

CHAPTER 5
DIFFERENCES IN THE ANCHOR AND AMALGAMATING BANK
EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION AND EXPERIENCE ON BANK MERGER

The second objective of the study is to investigate employees' perception and experience on bank merger with reference to the four merger cases of 2020. Employees are one of the stakeholders that are heavily impacted, whenever changes in the entity take place. When it comes to M&A, according to Holbeche (1998), the human resource side is often overlooked at the cost of the financial aspect, which becomes one of the major contributing causes in merger failure. Since they are regarded as the wheels which make the organization run smoothly, it is important to take into account their views and experience with regard to bank mergers.

This chapter presents the sub-part of the second objective of the study, i.e., differences in the perception and experiences of anchor bank and amalgamation bank employees on merger. The chapter is sub-divided into three parts. Analysis is based on the responses of the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. The first part (Section 5.1) presents the demographic profile of the respondents. The second section (Section 5.2) analyses the employees' views and experience across the type of bank, i.e., anchor and amalgamating banks. The last part (Section 5.3) provides a summary of the chapter.

5.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents

The number of total employees constituting the sample was 312. Section 5.1.1 to 5.1.13 shows the profile of the respondents based on certain classifications.

5.1.1 Gender

The classification of employees as per gender revealed that male respondents (62.20%) were larger in number as compared to the female respondents (37.80%). The same is shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Gender of employees

Gender	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Male	99 (66%)	95 (58.64%)	194 (62.20%)
Female	51 (34%)	67 (41.36%)	118 (37.90%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.2. Age

The classification of employees as per age group is shown in Table 5.2. Majority of employees belonged to the age group 26-35 years (54.8%) and 36-45 years of age (28.2%). Few of the employees fell in age group above 45 years (12.5%) and upto 25 years (4.5%).

Table 5.2 Age group of employees

Age	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Upto 25 years	7 (4.7%)	7 (4.3%)	14 (4.5%)
26-35 years	80 (53.3%)	91 (56.2%)	171 (54.8%)
36-45 years	41 (27.3%)	47 (29.0%)	88 (28.2%)
Above 45 years	22 (14.7%)	17 (10.5%)	39 (12.5%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.3 Marital Status

The classification of employees as per marital status is shown in Table 5.3. Majority of employees were married (71.5%). Only, 28.5% of the respondents were unmarried.

Table 5.3 Marital Status of employees

Marital Status	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Married	100 (66.7%)	123 (75.9%)	223 (71.5%)
Unmarried	50 (33.3%)	39 (24.1%)	89 (28.5%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.4 Educational Status

The respondents are clubbed according to their educational qualification as shown in Table 5.4. Most of employees completed their graduation (52.2%). Some of employees had done post-graduation (38.1%) and few had professional degree (9.7%).

Table 5.4 Educational Qualification of employees

Educational Qualification	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Graduate	87 (58%)	76 (46.9%)	163 (52.2%)
Postgraduate	57 (38%)	62 (38.3%)	119 (38.1%)
Professional Degree	6 (4%)	24 (14.8%)	30 (9.7%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.5 Designation

The classification of employees as per their designation is shown in Table 5.5. The number of employees in officer level (66%) was higher than the employees in clerical level (34%).

Table 5.5 Designation of employees

Designation	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Clerical	46 (30.7%)	60 (37.0%)	106 (34%)
Officer	104 (69.3%)	102 (63.0%)	206 (66%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.6 Length of experience

The classification of employees as per their experience in bank is shown in Table 6.6 A large number of respondents had experience between 6-8 years (31.1%), followed by respondents with 9-14 years of experience (30.5%) and upto 5 years of experience (28.5%). Very few had experience above 14 years (9.9%).

Table 5.6 Experience of employees

Length of experience	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Upto 5 years	44 (29.3%)	45 (27.8%)	89 (28.5%)
6-8 years	41 (27.3%)	56 (34.6%)	97 (31.1%)
9-14 years	44 (29.3%)	51 (31.5%)	95 (30.5%)
Above 14 years	21 (14.0%)	10 (6.2%)	31 (9.9%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.7 Salary per Month

The employees are classified in terms of their salary as shown in Table 5.7. Employees with the salary between 50,000-70,000 per month (34.9%) were highest, followed by 30,000-50,000 per month (26.6%). 70,000-100,000 per month (26.3%). Only few had salary above 100,000 per month (12.2%).

