

CHAPTER 6
AMALGAMATING BANK EMPLOYEES' VIEWS AND EXPERIENCE
ACROSS THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

This chapter presents the sub-part of the second objective which deals with amalgamating bank employees. The chapter is sub-divided into two parts. Analysis is based on the responses of the employees of amalgamating banks. The first part (Section 6.1) presents the amalgamating bank employees' views and experience across the demographic variables. The second part (Section 6.2) provides a summary of the chapter.

6.1 Study of Amalgamating Bank Employees' Views and Experience across the Demographic Variables

This section presents the views and experience of amalgamating bank employees across the demographic variables namely – gender, age, marital status, designation, educational qualification and experience. Independent sample t test and ANOVA has been used to see whether or not there are any differences in the views and experience on merger among amalgamating bank employees demographic variables. The Independent Samples t test is a statistical method that examines the means of two samples in order to ascertain whether there is a significant difference between the population means, whereas one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a tool employed to assess the means of more than two samples.

6.1.1 Communication and Awareness on Merger

The dimension consists of 6 items. Independent sample t test and ANOVA were employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the demographic variables. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.1(a) Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	95	4.51	.003
	Female	67	3.81	

From Table 6.1(a), as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across gender with respect to mean communication and awareness dimension. It was observed that the communication and awareness was higher in case of male employees.

Table 6.1(b) Communication and awareness items among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Communication and Awareness	Gender	Mean	p value
Clarity about objective	Male	4.16	.000
	Female	3.07	
Information has been communicated properly	Male	4.20	.068
	Female	3.69	
Clear direction throughout merger process	Male	4.21	.154
	Female	3.78	
Timely information communicated throughout the merger process	Male	4.15	.024
	Female	3.52	
Awareness about Banks identity	Male	5.57	.001
	Female	4.51	
Banks Interaction	Male	4.79	.108
	Female	4.31	

With regard to individual items, significant differences exists for all half of the items as shown in Table 6.1(b). Male employees were clearer about the objectives, feel timely information was communicated throughout the merger process and were more aware about banks identity as compared to female employees.

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.2 Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	123	4.30	.230
	Unmarried	39	3.97	

With regard to marital status (refer Table 6.2), we observed that married employees were perceived to be well communicated and aware about merger. However, the t test concludes that we cannot reject the null hypothesis. Hence the mean communication and awareness dimension scores don't differ significantly across marital status of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.3 Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	60	3.95	.072
	Officer	102	4.38	

With regard to designation (refer Table 6.3), we observed that clerical level employees were perceived to be well communicated and aware about merger compared to officers. However, the t test concludes that we cannot reject the null hypothesis. Hence the mean communication and awareness dimension scores don't differ significantly across designation of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.4 Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	98	4.22	.996
	Above 35 years	64	4.29	

From Table 6.4, we observed that employees above 35 years were perceived to be well communicated and aware about merger than employees' upto 35 years. However, it has been found that we do not have enough evidence to reject null hypothesis from t test results. The communication and awareness dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across age group of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.5 Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across educational qualification

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	76	4.05	.161
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	86	4.38	

From Table 6.5, we observed that postgraduate/professional degree holders were perceived to be well communicated and aware about merger compared to graduates. However, as significance value is more than 0.05, we cannot reject null hypothesis. Thus, the communication and awareness dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Communication and awareness does not differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.6 Communication and awareness dimension among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Length of experience	Upto 5 Years	45	3.94	.202
	6-8 Years	56	4.49	
	9-14 Years	51	4.09	
	Above 14 years	10	4.63	

From the mean values, we observed that employees with more than 14 years of experience were perceived to be well communicated and aware about merger compared employees of other groups. The ANOVA results as shown in Table 6.6, implies that as significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. It can be inferred that significant differences was not perceived among amalgamating bank employees with respect to communication and awareness dimension across length of experience.

