**1)Machine learning domain - Machine learning domain** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Computer vision | 82 | 82 | 5 | **6** | **100** | 8 | 10 | 80 | 2 | 2 | 66 | 58 | 71 | 83 | 9 | 11 | 75 |
| 2 | Genomics | 83 | 83 | 3 | 4 | 60 | 9 | 11 | 90 | 2 | 2 | 66 | 59 | 71 | 84 | 10 | 12 | 83 |
| 3 | Chatbots | 86 | 86 | 4 | 5 | 80 | 9 | 10 | 90 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 | 77 | 94 | 7 | 8 | 58 |
| 4 | Natural language processing | 80 | 80 | 2 | 2 | 40 | 7 | 9 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 79 | 90 | 8 | 10 | 66 |
| 5 | Trend analysis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Machine learning domain** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Computer vision | 82 | 82 | 50 | **61** | 88 | 30 | 36 | 73 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Genomics | 83 | 83 | 47 | 57 | 82 | 34 | 41 | 83 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Chatbots | 86 | 86 | 53 | 62 | 93 | 31 | 36 | 76 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Natural language processing | 80 | 80 | 56 | 70 | 98 | 22 | 27 | 54 | 3 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Trend analysis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Machine learning domain** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Computer vision | 82 | 82 | 45 | **55** | 88 | 37 | 45 | 75 |
| 2 | Genomics | 83 | 83 | 40 | 48 | 78 | 43 | 52 | 88 |
| 3 | Chatbots | 86 | 86 | 43 | 50 | 84 | 43 | 50 | 88 |
| 4 | Natural language processing | 80 | 80 | 46 | 57 | 90 | 34 | 43 | 69 |
| 5 | Trend analysis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

**Machine learning domain** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Computer vision | 82 | 82 | 22 | **28** | 85 | 25 | 30 | 81 | 20 | 24 | 80 | 15 | 18 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Genomics | 83 | 83 | 21 | 25 | 81 | 26 | 32 | 84 | 21 | 25 | 84 | 15 | 18 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Chatbots | 86 | 86 | 23 | 27 | 88 | 28 | 33 | 90 | 17 | 20 | 68 | 18 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Natural language processing | 80 | 80 | 19 | 24 | 73 | 26 | 33 | 84 | 16 | 20 | 64 | 17 | 23 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Trend analysis | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**2) Kind of problems attended generally**

**Kind of problems attended generally** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Existing problems | 84 | 84 | 5 | **6** | 100 | 9 | 10 | 90 | 2 | 2 | 67 | 58 | 69 | 83 | 10 | 12 | 83 |
| 2 | New problem | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 33 | 12 | 75 | 17 | 2 | 13 | 17 |

**Kind of problems attended generally** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Existing problems | 84 | 84 | 43 | **51** | 75 | 39 | 46 | 95 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | New problem | 16 | 16 | 14 | 88 | 25 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Kind of problems attended generally** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Existing problems | 84 | 84 | 44 | **52** | 86 | 40 | 48 | 82 |
| 2 | New problem | 16 | 16 | 7 | 44 | 14 | 9 | 56 | 18 |

**Kind of problems attended generally** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years**  **(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years**  **(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years**  **(18)** | | | **Above 20 years**  **(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Existing problems | 84 | 84 | 20 | **24** | 77 | 24 | 29 | 77 | 23 | 27 | 92 | 17 | 20 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | New problem | 16 | 16 | 6 | 38 | 23 | 7 | 44 | 23 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**3) Idea generation source**

**- Idea generation source** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | From employees | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 67 | 3 | 1 | 33 | 8 |
| 2 | Client/Customer | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 82 | 20 | 2 | 12 | 17 |
| 3 | Market study reports/external agencies | 80 | 80 | 5 | 6 | 100 | 9 | 11 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 54 | 68 | 77 | 9 | 11 | 75 |