Table 5.7 Salary per month of employees

Salary per Month (in Rs.)	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
30,000-50,000	43 (28.7%)	40 (24.7%)	83 (26.6%)
50,000-70,000	53 (35.3%)	56 (34.6%)	109 (34.9%)

70,000-100,000	32 (21.3%)	50 (30.9%)	82 (26.3%)
Above 100,000	22 (14.7%)	16 (9.9%)	38 (12.2%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.8 Anchor or Amalgamating Bank Employees

On the basis of the type of banks employees are clubbed as shown in Table 5.1.8.

Amalgamating bank employees (51.9%) outnumbered anchor bank employees (48.1%).

Table 5.8 Type of bank of employees

Bank Classification	Frequency	Percent
Anchor Bank	150	48.1
Amalgamating Bank	162	51.9
Total	312	100

5.1.9 Working hours per day

The working hours per day of employees are shown in Table 5.9. The employees who worked upto 8 hours (32.1%) were highest, followed by employees who worked till 9 hours (30.4%) and 10 hours per day (23.4%). There were also few employees who worked for more 10 hours per day (14.1%).

Table 5.9 Working hours per day of employees

Working hours per day	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Upto 8 hours	56 (37.3%)	44 (27.2%)	100 (32.1%)
9 hours	48 (32.0%)	47 (29.0%)	95 (30.4%)
10 hours	35 (23.3%)	38 (23.5%)	73 (23.4%)
above 10 hours	11 (7.3%)	33 (20.4%)	44 (14.1%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.10 Lunch break

Employees getting lunch break for atleast 30 minutes is shown in Table 5.10. Most of the employees either got lunch break 'always' (44.9%) or 'frequently' (27.9%). However, few employees got time for lunch for atleast 30 minutes 'sometimes' (17%), rarely (5.8%) and never (4.5%).

Table 5.10 Lunch break time of employees

Lunch break for atleast 30 minutes	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Never	1 (0.7%)	13 (8.0%)	14 (4.5%)
Rarely	5 (3.3%)	13 (8.0%)	18 (5.8%)
Sometimes	24 (16.0%)	29 (17.9%)	53 (17.0%)
Frequently	42 (28.0%)	45 (27.8%)	87 (27.9%)
Always	78 (52.0%)	62 (38.3%)	140 (44.9%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.11 Overtime

Employees working overtime are shown in Table 5.11. Most of the employees worked overtime ‘always’ (39.4%), ‘frequently’ (34%) and ‘sometimes’ (20.5%). Only small number of employees worked overtime rarely (3.5%) and never (2.6%).

Table 5.11 Employees working overtime

Overtime	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Never	6 (4.0%)	2 (1.2%)	8 (2.6%)
Rarely	7 (4.7%)	4 (2.5%)	11 (3.5%)
Sometimes	35 (23.3%)	29 (17.9%)	64 (20.5%)
Frequently	53 (35.3%)	53 (32.7%)	106 (34.0%)
Always	49 (32.7%)	74 (45.7%)	123 (39.4%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.12 Take work home

Employees taking work home are shown in Table 5.12. A major chunk of employees ‘never’ took work home (52.2%), followed by ‘rare’ occasions (24%). However, few of them took work home ‘sometimes’ (14.1%), ‘frequently’ (7.7%) and ‘always’ (1.9%).

Table 5.12 Employees taking work home

Take work home	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Never	84 (56.0%)	79 (48.8%)	163 (52.2%)
Rarely	33 (22.0%)	42 (25.9%)	75 (24.0%)
Sometimes	20 (13.3%)	24 (14.8%)	44 (14.1%)
Frequently	10 (6.7%)	14 (8.6%)	24 (7.7%)
Always	3 (3.0%)	3 (1.9%)	6 (1.9%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

5.1.13 Transfer due to merger

Employees transferred due to merger are shown in Table 5.13. About 20 percent of the total employees were transferred to other place of work permanently and few were transferred to other place temporarily (8%). 14.4 percent of the employees were transferred to other department permanently and 8 percent of the total employees were transferred to other department temporarily. However, majority continued being in the same place/position.

Table 5.13(a) Transfer due to merger

Transfer to other place	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Yes	25 (16.7%)	37 (22.8%)	62 (19.9%)
No	117 (78.0%)	108 (66.7%)	225 (72.1%)
Temporarily	8 (5.3%)	17 (10.5%)	25 (8.0%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

Table 5.13(b) Transfer due to merger

Transfer to other department	Anchor Bank	Amalgamating Bank	Total
Yes	17 (11.3%)	28 (17.3%)	45 (14.4%)
No	123 (82.0%)	119 (73.4%)	242 (77.6%)
Temporarily	10 (6.7%)	15 (9.3%)	25 (8.0%)
Total	150 (100%)	162 (100%)	312 (100%)

As mentioned previously, employees' perceptions were measured on the five dimensions:

1. Communication and awareness on merger - consisting of 6 items
2. General view on merger – consisting of 6 items
3. Benefits pertaining to merger – consisting of 13 items
4. Stress pertaining to merger- consisting of 19 items
5. Job satisfaction after merger – consisting of 12 items

5.2. Study of Employees' Views and Experience across the type of Bank

Independent sample t test has been used to see whether or not there are any differences in the views and experience on merger across anchor bank and amalgamating bank employees. The normality assumption for conducting the test has been fulfilled (refer Section 3.4).

