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#### Abstract

:

In the context of IT industry, employing more number of women and providing opportunities for their growth would be interesting to explore the status ofGender mainstreaming in Information Technology sector in India. This is an industry where women are supposed to stand shoulder to shoulder with the men. What is it that keeps women from making it to the top rung of authority in the country's IT sector? Is it the IT sector that has not recognized and rewarded women well enough for their efforts? In view of the above comments and observations, the present study addresses the dilemma of Gender mainstreaming in IT sector. The study utilized survey method of research. About 70 organizations took part in the study. 205 women and 98 men employees working with IT sector were contacted to collect the required information. Obtained data was analyzed by computing percentages, mean and standard deviations. Hypothesis testing was done employing chi-square. The research findings showed that Most of the respondents (more than $60 \%$ ) opined that women are treated less favorably in the HR practices. Appraisals are an exception. About $55 \%$ of the respondent employees opined that appraisals are gender neutral favoring neither men nor women


Keywords: HR Practices, Gender Equality, Employee Perception, Information Technology.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The IT Industry has been one of the most dynamic industries in India with more than 3.7 millionwith $34 \%$ of women workforce .India's first largest private sector employer in the organized sector. This is attributed to their highly skilled IT workforce, and their ability to speak English. The revenue of

Information Technology and Business Process Management (IT and BPM) industry in India is estimated to reach $\$ 350$ billion by 2025. Indian IT industry has more than 17,000 firms, of which over 1,000 are large firms with over 50 delivery locations in India. The country's cost competitiveness in providing IT services, which is approximately 3-4 times
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more cost-effective than the US, continues to be its unique selling proposition in the global sourcing market.As an industry, IT provides promising opportunities for the economic and personal advancement of everyone, including the women.

Thus, this study becomes important particularly in the current context when a large number of IT companies in India are experiencing change in the profile of their workforce. Of interest to the researchers has been the gender specificity and women in the field of IT.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Women and IT Scorecard - India report (2018),Indian IT sector is increasingly a woman centric. HR policies such as conveyance, flexi-work, work-from-home, parental leave, antiharassment, healthcare, have led to the progressive trend. It is on the right path towards recruiting and retaining more women in leadership roles, forecasting that half of firms will have over $20 \%$ women in the Csuite level, which is set to increase to nearly $60 \%$ at the senior level.

Insights exhibited that on average women working in IT are more highly qualified than men, and that more companies reported a higher proportion of young women aged between 30-35 in C-Suite roles than men (4.5\%) in the same age group. There are more young women in CXO and international roles and Progressive HR policies and shared parenting responsibilities remain priority than men (NasscomKavitaDoshi, 2018).

The Indian IT-BPO industry has emerged as the largest private sector employer in the country with direct employment of about 2.23 million professionals. The percentage of female employees, over the years, has steadily increased from $35 \%$ in 2006 to $36 \%$ in 2008 at the junior level (NASSCOMMencher, 2009).

Networking has always been recognized as a crucial element in career progression. Because of such poor representation, it becomes difficult for women to affect changes to the current status quo. As Hemingway (1995) and Meyerson and Fletcher(2000) noted, women actually encounter a "Glass Door" on entry to the international computing community rather than encountering the better known "Glass ceiling " as their careers progress.

Although there has been some improvement in women's representation at the level of management in IT, women remain significantly underrepresented at this level (Panteli, et. al., 2001). As is the case in many other occupations, women tend to be concentrated in the lower echelons of IT. Panteli et.al (2001) hold that masculine organisational culture is a significant barrier to Gender mainstreaming in IT and that IT companies are particularly likely to be strongly masculine.
3. OBJECTIVES:The present study has the following objectives.

1. To understand the perceptions of employees in I.T. industries;
2. To study HR practices of select IT companies in Hyderabad.
3. To investigate the influence of demographics on employees perceptions.
4. To suggest best H.R. Practices in I.T.Industries.

## 4. Hypothesis

H1: The perceptions of respondents on gender mainstreaming issues of HR practices are independent of demographic variables like age and gender.

