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CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The present research work is an attempt to understand the concept of Affirmative action, especially in terms of Indian quota system. India has been gripped by some such social scenarios which have lead to a lot of subjugation and discrimination amongst its people. One such social custom is the caste system prevalent since ages in India. To overcome the social injustice faced by people due to it, Indian government has implemented caste based quota system in various spheres of social life like occupations, education etc.

The preferential treatment often seen as a tool to implement social justice can have varying consequences. It produces positive outcomes but like any other aspect of life it does have some negative consequences too. There has been immense work on the topic of reservation policy from sociological, economic and anthropological point of view. A psychological research is a way to find out which consequence weighs more and how is it impacting the psychological aspects of the population impacted by it.

Before we proceed further, it is important to notify that there lay a difference between Affirmative action and Equal opportunity for employment. When equality is emphasised in employment by not discriminating against any group of employees based on race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin, it is equal opportunity for employment. But when a group of employees are given concessions (quota) during selection etc. in order to bring them at par with others in society or to forgo some other past mistake, it is called Affirmative action. Affirmative action thus in the name of creating equality may be viewed by some as negating the concept of equality by giving more importance and opportunity to the backward and neglecting the importance of merit.
The basic purpose of the present research was to study the perception of the employees working in government/public organisations (where there are reserved seats for the backward classes as per the policy of Indian quota system) towards the diversity climate of their organisations. Diversity climate includes the organisation’s efforts towards providing a just environment, inclusive work scenario etc. in which diversity is harnessed rather than exploited. The employees studied belonged to General (UR) as well as Reserved (R) category. As it was a psychological research, the socio-psychological consequences of the employees’ perception were also studied. Thus, two variables that were studied as consequences were experienced Work family conflict and Work Alienation.

After intensive review work, the requisite techniques for data collection that were selected comprised of both quantitative and qualitative methods. Three questionnaires along with a semi-structured open ended question seeking participants’ opinion towards the quota system were administered on the total sample along with a semi structured situational interview, which was conducted with the 30 percent of the sample. The data was later analysed using descriptive, inferential and co-relational statistics. And the qualitative data was thematically analysed.

Keeping in view the different variables and research studies in the literature, the results obtained have been interpreted in the present chapter. To get a good understanding of the results, they have been discussed keeping different variables in mind. The discussion proceeds with analysing the descriptive results and then the inferential results for each of the variables.

5.1 Perception of Diversity Climate

The first Variable that we would focus upon is the ‘Perception of Diversity Climate’ i.e. the perception of the employees regarding the diversity climate of their organisation. The dimensions covered under this variable are Organisational Fairness, Inclusiveness and Personal Diversity Value. The questionnaire used to tap this variable was ‘Perception of diversity climate questionnaire’ adapted by Dr. Surendra
Kumar Sia in 2008. It is an Indian modification of Diversity Perception Scale developed by Barak, Cherin & Berkman (1998) in order to suit the Indian work scenario.

Group wise analysis of the perception towards diversity climate was done and is presented below.

We would begin with the General Category’s perception towards the diversity climate. Within the General Category, two groups were formed on the basis of gender, namely, General Category Males (GCM) and General Category Females (GCF).

\[5.1.1 \textit{General Category Males}\]

General Category Males comprised of men who have been working in public/govt. sector organisations without the special privilege of affirmative action. They do not have any quotas for selection, promotion etc. in the organisation. Thus are selected on the basis of merit.

When we take a look at the descriptive quantitative data, it shows that their perception towards the overall diversity climate irrespective of various dimensions stands second in comparison with other groups. As the mean value obtained by them is 38.67 which is slightly higher than the values of General Category Females and Reserved Category Males (Referring to Table 4.1). But Reserved Category Females have a better perception of diversity as compared to them. Thus, we can say that their overall perception is neither too positive nor too negative in contrast with the other groups.

Now as we analyse each of the three dimensions of perceived diversity climate, we can get deeper insights.
5.1.1.1 Organizational Fairness

Beginning with the first dimension, namely, Organisational Fairness, it depicts the extent to which employee perceives the plans, policies and programs of the organisation to be fair towards him/her.

General Category Males perceive organisations to be acting fair in most aspects but are not fully convinced with the steps taken by the organisations to create a fair environment. Through the descriptive *quantitative data* we can see that after the Reserved Category Females who have a mean value of 18.33, they are the ones who are perceiving organisation to be fair in its activities, with the mean value of 18.23. (Table 4.1)

But through having a close look at the qualitative analysis, we can get a deeper picture. Their response to the *semi structured situational question* asked during the interview in which they had to imagine seeing a Reserved Category employee coming out of the boss’s cabin in a shattered emotional state, shows that 48.6% of them responded that such a situation has nothing to do with category, 43.2% responded that it could happen due to Reserved Category’s own incompetence and only 8.1% were of the opinion that boss could have been biased against the category (Table 4.54). This shows that most of them believe that organisation is fair in terms of their behaviour towards both the general and the Reserved Category. Perhaps they believe the employees belonging to Reserved Category are not being unnecessarily biased against, similarly they are also getting true feedback if they are not performing well. This latter point is helping the General Category Males in perceiving the climate being fair towards them as well because the potential of each employee is being recognised and fair feedback is also being provided irrespective of being from general or Reserved Category. So, if they believe themselves to be better performers than the Reserved Category, they seem to be happy that organisation is also accepting or at least not neglecting that.

The relevant themes that were derived from the interviews conducted depict that perhaps there are still areas which make the General Category Males perceive the climate unfair. As written in the previous paragraph; they seem to be only partially
convinced by the steps taken by the organisations to create a fair environment. This can be seen in themes (Table 4.49) such as Organisational neglect; in which 33.3% believe organisations neglect the Reserved Category employees, 33.3% believe organisations do not provide with mentoring facilities for the Reserved Category, 41.7% have said that Reserved Category employees are not given proper training. This theme depicts that many of them perhaps perceive that the organisations need to act fairly towards the Reserved Category in terms of providing them help. What could be sensed out of the above theme is that they are pointing out that organisation should take out some fair means to bridge the gap between reserved and the General Category by bringing the Reserved Category at par with the general through providing required trainings to them.

Other relevant theme is Work related efficiency; in which 41.7% believe that Reserved Category are given concessions in work which lead to increased work load for the General Category, this again can be warded of by providing Reserved Category employees relevant training. Third theme is Learned Helplessness; 25% of them also pointed out that Reserved Category often seek legal support even when not necessary, which threatens them. Although the percentage of the ones being threatened is not very high, but it is most likely somewhere making the General Category Males perceive, the organisational climate as unfair at times.

A critical Incident narrated by an interviewee goes as follows:

“Few years back there were many employees working under me. I used to make efforts to motivate this Reserved Category employee who never used to perform effectively. He often seemed uninterested in work and thus I kept pushing him to work harder, which also sometimes became ugly. One day I got a notification that the Reserved Category cell has got complained against me and thus I would be transferred to some rural town as the punishment decided by them. When I questioned about my mistake, it was told that the same employee has filed a complaint, that I indirectly insulted him by speaking wrong words for Dr. B.R Ambedkar. At the same time I realised that few days back during lunch time there was a discussion going about Indian
history in which we discussed about many well known personalities of India. We did not discuss anything about the reservation policy. And he abused the opportunity as he already had grudges against me that I made him work.”

A remark made be an interviewee:

“Reservation system is like providing crutches to walk.”

5.1.1.2 Organizational Inclusiveness

Moving on to the second dimension, namely, Organisational Inclusiveness, it taps the feelings or perception of the individual about the initiatives taken or interest shown by the organisation towards integration or accommodation of employees like him/her with the other employees belonging to various groups.

The data depicts that General Category Males have a mixed perception towards the Inclusiveness initiatives of the organisations. Although descriptive quantitative data depicts that similar to the first dimension, they are again second amongst the four groups in their perception towards the organisational inclusiveness with a mean value of 9.65, after the Reserved Category Females having a mean value of 10.10 (Table 4.1). Thus, we can’t say that they have a very poor perception towards this dimension as compared to the other groups.

Qualitative data, giving us a broader view depicts that they don’t have a very positive perception towards the inclusiveness efforts of the organisation. As their responses towards the semi structured situational questions asked show, for example for the question, “If Reserved Category employees are not included in discussions. What would be your opinion around it?” (Table 4.52) Only 8.1% said that they are always included, 37.8% said that they are included only if they work effectively, 27.03% responded that they are not included and should be included, and lastly other 27.03% said that they are not included and should not be included. Thus, from the above responses we can clearly make out that in total 54.06% agreed that Reserved Category employees are not included in discussions, showing poor inclusiveness efforts on part of the organisations. Secondly, 27.03% also said that Reserved
Category should not be included in discussions, which tends to depict a barrier between the two categories of employees working in the organisations, again depicting that organisations have failed to create policies towards integration or accommodation of employees belonging to various groups.

Another question asked during the interview depicts a similar picture. The question asked was “If you notice a co-employee from Reserved Category often keeping to his own self and not mingling with other. What could be the reason?” (Table 4.53) To this, 91.9% clearly responded that it is a frequent feature, as there are many Reserved Category employees who don’t mingle with others. This depicts that most of the Reserved Category employees either shy away or don’t feel like interacting with others at work place. The themes extracted from the interviews taken with the General Category Males can give us the reasons behind this lack of mingling from the point of view of General Category Males. As under the theme (Table 4.49) of Differing life experiences, 58.3% believed that Reserved Category come from less resourceful backgrounds, under the theme of Self Perception, 66.7% believed Reserved Category lacks confidence, 33.3% said they feel insecure and again a huge 66.7% believed them to be suffering from inferiority complex. And as described under the dimension of organisational fairness, they also perceive that organisation should provide Reserved Category with proper trainings so that they can overcome these problems of lack of confidence, language barriers etc.

Thus, we can say that the perception of General Category Males towards the dimension of Organisational Inclusiveness is somewhere mixed. Because it seems they personally don’t feel being neglected by the organisation but they do feel that there are lack of inclusiveness efforts by the organisations in terms of not providing training opportunities to Reserved Category employees in required areas, this is creating a gap between the two of them, which in turn is a flaw in creating an Inclusive climate at the workplace.
5.1.1.3 Personal Diversity Value

The third dimension, Personal Diversity Value implies how the employees value diversity in the organisational context.

Based on the descriptive *quantitative data*, their personal diversity value is again at the second position as compared to the other groups. The best mean value of 11.61 being of the Reserved Category Females and their mean being 10.78, one point above the mean of Reserved Category Males, who are having a mean of 10.77. (Table 4.1)

The *qualitative data* depicts a similar picture of a mixed but more of positive value orientation of the General Category Males towards diversity at the work place. The semi structured situational question asked during the interview “If you find a reserved and General Category employees arguing. Who would you feel easy to relate with and whom would you feel like protecting?” (Table 4.55) To this, 73% said it would have nothing to do with the category of the person, 19% said Reserved Category and 8.1% responded General Category. This seems to show that most of them have an unbiased attitude towards the categories depicting positive personal value towards diversity at workplace. But the ones who responded with Reserved Category as the answer also gave the reason that they will do so because they are scared of the unexpected legal actions that reserved categories often take. Even during interviews 25% believed that Reserved Category unnecessarily seek legal support, as came out in the theme of *Learned Helplessness*.

The themes that came out from the *Semi structured question on opinion towards Quota system* also provide us with the support of the above data (Table 4.43). It was found out that 60.6% of the participants felt threatened with the current quota system and 36% had a neutral outlook, while only 3% felt empowered by it. In the theme of *Insecurity of future*, 33.3% felt promotional bias against them at workplace and 18.2% believed that there is overseeing of merit. In the second theme, *Organisational Suffering*, 15.2% felt it is leading to poor quality of product and 13.6% believed that it is leading to poor overall performance of the organisation. But under another theme, *Immediate removal of quota system*, only 9.1% General
Category Males stood for it. Rather many believed in *Revamping the policy*, as 30.3% thought there should be creamy layer implementation, 9.1% were of the opinion that it should be benefitting an individual only once in lifetime, 7.4% believed there should be not generation to generation passing of the policy benefits and 7.6% also said that the selection should be competitive. Under another theme, *Worthwhile Present*, 12.1% believed that merit does count irrespective of quota policy and again 12.1% said that this policy least impacts the organisational work.

Thus, through above discussion it can be interpreted that although many General Category Males are not in favour of the present scenario of quota system, but most of them do not want its total removal, but they definitely want amendments to be made in it. This shows that majority of them have more of a positive personal value for the diversity at workplace. But, we should not negate the fact that most (60.6%) are threatened by the present quota scenario at the workplace. (Table 4.39)

### 5.1.2 General Category Females

Moving on to the General Category Females, this group comprised of women who, similar to the group discussed above, have been working in public/govt. sector organisations without the special privilege of affirmative action. They do not have any quotas for selection, promotion etc. in the organisations. Thus are selected on the basis of merit.

Based on descriptive *quantitative analysis*, this group stands third amongst the four groups based on the mean values obtained for overall perception of diversity climate, with a mean value of 37.57 (Table 4.1). Thus, when compared with General Category Males, their perception is poorer towards the diversity climate of their organisations.

Understanding dimension-wise perception of the present group would give us an insightful picture.
5.1.2.1 Organizational Fairness

Organisational Fairness being the first dimension, we will begin with it. General Category Females again stand third amongst the four groups with a mean value of 17.80 in this particular dimension (Table 4.1). It depicts that they have a rather poor perception of Organisational fairness in contrast to most of the other groups.

Qualitative data also provides support to the above stated. Although, the General Category Females seem to believe that organisations are fair in terms of behaving with different category employees. As 74% responded with ‘nothing to do with the category of the person’ to the semi structured situational question asking them about their opinion to the hypothetical situation of seeing a Reserved Category employee coming out of the boss’s cabin in a shattered emotional state (Table 4.54).

But, perhaps they personally don’t appreciate the quota policy as fair towards them. It is quite apparent in the themes that were deduced from the interviews taken with them (Table 4.50). Under the theme of Efficiency of the Reserved Category, 100% said Reserved Category employees have poor capability to work, 75% said they lack job related knowledge, 50% believed they lack qualifications and are unnecessarily privileged. Under another theme, Competency Utilization, 75% responded that Reserved Category are unwilling to work, 25% believed they lack initiative and ambition. They also seem to perceive that Reserved Category indulge into unethical activities which organisations often neglect. As 50% believed Reserved Category employees get forged certificates for selection and promotion, 25% said they seek unnecessary legal support and 25% also brought up the point that they maintain good networks amongst each other in the organisation to indulge into unofficial activities. All these three points came under the theme of Unethical activities.

These responses by the General Category women depicts that most likely they feel neglected in terms of their potentials and view Reserved Category as taking undue advantage of the quota policy. They did not express their view whether the organisation is taking care of these problems or not, but through the above
expressions it could be inferred that they are not perceiving the organisational diversity climate as fair towards them.

5.1.2.2 Organizational Inclusiveness

The second dimension, Organisational Inclusiveness portrays a similar picture. As based on the descriptive quantitative data, the General Category Females again stand third in contrast to other groups with a mean value of 9.37 (Table 4.1). This is depicting their poor perception in comparison to General Category Males and Reserved Category Females towards the inclusiveness measures taken by the organisations.

Looking into the qualitative data provides us with additional support. Beginning with their responses to the semi-structured situational questions, let us begin with the first question. The question asked was “If Reserved Category employees are not included in discussions. What would be your opinion around it?” (Table 4.52) To it none of them responded that they are always included, 26% said that they are included if they work efficiently, 26% said that they are not included but should be included and a huge 48% responded that they are not included and should not be included. Through the above responses we can say that most of them seem to believe that reserved categories are not included in discussions, which depicts poor organisational inclusiveness. But a shocking 48% clearly stated that they don’t want to include Reserved Category in discussions. This shows their uneasiness with the Reserved Category employees at the workplace.

To the second question of noticing whether Reserved Category employees mingle with others at the workplace or not, 74% said they do mingle (Table 4.53). This depicts that may be the Reserved Category are trying at their own personal level to become a part of the workforce, by interacting with others.

Thus, based on the results it could be understood that Organisational Inclusiveness is viewed poorly by the General Category women as they perhaps believe organisation should not waste time on coming out with inclusiveness
measures for reserved categories. Also they somewhere seem threatened of losing their own inclusion in the organisational aspects.

5.1.2.3 Personal Diversity Value

As we move to the third dimension, Personal Diversity Value, quantitative data depicts that General Category Females have worst Personal value for diversity amongst the four groups. As their mean value of 10.04 is the lowest (Table 4.1).

Although their responses to the semi structured question asked during the interview; “If you find a reserved and General Category employee arguing. Whom would you feel easy to relate with and whom would you feel like protecting?” (Table 4.55) were not directly signifying their negative value towards diversity, as 74% said that it would have nothing to do with the category of the person and other 26% responded by saying Reserved Category. But, the themes that emerged out of the semi-structured open ended question; “In these days of quota system you feel empowered or you feel threatened. Why?” that was clubbed with the questionnaires portrays their poor value towards diversity (Tables 4.44 & 4.50).

70.5% of them responded that they feel threatened, 27.9% said they have a neutral outlook and only 1.6% said that they feel empowered. Here the percentage of females feeling threatened is higher as compared to percentage of General Category Males who responded as feeling threatened. Themes that support our quantitative findings are immediate removal of quota system, which 21.3% of the females supported. This value is substantially higher than the General Category Male percentage of 9.1. Under Another theme, namely, Irrationality of policy; 18% believed it leads to overhearing of merit and 19.7% said it leads to inflow of non deserving candidates. Personal affect being another theme, shows 23.8% felt discouraged, 6.6% believed that this policy is snatching away opportunities and even 1.6% revealed that they feel depressed due to it. It was also seen that General Category women were also concerned about their children’s future as under the theme of Insecurity of future, 18% showed a deep concern for the coming generations by giving examples of the suffering that their own children may go through.
But there were few others; 14.7% who believed that Creamy layer implementation should be there, this emerged under the theme of *Revamping the policy*. But again when compared with the percentage of General Category Males who were willing to revamp the policy, the number of General Category Females is quite low. Rather it can be seen they are more likely willing in immediate removal of the policy.

All the above analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, about the Personal diversity value of General Category Females’ show that their personal value towards diversity is quite low.