5.2.1 Communication and Awareness on Merger

The dimension consists of 6 items. These statements measure the level of awareness and information communication in the merger process among the employees. Independent sample t test was employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. Then, individual items were checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Communication and awareness regarding merger does not differ across type of bank employees

H_1 = Communication and awareness regarding merger differ across type of bank employees

Table 5.14(a) Communication and Awareness dimension across type of banks

Communication and Awareness		N	Mean	p value
Anchor or Amalgamating	Anchor Bank	150	5.11	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	162	4.22	

From Table 5.14(a), as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, i.e., there exists significant difference across the anchor and amalgamating bank employees with respect to mean score for communication and awareness dimension. It was observed that the communication and awareness was higher in case of anchor bank employees.

Table 5.14(b) Communication and Awareness items among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Clarity about objective behind merger	Anchor Bank	4.360	.001
	Amalgamating Bank	3.710	
Information communicated properly	Anchor Bank	4.920	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.990	
Clear direction throughout merger process	Anchor Bank	4.910	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	4.030	
Timely information communicated throughout the merger process	Anchor Bank	5.160	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.890	
Awareness about Banks identity	Anchor Bank	5.910	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	5.130	
Banks Interaction	Anchor Bank	5.420	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	4.590	

With regard to individual items, significant differences exists for all the items as shown in Table 5.13(b). When compared to employees of the amalgamating bank, employees of the anchor bank knew more about the merger's objectives and were given information and clear direction in a fast manner. Awareness about changes in banks identity and interaction scores were higher as compared to amalgamating bank employees.

5.2.2 General View on Merger

The dimension consists of 6 items. These statements measure the general view of employees on merger. Independent sample t test was employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. Individual items were also checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

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

H_1 = General view on merger differ across type of bank employees

Table 5.15(a) General view on merger dimension among employees across type of banks

General view on merger		N	Mean	p value
Anchor or Amalgamating	Anchor Bank	150	4.30	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	162	3.24	

The t test results reject the null hypothesis. Hence, general view on merger differs significantly across the type of bank employees (refer Table 5.15(a))

Table 5.15(b) General view on merger items among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Beneficial for economic growth	Anchor Bank	4.240	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.340	
Financial Condition	Anchor Bank	4.540	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.720	
Global presence	Anchor Bank	4.760	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.920	
Beneficial for organization and employees	Anchor Bank	4.360	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.070	
Positive change in service quality	Anchor Bank	4.270	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.790	
Favour merger	Anchor Bank	3.650	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.570	

The anchor bank employees viewed the structural change positively in comparison to amalgamating ones. Anchor bank employees viewed merger to be beneficial for economic growth, financial condition, with more global presence, benefitting both organization and employees, bringing positive change in service quality. Hence, they favoured merger more as compared to their merging counterparts (refer Table 5.15(b))

5.2.3 Benefits Pertaining to Merger

The dimension consists of 13 items. These statements measure the extent to which employees had received benefits after merger. Independent sample t test was employed to check for differences across the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. Individual items were also checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

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

H_1 = Perceived benefits of merger differ across type of bank employees

Table 5.16(a) Benefits pertaining to merger dimension among employees across type of banks

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Anchor or Amalgamating	Anchor Bank	150	3.22	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	162	2.54	

The t test rejects the null hypothesis indicating that there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension. The mean value was higher for anchor bank employees (refer Table 5.16(a)).

