have the increased option to maintain greater physical distance and schedule their activities to meet the needs of the various groups to which they belong without concern for the location of others" (p. 32 - 33). As new technology emerges, it is becoming easier for employees to collaborate globally.

One technology that is used for distributed teams is Group Support Systems (GSS). GSS software allows users to effectively and easily participate in meetings in a distributed group setting. There is frequently a meeting facilitator that organizes and sets up the meetings. Also, virtual collaborative workspaces can allow distributed teams to work together and share information. Some software will track changes to documents/workspaces while other team members are offline and inform the users at logon what changes have been made. This makes it much more flexible for meetings to take place across the world since users can work during their normal business hours. It is important to make sure that the types of users of the system are taken into consideration when introducing new technology. Care must be taken to ensure that all team members are comfortable with the GSS software.

Virtual collaboration may not always be the ultimate answer for communicating. It is also important to meet face-to-face occasionally. Meeting face-to-face can cultivate trust among teams. Fisher & Fisher (2001)

recommend periodic face-to-face meetings for milestones and items that are best addressed in-person (such as training or social activities).

In addition to communication issues, language barriers can cause miscommunications and misunderstandings during global implementations. It is pertinent that all team members agree upon the chosen language. It is common for global businesses to conduct business in English. However, English may be a second language for some team members, and those team members may need additional processing time for system setups and decisions. As researched by Sheu et al, (2004), when different sites that do not speak the same language interact, communication can be very difficult. (p. 366). When important decisions are made during meetings, minutes should be sent out to ensure that all parties involved understand any deliverables or decisions. Elashmawi & Harris (1993) recommend the use of an interpreter to get past a language barrier. (p. 35). Additional consideration should be made for the different types of slang and other ways of speaking. Some cultures are much more formal than others, and it is important to keep this in mind when communicating. Phrases can be interpreted in many different ways, so care must be taken when speaking with team members.

Fear of change

User involvement can be one of the aspects of fear of change. It is important for the correct users to be chosen for the project team. Zhang et al.

(2003) found that if users are involved early in the organization requirements gathering, resistance to the new system will be decreased.

However, similar groups will tend to stick together. Gefen et al, (2005) found that when an individual is making a decision, it is common to identify with (and rely upon) members of the decision-maker's perceived social group (p. 60). It is important to engage all team members and to be aware of any potential "cliques" outside of the project implementation team so that outside decisions can be avoided.

The implementation team must be considerate of the requirements and desires of global locations. Wellins & Rioux (2000) noted that there are differences between business practices and locations and this can cause resistance to change. Organizations must be careful when proposing changes so that the local staff understands the initiative. If the staff does not accept the changes, it can cause resistance. Keeping all global team members engaged is most important to prevent these issues from surfacing.

Training is also very important when new systems are introduced. Elashmawi & Harris (1993) mention that training sessions must be created "with cultural values in mind. (p. 142). Learning style and language will also affect training sessions. Training materials and training style should be adjusted each time it is conducted in a different location, especially if the culture is different. Depending on the location of the trainers, the training session times should be held at times that are convenient for the location. Distance learning has been

introduced by many companies to save money on travel costs. Distance learning allows a trainer to remain at his/her office location and conduct training courses for employees worldwide. However, if training is conducted online, it is extremely important to ensure that the trainees are able to ask questions and fully understand the materials. Additional follow-up training courses can help alleviate instances of information overload. According to Noe (1999), one of the major disadvantages of distance learning is "the potential lack of interaction between the trainer and the audience" (p. 205). Noe (1999) stresses the importance of trainer/trainee communication.

According to a survey conducted by Atul Gupta (2000), "the main hurdle faced by all companies was resistance to change" (p. 116) Additionally, Gupta (2000) mentions that "top management commitment helps in streamlining difficult decisions with regard to integration of business processes" (p. 118). Maintaining open communication and allowing time for the normal acceptance of change will help ensure that new systems are accepted.

Aladwani (2001) suggests implementing a change management strategy consisting of knowledge formulation, strategy implementation, and status evaluation. The knowledge formulation phase looks at individual user attitudes. This will assist in finding the cause of resistance. The strategy implementation phase involves communicating the benefits of the new system including training and upper-management support. The status evaluation phase continuously evaluates the worker feedback to keep abreast of any additional resistance to the

ERP. (p.269). Top management support is also imperative to alleviate resistance to the ERP. Additional findings on management support are discussed below.

Management support

As experienced by Dow Corning Corporation, it is important for management to support both the implementation efforts, and the system staying power. Employees are willing to put more effort into an implementation if it is communicated that the software will be used for an extended period of time. (Ross, 265). Additionally, Zhang et al. (2003) found that top management support can help make the implementation successful by "(1) providing leadership and (2) providing the necessary resources" (p. 5).

It is important to have a steering committee in place for quick issue resolution and monitoring the direction of the project. Typically, upper-level or executive management should participate on the committee. Having upper-level management make final decisions for key issues throughout the implementation will allow them to remain visible. Aladwani (2001) states that by involving key leaders in the decision-making process throughout implementation will make those individuals feel more committed to the system. This commitment will flow down to from the leaders to other coworkers (p.272). In global implementations, representatives from each location or region should be present. Careful selection of the steering committee members can ensure that communication between the regions remains intact.

He (2004) mentions that management support "is important throughout the entire project life cycle". (p. 155). This is critical for the acceptance of the new system by the project team and any other personnel involved early on. Ghosh (2002) stresses the importance of management support for ERP implementations. He specifically states that the corporate level management support is necessary to keep everyone motivated. Communication from corporate level management throughout the project will get the employees excited (and prepared) for the change. Key milestones should be broadcast and celebrated.

In addition, Ghosh (2002) mentions that strong sponsorship is required from management during ERP implementations. Management support is important due to the "cross-functional nature and large budget of a typical ERP implementation" (Brown & Vessey, 1999, p. 11).

Trust

In regards to ERP implementations – "trust increases the positive assessment of IT usefulness" (Gefen et al. , p. 55). Trust is an important variable where global implementations are concerned. This is usually because team members are from diverse cultural backgrounds and in distributed locations. In respect to global data, Loeb et al. (1998) mentions "an organizational culture that takes advantage of the trust and respect of the users for integrity and professionalism is likely to implement and benefit" also "mutual trust among

executives, management personnel, and knowledge workers was found a necessity and had to be nurtured over a period of time" (p. 303)

Evaristo (2003) states that a reason for mistrust among individuals is "lack of knowledge about rationale for past or present behaviors and intentions" which also influences risk-taking of an unknown situation. (p. 62) This also influences "cooperative behavior". Issues of trust can sometimes be resolved by having face-to-face meetings. If meeting face-to-face is not possible, having social time – even if over the phone – can give other team members a chance to get to know each other. This can improve relationships and help open up communication.

According to Evaristo (2003), "higher levels of trust are supposed to result in more positive attitudes, superior levels of cooperation, and other forms of workplace behavior, as well as higher levels of performance. Trust enables an environment where more cooperation, higher performance, and other attitudes and perceptions are more likely." Trust can be developed using many different methods. For example, Fisher & Fisher (2001) find that good communication is key. Interactions with team members should be predictable, honest, consistent. This will help other team members learn to trust each other. Another tip is to remain visible and accessible. (p.93). This can be a challenge when working across many time zones, but it is imperative to gain the trust of the team. Taking the initiative to check email or take phone calls during off-hours can be an extremely effective means for building trust.

It is important for global implementation teams to include team members from different locations and different cultures. It is also important for all team members to communicate throughout the project. Trust issues can develop if the lines of communication are not open.