The reason behind this poor personal value towards diversity of the General Category Females could be that women are still not ready to accept diversity, or even something else which would modify our view towards the world. Since ages, women have been living within the circumference of ideas, opinions and thoughts coloured by patriarchy. The patriarchal world has not provided the women to have variety in their environment, roles and actions. They have always been governed by a set of rules that are correct and another set that are incorrect. So, when there come a sudden change in the environment, they are not able to accept it as they have been trained to always see in ‘the’ one direction; that is the correct direction as per the patriarchal rules.

Now, based on the above analysis, if we make a comparison between the two General Category groups, we can interpret that the perception of the diversity climate of the organisations is perceived poorer by women as compared to the men. Although in all the three dimensions of the Diversity climate both the groups showed their despair due to various reasons. But the General Category Females revealed a higher dissatisfaction and thus a weaker perception of the diversity climate of the organisations. Specifically, we can also point out that their Personal diversity value was quite low as compared to the males. Which is seen to be having certain major consequences for them as would be seen later in the discussion.

As the discussion for Perception of Diversity climate by the General Category has been well elaborated above. Now we should analyse the perception of the Reserved Category groups. In the present study similar to the General Category group
which was divided into two on the basis of gender. The Reserved Category group was also divided into two, namely, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females.

5.1.3 Reserved Category Males

Beginning with the Reserved Category Males, this group comprised of men who have been working in public/govt. sector organisations with the special privilege of affirmative action. They have quotas for selection, promotion etc. in the organisations. Thus are not selected entirely on the basis of merit, or are given leverage in the selection criteria and other organisational aspects.

Based on the quantitative analysis, they have the worst Perception of diversity climate as compared to all the other groups. Their mean value 37.24 as displayed in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.2 is lower in comparison to the General Category groups and is also substantially lower than the females belonging to Reserved Category. This analysis seems to depict that Reserved Category Males’ overall perception towards the steps taken by their organisations towards harnessing diversity is quite low as compared to other employees.

To understand it deeper, we would indulge into dimension-wise outlook of the group towards the diversity climate.

5.1.3.1 Organizational Fairness

Perception towards Organisational Fairness when tapped quantitatively, again it was found that the Reserved Category Males have the worst perception of fairness towards the organisational policies, programs, etc. As the mean obtained by them being 17.13 is again lowest amongst the four groups. (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

When we take a look at the qualitative data, we could find supporting evidence for the above stated result. When the semi-structured situational question “If
you see a Reserved Category employee coming out of the boss’s cabin in a shattered emotional state. What could be the reason?” (Table 54) was asked, 65% responded that the reason could be that the boss is being unfair and biased against the Reserved Category and 35% said that it has nothing to do with the category of the person. This shows that most of the Reserved Category Male employees perhaps believe that the organisation in terms of the boss is unfair towards them.

Even the themes extracted from the interviews as well as the semi-structured question on opinion towards quota system provide some support (Tables 4.40 & 4.46). Under the theme Facing Stereotypes/Biases, 28.6% revealed that they are not recognized for good work, 14.3% said credit is often taken away by General Category employees, another 14.3% believed that they need to work harder to prove themselves, 14.3% also said that they feel biased against due to subtle nonverbal communications going on between General Category employees. Under another theme, namely, Being Targeted, 28.6% said they suffer from Name calling, 14.3% said they are often insulted in front of others for language problems and 14.3% also revealed that they feel harassed specially when their annual performance reports are filled. The theme of Difficult Survival connotes that 7% believe there is prevalence of stigma with being from category.

A critical Incident narrated by an interviewee goes as follows:

“During training sessions I have witnessed that if in total there are 17 candidates and out of them 14 are from General Category and 3 from the Reserved Category. Initially the trainer does not know about the categories of the participants. And the three Reserved Category employees if participating well and putting up relevant questions are interpreted as intelligent. But the moment the trainer gets to know that they belong to the Reserved Category, the construct of intelligence is no more associated with the three Reserved Category participants.”

Another incident narrated by an interviewee was:
“Certain papers for my child’s school admission had to be signed by my boss; he did not sign them and kept giving me unnecessary excuses. The papers were getting delayed for submission. Thus I threatened him that I will complaint against you, and the moment I threatened he signed them. This is an example of how we are harassed unnecessarily”

Thus, through above analysis it could be interpreted that perhaps Reserved Category Males are quite unhappy with the fairness of the policies, programs and the environment prevalent at the work place. They seem to feel biased against either directly or even indirectly via non verbal cues at times.

5.1.3.2 Organizational Inclusiveness

Moving on to the second dimension Organisational Inclusiveness, quantitative data shows Reserved Category Males again stand last amongst the four groups. With a mean value of 9.35; their perception towards inclusiveness efforts of their organisations is the worst amongst the four groups (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

Although the qualitative data analysis; is providing only a partial support to the above stated quantitative data. The responses to the semi-structured situational questions; asked during the interview provides a mixed understanding. The question asked was “If Reserved Category employees are not included in discussions. What would be your opinion around it?” (Table 4.52) To it 65% responded that Reserved Category employees are always included in discussions and only 35% believed that they are not included and should be included. Although 35% is not a small number of responses but if we look at the proportion, there are many more who agree to the fact that Reserved Category employees are involved.

To another question “If you notice a co-employee from the Reserved Category often keeping to himself and not mingling with others. What could be the reason?” (Table 4.53) 75% said that there are many who don’t mingle, while on the other hand only 25% said that they often mingle with others.
The understanding that could be gathered from above responses is that most of the Reserved Category Males perhaps feel aloof in the organisation as they are not able to mingle with others due to various reasons, but the organisations are not the only cause behind their loneliness and lack of feeling of inclusiveness. This could be further understood by the themes that emerged during the interviews.

One of the major theme that emerged from the interviews taken with the Reserved Category Males was *Damaging disparities*, within which 71.4% believe that they are different from the general categories as they have more family responsibilities, again a huge 71.4% said that they belong to a very different set of family background, 42.9% responded that there are huge educational differences, 28.6% said that there is a variation in financial background and 14.3% also said that there is even a difference in the dressing style. (Table 4.46)

The above disparities perceived by the Reserved Category Males between the general and the Reserved Category employees perhaps is a major cause for their feeling of lack of inclusiveness. Simply, may be because they perceive themselves very different as compared to the General Category work force. This may also influence their self concept, as is studied under the theme of *Self Perception*. 57.1% believe that Reserved Category employees suffer from Inferiority complex, 42.9% said they suffer from language problems, 28.9% responded that they lack confidence (Table 4.46)

But, when we look from the perception of Reserved Category Males; the efforts of the organisation towards inclusiveness, again there is a mixed picture. Under the theme of *Organisational Efforts*, 28.6% believed that there is lack of training for the Reserved Category employees, again 28.6% responded that there is lack of boss/mentor’s support, 14.3% believed there is Promotional and training bias and 14.3% also said that they feel neglected. But to the researcher’s surprise there were 14.3% who also said that they feel well supported and do not feel discriminated against.

A statement made by an interviewee goes as follows:
“If a project/team leader has to be chosen, a Reserved Category employee would always be the last option. They would not depict this overtly, but would do it very consciously.”

Thus, we can conclude through the above discussion about the perception of Reserved Category Males towards organisational inclusiveness that perhaps they are not completely contended with the organisational efforts towards the inclusiveness of various groups and moreover they themselves perceive so many differences among the various groups, which is making it difficult for them to feel inclusive in the organisation.

5.1.3.3 Personal Diversity Value

Now, we move on to the third dimension of Diversity climate i.e. Personal Diversity Value. Looking at the Quantitative data, the personal diversity value of the Reserved Category Males is at the third position almost overlapping with that of the General Category Males. The mean values being 10.77 for the Reserved Category Males and 10.78 for the General Category Males. This shows that their personal value orientation towards the diversity at work place is neither high nor low as compared to the other groups. (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

The Qualitative analysis also supports the quantitative findings. The responses to the semi-structured situational question asked during the interview “If you find a reserved and a General Category employee arguing. Whom would you feel easy to relate with and whom would you feel like protecting?” (Table 4.55) were 65% said it would have nothing to do with the category of the employee and 35% answered that they would protect the Reserved Category employee. This somehow depicts that most Reserved Category employees would not indulge in favouritism and would thus accept the diverse environmental issues that could crop up from either of the sides of the categories.

The themes that emerged from the Semi structured question on the opinion towards the quota system that was asked from all the participants also support the
above discussion as presented in Table 4.43. Under the theme Human Right fulfilment, 24.6% said that quota system is important for moral, financial and social support for the needy, 19.3% believed it would help fulfil economic gap amongst the masses and 12.3% said that it would provide a single platform for all.

10.5% also said that quota system leads to inclusion of the backwards in the Indian workforce and 5.3% revealed that it would help in growth/progress of the country under the theme of Country’s development.

A very few percentage of Reserved Category Males said that the present quota system is truly a justified policy. As only 7% said that it is actually helping in upliftment of the backward classes, 5.3% believed that it should continue for a longer period of time as many still need it and 1.8% also said that discrimination happened for long, thus the quota policy should also go on for a long period of time. In totality as well 82.4% Reserved Category Males felt empowered by the quota system, 3.5% felt threatened and 14% had a neutral outlook towards it.

But there are many more who revealed that they would prefer a revamped policy. As under the theme of Revamping the policy, 15.8% said there should not be generation to generation passing of the benefits, 15.8% also said that economic and socially backward should be properly recognised before giving the policy, 12.3% revealed that it should be free from political gaming, 5.3% also said that there should be no quota in jobs and higher educational institutions. There were few others, about 1.8% who gave suggestions such as a short listing within Reserved Category candidate should be done according to their intellectual level, another 1.8% said that promotions should be quota free. Under the theme of Alternatives to policy, 12.3% said that facilities should be provided at the grass root level by the government and other 1.8% believed that inter-caste marriages can help reduce discrimination and thus the need for the quota system.

Through the above discussion it could be interpreted that perhaps the Reserved Category Males have a positive value for diversity at workplace in general. But they, like General Category Males highly press upon the need for revamping the current quota policy being implemented at the workplace.
5.1.4 Reserved Category Females

Moving on to the second group amongst the Reserved Category, Reserved Category Females, *Quantitative data* reveals that their perception towards the Diversity climate of their organisations is the best among the other three groups. And is especially quite different from the Reserved Category Males. The mean values being 40.48 for the Reserved Category Females and 37.24, the lowest amongst the four groups for the Reserved Category Males. It reveals a drastic difference in the perception of both the groups even though belonging from the same category. (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

5.1.4.1 Organisational Fairness

As we indulge into dimension-wise analysis of the perception, we begin with Organisational Fairness. *Quantitative analysis* again reveals that amongst the four groups, the Reserved Category Females having a mean value of 18.33 has the best perception towards the fairness of the policies, programs and actions of their organisations. Here it should be kept in mind that their position as the ‘best’ is relative to the other groups. (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

*Qualitative analysis* although reveals a different picture. The *semi-structured situational question* asked during the interview, “If you see a Reserved Category employee coming out of the boss’s cabin in a shattered emotional state. What could be the reason?” (Table 4.54) 50% said that the reason could be that the boss was biased against the employee due to his/her category, but the other 50% believed that it would have nothing to do with the category of the person. So perhaps an equal number of Reserved Category Females believe that organisation is fair and is also unfair.

Although they revealed during the interviews that it is difficult to survive as a Reserved Category employee in the organisation as they have to face biases, thus often they don’t reveal to others that they belong to the Reserved Category. This could be better understood by analysing the theme of *Difficult Survival;* that emerged
during interviews with them. 33.3% said that they suffer from Inferiority complex, 27.8% even said that they never reveal and don’t let their children reveal that they belong to the Reserved Category, 5.5% said that there are poor promotional opportunities for them and 5.5% also believed that generalisation happens i.e. if one Reserved Category employee is a poor performer, all others belonging to the Reserved Category are seen in the same light. (Table 4.47)

Thus, although Reserved Category Females have the best perception towards the fairness of their organisation relative to the other groups. But that doesn’t mean that they perceive their organisations to be totally fair in their actions. But definitely when we compare them with the Reserved Category Males, the women belonging to the Reserved Category do have a better perception towards the Fairness policies as can be seen by the number of problems highlighted and also the variations in the percentages.

5.1.4.2 Organizational Inclusiveness

Organisational Inclusiveness is the second dimension. Again quantitative data reveals that Reserved Category Females have the best perception towards the Inclusiveness efforts of the organisation, with the mean value of 10.09. For this dimension as well the Reserved Category Males have the lowest mean value and thus the poorest perception in contrast to other groups. (Table 4.1 & Fig. 4.2)

But the qualitative data provides us with a different picture, as the semi-structured situational questions asked during the interview, “If Reserved Category employees are not included in discussions. What would be your opinion around it?” (Table 4.52) To this 50% said that they are always included, 30% revealed that they are not included and should be included, while the rest 20% said that the scenario is different for males and females, as males are often included but females are not.

To the second question, “If you notice a co-employee from Reserved Category often keeping to himself and not mingling with others. What could be the reason?” (Table 4.53) 65% said that there are many who don’t mingle, 25% said that they often
mingle with others (especially females belonging to the Reserved Category) and the rest 10% revealed Reserved Category employees do mingle with others.

Through above analysis it could be inferred that perhaps the Reserved Category Females do not believe that enough inclusiveness is present within the organisation. Few of them also revealed that there exists a gender difference in inclusiveness, especially in a meeting scenario. Here, most probably they are trying to depict that males belonging to Reserved Category get more opportunity to be a part of the meetings and on the other hand women belonging to the Reserved Category compensate their feeling of inclusiveness by mingling more with co-employees as compared to the Reserved Category Males.

But, they did not mention any efforts taken up by the organisation per se to inculcate the feeling of inclusiveness among the employees.

5.1.4.3 Personal Diversity Value

The last dimension is Personal Diversity Value. Quantitative data again reveals that the Reserved Category Females have the most positive personal value towards diversity at the workplace in comparison to the other three groups. (Table 4.1 & fig. 4.2)

They seem to value a work environment where there is diversity. Qualitative analysis provides a partial support to this. The themes such as Self Advancement reveal that 16.7% believe that quota system helps in creation of opportunities for the masses and 16.7% also said that it provides good promotional opportunities. Under the theme of Quota, A rational policy, 16.7% said that despite the quota system there is focus upon merit and 11.1% believed that it is helping in the country’s progress. (Table 4.41)

But there were 5.5% Reserved Category Females who also said that there should be immediate removal of quota system. But on the other hand, many believed in revamping the policy. As under the theme of revamping the policy, 16.7% said that it should be income based, 11.1% also revealed that merit should be considered more,
5.5% said that it should be stopped once economic equilibrium in the country is reached and 5.5% also suggested inter-caste marriages as an alternative to the policy. Also the response to the semi structured open ended question asked from all the participants, “In these days of quota system due you feel empowered or threatened? Why?” 72.2% Reserved Category Females said that they feel empowered, 11.1% said that they feel threatened and 16.7% held a neutral opinion (Table 4.39)

Thus, although both Reserved Category Males and females had a positive personal value towards diversity, but both gave suggestions for revamping it. Thus perhaps signifying that, they are somewhere dissatisfied with the present quota policy.

Based on the above discussion on the perception of both the Reserved Category groups towards the Diversity climate of their organisations, quantitative data quite clearly reveals that women have a much better perception as compared to men. Although we cannot interpret that the women have an optimum perception towards diversity climate because, the results are relative to the other groups. The women have also revealed their despair towards the organisational fairness and inclusiveness efforts, but they have been lower as compared to the men. A reason for this could be that women do not have to face Name calling as it can be viewed as Sexual harassment.

Thus, based on the above discussion, we analyse the hypotheses formulated on the basis of the first variable of the present study, Perceived Diversity Climate.

5.1.5 Hypotheses based on Perceived Diversity Climate

The *First Hypothesis* stated was

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing genders and reservation categories in perception of diversity climate of their organisations.”
The results confirm the first hypothesis. It was found that there is a significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females. Table no 4.4 shows that with the interaction of Gender and Reservation category, the value of Analysis of variance being 8.682, significant at 0.01 level depicts that the four groups differ in their perception towards the diversity climate of their organisations. As discussed above, it was further found that the perception towards the diversity climate is best for the Reserved Category Females as they have the highest mean value amongst the four groups. It is further lower for the General Category Males, and then for General Category Females. But the perception was worst amongst the Reserved Category Males in contrast to the other groups, as is depicted in Table no. 4.1 and Figure 4.2.

We may explain this by stating that the *Reserved Category Females* despite facing some biases and stereotypes at workplace are still contended with the Diversity climate, as they are happier with the fact that they have got an opportunity to work despite their low qualifications, poor family background and strong patriarchal forces.

This notion again stands true for the *Reserved Category Males* but they are quite unhappy with the diversity climate. Thus, despite getting opportunity to work and become a part of the workforce, it is most likely becoming difficult for them to tolerate the name calling, finger pointing and stereotypes prevalent in the work environment. They also seem to find it difficult to merge with the General Category as they find major disparities in terms of background, qualification, language and even dressing between the two groups.

Focussing towards the *General Category* employees, the *males* seem to have accepted the diversity scenario, as they know that they are more qualified, most of them seem to enjoy this tag especially when the organisation also accepts it. But, many also seem to be concerned about the lack of organisational efforts that are put towards bridging the gap between the general and the Reserved Category employees by providing relevant training to the needy.
On the other hand, the *General Category Females* seem to be unhappier with the diversity climate of the workplace, as compared to the General Category Males. Unlike males they most likely are not getting the grandeur feeling of being more qualified than the Reserved Category and being given more importance than them by the organisation. Rather it seems being a woman they are feeling neglected by the organisation, less acknowledged for being more qualified than Reserved Category Males and are also quite concerned about their children’s future if the quota system keeps on existing.

Their concern for their children’s future depicts their feminine orientation towards life. The importance their family and specially children hold for them is supported by various studies. In a study exploring between- and within-gender differences in the importance of life roles and their implications for work–family conflict, it was found that out of 126 married men and 87 married women, more women than men attributed higher importance to family roles as compared to work roles. Also women reported higher parenting values than men did (Cinamon & Rich, 2002).

Thus, the present research proves that the four groups significantly differ in their perception towards the diversity climate of the organisations.

Moving to the first sub part (1a) of the First Hypothesis;

> “There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on gender and reservation categories in relation to perception of the extent of fairness in their organisations.”