Table 5.16(b) Benefits pertaining to merger items among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Improved working condition	Anchor Bank	3.21	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.50	
Learn new things	Anchor Bank	4.53	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.49	
Training and development	Anchor Bank	3.72	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.80	
Fringe benefits and perks	Anchor Bank	2.90	.625
	Amalgamating Bank	2.80	
Work load decreased	Anchor Bank	2.24	.001
	Amalgamating Bank	1.71	

Work hours decreased	Anchor Bank	2.01	.005
	Amalgamating Bank	1.60	
Work culture improved	Anchor Bank	2.94	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.14	
Belongingness with co-workers improved	Anchor Bank	3.86	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.01	
Better policies	Anchor Bank	3.29	.013
	Amalgamating Bank	2.80	
Power/Autonomy increased	Anchor Bank	3.42	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.36	
Better chance in career growth	Anchor Bank	3.25	.008
	Amalgamating Bank	2.73	
Employee Development	Anchor Bank	3.27	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.58	

The t test results implicate that all the items except one showed significant differences across the type of bank, the employees belonged to. The mean values were higher in anchor bank employees for the items namely - improved working condition, learn new things, training & development, reduced work load, reduced working hours, improved work culture, improved belongingness with co-workers, better policies, increased power/autonomy, better chance in career growth and employee development. No difference was perceived in case of fringe benefits and perks (refer Table 5.16(b)).

5.2.4 Stress Pertaining to Merger

One of the major stressors for bank employees was increase in work load, followed by transfer to other place of work, increase in working hours and work family conflict respectively. Least stressor was loss of power, followed by change in status (Table 5.17).

Table 5.17 Merger stressors for the employees

Stressor	Frequency	
	Amalgamating	Anchor
Transfer to other place of work	105	84
Transfer to other department	15	23
Loss of Power	15	11
Change in Job responsibilities	39	41
Hindrance in career growth	28	35
Work Family Conflict	43	61
Increase in Work load	107	95
Increase in Working hours	68	53
Change in status	25	20

The stress pertaining to merger dimension consists of 19 items. These statements measure the stress level among employees after merger. Independent sample t test was employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. Individual items were also checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

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

H_1 = Stress pertaining to merger differ across type of bank employees

Table 5.18(a) Stress pertaining to merger dimension among employees across type of banks

Benefits pertaining to merger		N	Mean	p value
Anchor or Amalgamating	Anchor Bank	150	3.11	.000
	Amalgamating Bank	162	3.59	

From Table 5.18(a), the t test result implicates that null hypothesis is rejected. There exists significant difference with regard to stress. As per mean values, amalgamating bank employees are more stressed due to merger as compared to their counterparts.

Table 5.18(b) Stress pertaining to merger items among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Feeling of Identity Loss	Anchor Bank	3.32	0.042
	Amalgamating Bank	3.80	
Feeling of helplessness	Anchor Bank	3.15	0.024
	Amalgamating Bank	3.61	
Cultural mismatch	Anchor Bank	4.65	0.274
	Amalgamating Bank	4.42	
Transfer to other place	Anchor Bank	3.45	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	4.41	
Transfer to other department	Anchor Bank	2.93	0.061
	Amalgamating Bank	3.34	
Change in status	Anchor Bank	2.94	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.83	
Loss of power	Anchor Bank	2.77	0.152
	Amalgamating Bank	3.07	
Loss of commitment	Anchor Bank	2.42	0.001
	Amalgamating Bank	3.10	
Job responsibility	Anchor Bank	2.93	0.697
	Amalgamating Bank	2.84	

Work load increased	Anchor Bank	4.37	0.166
	Amalgamating Bank	4.71	
Increase in working hours	Anchor Bank	3.87	0.107
	Amalgamating Bank	4.28	
Fringe benefits reduced	Anchor Bank	2.54	0.056
	Amalgamating Bank	2.95	
Interference with family life	Anchor Bank	3.37	0.021
	Amalgamating Bank	3.88	
More privilege to anchor bank employees	Anchor Bank	2.12	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.78	
Conflicts among employees	Anchor Bank	3.01	0.180
	Amalgamating Bank	3.30	
Feeling left out	Anchor Bank	2.67	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	3.44	
Interrupted career growth	Anchor Bank	2.72	0.261
	Amalgamating Bank	2.95	
Difficulty in adapting work culture	Anchor Bank	2.65	0.015
	Amalgamating Bank	3.14	
Stressed about staff changes	Anchor Bank	3.14	0.274
	Amalgamating Bank	3.38	

Observing the individual items of stress, amalgamating bank employees showed higher level of stress as compared to anchor bank employees with respect to feeling of loss of identity, feeling of helplessness, transfer to other place of work, change in status, loss of commitment, work interference with family life, more privilege to anchor bank employees, feeling of being left out and difficulty in adapting work culture. The t test showed significant difference with regard to above mentioned items. No difference could be seen in the following items: cultural mismatch, transfer to other department, loss of power, job responsibility, increased work load, increase in working hours, reduced fringe benefits, conflicts among employees, interrupted career growth and staff changes.

