Volume - 5, Issue- 10,October 2017 IC Value : 56.46 e-ISSN : 2347 - 9671| p- ISSN : 2349 - 0187
EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review SJIF Impact Factor(2016) : 6.484
ISI Impact Factor (2013): 1.259(Dubai)

Research Paper

www.eprawisdom.com

A STUDY ON THE GIVING UP THE "SECRET OF FIRE" THE IMPACT OF INCENTIVES AND SELF-MONITORING ON KNOWLEDGE SHARING WITH REFERENCE TO ASHOK LEYLAND, HOSUR

Dr.D.Rajasekar[1]	*[1]Associate Professor, AMET Business School, AMET University, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*
Dr.M.Thiagarajan[2]	*[2]HOD, Department of Buisness Administration, Alagappa Govt. Arts College, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India*

ABSTRACT

The organizations need to find ways of motivating employees to share proprietary knowledge. Failure to do so may render even the most technologically advanced and powerful KM systems useless as employees hoard valuable knowledge rather than contributing to this system. The present study investigated the impact of situational and dispositional factors on employees' willingness to share knowledge. Specifically, we examined the effectiveness of explicit incentives for increasing employees" willingness to share knowledge, considering both tangible and intangible incentives. We also examined the moderating role of employee impression management on the effects of these incentives. We approach these issues by regarding knowledge sharing as a form of organizational citizenship behavior, thus situating this research in a well-developed literature.

KEY WORDS: *Incentive, Motivation, Self-Monitoring, Knowledge Managment*

INTRODUCTION

Learning is a basic authoritative asset that gives a reasonable upper hand in an aggressive and dynamic economy. To pick up an upper hand it is essential however lacking for associations to depend on staffing and preparing frameworks that attention on choosing representatives who have particular learning, aptitudes, capacities, or capabilities or helping workers secure them. Associations should likewise consider how to exchange ability and learning from specialists who have it to beginners who need to know. That is, associations need to accentuate and all the more viably abuse learning based assets that as of now exist inside the organization.As one information focused action, learning sharing is the major means through which representatives can add to information application, development, and eventually the upper hand of the association. Information sharing amongst representatives and inside and crosswise over groups enables associations to misuse and gain by learning based assets. Research has demonstrated that learning sharing and mix is emphatically identified with diminishments underway costs, quicker consummation of new item improvement ventures, group execution, firm advancement capacities, and firm execution including deals development and income from new items and administrations.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Organizations have started to recognize that the effective management of technical, procedural, and corporate knowledge is a critical source of competitive advantage. This realization has been accompanied by dramatic growth in the knowledge management literature, but this literature has primarily focused on the technological challenges of capturing and distributing knowledge (e.g., Dewett& Jones, 2001; Goodman &Darr, 1998) while largely neglecting the "human dimension" of knowledge management. Much of the writing on KM is based on the questionable assumption that employees will naturally make use of KM systems once such systems are made available. However, the foundation of KM is knowledge sharing, and the success of KM efforts rests with the willingness of employees to share proprietary knowledge rather than "commodity grade" knowledge. Knowledge sharing is invested with a tension between individual self-interest and corporate interest: the sharing of knowledge among employees will always be of benefit to the organization, but individual employees may regard it as a loss of intellectual capital, particularly if the knowledge is clearly performance-enhancing.

COMPANY PROFILE

The birthplace of Ashok Leyland can be followed to the inclination for confidence, felt by free India. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India's initially Prime Minister convinced Mr. Raghunandan Saran, an industrialist, to enter car produce. In 1948, Ashok Motors was set up in what was then Madras, for the get together of Austin Cars. The Company's fate and name changed soon with value investment by British Leyland and Ashok Leyland started produce of business vehicles in 1955.

From that point forward Ashok Leyland has been a noteworthy nearness in India's business vehicle industry with a custom of innovative authority, accomplished through tie-ups with universal innovation pioneers and through vivacious in-house R&D.

For more than five decades, Ashok Leyland has been the innovation pioneer in India's business vehicle industry, forming the nation's business vehicle profile by presenting advancements and item thoughts that have gone ahead to end up industry standards.

From 18 seater to 82 seater twofold decker transports, from 7.5 ton to 49 ton in haulage vehicles, from various unique application vehicles to diesel motors for mechanical, marine and genset applications, Ashok Leyland offers an extensive variety of items. Eight out of ten metro transport transports in India are from Ashok Leyland. With more than 60 million travelers per day , Ashok Leyland transports convey more individuals

From that point forward Ashok Leyland has been a noteworthy nearness in India's business vehicle industry with a custom of innovative authority, accomplished through tie-ups with universal innovation pioneers and through vivacious in-house R&D.