Table 6.7 Summary table – Communication and awareness on merger among amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic variable	Result
Gender	Difference exists
Marital status	No difference
Designation	No difference
Age	No difference
Educational qualification	No difference
Length of experience	No difference

6.1.2 General view on Merger

The dimension consists of 6 items. Independent sample t test and ANOVA were employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the demographic variables. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = General view on merger does not differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = General view on merger differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.8 General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across gender

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	95	3.31	.486
	Female	67	3.13	

From Table 6.8, we observed that males had viewed merger relatively more positively compared to their female counterparts. However, as significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus, the general view on merger dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across gender of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = General view on merger does not differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = General view on merger differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.9 General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	123	3.22	.874
	Unmarried	39	3.28	

From the mean values, we observed that unmarried employees had viewed merger relatively more positively compared to married employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 6.9 revealed that significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the general view on merger dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across marital status of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = General view on merger does not differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = General view on merger differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.10(a) General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	60	2.74	.003
	Officer	102	3.53	

From Table 6.10(a), as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across designation of amalgamating bank employees with respect to general view on merger dimension. It was observed that the officer level employees were more positive about their view on merger compared to clerical level employees.

Table 6.10(b) General view on merger items among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Items	Designation	Mean	p value
Beneficial for economic growth	Clerical	2.80	.003
	Officer	3.66	
Financial Condition	Clerical	3.62	.574
	Officer	3.78	
Global presence	Clerical	3.27	.003
	Officer	4.30	
Beneficial for Organization and employees	Clerical	2.50	.003
	Officer	3.41	
Positive change in service quality	Clerical	2.42	.048
	Officer	3.01	
Favour merger	Clerical	1.85	.000
	Officer	3.00	

With respect to individual items of the dimension (Table 6.10(b)), the test results revealed that there exists significant differences in their view about merger being beneficial for economic growth, creating global presence, beneficial for employees & organization, bringing positive change in service quality and on favouring merger (as $p < 0.05$). For all the stated items, the mean values of officer level were higher. It implies that the officer level employees had comparatively more positive view about the merger in comparison to the clerical level employees.

H₀ = General view on merger does not differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

H₁ = General view on merger differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.11(a) General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across age group

General View on merger		N	Mean	p value
Age	Upto 35 years	98	3.50	.011
	Above 35 years	64	2.83	

From Table 6.11(a), the t test results reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across age group of amalgamating bank employees with respect to general view on merger dimension. It was observed that the employees belonging to the age group Upto 35 years were more positive about their view on merger as compared to employees above 35 years age.

Table 6.11(b) General view on merger items among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Items	Age group	Mean	p value
Beneficial for economic growth	Upto 35 years	3.59	0.032
	Above 35 years	2.95	
Financial Condition	Upto 35 years	3.76	0.768
	Above 35 years	3.67	
Global presence	Upto 35 years	4.19	0.042
	Above 35 years	3.50	
Beneficial for organization and employees	Upto 35 years	3.45	0.003
	Above 35 years	2.50	
Positive change in service quality	Upto 35 years	3.04	0.036
	Above 35 years	2.41	
Favour merger	Upto 35 years	2.97	0.001
	Above 35 years	1.97	

With respect to individual items of the dimension, the test results revealed that for majority of items the p value is less than 0.05. There exists significant differences in their view on merger with respect to the items namely - beneficial for economic growth, creating global presence, beneficial for employees & organization, bringing positive change in service quality and on favouring merger. Further from the mean values it was

observed that employees' upto 35 years had comparatively more positive view about the merger in comparison to the above 35 years employees.

H_0 = General view on merger does not differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = General view on merger differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.12 General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across educational qualification

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	76	3.09	.293
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	86	3.37	

From Table 6.12, we observed that the postgraduates/professional degree holders were more positive about their view on merger compared to graduate employees. However, the p value is more than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The general view on merger do not differ significantly across educational qualification among amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = General view on merger does not differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = General view on merger differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.13(a) General view on merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of experience	Upto 5 Years	45	3.13	.000
	6-8 Years	56	4.01	
	9-14 Years	51	2.65	
	Above 14 years	10	2.32	

From Table 6.13(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per ANOVA, we reject the null hypothesis. The general view on merger differs significantly across length of experience among amalgamating bank employees. Further, the post-hoc

analysis as per Games-Howell [refer Annexure C(i)] revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the group with experience 6-8 years and 9-14 years as well as between 6-8 years and above 14 years' experience. It has also been observed that the employees having experience of 6-8 years had more positive view regarding the merger as compared to others.