H2: The perceptions of respondents on gender mainstreaming issues of HR practices are independent of organizational variables like level of hierarchy and type of organization.
5.Research Methodology: The study utilized survey method of research. For primary data, astructured questionnaire is designed to collectemployee perceptions in IT sector .Secondary data is collected from published literature -books, journals, magazines and websites. .For the questions on perception a 5-point Likert scale is used for indicating agreement.

About 70 organizations took part in the study .The researcher has contacted IT companies located in Madhapur, Hyderabad city of Telangana during the first mid of 2019. Many companies had declined permission to conduct the study. In view of this rejection, the researcher has utilized her network of

From the above analysis, it can be said that though there is representation from different categories, the sample is dominated
friends to gain way in into the organizations. Questionnaires were distributed to about 700 employees both men and women at the rate of 10 per each organization. About 303 employees gave usable responses .The resultant sample comprised 205 women and 98 men representing a return of about $45 \%$ and $40 \%$ of the fully completed questionnaires.

Data obtained from the collection of questionnaires was analyzed by computing percentages, mean and standard deviations. Hypothesis testing was done employing chisquare. The level of significance is 0.05 , which is standard for social science research.

### 6.1 PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

Table -1 shows the profile of respondents to the survey. The sample is dominated by females. They constituted 67.66 percent of the sample. When it comes to age, the respondents are found almost in equal proportions in two age categories. About $95 \%$ of the respondents are under 40 years. Of them, $49.5 \%$ are in the $31-40$ years age group and the remaining $45.5 \%$ are in the below 30 years age category. Out of 303 respondents, 210 ( $69.31 \%$ ) are married, $93(30.69)$ are unmarried. When the level of hierarchy is considered, it is observed that the sample represents all the categories: junior level employees are more in number being $48.5 \%$, compared to $35.6 \%$ of middle and $15.8 \%$ of senior level employees.
by women, young, married, and junior employees.

Table - 1 Profile of Respondents ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S.No. | Variable | Categories | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Gender | Male | 98 | 32.34 |
|  |  | Female | 205 | 67.66 |
| 2 | Age | Below 30 | 138 | 45.54 |
|  |  | 31-40 | 150 | 49.50 |
|  |  | 41-50 | 15 | 4.95 |
|  |  | Above 50 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 3 | Marital status | Married | 210 | 69.31 |
|  |  | Unmarried | 93 | 30.69 |
| 4 | Level of hierarchy | Junior | 147 | 48.51 |
|  |  | Middle | 108 | 35.64 |
|  |  | Senior | 48 | 15.84 |

### 6.2 HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES

The views of respondents on human resource practices of their companies for their gender orientation are examined.

## Recruitment preferences

With large number of women competing for employment with men, what is the orientation of corporate organisations? Table-2 shows the approaches of organisation in three aspects:
(i) Women involvement in recruitment and selection- About $20 \%$ of the respondents said that women are involved in the process of selection in their organisation. Such a decision is under consideration in $54.5 \%$ of the organisations.
(ii) Preference to women in appointments -The response to this question is similar to the above.
(iii) Setting aside some jobs as gender specific- About $55 \%$ of the organisations are having gender specific identification of jobs.

From this it is obvious, that involvement of women in recruitment and selection process is less. Not giving preference may not be a negative factor for gender mainstreaming as gender mainstreaming conceptually argues for equal opportunities based on competence. However, the finding that there are gender specific jobs in organisations reveals that perceptions are sex biased. This is a negative indication in the context of gender movement.

Table -2 Recruitment preferences ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S.No. | Aspect | Yes | No | Under <br> consideration | I don't <br> know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Women are involved in the <br> process of recruitment <br> (interview panels, selection) <br> in your organization | 61 <br> $(20.13)$ | 66 <br> $(21.78)$ | 165 <br> $(54.46)$ | 11 <br> $(3.63)$ |
| 2 | Organization give preference <br> to women in appointments | 62 <br> $(20.46)$ | 61 <br> $(20.13)$ | 175 <br> $(57.76)$ | 5 |
| 3 | There are some jobs in the <br> organization that are <br> specifically done by men or <br> women | 167 <br> $(55.12)$ | 136 |  |  |
| $(44.88)$ | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |

### 6.3 RECRUITMENT OUTCOMES

Whether the recruitment and selection polices could achieve a sort of gender parity in the organisation, as a mark of gender equalisation? Table 3 shows the data. The percentage of women employees is less than $40 \%$ but above $10 \%$ according to about $67 \%$ of the respondents. As expected, only a meagre percent of women (below
Table 3 Recruitment Outcomes ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S. No | Aspect | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Of the total work force, women employees are <br> 0 - less than $10 \%$ <br> 10-less than $40 \%$ <br> 40-less than60\% <br> 60-100\% | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \\ & 203 \\ & 37 \\ & 2 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.13 \\ & 67.00 \\ & 12.21 \\ & 0.66 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | Women decision makers in our    <br> organisation    <br> 0-less than25\%    <br> 26-less than50\%    <br> $51-$ less than $75 \%$    <br> $76-100 \%$    | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 266 \\ 24 \\ 13 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.79 \\ & 7.92 \\ & 4.29 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |

### 6.4 COMPENSATION BENEFITS

Disparity in pay and benefits are reported even in IT sector. Table -4 supports the view in circulation. About $51 \%$ of the
respondents have confirmed this by saying no to the statement 'Women and men receive the same salaries for the same jobs in your organisation'. About 19.8\% of the respondents have a positive answer to this. In
case of allowances, a similar response is elicited.

From this, it is obvious that women get lower compensation than men in IT sector

Table 4 Compensation Benefits ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S.No | Aspect | Yes | No | Under <br> consideration | I don't <br> know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Women and men receive <br> the same salaries for the <br> same jobs in your <br> organization | 60 | 157 | 76 | 10 |
| 2 | Women and men receive <br> the same allowances like <br> travel /tour | 48 | $(51.82)$ | $(25.08)$ | $(3.30)$ |

### 6.5 WOMEN ORIENTED BENEFITS

Different types of benefits to women to help her balance work-life are now said to be part of HR policies in many organisations. Table -5 show the benefits provided by organisations in IT sector. According to a good majority of respondents, flexi-time and maternity leave are available to women. About 71.6\% of the respondents claimed that their organisations have flexi-time/part-time work /work-at-home arrangements for the convenience of women and $73.9 \%$ have stated that their organisations have maternity leave policy.

Protection of service and seniority and condoning breaks are available according to $34 \%$ of employees. The other benefits like paternity leave policy ( $20.8 \%$ ), leave in emergency cases ( $20.8 \%$ ), and accumulation of casual leave ( $19.1 \%$ ) are not found many organisations. The concept of leave bank for husband and wife to draw leaves is less common as about $14 \%$ of the respondents ticked yes for that. From the above analysis, it is clear that organisations are going an extra mile for supporting women but the benefits, when compared to enlightened organisations in advanced nations are not uncommon.

Table-5 Women Oriented Benefits in the Organisation ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S. No | Benefit | Yes | No | I don't <br> know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Allows Women employees are allowed to accumulate <br> casual leave for a longer period. | 58 <br> $(19.14)$ | 164 <br> $(54.13)$ | 81 <br> $(26.73)$ |
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| 2 | Has leave bank" allowing husbands and wives to pool their <br> leave; women being permitted to draw upon the leave of <br> their husbands when their own leave has been exhausted | 45 <br> $(14.85)$ | 153 <br> $(50.50)$ | 105 <br> $(34.65)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | Provides protection of the service and seniority of women <br> employees permitting them to work part time or flexi time <br> when her children are young. | 103 <br> $(33.99)$ | 121 <br> $(39.93)$ | 79 <br> $(26.07)$ |
| 4 | Condones break in service on account of marriage, transfer <br> of wife and husband, children's birth, family commitments. | 105 <br> $(34.65)$ | 136 <br> $(44.88)$ | 62 <br> $(20.46)$ |
| 5 | Provides facilities to take care of the needs of mothers of <br> new born (like break for breastfeeding, crèche/child care <br> facility | 64 <br> $(21.12)$ | 170 <br> $(56.11)$ | 69 <br> $(22.77)$ |
| 6 | Have flexi-time/part-time work /work-at-home <br> arrangements for the convenience of women. | 217 <br> $(71.62)$ | 52 <br> $(17.16)$ | 34 <br> $(11.22)$ |
| 7 | Has maternity leave policy. | 224 <br> $(73.93)$ | 43 <br> $(14.19)$ | 36 <br> $(11.88)$ |
| 8 | Has paternity leave policy. | 63 <br> $(20.79)$ | 132 <br> $(43.56)$ | 108 <br> $(35.64)$ |
| 9 | Allows women to take extra leave with pay to <br> attend emergency / important family/social commitments. | 63 <br> $(20.79)$ | 169 <br> $(55.78)$ | 71 <br> $(23.43)$ |