**Idea generation source** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years**  **(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years**  **(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years**  **(2)** | | | **Above 49 years**  **(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | From employees | 3 | 3 | 2 | **67** | 4 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Client/Customer | 17 | 17 | 12 | 71 | 21 | 5 | 29 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Market study reports/external agencies | 80 | 80 | 43 | 54 | 75 | 35 | 44 | 85 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Idea generation source** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | From employees | 3 | 3 | 1 | **33** | 2 | 2 | 67 | 4 |
| 2 | Client/Customer | 17 | 17 | 9 | 53 | 18 | 8 | 47 | 16 |
| 3 | Market study reports/external agencies | 80 | 80 | 41 | 51 | 80 | 39 | 49 | 80 |

**Idea generation source** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Machine learning domain** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years**  **(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years**  **(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years**  **(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | From employees | 3 | 3 | 2 | **67** | 8 | 1 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Client/Customer | 17 | 17 | 8 | 47 | 30 | 7 | 41 | 23 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Market study reports/external agencies | 80 | 80 | 16 | 20 | 62 | 23 | 29 | 74 | 24 | 30 | 96 | 17 | 21 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**4) Employee’s participation in idea generation**

**- Employee’s participation in idea generation** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Employee’s participation in idea generation** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | |  | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager**  **(3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff**  **(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Always advisable | 65 | 65 | 4 | **6** | 80 | 8 | 12 | 80 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 42 | 65 | 60 | 8 | 12 | 67 |
| 2 | Usually advisable | 25 | 25 | 1 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 80 | 29 | 2 | 8 | 17 |
| 3 | Sometimes advisable | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 80 | 11 | 2 | 12 | 16 |
| 4 | Rarely advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Never advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Employee’s participation in idea generation** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Employee’s participation in idea generation** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Always advisable | 65 | 65 | 34 | **52** | 60 | 29 | 44 | 71 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Usually advisable | 25 | 25 | 15 | 60 | 26 | 10 | 40 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Sometimes advisable | 10 | 10 | 8 | 80 | 14 | 2 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Rarely advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Never advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |

**Employee’s participation in idea generation** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Employee’s participation in idea generation** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Always advisable | 65 | 65 | 35 | **54** | 67 | 30 | 46 | 61 |
| 2 | Usually advisable | 25 | 25 | 10 | 40 | 21 | 15 | 60 | 31 |
| 3 | Sometimes advisable | 10 | 10 | 6 | 60 | 12 | 4 | 40 | 8 |
| 4 | Rarely advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Never advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Employee’s participation in idea generation** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Employee’s participation in idea generation** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Always advisable | 65 | 65 | **10** | **15** | 38 | 19 | 29 | 61 | 20 | 31 | 80 | 16 | 25 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Usually advisable | 25 | 25 | 9 | 36 | 35 | 10 | 40 | 32 | 4 | 16 | 16 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Sometimes advisable | 10 | 10 | 7 | 70 | 27 | 2 | 20 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Rarely advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Never advisable | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Rating the idea generation process**

**- Rating the idea generation process** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rating the idea generation process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 68 | 68 | **5** | **7** | 100 | 8 | 12 | 80 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 43 | 63 | 62 | 9 | 13 | 75 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 83 | 27 | 2 | 9 | 17 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 89 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 8 |
| 4 | Low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Rating the idea generation process** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rating the idea generation process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 68 | 68 | **36** | **53** | 63 | 30 | 44 | 73 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 13 | 57 | 23 | 10 | 43 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 9 | 9 | 8 | 89 | 14 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Rating the idea generation process** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rating the idea generation process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 68 | 68 | 35 | **51** | 69 | 33 | 49 | 67 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 12 | 52 | 24 | 11 | 48 | 22 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 9 | 9 | 4 | 44 | 7 | 5 | 56 | 11 |
| 4 | Low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Rating the idea generation process** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rating the idea generation process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 68 | 68 | **12** | **18** | 46 | 20 | 29 | 65 | 19 | 28 | 76 | 17 | 25 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 8 | 35 | 31 | 9 | 39 | 29 | 5 | 22 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 9 | 9 | 6 | 67 | 23 | 2 | 22 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Team assignment for the feasibility study**

**- Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Senior level management team | 83 | 83 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 9 | 11 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 56 | 67 | 80 | 10 | 12 | 83 |
| 2 | Pre designated team for all feasibility study | 17 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 82 | 20 | 2 | 12 | 17 |
| 3 | Random selection of members from each departments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Senior level management team | 83 | 83 | **47** | **57** | 82 | 34 | 41 | 83 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Pre designated team for all feasibility study | 17 | 17 | 10 | 59 | 18 | 7 | 41 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Random selection of members from each departments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Senior level management team | 83 | 83 | **43** | **52** | 84 | 40 | 48 | 82 |
| 2 | Pre designated team for all feasibility study | 17 | 17 | 8 | 47 | 16 | 9 | 53 | 18 |
| 3 | Random selection of members from each departments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Senior level management team | 83 | 83 | **22** | **27** | 85 | 22 | 27 | 71 | 22 | 27 | 88 | 17 | 19 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Pre designated team for all feasibility study | 17 | 17 | 4 | 24 | 15 | 9 | 53 | 29 | 3 | 18 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Random selection of members from each departments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Team assignment for the feasibility study** **- Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **0** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 68 | 69 | 97 | 12 | 12 | 100 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 55 | 56 | 96 | 41 | 42 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **1** | **50** | 2 | 1 | 50 | 2 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 50 | 51 | 98 | 48 | 49 | 98 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team assignment for the feasibility study** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team assignment for the feasibility study** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 24 | 24 | 92 | 31 | 32 | 100 | 25 | 26 | 100 | 18 | 18 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Idea selection process - Idea selection process** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Idea selection process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | By voting majority | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 89 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 8 |
| 2 | Consensus after discussion | 91 | 91 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 10 | 11 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 62 | 68 | 89 | 11 | 12 | 92 |
| 3 | Analytical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Idea selection process** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Idea selection process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | By voting majority | 9 | 9 | **9** | **100** | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Consensus after discussion | 91 | 91 | 48 | 53 | 84 | 41 | 45 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Analytical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Idea selection process** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Idea selection process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | By voting majority | 9 | 9 | **6** | **67** | 12 | 3 | 33 | 6 |
| 2 | Consensus after discussion | 91 | 91 | 45 | 49 | 88 | 46 | 51 | 94 |
| 3 | Analytical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Idea selection process** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Idea selection process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | By voting majority | 9 | 9 | **7** | **78** | 27 | 2 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Consensus after discussion | 91 | 91 | 19 | 21 | 73 | 29 | 32 | 94 | 25 | 27 | 100 | 18 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Analytical | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product**

**- Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product**

Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Experience from similar projects carried out by us | 79 | 79 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 9 | 11 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 52 | 66 | 74 | 10 | 13 | 83 |
| 2 | Competitors cost/quote | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 80 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 8 |
| 3 | Own estimate | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 88 | 20 | 1 | 6 | 8 |

**Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Experience from similar projects carried out by us | 79 | 79 | **43** | **54** | 75 | 34 | 43 | 83 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Competitors cost/quote | 5 | 5 | 4 | 80 | 7 | 1 | 20 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Own estimate | 16 | 16 | 10 | 63 | 18 | 6 | 38 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Experience from similar projects  carried out by us | 79 | 79 | **40** | **51** | 78 | 39 | 49 | 80 |
| 2 | Competitors cost/quote | 5 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 6 | 2 | 40 | 4 |
| 3 | Own estimate | 16 | 16 | 8 | 50 | 16 | 8 | 50 | 16 |

**Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Estimate the approximate time and cost for a product** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Experience from similar projects carried out by us | 79 | 79 | **16** | **20** | 62 | 26 | 33 | 84 | 20 | 25 | 80 | 17 | 22 | 94 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Competitors cost/quote | 5 | 5 | 2 | 40 | 8 | 2 | 40 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Own estimate | 16 | 16 | 8 | 50 | 30 | 3 | 19 | 10 | 4 | 25 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. **Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas**

**- Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Assigning different teams with different objectives | 85 | 85 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 10 | 12 | 100 | 3 | 6 | 100 | 56 | 66 | 80 | 11 | 13 | 92 |
| 2 | Studying reports of similar products within the company | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 93 | 20 | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| 3 | Competitors reports | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Assigning different teams with different objectives | 85 | 85 | **45** | **53** | 79 | 38 | 45 | 93 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Studying reports of similar products within the company | 15 | 15 | 12 | 80 | 26 | 3 | 20 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Competitors reports | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Assigning different teams with different objectives | 85 | 85 | **43** | 51 | 84 | 42 | 49 | 86 |
| 2 | Studying reports of similar products within the company | 15 | 15 | 8 | 53 | 16 | 7 | 47 | 14 |
| 3 | Competitors reports | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Methods for the detailed study on the selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Assigning different teams with different objectives | 85 | 85 | **18** | **21** | 69 | 25 | 29 | 81 | 24 | 28 | 96 | 18 | 21 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Studying reports of similar products within the company | 15 | 15 | 8 | 53 | 31 | 6 | 40 | 19 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Competitors reports | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas**

**- Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 68 | 69 | 97 | 12 | 12 | 100 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 55 | 56 | 96 | 41 | 42 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 49 | 50 | 96 | 49 | 50 | 100 |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Team leader for studying the details of selected ideas** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Member from marketing | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Member from technical | 98 | 98 | 24 | 24 | 92 | 31 | 32 | 100 | 25 | 26 | 100 | 18 | 18 | 100 |  |  |  |
| 3 | Member from finance | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Member from HR | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company**

**- Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 61 | 20 | 8 | 35 | 67 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 73 | 73 | 5 | 8 | 100 | 9 | 12 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 52 | 71 | 74 | 4 | 5 | 33 |
| 4 | Low quality | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 13 | 57 | 23 | 10 | 43 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 73 | 73 | 40 | 55 | 70 | 31 | 42 | 76 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 4 | Low quality | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

**Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 12 | 52 | 24 | 11 | 48 | 22 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 73 | 73 | 37 | 51 | 72 | 36 | 49 | 73 |
| 4 | Low quality | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 5 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Rate the process for the detailed study of an idea in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Very high quality | 2 | 2 | **2** | **100** | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | High quality | 23 | 23 | 10 | 43 | 38 | 10 | 43 | 32 | 3 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Neither high nor low quality | 73 | 73 | 12 | 16 | 46 | 21 | 29 | 68 | 22 | 30 | 88 | 18 | 25 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Low quality | 2 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Very low quality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Teams assigned for product development in the company**

**- Teams assigned for product development in the company** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Teams assigned for product development in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | New team with sufficient expertise in each functionality | 87 | 87 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 10 | 11 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 60 | 69 | 86 | 9 | 10 | 75 |
| 2 | Reassigning work to a team had  similar project | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 78 | 10 | 2 | 22 | 17 |
| 3 | Inviting application from employees | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 75 | 4 | 1 | 25 | 8 |

**Teams assigned for product development in the company** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Teams assigned for product development in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | New team with sufficient expertise in each functionality | 87 | 87 | **48** | **55** | 84 | 37 | 43 | 90 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Reassigning work to a team hadsimilar project | 9 | 9 | 6 | 67 | 11 | 3 | 33 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Inviting application from employees | 4 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 5 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Teams assigned for product development in the company** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Teams assigned for product development in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | New team with sufficient expertise in each functionality | 87 | 87 | **43** | **49** | 84 | 44 | 51 | 90 |
| 2 | Reassigning work to a team had  similar project | 9 | 9 | 5 | 55 | 10 | 4 | 45 | 8 |
| 3 | Inviting application from employees | 4 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 6 | 1 | 25 | 2 |

**Teams assigned for product development in the company** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Teams assigned for product development in the company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | New team with sufficient expertise in each functionality | 87 | 87 | **19** | **22** | 73 | 25 | 29 | 81 | 25 | 28 | 96 | 18 | 21 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Reassigning work to a team had similar project | 9 | 9 | 4 | 44 | 15 | 5 | 56 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Inviting application from employees | 4 | 4 | 3 | 75 | 12 | 1 | 25 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Serious issues in the last 6 months**

**- Serious issues in the last 6 months** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Serious issues in the last 6 months** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Once | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 80 | 6 | 1 | 20 | 8 |
| 2 | Twice | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 90 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 8 |
| 3 | Thrice | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 100 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | More than thrice | 73 | 73 | 5 | 7 | 100 | 10 | 14 | 100 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 45 | 62 | 64 | 10 | 14 | 84 |