Table 6.13(b) General view on merger items among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Items	Length of experience	Mean	p value
Beneficial for economic growth	Upto 5 Years	3.27	0.001
	6-8 Years	4.07	
	9-14 Years	2.80	
	Above 14 years	2.30	
Financial Condition	Upto 5 Years	3.53	0.027
	6-8 Years	4.29	
	9-14 Years	3.29	
	Above 14 years	3.60	
Global presence	Upto 5 Years	3.87	0.010
	6-8 Years	4.52	
	9-14 Years	3.61	
	Above 14 years	2.40	
Beneficial for Organization and employees	Upto 5 Years	2.89	0.000
	6-8 Years	3.93	
	9-14 Years	2.55	
	Above 14 years	1.80	
Positive change in service quality	Upto 5 Years	2.69	0.000
	6-8 Years	3.80	
	9-14 Years	1.92	
	Above 14 years	2.00	
Favour merger	Upto 5 Years	2.56	0.000
	6-8 Years	3.48	
	9-14 Years	1.75	
	Above 14 years	1.80	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension was done. It has been found that significant difference exists with regard to all the items across length of experience among amalgamating bank employees. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure C(ii)] revealed significant differences majorly between 6-8 years and 9-14 years as well as between 6-8 years and above 14 years' experience holders. Among all the employees, 6-8 years' experience holders viewed mergers more positively in terms of economic growth,

financial condition, global presence, beneficial for organization & employees, service quality and on favouring merger.

Table 6.14 Summary table – General view on merger among amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic variable	Result
Gender	No difference
Marital status	No difference
Designation	Difference exists
Age	Difference exists
Educational qualification	No difference
Length of experience	Difference exists

6.1.3 Benefits Pertaining to Merger

The dimension consists of 13 items. Independent sample t test and ANOVA were employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the demographic variables. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.15 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	95	2.59	.536
	Female	67	2.48	

From Table 6.15, it was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by male employees compared to female employees. However, as significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus, the benefits pertaining to merger dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across gender of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.16 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	123	2.57	.553
	Unmarried	39	2.44	

From the mean values, we observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by married employees as compared to unmarried employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 6.16 revealed that the significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the benefits pertaining to merger dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across marital status of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.17(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	60	2.25	.008
	Officer	102	2.72	

From Table 6.17(a), as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across designation with respect to mean benefits pertaining to merger dimension. It was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by officer level employees.

Table 6.17(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Items	Designation	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Clerical	2.32	.248
	Officer	2.61	
Learn new things	Clerical	2.73	.000
	Officer	3.93	
Training and development	Clerical	2.28	.002
	Officer	3.11	
Fringe benefits and perks	Clerical	2.22	.002
	Officer	3.14	
Work load decreased	Clerical	1.75	.747
	Officer	1.69	
Work hours decreased	Clerical	1.68	.486
	Officer	1.55	
Work culture improved	Clerical	2.02	.366
	Officer	2.22	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Clerical	3.07	.776
	Officer	2.97	
Better policies	Clerical	2.12	.000
	Officer	3.21	
Power/Autonomy increased	Clerical	1.97	.014
	Officer	2.59	
Better chance in career growth	Clerical	2.57	.324
	Officer	2.83	
Employee Development	Clerical	2.25	.029
	Officer	2.77	

After studying the individual items of the dimension it was found that significant difference exists for learning new things, training & development, fringe benefits & perks, better policies, increase in power/autonomy and employee development. Further, observing the mean values it has been inferred that the benefits corresponding to these items were higher for official level employees compared to clerical level employees. No difference was perceived in case of improved working condition, decrease in work load, reduction in work hours, improved work culture, belongingness with co-workers and better chance in career growth.

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.18(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Age	Upto 35 years	98	2.69	.033
	Above 35 years	64	2.31	

From Table 6.18(a), the t test results reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across age group of amalgamating bank employees with respect to mean benefits pertaining to merger dimension. It was observed that the employees belonging to the age group upto 35 years perceived merger more beneficial to them as compared to the employees above 35 years age.