### 6.7 PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL

Is performance appraisal system advantageous to males or taking a gender view to give fair treatment to both the sexes? Table -6 shows that most of the organisations have structured performance appraisal systems. About $58.09 \%$ of respondents informed that their organization has structured performance appraisal system. According to another $33.9 \%$ there is such a system to some extent. About $55 \%$ of the

Table-6 Performance Appraisal ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S. <br> No | Aspect | Yes | No | Some <br> extent | I don't <br> know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | The organization has a structured performance <br> appraisal system | 176 | 20 | 103 | 4 |
| $(58.1)$ | $(6.6)$ | $(33.9)$ | $(1.3)$ |  |  |
| 2 | Gender sensitivity taken as an indicator of <br> performance | 67 | 52 | 168 | 16 |
| $(22.1)$ | $(17.2)$ | $(55.5)$ | $(5.3)$ |  |  |
| 3 | Decision makers placing a higher value on the <br> ways males tend to work | 45 <br> $(14.8)$ | 78 <br> $(25.7)$ | 167 | 13 |
| $(55.2)$ | $(94.3)$ |  |  |  |  |

6.8 TRAINING, ASSIGNMENTS AND

Table-7 shows the responses of employees, it can be concluded that equality

## CAREER DEVELOPMENT

respondents opined that 'decision makers place higher value on the ways males tend to work'. In appraisal format, 'gender sensitivity is taken as indicator ofperformance' according to $55 \%$ of respondent employees.

From the above view points, it can be concluded that appraisals are structured and male biased. However, they are, becoming gender sensitive.
in opportunities is found in a limited way, while assignments are mostly gender free. Male domination is found in meetings. Security factor is given some consideration in
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conducting meetings, and giving work and travel assignments

Table -7Training, Assignments and Career Development (N=303)

| S. No | Aspect | Yes | No | To some extent | I don't know |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Training opportunities equal for men and women in the organization | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & (24.09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \\ & (18.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148 \\ & (48.84) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \\ & (8.91) \end{aligned}$ |
| 2 | Career opportunities (i.e. advancement possibilities) equal for men and women in the organization | $\begin{aligned} & 82 \\ & (27.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & (14.52) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 156 \\ & (51.49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & (6.93) \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | Work arrangements in the organization flexible enough to accommodate needs of women | $\begin{aligned} & 71 \\ & (23.43) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & (16.50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 161 \\ & (53.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & (6.93) \end{aligned}$ |
| 4 | Travel assignments given without gender consideration in the organization | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \\ & (26.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \\ & (12.87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 163 \\ & (53.80) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 22 \\ & (7.26) \end{aligned}$ |
| 5 | Timings and venue of meetings fixed taking into account convenience of women | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 68 \\ & (22.44) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & (15.84) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170 \\ & (56.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & (5.61) \end{aligned}$ |
| 6 | Meetings in the organization office tend to be dominated by male staff | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 76 \\ & (25.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 51 \\ & (16.83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 154 \\ & (50.83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 22 \\ (7.26) \end{array}$ |
| 7 | The Organization mechanisms ensure women's safety while officially travelling etc | $\begin{aligned} & 77 \\ & (25.41) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & (16.50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 156 \\ & (51.49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & (6.60) \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 | The Organization has special provision for women to work late hours in office | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & (25.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54 \\ & (17.82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151 \\ & (49.83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & (7.26) \end{aligned}$ |
| 9 | The organization provide for safe drop at your house when your work late hours in the night | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \\ & (25.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & (16.50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 149 \\ & (49.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & (9.24) \end{aligned}$ |

### 6.9 GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL

According to $28.38 \%$ of the respondents, organizations reinforce gender sensitive behaviour and procedures to prevent and address sexual harassment. About 20.13 \% respondents said that their organization has a
designated staff /committee to address gender related concerns/sexual harassments. To 'some extent' initiatives like procedures and organisational arrangements to address gender problems are found in the organisations of about 61-66 per cent of respondent employees (as shown in table 8).