5.2.5 Job Satisfaction after Merger

The dimension consists of 12 items. These statements measure the extent to which employees had received benefits after merger. Independent sample t test was employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the said dimension across the employees of anchor banks and amalgamating banks. Individual items were also checked to see for differences. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Job satisfaction after merger doesn't differ across type of bank employees

H₁ = Job satisfaction after merger differ across type of bank employees

Table 5.19(a) Job satisfaction after merger dimension among employees across type of banks

Job Satisfaction after merger		N	Mean	p value
Anchor or Amalgamating	Anchor Bank	150	4.17	.006
	Amalgamating Bank	162	3.83	

The above Table 5.19(a) implies the rejection of null hypothesis. Job satisfaction significantly differed among employees. Amalgamating bank employees were less satisfied as revealed by the mean values.

Table 5.19(b) Job satisfaction after merger items among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Current Salary satisfaction	Anchor Bank	3.74	0.001
	Amalgamating Bank	3.04	
Promotion incentives satisfaction	Anchor Bank	4.08	0.286
	Amalgamating Bank	4.29	
Current workload	Anchor Bank	3.32	0.001
	Amalgamating Bank	2.66	
Current degree of autonomy at work	Anchor Bank	3.61	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	2.85	
Current working condition	Anchor Bank	3.93	0.037
	Amalgamating Bank	3.49	
Current relation with co-workers	Anchor Bank	5.74	0.067
	Amalgamating Bank	6.05	
Current performance recognition	Anchor Bank	4.33	0.230
	Amalgamating Bank	4.56	
Current participation in decision making	Anchor Bank	4.20	0.163
	Amalgamating Bank	3.90	
Current conflict handling policy	Anchor Bank	4.18	0.947
	Amalgamating Bank	4.17	
Current job interference with family life	Anchor Bank	3.68	0.418
	Amalgamating Bank	3.49	
Currently happy working in bank	Anchor Bank	4.77	0.001
	Amalgamating Bank	4.15	
This Bank will always be first choice	Anchor Bank	5.17	0.000
	Amalgamating Bank	4.33	

Observing the individual items of job satisfaction, anchor bank employees showed higher level of satisfaction as compared to amalgamating bank employees with respect to salary, workload, degree of autonomy at work and working condition. The mean values for being happy working in the bank and bank always being the first choice were higher in comparison to their merging counterparts. For these items, significant differences exist as per t test. No difference were seen in the following items: promotion and incentives satisfaction, relation with co-workers, performance recognition, participation in decision making, conflict handling policy and job interference with family life.

5.2.6 Job Leaving Intention and Merging Smoothness

These statements assess the extent to which employees had intention to leave the job due to merger and rating on how smooth the merger process was. Independent sample t test was employed to see if there exists significant difference with regard to the above mentioned statements. The hypotheses framed was –

H_0 = Job leaving intention and view on smoothness relating to merger process does not differ across the type of bank among employees

H_1 = Job leaving intention and view on smoothness relating to merger process differ across the type of bank among employees

From Table 5.20, as the significance value is less than 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis for both the statements, i.e., there exists significant difference across the type of bank employees with respect to job leaving intension and merger smoothness. It was observed that the job leaving intention due to merger was high among amalgamating bank employees. On the contrary, view on smoothness relating to merger process was more positive among anchor bank employees.

Table 5.20 Job leaving intention and merging smoothness among employees across type of banks

Items	Anchor or Amalgamating	Mean	P value
Job leaving intention due to merger	Anchor Bank	2.20	.037
	Amalgamating Bank	2.64	
View on smoothness relating to merger process	Anchor Bank	3.69	.006
	Amalgamating Bank	3.12	

5.3 Chapter Summary

This chapter deals with the sub-part of the second objective of the study related to employees. It begins with the brief discussion on the demographic profile of respondents. Then the analysis on employees' perception and experience on merger across the type of bank, i.e., anchor and amalgamating banks has been shown. It was revealed that there exists significant difference in terms of communication & awareness on merger, general view on merger, benefits pertaining to merger, stress pertaining to merger, job satisfaction, job leaving intention and merger process smoothness across employees of anchor and amalgamating banks as summarised in Table 5.21. The findings of the study have been discussed in detail in chapter 9 of this study.

Table 5.21 Summary table – Differences across the type of bank among employees

Studied dimensions	Result
Communication and awareness on merger	Difference exists
General view on merger	Difference exists
Benefits pertaining to merger	Difference exists
Stress pertaining to merger	Difference exists
Job satisfaction after merger	Difference exists
Job leaving intention due to merger	Difference exists
View on smoothness relating to merger process	Difference exists