Access to global innovation empowered the Company to set a custom to be first with innovation. Be it full compressed air brakes, control guiding or raise motor transports, Ashok Leyland spearheaded every one of these ideas. Reacting to the working conditions and practices in the nation, the Company made its vehicles solid, over-building them with additional metallic muscles. "Outlining tough items that sound good to the shopper, utilizing proper innovation", turned into the plan rationality of the Company, which thusly has shaped purchaser dispositions and the brand identity.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

- There are a number of common situations that are widely recognized as benefiting from the knowledge management approaches.
- The place of organizational changes is also increasing as are the demands on the 'people skills' of management staff.
- Knowledge management can play a key role in supporting the information need of management staff.
- In this situation the loss of their key staff can have a major impact upon the level of knowledge within the organization.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. The study is conducted to know about the knowledge sharing process at Ashok Leyland
2. The study will help the company to identify whether the superiors are sharing information with their subordinates in a good way.
3. The study will identify whether the new employee are satisfied with the knowledge sharing with their seniors.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The major objectives of the study are

- To know the self willingness of employee in Ashok Leyland to share knowledge if there is an incentive for doing so.
- To analysis relationship between the long term monetary rewards with recognition-based incentives of employees.
- To examine the knowledge sharing attitude of high self-monitoring employee when.
  - Recognition-based incentives are offered.
  - Pay-based incentives.
  - No incentives.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The research problem is to identify the impact of recognitin-based incentives are offered and pay based incentives on knowledge sharing. The information will be collected from the employees working in the ashokleyland.

SOURCE OF DATA:

PRIMARY SOURCE

The method followed for collecting the primary data is survey approach and a questionaire has been used for the purpose

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Employee registers
- Brochures
- Evaluation statement of the employee

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research design is the arrangement of condition for collection and analyis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the human resources services with economist procedure. Descriptive research design is adapted for the present project out population sample were takes and response were obtained through questionnaires.

TOOLS & TECHNIQUES

- Chi-square test
- Regression analysis
- Factor analysis

SAMPLING DESIGN:

SAMPLE UNITS

All the employees of Ashok Leyland Ltd. Hosur constitute the sampling unit.

SAMPLING METHOD

The method adopted here is the convenient non-probability sampling method. A random sampling is that where each item in the universe has an equal chance of being selected.

SAMPLING SIZE

The convenient sampling technique was employed during the data collection. A sample of Ashok Leyland pvt Ltd, respondents was questioned in order to collect the data.

SAMPLING FRAME

The survey was conducted at Ashok leyland Ltd. Hosur. Where most of the respondence was belong to urban areas.

CHAPTERISATION

Chapter: 1

The First Chapter deals with the study "structural change in output and employment: an empirical exploration in "introduction that is out line of project, Industry profile, Company profile, Need of the study, scope of the study, objective of the study, research methodology, limitations.

Chapter 2

The Second Chapter includes the theoretical background and Literature Review.

Chapter 3

The third chapter includes the Data analysis and interpretation; Statistical analysis using Statistical tools like Chi-square test, Regression analysis, correlation, ANNOVA, cluster analysis, weighted average and factor analysis.

Chapter 4

The fourth chapter includes Findings, suggestions and conclusions.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDIES:

- ✓ Most of the expertise persons were not interested in discussing about the research.
- ✓ Convincing the respondent was the main problems.
- ✓ The personal interview is done only after getting appointment from the respondent
- ✓ To analyze the study, the time duration is not quite enough.
- ✓ There was also no sufficient information available from secondary source of data to conduct the research.
- ✓ Hence the research was done only in particular area, the information gathered may not be correct or sufficient.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Where sharing knowledge with coworkers enhances general productivity, it might be usefully conceived as a form of organizational citizenship behavior. As defined by Organ (1988), OCB is discretionary behavior that contributes to the effectiveness of the organization. It is discretionary in the sense that employees are not specifically required to engage in OCB by either their job descriptions or the performance appraisal process nor can employees be explicitly punished for not engaging in these behaviors. As a form of OCB, knowledge sharing might be considered akin to altruism/ helping (Organ, 1988; Williams & Anderson, 1991), at least if the primary aim is to help one's coworkers deal with specific challenges or to work more efficiently. It may also represent a form of individual initiative (George & Jones, 1997; Moorman & Blakely, 1995; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Pain, &Bachrach, 2000) or civic virtue (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff et al ., 2000) if the intent is to enhance of the overall effectiveness and competitiveness of the organization.Extensive research has been done on person-related antecedents of OCB. Among the factors found to be associated with OCB are job satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Wagner & Rush, 2000), organizational commitment (Organ & Ryan, 1995), justice/fairness perceptions (Farh, Podsakoff, & Organ, 1990; Moorman, 1991; Organ & Ryan, 1995), and personality factors such as agreeableness and conscientiousness (Chia, Nosworthy, Kamdar, &Chay, 2002; Organ &Lingl, 1995; Podsakoff et al ., 2000; though see Organ & Ryan, 1995, Podsakoff et al., 2000, and Organ, 1994, for counter-evidence on dispositional predictors). In fact, most of the research on OCB continues to focus on possible attitudinal and dispositional antecedents.