Table 6.18(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Items	Age	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Upto 35 years	2.67	0.073
	Above 35 years	2.23	
Learn new things	Upto 35 years	3.68	0.113
	Above 35 years	3.19	
Training and development	Upto 35 years	3.05	0.016
	Above 35 years	2.42	
Fringe benefits and perks	Upto 35 years	3.05	0.032
	Above 35 years	2.41	
Work load decreased	Upto 35 years	1.73	0.739
	Above 35 years	1.67	
Work hours decreased	Upto 35 years	1.54	0.412
	Above 35 years	1.69	
Work culture improved	Upto 35 years	2.23	0.294
	Above 35 years	2.00	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Upto 35 years	3.05	0.743
	Above 35 years	2.94	
Better policies	Upto 35 years	3.05	0.016
	Above 35 years	2.42	
Power/Autonomy increased	Upto 35 years	2.62	0.007
	Above 35 years	1.95	
Better chance in career growth	Upto 35 years	2.86	0.248
	Above 35 years	2.55	
Employee Development	Upto 35 years	2.78	0.039
	Above 35 years	2.28	

After studying the individual items of the dimension, it was found that significant difference exists related to benefits in terms of training & development, fringe benefits & perks, better policies, increase in power/autonomy and employee development. Further, observing the mean values it has been concluded that the employees belonging to the age group upto 35 years experienced merger to be more beneficial compared to employees above 35 years. No difference was perceived in the case of improved working condition, learning new things, decreased work load, decreased work hours, improved work culture, improved belongingness with co-workers and better chance in career growth.

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.19 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across educational qualification

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	76	2.46	.376
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	86	2.62	

From Table 6.19, we observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by postgraduates/professional degree holders as compared to graduate employees. However, as the significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. Thus, the benefits pertaining to merger dimension mean scores do not differ significantly across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Perceived benefits of merger does not differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.20(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of experience	Upto 5 Years	45	2.51	.005
	6-8 Years	56	2.89	
	9-14 Years	51	2.36	
	Above 14 years	10	1.69	

From Table 6.20(a), it can be seen that the p value is less than 0.05 and therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. The benefits pertaining to merger differ significantly across length of experience among amalgamating bank employees. Further, the post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure D(i)] revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the group with experience 6-8 years and 9-14 years as well as between 6-8 years and above 14 years' experience. It was also observed that the employees having experience of 6-8 years had viewed merger as more beneficial for employees compared to others.

Table 6.20(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Items	Length of experience	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Upto 5 Years	2.67	0.002
	6-8 Years	2.98	
	9-14 Years	1.94	
	Above 14 years	1.90	
Learn new things	Upto 5 Years	3.40	0.004
	6-8 Years	4.14	
	9-14 Years	3.10	
	Above 14 years	2.20	
Training and development	Upto 5 Years	2.56	0.008
	6-8 Years	3.34	
	9-14 Years	2.65	
	Above 14 years	1.70	
Fringe benefits and perks	Upto 5 Years	2.69	0.316
	6-8 Years	2.95	
	9-14 Years	2.92	
	Above 14 years	1.80	
Work load decreased	Upto 5 Years	2.04	0.152
	6-8 Years	1.63	
	9-14 Years	1.55	
	Above 14 years	1.50	
Work hours decreased	Upto 5 Years	1.69	0.795

	6-8 Years	1.61	
	9-14 Years	1.57	
	Above 14 years	1.30	
Work culture improved	Upto 5 Years	1.96	0.026
	6-8 Years	2.48	
	9-14 Years	2.12	
	Above 14 years	1.20	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Upto 5 Years	2.71	0.061
	6-8 Years	3.48	
	9-14 Years	2.98	
	Above 14 years	1.80	
Better policies	Upto 5 Years	2.67	0.086
	6-8 Years	3.07	
	9-14 Years	2.84	
	Above 14 years	1.70	
Power/Autonomy increased	Upto 5 Years	2.87	0.013
	6-8 Years	2.45	
	9-14 Years	1.96	
	Above 14 years	1.60	
Better chance in career growth	Upto 5 Years	2.60	0.005
	6-8 Years	3.32	
	9-14 Years	2.39	
	Above 14 years	1.80	
Employee Development	Upto 5 Years	2.27	0.001
	6-8 Years	3.20	
	9-14 Years	2.33	
	Above 14 years	1.80	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension were done. It has been found that significant difference exists with regard to all the items across length of experience among amalgamating bank employees. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure D(ii)] revealed significant differences between the groups. Among all the employees, 6-8 years' experience holders viewed mergers to be more beneficial to employees in terms of working condition, learning new things, training and development, improved work culture, increased power/autonomy, career growth and employee development compared to other groups.