Purpose of Research

As more companies are implementing global ERP/HRMS systems, it is realized that there are additional personnel issues encountered specific to global implementations. This research will look at success factors specific to one company when implementing global HRMS (Human Resources Management System) software. The research objective is to identify success factors that will positively influence the global implementation of HRMS software. The question: "What factors influence the successful global implementation of a HRMS" will be answered. A series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with key project team personnel. After the interview data was evaluated, a questionnaire was prepared and administered to global project personnel.

Research Model/Approach

The following implementation issues were found during the literature review: cultural differences, communication – distance, fear of change, management support, and trust. ERP implementations (successes and failures),

global software implementations, and issues faced when there are global cultural differences were all studied for the literature review.

The semi-structured interviews were conducted at various locations – mostly outside of the place of business being studied. A few of the interviews were administered to global personnel over the phone. The interview data was evaluated to find key issues associated with the implementation. The interviewees were selected based on their availability and willingness to participate in a brief semi-structured interview. The author selected a mixture of both global and U.S.-based personnel that had participated in the global HRMS implementation. Interviewees with a variation of job titles and departments were selected to get a broad range of experiences.

The questionnaire was written by the author to specifically look at the success of the implementation, management support, fear of change, communication – distance, trust, and cultural differences. An existing questionnaire was not found that would look at those specific issues. The questionnaire was administered online using Surveyz! software. The questionnaire data was consolidated and evaluated. The author selected the questionnaire respondents by viewing the project participation listing and selecting those individuals that had interaction with the global HRMS implementation. Respondents were contacted by email, and were informed that participation was completely voluntary. The author had a previous working

relationship with all of the individuals contacted, but it is unknown whether or not this influenced the respondents' participation.

The table below displays the variables and their origin (semi-structured interviews versus literature review). Some of the variables are a combination of both the literature review and the interview results.

Variable Name	Literature Review	Interview Results
Global HRMS Success	X	x
Management Support	X	X
Fear of Change	X	
Communication – Distance	X	
Trust	X	
Cultural Differences	X	X
Training		X
Globally Distributed Locations		X
Time Zones		X
Language		X

Research Results

A table displaying a comparison of research results to the literature review findings is shown below.

Research Findings	Factor in

	Literature Review
Communication – Distance	
Time zone differences made it difficult to communicate	Yes
Response time issues between locations	Yes
Participants had support	No
Steering committee global members didn't participate	Yes
Meeting times were not always convenient	Yes
Lack of face-to-face time	Yes
Cultural Differences	
Work ethic/work environment	No
Custom/Regulation issues	Yes
Language – ESL	Yes
Communication barriers	Yes
Management Support	
Executive HR allowed team to make decisions	Yes
Globally, not a good fit	No
Steering committee formed with regional directors	Yes
Fear of Change	
Resistance to training from global team members	Yes
Tool not meant to be used globally, which caused resistance	No
Global HRMS Success	
Was on time/on budget	No
Global data entry process did not improve	No
Software not intended to be used globally	No

Semi-structured interviews were given to seven U.S.-based and global Global Software Inc. HR employees. The interviews were conducted face-to-face when possible and over the phone when necessary. Several issues surfaced during the semi-structured interviews, some of which were also incorporated into the questionnaire.

The following project participants were interviewed:

Interview Number	Job Title	Location
1	Manager, Global HRIS	U.S.
2	Director of Benefits	U.S.
3	Project Manager	U.S.
4	Manager, Int'l HR Services	U.S.
5	HR Director, EMEA	U.K.
6	Manager, IT Project Planning	U.S.
7	HR Generalist	Brazil

The author was unable to find an existing questionnaire that evaluated the specific issues that were discussed in the literature review and uncovered during the semi-structured interview. Therefore, the author developed her own questionnaire to look at management support, fear of change, communication-distance, trust, and cultural differences. A seven-point Likert scale was used. The questionnaire was sent to team members electronically using Surveyz! software (www.surveyz.com).

The table below shows the questionnaire items related to each variable.

Variable Name	# of Items	Questionnaire Item #'s
Background Data	2	1-2
Global HRMS Success	6	3-8
Management Support	6	9-14
Fear of Change	5	15-19
Communication – Distance	6	20-25
Trust	6	26-31
Cultural Differences	6	32-37

Survey participants were selected based on participation with the global HRMS implementation. Seventeen invitations were sent by email. Of those seventeen, fourteen completed the questionnaire. Seven of the fourteen were U.S.-based team members, and seven were global. Participation was voluntary and confidential. The questionnaire was developed with a minimal amount of background questions to maintain respondent privacy.

The project role and location data is displayed in the tables below. The location data is broken down by specific location. The project roles that responded as "other" were: Interface and Report Specialist/IT PM, End User (2), Regional HR Head/Stakeholder, HR Personnel, and 1 blank "other" response.

Project Role	Number of Respondents
Project Manager	3
Developer/Programmer/ Software Engineer	0
Business Analyst	0
Subject Matter Expert	3
Executive Sponsor	1
Other	6
Left Response Blank	1

Location	Number of Respondents
United States	7
Global	7
(U.K.)	*1*
(Spain)	*1*
(Brazil)	*1*
(Argentina)	*1*
(Canada)	*1*
(Singapore)	*2*

It should be noted that in December 2005 the global division of Global Software Inc. was sold to another company. Some members are no longer with the company and the author was unable to make contact. Additionally, some of the participants chose not to respond for reasons that are unknown.

The detailed questionnaire results are in Appendix E. It should be noted that Question number eighteen, nineteen, twenty, and twenty one were each missing one response. Questions eighteen and nineteen are in the "fear of

change" category. Questions twenty and twenty one are in the "communication-distance" category.

The overall averages for mean and standard deviation for each set of questions are shown in the table below. The mean calculations are based on a 7-point scale, meaning that all of the averages for the questionnaire answers are on the positive end of the scale. The standard deviations are ideally greater than zero, but less than one. Looking at the data below, it is noticeable that the standard deviations are fairly high overall. This means that the questionnaire answers have a large amount of variance (high to low answers). However, with such a small number of respondents for the questionnaire, it is not surprising that the standard deviations have an average greater than one.

Overall Averages

Variable	Average Mean	Standard Deviation (Average)
Global HRMS Success	5.44	1.2
Management Support	5.73	1.06
Fear of Change	5.63	1.33
Communication-Distance	5.63	1.21
Trust	5.34	1.53
Cultural Differences	5.34	1.44

A table displaying the Cronbach's Alpha is shown below for each of the variables. This analysis was determined using SPSS software. The numbers for both Global HRMS Success and Fear of Change are low, but at least over .6. This indicates that the internal consistency is fair. However, Management Support and Communication-Distance are both over .8, which is considered good reliability. Overall, the results are sufficient.

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha
Global HRMS Success	.629
Management Support	.854
Fear of Change	.664
Communication-Distance	.884
Trust	.718
Cultural Differences	.772

Additional interview and questionnaire observations are noted below.

Communication - Distance

Time Zones

Many of the interviewees noticed that time zones affected the team's ability to all gather at the same time. The Manager of Global HRIS stated "if all four regions were on a call, some would have to have a 6am call and someone would have to been on a 9pm call." (Manager, Global HRIS, personal communication, March 1, 2006). This was mostly due to the fact that the Asia-Pacific region was a 12-17 hour time difference from the U.S. locations. The Manager of Global HRIS also mentioned that this caused her team to work a lot of late hours.

Another interesting fact in relation to time zone differences was the amount of time the global locations would have to wait for responses from the U.S.-based corporate location. This could range anywhere from ½ a day to a day (or longer). The delay in response time was sometimes frustrating to both parties. Human Resources had personnel located in the U.S., Brazil, Argentina, Canada, India, Singapore, Spain, United Kingdom, and France. It was very

difficult for the HRIS support team to manage communications with that magnitude of time difference. Both departments still had other job duties to perform in addition to the HRMS implementation functionalities. A fine balance had to be found to keep the project moving forward.