In contrast to these person-related factors, there has been relatively little research on the impact of situational or contextual factors on OCB (Podsakoff et al ., 2000). Where there has been, most of the work has concentrated on task characteristics (e.g., Farh, et al., 1990), leadership behavior (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, &Bommer, 1996), and substitutes for leadership (e.g., Podsakoff, et al., 1996). In fact, Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified these variables as among the strongest predictors of OCB and called for more research to be devoted to understanding their roles and effects. One potentially important contextual factor that has been largely neglected in the OCB literature is the role of rewards and incentives. This probably reflects perceived boundaries established by Organ's (1988) definition of OCB as a class of behavior that is "not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system" (p.4). However, there is credible evidence that OCB is rewarded, and is perceived as such by employees and supervisors, even if it is not explicitly captured in an organization's performance management system (see Allen & Rush, 1998; MacKenzie, Podsakoff, & Fetter, 1991; Schnake&Dumler, 1997).

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

STATISTICAL TOOL AND INTERPRETATION

TOOL-1 CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS

Aim: To set the significant difference between designation and aim of community

H0: There is no significant difference between designation with aim of community

H1: There is significant difference between designation with aim of community

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	62.211[a]	63	.504
Likelihood Ratio	64.851	63	.412
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.750	1	.186
N of Valid Cases	91		

a. 80 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5.
b. The minimum expected count is .01.

Result

Calculated value = 62.211

Degree of freedom = 63

Significance level 5% and Confidence limit 95%

Tabulated value is 82.53

The table value >the calculated value

Interpretation

The table value of chi-square contribution of % level of significance isgreater than calculated value. So the Ho is accepted. Thus there is no significant association between designations with aim of community

TOOL 2: REGRESSION

Aim: To find whether the model designed with Believe Sharing, Gained Help, Trust the Member, Reciprocity with Community, Share my Knowledge, Reputation in Field, Don't helping others and Shared knowledge.

HO: The Mean score ofBelieve Sharing, Gained Help, Trust the Member, Reciprocity with Community, Share my Knowledge, Reputation in Field, Don't helping Others and Shared knowledge is equal

H1: The Mean score of Believe Sharing, Gained Help, Trust the Member, Reciprocity with Community, Share my Knowledge, Reputation in Field, Don't helping Others and Shared knowledge is unequal

Model Summary[b]				
Model	**R**	**R Square**	**Adjusted R Square**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**
1	.531[a]	.282	.221	.828

Model Summary[b]					
Model	**Change Statistics**				
	R Square Change	**F Change**	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig. F Change**
1	.282	4.647	7	83	.000

ANOVA[b]						
Model		**Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1	Regression	22.328	7	3.190	4.647	.000[a]
	Residual	56.968	83	.686		
	Total	79.297	90			

Result:

The R value is 0.531, $r^2$is 0.282 and the adjusted r^2 is 0.221

The adjusted r^2 value is 0.221 which means only 1% variation between the variables ventilation and temperature.

Calculated value = 4.647

Degree of freedom = 7.83

Tabulated value = **2.12200353**

Tabulated value <calculated value

Interpretation:

The calculated value is greater than the tabulated value so null hypothesis is not accepted. So it is concluded the mean score ofBelieve Sharing, Gained Help, Trust the Member , Reciprocity with Community, Share my Knowledge, Reputation in Field, Don't helping Others and Shared knowledge is unequal.

Coefficients[a]						
Model		**Unstandardized Coefficients**		**Standardized Coefficients**	**t**	**Sig.**
		B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1	(Constant)	-.338	1.308		-.258	.797
	Gained Help	.871	.160	.511	5.427	.000
	Share my Knowledge	.061	.079	.093	.778	.439
	Trust the Member	.031	.105	.036	.292	.771
	Reciprocity with Community	-.082	.101	-.098	-.811	.420
	Reputation in Field	.100	.119	.106	.841	.403
	Don't helping Others	.196	.150	.178	1.305	.195
	Believe Sharing	-.187	.141	-.167	-1.330	.187
a. Dependent Variable: Shared Knowledge						

Residuals Statistics[a]					
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	4.40	6.76	6.09	.498	91
Residual	-2.288	2.292	.000	.796	91
Std. Predicted Value	-3.388	1.359	.000	1.000	91
Std. Residual	-2.762	2.766	.000	.960	91
a. Dependent Variable: Shared Knowledge					

TOOL 3: CHI-SQUARE

Aim: To set the significant difference between Knowledge Asset base and Factors motivate.

