

**CHAPTER 7**  
**ANCHOR BANK EMPLOYEES' VIEWS AND EXPERIENCE ACROSS THE**  
**DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES**

This chapter presents the sub-part of the second objective which deals with anchor bank employees. The chapter is sub-divided into two parts. Analysis is based on the responses of the employees of anchor banks. The first part (Section 7.1) presents the anchor bank employees' views and experience across the demographic variables. The second part (Section 7.2) provides a summary of the chapter.

**7.1 Study of Anchor Bank Employees' Views and Experience across the Demographic Variables**

This section presents the views and experience of anchor bank employees across the demographic variables namely – gender, marital status, designation, age, 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 anchor bank employees' demographic variables.

**7.1.1 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 among anchor bank employees does not differ across gender

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across gender

**Table 7.1 Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across gender**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	99	5.13	.843
	Female	51	5.09	

From Table 7.1, as per mean scores, males were more aware and communicated about merger than their female counterparts. However, as the significance value is more than 0.05, we do not have enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there does not exist significant difference across gender with respect to mean communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees does not differ across marital status

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across marital status

**Table 7.2 Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across marital status**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	100	5.01	.132
	Unmarried	50	5.33	

As per mean scores, with regard to marital status, unmarried employees were more aware and communicated about merger than married employees (refer Table 7.2). However, as per t test we conclude that we cannot reject the null hypothesis. Hence the mean communication and awareness dimension scores don't differ significantly across marital status of anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees does not differ across designation

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across designation

**Table 7.3(a) Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across designation**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	46	4.70	<b>.010</b>
	Officer	104	<b>5.29</b>	

With regard to designation (refer Table 7.3(a)), the t test concludes that we reject the null hypothesis. Hence the mean communication and awareness dimension scores differ significantly across designation of anchor bank employees. As per mean

scores, officers were more aware and communicated about merger than clerical level employees.

**Table 7.3(b) Communication and awareness items among anchor bank employees across designation**

Communication and Awareness	Designation	Mean	p value
Clarity about objective	Clerical	3.70	<b>0.002</b>
	Officer	<b>4.65</b>	
Information has been communicated properly	Clerical	4.30	<b>0.003</b>
	Officer	<b>5.19</b>	
Clear direction throughout merger process	Clerical	4.46	<b>0.015</b>
	Officer	<b>5.12</b>	
Timely information communicated throughout the merger process	Clerical	4.89	0.179
	Officer	5.28	
Awareness about Banks identity	Clerical	5.74	0.348
	Officer	5.98	
Banks Interaction	Clerical	5.13	0.112
	Officer	5.55	

The t test results with regard to individual items of communication and awareness revealed that significant differences exist with respect to clarity about objective, proper information communication and clarity of direction during merger process. Further, the mean scores were higher for officers (refer Table 7.3(b)).

$H_0$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees does not differ across age

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across age

**Table 7.4 Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across age group**

Communication and Awareness	N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	87	5.13
	Above 35 years	63	
			5.09

As per mean scores, employees' upto 35 years of age were more aware and communicated about merger than employees above 35 years. However, from Table 7.4, 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 does not differ significantly across age group of anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees does not differ across educational qualification

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across educational qualification

**Table 7.5 Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across educational qualification**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	87	5.08	.738
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	63	5.16	

As per mean scores, postgraduate/professional degree holders were more aware and communicated about merger than graduate employees. However, from Table 7.5, 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 anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees does not differ across length of experience

$H_1$  = Communication and awareness among anchor bank employees differ across length of experience

**Table 7.6(a) Communication and awareness dimension among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Length of Experience	Upto 5 Years	44	5.07	<b>.049</b>
	6-8 Years	41	<b>5.33</b>	
	9-14 Years	44	5.28	
	Above 14 years	21	4.43	

The ANOVA results as shown in Table 7.6(a), implies that as significance value is less than 0.05, hence we reject the null hypothesis. It can be inferred that there exists significant differences among anchor bank employees with respect to

communication and awareness dimension across length of experience. The mean scores revealed that employees with experience of 6-8 years were more aware and communicated as compared to others [refer Annexure F(i)].