Looking at the questionnaire data, question number twenty one stated, 'I had support available any time that I needed it' was related to time zones. The mean (average) for this question was 6.0. This is on the higher end of the scale for the rest of the questions. This means that most of the participants agreed that they had support during the implementation. Additionally, the standard deviation is .877, which is on the lower end of the scale for the rest of the questions. This means that most of the answers were closely related to each other. This data indicates that even though some team members communicated that there was a lag time for support during the semi-structured interviews, the team overall felt support was acceptable.

One example of a specific time zone issue is related to the steering committee meetings. During the project, the directors would meet on a biweekly basis to discuss issues with key project personnel. This meeting was held at 8am CST which was 2pm for the United Kingdom and 10pm for Singapore. Because of this time choice, the EMEA (Europe Middle East Africa) and APAC (Asia-Pacific) regional directors rarely participated. The Director of Benefits mentioned that if this project were repeated in the future, "we might have to have a separate steering committee for domestic vs. global issues. Things would tend

to get pushed back for other regions, because we were so focused on the U.S.".(Director of Benefits, personal communication, March 3, 2006). It was difficult for the regional management to remain involved, which commonly created communication issues with their employees. Fortunately, a majority of the system setup was performed by the HRIS group, which allowed the team to make continued progress.

Question number twenty five, 'meetings held throughout the implementation were at convenient times' is related to time zones. The mean for this question was 5.143 and the standard deviation was 1.059. Not all of the respondents agreed with this statement, which is why the mean is low compared to the other questions and the standard deviation is slightly high. There were some discrepancies when comparing the interview results to the questionnaire results. Looking at the questionnaire data, some of the respondents did feel that meetings were at convenient times, but the semi-structured interviews had instances and specific examples that the times were not always convenient.

Globally Distributed Locations

One of the noteworthy issues that surfaced during the interview regarding globally distributed locations was the lack of face-to-face time. It was costly to travel to the different locations, and only a few trips were made during the project. This caused frustrations among the entire team, since it was difficult for

both the regional teams and the U.S.-based team to communicate and effectively make decisions.

The Project Manager mentioned that "international were on their own, they didn't have the same support as in the U.S. office" (Project Manager, personal communication, March 7, 2006). This was due to the fact that the entire technical support team was located in the United States. All support issues had to be filtered through the U.S. As mentioned previously, there was sometimes a delay in communication between locations.

The questionnaire did not specifically address globally distributed locations, but the communication-distance area did have a few questions related to this variable. Question numbers twenty, twenty two, and twenty three had reference to globally distributed locations. They refer to ease of communication with others on the team, ease of communication during global meetings, comfort speaking with other team members during meetings. Each of the questions had a fairly middle range mean, meaning that most of the respondents were in agreement. Not many issues specific to globally distributed locations were mentioned during the semi-structured interviews, which is in agreement with the questionnaire data results. The team members did not see the globally distributed locations as a main area of concern.

Cultural Differences

One of the cultural issues noted during the interviews were the differences between work ethic and work environment in the other regions compared to the United States. For example, the Project Manager mentioned that "we in the U.S. are more willing to work weekends and holidays and globally they are not" (Project Manager, personal communication, March 7, 2006). All of the locations have different vacation and holiday schedules that had to be worked around.

Additionally, comparing the United States with Asia, the U.S. was perceived to have a more relaxed work environment vs. a more formal environment in Asia. It was observed by team members that when members of executive management in the United States were on a conference call with the Asia/Pacific region, the environment was much more formal. Care was taken to build rapport and trust with the team members so that communication was effective.

Other cultural issues mentioned were associated with the different customs and regulations that had to be taken into account because of the various locations. For example, for data from Italy, United Kingdom, France, Spain, Germany, and Belgium to be stored in the system, the company had to become Safe Harbor Compliant. The certification was not obtained until February 2005, which was after the software go-live date. This made the company unable to store complete employee data in the system for the European countries.

Each local payroll vendor had to be contacted to prepare for data feeds into the system. It was very difficult for the U.S.-based HRIS team to gather this

information from the vendors. In the end, minimal information was stored in the system. The additional issues section has further information obtained regarding this challenge.

The questions in the questionnaire that relate to cultural differences had the second highest overall standard deviation. The respondents had a large amount of variance in their answers. The mean was one of the lowest overall for cultural differences. This means that the respondents agreed the least with the questions related to culture, and the answers were spread further apart.

Issues that are related to trust can also be noted when groups from many different cultures converge. The questions that were related to trust also had one of the lowest averages for mean. (Both trust and cultural differences were tied for the lowest average mean). The standard deviation for trust was the highest overall. An interesting observation is that the question 'the implementation was United States versus the rest of the world' had the lowest mean, which indicates that the respondents agreed the least with this question. However, the variance was high compared to the other questions. Looking at the individual survey results, the answers were split nearly half and half between agreement and disagreement. Some team members felt that this statement was true, which could explain many of the interview comments regarding the capabilities (or lack thereof) of the global HRMS software chosen. The distribution between global and U.S.-based respondents for this question show that more of the global

respondents agreed with this statement. This indicates that the global respondents felt that the implementation was U.S.-based.

The questionnaire and semi-structured interview results both indicate that there were cultural issues associated with this implementation. However, these issues were not based specifically by location. In fact, a large amount of disagreement was answered by U.S.-based respondents for those questions related to Trust and Cultural Differences. It seemed that it was difficult for team members to name specific instances of issues during the interviews, but many of the interviewees would mention "cultural issues" as something that was experienced among team members.

Language

Language was another issue mentioned during the interviews. English was the second language for a majority of the global team members. This created some barriers when trying to communicate. From a system standpoint, the HR Generalist, Brazil, noticed that there were certain items in the software that did not make sense to them as a region. For example, Brazil does not use Exempt/Non-Exempt classification for pay scales. This was something that was required to be entered from a corporate standpoint, but it did not have any meaning for them regionally.

The HR Director, EMEA also noted issues with "people not understanding the Americanisms" (HR Director, EMEA, personal communication, March 9,

2006). This caused delay in how the region learned to use the software. Because the HRIS team was performing a majority of the system setup, the EMEA team was not as involved in the implementation until the very end. There was a learning curve for the region.

Additionally, each of the countries had different policies and processes. For data to be stored globally, data privacy laws had to be taken into consideration for each separate country. Some of the regions had to reevaluate and adjust their processes to fit with the software. The corporate-level data requirements did not necessarily make sense to the regions from a day-to-day data entry standpoint.

Communication was also key for the global implementation. The Project Manager mentioned that there were issues in the global locations because they did not have the same amount of support that the U.S.-based team members did. An example is that they were not able to be in the same room like the U.S. was, and that they were "on their own" (Project Manager, personal communication, March 7, 2006). Question number twenty, 'I was able to easily communicate with others on the implementation team', was related to language. This question had an average mean that was fairly high compared to the other questions. Also, the standard deviation was low. This means that respondents were overall in agreement with the statement.

The team members took the additional time necessary to ensure that all members understood what decisions were being made. Additionally, the HR

management team made an effort to make the system work for all locations. As mentioned by the Director of Benefits, the Executive Director of HRIS made an effort to let global team members know what was going to change, and let the global team give feedback. (Director of Benefits, personal communication, March 3, 2006). This helped alleviate frustrations associated with communicating among team members.

Management Support

The Manager, Global HRIS stated that the team had "unflagging support from the executives" (Manager, Global HRIS, personal communication, March 1, 2006). HR Management was very supportive of the project, the Director of Benefits explained that the Sr. Vice President of Human Resources was extremely supportive and that he allowed the team to make their own decisions. Other interviewees commented that the transition was seamless, so executive management outside of HR was not affected by the transition. Their involvement was minimal.

The questionnaire responses related to management support validated the interview findings. Management support had the highest overall average. This indicates that the respondents had the most positive response for management support. Additionally, the overall standard deviation for management support was the lowest. It was the only area of questions that had

a standard deviation of less than one. The respondents were not very spread out on their answers for management support.