The results confirm the hypothesis. It was found that there is a significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females in their perception of Organisational Fairness. Table no. 4.5 shows that with the interaction of Gender and Reservation category, the value of Analysis of variance being 3.333 is significant at .05 level depicting that the four groups differ in their perception towards the Fairness of their organisations. It was further found that the perception towards
Organisational Fairness is best for the Reserved Category Females as they have the highest mean value amongst the four groups. It is further lower for the General Category Males, and then for General Category Females. But the perception was worst amongst the Reserved Category Males in contrast to the other groups, as is depicted in Table no. 4.1 and Figure 4.2.

As the results depict a comparative standing of the four groups, we cannot assume that if Reserved Category Females have depicted the best perception towards Organisational Fairness, this means that they believe the organisation to be perfectly fair in their plans, policies and programs. The research could only state that they have a better perception of organisational fairness as compared to the other three groups.

The Reserved Category women have highlighted during interviews that they do face difficulties in the organisational context. As discussed initially, they often have to face biases and are quite a lot of times unwilling to reveal their category status to others. Although otherwise most of them seem to perceive organisational actions to be fair and just.

The Reserved Category Males, on the other hand perceive the Organisational fairness, in terms of the policies, programs and actions in quite a negative way. They seem to be highly dissatisfied with the stereotypes attached to them, as many revealed that they have to work harder to prove themselves. Most of them perhaps are also quite unhappy with the insults that they have to face on day to day basis due to language problems and prevalence of stigma attached to their category. They also find it unfair that often the General Category bosses take away the credit for their work. They have also revealed that they have to face disrespect not only directly but sometimes also indirectly through employee’s non verbal actions.

General Category Males most likely perceive the organisational policies as only partially fair. They have revealed that organisation gives importance to a persons’ potential, thus they are recognised as better performers as compared to the Reserved Category employees. Although they don’t seem to believe that there is any sort of bias against the Reserved Category employees, but they definitely insist on some training programs for the Reserved Category for bridging the gap between the
two categories of employees. The General Category men perhaps want organisation to be fair in terms of providing requisite learning to the Reserved Category employees once they are employed, so that they can perform better and also in turn enhance their self concept. Thus finally leading to quota free promotions.

On the other hand *General Category Females*, seem to be perceiving, the organisational policies and activities as quite unfair. They unlike, the General Category men, believe that their potential as being more qualified than the Reserved Category is neglected by the organisation. They also perhaps find the organisational policies as unfair because they believe that many Reserved Category employees via forged certificates get selected and further promoted in the organisations and this is often neglected by the management. The legal system that helps the Reserved Category employees to complaint against any harassment faced by them; is often viewed by the General Category women as being misused and not being fairly catered to in the organisations. The General Category women most likely have started feeling as a secondary citizen in the organisation even after being more qualified and having higher potentials than the Reserved Category.

Moving to the second sub-part (1b) of the first hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on gender and reservation categories in relation to perception of the extent of inclusiveness in their organisations.”

The results confirm the hypothesis. It was found that there is a significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females in their perception towards Organisational Inclusiveness. Table no. 4.6 shows that with the interaction of Gender and Reservation category, the value of Analysis of variance being 4.601 is significant at 0.033 level depicting that the four groups differ in their perception towards the Inclusiveness efforts of the organisations. It was further found that the perception towards Organisational Inclusiveness is best for the Reserved Category Females as they have the highest mean value amongst the four groups. It is further lower for the General Category Males, and then for General Category
Females. But the perception was worst amongst the Reserved Category Males in contrast to the other groups, as is depicted in Table no. 4.1 and Figure 4.2.

Again as clarified earlier, it is important to understand that the results depict a comparative standing of the four groups, we cannot believe that if Reserved Category Females have depicted the best perception towards Organisational Inclusiveness, this means that they believe the organisation to be perfectly taking measures for the inclusion of various groups. The research could only state that they have a better perception of organisational Inclusiveness as compared to the other three groups.

Beginning with the Reserved Category Females; although they have scored the highest amongst the four groups in their perception towards the Organisational efforts of inclusiveness but they have also displayed their lack of contentment with the inclusiveness efforts. They perhaps believe that Inclusiveness is still needed to be achieved as often Reserved Category employees are not included in important discussions. They also revealed that there exists a gender difference among the Reserved Category employees’ inclusiveness in the organisations. As they conveyed that, women belonging to the Reserved Category seem to be less involved in the meetings as compared to Reserved Category men. On the other hand they also portrayed that Reserved Category women are able to feel inclusive by mingling around with co-workers, which is difficult for the men belonging to the Reserved Category.

As we move on to the Reserved Category Males, they seem to believe that they get lesser opportunities to prove their talent as compared to the General Category employees. They most likely are quite unhappy with the organisational inclusiveness efforts. As by themselves they find that they as belonging from the Reserved Category are highly different from the General Category employees, be it family background, educational qualifications or responsibility towards the family. Due to these differences it even becomes more important a responsibility of the organisation to bridge the gap through inclusiveness efforts, which the Reserved Category Males view as lacking. As many of them have pointed out that, relevant training programs,
mentor’s support and also focus towards their overall development should be taken up by the organisations.

The *General Category Males*, with a second position relative to other groups on this particular dimension shows that perhaps they personally don’t feel being neglected by the organisation but they do feel that there are lack of inclusiveness efforts by the organisations in terms of not providing training opportunities to Reserved Category employees in required areas, this is creating a gap between the two of them, which in turn is a flaw in creating an Inclusive climate at the workplace. Thus, similar to the Reserved Category Males, they also most likely believe that organisations should put in more efforts for bringing the Reserved Category employees at the workplace at the same platform with the General Category employees by establishing inclusiveness policies.

In contrast, the *General Category Females* with one position lower on the dimension of organisational inclusiveness; perhaps do not want the organisation to come up with any special inclusiveness efforts for the Reserved Category employees. They seem to be not yet ready to include the Reserved Category workforce with them as many of them revealed that they do not want Reserved Category employees to be included in the meetings. This could be because they may be afraid that the position and respect that they have earned over the years after proving their worth in the workplace, should not be easily passed over to the less qualified Reserved Category employees.

The third sub-part (1c) of the first hypothesis is as follows:

“*There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing genders and reservation categories in their personal diversity values.*”

The results confirm the hypothesis. It was found that there is a significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females in their Personal Diversity Value. Table no. 4.7 shows that with the interaction of Gender and
Reservation category, the value of Analysis of variance being 4.149 is significant at .043 level depicting that the four groups differ in their personal value towards diversity. It was also found that for the Category group alone, the value of Analysis of Variance, 3.938, is significant at 0.048 level.

It was further found that the personal value towards diversity is best for the Reserved Category Females as they have the highest mean value amongst the four groups. It is further lower for the General Category Males, and then for Reserved Category Males. But the personal value was worst amongst the General Category Females in contrast to the other groups, as is depicted in Table no. 4.1 and Figure 4.2. The mean values also show that the Reserved Category have higher personal value towards diversity as compared to the General Category employees.

Beginning with the Reserved Category Women, they seem to value a work environment where there is diversity. As many have given points in support of the quota policy but on the other hand there are many others who believe that revamping of the policy is required so that it becomes income based, merit is considered and generational passing of the policy benefits should be stopped. Revamping of the policy may provide a better work environment in which diversity would be valued rather than taken up as a distressing government policy.

Similarly, Reserved Category Men, also value a diverse work environment but perhaps due to the present difficulties faced by them at the workplace, they are not very sure about it. But they quite confidently posed that quota system is required due to reasons like upliftment of the backward classes, moral, social and economic support for the needy and overall progress of the country. Alongside they have also portrayed that a major revamping of the policy is required for harmonious work environment and for harnessing the benefits of diversity.

As we analyse the personal value towards diversity for the General Category Men, it is important to state that there was a very slight difference between the mean values obtained on this dimension between the Reserved Category Men and the General Category Men. The General Category Males seem to partially value diversity, as on one hand there are the ones who have focussed on the difficulties
faced due to diversity created by quota system. Such as; the irrelevant legal issues aroused against them, overseeing of merit, promotional bias, poor quality of organisational product etc. But it was found only few of them opted for the total removal of the quota system, rather most wanted the policy to revamp so that the diversity is enjoyed and used efficiently rather than creating gaps between the co-workers.

The worst value orientation toward diversity in contrast to the three groups was found amongst the General Category Women. Based on the responses on the questionnaires and the interviews taken, it could be interpreted that perhaps at present the General Category women are so unhappy with the consequences of the current quota system that their value towards diversity is almost nil. Many of them revealed that they would prefer an immediate removal of the policy as it leads to overseeing of merit, inflow of non deserving candidates and poor future opportunities for their children. They even said that it is creating high level of distress among them and is very demoralising. Although a small percentage also believed in revamping the policy, but most likely, at present for most of them importance of diversity at workplace is a secondary issue.

Thus, by analysing the first variable of our study, Perceived Diversity Climate, it becomes apparent that the varieties of employees based on category and gender, who are working in the public/govt. sector organisations have a low/poor perception of the diversity climate of their organisations. Although all of them vary in their perceptions, but none has a totally positive perception towards the organisational efforts of being fair and inclusive of the diversity present at work. Thus, an inference that could be made here is that a major revamping is required in organisational efforts towards creating a valuable and effective diversity climate at the work place. Various groups have given their opinions about the changes that could be made, if taken seriously diversity could be harnessed in a very efficient manner. Further implications and the ways of improving the diversity climate would be discussed later in the discussion.
5.2 Work Alienation

We now move on to the next phase of the discussion, in which we would discuss the second variable of our present study, ‘Work Alienation’. This variable has been studied independently for the four groups in our research and has also been analysed as one of the consequences to the first variable i.e. perception of diversity climate.

Work Alienation can be defined as a general syndrome made up of a number of different objective conditions and subjective feeling-states which emerge from certain relationships between workers and the socio technical settings of employment (Blauner, 1964)

In the present study, alienation has been analysed as social process as it can be understood best in reference to man’s complex relationship to objects of his environment and in terms of the interaction process between self and social structure.

For tapping employees’ experience of work alienation, the questionnaire employed in the present research is ‘Alienation from Work’ developed by Shepard, 1972. Using Seeman’s (1959) analysis, the author of the questionnaire set out to operationalize five dimensions of the term in respect to work. Thus, the dimensions covered under this variable are Powerlessness, Meaninglessness, Normlessness, Instrumental Work Orientation and Self-evaluative Involvement.

For the dimension of Powerlessness; a question was also included in the interview schedule. The question was, “Does powerlessness lead to boredom in your work? Please illustrate with a true event.” This particular dimension of work alienation was focussed more upon because it was assumed by the researcher that the participants’ perception towards diversity would have greater chances to be impacting the Powerlessness dimension of their experienced work alienation.

Group wise analysis of the experienced work alienation was done and is presented below.
5.2.1 General Category Males

Beginning with the General Category groups, the first group under study is General Category Males.

*Descriptive Quantitative data analysis* depicts that the General Category Males suffer from highest work alienation in comparison to other groups. Their mean value being 94.72 is lowest amongst the mean values of the four groups under study as displayed in Table 4.2 and Fig. 4.3. It should be kept in mind that as per the questionnaire used, lower the mean value, higher is the experienced Work alienation.

Now as we analyse their relative standing with other groups, under various dimensions of Work alienation; we would get deeper insights.

5.2.1.1 Powerlessness

The first dimension under study is Powerlessness. It 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.

*Descriptive Quantitative data* reveals that the General Category Males are experiencing highest Powerlessness as compared to other groups. As their mean value, 24.54 is lowest among all the groups (Table 4.2)

*Qualitative data* partially supports the above findings. As the responses to the *Semi-Structured situational question* asked during the interview, “*Does powerlessness leads to boredom in your work? Please illustrate with a true event.*” (Table 4.56) do not clearly depict that most of the General Category Males are suffering from Powerlessness. 50% believed that they are suffering from powerlessness, but the rest 50% refused.

Although half the employees agreeing that they are suffering from powerlessness does depict a high extent of the negative feeling of powerlessness prevalent amongst the General Category Male workforce.
Most of them have given the reason for powerlessness as the staunch hierarchical system within their organisations. As they seem to believe that they are given responsibility for various tasks but are not given enough power to execute the tasks in their own way. This is often happening due to last minute interference of the boss or tall hierarchical system that has to be followed.

One of the interviewees narrated an incident, which is as follows:

“I was working hard on a project. At the verge of its completion, boss did not let me complete it because he was scared to take risk in front of his superiors. It lead to immense anger in me and high level of de-motivation.”

Another incident narrated by an interviewee goes as follows:

“If a subordinate asks me about something, to which I can not respond till I discuss it with my own boss. This leads to disrespect and powerlessness in me.” Or “Some other times when the subordinate rather than coming to me (I being his immediate boss) to discuss something goes directly to my boss. In such a situation I feel powerless.”

Few others also said that a mismatch between the employee’s knowledge and job responsibility can also be a major reason behind feeling Powerless.

But, as revealed above there were other 50% also who did not feel powerless. They perhaps had an optimistic view towards the work environment. As, can be inferred by the statements made by them.

One of the interviewee said:

“Everybody is powerless because you are not the end of everything. I always sit with the hope and never feel powerless.”

Another interviewee said:

“Absolute authority is not possible. But definitely some is required.”

Thus, we could infer that many General Category Males are suffering from Powerlessness, perhaps due to tall hierarchical structure of the organisations. Also
most likely the ones who have depicted that they are not suffering from it are just being optimistic, as could be made out through the statements given by them.

5.2.1.2 Meaninglessness

The second dimension is Meaninglessness. It 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.

The General Category Males again have the lowest mean value of 26.50 amongst the four groups as displayed in Table 4.2. Depicting that, they are experiencing highest Meaninglessness in comparison to the other groups. This could be attributed to their below average perception towards the diversity climate of their organisation. They may have lost meaning in their work due to poor promotional opportunities and lack of importance attributed to merit.

5.2.1.3 Normlessness

Normlessness is the third dimension under study. It is the expectation that culturally accepted goals (such as upward mobility in a company) can only be achieved through illegitimate means.

Quantitative data analysis again reveals that the General Category Males are experiencing highest Normlessness amongst the four groups. Their mean value, 14.78 is again lowest when compared to the mean values of the other three groups as displayed in Table 4.2. This could be understood as a wrong way of gaining importance in the organisation to surpass the Reserved Category. As many Reserved Category Male employees did reveal that their General Category bosses often take away the credit of work.

5.2.1.4 Instrumental Work Orientation

The fourth dimension is Instrumental Work Orientation. It 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 can be cited as an example.

It could be assessed based on the descriptive quantitative data analysis that the General Category Males stand second in experiencing Instrumental work orientation with a mean value of 12.96 as depicted in Table 4.2. The group that is suffering from it the most is the Reserved Category Females with a mean value of 12.85.

5.2.1.5 Self-Evaluative Involvement

The last and the fifth dimension is Self-evaluative Involvement. It 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.

The General Category Males again stand second in suffering from lack of Self-evaluative involvement with a mean value of 15.91 as depicted in Table 4.2. Among the other three groups, it is the General Category Females who are suffering from it the most, with a mean value of 15.66.

In totality, through the above discussion it could be assessed that General Category Males are suffering from a high amount of Work alienation. As they have stood as having the highest work alienation in almost all the dimensions.

But, here a note of caution is that the results are a comparative analysis amongst four groups. So, if the General Category Males have been revealed as suffering from high extent of Work Alienation, it is in relation to other employees of the organisation differing in gender and category.

5.2.2 General Category Females

Moving on to the second group belonging to the General Category, we now analyse the experienced Work Alienation of General Category Females (GCF).
Quantitative data analysis depicts that the GCF suffer from high work alienation in comparison to other groups. As they stand second among the four groups after GCM topping the list in experiencing Work alienation. Their mean value being 96.27 is lower than the mean values of the Reserved Category groups under study. It should be kept in mind that as per the questionnaire used, lower the mean value, higher is the experienced Work alienation. (Table 4.2 & Fig. 4.3)

Now as we analyse their relative standing with other groups, under various dimensions of Work alienation; we would get deeper insights.

5.2.2.1 Powerlessness

Beginning with the first dimension; Powerlessness. Quantitative data reveals that GCF stands second in comparison to other groups in the experience of Powerlessness. Although they are second with the mean of 24.63, but they do reveal a high extent of powerlessness because their mean value is quite close to the mean of GCM; 24.54, who have found out to be experiencing the highest powerlessness. (Table 4.2)

Qualitative data also supports the above findings, as the 75% GCF responded with a ‘Yes’ to the question asked during the interview; “Does Powerlessness lead to boredom in your job? Illustrate with a true event.” (Table 4.56)

A huge percentage revealed that they suffer from Powerlessness, but they did not specify many reasons for the same. Although few of them did share their personal experiences.

One of the interviewee said:

“If in a team a person has good ideas, but still is not made the leader. It leads to the feeling of powerlessness.”

Other said:
“When my boss does not recognize my work or at times takes away the credit. It leads to powerlessness and high de-motivation.”

The above statements and the other narratives provided by the GCF may be interpreted as a feeling of being biased against. The reasons could be many such as gender bias or even insecurity due to presence of Reserved Category, but nothing was said out very clearly. Thus, we would leave the reasoning for the later part of the discussion when the relation between various variables under study would be analysed.

5.2.2.2 Meaninglessness

The second dimension is Meaninglessness. GCF are again second in position after GCM in experiencing Meaninglessness in their work. The mean value is 26.65 as displayed in Table 4.2.

5.2.2.3 Normlessness

The third dimension is Normlessness. GCF stand third among the four groups in this dimension, with the mean value of 16.16 at displayed in Table 4.2.

5.2.2.4 Instrumental Work Orientation

In the fourth dimension of Instrumental Work Orientation again GCF stand third among the four groups, with a mean value of 13.15 as displayed in Table 4.2.

5.2.2.5 Self-Evaluative Involvement

In the last and the fifth dimension; Self-Evaluative Involvement, they have the lowest mean value among the four groups. This indicates that they are suffering from a lack of attachment with their work. As it indicates that they are not able to attach
their sense of self-esteem with their involvement in the organisational work. The importance they give to their role in the organisation in defining their selves is low, the reasons could be the prevalence of quota system, gender bias etc. Which later would be analysed in the correlation and regression based analysis.

