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ABSTRACT

As per the report drafted by NASSCOM (20 Feb, 2018), year 2017 was considered to be an economical enriched year. Also, India is considered to be the fourth largest base for new businesses in the world and is set to increase its base to 11,500 tech start-ups by 2020. The involvement of IT industry in the economy to such a level opens the gates for opportunities as well as threats. The threats could be structural or eruptional depending upon the variability that surrounds an organization. This research paper focuses on studying the impact of gender on overall organizational climate by evaluating degree to which gender affects chosen dimension of the organizational climate. It is done through surveying 304 employees working in IT and ITES companies in National Capital Region of India. Likert's seven point scale is used in the questionnaire centralizing on 17 key dimensions of organizational climate and conclusions are drawn by applying Kruskal-Wallis test which is a non parametric alternative for the one-way ANOVA while using IBM Statistic software (SPSS). Performance appraisal and career planning were statistically found to be two dimensions that are significantly affected by category of gender. However, there was no respondent falling into “other” category.
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INTRODUCTION:

Today's organizations are facing a lot more challenges and more vulnerable environment. One of the difficulties so faced by organizations these days is of decoding their climate and understanding exactly what does the employees want or aspire to do currently. Research on organizational climate can be traced back to the 1930s. With the human relations movement pioneered by Hawthorne, researchers turned their attention from the “hard” physical environment to the “soft” psychological environment; thus the concept of organizational climate was born. According to a survey of more than 1200 executives and managers by American Management Association (AMA), 52% of companies report their employees are less loyal than five years ago. This means, organizations must indulge their time in ascertaining the ways to improve employee commitment towards a particular organization. The third dependent variable so taken in this project title is of Job Satisfaction. It is the phenomenon that affects many organizations worldwide. From the research of Garcia Bernal et al., (2005) it was inferred that the key Organizational objective is job satisfaction and is essential for higher competitive level and Organizational success. All of the above three elements are witnessed in any organization and these effect each other in manifold way. That is why it becomes necessary and crucial to study equation between these by 21st century organizations and managers.

In India, IT & ITES companies have segregated themselves into four basic categories. 1) IT Services; 2) Business Process Management (BPM); 3) Software Products & Engineering Services; 4) Hardware. Out of
these, BPM sector (including hardware) have expected to engender revenue of US$ 160 billion in the financial year 2017 as compared to US$ 146.5 billion in the financial year 2016 thus insinuating a growth rate of 9.2 per cent. The technological scenario in India is managing well as per the January 2017 report, where it is mentioned that India is the world’s largest sourcing destination for the information technology (IT) industry, accounting for approximately 67 per cent of the USD 124-130 billion market. Also, as per an another report by NASSCOM and Zinnov Management Consulting Pvt. Ltd, India is considered to be the fourth largest base for new businesses in the world and home to over 3,100 tech start-ups. Such favorable conditions for flourishing and expanding technological base have given atmosphere for innovations but on the contrary it embeds with certain other problems too. Managing manpower with rapid growth is a crucial task for the employers. The problems related to organizational climate is getting more complex as organizations are operating in highly competitive environment. Thus, as a researcher, it is an area of deep analysis, so as to see that how organizational climate is affecting functioning of such organizations. Also, gender based study will give insights on the status of gender equality in the proposed geographical area.

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE:

Definition and Meaning:
The concept of Organizational Climate was originated in the late 1930s. Since the conception of human relation movement initiated by Hawthorne, several researchers made people realize that there are two forms of operational environment in the organizations namely, physical environment and psychological environment. Appelbaum et al., (2007) defined ‘Organizational climate to be something that includes organizational norms which are a grouping of expected behaviors, languages, principles and postulations that allow the workplace to perform at a suitable pace’. The climate of the organization is dependent on the feelings of the employees and perceptions of the organization’s practices, procedures and reward systems and Organizational Climate refers to the perception of the employees regarding their work environment. Litwin defined organizational climate as a group of measurable characteristics that members could perceive directly or indirectly in the work environment. Therefore, it is quite interpreted that climate is something more or less perceived by some employee and it is prone to change as per the thinking of the employee. According to Neher (1996), organizational climate is similar to the moods of individuals, which are subject to change at any given time. Steers, 1977 suggested that Organizational Commitment is valued for the following reasons: (1) Organizational Commitment can predict employee turnover, (2) employees with high levels of Organizational Commitment perform better at work, and (3) Organizational Commitment could be an index to predict organizational efficacy. In the context of the present study, Allen and Meyer, 1990, describe Organizational Commitment as something that is regarded as an attitude, as it relates to individuals’ mindsets about the organization.

Organizational climate Dimensions:
Many researchers in the past had worked on defining climate by taking in account some of the key dimensions and developing questionnaire that are also statistically redefined afterwards. For example, Organizational Climate Questionnaire (Litwin & Stringer, 1968), Agency Climate Questionnaire (Schneider & Bartlett, 1968), Executive Climate Questionnaire (Tagiuri, 1968), Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Margulies, 1969). These questionnaires are centralized on various dimensions so that organizational climate could be studied in a better way. For this research study 17 dimensions presented by Patterson et al. (2005), is shortlisted because of its diverse adaptability, validity and reliability. These are autonomy, integration, involvement, supervisory support, training, welfare, formalization, tradition, innovation and flexibility, outward focus, clarity of organizational goals, performance feedback, pressure to produce, quality, efficiency, effort and reflexivity.

Organizational Climate and role of gender in IT & ITES Industry:
Till date, several research studies attempt to study that whether gender of the employee play vital role in analyzing organizational climate or not. Such review of literature helps new researchers in strengthening their conclusions and validating the hypothesis so created. The research article published by Mor Barak et al. (1998), examines gender and ethnic differences of 2686 employees working in an electronic company. The study reveals that gender of the employee have different perceptions related to one’s organizational climate as in this study it was ascertained that Caucasian men feels organization to be more fair and Caucasian women feel more comfortable with diversity. According to Trauth et al. (2009), there is visible gender imbalance in the IT...
profession in USA. They identified organizational climate to be one of the crucial factor that affect the gender imbalance quotient. A study conducted by Santoshi Sengupta (2011), on 500 middle level BPO employees revealed that job related variables that make climate structures also have significant difference on the basis of gender. As per Phalgu & Biswajeet (2005) research conducted on 600 employees working in service and manufacturing industry in India traced out that there is significant difference between gender of the employee and organization ethos, learning intention and overall behavior which forms the input for organizational climate. According to the research of M.K.Ahuja (2002), gender gap in IT profession appears to affect global competition for India. Due to imbalance demographic composition within IT organizations, the overall growth gets hampered for organization as a whole.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:
Research Purpose and Objective:
The research study aims at following objectives:

a) To study the overall effect of gender on organizational climate of the employees working in IT & ITES companies in NCR
b) To explore the importance of organization climate in IT & ITES while analyzing which dimension of organizational climate is influenced more by which segment of gender

Sample Size, Location, Sampling Technique & Sample Composition:
The data was collected from employees working in IT and ITES companies across India working at entry level, middle level and top level positions in their organization. Approached sample size was 800 and out of this number, total responses received were 304. Voluntary participation was there and there was no monetary or any other type of remuneration provided to them. Random & Snowball sampling technique is used for this research. Figure 1 showcases key particulars about participant’s gender.

Data Collection & Survey Instrument:
Primary Data is collected through questionnaire filling from 304 employees working in IT & ITES organization across NCR. The questions were multiple response questions which focused on 17 dimensions of organizational climate and total 51 questions were asked from the respondents. The secondary data was collected through Journals, articles, organizations website, other concerned online material.

Research Method/Technique:
For this research study, Descriptive Research Design is opted so that gender influence could be studied in relation to the variables of organizational climate.

Statistic Application:
For this research study, non-parametric testing is applied on the sample so collected as data was not normally distributed. Specifically, Kruskal-wallis test is applied which is a non-parametric alternative for one-way ANOVA because the data contains one random sample and further divided it into three groups i.e. male and female and transgender. Although, this study also contain fourth group (Others) but none of the respondent fall into this category.

Now, for the statistical conclusion, comparing means of the above mentioned three groups is required which is to be done by Kruskal-wallis test.

Hypothesis:

H₀₁: There is no significant influence of gender on Organizational climate of IT & ITES companies in India
H₀₂: There is no significant affect of gender on autonomy, integration, involvement, supervisory support, training, welfare, formalization, tradition, innovation and flexibility, outward focus, clarity of organizational goals, performance feedback, pressure to produce, quality, efficiency, effort and reflexivity of the employees working in IT & ITES companies in India.

Preliminary Testing and results:
Before going for one-way ANOVA, following tests are required for better understanding.

Test for Validity: Nominal and ordinal data was proved to be valid as none of the value was missing and it consists of a valid percent and frequency. Scale data was also proved to be valid as N=304 and minimum and
maximum values turned out to be 1 and 7 respectively.

**Test for Reliability:** the value of Cronbach’s Alpha comes out to be 0.912 which indicates higher level of consistency with 17 numbers of items.

**Test for Data Normalcy:** the next thing is to check whether data is normally distributed or not. As the values of mean & median are quite close, it indicates normal distribution. But by dividing value of skewness with std.error of skewness and Kurtosis with std.error of kurtosis, the values comes as 16.25 and 28.874, as these values are not between +2 and -2 range, hence data is not normally distributed.

**Hypothesis Testing and Results:**

**Hypothesis 1:**

H0: There is no significant influence of gender on Organizational climate of IT & ITES companies in NCR

H1: There is significant influence of gender on Organizational climate of IT & ITES companies in NCR

In Table 2, the significance value of kruskal-wallis test comes out to be 0.825 which is larger than .05 which compel us to not to reject null hypothesis and retain the null hypothesis i.e. There is no significant influence of gender on Organizational climate of IT & ITES companies in NCR.

**Hypothesis 2:**

H0: There is no significant affect of gender on autonomy, integration, involvement, supervisory support, training, welfare, formalization, tradition, innovation and flexibility, outward focus, clarity of organizational goals, performance feedback, pressure to produce, quality, efficiency, effort and reflexivity.

H1: There is significant affect of gender on autonomy, integration, involvement, supervisory support, training, welfare, formalization, tradition, innovation and flexibility, outward focus, clarity of organizational goals, performance feedback, pressure to produce, quality, efficiency, effort and reflexivity.

The above mentioned hypothesis is studied by breaking it into following sub- hypothesis.

H0 2(1): There is no significant affect of gender on autonomy

H1 2(1): There is significant affect of gender on autonomy

Table 3 and 4 gives glance on the basic statistic values which state the difference between mean values of male, female and transgender with respect to autonomy. Male mean value is 10.99, female mean value is 11.11 and transgender mean value computed to be 12.50. Table 5 showcases 0.535 as the value of significance presented by Kruskal-wallis test which emphasize that null hypothesis could not be retain.

H0 2(2): There is no significant affect of gender on integration

H1 2(2): There is significant affect of gender on integration

As per table 3 & 4, mean value of males with respect to integration comes out to be 12.30 and that of the female is 12.33 and that of transgender is 12.00. On reviewing table 5, it indicates towards significance value of 0.907. As this value is greater than 0.05, hence null hypothesis could not be rejected.

H0 2(3): There is no significant affect of gender on involvement

H1 2(3): There is significant affect of gender on involvement

In table 3 and 4, mean value of males with respect to involvement is 11.22. Female and transgender forms the composition of 10.44 and 15.00. In table 5, 0.064 is the significance value of Kruskal-wallis test which is again higher than 0.05. Hence, null hypothesis is failed to reject.

H0 2(4): There is no significant affect of gender on supervisory support

H1 2(4): There is significant affect of gender on supervisory support

By reviewing table 3 & 4, this was ascertained that mean value of the males with respect to supervisory control is 12.72, 12.89 is of females and 13.50 is of transgender. According to table 5, 0.586 significance value from the test is computed which is higher than 0.05 and hence, state the fact that null hypothesis could not be rejected.

H0 2(5): There is no significant affect of gender on training

H1 2(5): There is significant affect of gender on training

Table 3 and 4 states the comparison of mean values of male, female and transgender with respect to training dimension of organizational climate. The values were 13.31, 13.16 & 13.50 respectively. In table 5, 0.847 comes out to be a significance value of Kruskal-wallis test which compels us to non-rejection of null hypothesis.

H0 2(6): There is no significant affect of gender on welfare

H1 2(6): There is significant affect of gender on welfare

As per the values depicted in table 3 & 4, the mean value of males with respect to welfare is calculated as 12.62, whereas mean value of females were 12.38 which is insignificantly lower than males. Transgender mean value computed to be 13.50. From table 5, this could be inferred that 0.531 is the value of significance which is higher.
than 0.05. Therefore, we fail to reject null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(7):** There is no significant affect of gender on formalization

**H₁ 2(7):** There is significant affect of gender on formalization

According to table 3 & 4, the basic statistic mean value of males with respect to formalization turns out to be 11.71, for the female it turns out to be 11.66 and that of the transgender, it is 12.00. Table 5 give 0.912 as the value of significance. This depicts retention of null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(8):** There is no significant affect of gender on tradition

**H₁ 2(8):** There is significant affect of gender on tradition

Table 3 & 4 triggers out mean value of males with respect to tradition to be 11.14 and that of females to be 11.48. Transgender mean value comes out to be 11.50. Table 5 shows significance value to be 0.466 as it is larger than 0.05, therefore, null hypothesis could not be rejected.

**H₀ 2(9):** There is no significant affect of gender on innovation & flexibility

**H₁ 2(9):** There is significant affect of gender on innovation & flexibility

Table 3 & 4 gives insight to the extent to which innovation & flexibility is affected by gender. The mean values of male comes out to be 11.12, female values comes out to be 10.99 and transgender values comes out to be 10.00. Also, table 5 shows the significance value computed by Kruskal-Wallis test as 0.594. As this value is more than 0.05, therefore null hypothesis could be retained.

**H₀ 2(10):** There is no significant affect of gender on outward focus

**H₁ 2(10):** There is significant affect of gender on outward focus

Table 3 & 4 gives male mean value with respect to outward focus as 12.03, female mean value is 12.01 and transgender mean value to be 11.00. The significance value calculated as 0.788 conclude at retention of null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(11):** There is no significant affect of gender on clarity of organizational goals

**H₁ 2(11):** There is significant affect of gender on clarity of organizational goals

From table 3 and 4, the mean value for male, female and transgender when significantly viewed with respect to clarity on organizational goals turns out to be 12.03, 11.99 and 13.00. From the test significance value comes out to be 0.176 which is higher than 0.05. It states that we fail to reject null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(12):** There is no significant affect of gender on performance feedback

**H₁ 2(12):** There is significant affect of gender on performance feedback

Table 3 & 4 gives mean value of male with respect to performance feedback as 12.30 , that of female as 12.25 and that of transgender as 14.40. By reviewing table 5, The value for test for significance by Kruskal-Wallis gives value as 0.181. As this value is greater than 0.05, therefore, null hypothesis could not be rejected.

**H₀ 2(13):** There is no significant affect of gender on pressure to produce

**H₁ 2(13):** There is significant affect of gender on pressure to produce

As per table 3 & 4, mean value of males with respect to pressure to produce comes out to be 12.31, that of the female is 12.25 and that of transgender is 11.50. On reviewing table 5, it indicates towards the significance value of 0.739. As this value is greater than .05, hence null hypothesis could not be rejected.

**H₀ 2(14):** There is no significant affect of gender on quality

**H₁ 2(14):** There is significant affect of gender on quality

As per the values depicted in table 3 & 4, the mean value of males with respect to quality calculated as 11.56 whereas mean value of females were 11.56 and transgender mean value is 11.50 . From table 5, this could be inferred that 0.914 is the value of significance value which is higher than 0.05. Therefore, we fail to reject null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(15):** There is no significant affect of gender on efficiency

**H₁ 2(15):** There is significant affect of gender on efficiency

According to table 3 & 4, the basic statistic mean value of males with respect to efficiency turns out to be 12.18 and that of the female turns out to be 11.91. Transgender have mean value of 10.00. Table 5 gives 0.350 as the value significance which is higher than 0.05. Hence, null hypothesis could not be rejected.

**H₀ 2(16):** There is no significant affect of gender on effort

**H₁ 2(16):** There is significant affect of gender on effort

Table 3 & 4 states the comparison of mean values of male, female and transgender with respect to effort dimension of organizational climate. The values were 11.70, 11.81 & 9.50 respectively. In table 5, 0.335 is the significance value of Kruskal-Wallis test which compels us to fail to reject null hypothesis.

**H₀ 2(17):** There is no significant affect of gender on reflexivity

**H₁ 2(17):** There is significant affect of gender on reflexivity

As per table 3 & 4, mean value of males with respect to reflexivity comes out to be 13.09, that of the female is
12.81 and that of transgender is 12.00. On reviewing table 5, it indicates towards significance value of 0.636. As this value is greater than 0.05, hence null hypothesis could not be rejected.

SUMMARIZED RESULT AND CONCLUSION:

The statistics so applied depicts some seminal results that help one to draw further conclusions. While studying the overall effect of gender on organizational climate of IT & ITES companies in NCR, we concluded that observation of the said phenomenon to be insignificant in nature. But while studying it with respect to 17 dimensions of organizational climate, male, female and transgender gave varied opinions. The description of dimensions has shown compliance with validity and reliability but due to data non-normalcy, non-parametric testing took place. The gender variability failed to give significant influence on organizational climate and when studied individually, it again shows insignificant values.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY:

The difficulty of getting responses was the biggest hurdle in such social science research study. Also, there was no enriched review of literature available in Indian IT context related to gender studies. The “other” category was totally missed out and the prior research studies mainly focused on male and female categories. In this research study, there was no respondent belonging to “other” category. Moreover, only two responses were from transgender group which is a too small data to generalize anything.

FUTURE SCOPE:

Studying the gender role in building of organizational climate is a vast and exploring field of study. This research paper could give enough statistical proof to the fact that each dimension of the organizational climate affects gender in different ways. It will be interesting to see when other dimensions are used by future researchers. Also, the affect of “other” category respondent on organizational climate would be seminal research in nature which has huge future scope. India can expect more participation from “other” category of gender now as such positivity is indicated by a professional human relation membership association devoted to human resource management, The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). In their statement it is mentioned that IT companies across globe have stopped taking information on gender and now considers this as one’s private detail.
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**TABLES AND FIGURES:**

**Figure 1:** Gender Composition of the sample

**Table 1:** Data Normalcy:

| Total Organizational climate score | N  | Valid | Missing |
|-----------------------------------|----|-------|---------|
| Mean                              |    | 203.6974 | 0       |
| Median                            |    | 194.0000 |         |
| Mode                              |    | 194.00   |         |
| Skewness                          |    | 2.275    |         |
| Std. Error of Skewness            |    | .140     |         |
| Kurtosis                          |    | 8.056    |         |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis            |    | .279     |         |

**Table 2:**

**Hypothesis Test Summary**

| Null Hypothesis | Test         | Sig. | Decision          |
|-----------------|--------------|------|-------------------|
| The distribution of Total Organizational climate score is the same across categories of Gender. | Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test | .825 | Retain the null hypothesis. |

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.
### Table 3: Male and Female’s description on dimensions

| Gender of the employees | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Autonomy                |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 10.9934 | 2.29927        | .18711          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.1126 | 2.28486        | .18594          |
| Integration             |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.3046 | 1.54916        | .12607          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.3377 | 1.68478        | .13711          |
| Involvement             |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.2252 | 3.93814        | .32048          |
| Female                  | 151| 10.4437 | 4.09168        | .33298          |
| Supervisor              |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.7152 | 2.10516        | .17132          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.8874 | 2.08979        | .17007          |
| Training                |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 13.1131 | 2.37819        | .19353          |
| Female                  | 151| 13.1589 | 2.39470        | .19488          |
| Welfare                 |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.6225 | 2.94786        | .23989          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.3841 | 2.99302        | .23457          |
| Formalization           |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.7086 | 2.58093        | .21003          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.6556 | 2.52203        | .20524          |
| Tradition               |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.1391 | 2.02003        | .16439          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.4768 | 2.05535        | .16726          |
| Innovation              |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.1192 | 2.43564        | .19821          |
| Female                  | 151| 10.9868 | 2.66580        | .21694          |
| outward focus           |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.0331 | 2.11476        | .17210          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.0132 | 2.16329        | .17605          |
| clarity of organizational objective | | | | |
| Male                    | 151| 12.0331 | 1.57233        | .12795          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.9801 | 1.97811        | .16098          |
| Efficiency              |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.2980 | 2.11595        | .17219          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.2450 | 2.43575        | .19822          |
| Effort                  |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.3113 | 2.06619        | .16814          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.2450 | 2.18774        | .17804          |
| performance feedback    |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.5563 | 2.06442        | .16800          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.5629 | 2.28495        | .18595          |
| pressure to produce     |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 12.1788 | 2.68350        | .21838          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.9073 | 2.56216        | .20851          |
| Quality                 |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 11.6954 | 2.39720        | .19508          |
| Female                  | 151| 11.8079 | 2.19002        | .17822          |
| Reflexivity             |    |      |                |                 |
| Male                    | 151| 13.0927 | 2.68912        | .21884          |
| Female                  | 151| 12.8146 | 2.38720        | .19427          |