Table 6.21 Summary table – Benefits pertaining to merger among amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic variable	Result
Gender	No difference
Marital status	No difference
Designation	Difference exists
Age	Difference exists
Educational qualification	No difference
Length of experience	Difference exists

6.1.4 Stress Pertaining to Merger

The dimension consists of 19 items. Independent sample t test and ANOVA were employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the demographic variables. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.22 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	95	3.69	.205
	Female	67	3.45	

From Table 6.22, we observed that the female employees were more stressed due to merger compared to their male counterparts. However, the p value is more than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The stress pertaining to merger do not differ significantly across gender among amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.23 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	123	3.58	.854
	Unmarried	39	3.62	

From the mean values, it was observed that the unmarried employees were more stressed due to merger compared to married employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 6.23, revealed that the significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the mean scores of the stress pertaining to merger dimension do not differ significantly across marital status of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.24(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	60	3.18	.042
	Officer	102	3.71	

From Table 6.24(a), the t test results reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across designation of amalgamating bank employees with respect to mean stress pertaining to merger. It was observed that the officer level employees were more stressed due to merger compared to clerical level employees.

Table 6.24(b) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Items	Designation	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Clerical	3.80	.986
	Officer	3.79	
Feeling of helplessness	Clerical	3.68	.685
	Officer	3.57	
Cultural mismatch	Clerical	4.58	.413
	Officer	4.32	
Transfer to other place	Clerical	3.77	.004
	Officer	4.78	
Transfer to other department	Clerical	2.80	.008
	Officer	3.66	
Change in status	Clerical	3.67	.452
	Officer	3.92	
Loss of power	Clerical	3.15	.694
	Officer	3.02	
Loss of commitment	Clerical	3.05	.817
	Officer	3.13	
Job responsibility	Clerical	2.65	.369
	Officer	2.95	
Work load increased	Clerical	4.35	.102
	Officer	4.92	
Increase in working hours	Clerical	3.58	.002
	Officer	4.69	
Fringe benefits reduced	Clerical	2.83	.574
	Officer	3.02	
Interference with family life	Clerical	3.32	.006
	Officer	4.22	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Clerical	3.68	.618
	Officer	3.84	
Conflicts among employees	Clerical	3.22	.697
	Officer	3.35	
Feeling left out	Clerical	3.38	.778
	Officer	3.48	
Interrupted career growth	Clerical	2.82	.481
	Officer	3.03	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Clerical	2.92	.259
	Officer	3.26	
Stressed about staff changes	Clerical	2.97	.047
	Officer	3.62	

With respect to the individual items of the dimension, t test revealed that there exists significant difference in the stress associated with transfer to other place of work, transfer to other department, increase in working hours, job interference with family life, and staff changes ($p < 0.05$). Further, it has been observed from the mean values that officer level employees were more stressed compared to clerical level employees.

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.25(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	98	3.44	.041
	Above 35 years	64	3.82	

From Table 6.25(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The stress pertaining to merger differ significantly across age groups of amalgamating bank employees. As per mean values, employees above 35 years of age were more stressed than employees' upto 35 years of age.