**Table 7.6(b) Communication and awareness items among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Communication and Awareness	Length of experience	Mean	p value
Clarity about objective	Upto 5 Years	<b>4.66</b>	<b>0.023</b>
	6-8 Years	4.39	
	9-14 Years	4.55	
	Above 14 years	3.29	
Information has been communicated properly	Upto 5 Years	4.93	<b>0.038</b>
	6-8 Years	<b>5.39</b>	
	9-14 Years	4.86	
	Above 14 years	4.1	
Clear direction throughout merger process	Upto 5 Years	4.57	0.05
	6-8 Years	5.2	
	9-14 Years	5.23	
	Above 14 years	4.43	
Timely information communicated throughout the merger process	Upto 5 Years	5.11	0.507
	6-8 Years	5.32	
	9-14 Years	5.27	
	Above 14 years	4.71	
Awareness about Banks identity	Upto 5 Years	5.75	<b>0.039</b>
	6-8 Years	6.15	
	9-14 Years	<b>6.18</b>	
	Above 14 years	5.19	
Banks Interaction	Upto 5 Years	5.41	0.271
	6-8 Years	5.51	
	9-14 Years	5.61	
	Above 14 years	4.86	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension were done. Significant differences exists with regard to clarity about objective, proper information communication and awareness about banks identity. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure F(ii)] revealed significant differences between the groups. Employees with upto 5 years' experience were more clear about the objective behind merger. Employees having experience of 6-8 years had highest mean value with respect to proper information communication. 9-14 years' experience holders were more aware about the changes in banks' identity.

**Table 7.7 Summary table – Communication and awareness on merger among anchor bank employees across demographic variables**

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

### 7.1.2 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 among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across gender

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across gender

**Table 7.8 General view on merger dimension among anchor bank employees across gender**

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	99	4.37	0.466
	Female	51	4.17	

It was observed that the male employees were more positive about their view on merger compared to female employees. However, from Table 7.8, 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 anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across marital status

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across marital status

**Table 7.9 General view on merger dimension among anchor bank employees across marital status**

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	100	4.24	.506
	Unmarried	50	4.44	

It was observed that the unmarried employees were more positive about their view on merger compared to married employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 7.9, 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 anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across designation

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across designation

**Table 7.10(a) General view on merger dimension among anchor bank employees across designation**

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	46	3.70	<b>.005</b>
	Officer	104	<b>4.57</b>	

From Table 7.10(a), as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across designation of anchor bank employees with respect to mean 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 7.10(b) General view on merger items among anchor bank employees across designation**

Items	Designation	Mean	p value
Beneficial for economic growth	Clerical	3.61	<b>0.010</b>
	Officer	<b>4.52</b>	
Financial Condition	Clerical	3.70	<b>0.000</b>
	Officer	<b>4.91</b>	
Global presence	Clerical	4.24	<b>0.027</b>
	Officer	<b>4.99</b>	
Beneficial for Organization and employees	Clerical	3.70	<b>0.003</b>
	Officer	<b>4.65</b>	
Positive change in service quality	Clerical	3.76	<b>0.030</b>
	Officer	<b>4.50</b>	
Favour merger	Clerical	3.20	0.086
	Officer	3.85	

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

$H_0$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across age

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across age

**Table 7.11 General view on merger dimension among anchor bank employees across age group**

General View on merger		N	Mean	p value
Age	Upto 35 years	87	4.30	.958
	Above 35 years	63	4.31	

As per mean values, we observed that both the groups of employees, i.e., upto 35 years and above 35 years, had almost same mean values regarding their view on merger. From Table 7.11, since p value is more than 0.05, we cannot reject the null



hypothesis. There doesn't exist significant difference across age group of anchor bank employees with respect to general view on merger dimension.

$H_0$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across educational qualification

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across educational qualification

**Table 7.12 General view on merger dimension across among anchor bank employees educational qualification**

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	87	4.21	.461
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	63	4.43	

It was observed from the mean values that the employees holding postgraduate/professional degree were more positive about their view on merger compared to graduates. However, from Table 7.12, we observed that 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 don't differ significantly across educational qualification among anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across length of experience

$H_1$  = General view on merger among anchor bank employees differ across length of experience

**Table 7.13 General view on merger dimension among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of Experience	Upto 5 Years	44	4.42	.149
	6-8 Years	41	4.10	
	9-14 Years	44	4.66	
	Above 14 years	21	3.69	

It was observed from the mean values that the employees with 9-14 years of experience were more positive about their view on merger compared to employees of other groups. However, from Table 7.13, we observed that the p value is more than 0.05. Hence, as per ANOVA, we cannot reject the null hypothesis. The general view on merger don't differ significantly across length of experience among anchor bank employees.