Table-8 Grievance Redressal ( $\mathbf{N}=\mathbf{3 0 3}$ )

| Sno | Aspect | Yes | No | Some <br> extent | I don't <br> know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | The organization reinforces gender sensitive <br> behaviour and procedures to prevent and <br> address sexual harassment? | 86 <br> $(28.38)$ | 10 <br> $(3.30)$ | 201 <br> $(66.34)$ | 6 <br> $(1.98)$ |
| 2 | The organization has a designated staff <br> /committee to address gender related <br> concerns/sexual harassments? | 61 | 40 | 187 | 15 <br> $(20.13)$ |
| $(13.20)$ | $(61.72)$ | $(4.95)$ |  |  |  |

### 6.10 CAMPUS FACILITIES

Are women provided separate facilities? Table-9shows separate toilets for men and women are provided by all the organisations. According to $59.7 \%$ of the employees have separate lunch room/lunch

It can be said that separate facilities are not provided to men and women in most of the cases in most of the organisations
table provided by organisations. About $25 \%$ of the employees have separate sports (25\%) facility. Very less number of employees (2$6 \%$ ) says that they have separate parking and catering facility.

## . Table -9 Campus Facilities ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { S.No. } & \text { Aspect } & \text { Yes } & \text { No } \\ \hline 1 & \text { Separate toilets for men and women } & 303 & 0 \\ (100.0)\end{array}\right)$

## SUMMARY VIEW OF PRACTICES

Table - 10 Overview of Practices ( $\mathrm{N}=303$ )

| S. <br> No | Decision areas | Women <br> treated less <br> favourably | Men and <br> Women <br> treated <br> equally | Men <br> treated <br> less <br> favourably | I Don't <br> Know |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| A | Recruitment and <br> Selection | 193 <br> $(63.70)$ | 99 <br> $(32.67)$ | 5 <br> $(1.65)$ | 6 <br> $(1.98)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B | Compensation and <br> benefits | 221 <br> $(72.94)$ | 69 <br> $(22.77)$ | 4 |  |
| $(1.32)$ | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| $(2.97)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | Appraisals | 123 <br> $(40.59)$ | 168 <br> $(55.45)$ | 6 |  |
| $(1.98)$ | 6 |  |  |  |  |
| $(1.98)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | Training, Assignments <br> and <br> development career | 227 |  |  |  |
| $(74.92)$ | 65 <br> $(21.45)$ | 5 |  |  |  |
| $(1.65)$ | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| $(2.31)$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | Grievance redressal | 218 <br> $(71.95)$ | 51 <br> $(16.83)$ | 6 <br> $(1.98)$ | 28 <br> $(9.24)$ |
| F | Campus Facilities | 251 <br> $(82.85)$ | 38 <br> $(12.54)$ | 9 <br> $(2.97)$ | $(1.65)$ |

So far the practices of human resource management in respect of six key elements (A to F in Table10) are examined individually. An overall assessment of these six factors is made in Table -10 to identify whether they are favorable to men or women or to none.

### 6.11 INFLUENCE OF DEMOGRAPHICS ON PERCEPTION

Analysis across age in Table-11 shows no significant difference in the response patterns between men and women in respect of HR practices studied. The chi-square values are not significant at 0.05 level in respect of all the HR practices. Hence Hypothesis (H1) is rejected.

Table -11 Views on HR practices-Across Age

| Decision area | Age categories | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Women } \\ & \text { treated less } \\ & \text { favorably } \end{aligned}$ | Men and Women treated equally | ```Men treated less favorably``` | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { I } \\ \text { Don't } \\ \text { Know } \end{array}$ | Chi square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruitment \& Selection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Below } \\ & 30(\mathrm{~N}=138) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 82 \\ (59.42) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \\ & (36.23) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.45) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (2.90) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2.9* |
|  | Above $30(\mathrm{~N}=165)$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 111 \\ (67.27) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 49 \\ & (29.70) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 3 \\ (1.820 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.21) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Compensation \& benefits | Below$30(\mathrm{~N}=138)$Above$30(\mathrm{~N}=165)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 97 \\ & (70.29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & (24.64) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.45) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (3.62) \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 124 \\ & (75.15) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & (21.21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.21) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (2.42) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Appraisals | Below $30(\mathrm{~N}=138)$ <br> Above 30(N=165) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 60 \\ & (43.48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 72 \\ & (52.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ (2.17) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (2.17) \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 63 \\ (38.18) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \\ & \hline(58.18) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ (1.82) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (1.82) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Training, Assignments | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Below } \\ & 30(\mathrm{~N}=138) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 102 \\ (73.91) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 30 \\ (21.74) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.45) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (2.90) \end{aligned}$ | 1.2 |
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| and career development | Above $30(\mathrm{~N}=165)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 125 \\ & (75.76) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 35 \\ (21.21) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (1.82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.21) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grievance redressal | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Below } \\ & 30(\mathrm{~N}=138) \\ & \text { Above } \\ & 30(\mathrm{~N}=165) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 99 \\ & (71.74) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 20 \\ (14.49) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (2.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 16 \\ (11.59) \end{array}$ | 2.4 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 119 \\ & (72.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 31 \\ (18.79) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (1.82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 12 \\ (7.27) \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Campus Facilities | Below $30(\mathrm{~N}=138)$ <br> Above $30(\mathrm{~N}=165)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 115 \\ & (83.33) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 15 \\ (10.87) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (2.90) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (2.90) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2.9* |
|  |  | 136 (82.42) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 23 \\ (13.94) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (3.03) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1 \\ & (0.61) \end{aligned}$ |  |

* Significant at 0.05 level

Analysis across gender categories in Table -12 shows no significant difference in the response patterns between men and women in respect of HR practices studied. The chi-square values are not significant at 0.05 level in respect of all the HR practices. Hence Hypothesis (H1) is rejected
.Table -12 Perceptions about HR Practices -Across Gender

| Decision area | Gender categories | Women treated less favorably | Both treated equally | Men treated less favorably | I <br> Don't <br> Know | Chi square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruitment \& Selection | Female ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) Male ( $\mathrm{N}=98$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 130 \\ & (63.41) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 70 \\ (34.15) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 3 \\ (1.46) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (0.98) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3.7 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 63 \\ & (64.29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 29 \\ & (29.59) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 2 \\ \hline(2.04) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $4$ |  |
| Compensation \& benefits | Female ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) Male ( $\mathrm{N}=98$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 152 \\ & (74.15) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & (21.95) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (1.46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 5 \\ (2.44) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.0 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 69 \\ & (70.41) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & (24.49) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 1 \\ (1.02) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 4 \\ (4.08) \end{array}$ |  |
| Appraisals | Female ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) Male ( $\mathrm{N}=98$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 91 \\ & (44.39) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 107 \\ & (52.20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (1.95) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 3 \\ (1.46) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4.3 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 32 \\ & (32.65) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 61 \\ (62.24) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (2.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ (3.06) \end{array}$ |  |
| Training, Assignments and career development | Female ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) Male ( $\mathrm{N}=98$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 161 \\ & (78.54) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & (19.51) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (1.46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (0.49) \end{aligned}$ | 9.5* |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 66 \\ & (67.35) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 25 \\ & (25.51) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (2.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 5 \\ (5.10) \end{array}$ |  |
| Grievance redressal | Female ( $\mathrm{N}=205$ ) Male ( $\mathrm{N}=98$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 153 \\ & (74.63) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & (14.63) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 2 \\ (0.98) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 99.76) \end{aligned}$ | 5.8 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 65 \\ & (66.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & (21.43) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4 \\ & (4.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 8 \\ (8.16) \end{array}$ |  |
| Campus Facilities | Female $(\mathrm{N}=205)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 172 \\ & \hline(83.90) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & (12.20) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 6 \\ (2.93) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (0.98) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1.9 |


|  | Male <br> $(\mathrm{N}=98)$ | 79 <br> $(80.61)$ | 13 | $(13.27)$ | 3 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(3.06)$ | $(3.06)$ |  |  |  |  |  |

* Significant at 0.05 level .


### 6.12

## INFLUENCE OF ORGANISATIONAL VARIABLES ON PERCEPTIONS

Analysis across organizational hierarchy presented in Table - 13 establishes that there is no significant difference in the response patterns between men and women in respect of HR practices studied. The chi-square values are not significant at 0.05 levels in respect of all the HR practices. Hence Hypothesis (H2 )is rejected.

Table - 13 Views on HR practices -Across Level of hierarchy

| Decision areas | Hierarchy categories | Women treated less favorably | Both treated equally | Men treated less favorably | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I Don't } \\ & \text { Know } \end{aligned}$ | Chi square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruitment \& Selection | Senior <br> $(\mathrm{N}=48)$ <br> Middle <br> $(\mathrm{N}=108)$ <br> Junior <br> $(\mathrm{N}=147)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & (60.42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \\ & (37.50) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 7.7 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & (64.81) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37 \\ & ((34.26) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (0.93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 94 \\ & (63.95) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & (29.93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (2.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & (4.08) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Compensation \& benefits | Senior <br> $(\mathrm{N}=48)$ <br> Middle <br> $(\mathrm{N}=108)$ <br> Junior <br> $(\mathrm{N}=147)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & (70.83) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & (29.17) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11.7 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & (75.00) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & (23.150 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (1.85) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ 0.00 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 106 \\ & (72.11) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & (20.41) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.36) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & (6.12) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Appraisals | Senior$(\mathrm{N}=48)$Middle$(\mathrm{N}=108)$Junior$(\mathrm{N}=147)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \hline(16.67) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38 \\ (79.17) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | 19.0** |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 941.67) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61 \\ & (56.48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.85) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (2.00) \\ & 0 \\ & 0.00 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 70 \\ (47.62) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 69 \\ (46.94) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (2.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \hline(3.40) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Training, Assignments and career development | Senior ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) <br> Middle <br> ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) <br> Junior $(\mathrm{N}=147)$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34 \\ & (70.83) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (25.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | 4.7 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \\ & (75.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & (23.15) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.85) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.00 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 112 \\ & (76.19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 28 \\ (19.05) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.36) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (3.40) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Grievance redressal | Senior ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) <br> Middle <br> ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) <br> Junior <br> ( $\mathrm{N}=147$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & (60.42) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & (31.25) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (4.17) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (4.17) \end{aligned}$ | 21.1* |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 86 \\ & (79.63) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 17 \\ (15.74) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (0.93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (3.70) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 103 \\ & (70.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & (12.93) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (2.04) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & (14.97) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Campus Facilities | Senior ( $\mathrm{N}=48$ ) <br> Middle <br> ( $\mathrm{N}=108$ ) <br> Junior | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & (79.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & (16.67) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & (2.08) \end{aligned}$ | 7.3 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 89 \\ & (82.41) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \\ & (15.74) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.85) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | 124 | 13 | 6 | 4 |  |


|  $(\mathrm{N}=147)$ $(84.35)$ $(8.84)$ $(4.08)$ <br> *Significant at 0.05 level .     <br> Differences in perceptions of respondent employees belonging to Indian companies and     |
| :--- |
| (2.72) |

MNCs presented in Table -14 shows no significant difference in the response patterns in respect of HR practices. The chi-square values are not significant at 0.05 levels in respect of all the HR practices.

Table -14 Views on Practices-Across Type of organization

| Decision areas | Organization type | Women treated less favorably | Both treated equally | Men treated less favorably | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { I Don't } \\ \text { Know } \end{array}$ | Chi square |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruitment \& Selection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=140) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92 \\ & (65.71) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & (29.29) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (2.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (2.86) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2.5 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MNC } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101 \\ & (61.96) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58 \\ & (35.58) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 2 \\ \hline(1.23) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.23) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Compensation \& benefits | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=140) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 105 \\ & (75.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \\ & (20.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (1.43) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (3.57) \end{aligned}$ | 1.4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MNC } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116 \\ & (71.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41 \\ & (25.15) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.23) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (2.45) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Appraisals | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=140) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 60 \\ & (42.86) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73 \\ & (52.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (2.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (2.86) \end{aligned}$ | 1.9 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MNC } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \\ & (38.65) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 95 \\ & (58.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & (1.84) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.23) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Training, Assignments and career development | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=140) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 104 \\ & (74.29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & (21.43) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 2 \\ (1.43) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & (2.86) \end{aligned}$ | 1.1 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{MNC} \\ & (\mathrm{~N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 123 \\ & (75.46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35 \\ & (21.47) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ (1.84) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (1.23) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Grievance redressal | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Indian } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=140) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 102 \\ & (72.86) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 22 \\ & (15.71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 3 \\ (2.14) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (9.29) \end{aligned}$ | 0.3 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MNC } \\ & (\mathrm{N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116 \\ & (71.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & (17.79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 3 \\ (1.84) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & (9.20) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Campus facilities | Indian ( $\mathrm{N}=140$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 117 \\ & (83.57) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & (13.57) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (1.43) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & (1.43) \end{aligned}$ | 2.4 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{MNC} \\ & (\mathrm{~N}=163) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 134 \\ & (82.21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19 \\ & (11.66) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7 \\ & (4.29) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (1.65) \end{aligned}$ |  |

*Significant at .05 level .

## 7. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS \& DISCUSSION

In the IT sector the same discussion is carried on in the context of glass ceiling under different labels as given under. Mention is made how they relate to the above models.

Table-15 Approaches to Glass ceiling and research works

| Theory | Basic theme and researchers | Research works in IT <br> context |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| Psychological (similar to individual deficit model) | There are inherent differences in men and women's aptitudes and motivations. <br> Eysenk (1957), Garai and Scheinfeld (1968) and Mc Coby (1966), Horner, (1968), O’Leary (1974), White, DeSanctis, Crino, (1980)Nieva (1976) and Gutek (1987). | Trauth, Quesenberry, \& Morgan(2004), Adam, Howcroft and Richardson (2004) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sociological (Combination of structural -institutional, sex role and intergroup models). | Masculinity and femininity, their associated stereotypes and roles are socially constructed. It is all in perceptions of people. <br> Alport, (1954), Bartol,( 1978), Eagly, (1983), Hartmann(1981) Kanter 1977, Yoder, (1983),Ashmore and Del Boca, (1986), Khandelwal, 2003 Brovdermen, Vogel, Broverman Clarkson and Rosencranitz, 1972 Spencer 1973). | Nielson, Von Hellens, Beekhuyzen, and Trauth (2003) Khanna, Girija and Varghese(1978) |
| Human capital | An individual's earning s will correlate to the value of their human capital; for e.g ,their education and training. Less number of women prefers engineering and management and subsequently corporate training opportunities. It explains why there is glass ceiling. Gelernter(1999) | Baroudi and lgbaria (1995) Keller(1977) Hall and Sandler (1982), and Gornick,1983) Hopkins(1995) |
| Endogenous individual differences theory (close to Systems model) | Besides some individual differences there are differences in the external environment that together make women's progress and career advancement difficult. Miller (1990). | Trauth et.al.(2004) and Trauth, Quesenberry , and Yeo(2005) |

## Comparison with present findings

The present findings are compared along with those of the present ones. They are very much similar to the earlier findings, though the severity of some of the problems is being reduced by the measures taken by some of the progressive organizations.

## 9. CONCLUSIONS

Most of the respondents (more than 60\%) opined that women are treated less favorably in the HR practices. Appraisals are an exception. About 55\% of the respondent
employees opined that appraisals are gender neutral favoring neither men nor women. Based on the above inputs and the overall market indicators, IT-BPO companies must further refine their policies and processes to strongly influence the participation of women in key projects. The organizations have to approach the problem of gender main streaming from different perspectives mentioned above. From psychological perspective they have to bring about altitudinal change in women. From sociological point of view, measures to create women friendly culture and promote gender sensitive perceptions are to be taken. Based
on Human capital theory, training and education are to be provided to women employees. Finally, from endogenous individual differences theory, the external factors like HRM practices are to be made gender sensitive.
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