Thus, after analysing the Work Alienation data of both the General Category groups, it could be assumed that although both are suffering from higher amounts of Work Alienation as compared to the Reserved Category groups. And also the mean values reveal that GCM are suffering slightly higher work alienation as compared to GCF in almost all the dimensions except in Self-evaluative Involvement.

5.2.3 Reserved Category Males

Now, we proceed towards understanding the extent of Work Alienation suffered by Reserved Category employees. Beginning with the Reserved Category Males (RCM), quantitative data reveals that they stand in the third position of experiencing Work alienation, with the mean value 100.63, which is higher than both the General Category groups. Thus, their experience of overall Work Alienation is lower than General Category employees.

5.2.3.1 Powerlessness

The first dimension Powerlessness depicts that RCM stand third on experiencing it with the mean value of 26.31 as depicted in Table 4.2. According to the descriptive quantitative data both the General Category groups having lower mean values than RCM seems to experience more powerlessness as compared to RCM.

Qualitative data on the other hand reveals that 50% of the RCM did accept that they suffer from powerlessness at work as grasped through their response to the interview question; “Does powerlessness lead to boredom in your work? Please illustrate with a true event.” (Table 4.56).
A respondent who accepted that he suffers from powerlessness said,

“Reserved Category feels powerless because of poor and less educated background.”

Other interviewee said’

“Powerlessness is being suffered due to lack of computer knowledge and language barriers.”

One other said,

“Routine work is leading to boredom, making you feel powerless.”

Thus, the reasons given by most in terms of feeling powerless can be accounted to their own lack of ability and skills, which can be refined through proper training.

Others who believed that they do not suffer from any sort of powerlessness, gave reasons like; “Absolute power is impossible. In team work, one should always hear others views as well. This does not make a person powerless.”

Thus, it can be perceived that not many RCM are feeling powerless and also as compared to the General Category employees their feeling of powerlessness is lower, supported by the mean values. The ones experiencing it have most likely given the reason for it being their lack of knowledge and backward background.

5.2.3.2 Meaninglessness

Meaninglessness being the second dimension, quantitative data reveals that RCM are suffering from it the lowest among the four groups. As their mean value 29.19 is the highest. This could be attributed to the fact that they are enjoying the work and position which they have achieved after a long period of struggle. (Table 4.2)
5.2.3.3 Normlessness

The third dimension is Normlessness; the quantitative data reveals that RCM stand second on this dimension with a mean value of 15.54. GCM suffer from it the highest and the RCM are the second among the four groups. (Table 4.2)

5.2.3.4 Instrumental Work Orientation

The fourth dimension is Instrumental Work orientation, the quantitative data reveals that RCM with the mean value 13.42 experiences it the least among the four groups. It depicts that for them work has an intrinsic value as they do not merely work for money. This could be attributed to the fact that they have achieved this status and responsibility in society after a long struggle and belittling. Thus, they value work the most among the four groups as they seem to feel one with work and give it a special place in their lives.

5.2.3.5 Self-Evaluative Involvement

But as we move to the fifth dimension, Self-Evaluative Involvement, quantitative data reveals that they are second among the four in attaching their self esteem with the work they do. Their mean value; 16.15 is lesser than the RCF. But on the other hand it is higher than both the General Category groups. This portrays that RCM even after being intrinsically valuing the work they are doing as revealed in the fourth dimension are still not able to attach their sense of self with their organisational work to that extent. The reason could be that as discussed in the initial phase of the discussion, they are struggling with the diversity climate of their organisations and thus require more time, training and support to feel one with the organisation as a whole.
5.2.4 **Reserved Category Females**

The second group belonging to the Reserved Category is of the Reserved Category Females (RCF).

*Descriptive Quantitative data* reveals that RCF have lowest overall experience of Work alienation as compared to the other four groups. It is supported by the mean value achieved by them, 100.90 which is the highest among the four groups, depicting lowest experience of work alienation. (Table 4.2)

A further analysis of each dimension of work alienation would give us an in depth picture about RCF’s experience of work alienation.

### 5.2.4.1 Powerlessness

Beginning with the first dimension, Powerlessness, *Quantitative data* shows that RCF have the lowest experience of powerlessness as compared to the other three groups. Their mean value is 26.90 which is highest amongst all the groups. Thus, we can say that, as compared to the employees belonging to the other three groups RCF are experiencing least powerlessness.

Qualitative data also supports the above findings as only 24% of the interviewees reported that they suffer from powerlessness. (Table 4.56)

### 5.2.4.2 Meaninglessness

Moving on to the second dimension, Meaninglessness, data shows that RCF stand third amongst the four groups in their experience of meaninglessness in organisational work. With the mean value 27.42, they seem to suffer from more meaninglessness as compared to the RCM. (Table 4.2) This could be attributed to their low qualifications and novelty to the organisational setup that they have not yet been able to attach meaning of their work with the organisation at large.
5.2.4.3 Normlessness

The third dimension is Normlessness; data shows that RCF with the mean value 16.52 experience lowest normlessness as compared to the other three groups. This could be attributed to the fact that these women have been rule bound throughout their lives and thus believe in obeying rules and regulations to the utmost.

5.2.4.4 Instrumental Work Orientation

The fourth dimension is Instrumental work Orientation; data shows that RCF with the mean value 12.85 has the highest Instrumental work orientation. This depicts that they amongst all the other three groups undertake the organisational activities solely for anticipated future rewards and not for any intrinsic value. For them work seems to be satisfying only extrinsic needs like money, independence or future security but it doesn’t lead to any personal satisfaction or enjoyment.

5.2.4.5 Self-Evaluative Involvement

The fifth dimension is Self-evaluative Involvement, RCF with the mean value 17.19 have scored the highest among the four groups. This indicates that they feel proud to be working in their organisation and attach their sense of self quite strongly with their work role. It could be because after being subjugated doubly by caste system and patriarchy they have finally been able to make their own place in the society and that too due to their work/job.

Thus, after analysing the mean values of the four groups on the five dimensions of Work Alienation along with their overall experience of Work alienation, it could be assumed that the General Category seem to be suffering from Work Alienation more as compared to the Reserved Category employees. But this assumption presently is being made only on the basis of their obtained mean values.
5.2.5 Hypotheses based on Work Alienation

To find out how valid our assumptions are, we now move to the next hypothesis, i.e. the Second Hypothesis of our study:

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing genders and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Work Alienation.”

This hypothesis has been partially accepted. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, General Category employees and the Reserved Category employees at 0.002 level of significance. Table no. 4.8 shows that based on the category only, the value of Analysis of variance is 9.307 depicting that the two broader groups differ in their experience of Work Alienation. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced work alienation, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

As discussed above, based on the mean values it was further found that the experienced Work Alienation is more for the General Category groups as they have the lower mean value as compared to the Reserved Category groups.

When both the General Category groups display higher Work Alienation than the Reserved Category, irrespective of the gender differences, it could be assumed that the category has to do something with it. May be it is the General Category’s perception towards the diversity climate of their organisation that is leading to their experience of work alienation. On the other hand the Reserved Category, especially males even after having the poorest perception towards the diversity climate is less work alienated due to the reason that they are happy be at least getting the opportunity to do a respectable job which is at par with the general population of the country. They may not be happy with the diversity and its impacts within the organisation but seem to be satisfied with the nature of work and respect attached to it. This could mean that they may or may not be feeling attached to the organisation and their co-
employees, but are definitely much more satisfied and attached to the work they are doing.

The second hypothesis has been divided into various subparts.

Moving to first sub part 2(a) of the Second Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Powerlessness at work.”

This hypothesis has been *partially accepted*. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, General Category employees and the Reserved Category employees at 0.004 level of significance. Table no. 4.9 shows that based on the category only, the value of Analysis of variance being 8.415, depicts that the two broader groups differ in their experience of Powerlessness. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced Powerlessness, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

Similar to the overall second hypothesis, based on the mean values it was further found that the Powerlessness is more for the General Category groups as they have the lower mean value as compared to the Reserved Category groups.

The previous discussion about the experience of work alienation by the four groups, do give us a hand on what is the difference between the various categories of employees in experiencing powerlessness. Through qualitative data, it could be interpreted that both the General Category groups, namely, GCM and GCF are experiencing powerlessness due to organisational factors like tall hierarchy, gender bias, and lack of support by authority etc. On the other hand the Reserved Category employees, especially RCM who accepted that they suffer from powerlessness depicted that the reason behind it was their own lack of capability such as in terms of language and knowledge. RCF experienced lowest powerlessness may be because at present they are elated enough by the fact that they have got the opportunity to work outside home and at par with the general population.
Moving to the second sub part (2b) of the Second Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Meaninglessness at work.”

Again, the hypothesis has been partially accepted. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, General Category employees and the Reserved Category employees at 0.027 level of significance. Table no. 4.10 shows that based on the category only, the value of Analysis of variance being 4.911, depicts that the two broader groups differ in their experience of Meaninglessness. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced Meaninglessness, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

Based on the mean values it was further found that the Meaninglessness is more for the General Category groups as they have the lower mean value as compared to the Reserved Category groups.

This could be attributed to the reason that General Category employees, especially GCF are losing meaning in their work due to the poor perception they hold towards the diversity climate of the organisation. On the other hand, Reserved Category employees being new to the work of corporate world are striving hard to find meaning in whatever they do, but have not given up so as to feel meaningless.

The third sub part 2(c) of the Second Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Normlessness at work.”

The hypothesis has been partially accepted. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, Male employees and the Female employees at 0.029 level of significance. Table no. 4.11 shows that based
on the gender only, the value of Analysis of variance being 4.805, depicts that the two broader groups differ in their experience of Normlessness. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced Normlessness, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

Based on the mean values it was further found that Normlessness is more for the Male employees as compared to the Female employees, irrespective of the categories. (Fig. 4.12)

There are various research studies that support the above findings that male employees indulge into more norm-less activities as compared to female employees.

Loo (2003) concluded that men’s focus on competitive success implies a willingness to engage in unethical behaviours to achieve those outcomes.

In another study it was found that women judge unethical actions as more unethical than men. Both men and women see the actions (unethical) as unethical and rate the probability that they would take the same action as low. However, women indicate that they are even more unlikely than men to act in such an unethical way (Stedham, Yamamura, Beekun, 2007).

The fourth sub part 2(d) of the Second Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Instrumental Work Orientation at work.”

The hypothesis has been rejected. It was found that there is no significant difference between the four groups namely, GCM, GCF, RCM and RCF. Table no. 4.12 shows that none of the values for Analysis of Variance i.e. for the interaction between the Gender and the category, only category and only gender have come out to be significant.
Moving on to the fifth (e) and the last sub part of the Second Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Self-evaluative Involvement at work.”

The hypothesis has been partially accepted. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, General Category employees and the Reserved Category employees at 0.05 level of significance. Table no. 4.13 shows that based on the category only, the value of Analysis of variance being 4.031 depicts that the two broader groups differ in their experience of Self-evaluative Involvement. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced Self-evaluative Involvement, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

Based on the mean values it was further found that the lack of Self-evaluative Involvement is more for the General Category groups as they have the lower mean value as compared to the Reserved Category groups. (Fig. 4.14)

As the second variable has been studied in depth among the four sample groups, we can come with an overall understanding that among most of its dimensions, the General Category employees depict higher Work Alienation as compared to the Reserved Category employees.

Although its relationship as a consequence to the first variable has not been studied yet, it would be taken up in the fourth hypothesis.

5.3 Work – Family Conflict

Now we proceed our discussion towards the third variable, namely, ‘Work – Family Conflict’. This variable, similar to the second variable has been studied
independently for the four groups in our research and has also been analysed as one of the consequences to the first variable i.e. Perception of Diversity climate.

Work-family conflict has been defined as a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). As Frone (2000) suggested, the definition of Greenhaus and Beutell implies a bidirectional relation between work life and family life. Therefore, usually two types of work-family conflict are distinguished: Work interfering with family (WIF) and family interfering with work (FIW). WIF occurs when work related demands interfere with home responsibilities, such as bringing work into the home domain and trying to complete at the expense of family time. Conversely, FIW conflict arises when family responsibilities impede work activities, such as having to cancel an important meeting because a child is suddenly taken ill (Frone et al, 1992)

In the present research the four groups have been studied on their experience of Work family conflict.

The questionnaire employed for the present variable is ‘Work Interference with family and Family interference with Work questionnaire’ developed by Gutek, Searle and Klepa in 1991, which was later revised by Carlson and Perrewe in 1999. The questionnaire is divided into two dimensions, namely, Work interference with family and Family interference with Work.

A group wise analysis of the experienced Work-Family conflict is presented below.

5.3.1 General Category Males

Beginning with the General Category groups, the first group under study is General Category Males (GCM).

The descriptive *Quantitative data* analysis reveals that GCM are suffering from lowest Work-family conflict, as they have the highest mean value on Total Work
family conflict among the four groups. The questionnaire is such that the lower the mean value higher is the experienced WFC. Thus, with a mean value of 43.57 GCM are experiencing lowest WFC amongst the four groups as displayed in Table 4.3.

5.3.1.1 Work Interference With Family

Now, focussing on the dimension wise analysis, the first dimension being Work Interference with Family (WIF), they again experience low WIF conflict, but not the lowest as RCM experience it the least. The mean value for the GCM being 24.11 reveals low conflict but only in contrast to the other three groups. This does not connote that they are not suffering from WFC at all. (Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4)

5.3.1.2 Family Interference With Work

Moving on to the second dimension i.e. Family Interference with Work (FIW), they experience it the least with the highest mean value of 24.11 among the four groups. (Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4)

Thus, the quantitative data reveals that when compared to other three groups, GCM experience least Work family conflict, low work to family interference and again least Family to work interference.

The Qualitative data analysis partially supports the findings. A semi structured situational question was asked, “Is there any difference for reserved and General Category employees to strike a balance between work and family responsibilities?” 42% GCM responded that there does exist a difference between the two category of employees in their experience of WFC (Table 4.56). Few statements that were made by the GCM proving that General Category experience less WFC were as follows:

“The Reserved Category has to focus more on work as they need more time and effort to understand it.”
“Unlike General Category who strikes a better balance, the Reserved Category either neglects family or work.”

But, most of the GCM gave statements connoting that they suffer from Work-family imbalance more as compared to the Reserved Category. Few of the statements that they made were as follows:

“General Category is expected to perform more as they are better workers and more educated.”

“Reserved Category can strike better balance as they have more time for family because they focus less on work.”

“The Reserved Category doesn’t have to focus on family that much as the future of their family is secure due to the quota policy.”

More GCM were of the opinion that they suffer from Work-family conflict more as compared to the Reserved Category which is not true as per the quantitative analysis.

5.3.2 General Category Females

The second group of the General Category that is under discussion now is of the General Category Females (GCF).

Descriptive Quantitative data analysis shows that they stand second in suffering from Work Family conflict with a mean value of 42.64 (Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4)

Qualitative data also reveals that most of them believed that they suffer from more work family conflict as compared to the Reserved Category employees. As 75% responded with a ‘Yes’ to the semi structured situational question, “Is there any difference for reserved and General Category employees to strike a balance between work and family responsibilities?” (Table 4.57) . They also gave explanations to why they think that Reserved Category tend to suffer from it less.
One respondent said, “Reserved Category employees are better off at work because they have good networks with each other at workplace.”

Other said, “They have lower work load as compared to the General Category.”

It was also believed that Reserved Category employees have more supportive spouses leading to less WFC.

5.3.2.1 Work Interference With Family

Now, focussing on the dimension wise analysis, the first dimension is Work Interference with Family (WIF). The mean value being 19.37 GCF are again second in suffering from WIF conflict in comparison with the other three groups. (Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4)

5.3.2.2 Family Interference With Wprk

On the second dimension of Family Interference with Work (FIW), their mean value is 23.26 which again bring them to the second position in the suffering among the four groups. (Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4)

Overall, based solely on the mean values obtained by the two General Category groups in comparison with each other, we can only assume that the women are experiencing more Work-family conflict as compared to the men.

5.3.3 Reserved Category Males

Moving on to the Reserved Category groups, we begin our analysis with the Reserved Category Males (RCM).

Descriptive Quantitative data shows that with the mean value of 43.28, they stand third in experiencing WFC in comparison to the other three groups as can be
seen in Table 4.3 & Fig. 4.4. They have a lower mean value as compared to the GCM but a higher mean to the GCF. Thus, they may be experiencing higher WFC than GCM but lower WFC than GCF.

Qualitative data partially supports the findings, as 62.5% of RCM believed that they suffer more WFC than the General Category employees (Table 4.57). But our mean values show that they suffer higher WFC as compared to the GCM but not the GCF.

In response to the semi structured situational question based on the Work family conflict, various reasons were given by RCM for suffering from higher WFC as compared to the General Category employees.

Many participants believed that Reserved Category employees have more family responsibilities especially due to their poor financial background.

A respondent said,

“Our families stay away in the rural areas, thus we tend to take more holidays to go meet them. This leads to Work family conflict.”

Two others said,

“Migrating to cities from our native places leads to WFC as we also need to find a settlement”

Other participant said,

“We need to work harder to prove our worth to the organisation.”

But there were few others (37.5%), who believed there is no difference among Reserved and the General Category employees in suffering from WFC.

5.3.3.1 Work Interference with Family

A dimension wise analysis would provide us with in depth understanding. Thus, starting with the first dimension, Work interference with family (WIF), they
seem to suffer from it the least, as their mean value 19.75 is the highest among all the four groups. (Table 4.3 & fig. 4.4)

5.3.3.2 Family Interference with Work

The second dimension is Family to work interference (FIW). RCM again stand third among the four groups in experiencing FIW with a mean value of 23.53. (Table 4.3 & fig. 4.4)

Although in many statements mentioned above, the ones RCM made in response to the interview question, they have revealed that they suffer from high FIW. But such is not the case when we look at the mean values. But it should be kept in mind that the mean values are only relative comparisons between the four groups under our study. They don’t tell the independent standing of any group on various dimensions of and the overall WFC.

5.3.4 Reserved Category Females

The second group from the Reserved Category is Reserved Category Females (RCF).