**Table 7.14 Summary table – General view on merger among anchor bank employees across demographic variables**

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

### 7.1.3 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 anchor bank employees

$H_1$  = Perceived benefits of merger differ across gender of anchor bank employees

**Table 7.15 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across gender**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	99	3.26	.577
	Female	51	3.14	

From Table 7.15, it was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by male employees compared to their female counterparts. 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 gender of anchor bank employees.

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

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

**Table 7.16 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across marital status**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	100	3.23	.940
	Unmarried	50	3.21	

It was observed from the mean values that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by married employees than unmarried ones. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 7.16, 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 anchor bank employees.

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

$H_1$  = Perceived benefits of merger differ across designation of anchor bank employees

**Table 7.17(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across designation**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	46	2.91	<b>.045</b>
	Officer	104	<b>3.36</b>	

From Table 7.17(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. It was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by officer level employees.

**Table 7.17(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among anchor bank employees across designation**

Items	Designation	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Clerical	2.85	0.105
	Officer	3.38	
Learn new things	Clerical	4.39	0.588
	Officer	4.59	
Training and development	Clerical	3.43	0.251
	Officer	3.85	
Fringe benefits and perks	Clerical	2.28	<b>0.007</b>
	Officer	<b>3.17</b>	
Work load decreased	Clerical	1.67	<b>0.005</b>
	Officer	<b>2.49</b>	
Work hours decreased	Clerical	1.65	<b>0.044</b>
	Officer	<b>2.17</b>	
Work culture improved	Clerical	2.67	0.264
	Officer	3.06	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Clerical	4.00	0.549
	Officer	3.80	
Better policies	Clerical	2.78	<b>0.019</b>
	Officer	<b>3.51</b>	
Power/Autonomy increased	Clerical	3.54	0.618
	Officer	3.37	
Better chance in career growth	Clerical	2.87	0.082
	Officer	3.41	
Employee Development	Clerical	2.72	<b>0.009</b>
	Officer	<b>3.52</b>	

After studying the individual items of the dimension it was found that significant difference exists for fringe benefits & perks, working hours, work load, better policies 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, learning new things, training & development, improved work culture, belongingness with co-workers, increased autonomy and better chance in career growth.

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

$H_1$  = Perceived benefits of merger differ across age of anchor bank employees

**Table 7.18 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across age group**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Age	Upto 35 years	87	3.23	.882
	Above 35 years	63	3.20	

From Table 7.18, it was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by employees' upto 35 years of age as compared to employees above 35 years. However, the t test results cannot reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there doesn't exist significant differences across age group of anchor bank employees with respect to mean benefits pertaining to merger dimension.

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

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

**Table 7.19 Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across educational qualification**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	87	3.09	.156
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	63	3.40	

From Table 7.19, it was observed that the benefits relating to merger was perceived higher by employees holding postgraduate/professional degree as compared to graduates. 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 anchor bank employees.

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

H<sub>1</sub> = Perceived benefits of merger differ across length of experience of anchor bank employees

**Table 7.20(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of Experience	Upto 5 Years	44	3.36	<b>.039</b>
	6-8 Years	41	2.85	
	9-14 Years	44	<b>3.58</b>	
	Above 14 years	21	2.88	

From Table 7.20(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 bank experience among anchor bank employees. Further, the post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure G(i)] revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the group with experience 6-8 years and 9-14 years' experience. It was also observed that the employees having experience of 9-14 years had viewed merger as more beneficial for employees compared to others.

**Table 7.20(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Items	Length of experience	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Upto 5 Years	3.55	0.162
	6-8 Years	3.02	
	9-14 Years	3.39	
	Above 14 years	2.52	
Learn new things	Upto 5 Years	4.45	<b>0.029</b>
	6-8 Years	4.00	
	9-14 Years	<b>5.25</b>	
	Above 14 years	4.19	
Training and development	Upto 5 Years	3.86	0.132
	6-8 Years	3.37	
	9-14 Years	4.18	
	Above 14 years	3.14	
Fringe benefits and perks	Upto 5 Years	3.09	0.814
	6-8 Years	2.85	
	9-14 Years	2.89	
	Above 14 years	2.62	
Work load decreased	Upto 5 Years	<b>2.77</b>	<b>0.018</b>
	6-8 Years	1.68	