Ho: There is no significant difference between Knowledge Asset base withFactors motivate.

H1: There is significant difference between Knowledge Asset base withFactors motivate.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.790[a]	10	.833
Likelihood Ratio	5.458	10	.859
Linear-by-Linear Association	.024	1	.877
N of Valid Cases	91		
a. 13 cells (72.2%) have expected count less than 5. b. The minimum expected count is .01.			

Result

Calculated value =5.790

Degree of freedom =10

Significance level 5% and Confidence limit 95%

Tabulated value is 18.31

The table value >the calculated value

Interpretation

The table value of chi-square contribution of % level of significance isgreater than calculated value. So the Ho is accepted. Thus there is no significant association between Knowledge Asset base withFactors motivate.

TOOL 4: CHI-SQUARE

Aim: To set the significant difference between Communities Practice with Factors Motivate.

Ho: There is no significant difference between Communities Practice with Factors Motivate.

H1: There is significant difference between Communities Practice with Factors Motivate.

Communities Practice * Factors Motivate			
Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.206[a]	5	.820
Likelihood Ratio	3.538	5	.618
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.520	1	.218
N of Valid Cases	91		

Result

Calculated value is 2.206

Degree of freedom is 5

Significance level 5% and Confidence limit 95%

Tabulated value is 11.07

The table value >the calculated value

Interpretation

The table value of chi-square contribution of % level of significance isgreater than calculated value. So the Ho is accepted. Thus there is no significant association between Communities Practice with Factors Motivate

TOOL 5: FACTOR ANALYSIS

Aim:

This tool has been applied on the following 12 variables to identify the important influencing factors under different dimensions. The factors considered for the analysis are

- ✓ Improve Competitive.
- ✓ Improve Customer
- ✓ Innovation
- ✓ Inventory Reduction
- ✓ Employee Development
- ✓ Cost Reduction
- ✓ Revenue Growth
- ✓ Decision Making
- ✓ Property Rights
- ✓ Partner Rights
- ✓ Improve Quality
- ✓ Improve Delivery

Communalities		
	Initial	Extraction
Improve Competitive	1.000	.685
Improve Customer	1.000	.719
Innovation	1.000	.746
Inventory Reduction	1.000	.754
Employee Development	1.000	.715
Cost Reduction	1.000	.663
Revenue Growth	1.000	.524
Decision Making	1.000	.726
Property Rights	1.000	.785
Partner Rights	1.000	.683
Improve Quality	1.000	.627
Improve Delivery	1.000	.632
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.		

Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Cost Reduction	.736	.155	.284	-.126
Revenue Growth	.651	.098	-.284	-.103
Improve Delivery	-.632	-.121	.464	-.042
Improve Customer	-.581	.562	-.226	.117
Employee Development	.578	.223	.568	.092
Improve Quality	-.567	-.392	.389	.008
Improve Competitive	-.558	.447	-.406	.095
Property Rights	.120	-.747	-.160	.432
Partner Rights	-.195	-.686	.157	.388
Decision Making	.427	-.368	-.566	.296
Innovation	-.131	.464	.040	.715
Inventory Reduction	.328	.442	.306	.598
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.				
a. 4 components extracted.				

Rotated Component Matrix[a]				
	Component			
	1	2	3	4
Improve Delivery	.786	-.101	-.055	-.035
Improve Quality	.747	-.057	.210	-.144
Revenue Growth	-.672	.261	-.040	-.049
Decision Making	-.604	-.047	.598	-.047
Improve Competitive	.025	-.768	-.266	.156
Employee Development	-.074	.724	-.204	.379
Cost Reduction	-.363	.691	-.204	.108
Improve Customer	.138	-.691	-.383	.275
Property Rights	-.031	.068	.881	-.052
Partner Rights	.392	.053	.726	-.006
Innovation	.022	-.266	.002	.822
Inventory Reduction	-.119	.255	-.067	.819
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.				
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.				

Interpretation

From the communalities table and rotated component matrix table it is inferred that the following factors were classified under different dimensions and identified as very important variables.