Table 6.25(b) Stress pertaining to merger items among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Items	Age group	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Upto 35 years	3.51	0.024
	Above 35 years	4.27	
Feeling of helplessness	Upto 35 years	3.53	0.382
	Above 35 years	3.78	
Cultural mismatch	Upto 35 years	4.05	0.002
	Above 35 years	5.02	
Transfer to other place	Upto 35 years	4.24	0.116
	Above 35 years	4.77	
Transfer to other department	Upto 35 years	3.53	0.275
	Above 35 years	3.17	
Change in status	Upto 35 years	3.50	0.012
	Above 35 years	4.34	
Loss of power	Upto 35 years	2.72	0.003

	Above 35 years	3.66	
Loss of commitment	Upto 35 years	2.86	0.048
	Above 35 years	3.67	
Job responsibility	Upto 35 years	2.91	0.635
	Above 35 years	2.75	
Work load increased	Upto 35 years	4.95	0.078
	Above 35 years	4.34	
Increase in working hours	Upto 35 years	4.34	0.678
	Above 35 years	4.19	
Fringe benefits reduced	Upto 35 years	3.00	0.889
	Above 35 years	2.95	
Interference with family life	Upto 35 years	4.03	0.326
	Above 35 years	3.72	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Upto 35 years	3.97	0.249
	Above 35 years	3.59	
Conflicts among employees	Upto 35 years	2.80	0.000
	Above 35 years	4.17	
Feeling left out	Upto 35 years	2.96	0.000
	Above 35 years	4.27	
Interrupted career growth	Upto 35 years	2.67	0.014
	Above 35 years	3.42	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Upto 35 years	3.06	0.360
	Above 35 years	3.34	
Stressed about staff changes	Upto 35 years	3.38	0.812
	Above 35 years	3.45	

The independent sample t test results with respect to the individual items revealed that there exists significant difference in the stress after merger relating to feeling of identity loss, cultural mismatch, change in status, loss of power, loss of commitment, conflicts among employees, feeling of being left out and interrupted career growth ($p < 0.05$). Further, it has been observed from the mean values that for the above mentioned items employees belonging to age group above 35 years were more stressed compared to employees upto 35 years age.

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.26 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across educational qualification

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	76	3.59	.890
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	86	3.61	

As per mean values, it was observed that the employees holding postgraduate/professional degree were more stressed due to merger compared to graduates. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 6.26, revealed that significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the mean stress pertaining to merger dimension do not differ significantly across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Stress pertaining to merger does not differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.27(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of experience	Upto 5 Years	45	3.61	.000
	6-8 Years	56	3.11	
	9-14 Years	51	4.03	
	Above 14 years	10	3.96	

From Table 6.27(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per ANOVA, we reject the null hypothesis. The stress pertaining to merger differ significantly across length of experience among amalgamating bank employees. Further, the post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure E(i)] revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the group with experience 6-8 years and 9-14 years as well as between 6-8 years and above 14 years' experience. It was also observed that the employees having experience of 9-14 years were most stressed due to merger as compared to others.

Table 6.27(b) Stress pertaining to merger items among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Items	Length of experience	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Upto 5 Years	3.62	0.280
	6-8 Years	3.52	
	9-14 Years	4.18	
	Above 14 years	4.40	
Feeling of helplessness	Upto 5 Years	3.73	0.066
	6-8 Years	3.14	
	9-14 Years	4.02	
	Above 14 years	3.90	
Cultural mismatch	Upto 5 Years	4.47	0.041
	6-8 Years	3.91	
	9-14 Years	4.78	
	Above 14 years	5.40	
Transfer to other place	Upto 5 Years	4.38	0.037
	6-8 Years	3.98	
	9-14 Years	4.76	
	Above 14 years	5.80	
Transfer to other department	Upto 5 Years	3.49	0.983
	6-8 Years	3.36	
	9-14 Years	3.33	
	Above 14 years	3.40	
Change in status	Upto 5 Years	3.80	0.000
	6-8 Years	3.05	
	9-14 Years	4.33	
	Above 14 years	5.80	
Loss of power	Upto 5 Years	3.04	0.000
	6-8 Years	2.36	
	9-14 Years	3.59	
	Above 14 years	4.90	
Loss of commitment	Upto 5 Years	2.98	0.000
	6-8 Years	2.21	
	9-14 Years	3.90	
	Above 14 years	4.50	
Job responsibility	Upto 5 Years	3.18	0.059
	6-8 Years	2.29	
	9-14 Years	3.22	
	Above 14 years	2.60	
Work load increased	Upto 5 Years	5.38	0.004
	6-8 Years	4.25	
	9-14 Years	4.92	
	Above 14 years	3.20	
Increase in working hours	Upto 5 Years	4.67	0.099