**Serious issues in the last 6 months** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Serious issues in the last 6 months** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Once | 5 | 5 | **3** | **60** | 5 | 2 | 40 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Twice | 10 | 10 | 7 | 70 | 12.5 | 3 | 30 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Thrice | 12 | 12 | 7 | 58 | 12.5 | 5 | 42 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | More than thrice | 73 | 73 | 40 | 55 | 70 | 31 | 42 | 76 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Serious issues in the last 6 months** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Serious issues in the last 6 months** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Once | 5 | 5 | **3** | **60** | 6 | 2 | 40 | 4 |
| 2 | Twice | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 19 | 5 | 50 | 10 |
| 3 | Thrice | 12 | 12 | 8 | 67 | 16 | 4 | 33 | 8 |
| 4 | More than thrice | 73 | 73 | 38 | 52 | 75 | 35 | 48 | 71 |

**Serious issues in the last 6 months** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Serious issues in the last 6 months** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Once | 5 | 5 | **3** | **60** | 12 | 2 | 40 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Twice | 10 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 23 | 4 | 40 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Thrice | 12 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | More than thrice | 73 | 73 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 32 | 75 | 23 | 32 | 92 | 18 | 25 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Code review methods**

**- Code review methods** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Code review methods** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Self | 16 | 12 | **1** | **6** | 20 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 81 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 8 |
| 2 | Peer | 13 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 20 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 77 | 14 | 1 | 8 | 8 |
| 3 | Lead | 97 | 78 | 5 | 5 | 100 | 10 | 10 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 68 | 71 | 97 | 11 | 11 | 92 |
| 4 | Architect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Code review methods** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Code review methods** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Self | 16 | 12 | **11** | **69** | 19 | 4 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Peer | 13 | 10 | 10 | 77 | 21 | 2 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Lead | 97 | 78 | 54 | 56 | 98 | 41 | 42 | 100 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Architect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Code review methods** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Code review methods** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Self | 16 | 82 | **8** | **50** | 16 | 8 | 50 | 14 |
| 2 | Peer | 13 | 83 | 6 | 46 | 12 | 7 | 54 | 14 |
| 3 | Lead | 97 | 86 | 51 | 53 | 100 | 46 | 47 | 94 |
| 4 | Architect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Code review methods** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Code review methods** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Self | 16 | 12 | **8** | **50** | 31 | 6 | 38 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Peer | 13 | 10 | 8 | 62 | 31 | 3 | 23 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Lead | 97 | 78 | 25 | 26 | 96 | 29 | 30 | 94 | 25 | 26 | 100 | 18 | 18 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Architect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Capability of workforce in working in new technology**

**- Capability of workforce in working in new technology**

Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Capability of workforce in working in new technology** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Definitely would | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 87 | 19 | 2 | 13 | 17 |
| 2 | Probably would | 85 | 85 | 5 | 6 | 100 | 10 | 12 | 100 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 57 | 67 | 81 | 10 | 12 | 83 |
| 3 | Probably would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Definitely would not | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Capability of workforce in working in new technology** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Capability of workforce in working in new technology** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Definitely would | 15 | 15 | **10** | **67** | 18 | 5 | 33 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Probably would | 85 | 85 | 47 | 55 | 82 | 36 | 42 | 88 | 2 | 24 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Probably would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Definitely would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Capability of workforce in working in new technology** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Capability of workforce in working in new technology** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Definitely would | 15 | 15 | **8** | **53** | 16 | 7 | 47 | 14 |
| 2 | Probably would | 85 | 85 | 43 | 51 | 84 | 42 | 49 | 86 |
| 3 | Probably would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Definitely would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Capability of workforce in working in new technology** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Capability of workforce in working in new technology** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Definitely would | 15 | 15 | **8** | **53** | 31 | 6 | 40 | 19 | 1 | 67 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Probably would | 85 | 85 | 18 | 21 | 69 | 25 | 29 | 81 | 24 | 28 | 96 | 18 | 21 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Probably would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Definitely would not | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Positives of prototype development process**

**- Positives of prototype development process**

Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of prototype development process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Approach for development | 80 | 31 | **5** | **6** |  | 9 | 11 |  | 3 | 4 |  | 51 | 64 |  | 12 | 15 |  |
| 2 | The way in which selecting members for the development team | 94 | 35 | 5 | 5 |  | 10 | 11 |  | 3 | 3 |  | 66 | 70 |  | 10 | 11 |  |
| 3 | Availability of subject matter experts | 88 | 34 | 5 | 6 |  | 10 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 58 |  |  | 12 |  |  |