DIMENSION 1:

- ✓ Improve Delivery
- ✓ Improve Quality

DIMENSION 2:

- ✓ Employee Development
- ✓ Cost Reduction

DIMENSION 3:

- ✓ Property Rights
- ✓ Partner Rights

DIMENSION 4:

- ✓ Innovation
- ✓ Inventory Reduction

FINDINGS, SUGGESTION AND CONCLUSION

FINDINGS:

- ➢ Most of the respondents belong to 31-40 age group.
- ➢ The entire respondents in the Ashok Leyland are male.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are married in this organization.
- ➢ Most of them are having 3-4 dependents.
- ➢ Most of the respondents working in Ashok Leyland are B.E, qualified.
- ➢ Most of the respondents have experience of 6-10yrs, which the organization always recruit mostly experience candidates.
- ➢ Most of the respondents have experience of more than 11-15yrs totally in their life time.
- ➢ Most of the respondents earn between 31000-40000.
- ➢ Most of the respondents agree that knowledge is the asset base in organization.
- ➢ Most of the respondents understand the meaning of communities of practice in organization.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are highly significant with the statement of improve competitive advantage and the 21-30 age group respondents said relatively significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of innovation and the 41-50 age group respondents said highly significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents is relatively significant with the statement of inventory reduction.
- ➢ .Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of cost of reduction and the 31-40 year age group respondents said somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are somewhat significant with the statement of cost reduction, 41-50 years age group respondents said relatively significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents said somewhat significant with the statement of revenue growth, 41-50 years age group respondents said relatively significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statements of better decision-making whereas 41-50 years age respondents are somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of intellectual property-right management whereas 41-50 years age group respondents is somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents said relatively significant with the statement of partner response to key business issue whereas the 41-50 years age group respondents is somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents said relatively significant with the statement of the improve delivery whereas the 31-40 year age group respondents said highly significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents said relatively significant with the statement of the improve competitive advantage whereas the MBA,BSC,BCOM respondents said very highly significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are highly significant with the statement of the improve customer focus whereas the Bcom,Bsc respondents said extremely significant
- ➢ Most of the respondents are highly significant with the statement of innovation whereas the Bcom,ME,Bsc qualification respondents said relatively significant, somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of inventory reduction whereas the Bcom, BSC, Educational qualification respondents said the somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of employee development ,Bcom,BSE,ME Educational qualification respondents said lesser significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are somewhat significant, with the statement of cost reduction.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are the somewhat significant with the statement of revenue growth.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of better decision making whereas the Bcom,BSE Educational qualification respondents said somewhat significant.
- ➢ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with the statement of the intellectual property rights management whereas the BE,MBA Educational qualification respondents said somewhat significant.

SUGGESTIONS:

- ✓ Most of the respondentsneither agree nor disagree with their income. So the organization can try to satisfy the basic needs of the employees.
- ✓ Most of the respondents agree that every one's and top management helps in creation of new knowledge. So the organization provides opportunity for creation of new knowledge.
- ✓ Most of the respondents are highly significant to improve competition when compared with Experience present. So the organization always has competition which helps for their achievements.
- ✓ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with employee development and cost reduction compared with Educational qualification. So the organization can give proper development programs for the employees

- ✓ Most of the respondents are relatively significant with Decision Making and Property Rights when compared with Designation. It shows that the organization gives the benefit for employees in decision making and property rights.

CONCLUSION

This study has shown that employees are unlikely to share job-related knowledge whenthere is no clear incentive for doing so. As such, researchers and organizations may be mistakenif they assume that employees will simply share knowledge if knowledge management systemsare made available. If employees are to share productivity-enhancing knowledge beyond theirfriends, they will have to perceive some personal benefit. This appears to be especially true foremployees who are high in self-monitoring, as they are more sensitive to the costs involved insharing such knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Gupta C B 1st edition;1996, seventh edition:2006.,Published by Sultan chand*
2. *Gupta, S.P., "Introduction to Mathematical and Statistics", Mc Graw Hill Book Co., New York.*
3. *Gupta, S.P., (2004) "Business Statistics", University of Delhi.*
4. *Hacon,R.j.,Management Training :Aims and methods, English university prees 1961,*
5. *K.Aswathappa Human resource& personal management., copyright 2005,2002,1999,1997*
6. *Kothari, C.R.,(1930) "Research Methodology", Sultan Chand & Son Publications*
7. *Peter F.Durcker, Peter Ferdinand ., Management: tasks responsibilities, practices.*
8. *RichartL.Daft, Dorothymarcby:Understanding management*

WEBSITES:

1. *www.google.com*
2. *www.yahoo.com*
3. *www.scribd.com*
4. *www.wikepedia.com*
5. *www.ashok leyland.com*
6. *www.hrm.com*