	9-14 Years	2.09	
	Above 14 years	2.52	
Work hours decreased	Upto 5 Years	2.43	0.123
	6-8 Years	1.85	
	9-14 Years	1.73	
	Above 14 years	2.05	
Work culture improved	Upto 5 Years	3.18	<b>0.000</b>
	6-8 Years	1.93	
	9-14 Years	<b>3.59</b>	
	Above 14 years	3.05	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Upto 5 Years	3.64	<b>0.005</b>
	6-8 Years	3.24	
	9-14 Years	<b>4.64</b>	
	Above 14 years	3.90	
Better policies	Upto 5 Years	3.34	0.249
	6-8 Years	3.10	
	9-14 Years	3.66	
	Above 14 years	2.76	
Power/Autonomy increased	Upto 5 Years	3.18	<b>0.001</b>
	6-8 Years	3.02	
	9-14 Years	<b>4.36</b>	
	Above 14 years	2.71	
Better chance in career growth	Upto 5 Years	3.27	0.135
	6-8 Years	2.95	
	9-14 Years	3.70	
	Above 14 years	2.81	
Employee Development	Upto 5 Years	<b>3.59</b>	<b>0.024</b>
	6-8 Years	3.17	
	9-14 Years	3.52	
	Above 14 years	2.29	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension were done. It has been found that significant difference exists with regard to learning new things, work-load, work culture, belongingness with co-workers, autonomy and employee development across length of experience among anchor bank employees. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure G(ii)] revealed significant differences between the groups. Among all the employees, employees upto 5 years' experience viewed merger to be more beneficial in terms of work-load and employee development. 9-8 years' experience holders viewed mergers to be more beneficial in terms of learning new things, work culture, belongingness with co-workers and power/autonomy.

**Table 7.21 Summary table – Benefits pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees across demographic variables**

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

#### 7.1.4 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 among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across gender

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across gender

**Table 7.22(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across gender**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	99	2.96	<b>.022</b>
	Female	51	<b>3.39</b>	

From Table 7.22(a), we observed that the p value is less than 0.05. Hence, as per t test, we reject the null hypothesis. The stress pertaining to merger differ significantly across gender of anchor bank employees. As per mean values, female employees were more stressed as compared to their male counterparts.

**Table 7.22(b) Stress pertaining to merger items among anchor bank employees across bank gender**

Items	Gender	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Male	3.20	0.326
	Female	3.55	



Feeling of helplessness	Male	3.06	0.440
	Female	3.31	
Cultural mismatch	Male	4.74	0.348
	Female	4.47	
Transfer to other place	Male	3.54	0.412
	Female	3.27	
Transfer to other department	Male	2.95	0.878
	Female	2.90	
Change in status	Male	2.75	0.067
	Female	3.31	
Loss of power	Male	2.41	<b>0.001</b>
	Female	<b>3.45</b>	
Loss of commitment	Male	2.24	0.083
	Female	2.76	
Job responsibility	Male	2.56	<b>0.001</b>
	Female	<b>3.65</b>	
Work load increased	Male	4.29	0.520
	Female	4.53	
Increase in working hours	Male	3.60	<b>0.030</b>
	Female	<b>4.41</b>	
Fringe benefits reduced	Male	2.28	<b>0.012</b>
	Female	<b>3.04</b>	
Interference with family life	Male	3.14	<b>0.046</b>
	Female	<b>3.80</b>	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Male	1.97	0.083
	Female	2.41	
Conflicts among employees	Male	2.96	0.569
	Female	3.12	
Feeling left out	Male	2.48	<b>0.049</b>
	Female	<b>3.02</b>	
Interrupted career growth	Male	2.68	0.673
	Female	2.80	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Male	2.37	<b>0.004</b>
	Female	<b>3.20</b>	
Stressed about staff changes	Male	3.03	0.305
	Female	3.35	

However, with regard to the individual items of the dimension, t test revealed that there exists significant difference concerning stress after merger because of loss of power, job responsibility, increase in working hours, reduced fringe benefits reduced, interference with family life, left out feeling and difficulty in adapting to new work culture ( $p < 0.05$ ). Further, it has been observed from the mean values that the female employees were more stressed than male employees due to merger. No

difference was perceived in case of feeling of identity loss, feeling of helplessness, cultural mismatch, transfer to other place, transfer to other department, change in status, loss of commitment, increased work load increased, giving more privilege to anchor bank employees, conflicts among employees, interrupted career growth and staff changes.