	6-8 Years	3.89	
	9-14 Years	4.57	
	Above 14 years	3.20	
Fringe benefits reduced	Upto 5 Years	3.51	0.137
	6-8 Years	2.71	
	9-14 Years	2.96	
	Above 14 years	2.20	
Interference with family life	Upto 5 Years	4.04	0.309
	6-8 Years	3.64	
	9-14 Years	4.22	
	Above 14 years	3.20	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Upto 5 Years	4.44	0.098
	6-8 Years	3.50	
	9-14 Years	3.71	
	Above 14 years	3.40	
Conflicts among employees	Upto 5 Years	3.27	0.000
	6-8 Years	2.23	
	9-14 Years	4.35	
	Above 14 years	4.70	
Feeling left out	Upto 5 Years	2.93	0.000
	6-8 Years	2.68	
	9-14 Years	4.43	
	Above 14 years	5.50	
Interrupted career growth	Upto 5 Years	3.04	0.040
	6-8 Years	2.54	
	9-14 Years	3.49	
	Above 14 years	2.40	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Upto 5 Years	2.96	0.054
	6-8 Years	2.79	
	9-14 Years	3.75	
	Above 14 years	3.40	
Stressed about staff changes	Upto 5 Years	3.16	0.032
	6-8 Years	3.02	
	9-14 Years	4.08	
	Above 14 years	3.30	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension were done. Significant differences exists with regard to cultural mismatch, transfer to other place, change in status, loss of power, loss of commitment, work load, conflicts among employees, left out feeling, interrupted career growth and staff changes. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure E(ii)] revealed significant differences between the groups. Employees with upto 5 years' experience were more stressed due to work load. Whereas, employees

having experience of 9-14 years were more stressed due to interruption in career growth and staff changes and above 14 years' experience holders were more stressed due to cultural mismatch, transfer to other place, change in status, loss of power, loss of commitment and left out feeling as compared to other group of employees.

Table 6.28 Summary table – Stress pertaining to merger among amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic variable	Result
Gender	No difference
Marital status	No difference
Designation	Difference exists
Age	Difference exists
Educational qualification	No difference
Length of experience	Difference exists

6.1.5 Job Satisfaction after Merger

The dimension consists of 12 items. Independent sample t test and ANOVA were employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the demographic variables. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across gender of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.29(a) Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	95	4.06	.033
	Female	67	3.71	

From Table 6.29(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The job satisfaction after merger differs significantly across gender among amalgamating bank employees. As per mean values, male employees were more satisfied than female employees.

Table 6.29(b) Job satisfaction after merger items among amalgamating bank employees across gender

Items	Gender	Mean	P value
Current Salary satisfaction	Male	2.89	.149
	Female	3.30	
Promotion incentives satisfaction	Male	4.18	.282
	Female	4.49	
Current workload	Male	2.79	.227
	Female	2.48	
Current degree of autonomy at work	Male	3.06	.047
	Female	2.61	
Current working condition	Male	3.43	.793
	Female	3.51	
Current relation with co-workers	Male	6.34	.001
	Female	5.58	
Current performance recognition	Male	4.54	.872
	Female	4.49	
Current participation in decision making	Male	4.23	.017
	Female	3.49	
Current conflict handling policy	Male	4.46	.038
	Female	3.84	
Current job interference with family life	Male	3.77	.048
	Female	3.16	
Currently happy working in bank	Male	4.40	.024
	Female	3.76	
This Bank will always be first choice	Male	4.62	.015
	Female	3.87	

With regard to the individual items of the dimension, t test revealed that there exists significant difference concerning job satisfaction after merger in autonomy at work, relation with co-workers, participation in decision making, conflict handling policy, job interference with family life, happy working in bank and bank always being first choice ($p < 0.05$). Further, it has been observed from the mean values that males were more satisfied than females for the above mentioned items.