The Manager of IT Project Planning had a slightly different observation regarding HR management, stating that the executive management in HR was overwhelmed with all of the decisions that had to be made. Additionally, the statement "I think that [HR] management got caught up in the bells and whistles" was made. (Manager, IT Project Planning, personal communication, March 9, 2006). This caused some stress on the project team, but HR management was supportive overall.

An interesting find is that the HR Generalist, Brazil commented that the reaction from HR Management was that they were not thrilled with the system because of limitations. Additional data regarding system limitations is mentioned in the Additional Issues section. Overall, research results were that management was supportive and had a positive reaction to the system.

Fear of Change

Training

Some of the issues experienced during training were associated to lack of ability in the regions. Additionally, there was resistance to the new tool. The HR Generalist, Brazil had the comment that part of training involved "adapting my needs to get data in the system and learning what the system required." (HR Generalist, Brazil, personal communication, March 14, 2006). It was difficult for

the regions to see the value in the new system. The data entry process did not improve for the CALA (Central America Latin America) region, which caused frustration within the region.

Resistance to training can be a symptom of fear of change. The overall average for questionnaire items under this category scored just about in the middle of all of the other items. Question number fifteen, 'I feel comfortable learning new systems' had a mean of 6.143, one of the highest averages. The standard deviation for the question was less than one. In effect, this means that there might not have been resistance within the group to learning new systems. However, the semi-structured interview results indicate that there was not a positive response to training. The lack of consistency is most likely because the question does not ask specifically about the HRMS.

The Manager, Global HRIS mentioned that the global locations did not understand the importance of data accuracy. The corporate-level data was fed to a large number of ancillary applications, so if the data was incorrect it created a domino-effect of problems. It was difficult to maintain a balance of getting the regions to use the system and also enter data correctly.

Since the tool was not truly meant to be used globally, many exceptions had to be made by the global teams. Many of the issues that come up for the global team were related to this fact; the frustrations are further discussed in the next section.

Additional Issues

Many of the interviewees mentioned that there was a U.S. versus International mentality. This is partially due to the fact that the HRMS software was not needed to run an actual payroll in locations outside of the United States. The system was chosen because 80% of the total requirements were met. However, many of the locations felt that the system chosen did not meet their regional requirements. It was expressed by team members that the international locations should have been more involved in the decision-making process for the selection of the HRMS tool. Also, the groups outside of the U.S. should have had earlier involvement in the entire process in general. Both individuals in the U.S. and globally commented that it was not a true global system. This led to many issues with the global team accepting the system.

Question number twenty nine address specifically the issue of the implementation being the United States versus the rest of the world. As mentioned previously, the responses to this question were nearly half in agreement, half in disagreement. Globally, the respondents had a lower mean than the U.S. Question number thirty five, 'my needs were taken into consideration during the global HRMS implementation also had about half of the answers in agreement and half in disagreement (though a larger number of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed). Exploring further into individual results, the U.S.-based respondents had a mean of 3.71 for this question and global respondents a mean of 6.14. The global respondents did feel that their

needs were considered. 12 of the 14 respondents for question number thirty seven, 'overall the HRMS was a good value to my region' were in agreement. So, as indicated by the results overall, the software might not have been a good fit globally, but it was a good value to the respondents. This also ties in to the questions regarding implementation success in the next section.

Global HRMS Success

The interviewees were asked if they felt that the global HRMS implementation was a success. The vast majority responded that they felt that the implementation was a success. However, there were many comments made about the fact that the software was not a good fit for the global team. The system is not being utilized as it was intended to be. The system was implemented to improve global data entry processes, and some of the international locations were still using spreadsheets to track data. This was not an improvement for them.

The questionnaire results related to implementation success show that overall; the respondents were in agreement that the implementation was a success. Eleven of the fourteen respondents felt that their region had a successful implementation. The question with the lowest mean was number eight, 'the HRMS improved the process for global data entry'. This question also had the highest standard deviation for the questions related to global HRMS success. The respondents agreed the least (but had the highest variation on

answers) with this statement. The questionnaire results were in agreement with the semi-structured interview results. However, some of the respondents did not feel that the system implementation was a success.

The mean for questions related to Global HRMS Success between respondents located in the United States versus global locations are shown in the table below.

Global HRMS Success

Question	U.S. Mean	Global Mean
3. The implementation of the global HRMS was a success.	5.43	5.0
4. My region had a successful implementation.	6.14	5.14
5. The global Lawson Human Resources Management System (HRMS) implementation was completed on time.	6.0	5.29
6. The data in the HRMS contains valuable global information.	5.43	5.0
7. The HRMS implementation was completed with input from the global regions.	5.71	6.29
8. The HRMS improved the process for global data entry.	5.0	4.86
Overall Mean	5.62	5.26

The overall averages between U.S. and global locations are similar, but the global locations scored lower for the questions related to implementation success. These results are in agreement with the semi-structured interview responses regarding the fact that the software did not store global data properly (and that the global data entry process did not improve).

Additional Observations

The standard deviation was high for many of the questions. This means that there was variance in many of the answers. This is most likely due to the fact that that the participants had different perceptions of the global implementation. The author wanted the respondents' identities to remain unknown, so that they would not feel uncomfortable answering the questions honestly. By reviewing the data based on global versus U.S. responses, there does not seem to be a pattern regarding disagreement.

The question with the highest overall mean was "improving the global data entry process is valuable to the company". This means that the respondents agreed the most overall with the statement. However, since one respondent did not answer this question, it may not have actually been the highest. This question was categorized under fear of change. There were not an extremely large amount of issues to resistance that surfaced during the semi-structured interviews.

There was a three-way tie for the question with the second highest mean. A table is shown below.

Question	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
HR management was aware of the accomplishments of the global HRMS project.	6.143	.639
I feel comfortable learning new systems.	6.143	.990
Implementing a global tool will help the organization.	6.143	.990

The mean and the standard deviation from the statements above indicate that the respondents were in agreement with the statements and their answers did not vary greatly. These questions pertained to management support and fear

of change. There did not seem to be any outlying issues regarding these areas. The question with the one of the lowest variances was "HR management was aware of the accomplishments of the global HRMS project". Again, management support had a positive reaction from team members. The respondents did not have extremely different answers for those statements.

In comparing the literature review to the semi-structured interview/questionnaire results, it seems that the issues previously noted as being related to global HRMS/ERP implementations were again validated.

In fact, the main issues identified in both the literature and the respondent data will be an excellent starting point for future research as to how these issues affect the success of global HRMS implementations. It is predicted that the success of a global HRMS implementation will be positively influenced when management support and trust exist; and fear of change, communication-distance, and cultural issues are resolved.

Conclusions

Even though trust had the lowest average on the questionnaire, there was no mention of issues associated with trust during the semi-structured interviews. It is not surprising that management support had the highest average, since comments from the semi-structured interviews were positive.

Nearly all of the questions that measured global HRMS success had a variance of greater than 1.1. Most team members felt that the implementation

was a success, but some were neutral and some disagreed completely. It is unknown why some of the respondents felt that the system implementation was a success and others did not. Once again, adding additional identifiers between the locations would help evaluate the data to find the discrepancies.

The literature review did not look at issues with organizational fit and the global HRMS software chosen. The semi-structured interview results clearly identify that these issues existed in this particular implementation. This could have affected team member's views on implementation success. There did not seem to be large issues with communication-distance within the team. Time zones did create issues with the ability to communicate, but the implementation team was able to work around these.

Overall, those interviewed felt that the implementation was a success, and that their data entry processes improved. However, organizational fit and the software functionality were issues that were mentioned by many team members. The company was aware of some of these potential issues, and took care to ensure that the risk of project success being affected was mitigated. The issues identified were in agreement with the literature review data. The questionnaire and semi-structured interview summaries in the Appendix give further information on specific results.

The successful implementation of a global HRMS in this case study was influenced by management support, communication-distance, addressing cultural differences, alleviating fear of change, and working out cultural differences. In

this particular implementation, management support was by far the most obvious success factor. The research data indicated that there were no negative issues regarding management support. Executive management was initially the driving factor behind the implementation, and this support and initiative was carried throughout the entire project from inception to implementation.

The team experienced a few issues regarding communication, but overall, the commitment to ensuring the global team members were included in the implementation process helped the project succeed. The HRIS department took the initiative to provide support at all hours of the day. This gave the global members the opportunity to work out problems and communicate issues. Additionally, by incorporating weekly calls into team schedules, there was time for the team members to build rapport and get to know one another personally. These personal relationships helped build trust and alleviate cultural issues as well. In fact, the global team member questionnaire respondents had a surprisingly positive response to the questions related to Communication-Distance, Trust, and Cultural Differences. All of the variables positively influenced the success of the implementation.

The factor that negatively influenced the implementation success was the choice of software for the company. The software was not designed to be used in locations other than the United States and Canada. This caused many frustrations among the regions outside of the United States and prevented the improvement on global data entry processes. The fact that the regions were still

using spreadsheets to track employee data indicates that the software did not support their day-to-day functions. Research findings from both U.S.-based and global participants also validated this inhibitor.

Research Limitations

There were a few research limitations that should be noted. The number of team members was small. This number was further decreased when global team members were no longer with the company due to the sale of the global division of the company. Luckily, the author had built rapport with the global members so that it was not extremely difficult to make contact.

Not all of the questionnaire respondents participated in semi-structured interviews, it is possible that the individuals interviewed did not have the perception that there were issues in areas of trust and cultural differences. It would be helpful if further research had more background information so that variance could be measured and conclusions could be made as to whether or not the respondents in the United States had different perceptions than those that were located outside of the U.S.

Future Areas of Research

This case study evaluated one company's experience with a global HRMS implementation. The author would like to continue to research similar topics, extending the research to other companies' experiences with implementing

global HRMS/ERP software. There is not a large amount of existing research on this specific topic. Much of the research is based on supply chain management implementations, which focus more on the customer and suppliers.

The issues identified were only based on a majority of the existing research findings available. When multiple companies are surveyed, additional issues will most likely be identified. This is an exciting subject to learn more about, and the data that is collected can help predict and alleviate some of the issues that other companies could face when implementing HRMS software globally.

Additional studies on organizational fit with global ERP implementations would be added to this research, since that was something that surfaced during this particular implementation.

Bibliography

Aladwani, Adel M. (2001). Change Management Strategies for Successful ERP Implementations. *Business Process Management Journal,* 7(3), 266-275.

Bagchi, K., Hart, P., & Peterson, M.F. (2004). National Culture and Information Technology Product Adoption. *Journal of Global Information Technology Management,* 7(4), 29 -46.

Brown, C. & Vessey, I. (1999). "ERP Implementation Approaches: Toward a Contingency Framework" in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Information Systems, Charlotte, NC, December 13-15, 411-416.*

Donelly, M. (2005). Avaya's Journey to Global HR Shared Service. *Strategic HR Review,* 4(2), 20 – 23.

Elashmawi, F. & Harris, P. R. (1993). Multicultural Management New Skills for Global Success. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Evaristo, R. (2003). The Management of Distributed Projects Across Cultures. *Journal of Global Information Management,* 11(4), 58 – 70.

Fisher, K. & Fisher, M.D. (2001). The Distance Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gefen, D., Pavlou, P., Rose, G., & Warkentin, M. (2005). Cultural Diversity and Trust in IT Adoption: A Comparison of Potential e-Voters in the USA and South Africa. *Journal of Global information Management,* 13(1), 54 – 78.

Ghosh, S. (2002). Challenges on a Global Implementation of ERP Software. *2002 IEEE International Engineering Management Conference,* 101 – 106.

Greengard, Samuel. (1995). When HRMS Goes Global: Managing the Data Highway. *Personnel Journal,* 74(6), 90 – 106.

Gross, S. & Wingerup, P. (1999). Global Pay? Maybe Not Yet! *Compensation and Benefits Review,* 31(4), 25 – 34.

Gupta, A. (2000). Enterprise Resource Planning: the Emerging Organizational Value Systems. *Industrial Management & Data Systems,* 100(3), 114 – 118.

He, X. (2004). The ERP Challenge in China: a Resource-Based Perspective. *Information Systems Journal,* 14(2), 153 – 167.

Hofstede, G. (1983). The Cultural Relativity of Organizational Practices and Theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2), 75 – 89.

Hofstede, G. (1985). The Interaction Between National and Organizational Value Systems. *Journal of Management Studies,* 22(4), 347 – 358.

Hustad, E. (2004). Knowledge Networking in Global Organizations: The Transfer of Knowledge. *Proceedings of the 2004 SIGMIS Conference on Computer Personnel Research: Careers, Culture, and Ethics in a Networked Environment,* Tucson, AZ, USA, 55 – 64.

Ives, B. & Jarvenpaa, S.L. (1991). Applications of Global Information Technology: Key Issues for Management. *MIS Quarterly,* 15(1), 33 – 49.

Krumbholz M., Galliers J.R., Coulianos N. & Maiden N.A.M. (2000). Implementing Enterprise Resource Planning Packages in Different Corporate and National Cultures. *Journal of Information Technology,* 15(4), 267 – 279.

Laudon, K.C & Laudon, J.P. (2004). Management Information Systems: Managing the Digital Firm. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Loeb, K. A., Rai, A., Ramaprasad, A., & Sharma, S. (1998). Design, Development, & Implementation of a Global Information Warehouse: A Case Study at IBM. *Information Systems Journal*, 8, 291-311.

Markus, M.L., Tanis, C., van Fenema, P.C. (2000). Multisite ERP Implementations. *Communications of the ACM,* 43(4), 42 – 46.

Mathis, R.L. & Jackson, J.H. (2000). Human Resource Management. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.

Newell, S., Pan, S.L., Galliers, R.D., Huang, J.C. (2001). The Myths of the Boundaryless Organization. *Communications of the ACM*, 44(12), 74 – 76.

Noe, Raymond A. (1999). Employee Training & Development. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Project Management Institute. (2004). *A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge.* Pennsylvania: Author.

Purba S. & Shah, B. (2000). How to Manage a Successful Software Project. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Rioux, S. & Wellins, R. (2000). The Growing Pains of Globalizing HR. *Training & Development,* 54(5), 79 – 85.

Ross, Jeanne. (1999). Dow Corning Corporation: Business Processes and Information Technology. *Journal of Information Technology,* 14(3), 253-266.

Rothwell, W.J. & Prescott, R.K. (1999). Transforming HR Into a Global Powerhouse. *HR Focus,* 76(3), 7 – 8.

Scott, J.E. & Vessey, I. (2002). Managing Risks in Enterprise Systems Implementations. *Communications of the ACM*, 45(4), 74 – 81.

Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Smith, B. (1994). The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook. New York: Doubleday.

Sheu, C., Chae, B., Yang, C-L. (2004). National Differences and ERP Implementation: Issues and Challenges. *OMEGA The International Journal of Management Science,* 32(5), 361 – 371.

Solomon, C.M. (1998). Sharing Information. *Workforce,* 77(3), 12 – 16.

U.S Department of Commerce. [Online]. Available: http://www.export.gov/safeharbor/sh_workbook.html

Wellins, R. & Rioux, S. (2000). The Growing Pains of Globalizing HR. *Training & Development,* 54(5), 79-85.

Wiechmann, D., Ryan, A.M., Hemingway, M. (2003). Designing and Implementing Global Staffing Systems: Part I – Leaders in Global Staffing. *Human Resource Management,* 42(1), 71. Retrieved from ABI/INFORM Global Database on February 17, 2005.

Zhang, L., Banerjee, P., Lee, M., Zhang, Z. (2003). Critical Success Factors of Enterprise Resource Planning Systems Implementation Success in China. *Proceedings of the 36th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences,* USA, 1 – 10.

Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Questions

1. Tell me a little about your background with Global Software Inc. (i.e. position, title, etc...)
2. How were you involved in the decision to implement a global HR system?
3. What was your role in the project?
4. What were some of the challenges that occurred during the implementation strictly because the software was being implemented globally? 4a. Do you think any of these could have been prevented?
5. What were the reactions from executive management throughout the implementation?
6. How do you think the regions felt regarding the fact that the U.S. was the main driving force behind the project?
7. Do you think the Lawson implementation was a success? Why or why not?
8. What influences did management have on the decision to implement a global HR tool?
9. What was the reaction to training from a global standpoint?
10. Looking back at the project inception until now, how would you say that the HR department has changed (because of the global implementation)?
11. What cultural issues (if any) were associated with the implementation?
12. What issues did you think the implementation team faced in regards to the globally distributed locations?

13. How do you think the implementation team (yourself included) accepted the changes associated with implementing a global ERP system?
14. What do you feel that your impact was to the success or failure of the implementation?

Appendix B: Semi-Structured Interview Responses

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
Manager, Global HRIS	3	Implementation lead, Worked with global group, tasked overall with communication/training
	4	Time zones; Cultural issues between team members; Mentality of "only thing that matters is in the U.S.
	4a	Not time zones; cultural issues better as contact was limited to those that understood regions; My team tasked with making sure regional voice was heard.
		Comm. Spec issues – had to be specific, ask lots of questions... Eng was 2nd language for majority of int'l group
	5	Unflagging support from execs; Some US execs felt that we were overshadowing domestic with int'l requests (opposite of what happened on int'l side)
	6	Initially mainly resentful; hated what we did or things we would try to bring to them; took a lot of hard work to change perceptions.
	7	Yes, with original requirements; we saw process improvements and time improvements.
	8	Had specific requirements from upper-level mgmt, we needed it, justified it and got permission to spend the money.
	9	Int'l struggled with big picture. Didn't understand importance of accuracy.
	10	U.S. HR looks at from a global perspective instead of just w/in their own team
	11	U.S. had relaxed work environment, Asia is more formal; single largest was language
	12	Sheer logistics of time zone coordination (if all four regions were on a call, some would have to have a 6am call and someone would have to been on a 9pm call) Travel was also challenging – I was out of the country for 2 ½ months.
	13	Take myself out, I was 100% behind changes, my team was the only team that felt that way. There was a lot of martyrdom, a lot of whining.
	14	I really think I went a long way to get Int'l buy-in. We spent hours making sure they were comfortable and making sure their voices were

		heard. Int'l adapted better than the U.S.

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
Director of Benefits	1	Responsible for plan design, compliance, and costing. I have been with Global Software Inc. since Oct 94 and in HR since 1981.
	2	Was part of the group that identified the needs and wishes, love to haves; and put together what became the RFP. (and sat in on demos)
	3	Testing, data verification,
	4	Only basic info on global employees, difficult for me to get data in the manner that I wanted
	4a	N/A
	5	I think it was a positive; I think one of the things that was good - we didn't want anyone to know there was a change, to make it as seamless as possible.
	6	Anything was better than what they had. What might have helped was that Denise [Exec Dir] did a good job of letting them know what was going to happen. They had plenty of opportunity for input; they didn't feel that we were forcing them to do this.
	7	Yes, I do think it was a success. But, we're not utilizing all that the system has to offer and reporting did not come together from a global standpoint. We as a group have lofty expectations. But we are much more integrated than before.
	8	I think we had a very free reign on what the system would look like and the processes we set up. Paul [Exec VP] was very "hands-off".
	9	I didn't hear anything negative. One interesting thing about the steering committee was that the meetings were at 9am CST. Sometimes Jonas (APAC Dir) would join in, but Karen and Dawn (EMEA) hardly ever participated. I don't know if it was because it was an inconvenient time or if they didn't care or feel they were a part of the things going on. A lot of times issues were focused on the U.S. only, so they might have been excluded. If we did this again, we might have to have a separate steering committee for domestic vs. global issues. Things would tend to get pushed back for other regions, because we were so

		focused on the U.S. The number of people impacted internationally was not as high.
	10	From a teamwork perspective, I was very concerned initially, that there might be an us vs. them mentality. Friction, but overall better than expected.
	11	The group responsible for the implementation would forget that the SME's had full time jobs. The groups (especially APAC) would sometimes struggle.
	12	Employee Self Service was not supported globally, that was the corporate Intranet, and it was limited. Benefits not where I wanted it to be, needed data from external payroll vendors
	13	OK, huge amount of work... I think we waited too long to do the Conference Room Pilot, we should have given ourselves more time.
	14	I hope I played a small part. If I was in a global company again, I would focus more on global software like SAP or Peoplesoft – we would have to be able to get everything to work.

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
Project Manager	1	Initially Sr. Business Analyst Liaison, then promoted to Project Manager in middle of project.
	2	Brought on at demo side, tabulated how the systems met requirements; steering committee made the final decision.
	3	My title was Project Manager but did focus more on the U.S. but for the project plan I was responsible for making sure everything was on schedule.
	4	Because they [Lawson] hadn't really had their foot in the global market – field lengths, Italian NI # - even though Lawson labeled fields for International purposes, they didn't understand how the fields were to be used; the background in the database didn't back it up. On an International basis, time zones and cultural differences – and work ethic were very different across the continents.
	4a	The cultural differences – as far as personnel – if we had had more backing from their superiors (other job duties interfered)

	5	Very supportive, wanted it on time and on-budget. Great VP support.
	6	Not very happy – they weren't consulted, they were told. They were invited to the steering committee meetings but the time wasn't convenient and they still had to do their jobs. They felt that they were forced into it vs. consulted.
	7	Internationally - We gave them the ability to store more information, but it was very difficult for them to learn it. I don't think they see it as a big success.
	8	We needed one tool everyone could use to query data globally – one data source and that's it. Had an employee with previous implementation experience.
	9	Overwhelming – I wasn't as involved... I don't think they took it as seriously as they should have done, and they thought they could do it around their regular daily activities.
	10	I think there is more of a relationship between HRIS and global. We understand their daily functions better.
	11	Workdays, holidays, the fact that in the U.S. we are very work-oriented and not very family oriented. But other countries are more family-oriented vs. work-oriented. We in the US are more willing to work weekends and holidays and globally they are not. Language, role of the sexes – in HR we have very female-driven projects. I don't know in some of the cultures how well that went down.
	12	No face-to-face time – that was limited because of travel. We were in different time zones – it was difficult to get everyone on the phone at the same time. There were language barriers, it was that international were on their own, they didn't have the same support as in the U.S. office. They weren't all in the same room like we were.
	13	It was 50/50 to be quite honest. I think that International accepted it better than the U.S.
	14	The details – I kept track of the project plan and followed up with details. I made sure the right people were involved at the right time.

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
Manager, International HR Services	1	My international role was making sure all aspects of Ex-patriots were taken care of – immigration paperwork, taxes.
	2	I wasn't involved in making the decision. However, the bottom line was that everyone knew it was a necessity and what was the best solution. They knew it had to happen, we will move forward and what is the best solution.
	3	It wasn't that extensive – I didn't have the time to be that involved.
	4	So much info – the global community was trying to get all of the information in the same format to get into the same system. It was a challenge to get the proper access to those who needed it. It was also frustrating that some information wasn't able to be housed in Lawson
	4a	Spend more time verifying Lawson was right solution, get more feedback, more training
	5	Not any – they didn't care, it didn't impact them at all. HR Mgmt supportive
	6	Assumed it would be that way. US-based system but global. They would have liked it to be a better fit within their region. Had to force system to be global.
	7	Successful as it could have been. Think of success as more of a positive reaction. Not ideal fit for global
	8	Saw it as complete necessity
	9	It could be better, still could be better. I don't think it was that good.
	10	HR further removed from ERP software; System didn't house the information I needed – not a benefit to me from an ex-pat standpoint
	11	U.S. vs. global – putting all other cultures under the global umbrella; didn't provide benefit globally
	12	The roll-out itself, the timing of the communications; how best to communicate to all groups
	13	With reluctance; lost capabilities
	14	Very little involvement in that

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
HR Director, EMEA	1	Interim HR Manager Dec 2004, Sr HR Manager May 2004, HR Director Aug 2005
	2	Wasn't here when initial decision made, but feel I was hired on due to my previous ERP software experience.
	3	Compared existing ERP data to Lawson data. Also gave input for system improvements
	4	We had to fit our data into US a system; US had different definitions for data than we did. Things like fitting the data into a mold that wasn't a very good global model. Lack of ability in other regions, make sure people have skills to take on technology
	4a	Head office is in US, bulk of employees were US-based. Was it more beneficial for company to decide we have bulk (where will we use system most)? The other countries suffered because of it. Finance was decision, was it really worth cost of getting global system, at the end of the day we did manage.
	5	Mistakes in system impacted managers. Were for it/technology.
	6	HR group resented it in EMEA, it wasn't EMEA customized. Not very happy it was a US based system.
	7	Was a success. Robust system.
	8	Decision made centrally in U.S. Global HR team together agreed to use system.
	9	Lack of ability in HR team, training was excellent. Can always improve upon, though. Main reaction was 'oh, that's not very good, how can we fit that in'.
	10	Totally transformed. All of HR info was accessible. It was for the better.
	11	Literally "the American", US people doing training, US people based system. Language barriers, training issues, people not understanding "Americanisms"
	12	Cultural issues, language barriers, time zones. Answering queries in a timely manner. Asia would typically have to wait a day for a response, for us, it

		would be the afternoon or longer.
	13	Normal process of accepting change... Frustration initially. Some would give up and not use if at all possible, others would get by and actually learn it.
	14	I helped EMEA come to grips with it, my previous experience with HR systems helped.

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
Manager, IT Project Planning	1	With Global Software Inc. 4 years, in HR 3. Previously worked on HRIS systems and implementations since 1999.
	2	Brought in after decision made to replace current product. Based on past experience with implementing HR systems.
	3	Application Expert and a little Project Management
	4	Different processes, different cultures and regulations to take into account. How will data flow to other systems? So many pieces, overwhelming to end-user.
	4a	Maybe spending a little more time on planning and documentation. Should have spent more time thinking through the cause and effect of "if I do this" what needs to happen. Team still had to do own jobs in addition to implementation.
	5	At first very positive, then as the process continued, you could see that it was overwhelming for them. A lot to digest. Trying to implement too much too fast.
	6	A lot of conflict and not a lot of buy-in. Needed to involve Int'l earlier on.
	7	Fell short. Should have just implemented core system first. (phased in approach)
	8	They had international employees driving it. Cumbersome amt of external applications
	9	Not very involved, but some open to it, some were not.
	10	How was what we were doing going to affect the different countries, regulations, data privacy? No tunnel vision, had to think of all countries
	11	Different customs, regulations. Vacation, leave of absences. Sense of urgency [for Int'l group] was not what they were used to. It was different than U.S.

	12	Had to deal with government and different regulations, different employees in all different countries. Also interfacing with other third party applications in different countries.
	13	Hard to get out of "we've always done it this way" bubble.
	14	Helped with conversion and getting data in correctly and formatted correctly. However, hadn't done global implementation before and should have been more vocal and not implemented so much so fast. I should have pushed for us to take more time and implement over a longer period of time and do more front-end research in selecting similar tools.

Job Title	Question	Summarized Answer
HR Generalist, Brazil	1	HR Generalist for about 40 employees performing various functions.
	2	Not all involved, decided by Global Software Inc. HR Mgmt, just involved in implementing in Latin America - see what would makes sense for implementing and localizing what we could and also user training.
	3	Implement system and be focal point for training and requirements gathering for Latin America.
	4	System sold as Int'l system but wasn't. Could not enter full name, SSN, phone numbers, address, etc... A lot of system limitations we had to work around. Huge database of nothing and doubled our work
	4a	Wasn't a central db, everything I could find and wish for wasn't there. More for global reporting/internal
	5	Mixed, Mgmt not happy with limitations. I didn't use at all on a day to day basis.
	6	American company, expected US would be leading. Regions frustrated b/c system chosen was US system. Global areas should have been more involved in decision-making process. Still had spreadsheets in addition to entering data because it didn't meet my needs at all.
	7	Success that system was up and running. Did not

		use it and didn't replace other tools for me.
	8	Wasn't involved.
	9	Faced resistance to new system and people could not see the value in using it. Adapting my needs to get data in the system and learning what the system required. Frustrating.
	10	Added more that I had to do. Changed the day to day.
	11	Individuals in CALA understand American culture. Time differences in APAC affected the team. Communication – what definitions of things are (example Exempt/Nonexempt). How can we cover those distances and create something that will make sense to everybody? It's very cultural based; local to US where we were forced to understand those and come up with something that will make sense.
	12	Implementation team had very different needs, but closely related to own country's needs.
	13	Had to accept it, but system implemented was not global. Hard time selling value to rest of team – couldn't see value myself.
	14	Embraced and figured out how could we adapt our needs in the system to take advantage of most of it. Had to get past "if there is no value I am not going to use it"

Appendix C: Questionnaire Cover Letter

March 29, 2006

Dear Participant,

I am conducting research for a case study involving the global Lawson implementation during 2004. The focus of the questionnaire is on issues associated with the implementation.

The electronic survey should only take about 15-20 minutes of your time. I would like to have your response back by April 5, 2006. Please go to the following url to take the questionnaire: **http://www.surveyz.com/TakeSurvey?id=44322**

All answers to these questions will be kept strictly confidential. In addition, if you would like to receive a copy of the survey results, please contact the researcher at dalff@hotmail.com. If you have any questions about the survey or the research in general, please contact the researcher at the email address mentioned above, or at 402-553-8406.

The survey results will be used by the researcher in a Master's degree research thesis at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Thank you again for taking the time to participate in this survey. Your assistance is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Deanna House
Master's of Management of Information Systems
Student Researcher

Appendix D: Questionnaire

Variable Name	# of Items	Questionnaire Item #'s
Background Data	2	1-2
Global HRMS Success	6	3-8
Management Support	6	9-14
Fear of Change	5	15-19
Communication – Distance	6	20-25
Trust	6	26-31
Cultural Differences	6	32-37

Questionnaire – Implementing a Global HRMS

1. What was your role in the global Lawson implementation project?
   __ Project Manager
   __ Developer/Programmer/Software Engineer
   __ Business Analyst
   __ Subject Matter Expert
   __ Executive Sponsor
   __ Other, please specify _____

2. Where were you working during the Lawson implementation?
   __ United States
   __ Other Please Specify _____.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Neither Agree Nor Disagree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**

3. ***The implementation of the global HRMS was a success.***

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. ***My region had a successful implementation.***

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. ***The global Lawson Human Resources Management System (HRMS) implementation was completed on time.***

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. ***The data in the HRMS contains valuable global information.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. ***The HRMS implementation was completed with input from the global regions.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. ***The HRMS improved the process for global data entry.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. ***HR management was involved with making decisions related to the implementation.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. ***HR management was aware of the accomplishments of the global HRMS project.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. ***Issues that were unresolved during the global HRMS project could be escalated and resolved in a timely manner.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. ***My opinion was important, and my managers trusted me to make good decisions during the project.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. ***The steering committee was open to resolving issues related to the global HRMS implementation.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. ***Goals and milestones were adequately communicated from management to the implementation team.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. ***I feel comfortable learning new systems.***

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Implementing a global tool will help the organization.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. The HRMS made my job easier.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Improving the global data entry process is valuable to the company.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I was able to easily fit processes that resulted from the HRMS implementation into my job duties.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I was able to easily communicate with others on the implementation team.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I had support available any time that I needed it.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. During global implementation team meetings, I was able to voice my opinions easily.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. It was comfortable to speak with many different team members on conference calls.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. My opinions were needed at meetings during the implementation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Meetings held throughout the implementation were at convenient times.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. When I was unable to participate in tasks, I trusted my teammates to communicate my opinions.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. During the implementation I got to know my other teammates well.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. If my other teammates volunteered to complete a task, I could rely on them to finish that task without follow-up.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. The implementation was United States versus the rest of the world.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. I could be open and honest about my feelings during the implementation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

31. I could relate to the other members on the implementation team.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

32. Everyone put a good effort into making the HRMS implementation a success.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

33. I was able to take part and share my opinions in the global implementation of the HRMS system.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

34. If I misunderstood something my teammate was trying to say, I had the opportunity to communicate until we both understood.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

35. My needs were taken into consideration during the global HRMS implementation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

36. My teammates were able to reach consensus across the globe.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

37. Overall, the HRMS was a good value to my region.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix E: Questionnaire Detailed Results

1. What was your role in the global Lawson implementation project?		
Project Manager	3	23.08%
Developer/Programmer/Software Engineer	0	0.00%
Business Analyst	0	0.00%
Subject Matter Expert	3	23.08%
Executive Sponsor	1	7.69%
Other	6	46.15%
2. Where were you working during the Lawson implementation?		
United States	7	50.00%
Other - Please Specify	7	50.00%
3. The implementation of the global HRMS was a success.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	3	21.43%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	0	0.00%
Mean		5.214
Standard Deviation		1.145
4. My region had a successful implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	9	64.29%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.643
Standard Deviation		1.109
5. The global Lawson Human Resources Management System (HRMS) implementation was completed on time.		

Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	3	21.43%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		5.643
Standard Deviation		1.109
6. The data in the HRMS contains valuable global information.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	6	42.86%
Agree	5	35.71%
Strongly Agree	1	7.14%
Mean		5.214
Standard Deviation		1.145
7. The HRMS implementation was completed with input from the global regions.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	5	35.71%
Agree	4	28.57%
Strongly Agree	5	35.71%
Mean		6.0
Standard Deviation		.845
8. The HRMS improved the process for global data entry.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%

Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	3	21.43%
Somewhat Agree	4	28.57%
Agree	3	21.43%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		4.929
Standard Deviation		1.387
9. HR management was involved with making decisions related to the implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	4	28.57%
Mean		6.071
Standard Deviation		.799
10. HR management was aware of the accomplishments of the global HRMS project.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	4	28.57%
Mean		6.143
Standard Deviation		.639
11. Issues that were unresolved during the global HRMS project could be escalated and resolved in a timely manner.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%

Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	3	21.43%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		5.714
Standard Deviation		.958
12. My opinion was important, and my managers trusted me to make good decisions during the project.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	2	14.29%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.286
Standard Deviation		1.532
13. The steering committee was open to resolving issues related to the global HRMS implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	5	35.71%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	1	7.14%
Mean		5.357
Standard Deviation		.972
14. Goals and milestones were adequately communicated from management to the implementation team.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%

Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	9	64.29%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.786
Standard Deviation		.860
15. I feel comfortable learning new systems.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	6	42.86%
Mean		6.143
Standard Deviation		.990
16. Implementing a global tool will help the organization.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	5	35.71%
Mean		6.143
Standard Deviation		.990
17. The HRMS made my job easier.		
Strongly Disagree	1	7.14%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	6	42.86%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	2	14.29%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%

Mean		4.571
Standard Deviation		1.545
18. Improving the global data entry process is valuable to the company.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.69%
Agree	8	61.54%
Strongly Agree	4	30.77%
Mean		6.231
Standard Deviation		.576
19. I was able to easily fit processes that resulted from the HRMS implementation into my job duties.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.69%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	3	23.08%
Somewhat Agree	3	23.08%
Agree	5	38.46%
Strongly Agree	1	7.69%
Mean		5.077
Standard Deviation		1.269
20. I was able to easily communicate with others on the implementation team.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.69%
Somewhat Agree	3	23.08%
Agree	7	53.85%
Strongly Agree	2	15.38%
Mean		5.769

Standard Deviation		.799
21. I had support available any time that I needed it.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.69%
Somewhat Agree	2	15.38%
Agree	6	46.15%
Strongly Agree	4	30.77%
Mean		6.0
Standard Deviation		.877
22. During global implementation team meetings, I was able to voice my opinions easily.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		5.5
Standard Deviation		1.592
23. It was comfortable to speak with many different team members on conference calls.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	7	50.00%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		5.643
Standard Deviation		1.288

24. My opinions were needed at meetings during the implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	4	28.57%
Mean		5.714
Standard Deviation		1.221
25. Meetings held throughout the implementation were at convenient times.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	3	21.43%
Somewhat Agree	4	28.57%
Agree	5	35.71%
Strongly Agree	1	7.14%
Mean		5.143
Standard Deviation		1.059
26. When I was unable to participate in tasks, I trusted my teammates to communicate my opinions.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		5.857
Standard Deviation		.915
27. During the implementation I got to know my other teammates well.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%

Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.714
Standard Deviation		.881
28. If my other teammates volunteered to complete a task, I could rely on them to finish that task without follow-up.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.643
Standard Deviation		1.042
29. The implementation was United States versus the rest of the world.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	3	21.43%
Somewhat Disagree	3	21.43%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	2	14.29%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		4.429
Standard Deviation		1.879
30. I could be open and honest about my feelings during the implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	1	7.14%
Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%

Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	0	0.00%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.071
Standard Deviation		1.907
31. I could relate to the other members on the implementation team.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	2	14.29%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	4	28.57%
Strongly Agree	4	28.57%
Mean		5.286
Standard Deviation		1.623
32. Everyone put a good effort into making the HRMS implementation a success.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	3	21.43%
Agree	5	35.71%
Strongly Agree	5	35.71%
Mean		6.0
Standard Deviation		.926
33. I was able to take part and share my opinions in the global implementation of the HRMS system.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%

Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%
Agree	7	50.00%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.286
Standard Deviation		1.532
34. If I misunderstood something my teammate was trying to say, I had the opportunity to communicate until we both understood.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	8	57.14%
Strongly Agree	2	14.29%
Mean		5.429
Standard Deviation		1.40
35. My needs were taken into consideration during the global HRMS implementation.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	2	14.29%
Somewhat Disagree	1	7.14%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	3	21.43%
Somewhat Agree	1	7.14%
Agree	4	28.57%
Strongly Agree	3	21.43%
Mean		4.929
Standard Deviation		1.710
36. My teammates were able to reach consensus across the globe.		
Strongly Disagree	0	0.00%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	3	21.43%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	2	14.29%

Agree	7	50.00%
Strongly Agree	1	7.14%
Mean		5.143
Standard Deviation		1.301
37. Overall, the HRMS was a good value to my region.		
Strongly Disagree	1	7.14%
Disagree	0	0.00%
Somewhat Disagree	0	0.00%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	1	7.14%
Somewhat Agree	5	35.71%
Agree	6	42.86%
Strongly Agree	1	7.14%
Mean		5.214
Standard Deviation		1.372