$H_0$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across marital status

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across marital status

**Table 7.23 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across marital status**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	100	3.08	.686
	Unmarried	50	3.15	

As per mean values, unmarried employees were more stressed as compared to married employees. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 7.23, 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 anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across designation

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across designation

**Table 7.24 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across designation**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	46	2.86	.062
	Officer	104	3.22	

From Table 7.24, as per mean values, officers were more stressed as compared to clerical level employees. However, the t test shows that we do not have enough

evidence to reject the null hypothesis, i.e., stress among anchor bank employees don't differ significantly with respect to designation.

$H_0$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across age

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across age

**Table 7.25 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across age group**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	87	2.99	.115
	Above 35 years	63	3.27	

As per mean values, employees above 35 years were more stressed as compared to employees' upto 35 years. However, From Table 7.25, as per t test, we cannot reject null hypothesis. The stress pertaining to merger don't differ significantly across age group among anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across educational qualification

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across educational qualification

**Table 7.26 Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across educational qualification**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	87	3.14	.663
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	63	3.06	

As per mean values, postgraduate/professional degree holders were more stressed as compared to graduates. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 7.26, 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 do not differ significantly across educational qualification of anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across length of experience

$H_1$  = Stress pertaining to merger among anchor bank employees differ across length of experience

**Table 7.27(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Stress pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of Experience	Upto 5 Years	44	3.13	<b>.029</b>
	6-8 Years	41	3.22	
	9-14 Years	44	2.76	
	Above 14 years	21	<b>3.56</b>	

From Table 7.27(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 anchor bank employees. Further, the post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure H(i)] revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the group with experience 9-14 years and above 14 years' experience. It was also observed that the employees having experience of above 14 years were most stressed due to merger as compared to others.

**Table 7.27(b) Stress pertaining to merger items among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Items	Length of experience	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Upto 5 Years	3.52	<b>0.000</b>
	6-8 Years	3.27	
	9-14 Years	2.43	
	Above 14 years	<b>4.86</b>	
Feeling of helplessness	Upto 5 Years	3.05	<b>0.000</b>
	6-8 Years	3.07	
	9-14 Years	2.59	
	Above 14 years	<b>4.67</b>	
Cultural mismatch	Upto 5 Years	4.09	<b>0.012</b>
	6-8 Years	4.46	
	9-14 Years	5.05	
	Above 14 years	<b>5.33</b>	
Transfer to other place	Upto 5 Years	3.23	0.057
	6-8 Years	4.00	
	9-14 Years	2.98	

	Above 14 years	3.81	
Transfer to other department	Upto 5 Years	2.95	<b>0.005</b>
	6-8 Years	3.17	
	9-14 Years	2.25	
	Above 14 years	<b>3.86</b>	
Change in status	Upto 5 Years	3.32	0.095
	6-8 Years	3.12	
	9-14 Years	2.39	
	Above 14 years	2.95	
Loss of power	Upto 5 Years	<b>3.41</b>	<b>0.002</b>
	6-8 Years	2.90	
	9-14 Years	2.02	
	Above 14 years	2.71	
Loss of commitment	Upto 5 Years	2.20	<b>0.032</b>
	6-8 Years	<b>2.98</b>	
	9-14 Years	2.02	
	Above 14 years	2.62	
Job responsibility	Upto 5 Years	2.98	0.601
	6-8 Years	2.63	
	9-14 Years	2.95	
	Above 14 years	3.33	
Work load increased	Upto 5 Years	3.80	0.171
	6-8 Years	4.51	
	9-14 Years	4.55	
	Above 14 years	4.95	
Increase in working hours	Upto 5 Years	3.61	0.559
	6-8 Years	4.24	
	9-14 Years	3.91	
	Above 14 years	3.62	
Fringe benefits reduced	Upto 5 Years	2.75	0.674
	6-8 Years	2.61	
	9-14 Years	2.32	
	Above 14 years	2.43	
Interference with family life	Upto 5 Years	3.36	0.944
	6-8 Years	3.51	
	9-14 Years	3.30	
	Above 14 years	3.24	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Upto 5 Years	2.09	0.066
	6-8 Years	2.46	
	9-14 Years	1.68	
	Above 14 years	2.43	
Conflicts among employees	Upto 5 Years	2.93	0.378
	6-8 Years	3.17	
	9-14 Years	2.75	