Quantitative data reveals that they suffer from highest WFC among the four groups. They have the lowest mean value of 40.90. (Table 4.3 & fig. 4.4)

Dimension wise analysis also reveals the same as they again have lowest mean values of 19.09 and 21.80 on Work interference with family (WIF) and Family interference with Work (FIW) respectively. Thus, a comparison between the means reveals that they are suffering from WFC the most. (Table 4.3 & fig. 4.4)

Qualitative data partially support our finding, as only 25% believed that there is difference between the general and the Reserved Category employees in suffering from WFC. This was revealed when the following interview question was asked, “Is
there any difference for reserved and General Category employees to strike a balance between work and family responsibilities?” (Table 4.57)

Thus, solely based on the mean values we can assume that the women belonging to the Reserved Category suffer from more WFC as compared to the males from Reserved Category. But, no clear distinction could be made between the employees belonging to General and the reserved categories.

5.3.2 Hypotheses Based on Work – Family Interference

Thus, to be more clear and empirical, the third hypothesis is brought into picture. It is as follows:

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing genders and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Work-Family Conflict.”

The results reject the third hypothesis. It was found that there is no significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females. Table no. 4.14 shows that on the interaction of Gender and Reservation category, among the categories groups only and among the gender groups only, the values of Analysis of variance do not depict any significant difference between the four groups in their experience of Work Family Conflict on any of the interaction.

Thus, as believed by 58.3% of GCM, 25% GCF, 37.5% RCM and 25% RCF based on their responses to the semi structured situational question asked during the interview, “Is there any difference for reserved and General Category employees to strike a balance between work and family responsibilities?”, the present research found out that there is no significant difference in the experience of WFC among the four groups under study.
Although many participants during the interviews, displayed their belief, that there exists a difference between their own and the other category’s experience of WFC. But, the quantitative data proves it as a wrong belief.

For instance, 75% GCF said that General Category suffer from WFC more as compared to the Reserved Category employees. Also 41.7% GCM believed that there exists a difference in the experience of WFC among the general and the Reserved Category employees. Similarly 62.5% RCM said that Reserved Category employees suffer more WFC as compared to the General Category employees. (Table 4.57)

Going deeper into the sub dimensions of WFC, the discussion now proceeds towards the next hypothesis.

The first sub part 3(a) of the Third Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Work Interference with Family.”

The hypothesis has been rejected. It was found that there is no significant difference between the four groups namely, General Category Males, General Category Females, Reserved Category Males and Reserved Category Females on their experience of WIF. Table no. 4.15 shows that the values of Analysis of variance do not depict any significant difference between the four groups in their experience of Work Interference with Family Conflict on any of the interaction.

All the groups experience the interference of Work to their family realm almost at to the same extent.

The second sub part 3(b) of the Third Hypothesis;

“There would be a significant difference between the four groups based on differing gender and reservation categories in their extent of experienced Family Interference with Work.”
The hypothesis has been *partially accepted*. It was found that there is a significant difference between the two broader groups namely, General Category employees and the Reserved Category employees at 0.04 level of significance with the value of Analysis of Variance being 4.264. Table no. 4.17 shows that based on the differences in category, the value of Analysis of variance depicts that the two broader groups differ in their experience of FIW. Also there is a significant difference between the Male employees and Female employees irrespective of the category in their experience of FIW. As the value for Analysis of Variance for differences in Gender being 6.763 has been found to be significant at .01 level of significance. But the four groups have not been found to be significantly differing in their experienced FIW, as the value for Analysis of Variance for the interaction between the Gender and the category has not come out to be significant.

Thus, employees belonging to the reserved and the general categories differ in their experience of FIW. Although through the mean values we do not get a very clear cut picture of which category is suffering more but it could be understood that Reserved Category seems to be suffering from it more as compared to the General Category, especially the RCF.

There could be multi fold reasons for RCF suffering from FIW more as compared to other groups; One, they are new to the world of work and it is presently difficult for them to detach themselves from family role to give time and effort to the work role. Two, their families are also new to the experience of them surpassing their traditional role of being a home maker and spending family time at work and Third, Being women it is becoming even more difficult for them to balance work and family roles as their crucial roles since ages have always been surrounded around family such as to be a good wife, mother and daughter.

It has also been found out that, Women employees, irrespective of the categories to which they belong are suffering from higher FIW than Male employees.

Our findings have been supported by many previous studies.
Family Interference with Work conflict refers to “a form of inter-role conflict in which the general demands of time devoted to, and strain created by the family interfere with performing work-related responsibilities (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996).

Studies have shown that employed women generally face more demands (from paid work, child care, and housework) than employed men (Robinson & Godbey, 1997).

The degree of this difference for women is made up by housework: when men and women differ on number of hours dedicated to housework, flexibility of the activity, and the challenging and or creativity of the task. Hochschild (1989) also reported that employed mothers work an extra month per year of 24 hour days when compared with employed fathers with their number of hours dedicated to housework. Similarly, research has shown that men do not adjust the time that they spend on home and family activities according to their wives’ employment decisions (Shelton & John, 1996). Consequently, even if women increase the number of hours they work, men are not likely to spend more hours on housework. It’s not just time that leaves women with the feeling of imbalance. Housework is gendered that is, there are tasks that women are expected to perform and others that are generally men’s expected responsibility. Women cook, clean, and care for children, while men usually take care of home repairs and lawn maintenance, (Robinson & Godbey, 1997). In this regard “male” activities are more flexible while “female” responsibilities are often necessary to do every day. Therefore men do their tasks as leisure-like and discretionary activities (Larson, Richards, & Perry-Jenkins, 1994); (Shaw, 1988).

Another study by Williams & Alliger (1994) found that spillovers of distress and fatigue from work to family and from family to work were stronger for women than for men.
5.4 Relationships between Variables

By now we have discussed variable wise differences among the four groups under study, now the discussion would proceed towards the relationships between these variables found for all the groups separately.

5.4.1 Perceived Diversity Climate and Work – Family Conflict

Beginning with the first relationship under study, the fourth hypothesis is discussed below.

The Fourth Hypothesis is as follows:

“There would be a relationship between the Perceived diversity climate with its various dimensions and experienced Work family conflict with its various dimensions across the groups.”

The hypothesis has been partially accepted, as through Regression Analysis it was found out that Perception towards the diversity climate is having an impact on the experience of Work family conflict only for the General Category employees and not for the Reserved Category employees as displayed in Tables 4.19, 4.20 and 4.21.

A group wise analysis of the relationship between the two variables is discussed below.

5.4.1.1 General Category Males

Beginning with the General Category groups, the first one is General Category Males (GCM), the regression values have been found significant for various relationships for this particular group.

The results provide us with various findings. The first finding being that the overall perception held by GCM towards the diversity climate of their organisation is impacting their experience of Work Family conflict at .05 level. (Table 4.19)
could be interpreted as that the extent of WFC experienced by GCM is partially due to their poor perception towards the diversity climate of the organisation.

In the present research GCM have depicted almost a neutral perception towards the diversity climate, by neither taking too harsh or too soft an approach towards the quota system. Although they have expressed their grudges towards the diversity climate created by the quota system but they have not displayed extreme dislike towards it. As discussed under the first hypothesis, most of GCM wish for revamping the policy, but there are only few who wish to abolish the policy all together. Adding to that, it was also analysed that the reservation system although creating loads of difficulties for them, still seems to provide them with a grandeur feeling of being better than the Reserved Category work force.

Similarly, they have not been found to be experiencing loads of WFC, as they did not stand out in the four groups to be experiencing it the most, also their mean values depicted that they may suffer from it the least among the four groups.

But, the regression analysis shows that whatever extent of dissatisfaction they may be experiencing due to the diversity climate of their organisation is substantially impacting their work-family balance.

*Second finding* is that that their overall perception towards the diversity climate is specifically leading to Family to work interference. As the value of regression for the two variables is significant at .01 level. (Table 4.20)

*Third finding* is that GCM’S perception towards one of the dimensions within the variable, Perception towards diversity climate, namely Organisational Fairness is leading to WFC at .05 level and FIW at .01 level. (Table 4.19 & Table 4.20) If the first hypothesis is recalled, it can be remembered that GCM were unhappy with the fairness of the organisational policies and programmes towards bridging the gap between the general and the reserved workforce. They believed that proper training and mentoring facilities should be provided to the Reserved Category employees. They also felt the injustice on the part of the organisation as they believed that
Reserved Category employees get concessions in work and tend to take illegitimate legal actions against the General Category employees.

All these perceptions that they hold of the lack of Fairness is leading to the suffering of Work family conflict and more specifically, family interference with work.

*Fourth finding* is that GCM’s Personal diversity value which is again somewhere average as compared to other three groups is leading to FIW conflict for them at .05 level. (Table 4.20)

5.4.1.2 General Category Females

The second General Category group is that of General Category Females (GCF). The regression values have been found significant for this particular group as well.

It was found that their perception towards the diversity climate is having an impact on their overall experience of Work family conflict at .05 level of significance. (Table 4.21)

Although as we recall from the previous hypotheses, their overall perception towards the diversity climate was poor in comparison to other groups under study. Their perception was poorer than the males of the General Category and females of the Reserved Category. They were in higher percentage in opting for total removal of the quota system as compared to the GCM. They were also more in number when feeling threatened by the quota system as compared to other groups.

Although no significant difference was found between the groups on the experience of WFC, but by studying the mean values, it could be interpreted that they were suffering from WFC more than their male counterparts irrespective of the categories.
Thus, through the regression analysis it could be inferred that one of the main causes behind WFC experienced by GCF is their poor perception towards the diversity climate.

5.4.1.3 Reserved Category Males and Females

Moving on to the Reserved Category groups, namely Reserved Category Males (RCM) and Reserved Category Females (RCF), the regression analysis depicted that no direct relation was found between their perception of diversity climate and their experience of Work family conflict. There was also no dimension wise relationship for the two variables within the two groups.

Thus, it could be inferred that the perception held by the Reserved Category employees towards the diversity climate of their organisation is not having any direct impact on their experience of Work family conflict.

5.4.2 Perceived Diversity Climate and Work Alienation

Now, the second relationship would be studied in the next hypothesis.

The Fifth Hypothesis is as follows:

“There would be a relationship between the Perceived diversity climate with its various dimensions and experienced Work Alienation with its various dimensions across the groups.”

The fifth hypothesis has been accepted as there does exist a relationship between the said variables for all the four groups. As displayed in Tables 4.22, 4.23, 4.24, 4.25, 4.26, 4.27, 4.28, 4.29 and 4.30.
5.4.2.1 General Category Males

Beginning with the General Category Males (GCM), two findings can be highlighted.

The first finding is that the regression value was found significant at .05 level for the relationship between Organisational Fairness and Meaninglessness dimension of Work Alienation. (Table 4.22)

Through the first and the second hypotheses respectively, we could recall that GCM were suffering from poor perception toward Organisational Fairness and also they were the ones suffering from Meaninglessness in work the most. Thus, the regression value tells us that one of the major consequence of poor perception held by the GCM towards the Organisational Fairness is experiencing Meaninglessness at work.

The second finding is that their personal diversity value is impacting their experience of self evaluative involvement at 0.05 level of significance. (Table 4.23) Thus, the reason behind their poor self evaluative involvement as compared to the Reserved Category employees is their own average personal value towards diversity. It could be explained as, because they do not value diversity much at the workplace but on the other hand it is increasing rapidly, this is leading them to get detached from their work and consequently stop evaluating themselves based on their work role.

5.4.2.2 General Category Females

Proceeding to the General Category Females (GCF), based on the Regression analysis many significant relationships have been found between the two variables, Perception of diversity climate and Work Alienation and their various dimensions.

First finding is that the overall perception towards the diversity climate held by GCF is leading to Total Work alienation at 0.05 level of significance. (Table 4.24)

Recalling from the first and the second hypothesis respectively, GCF had quite a poor perception of diversity climate in comparison to other three groups. Also their
experience of overall Work Alienation was quite high, more than the experienced alienation of the Reserved Category employees.

Thus, the regression analysis proves that the perception towards the diversity climate of their organisation is leading to Work alienation among the GCF. Signalling that, quota system is having a negative impact on them, detaching them from their work and its relevance in their life.

**Second finding** is that GCF’s perception towards the diversity climate is also significantly impacting one of the dimensions of Work Alienation namely, Powerlessness at .05 level. (Table 4.25)

Recalling from the second hypothesis, it was found that the General Category groups suffer from higher powerlessness as compared to the Reserved Category groups.

Although qualitative data revealed that GCF believed that they suffer from powerlessness specifically due to organisational reasons like Tall hierarchy, unsupportive boss etc. But regression analysis reveals that powerlessness is somewhere also being experienced due to the poor perception held by GCF towards the diversity climate of their organisations.

The **third finding** is that the poor personal diversity value held by GCF is leading to overall work alienation at .01 level of significance. (Table 4.24)

Thus, due to the unhealthy experiences that GCF have went through in the organisations due to the quota system, such as feeling as being a secondary citizen even after being more qualified than the Reserved Category, worrying about the future of their children in this quota driven world of work etc. leading them to develop a poor personal value for diversity as elaborated in the first hypothesis is majorly impacting their relationship with their work. It has been found to be a major cause for experiencing Work alienation by GCF.
The *fourth finding* is that poor personal diversity value held by GCF is specifically leading to Instrumental work orientation amongst them at 0.01 level of significance. (Table 4.26)

The low personal value held by GCF towards diversity at workplace is leading them to take work activities solely for anticipated future rewards and not for any intrinsic value.

The *fifth finding* is that poor personal value towards diversity held by GCF is impacting Self evaluative involvement of the group towards the work at .05 level of significance. (Table 4.27)

It has been seen in the second hypothesis that General Category employees and more specifically GCF are suffering from poor Self evaluative involvement i.e. they don’t test their self esteem through involvement in the work role.

Thus, as per the regression analysis GCF have started attaching their self esteem outside the roles they play from work, as they have a low score on Self evaluative involvement because they hold a poor personal value towards diversity. This diversity is highly prevalent at the workplace more so due to quota system which is reducing GCF’s self evaluative involvement with the world of work rapidly.

Thus, it could be inferred that Perception of the diversity climate held by GCF and more specifically their personal value towards diversity is leading to Work Alienation among them.

5.4.2.3 Reserved Category Males

Moving on to the Reserved Category groups, beginning with Reserved Category Males (RCM), two relationships came out to be significant.

*Firstly*, their perception towards Organisational Fairness is impacting their experience of overall Work Alienation with a regression value significant at .05 level of significance. (Table 4.28)
Recalling from the first hypothesis RCM had the worst perception towards the Fairness of the organisation’s plans, policies and programmes towards them. They felt that they are not recognized for good work, believed that they need to work harder to prove themselves, felt biased against due to name calling, prevalence of stigma attached with the category and also felt harassed by both direct and indirect insults targeted on them by the colleagues and the superiors.

Regression analysis has helped us find out the consequence of this poor perception towards Organisational fairness for RCM as increasing Work Alienation. Although RCM are suffering from lesser Work alienation as compared to the General Category employees, but that does not mean that they are not suffering from it at all or lesser focus should be given to their experience of Work Alienation.

Secondly, it was found that their perception towards Organisational Fairness is specifically increasing Normlessness in them, a dimension of work alienation. The finding is significant at .01 level. (Table 4.29)

Recalling from the second hypothesis Normlessness has been found to be high among all male employees as compared to the female employees. Among the two groups of male employees, namely GCM and RCM, RCM suffered from lesser Normlessness denoting that they are still in the process of learning it.

Thus, it could be inferred that with growing dissatisfaction of RCM with organisation’s efforts towards being fair, their work alienation and more specifically normlessness would also increase.

5.4.2.4 Reserved Category Females

The fourth group under study is Reserved Category Females (RCF). One significant relation has been found out for this particular group. It is that, their poor perception towards Diversity Inclusiveness efforts of their organisations is leading to Instrumental work orientation within them at .01 level of significance. (Table 4.30)
Although as reported in the first hypothesis, they have the best perception towards Inclusiveness efforts of the organisation among the four groups, but that does not mean that they have optimum perception of the inclusiveness efforts. As our findings are a comparison between the four groups, we can not infer that the best perception among the groups also means perfect perception towards that variable.

As conceivable from the second hypothesis, on the dimension of Instrumental work orientation, although there is no significant differences between the four groups, but the mean values depict that RCF experience it the most i.e. they tend to take the work activities solely for anticipated future rewards and not for any intrinsic value.

Thus, it could be interpreted that their perception towards the inclusiveness efforts of their organisations is leading to increased Instrumental work orientation within them. Their feeling of being viewed as an outsider by the colleagues and organisation’s neglect over it seems to be detaching them from the intrinsic satisfaction they could gain from the work.

Thus, an in depth analysis of the relationship between the two variables, namely, Perception of diversity climate and Work Alienation shows that the perception held by the public/government sector workforce who are experiencing firsthand experience of quota system is tremendously impacting their work alienation index. General Category employees’ perception is impacting their work the most. As both the Males and females belonging to the General Category have depicted multiple relationships between various dimensions of Perceived diversity climate and Work alienation, they seem to be impacted the most. Also they have shown more Work Alienation as compared to the Reserved Category employees, which can now be attributed to their poor perception towards the diversity climate of their organisation. On the other hand, Reserved Category employees, specifically males are being impacted in their attachment with work due to their poor perception towards organisational fairness. The females are also not being able to attach intrinsic value to work because of their poor perception towards inclusiveness efforts of their organisations.
An analysis of the fourth and the fifth hypothesis makes it clear that the first variable of the present study i.e. Perception towards the diversity climate can be attributed as a cause for the second and the third variables, namely, Work alienation and experience of Work family conflict respectively among various employees working in the public/government sectors.

A relationship between the second and the third variable has to be found out to know which variable among the two is acting as the moderating variable and which one is the final consequence. Thus, the discussion proceeds to the sixth hypothesis.

5.4.3 Work Alienation and Work – Family Conflict

The Sixth Hypothesis is as follows:

“There would be a relationship between experienced Work Alienation with its various dimensions and experienced Work Family conflict with its various dimensions across the groups.”

The Hypothesis has been partially accepted. Using regression analysis, significant relationship between the two variables have been found for three groups, but has not been found for the fourth group i.e. Reserved Category Females as displayed in tables 4.31, 4.32, 4.33, 4.34, 4.35, 4.36, 4.37 & 4.38.

