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Looking at the review and the introduction, to test the stated hypothesis the present research intended to use the following method to establish the validity of the hypothesis and also make an effort to explore the relevance of understanding diversity and appreciating it in relation to the selected variables.

After examining the available researches and searching the appropriate tools the research proposed to use both the qualitative as well as the quantitative methods to arrive at a holistic conclusion.

3.1 The Quantitative Approach

For Quantitative research three questionnaires were used. They have been described below.

3.1.1 Perceived Diversity Climate Questionnaire

This scale was developed by Dr. Surendra Kumar Sia (2008). It is an Indian adaptation of the Diversity perception scale developed by Barak, Cherin & Berkman, 1998.

This questionnaire indicates the nature of diversity management in the organisation; in other words, the employees’ perception towards diversity handling of their respective organisations. More the scores, better is the diversity management scenario in the organisation.
The questionnaire comprises of three dimensions- Perceived organisational fairness, Perceived organisational Inclusiveness and Personal diversity value.

*Organisational Fairness* depicts the extent to which employee perceives the plans, policies and programs of the organisation to be fair towards him/her.

*Organisational Inclusiveness* taps the feelings or perceptions of the individual about the initiative taken or interests shown by the organisation towards integration or accommodation of employees like him/her with the other employees belonging to various groups.

*Personal Diversity Value* implies how the respondent values diversity in the organisational context.

Total number of items in the scale is 11. Out of which 5 are for tapping organisational fairness, 3 for organisational inclusiveness and again 3 for personal diversity value. The response pattern for the questionnaire is that of a 5 point Likert type scale i.e. 1 for strongly agree and 5 for strongly disagree.

Examples of representative items included are: ‘I feel I have been treated differently here because of my religion/sex/reservation category/mother tongue etc.’ (Organisational Fairness). ‘Management here encourages them who give support to the minority or women employees’ (Organisational Inclusiveness). ‘Employees from different background make the environment uncomfortable’ (Personal diversity value).

The psychometric properties of the questionnaire are given in Table 3.1. Split Half Reliability and Cronbach Alpha for the questionnaire are .75 and .71 respectively.

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Range of Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Fairness</td>
<td>.44 and .92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Inclusiveness</td>
<td>.46 and .88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Diversity Value</td>
<td>.51 and .83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.2 Work Interference with Family and Family Interference with Work

Questionnaire

This measure was developed by Gutek, Searle & Klepa (1991). The original measure used eight items to describe the extent to which an employee’s work demands interfere with family responsibilities (four items) and the extent to which family demands interfere with work responsibilities (four items). Two additional items added to each of these subscales by Carlson and Perrewe (1999). The two subscales have also been combined into a composite measure of work and family interference (Carlson & Perrewe, 1999).

In the questionnaire the responses are obtained using a five-point Likert type scale where one refers to strong agreement and five to strong disagreement. A higher score depicts lower work family Conflict. Total items in the scale are twelve, out of which six represent work interference with family and the rest represent family interference with work.

Examples of representative items included are: ‘After work, I come home to tired to do some of the things I would like to do’ (Work interference with family). ‘My personal life takes up time that I would like to spend at work’ (Family interference with Work).

Psychometric properties of the questionnaire are described ahead.

Reliability: Coefficient alpha values for the measure of work interference with family ranged from .71 to .87. For the measure of family interference with work, alpha values ranged from .74 to .83 (Aryee, Fields & Luk, 1999; Gutek et al., 1991; Judge, Boudreau & Bretz, 1994; Williams & Alliger, 1994). Coefficient alpha values for the composite measure of work and family interference ranged from .66 to .89 (Adams, King & King, 1996; Carlson & Perrewe, 1999; Frone, Russell & Cooper, 1996; Gutek et. al., 1991)

Validity: Factor Analysis conducted by Gutek et al. (1991) and Frone et al. (1996) showed that work interference with family was empirically distinct from family interference with work. Judge et al. (1994) examined confirmatory factor models that
indicated that work-family conflict, family-work conflict, job satisfaction, life satisfaction, and job stress were empirically distinct. Structural equation models evaluated by Aryee et al. (1999) and Frone et al. (1992) also showed that work-family and family-work conflict co-vary, but were empirically distinct.

For the present study, a pilot run was conducted of this questionnaire to validate that it can be used on Indian population. Thus, Cronbach alpha was computed which came out to be 0.85.

### 3.1.3 Alienation from Work Questionnaire

Drawing upon Marx’s concept of alienation, the author, Shepard (1972) views alienation as “social psychological separation from some social referent”. He points out that people may be differently alienated from different aspects of their social life, and takes the work setting one illustrative social referent. Using Seeman’s (1959) analysis, he sets out to operationalize five uses of the term in respect to work:

*Powerlessness* refers to perceived lack of freedom and personal control on the job, where the worker feels that he or she is dominated by other people or a technological system.

*Meaninglessness* refers to an inability to understand the events in which one is engaged, for example how one’s work activities relate to other jobs and the larger organisation.

*Normlessness* is the expectation that culturally accepted goals (such as upward mobility in the company) can only be achieved through illegitimate means.

*Instrumental Work Orientation* is a specific case of “self-estrangement”, when activities are undertaken solely for anticipated future rewards and not for any intrinsic value. Working merely for money is cited as an example for the occupational setting.
Self evaluative Involvement refers to the degree to which a person tests his or her self esteem through involvement in a particular role, for example as a worker. In this specific sense it has similarities with the concept of Work Involvement.