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across marital status of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.30(a) Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	123	4.00	0.046
	Unmarried	39	3.65	

From Table 6.30(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The job satisfaction after merger differ significantly across marital status among amalgamating bank employees. As per mean values, married employees were more satisfied than unmarried employees.

Table 6.30(b) Job satisfaction after merger items among amalgamating bank employees across marital status

Items	Marital Status	Mean	P value
Current Salary satisfaction	Married	3.200	.041
	Unmarried	2.640	
Promotion incentives satisfaction	Married	4.540	.003
	Unmarried	3.560	
Current workload	Married	2.670	.932
	Unmarried	2.640	
Current degree of autonomy at work	Married	2.940	.336
	Unmarried	2.670	
Current working condition	Married	3.330	.114
	Unmarried	3.870	
Current relation with co-workers	Married	6.130	.122
	Unmarried	5.690	
Current performance recognition	Married	4.500	.832
	Unmarried	4.560	
Current participation in decision making	Married	4.160	.006
	Unmarried	3.180	
Current conflict handling policy	Married	4.380	.020
	Unmarried	3.640	
Current job interference with family life	Married	3.590	.476
	Unmarried	3.310	
Currently happy working in bank	Married	4.130	.939
	Unmarried	4.150	
This Bank will always be first choice	Married	4.430	.154
	Unmarried	3.920	

With regard to the individual items of the dimension, t test revealed that there exists significant difference concerning job satisfaction after merger in salary, promotion & incentives, participation in decision making and conflict handling policy ($p < 0.05$). Further, it has been observed from the mean values that the married employees were more satisfied than unmarried employees for the above mentioned items.

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across designation of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.31 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across designation

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	60	3.88	.548
	Officer	102	3.98	

As per mean values, officer level employees were more satisfied than clerical level employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 6.31, revealed that the significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the mean job satisfaction after merger do not differ significantly across designation of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across age of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.32 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across age group

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	98	3.98	.570
	Above 35 years	64	3.88	

As per mean values, employees' upto 35 years were more satisfied than employees above 35 years. However, from Table 6.32 we observed that the p value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred

that the mean job satisfaction after merger dimension do not differ significantly across age group of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.33 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across educational qualification

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	76	4.01	.172
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	86	3.81	

As per mean values, graduates were more satisfied than employees holding postgraduate/professional degree. However, as shown in Table 6.33, the significance value is more than 0.05. Hence, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. It can be inferred that the mean job satisfaction after merger dimension do not differ significantly across educational qualification of amalgamating bank employees.

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger does not differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

H_1 = Job satisfaction after merger differ across length of experience of amalgamating bank employees

Table 6.34 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among amalgamating bank employees across length of experience

Job satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of experience	Upto 5 Years	45	3.64	.062
	6-8 Years	56	3.99	
	9-14 Years	51	3.94	
	Above 14 years	10	4.58	

As per mean values, employees with above 14 years of experience were more satisfied than other groups of employees. However, the ANOVA results as shown in Table 6.34,

implies that as the significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. It can be inferred that there does not exist significant differences among amalgamating bank employees with respect to job satisfaction dimension across length of experience.

Table 6.35 Summary table – Job satisfaction after merger among amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic variable	Result
Gender	Difference exists
Marital status	Difference exists
Designation	No difference
Age	No difference
Educational qualification	No difference
Length of experience	No difference

6.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter deals with the sub-part of the second objective of the study related to amalgamating bank employees. The amalgamating bank employees' experience and perception has been checked across demographic variables namely - gender, marital status, designation, age, educational qualification and length of service. The analysis has been done separately for the five dimensions i.e., communication & awareness on merger, general view on merger, benefits pertaining to merger, stress pertaining to merger and job satisfaction. It was found that some variables had significant difference with respect to the above mentioned dimensions, whereas others didn't. The summary of the findings has been presented in Table 6.36. The detailed findings of the study are discussed in chapter 9 of this study.

Table 6.36 Overall summary of amalgamating bank employees across demographic variables

Demographic Variable	Gender	Marital Status	Designation	Age	Educational Qualification	Length of Experience
Communication & Awareness	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
General view	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Benefits pertaining to merger	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Stress pertaining to merger	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✓
Job satisfaction	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