5.4.3.1 General Category Males

Reflecting on the nature of relationship found, the first group under study is General Category Males (GCM). There was strong relationship found, which goes as follows:

Firstly, the overall Work Alienation experienced by GCM has been found to be leading to their experience of Total Work Family conflict at .01 level of significance. (Table 4.31)
Recalling from the second and the third hypothesis, GCM experienced most Work Alienation but their experience of the WFC was mild as compared to the other groups. But, through the regression analysis it could be inferred that Work Alienation is not only impacting their work life but is also dwindling their work life balance, which may not be profound at the moment but can increase with increasing Work alienation.

Secondly, it was found that it is not only work alienation that is leading to WFC, but it is also the total WFC that is leading to Work alienation at .01 level of significance. (Table 4.32) Thus, there is a bi-directional relationship between the two variables. If either of them would increase among GCM, the other would also increase automatically as they have a mutually strong relationship amongst them.

Thirdly, and more specifically it was also found that particularly FIW dimension of WFC is also leading to Work alienation among GCM at .01 level of significance. (Table 4.32)

5.4.3.2 General Category Females

Moving on to the second General Category group; General Category Females (GCF). There are significant relationships found between the two variables for this particular group as well.

It was found that total experience of Work alienation among GCF is leading them to experience total WFC at .01 level, also it is making them experience both the sub dimensions of WFC, namely, WIF and FIW at .01 level separately. Thus, it could be inferred that the high extent of Work alienation that GCF are suffering from is the reason behind their strong experience of WFC. (Table 4.33, 4.34 & 4.35)

5.4.3.3 Reserved Category Males

For the Reserved Category employees the findings go as follows, starting with the Reserved Category Males (RCM), their experience of overall Work Alienation has
also been found to be leading to WFC for them at .01 level of significance. It is also leading to WIF at .01 level and FIW at .05 level. (Table 4.36, 4.37 & 4.38)

Although their level of Work alienation was found to be lower than the General Category groups and even their experience of WFC was lesser than the women employees. But, the regression analysis depicts that what so ever extent of Work Alienation and WFC is being experienced by them, there exists a cause effect relationship. Work alienation being the cause and WFC being the effect.

It was also found that Normlessness, which is quite high for RCM is leading to WIF conflict at .05 level. The reason may be that when they are acting normless in the organisation it is against their morals and family values which is becoming a hindrance in their day to day interaction with their families. (Table 4.37)

5.4.3.4 Reserved Category Females

For the Reserved Category Females (RCF) no significant relationship was found between the two variables. Recalling from the second and the third hypothesis, they are suffering from high WFC but least Work alienation in comparison with the other three groups. Thus the insignificant regression value connotes that, the cause behind their suffering of the WFC doesn’t lie in the Work alienation experienced by them.

5.5 Overall Findings

After analysing all the hypotheses under study, the overall findings can be interpreted and webbed around the Model “Alienation as a Social process” developed by James E. Twining in 2010. (Fig. 1.1)

He has divided his model into three phases, the first phase explains how an individual develop a sense of self in an organisational setup, the second phase deals with the way the developed sense of self leads to an overall positive or negative
experience of the individual at work, negative experience leading to various types of Work alienation. The third phase involves the response of the employee at work and outside it based on his/her experience in the second phase.

The First Phase: In it the individual interacts with, and thereby responds to, his environment in terms of how he sees himself in his definition of the situation, including such issues as the nature of the work, the interaction among workers, unions, and management, the nature of community and so forth. This phase depicts the ‘Relational Convergence’ of three primary components of a situationally-specific interaction process: the historical context, the structural conditions and the individual participants. From the historical perspective, both specific developments and historical generalizations are important. For instance, the history of the Amoskeag Manufacturing Company, New Hampshire (Hareven and Langenbach, 1978) suggests that changing conditions of relative flexibility to relative rigidity in the work process, changing conditions in the external environment of the textile industry and changing composition of the workforce influence the workers’ relation to the process of production and world at large.

The Second Phase: During this stage, the participants’ perceived degree of control and definition of self derived interactionally leads to a definition of the situation as either positive or negative in relation to the meaningfulness or power relations, of the situation. If the situation is positively defined, there will exist a substantive integration of situationally specific relations. From this perspective, the participant’s involvement with the situation is viewed as a valuable experience, a response derived both from the participants’ interpretation and from the nature of the activity which stimulates and enhances the participants’ involvement.

If the situation is negatively defined, there are at least, three alternative responses. One potential response is an instrumental integration (Partial Alienation) where some external gain is perceived by adaptation to the situation. Essentially, the situation may be defined as intrinsically meaningless, but it produces some positive gain in reference to the larger social setting. A similar, though more critical, response is one of Fundamental Alienation in which case individuals experience a loss of
control and meaning in the situation and acknowledge a felt separateness between themselves and their activities. This felt separateness may be viewed as a feeling of detachment from the immediate activity without the motivational purpose of the external gain found in partial alienation; the worker is merely an extension of his machine.

As a final aspect of phase two, there exists the strong possibility for conflict to develop as participants respond to the perceived sources of alienation. The range of conflict may include individual violence, sabotage to the production process, and organised struggles between management and labour in response to the conditions of work.

**The Third Phase:** It involves a second level of response to both partial and fundamental types of alienation as emerging from the process of interpreting and experiencing a situation which have been negatively evaluated. Because instrumental integration only provides an external reward while still contributing to a partial alienation, the participants will most likely seek an alternative focus in order to re-establish a sense of control over their activities and a positive definition of self. Situations which typically exemplify this view are family, neighbourhood and social club activities (Gans, 1962). Further, the value found in the alternate focus will probably allow the instrumental activity to serve its external purpose.

Participants experiencing a fundamental alienation might well withdraw from the situation in order to establish new relations which offer the opportunity for control and meaning. This response undoubtedly is stimulated by external conditions and includes such possibilities as other conventional work situations, alternative institutions or involvement in the formation of new meaning systems.

The second level of response is that of total alienation. In this case, the loss of control and meaning within situationally specific relations lead to a condition of social isolation and, ultimately, self-estrangement. This stage is synonymous with the linkages between alienating work and mental illness and its complex, yet pervasive impact beyond the immediate situation. Hence, there is a growing isolation of self from others even beyond the initially alienating situation which creates a tendency
towards self-estrangement, or the failure to acknowledge the existence of a meaningful self. It is at this final point that the participants lose their identity as meaningful contributors to the interaction process.

*In the present study*, the first phase of defining self in correspondence to the workplace is mediated by the diversity created by the quota system. All the employees of the public/government sector know the reason behind the affirmative action. They all understand that there has been a historical reason; caste based discrimination, due to which the quota system is in place. But, they all have a different opinion towards the policy’s usefulness as well as its uselessness.

The participants of the present study have been divided into four groups, all of which are impacted by the quota system and hold different perceptions towards the diversity climate of their organisations as discussed in the first hypothesis.

Now, a group wise discussion based on each groups’ present position on the model would be followed. All the discussion that has been done till now, would be summed up by clubbing all the findings together, to come to an overall view of each group based on the interaction of the three variables of the study.

### 5.5.1 General Category Males

Beginning with the first group, General Category Males (GCM), their overall perception towards the diversity climate of their organisations is neither too positive nor too negative when compared with other three groups under study. But when qualitatively analysed it is found that although their position among the four groups may be of a neutral stance towards the diversity climate, but they are of a view that quota system requires major revamping. Thus, their present perception towards the diversity climate is not positive.

As explained under hypotheses two and five, they suffer from high extent of Work alienation. Their perception towards the diversity climate is a major reason for
their experience of Work alienation. Thus, according to the model, they are negatively defining the present situation at the workplace in terms of the quota system.

This is leading to the experience of ‘Partial Alienation’ amongst them i.e. work has become intrinsically meaningless for them but is still producing some positive gain in reference to the larger social setting. This denotes that they are working for the sake of money, status and need fulfilment but for them the intrinsic value of work has and is diminishing.

This extent of work alienation is making them seek alternate focus in order to re-establish a sense of control over activities and a positive definition of self. And to achieve that they have started focussing and spending more time outside work, especially with family. This is leading to mild but some extent of WFC among them and specifically FIW conflict. Because they are trying to find a positive sense of self in the family in order to overcome work alienation and specifically meaninglessness at workplace, at times they feel their family is interfering with their job responsibilities.

This confused state of weather the family is helping them over come or is creating further hindrance in their work is creating additional stress intensifying the alienation for them.

Thus, as discussed under sixth hypothesis both work alienation and WFC are having a bi directional relationship. But both are a consequence to the poor perception held toward the diversity climate of their organisation by GCM.

5.5.2 General Category Females

Moving on to the second group, General Category Females (GCF), their overall perception towards the diversity climate is poor. They have a poor perception towards the fairness and the inclusiveness efforts of the organisations; also they hold a very low personal value towards diversity. As elaborated under hypothesis one, they feel as a secondary citizen of the organisation even after being more qualified than the
Reserved Category. They believe that they are not given due credit for their qualifications may be because they are women. Also most of them feel threatened by the present quota system and opt for its total removal. They also worry about their children’s future if the policy goes on in the coming years.

According to Twining’s model, this poor perception toward diversity is leading them to define their sense of self in a negative way in the present work scenario.

Consequently, as discussed under the fifth hypothesis, it is leading to high extent of Work Alienation amongst them. More specifically, their poor personal value towards diversity is leading to increased instrumental work orientation and also reduced self evaluative involvement. They are also feeling Powerless in the organisation due to the quota system. Thus, they are suffering from ‘Fundamental Work Alienation’ in which they are experiencing a loss of control and meaning at work. They are acknowledging separateness between themselves and their work without the motivational purpose of the external gain. Thus, they are suffering from more intense Work alienation as compared to the GCM, as the GCF are not even being able to focus on work for extrinsic gains like money, status etc.

In turn this high experienced Work alienation is leading to Withdrawal from social situations for some and Social Isolation and Self estrangement for others as denoted in the third phase of the model. Many of the GCF are mentally withdrawing from the workplace in order to establish new relations which offer the opportunity for control and meaning. But many others who are experiencing more intensified alienation are experiencing social isolation. It is impacting their relation with their job, relations they hold with other employees and even their social relationships in other realms of life. This is why as elaborated in the fourth and the sixth hypotheses; they are suffering from high WFC.

Fundamental work alienation is leading to WFC in which both WIF and FIW conflict is prevalent. As they are unhappy at the workplace due to poor perception towards the diversity climate, they are not being able to focus well on their family
roles. Adding to that, thus as they are not fulfilling their family roles it is in turn leading to grave dissatisfaction at work.

They have got stuck in a vicious circle where their poor perception towards the diversity climate is leading to fundamental work alienation in them, which in turn is hampering their performance both at work and family levels. The hampered family role is increasing their difficulty of focusing well on the work role.

Thus, for the present group Work alienation is a mediating variable between perceived diversity climate and WFC. Work alienation is a direct consequence of poor perception towards diversity which is further leading to WFC.

5.5.3 **Reserved Category Males**

The third group under study is Reserved Category Males (RCM). They have the worst perception towards the diversity climate in comparison to the other three groups. Although happy being the part of the workforce, they experience name calling, humiliation and feel inferior as compared to the General Category. They hold a neutral personal value toward diversity, few being uncomfortable as they believe that they are too different from others based on educational and economic background and others accepting diversity as it is due to an empowering policy of quota system.

But their perception towards the organisations’ policies of implementing fairness and inclusiveness in the organisation is very poor. They feel biased against sometimes directly during performance appraisals and at other times indirectly in the ways co employees’ mock and talk about the quota policy.

Presently they are not facing a very high extent of Work alienation, as their experience is lower than the General Category. But still they are not free from the experience of alienation.

Thus, again according to the model, similar to the previous two groups, RCM also have a negative view towards the diversity climate of their organisations. It is
leading to the suffering of ‘Partial alienation’. Even the GCM suffer from Partial alienation but RCM’s extent of the suffering is lesser as compared to the GCM. RCM are specifically suffering from high Normlessness. They seem to be unable to meet the norms of the organisations such as work procedures, policies, rules etc. because they are still trying to adjust to the workplace and fighting hard to make their place in the organisation where they are facing many biases and instances of humiliation.

This Partial Alienation is further leading to WFC. As they have not been able to settle well in the organisation till now, they take this frustration back home due to which they are facing WIF conflict. And the additional family responsibilities due to migration to cities lead to FIW conflict.

But, the balance between work and family is dwindling majorly because they are not happy with the organisations not taking any steps towards making the workplace a fair place to be. They want to attain a respectable status in the organisation which is still lacking.

Thus, overall it could be inferred that RCM’s poor perception towards the fairness of the policies and lack of inclusiveness efforts of the organisation to make them comfortable in the world of work is leading to partial work alienation in them which in turn is leading to WFC, in terms of both WIF and FIW.

5.5.4 Reserved Category Females

The fourth group comprises of Reserved Category Females (RCF). They have the best perception towards the diversity climate of their organisations in comparison to the other groups under study. This does not imply that they have an optimum perception, but it does imply that they are less dissatisfied with the diversity around them created through quota system.

Referring to the discussion done under hypotheses one and five, it was found that RCF hold a slightly poor perception towards the inclusiveness efforts of the organisation. They also revealed that often they do not let others at the work place
know that they belong to the Reserved Category and they also do not let their children reveal the truth. This shows that somewhere they believe that Reserved Category people do go through various biases and humiliations in and outside the organisations.

But in the present research most of them have revealed a positive perception towards the diversity climate of their organisations, may be because they are so happy by getting the job that they are neglecting any signs of discomfort on their part or as many said that they have not revealed the truth of their category to the co-workers, they are not being biased against.

Thus, according to Twining’s model, this group is defining their sense of self positively in today’s world of work where there is so much diversity due to quota system. Due to this positive definition they have been able to substantially integrate themselves in the workplace.

Although it has been found that they are suffering from Instrumental work orientation due to their poor perception towards inclusiveness efforts of the organisations. Thus, it could be said that they are enjoying their work life not because they are getting intrinsically enriched by their participation at work rather because after long years of subjugation, they have got an opportunity to come out of their homes, become a part of the workforce and earn a living.

Additionally, RCF are also suffering from high levels of WFC but it is not a consequence of any of the two variables of the study. Despite holding positive sense of self at work and suffering from minimal work alienation (IWO), they are suffering from WFC due to some other factors.

They are suffering from high WIF conflict and even higher FIW conflict. The reasons for the suffering could be that since ages RCF have been indulged into their traditional roles of being a homemaker. Thus, it is a major shift in roles for them as well as for their families. Now because they have to come to the workplace, they have to compromise with the time spent with their families, which is leading to WIF conflict. At the same time as the organisations give them challenging tasks and expect
them to perform, they are not able to meet the expectations as they still focus more on their family roles which is leading to FIW conflict.

Thus, we could say that RCF are the ones with best perception towards the diversity climate and least experience of Work Alienation among the four groups. They are the only ones who have been able to adjust well to the diversity created by the quota system. Although as discussed above many have not disclosed their true identities to the co-workers, thus it could not be said till when they would hold a positive perception in the real scenario of the work place today, because lies have a short life.

5.6 Learning from the Present Findings

Overall, the results depict that the employees working in the public/government sector organisations are unhappy with the present quota system. Their view towards the policy is in most part impacted by their perception towards their organisations’ efforts in managing the diversity created by the policy. Such policy is of no use which is only monetarily helping people to grow but is negatively impacting their mental and physical health. As discussed throughout, all the four groups, especially GCF and RCM are in deep pain with the surrounding diversity and the way it is being handled. The two psychological consequences of the perception towards diversity climate, for the workforce as found out in the present study are the suffering of Work Alienation and Work Family conflict.

Literature has always supported the truth that Diversity, if harnessed well can bring many positive outcomes, both for the employees and the organisations. But, sadly diversity is being mismanaged in the present scenario and thus the quota policy is having a boomerang effect.

In management literature, it is argued that the challenges within competitive, dynamic and increasingly global markets (demanding innovation, creativity as well as flexibility) are best met by a broadened pool of experience and knowledge found in an
effectively managed diverse workforce (Cox and Blake, 1991; Milliken and Martins, 1996; Nemeth, 1985; Nemeth and Wachtler, 1983; Shaw and Barrett-Power, 1998; Wright et al., 1995). The innovative and creative potential inherent in a diverse workforce (in terms of ethnic origin, nationality, cultural background, religion, gender, age, education, lifestyle, working style, way of thinking etc.) can be used to bridge cultural boundaries and search for original problem solutions, innovative product ideas and targeted marketing initiatives. This diversity can become a competitive advantage.

But in the present scenario of the quota system, diversity is not showing any positive effects rather it is creating damage for the workforce and the organisations. The reason can be the selective approach of Indian organisations to managing diversity i.e. assimilation. The assimilation approach simply ignores differences and thus no integrational efforts are made. The minorities are more or less expected to assimilate into a pre-defined and dominant corporate culture (Thomas and Gabarro, 1999). This is what is happening. The Reserved Category are being expected to just get accustomed to the already prevalent way of working, without recognizing their individual uniqueness, which can be harnessed and utilized to improve the present work culture.

Apart from interpersonal conflicts and experiences of not being heard, recognized or valued, their specific knowledge and experience is not being leveraged, they are not being able to perform to the highest potential and are experiencing barriers in advancing within the organisation.

Sadly, such an environment would neither foster the realization of the potential for diversity nor the retention of talented people with diverse backgrounds.

Belonging to minority group is viewed as being inferior. This is evident as many RCF said that they don’t reveal their belongingness to the Reserved Category. RCM also displayed their fears about revealing their true group identity to others. As one said, “I don't let me neighbours know that I am from the Reserved Category, otherwise their behaviour would change towards my family.”
Other said, “I don’t put my surname after my name otherwise I have to face bias and my group identity becomes more important to others than my true self identity.”

Shockingly, many GCM employees very proudly said that “We don’t even know who belongs to which category. Thus, how would be discriminate?”

These, narratives are pointing to the assimilation approach taken up by the Indian organisations. If knowing an employees’ category or revealing ones’ category is a bad sign, this shows that diversity present in the workforce is not respected. And if the diversity is not recognised as a boon and rather viewed as shameful, it is impossible to harness it and unite the people belonging to different groups.

To overcome the present difficulties with the diversity created by the quota system, diversity management has to be built on solid normative grounds, on founding principles, understood as pillars of a ‘Culture of Inclusion’. Following an inclusionary approach differences are recognized, valued and engaged. Different voices are understood as being legitimate and as opening up new vistas; they are heard and integrated in decision making and problem solving processes, they have an active role in shaping culture and fostering creativity and innovation and eventually in adding value to the company’s performance.

Thus, as the researcher argues that in order to unleash the potential of workforce diversity, a culture of inclusion needs to be established; a culture that fosters enhanced workforce integration and brings to life latent diversity potentials; a culture that is build on clarified normative grounds and honour the differences as well as the similarities of the individual self and others. Diversity is about balancing this natural tension in different organisational and cultural settings.

The truth is however diversity may have started out in a corporation- as a response to a legitimate mandate, as a reaction to the shortage in qualified personnel or to become more attractive for young talents, it is important to realise that diversity management will not unleash any potential benefits unless diversity is culturally valued.
5.7 Present Scenario: Lack of Inclusion

5.7.1 A Culture of Inclusion

A culture of inclusion is defined by an organisational environment that allows people with multiple backgrounds, mindsets and ways of thinking to work effectively together and to perform to their highest potential in order to achieve organisational objectives based on sound principles. In such an environment different voices are respected and heard, diverse viewpoints, perspectives and approaches are values and everyone is encouraged to make a unique and meaningful contribution.

In order to bring such a vision of inclusion to life certain preconditions need to be established. Following are some founding principles which constitute the minimal requirements for the formation of a discourse that aims at integrating multiple voices and at creating a culture of Inclusion.

5.7.1.1 Principal of Recognition

Coping with diversity means; recognizing differences while looking for the common bond. The more conscious the treatment of the ethical underpinnings is, the better are the chances that the essential moral needs of those involved are met and, at the same time, inclusiveness is enhanced to a degree where the many advantages become visible and liveable; in the culture of inclusion, that is.

Following Honneth (1994) and Maak (1999) the researcher would like to distinguish mutual recognition in terms of emotional recognition, solidarity and legal and political recognition.

Emotional Recognition

As the most basic form of affirmation of a person it is literally the most fundamental recognition. It takes place in close relationships such as mother/parents-
child relations or those between partners, friends, but also between colleagues. Non-recognition here means emotional damage through verbal, psychological and/or physical assault, ranging from any kind of harassment to extreme cases such as rape or torture. The absence of emotional recognition can hinder a person to develop self-esteem and ultimately to create healthy and sustainable relationships with people. Thus, there is a fundamental need for emotional recognition in the relationships we grow up in, live in and work in.

In the organisational context, it means, first and foremost, that we need to recognize and pay attention to our mutually shared need for emotional recognition by fostering a cultural climate that allows for it to happen, through words, gestures and relational commitment. One of the core challenges in realizing this is the art of balancing emotional expressions - because i.e., one person's gesture can be perceived by another person as inappropriate or even harassing. This illustrates the necessity for taking nothing for granted, reflecting own assumptions and behaviour, adapting behaviour, talking about differences and ultimately creating a mutually agreed sphere of emotional expression. Again, a culture of inclusion is about recognizing difference, on various levels, while looking for the common bond.

In the present sample, emotional recognition was lacking. As noted previously as well, many employees belonging to General Category reported that they don’t even know which employee belongs to which category. Although they believed it to be a very positive sign towards diversity management, but they did not notify that not knowing about others around them can actually lead to unintentional hurting of their emotions, such as by saying something related to their category. In support of this, few Reserved Category employees said, “When they read some news in the newspaper, they criticise the reservation policy and the people belonging to it, they should know that we also belong to quota and should learn to mind their words.”

Other Reserved Category employee said, “They may not say it on our face, but their body language depicts the hatred towards us.”

One other Reserved Category participant said, “I feel threatened if quota system as it reduces my confidence, I don’t participate and give my views as my
constant worry is that people generalise the Reserved Category people to be incapable...I am so uncomfortable.”

In all the above narratives emotional recognition is missing, sensitivity towards what can hurt others is missing.

The next principle of recognition important for fostering the culture of inclusion is;

Legal and Political Recognition

Being equal in terms of human, civil and labour rights means being recognized as an *equally free organization citizen*. Valuing diversity starts with guaranteeing the same rights for everyone and by encouraging people to be good organization citizens. Thus, to speak up and actively engage in creating a culture of inclusion. It is, in essence, about recognizing the individual self as a unique person and as a different other.

In India, Reserved Category people are seen to have more legal rights, as they have their own unions and support committees. In the present study, it could be seen that many General Category employees were scared that the Reserved Category employees would use their legal rights unnecessarily.

Few of the General Category employees narrated their personal experiences about how they were punished by being transferred or suspended due to an illegitimate complained made by their Reserved Category co employee or subordinate.

A General Category Male employee, high up in the hierarchy narrated one of his experiences. He said, “*Few years back there were many employees working under me. I used to make efforts to motivate this Reserved Category employee who never used to perform effectively. He often seemed uninterested in work and thus I kept pushing him to work harder, which also sometimes became ugly. One day I got a notification that the Reserved Category cell has got complained against me and thus I*
would be transferred to some rural town as the punishment decided by them. When I questioned about my mistake, it was told that the same employee has filed a complaint, that I indirectly insulted him by speaking wrong words for Dr. B.R Ambedkar. After giving a thought I realised that few days back during lunch time there was a discussion going about Indian history in which we discussed about many well known personalities of India. We did not discuss anything about the reservation policy. And he abused the opportunity as he already had grudges against me that I made him work.”

Other General Category participant when asked whom would he help if he sees a general and Reserved Category employees arguing, he very clearly said “the Reserved Category, otherwise he may complain against me.”

This lopsided legal help creates a divide and is thus reducing mutual recognition. Equal legal rights need to be provided to all at the workplace so that unnecessary differences are not created.

People who feel recognized as different but equal, who know that they can be their true selves, not only in private but also at the workplace, are at ease with their personality, can play a confident role and are motivated to give their best. Provided that they also experience solidarity in relation to other members of the organization. While legal and political recognition are moral essentials for the individual state of mind, it is practiced solidarity, the actual face-to-face recognition among equal but different people, that provides affirmation and motivation and ultimately unleashes any given potential.

Solidarity grows in an environment where people feel confident; where they like to work together and trust each other; where they acknowledge each other's individual achievements as well as those in teams.

The above definition of solidarity when related with the present scenario at the public/govt. sector provides a devastating view. Confidence highly lacks in the workforce, especially Reserved Category employees, working together is a myth,
often they don’t even want to look at each other and acknowledging each other’s achievements is absent as stereotypes overpower ever rational understanding.

There is a complete lack in trusting each other’s capabilities. Going through the entire discussion it could be inferred well that General Category employees do not find Reserved Category capable at least presently. The reason behind this could be the lack of training provided to the Reserved Category employees, which is acknowledged by both the reserved and the General Category workforce.

Many Reserved Category employees have admitted to be lacking in confidence due to their lack of command over English language, being attached with the stigma of belonging to the Reserved Category and being humiliated due to name calling and so forth.

The organisations need to build a culture of confidence, trust and mutual recognition of achievements. This can only happen if all the employees are brought and viewed at the same platform of capability and potential through proper training, diverse work teams and common tackling of all irrespective of the category and gender.

Culture is always a common achievement (Smircich, 1983; Schein, 1985); and a culture of inclusion depends on the level of mutual recognition. For an inclusive diversity culture this also means that respect is paid to the plurality of sub cultures inside the corporation; that none is excluded from the ongoing moral discourse and that each subculture has the opportunity to take part in shaping the cultural reality in the organization, its values, norms, policies, etc.

Next founding principle for the culture of inclusion is reciprocal understanding.

5.7.1.2 Reciprocal Understanding

In order to create an inclusive organizational culture in which people from different backgrounds respect and understand each other and successfully work
together to reach common goals, it becomes crucial to foster relationships and stimulate discursive processes between the diverse cultures in a way that hitherto marginalized voices are not only tolerated but actively invited, supported and empowered to state their viewpoints, ideas and opinions. This requires the openness to get involved with people with different perspectives, and the willingness to actively listen to other viewpoints, in order to learn more about them and understand their basic assumptions to a point where one is able to commonly assess them, based on reciprocal understanding. The point here is to recognize each other as open and able to communicate and thus as a communicative being and member of a speech community.

Presently, the reciprocal understanding is lagging behind. The two categories if at all rarely talk about the topic of quota system, thus and understanding towards each other has not developed yet. They may be working together but are still present at two ends of the continuum, and are not even trying to come close.

Affirmative action as a policy seems to have made them more distanced from each other and it is now the job of the organisation to bring them close enough to be able to successfully work together. The task would not be easy but is highly necessary.

Statements made by few participants made the researcher realise the huge psychological distance between the two categories.

A GCM said, "Hierarchy is required in the society, otherwise who will do the lower jobs?"

Other GCM said, "If my name is same as that of a RCM, that doesn’t make me close to him. We are far apart on the basis of our surnames."

A RCM said, "I have much more work experience than the General Category, I have been working for earning a living for my family since I was 5 years of age. I used to distribute newspapers, work as a labour in factory since then. And they believe they know more than me."
These statements above depict a lack of understanding and respect for each other among the two categories of employees. The gap has to be bridged by the organisation via proper knowledge based training to the Reserved Category and sensitivity training for the General Category.

5.7.1.3 Standpoint Plurality and Mutual Enabling

Inclusiveness requires openness to different stand points; this seems easy to agree upon. However, in practice it can become difficult to ensure this openness if intellectual traditions induce people to find the one right way, the one and true answer. In fact, there might be no "right" solution at all. And yet, this can easily lead into a situation where a dominant voice is generalized and all the "other" voices are marginalized. Such situations of inequality and domination often arise in the workplace, when there are conflicting standpoints coupled with an unequal distribution of power among parties, meaning that one or more parties possess the power (due to position, resources or other means) to push through their interests against the will of others.

While both, the extent to which power is exercised and the extent to which unequal power distribution is accepted (by the less powerful members of institutions) can vary with respect to the degree of power distance in an organization and/or country, there is no doubt that whatever the context there are and will always be imbalances in the distribution of power. The objective is thus to raise awareness for the power aspect in relations and the necessity to create an inclusive discursive environment.

In the present research one of the interview questions asked, ‘If a Reserved Category employee is not included in discussions. What would be your opinion about it?’ Many participants, both from the reserved and the General Category responded that it’s a common situation that they are not included in discussions especially due to their lack of knowledge and ability.
This is a clear example of a lack of mutual enabling. Even if a person is incapable, keeping him out would strengthen his/her incapability.

A GCM said, “My co-employee belonging to the Reserved Category never went for the meetings and always used to push me to attend them for him. He didn’t feel confident enough to face a public situation such as that of a meeting.”

In order to be able to deal with the above addressed situation which frequently arises in diverse and multicultural work environments, it becomes necessary to enable a dialogue and dismiss some hindering assumptions such as the belief that there is one objective and true knowledge claim that proves all the others wrong. What is considered right or wrong, in the end, should be a shared insight based on the common deliberations over the issues involved. Thus, it is essential to create an open and participative dialogue, integrate different voices into that dialogue, enable “other” voices to speak up, discuss and weigh different arguments and find a common approach to a topic or issue. As a consequence, what is considered morally right and legitimate, results from an ongoing moral discourse, a discursive process in which only one thing counts: the power of the better reasoned argument. Habermas, accordingly, emphasizes the following general discourse requirements: inclusiveness, equality, sincereness and absence of force (Habermas, 1996). This means for the organizational context that diverse groups with different "local realities" need to be enabled to come together and create their organizational story and shared cultural identity in an ongoing process of common discursive action, built on mutual recognition. Throughout this process it becomes necessary to actively integrate the divergent and, in particular, heretofore marginalized voices (mutual enabling). This requires that their voices are heard, that they are encouraged to share their ideas, thoughts and perspectives and that they are enabled to participate in an ongoing process of forming common cultural realities. Such a context allows standpoint plurality, free expression and the supporting of different opinions and stand points as well as touching on topics with which others do not agree - without running the risk of being sanctioned and/or cut off. Again, what counts with respect to consensual validation of claims is the power of the better reason, not that of a function or position.
5.7.1.4 Trust

Getting people from different cultural backgrounds to work co-operatively together and to comfortably share their knowledge, experiences and viewpoints presupposes a basis of trust. Reciprocal recognition is an important foundation on which mutual trust can be developed through ongoing relationship work (Calton and Kurland, 1996). It is apparent that there are relational frameworks in which trust may develop more easily than in others. It is less likely that trust will develop in relations that are shaped by delimitation and distance, legalism and bargaining, "dog eat-dog" or "winner-take-all" competition and short term "means-to-an-end" thinking: what counts in such settings are one dominant person or player, the "winner", and short-term results. If, by contrast, the relational framework is built on closeness, cooperation, and reciprocal recognition, mutual trust is more likely to develop. While building trust is a lengthy process, it can be quickly lost; therefore, trust requires continual nurturing if it is to be maintained. It is, after all, the relationships that create trust and upon which trust is based, where "authentic trust" can be found (Solomon and Flores, 2001).

Integrity

Building trust among diverse workforce which has come together due to affirmative action is surely a difficult task.

A RCM said, “It annoys me when people say yeh to quota se hai, baithte hi promotion mil jayega. When I pass an exam for promotion, I agree that I get concessions of 5% in the total marks but that doesn’t mean I didn’t study for it. Even to score for the Reserved Category cut off we need to study, then how are we incapable?”

Many RCF said, “I have enrolled my children as General Category individuals, I don’t want others to see them as incapable and demean them directly or indirectly. Being from Reserved Category is not less than being stigmatized.”

Above narratives clearly demonstrate a lack of trust in the workforce towards each others’ capabilities and also each others’ thought process towards one another.
But while data collection, there were certain participants who displayed trust towards the other groups capabilities. A GCM said, “I successfully worked with my co-employee for 5 years and we completed few really good projects together, later I got to know he is from quota. Thus, being from quota doesn’t ascertain that you are incapable.”

Thus, having successful experiences with the employees belonging to a different category can help enhance trust between employees.

5.7.1.5 Integrity

For a culture of inclusion to develop, moral reliability and coherence is as essential as mutual trust. By that it means the integrity of people and processes in an organization. Integrity can be described as the quality of moral self-governance, i.e. that a person subscribes to a set of principles and commitments and upholds these, especially when facing a challenge, for what she takes to be the right reasons (Sharp Paine, 1997a; McFaul, 1992). People who act with integrity, base their actions on principles and act in a reliable and coherent manner. They show "wholeness" (this is what integrity stands for) and demonstrate, in a moral sense, character. This "wholeness" of a person is essentially determined by the quality of relationships a person has; to herself as well as to other people or to organizations. (Solomon, 1999, p. 38) As a culture of inclusion implies "wholeness" and develops around these relationships in an organization the meaning of integrity strongly supports the notion that only a wholehearted commitment to recognizing each others sameness and difference will be successful. Because diversity is essentially about mutual recognition and the core values people share in an organization, no half-hearted approach to this subject will do. In fact, structures and processes, too, should be designed to support moral self-governance by creating a system of organizational integrity. (Sharp Paine, 1997b; Moorthy et al., 1998; Thome Leclair et al, 1998)

Thus, Indian Organisations today have to take an inclusionary approach towards diversity management so that Affirmative action is viewed positively and also reaps good and effective outputs for them as well as the society.
5.8 Improving the Present Situation

5.8.1 Steps of Building a Diverse Culture of Inclusion

Inspired by the work of Cox and Beale (1997), who discuss the process of learning to effectively deal with diversity and Kotter's model of leading change (1996) Pless and Maak (2004) focussed on four essential transformation stages for building a culture of inclusion (depicted in Figure 5.1).

Figure 5.1. Transformational stages for building a culture of inclusion

5.8.1.1 Phase 1: Raising Awareness, Creating Understanding and Encouraging Reflection

As Gilbert and Ivancevich point out, "to create inclusion, alternative ways of perceiving reality must be available" (2000, p. 101). This permits change in reality construction and allows the creation of other possible realities like an inclusive diversity culture. A necessary first step is to start an ongoing discursive learning process, which aims at raising awareness for the fact that different people perceive reality differently; building understanding and respect for these different realities through ongoing discourse and encouraging reflection; and last but not least, bringing the fundamental principles to life, which constitute the basis for a culture of inclusion. Such a discursive process to form a common cultural understanding should consist of two major steps: The first step is about becoming aware of standpoint plurality and
what it means to integrate diverse voices in a discourse; that people with different backgrounds have different perceptions of reality due to their disparate background of experiences rooted in social, ethnic, cultural, gender, etc. differences, and that there is no such thing as a given objective and true reality; that some of the voices are privileged and others marginalized and that it becomes necessary to integrate and enable the marginalized ones in order to create an inclusive environment. The second step is about creating a common basis of understanding by identifying the common moral grounds as well as reflecting the different underlying assumptions on which specific thought and behaviour patterns are based. It is essentially about creating an organizational discourse, and thus bringing to life discourse ethics, as a relational process in which the basic assumptions about a diverse culture of inclusion are worked out through the conscious, reciprocal reference to the text and context of one's own and all other cultures integrated in the discourse. Based on awareness for and understanding of other positions, a cultural transformation process is triggered and alternative ways of creating organizational reality can be pursued.

Good corporate ethics is unthinkable without that kind of reflection work. In fact the critical scrutiny and the continuing development of corporate values and norms, the practical reasoning and discursive deliberation for the legitimation of moral claims, within a corporation as well as a part of a stakeholder dialogue, should be at the core of corporate ethics (Ulrich and Maak, 2000). It generates orienting knowledge of reasonable purposes, principles and preconditions for business and lays out the groundwork for legitimate corporate success. A crucial part of managing diversity is about valuing and validating diverse moral claims. This process, however, can only succeed if everyone is heard, included in rather than excluded from the moral realms of an organization.

5.8.1.2 Phase 2: Developing a Vision of Inclusion

A clearly defined vision is an important starting point in forming a culture of inclusion. It clarifies the general direction for change, provides a common mental frame, draws a picture of the future and makes clear where the company wants to be
Having a vision becomes particularly important in a situation of change where values, assumptions, belief systems and mental maps that used to be seen as effective and functional are no longer desirable and must be changed.

To create a multicultural and inclusive organizational culture the vision needs to address and incorporate the following aspects:

- Creating a work environment that is free from any kind of harassment and is based upon respect for all individuals (inside and outside the corporation) regardless of sex, gender, race, class, social or cultural origin, religion, disability, lifestyle, organizational level, circumstances, etc. (a basic requirement of mutual recognition);

- Building and nourishing a culture of communication where inclusion and trust are the norms - by integrating different perspectives to decision-making and problem-solving processes, by listening to and trying to understand different opinions, by valuing contrary opinions and arguing positions fairly, and by looking for the better argument among the validation claims;

- Providing equal rights and opportunity for each employee as a citizen of the organization to achieve her fullest potential and to speak up and open (and thus, legal and political recognition);

- Appreciating the contributions each employee can make by bringing their own perspectives, viewpoints and ideas, and demonstrating solidarity; and

- Showing sensitivity to workloads and fostering (and recognizing the need for) an appropriate balance between work and personal life.

These are only aspects of a diversity vision that need to be addressed; they do not absolve companies of the need to find and define their own tailor-made visions and articulating the desired outcomes in their own language. It is also important to note that such visions should be part of a larger corporate vision, where a corporation defines, among other visionary issues, its status as a corporate citizen.
Creating an effective vision that helps build a culture of inclusion is an important process that should include a multitude of stakeholder voices (employees, customers, stockholders, suppliers, communities) to develop a consensual vision that addresses all relevant concerns. Higher levels of trust, credibility and legitimacy inside and outside the corporation can be attained, resistance from within the organization can be reduced and commitment for the long and arduous way to create a diverse culture of inclusion can be mobilized. A similar line of argumentation is made by Kotter (1996). Once the vision is created, it needs to be spread throughout the organization and fed back to the people involved inside and outside the corporation in order to ensure their buy-in and commitment. It is essential that CEO and the leaders of the organization widely broadcast their sponsorship of both the vision and the ensuing course of action (Champy, 1997; Gouillart and Kelly, 1995; Leach et al., 1995).

5.8.1.3 Phase 3: Rethinking Key Management Concepts and Principles

An essential element of the change process is the reflection on and the rethinking of key management concepts in the organization, as well as the principles they are based on.

**Business Principles**

The diversity vision has to be translated into guiding business principles. In fact, a fundamental change process will ultimately lead to rethinking and redefining of business principles and codes of conduct in an organization. It is a necessary and important process of adjustment that has to reflect the organizational discourse and thus, the shared assumptions, values and beliefs. As the essential reference point, a thoroughly considered set of principles based on mutual recognition offers guidance about what a corporation stands for, thus documenting the commitment to form and sustain a culture of inclusion.
**Integrative Leadership**

Within an inclusive environment, leadership "becomes a question of coordinated social processes in which an appointed leader is one voice among many. [Leaders] share responsibility with others for the construction of a particular understanding of relationships and their enactment." (Dachler and Hosking, 1995, p. 15) Instead of defining a solitary role, leadership becomes a relational, interactive task aimed at involving all people within the company, all members of teams, departments and areas in the ongoing processes of initiating, defining and realizing projects and the company's objectives. In the relational role as mentor, coach, moderator, facilitator and cultivator, the leader is no longer the sole author of a particular reality but rather becomes a co-author, and to some extent a lead-author, in a community of equal employees (Dachler, 1992; Dachler and Dyllick, 1988). The role of mentor and coach involves supporting employees in their development, thus, giving them advice, opening up new developmental perspectives and opportunities as well as discussing and weighing alternatives. The leader as cultivator tries to secure a working climate in which diversity flourishes and creativity is harvested. In a teams, setting this role would imply that the leader acts as a moderator and facilitator, aiming at integrating the diverse voices, including them in order to open up new vistas, getting them involved in the dialogue and providing the possibility for partnership, creativity and innovation (Pless, 1998).

**Participatory Decision-Making and Stakeholder Dialogue**

This leads us to the question of decision-making and corporate dialogue. In traditional, hierarchically organized corporations, important and long-term decisions are usually made by a small group of top management strategists. Routine decisions, in contrast, are for the most part delegated downwards. Yet, in an inclusive culture, this traditional, decision-making logic is quasi-reversed, "critical decisions reserved for the many and routine decisions delegated horizontally to the few." (Iannello, 1992, p. 121) By means of including multiple voices, it becomes possible to considerably broaden the knowledge base for decision alternatives and to in crease the number of
possible paths leading to problem solutions (Nemeth, 1986; Nemeth and Wachtler, 1983; Shaw and Barrett-Power, 1998).

Furthermore, by coordinating with the external environment and stakeholders of the corporation and including representatives from different groups in a "stakeholder dialogue", it becomes possible to achieve higher levels of trust, credibility and legitimacy in the critical public. In fact, most of today's corporations are "stakeholder corporations" (Phillips, 2003; Post et al., 2002; Svendsen, 1998; Wheeler and Sillanpaa, 1997; Zadek, 2001), i.e. they exist and operate in an environment where various demands have to be taken into consideration (shareholder, employees, clients, equity holders, government, nature, local and global society, etc.). In this respect, building a culture of inclusion consequently means to engage in an ongoing stakeholder dialogue aiming at respecting all legitimate claims. Legitimate are those stakeholder claims that are supported by good reasons. Thus, what counts in the end is not the power-based influence that a particular stakeholder (group) might exercise, but the mere strength of the better reasoned argument.

In general, when deliberating critical business decisions that question the status quo (i.e. mergers and acquisitions, new vision or principles), the search for consensual decisions with a multitude of parties is important. Even if the decision-making process takes longer, the translation into action will be more efficient and successful since motivation and commitment of those participating are higher and resistance and micro-political barriers smaller. Iannello (1992) and Srivastva and Cooperrider (1986) have demonstrated with case studies of egalitarian organizations that participatory decision-making is also connected with long-term top performance and economic success.

**Work-Life Balance**

An important part of a principle-based culture of inclusion is to help people balance work and personal life so that they can be productive while having various lifestyles and personal responsibilities. Essentially, this reflects the recognition of every person, employee or manager, as having both a work and a personal life, and
thus, as a human being rather than a human "resource". Proven instruments to do this are providing flex-time, job-sharing, telecom muting, on-site child care, extended leave, and renewal breaks between major assignments, etc. In order to create a sustainable balance between work and personal life Friedman et al. (1998) suggest a collaborative approach between managers and employees to achieve work and personal objectives to everyone’s benefit. It is likely that this approach flourishes in a culture of inclusion that is based on recognition, trust and understanding. On the other hand, this approach also reinforces a culture of inclusion by enabling people to respect, understand and trust each other by making employees feel respected as people with different work lives and diverse personal lives. It also fosters a stronger commitment to the organization, thus making it easier to retain people from diverse backgrounds. It is, after all, the individual notion of a "good life" that most people are working for.

5.8.1.4 Phase 4: Adapting HR systems and processes

Once awareness and understanding have been built (and thereby a motivation to change and a general knowledge base have been established), once a vision has been developed which clarifies the general direction for change, and key management concepts have been newly defined, individuals or organizations are positioned to take action to actually change behaviour and culture.
Competencies of inclusion

In order to be able to change and create a culture of inclusion people need to have certain qualities and traits, which are the competencies of inclusion, that enable them to effectively respond to challenges and opportunities in a diverse and inclusionary work environment. These competencies play an important role in creating a diverse culture of inclusion due to their catalytic function between values and norms on the one hand and actual behaviour on the other hand. Let's explain that in more detail: competencies can be derived from the founding principles which they translate into observable and measurable behaviours, such as:

- Showing respect and empathy;
- Recognizing the other as different but equal;
- Showing appreciation for different voices, e.g:
listening actively to them

- trying to understand disparate viewpoints and opinions

- integrating different voices into the ongoing cultural discourse.

- Practising and encouraging open and frank communication in all interactions;

- Cultivating participative decision making and problem solving processes and team capabilities;

- Showing integrity and advanced moral reasoning, especially when dealing with ethical dilemmas;

- Using a cooperative/consultative leadership style.

These competencies play a crucial role in sensitizing employees, managers and leaders to behaviours that are critically important to a culture of inclusion. They indicate clearly which behaviour is valued. However, as the following example shows these competencies won't have any long-term impact on the organization unless they are embedded in an integrated management system. Take for instance the manager who gets trained to use a participative decision making approach and a cooperative leadership style: She knows that this behaviour is seen as desirable within the organization and understands that it is in line with the diversity vision and beneficial for the corporate culture. However, if her performance evaluation as well as pay and bonus still solely depend on quarterly results, not on actual inclusive behaviour, there is simply no need for her to change her leadership style. Especially, if one takes into account that it will take her more time to integrate people into decision making processes and will take more personal effort to change familiar leadership behaviour. Therefore, it is more than likely that she will continue to demonstrate an authoritarian style that, in the past, allowed her to meet her revenue goals and guaranteed her bonus. This example underscores the importance of embedding competencies of inclusion into an integrated Human Relations Management system in order to unleash their behavioural potential and foster change (see also Gilbert and Ivancevich, 2000;
Cox and Beale, 1997). In the following we show how such an integrated approach can look like:

As discussed above, the founding principles have to be translated into observable and measurable competencies. These competencies form the basis for different personnel processes like recruitment, performance evaluation, training and development, reward and compensation. In the following, we like to take a closer look at these processes because they are fundamental in helping to build and cultivate a culture of inclusion by steering and supporting inclusive behaviour.

**Recruiting**

Looking at processes, the selection and hiring of people with diverse backgrounds (women, minorities, different nationalities) is an important approach to enhance diversity within the corporation. However, in order to create a culture of inclusion it is not enough to simply recruit people from different backgrounds into the organization. It becomes necessary to select those candidates who share the desired values in terms of diversity and show competencies and behaviour favourable to an inclusive and diverse work culture. A culture of inclusion can only be brought to life with the help of people who buy into this idea, who feel comfortable working in a diverse work environment and are committed to bringing the vision to life. People are the most important "capital" for any value-based organization. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the right people and have a selection process and instruments in place that support this endeavour. Consequently, tools for personnel selection such as interviews and assessment centres (AC) have to be adapted to the idea of diversity and inclusiveness. The selection tools have to be revised in accordance with the ethical and strategic requirements of the diversity vision and re-designed based on the competencies of inclusion. In order to ensure a fair process all candidates are tested and observed by trained assessors and interviewers in different assessment exercises (i.e. role plays) and/or interviews and assessed against the same set of pre-defined competencies (competency-based selection).
Performance Evaluation

For both purposes, creating and cultivating a culture of inclusion, performance evaluation can be a valuable tool because (if applied responsibly) it can be a means to stimulate the dialogue between employees and their supervisors to foster lifelong learning, and to encourage and motivate people to show inclusive behaviour. However, this presupposes that performance is not simply evaluated based on pure output (what people achieve), but in equal terms on the evaluation of their behaviour (how people achieve results).

In such evaluations, which are a crucial element in diversity and performance management (Cox, 1991), behaviour and outcome are monitored and measured. Employees and supervisors agree at the beginning of the performance management cycle (usually once a year) on a set of objectives which are linked to the competency model. The performance is then assessed with respect to the defined objectives. In a dialogue employee and supervisor discuss and agree upon the evaluation, identify areas of strengths and weaknesses, and define developmental areas and measures. We agree with Williams (1998) that it is important to review performance regularly and provide feedback to the employee on an ongoing basis during the performance cycle, so that behavioural adaptations can be made spontaneously, and coaching be given when needed.

Due to the following reasons, which are not exclusive, we see performance evaluations (PE) as a means to live and practice the founding principles:

- PE fosters integrity by motivating people to base their action on principles and acting in a reliable and coherent manner.

- PE stimulates an ongoing dialogue which is crucial to develop trusting relationships.

- PE encourages supervisors to observe employee's behaviour on a regular basis and to give feedback. While positive feedback is a means to express appreciation and to provide affirmation, constructive negative feedback can help employees to develop and change behaviour as well as unleash
hidden potential. This can, on the other hand, motivate the supervisor to find out and understand the causes of i.e. poor performance as well as to find a common solution to improve performance together with the employee.

- PE provides a chance to subordinates to express needs and to articulate developmental aspirations.

Development

The development field is a vast area which provides instruments, methods and processes at different levels (the organizational, the team and the individual level) to support the creation of a culture of inclusion. For example, training programs (with follow-up modules) based on competencies of inclusion can be designed to train intercultural effectiveness and strengthen inclusive behaviour while raising moral awareness on an individual level; succession planning programs can be introduced to ensure that each individual (independent from gender, race, national origin, age, etc.) can grow into positions at all management levels of an organization according to their talents and potential.

- Individual development - mentoring:

Mentoring is seen as a useful development instrument and an important factor for career development (Thomas and Gabarro, 1999). Mentoring is a learning partnership between a senior person (a mentor) and a less experienced staff member (mentee). The benefits for the mentee are manifold: mentoring aims at increasing the mentee's knowledge base as well as the understanding of institutional operations and culture, developing greater confidence and self-esteem, and enhancing communication and net working skills. On the other hand, mentors can benefit simultaneously by enhancing their ability to listen, expanding their coaching and counselling skills as well as developing their emotional intelligence. Mentoring seems to be helpful in the endeavour to build an inclusive work environment since it fosters relationship building beyond ranks and hierarchies, creates trust, and encourages
mutual learning and enabling between mentors and mentees. In essence, for those involved, a mentoring relationship can be a crucial part of actual mutual recognition.

- Team development - developing inclusive teams:

As Rosabeth Moss Kanter points out, team building has to be emphasized to help "a diverse workforce appreciate and utilize fully each other's skills." (1997, p. 149) In order to realize the potential attributed to a diverse workforce an enabling team environment has to be developed in which people understand one another's differences. The discursive learning process introduced earlier (in phase 1 of the transformation process) is essential to raise awareness for diversity, understand why people are different and to use this understanding to support the development of a team environment that fosters both personal growth as well as business success. The real challenge in a diverse team is to cope with these differences in everyday business life and find solutions for arising conflicts. Sheridan (1994) offers an example from an Exxon Chemical plant in Baytown, Texas, of how teams can cope with conflicts arising from differences in everyday business life by making the team environment more inclusive and enabling: In this case a highly skilled and very intelligent engineer who happened to be an Asian women found herself trapped in a cumbersome culture clash arising from her cultural up-bringing: On the one hand, she had been taught by her family that respected women in her culture "wait until no one else is speaking before they speak, and that a [...] woman rolls her words seven times on her tongue before speaking - to be certain that what she says is not offensive. Her cultural belief about the way that a [respected] woman communicates leads to behaviour that is very, very polite." On the other hand, the culture at the Baytown plant dictated an aggressive communication style at meetings. Consequently, "being a very polite woman who waited for silence before speaking, she seldom got the chance to contribute to team discussions". Recognizing her dilemma, the team members eventually developed a different communication style, accommodating her needs for pausing before arguing. What this short example illustrates is that an inclusive approach requires "relational work" (Dachler, 1999), in the sense of a concerted effort to recognize a team members dilemma, to understand the team processes, and to be willing to change usual ways of communicating and interacting in order to bring
mutual recognition in everyday discourse settings to life and eventually leverage the contribution each member can make in a diverse team. To benefit from the wealth of experiences in a diverse work force, it is necessary to create and nurture a culture of cooperation, respect and trust. As mentioned earlier, it is only in a context of trust - without fear of exclusion, hurt feelings and knowledge abuse - that people from diverse backgrounds are willing to share their authentic and culturally specific experience with their working teams; especially since all those with such experience leave behind a little of themselves. In contrast to the current management trend of constantly changing team compositions (Sennett, 1998), an inclusive team culture requires constancy in team composition so that a workable trusting relationship can be established.

- Organizational development:

Since change itself is an ongoing process that does not happen easily (Kotter, 1996) we like to stress again that organizational discourse is the backbone of cultural development, and, therefore, reflection and awareness workshops have to be scheduled regularly for all staff to raise awareness, build understanding and foster reflection (i.e., reflecting, challenging predominant assumptions, confronting them, and going through their implications) on an ongoing basis. This process is to be accompanied by discourse-trained professionals, whose task it is to propose a communication framework (including basic speech rules) that follows the above-mentioned principles of inclusion, to facilitate an inclusionary discourse among diverse voices within the organization, and to ensure the ongoing process of learning and education.

The translation of the founding principles into competencies of inclusion, the adaptation of systems and processes, which lead to behavioural changes, can reinforce the other phases of the change process, bringing new awareness, triggering further reflection and motivating a rethinking of dominant thinking styles, systems and processes. Thus, change becomes an ongoing organizational learning process.
Reward and Compensation

In an integrated personnel system not only developmental measures are derived from performance evaluations but also reward systems such as salary, bonus, etc. Reward systems can be used as an additional method to implement the principle of recognition and to reinforce integrity and inclusive behaviour. A possible approach is to make a certain percentage of each employee's compensation (salary and bonus) dependent on inclusive and diversity supporting behaviour. However, a prerequisite for reward systems is their structural integrity, ensuring equality and guaranteeing the same rights for everyone, e.g. "equal pay for equal jobs". This means that salary disparities among people who do the same job and deliver the same performance standard have to be abolished. Gilbert and Ivancevich, e.g., describe a multicultural company where "[p]ay of all employees is analysed yearly to ensure that no disparity exists among peers, or among those ranked at the same level in terms of hierarchy, years of service, and education." (2000, p. 96) If a disparity exists and there is no underlying performance issue, pay is adjusted upward for the underpaid party. Based on such a fair and equal process diversity driven and inclusive behaviour can be rewarded and individual and team contribution acknowledged. Fair and equal processes are an important prerequisite for trust to be built within an organization and an expression of material recognition.
Thus, the realization of any potential benefit inherent in a diverse workforce requires an integrative approach to diversity starting with the definition of a framework of inclusion built upon principles of recognition, mutual understanding, standpoint plurality and mutual enabling, trust and integrity that allows for the integration of different and multiple voices into the organizational discourse. An important part of the process is a reexamination of underlying and rarely questioned assumptions which interfere with inclusiveness. Against this backdrop, leadership, decision-making and teamwork need to be redefined in order to foster enhanced employee integration. Management and personnel within an organization play a crucial role in setting the stage for change by recognizing the importance and value of a culture of inclusion, by facilitating the process of defining a vision of inclusion and putting it into action by building awareness, educating and developing people, reformulating existing and introducing new personnel processes and instruments, and, last but not least, ensuring an integrated human relations-approach to management that allows to foster and reward inclusive behaviour systematically at all organisational levels.