The full scale has 30 items, with 8, 8, 5, 4 and 5 tapping the five separate constructs, powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, Instrumental work orientation and Self evaluative involvement respectively. Sub scale scores are obtained by summing responses across items, with a high score indicating low alienation. The powerlessness, meaninglessness and normlessness items each refer to a characteristic of work, and responses are in terms of the extent to which the feature exists in the respondent’s job, from minimum scored 1 to maximum scored 5. Instrumental Work orientation and Self evaluative involvement are measured through statements open to agreement or disagreement, scored from 1 to 5.

Examples of representative items included are: ‘To what extent can you vary the steps involved in doing your job?’ (Powerlessness), ‘To what extent do you know how your job fits into the total work organisation?’ (Meaninglessness), ‘To what extent do you feel that people who get ahead in the company deserve it?’ (Normlessness), ‘Your job is something you do to earn a living—most of your real interests are centred outside your job’ (Instrumental work orientation) and ‘To you your work is only a small part of who you are’ (Self evaluative involvement).

Psychometric properties of the questionnaire are described ahead.

With a sample of 305 male production workers, corrected item-whole reliabilities were within the following ranges for items from the five sub scales respectively: 0.49 to 0.63, 0.35 to 0.70, 0.50 to 0.65, 0.38 to 0.48, and 0.29 to 0.49.

The five subscales are also significantly correlated. The values ranged from 0.52 between Powerlessness and Meaninglessness to 0.15 between Meaninglessness and Instrumental work orientation.

For the present study, a pilot run was conducted for this questionnaire to validate that it can be used with Indian population. Thus, Cronbach alpha was computed which came out to be 0.79.
3.2 The Qualitative Approach

For Qualitative research, a semi structured situational interview would be conducted on 30% of the sample. Along with the interview the Critical incident technique would also be employed, in which the respondents would be probed to narrate their true experiences related to the topic of research. The data collected would then be analysed by employing thematic analysis and content analysis.

3.3 Statistical Analysis

Statistics used for analysing the quantitative data included simple descriptive statistics of Mean and Standard Deviation.

Later, for computing the differential Perception of the diversity climate, experienced Work Alienation and Work Family Conflict of the 4 groups under study, two way ananlysis of variance was employed. It was a 2×2 Factorial Design, factors being Category and Gender.

Multiple correlations were also computed to find the relationship between various dimensions of Perceived Diversity Climate and Work family conflict as well as Work Alienation.

Step wise regression was applied to find the cause effect relationship for the significant correlations.

3.4 Sample

The sample comprised of both males and females employees belonging to General and Reserved category randomly chosen from public and Government sector organisations. Reserved category comprised of employees belonging to Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes.
The total sample comprised of 300 participants. The age of the sample ranged from 25 to 55 years.

The total sample can be divided into four groups, namely, General Category Male (GCM), General Category Female (GCF), Reserved Category Male (RCM) and Reserved Category Female (RCF). The sample design is illustrated in Figure 3.1.
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Figure 3.1. Sample Design

3.5 Procedure

After studying and reviewing the past researches on various topics, the topic and the objective for the present study were finalised. Reviewing the literature was a constant process throughout the time period of research. As it was decided that a mixed methodology would be employed, thus the three questionnaires were chosen for the quantitative research and an Interview schedule was developed both in English and Hindi for qualitative data collection.

The permission was sought from various public and government sector organisations for data collection. The data collection began with the quantitative methods i.e. the questionnaires were getting filled. Initially 35 questionnaires were administered as a part of the pilot study. As two of the questionnaires were developed by foreign authors, thus their reliability and validity had to be checked on the Indian population. For this purpose Cronbach Alfa was computed. Alongside during the pilot run, a direct feedback was also sought from the participants about the semantics, difficulty level etc. of the questionnaires.
Once the pilot run was completed, the administration of the questionnaire was taken up in full swing. Each organisation gave a written permission which the researcher could show the respondents before introducing the questionnaire to him or her. Each questionnaire was administered personally by the researcher.

The confidentiality of the responses was assured to all the respondents, they were told that the study was purely for academic purpose and thus would not affect their job security. As the topic of research was sensitive thus the researcher always carried her identity card displaying her affiliation to the PhD program in Delhi University.

The researcher was glad to observe that most of the respondents were very enthusiastic in filling the questionnaires as the topic was such that everybody had a strong opinion towards it. The enthusiasm was to the extent that even without probing, respondents sometimes started narrating their personal experiences related to the quota system. But on the other hand, there were few who were afraid of giving their opinions as they said that they would not want to risk their jobs as it’s a legal matter.

Once three fourth of the sample was covered, the interview process began. The respondents were again randomly chosen from the already existing pool of participants. Each interview averagely took one and a half hour. Interview was always conducted in a place where the respondent was comfortable i.e. the responses were not being heard by any third person. During the interview the questions were asked from the semi structured interview schedule and the participants were also probed to narrate their personal experiences. There were some respondents who were very open and interested in the process but there were few others who seemed a little detached. The ones who were interested also gave the researcher references of other participants who could help in the process by providing more knowledge.

All the participants were personally thanked for their cooperation, time and trust that they devoted and showed towards the study.