### Table 4: Transgender description on dimensions

| Gender of the employees | N  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------|----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| Autonomy                |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 10.9934 | 2.29927        | .18711          |
| transgender             | 2  | 12.5000 | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| Integration             |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 12.3046 | 1.54916        | .12607          |
| transgender             | 2  | 12.0000 | .00000         | .00000          |
| Involvement             |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 11.2252 | 3.93814        | .32048          |
| transgender             | 2  | 15.0000 | 8.2843         | 2.00000         |
| Supervisor              |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 12.7152 | 2.10516        | .17132          |
| transgender             | 2  | 13.5000 | .70711         | .50000          |
| Training                |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 13.3113 | 2.37819        | .19353          |
| transgender             | 2  | 13.5000 | 3.53553        | 2.50000         |
| Welfare                 |    |      |                |                 |
| male                    | 151| 12.6225 | 2.94786        | .23989          |
| transgender             | 2  | 13.5000 | 3.53553        | 2.50000         |
| Gender of the employees | N   | Mean    | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------------------------|-----|---------|----------------|-----------------|
| Formalization          |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 11.7086 | 2.58093        | .21003          |
| transgender             | 2   | 12.0000 | 4.24264        | 3.00000         |
| Tradition               |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 11.1391 | 2.02003        | .16439          |
| transgender             | 2   | 11.5000 | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| Innovation              |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 11.1192 | 2.43564        | .19821          |
| transgender             | 2   | 10.0000 | 1.41421        | 1.00000         |
| outward focus           |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 12.0331 | 2.11476        | .17210          |
| transgender             | 2   | 11.0000 | 0.00000        | 0.00000         |
| clarity of organizational objective | |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 12.0331 | 1.57233        | .12795          |
| transgender             | 2   | 13.0000 | 1.41421        | 1.00000         |
| Efficiency              |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 12.2980 | 2.11595        | .17219          |
| transgender             | 2   | 14.5000 | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| Effort                  |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 12.3113 | 2.06619        | .16814          |
| transgender             | 2   | 11.5000 | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| performance feedback    |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 11.5563 | 2.06442        | .16800          |
| transgender             | 2   | 11.5000 | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| pressure to produce     |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 12.1788 | 2.68350        | .21838          |
| transgender             | 2   | 10.0000 | 1.41421        | 1.00000         |
| Quality                 |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 11.6954 | 2.39720        | .19508          |
| transgender             | 2   | 9.5000  | 2.12132        | 1.50000         |
| Reflexivity             |     |         |                |                 |
| male                    | 151 | 13.0927 | 2.68912        | .21884          |
| transgender             | 2   | 12.0000 | 2.82843        | 2.00000         |

Table 5: Individual Hypothesis Summary

| Hypothesis Test Summary                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Null Hypothesis | Test | Sig   | Decision               |
|-----------------|------|-------|------------------------|
| 1               |      | .595  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 2               |      | .607  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 3               |      | .004  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 4               |      | .580  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 5               |      | .647  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 6               |      | .691  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 7               |      | .906  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 8               |      | .504  | Retain the null hypothesis |
| 9               |      | .788  | Retain the null hypothesis |

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05.