	Above 14 years	3.43	
Feeling left out	Upto 5 Years	2.93	<b>0.000</b>
	6-8 Years	2.51	
	9-14 Years	2.02	
	Above 14 years	<b>3.76</b>	
Interrupted career growth	Upto 5 Years	2.82	<b>0.030</b>
	6-8 Years	2.80	
	9-14 Years	2.16	
	Above 14 years	<b>3.52</b>	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Upto 5 Years	2.95	0.242
	6-8 Years	2.78	
	9-14 Years	2.32	
	Above 14 years	2.48	
Stressed about staff changes	Upto 5 Years	3.41	0.251
	6-8 Years	3.02	
	9-14 Years	2.77	
	Above 14 years	3.57	

The ANOVA test for the individual items of the dimension were done. Significant differences exists with regard to feeling of identity loss, feeling of helplessness, cultural mismatch, transfer to other department, loss of power, loss of commitment, left out feeling and interrupted career growth. Post-hoc analysis [refer Annexure H(ii)] revealed significant differences between the groups. Employees with experience above 14 years were more stressed due to the above mentioned items, except loss of power and loss of commitment, compared to others. Upto 5 years' experiences were more stressed due to loss of power. Whereas, employees having experience of 6-8 years were more stressed due to loss of commitment.

**Table 7.28 Summary table – Stress pertaining to merger among anchor 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	Difference exists

### 7.1.5 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 among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across gender

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across gender

**Table 7.29 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across gender**

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Gender	Male	99	4.28	.363
	Female	51	4.14	

From Table 7.29, we observed from the mean values that males were more satisfied than their female counterparts. However, as per t test, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The job satisfaction after merger don't differ significantly across gender among anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across marital status

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across marital status

**Table 7.30 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across marital status**

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Marital Status	Married	100	4.25	.711
	Unmarried	50	4.19	

We observed from the mean values that married employees were more satisfied as compared to unmarried employees. However, from Table 7.30, as per t test, we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. The job satisfaction after

merger don't differ significantly across marital status among anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across designation

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across designation

**Table 7.31 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across designation**

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Designation	Clerical	46	4.26	.796
	Officer	104	4.22	

We observed from the mean values that clerical level employees were more satisfied as compared to officers. However, the independent sample t test results as shown in Table 7.31, 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 dimension do not differ significantly across designation of anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across age

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across age

**Table 7.32 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across age group**

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Age group	Upto 35 years	87	4.24	.874
	Above 35 years	63	4.21	

We observed from the mean values that employees upto 35 years of age were more satisfied as compared to employees above 35 years. However, from Table 7.32 as per t test, 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 anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across educational qualification

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across educational qualification

**Table 7.33 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across educational qualification**

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Educational Qualification	Graduate	87	4.11	.096
	Postgraduate/Professional Degree	63	4.39	

We observed from the mean values that employees holding postgraduate/professional degree were more satisfied as compared to graduates. However, as shown in Table 7.33, the t test revealed that we do not have significant evidence to reject null hypothesis. Hence, the mean score of job satisfaction after merger dimension doesn't differ significantly across educational qualification of anchor bank employees.

$H_0$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees doesn't differ across length of experience

$H_1$  = Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees differ across length of experience

**Table 7.34 Job satisfaction after merger dimension among anchor bank employees across length of experience**

Job satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Length of Experience	Upto 5 Years	44	4.38	.083
	6-8 Years	41	3.90	
	9-14 Years	44	4.27	
	Above 14 years	21	4.49	

We observed from the mean values that employees above 14 years of experience were more satisfied as compared to employees of other groups. However, the

ANOVA results as shown in Table 7.34, 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 don't exist significant differences among anchor bank employees with respect to job satisfaction dimension across length of experience.

**Table 7.35 Summary table – Job satisfaction after merger among anchor bank employees across demographic variables**

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

## 7.2 Chapter Summary

This chapter deals with the sub-part of the second objective of the study related to anchor bank employees. The anchor 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 7.36. The detailed findings of the study are discussed in chapter 9 of this study.

**Table 7.36 Overall summary of anchor 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	×	×	×	×	×	×