**Positives of prototype development process** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of prototype development process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Approach for development | 80 | 31 | **40** | **50** |  | 38 | 48 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 2 | The way in which selecting members for the development team | 94 | 35 | 50 | 53 |  | 41 | 44 |  | 2 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 3 | Availability of subject matter experts | 88 | 34 | 44 | 50 |  | 41 | 47 |  | 2 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |

**Positives of prototype development process** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of prototype development process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Approach for development | 80 | 31 | **43** | **54** |  | 37 | 46 |  |
| 2 | The way in which selecting members for the development team | 94 | 35 | 45 | 48 |  | 49 | 52 |  |
| 3 | Availability of subject matter experts | 88 | 34 | 44 | 50 |  | 44 | 50 |  |

**Positives of prototype development process** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of prototype development process** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Approach for development | 80 | 31 | **12** | **15** |  | 28 | 35 |  | 22 | 28 |  | 18 | 22 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | The way in which selecting members for the development team | 94 | 35 | 21 | 22 |  | 30 | 32 |  | 25 | 27 |  | 18 | 19 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Availability of subject matter experts | 88 | 34 | 20 | 23 |  | 26 | 30 |  | 24 | 27 |  | 18 | 20 |  |  |  |  |

**1) Assigning the task of unit testing**

**- Assigning the task of unit testing**

Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Assigning the task of unit testing** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Developer along with the development | 90 | 90 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 10 | 11 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 61 | 68 | 87 | 11 | 12 | 92 |
| 2 | Assigning to a separate team member | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 90 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 8 |

**Assigning the task of unit testing** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Assigning the task of unit testing** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Developer along with the development | 90 | 90 | **50** | **56** | 88 | 38 | 42 | 93 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Assigning to a separate team member | 10 | 10 | 7 | 70 | 12 | 3 | 30 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Assigning the task of unit testing** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Assigning the task of unit testing** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Developer along with the development | 90 | 90 | **48** | **53** | 94 | 42 | 47 | 86 |
| 2 | Assigning to a separate team member | 10 | 10 | 3 | 30 | 6 | 7 | 70 | 14 |

**Assigning the task of unit testing** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Assigning the task of unit testing** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Developer along with the development | 90 | 90 | **21** | **23** | 81 | 27 | 30 | 87 | 24 | 27 | 96 | 18 | 20 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Assigning to a separate team member | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 19 | 4 | 40 | 13 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Process of requirement gathering for testers**

**- Process of requirement gathering for testers** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Process of requirement gathering for testers** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Developer | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 84 | 37 | 3 | 10 | 25 |
| 2 | Self-learning from design and requirement documents | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 100 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Business Analysts and Developers | 59 | 59 | 5 | 8 | 100 | 8 | 14 | 80 | 3 | 5 | 100 | 34 | 58 | 49 | 9 | 15 | 75 |

**Process of requirement gathering for testers** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Process of requirement gathering for testers** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Developer | 31 | 31 | **22** | **71** | 54 | 9 | 29 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Self-learning from design and requirement documents | 10 | 10 | 8 | 80 | 14 | 2 | 20 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Business Analysts and Developers | 59 | 59 | 27 | 48 | 47 | 30 | 51 | 74 | 2 | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Process of requirement gathering for testers** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Process of requirement gathering for testers** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Developer | 31 | 31 | **15** | **48** | 29 | 16 | 52 | 33 |
| 2 | Self-learning from design and requirement documents | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 10 |
| 3 | Business Analysts and Developers | 59 | 59 | 31 | 53 | 61 | 28 | 47 | 57 |

**Process of requirement gathering for testers** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Process of requirement gathering for testers** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Developer | 31 | 31 | **13** | **42** | 50 | 12 | 39 | 39 | 6 | 19 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Self-learning from design and requirement documents | 10 | 10 | 5 | 50 | 19 | 3 | 30 | 10 | 2 | 20 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Business Analysts and Developers | 59 | 59 | 8 | 14 | 31 | 16 | 27 | 52 | 17 | 29 | 68 | 18 | 31 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies**

**- Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 100 | 11 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Somewhat Agree | 80 | 80 | 5 | 6 | 100 | 9 | 11 | 90 | 3 | 4 | 100 | 54 | 68 | 77 | 9 | 11 | 75 |
| 3 | Neither Agree nor disagree | 12 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 67 | 11 | 3 | 25 | 25 |
| 4 | Somewhat disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 8 | 8 | **6** | **75** | 11 | 2 | 25 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Somewhat Agree | 80 | 80 | 42 | 53 | 74 | 36 | 45 | 88 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Neither Agree nor disagree | 12 | 12 | 7 | 58 | 12 | 3 | 25 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Somewhat disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 8 | 8 | **4** | **50** | 8 | 4 | 50 | 8 |
| 2 | Somewhat Agree | 80 | 80 | 45 | 56 | 88 | 35 | 44 | 71 |
| 3 | Neither Agree nor disagree | 12 | 12 | 2 | 17 | 4 | 10 | 83 | 20 |
| 4 | Somewhat disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Effectiveness of assigning testing to external companies** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Strongly Agree | 8 | 8 | **4** | **50** | 15 | 4 | 50 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Somewhat Agree | 80 | 80 | 18 | 23 | 69 | 21 | 26 | 68 | 23 | 29 | 92 | 18 | 23 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Neither Agree nor disagree | 12 | 12 | 4 | 33 | 15 | 6 | 50 | 19 | 2 | 27 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Somewhat disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**1) Positives of overall testing process in your company**

**- Positives of overall testing process in your company** Vs **Designation (1)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of overall testing process in your company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Senior Manager (5)** | | | **Technical Manager**  **(10)** | | | **Non-Technical Manager (3)** | | | **Technical staff**  **(70)** | | | **Non-technical staff(12)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Enough allocation of time for testing | 86 | 86 | **5** | **6** | 100 | 10 | 12 | 100 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 57 | 66 | 81 | 11 | 13 | 92 |
| 2 | Detailed review for Unit testing, SIT and UAT results | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 91 | 14 | 1 | 9 | 8 |
| 3 | Testing is done by other company | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Very active user base to check detailed user acceptance | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Positives of overall testing process in your company** Vs **Age (2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of overall testing process in your company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 30 years(57)** | | | **30 – 39 years(41)** | | | **40 – 49 years(2)** | | | **Above 49 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Enough allocation of time for testing | 86 | 86 | **47** | **55** | 82 | 37 | 43 | 90 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Detailed review for Unit testing, SIT and UAT results | 11 | 11 | 7 | 64 | 12 | 4 | 36 | 88 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Testing is done by other company | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Very active user base to check detailed user acceptance | 3 | 3 | 3 | 100 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Positives of overall testing process in your company** Vs **Gender (3)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of overall testing process in your company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Male (51)** | | | **Female(49)** | | |
| **#** | **%** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **%** |
| 1 | Enough allocation of time for testing | 86 | 86 | **46** | **53** | 90 | 40 | 47 | 82 |
| 2 | Detailed review for Unit testing, SIT and UAT results | 11 | 11 | 4 | 36 | 8 | 7 | 64 | 14 |
| 3 | Testing is done by other company | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Very active user base to check detailed user acceptance | 3 | 3 | 1 | 33 | 2 | 2 | 67 | 4 |

**Positives of overall testing process in your company** Vs **Total industry experience (4)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Si. No.** | **Positives of overall testing process in your company** | **Total Respondents** | **Total Percentage** | **Below 2 years(26)** | | | **3 – 5 years(31)** | | | **5 – 10 years(25)** | | | **10 – 20 years(18)** | | | **Above 20 years(0)** | | |
| **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  | **#** | **%** |  |
| 1 | Enough allocation of time for testing | 86 | 86 | **21** | **24** | 81 | 24 | 28 | 77 | 23 | 27 | 92 | 18 | 21 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | Detailed review for Unit testing, SIT and UAT results | 11 | 11 | 5 | 46 | 19 | 4 | 36 | 13 | 2 | 18 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | Testing is done by other company | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | Very active user base to check detailed user acceptance | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 100 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |