



A STUDY ON POST-MERGER EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION ABOUT THEIR ROLE WITHIN THE ORGANISATION

Dr. Rangana Maitra

Associate Professor, IES' Management College and Research Centre, Mumbai, Maharashtra

Cite This Article: Dr. Rangana Maitra, "A Study on Post-Merger Employees' Perception about Their Role within the Organisation", International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities, Volume 7, Issue 1, Page Number 1-11, 2022.

Abstract:

Mergers and acquisitions are well known phenomena in corporate houses to attain their business goals. Research has indicated that in the banking sector of India, mergers and acquisitions are going to be continued as one of the important strategies for survival and growth. Although banks emphasise on mergers, many a time they turn into failure and it was observed based on research findings that one of the major issues or the failures was that HR aspects were not taken into consideration during the processes. This paper was written to understand employees' attitude about post-merger the changed roles in the banks. This paper will also help to understand the perception of the employees toward the new organisation on justice and fairness with regard to promotions. Hypotheses were developed based on the objectives. Data was collected following the survey method. For the purpose of data collection, a structured questionnaire was developed. Data was analysed using Frequency Distribution, and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs). Based on the analysis conclusion was drawn. 6 banks which are having branches in Mumbai Region and had gone through merger were taken into consideration for the study.

Key Words: Merger and Acquisition, Banking Sector, Employees' role

Introduction:

Although business organisations emphasise on merger and acquisition as a business strategy, many of the mergers and acquisitions were not successful and various researches has highlighted that human factor was not taken into consideration in those failed ones. Post-merger a sense of defeat is generated in the minds of the employees leading to low morale and dissatisfaction. As a result productivity suffers and organisations are unable to attain the desired goals which were the agenda of a merger or an acquisition. In case, post-merger there is role ambiguity, if the employees apprehend that their roles are not in congruence with the objectives or goals of the banks they are associated with, dissatisfaction will be generated among employees. Also if they understand that post-merger there is no appreciation for good job, management is biased, they will be frustrated and discontented with the job. The present study has made an attempt to investigate these aspects in the Indian banking sector.

Study Objectives:

- To understand post-merger employee-awareness of their roles
- To understand the perception of employees as to whether their roles are in sync with bank-objectives
- To assess whether post-merger there was appreciation of employees' work

Research Methodology:

The research was initiated to understand post-merger employee-awareness of their roles. Also, it will identify whether their roles are in sync with company-objectives and whether there was appreciation of employees' work or not. Data was collected from 500 respondents associated with banks which had gone through mergers, following a survey-method. Each item was rated on a six-point Likert scale. Considering the objectives of the study, the hypotheses for Research Questions in null and alternative forms are as follows:

- H0A0 (null hypothesis): There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected of my role' with respect to their gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.
- H1A1 (alternative hypothesis): There was significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected of my role' with respect to their gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.
- H0B0 (null hypothesis): There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I think my role is in sync with the mission /objectives of the company' with respect to their gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.
- H1B1 (alternative hypothesis): There was significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I think my role is in sync with the mission /objectives of the company' with respect to their gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.
- H0C0 (null hypothesis): There was no significant difference in the perception of the employees on 'I regularly receive recognition or praise for good job' with respect to gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.

- H1C1 (alternative hypothesis): There was no significant difference in the perception of the employees on 'I regularly receive recognition or praise for good job' with respect to gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.

To test each hypothesis, one way Anova was used

Literature Review:

As mentioned in the book 'Mergers in the banking industry: A Global Perspective' edited by: Vandana Shajan, Sandipa Lahiri Anand, in the banking industry, From the early 1980s, in the Indian Banking sector India, many merger are taking place.² Banks in India go for merger to increase the size and scale of business and also for bringing synergy between two banks going for merger. It is believed that mergers or acquisitions help to reduce unhealthy rivalry among banks and leverage benefits through economies of scale and scope. As mentioned in Financial Times M&A boom set to continue in 2017. In order to attain its goal to appear as a global bank and to have competitive edge in emerging markets; in May, 2016 State Bank of India declared its plan to merge with its five associate banks viz. State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur, State Bank of Travancore, State Bank of Mysore, State Bank of Patiala, State Bank of Hyderabad and one PSU bank - Bharatiya Mahila Bank by 2017.

Based on the above mentioned details conclusion can be drawn that merger and acquisitions will always be considered as a noteworthy business strategy for growth in business.

Research of Bellou (2007) emphasised that post-merger employees become interested to as to what extent their increased self-interest is getting fulfilled, what impact the merger can create as far as their professional life is concerned. Researchers also studied that there is connectivity between respondents' job levels within the organization and job satisfaction. Management process and fairness in work set up are very significant for any organization; especially after M&A. Lau et.al (2008) observed that there is imperious relationship between employee gratification and equality at work, especially in relation to performance appraisal. Therefore, appreciation from the supervisor and promotion as factors related to justice were taken into consideration. As mentioned by the researchers like Appelbaum, S.H., Gandell, J., Shapiro, B.T., Belisle, R, and Hoeven, E.(2000), Cartwright and Cooper (1995), Marks and Mirivis (1985), Schweiger and DeNisi (1991), Seo and Hill (2005); mergers may have harmful effects on employees, including their behaviour, performance, well-being, stress, commitment, satisfaction, and identification. Again according to Rafferty and Restubog (2010), mergers have been associated with increased employee turnover and layoffs.

As emphasized by Wieckrmasinghe and Karunaratne (2009), and again by Ivancevich, Schweiger, and Power (1987) employees are concerned about changes in the job, role, and assignments and changes in performance evaluation systems. These uncertainties could trigger negative reactions, including less motivation and lower performance as identified by the researchers like Schweiger. On the basis of the literature review it was identified post-merger, the role played by the employees and perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for doing good job. A detailed analysis is given below based on the survey conducted

Analysis and Interpretation of Data:

With reference to job levels, out of the 500 respondents, the survey revealed that 40.6% was from semi-skilled category, personal banker/ loan assistant was 37.7%, 21.4% from supervisory category and 8% from executive category. 63.4% of the respondents were male and 36.6% were female. Also 43.4% were in the age of 23 to 30, 34.2% were in the age of 31 to 40, 19.4% i.e., 97 respondents were in the age of 40 plus and only 3% i.e., 15 of them were in the age of 18 to 22. Also 68.8% were from private sector banks and 31.2% were from public sector banks. Again, 55.4% respondents were graduates, 20.2% were post-graduates and 24.4% had professional qualifications.

Derivation:

When the question was asked to find out the perception of the respondents as to whether they knew what was expected of them, out of 500 respondents, 254 i.e., 50.8% agreed that they knew what was expected of them, 92 of them i.e., 18.4% neither agreed nor disagreed that they knew what was expected of them and 71 of them i.e., 14.2% strongly agreed that knew what was expected of them, 48 of them i.e., 9.6% strongly disagreed that they knew what was expected of them.

Interpretation:

Majority of the respondents agreed that they knew what is expected of them. Again, some of the respondents strongly agreed to that. For the respondents who either agreed or strongly agreed, the situation might be satisfactory.

Derivation:

When the question was asked to find out the perception of the respondents as to whether their roles were in sync with mission of the bank, out of 500 respondents, 248 i.e., 49.6% agreed that their roles were in sync with mission, 93 of them i.e., 18.6% neither agreed nor disagreed that their roles were in sync with mission, 70 of the respondents i.e., 14% informed that they strongly agreed that their roles were in sync with mission. 56 of the respondents i.e., 11.2% informed that they disagreed that their roles were in sync with mission and 33 of them i.e., 6.6% informed that they strongly disagreed their roles are in sync with mission.

Interpretation:

Research reveals that according to majority of the employees, agreed that their roles are in sync with mission. Again some of the respondents strongly agreed to that. For the respondents, this situation can be satisfactory. Some of the respondents informed that they neither agreed nor disagreed that their roles are in sync with mission. Might be they did not understood the meaning of roles in sync with mission or might be they were not ready to disclose the information. For that minority of respondents who either strongly disagreed or disagreed, the situation could lead to job dissatisfaction. Therefore, overall it was a satisfactory situation for majority of the respondents.

Derivation:

When the question was asked to find out the perception of the respondents as to whether they liked their roles, out of 500 respondents, 268 i.e., 53.6% agreed that they liked their roles, 87 of them i.e., 17.4% neither agreed nor disagreed that they like their roles, 75 respondents i.e., 15% of the total respondents strongly agreed that they like their roles and 53 i.e., 10.4% of them disagreed that they liked their roles and 17 respondents i.e., 3.4% strongly disagreed that they liked their roles.

Interpretation:

According to majority of the respondents they liked their roles. Again some of the respondents strongly agreed to that. For the respondents, this situation would lead to satisfaction in the job.

Derivation:

When the question was asked to find out the perception of the respondents on ‘I have the opportunity to do what I do best’, out of 500 respondents, 207 i.e., 41.4% agreed that they had the opportunity to do what they do best, 109 i.e., 21.8% neither agreed nor disagreed that they had the opportunity to do what they do best, 99 of them i.e., 19.8% strongly agreed that they had the opportunity to do what they do best and 54 of them i.e., 10.8% disagreed that they had the opportunity to do what they did best and 25 of them i.e., 5% strongly disagreed with the statements.

Interpretation:

According to majority of the respondents they had the opportunity to do what they do best. Again some of the respondents strongly agreed to that. Therefore for majority of the respondents this situation can lead to job satisfaction. Some respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that they had the opportunity to do what they do best. Might be they did not understand the meaning that they had the opportunity to do what they do best or might be they did not understand what they would do best.

To test hypotheses one way Anova table was used.

One-Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘I Know What Is Expected of My Role’ With Respect to their Gender:

Table No. 1.1A _{1a} Descriptives Known what is expected								
Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Female	185	3.70	1.014	0.116	3.47	3.93	1	5
Male	315	3.44	1.177	0.103	3.23	3.64	1	5
Total	500	3.53	1.125	0.078	3.38	3.69	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1A _{1b} Known what is expected					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	3.436	1	3.436	2.740	0.099
Within	258.328	206	1.254		
Total	261.764	207			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.099 which is greater than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on ‘I know what is expected of my role’ with respect to their gender in the banks.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘I Know What Is Expected of My Role’ With Respect to the Age-Group:

Table No. 1.1A _{2a} Known what is expected descriptives								
Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Between 20 to 24	16	3.17	0.753	0.307	2.38	3.96	2	4

Between 25 to 30	214	3.74	0.919	0.102	3.54	3.94	1	5
Between 31 to 40	175	3.33	1.219	0.150	3.03	3.63	1	5
40 plus	95	3.44	1.362	0.227	2.98	3.91	1	5
Total	500	3.52	1.128	0.082	3.36	3.69	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1A _{2b} Known what is expected					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	7.198	3	2.399	1.914	0.129
Within	231.944	185	1.254		
Total	239.143	188			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.129 which is greater than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on ‘I know what is expected of my role’ with respect to the age of the respondents.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘I Know What Is Expected of My Role’ With Respect to their Job Levels in the Banks:

Table No. 1.1A _{3a} Descriptives Known what is expected								
Job Levels	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Semi-Skilled	204	3.60	0.954	0.090	3.42	3.78	1	5
Personal Banker/ Loan Assistant	189	3.51	1.166	0.114	3.28	3.74	1	5
Supervisory	103	3.56	1.282	0.170	3.22	3.90	1	5
Executive	7	3.00	2.828	2.000	-22.41	28.41	1	5
Total	500	3.55	1.117	0.067	3.42	3.69	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA						
Table No. 1.1A _{3b} Known what is expected						
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Between	1.040	3	0.347	0.276	0.843	
Within	340.945	271	1.258			
Total	341.985	274				

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.843 which is greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on ‘I know what is expected of my role’ with respect to their job levels.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘I Know What Is Expected of My Role’ With Respect to the Banks:

Table No. 1.1A _{4a} Descriptives Known what is expected								
Bank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Private	347	3.59	1.324	0.146	3.29	3.88	1	5
Public	153	3.36	1.222	0.204	2.95	3.77	1	5
Total	500	3.52	1.293	0.119	3.28	3.75	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1A _{4b} Known what is expected					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	1.258	1	1.258	0.751	0.388

Within	194.208	116	1.674		
Total	195.466	117			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.388 which is greater than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected of my role' with respect to the banks they are associated with.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on 'I Know What is Expected of My Role' With Respect to the Income-Group:

Income s	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than Rs. 15000/-	50	3.17	1.403	0.405	2.27	4.06	1	5
From Rs.15001/- to Rs.30000/-	167	3.28	1.176	0.186	2.90	3.65	1	5
From Rs.30001/- to Rs. 50000/-	167	3.33	1.163	0.184	2.95	3.70	1	5
More than Rs. 50000/-	116	3.57	1.451	0.274	3.01	4.13	1	5
Total	500	3.35	1.255	0.115	3.12	3.58	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	2.026	3	0.675	0.423	0.737
Within	185.274	116	1.597		
Total	187.300	119			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.737 which is greater than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected of my role' with respect to the income-group.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on 'I Know What is Expected of My Role' With Respect to Qualifications:

Qualifications: 1: Graduate 2: Post graduate 3: Professional qualifications	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	277	3.06	1.330	0.222	2.61	3.51	1	5
2	100	3.46	1.198	0.332	2.74	4.19	1	5
3	123	4.00	1.033	0.258	3.45	4.55	2	5
Total	500	3.37	1.282	0.159	3.05	3.69	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	10.019	2	5.009	3.265	0.045
Within	95.120	62	1.534		
Total	105.138	64			

Source: Questionnaire administered,

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.045 which is greater than 0.05. There was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected of my role' with respect to qualifications.

Considering the analysis of all the above-mentioned aspects based on the tables, 1.1A_{1a}-1.1 A_{6b}, null hypothesis H_{1A0} was accepted. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on

‘I know what is expected of my role’ with respect to gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘Role Is In Sync with Mission’ With Respect to their Gender:

Table No. 1.1B _{1a} Role in sync with mission Descriptives								
Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Female	184	3.62	1.089	0.124	3.38	3.87	1	5
Male	316	3.49	1.045	0.091	3.31	3.67	1	5
Total	500	3.54	1.060	0.073	3.40	3.69	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No.1.1B _{1b} Role in sync with mission					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	0.834	1	0.834	0.741	0.390
Within	233.070	207	1.126		
Total	233.904	208			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .039 which is greater than 0.05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to their gender.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘Role Is In Sync with Mission’ With Respect to their Age-Group:

Table No. 1.1B _{2a} Role in sync with mission Descriptives								
Age s	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
between 20 to 24	15	4	1.095	0.447	2.85	5.15	2	5
between 25 to 30	194	3.73	0.881	0.098	3.53	3.92	1	5
between 31 to 40	158	3.47	1.153	0.142	3.19	3.75	1	5
40 plus	88	3.22	1.205	0.198	2.81	3.62	1	5
Total	500	3.55	1.067	0.077	3.39	3.7	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA				
Table No. 1.1B _{2b} Role in sync with mission				
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F
Between	8.339	3	2.780	2.501
Within	206.734	186	1.111	
Total	215.074	189		

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .0061 which is greater than 0.05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to their age.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘Role Is In Sync with Mission’ With Respect to their Job Levels:

Table No. 1.1B _{3a} Role in sync with mission Descriptives								
Job levels	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Semi – Skilled	203	3.63	0.871	0.082	3.46	3.79	1	5

Personal Banker / Loan Assistant	188	3.42	1.204	0.118	3.19	3.66	1	5
Supervisory	105	3.50	1.143	0.150	3.20	3.80	1	5
Executive	4	3.50	2.121	1.500	-15.56	22.56	2	5
Total	276	3.52	1.070	0.064	3.39	3.65	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1B _{3b} Role in sync with mission					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	2.235	3	0.745	0.648	0.585
Within	312.635	272	1.149		
Total	314.870	275			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .0585 is greater than 0.05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to their job-level.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on 'Role Is In Sync with Mission' With Respect to Banks:

Table No. 1.1B_{4a} Role in sync with mission Descriptives

Banks	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Private	345	3.54	1.229	0.136	3.27	3.81	1	5
Public	155	3.54	0.960	0.158	3.22	3.86	1	5
Total	500	3.54	1.148	0.105	3.33	3.75	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1B _{4b} Role in sync with mission					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	0.000	1	0.000	0.000	0.986
Within	155.579	117	1.330		
Total	155.580	118			

Source: Questionnaire administered, 2016

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .0986 which is greater than 0.05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to the banks.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on 'Role Is In Sync with Mission' With Respect to the Income-Group:

Table No. 1.1B_{5a} Role in sync with mission Descriptives

Income s	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than Rs. 15000/-	50	3.42	1.311	0.379	2.58	4.25	1	5
from Rs.15001/- to Rs.30000/-	165	3.40	1.194	0.189	3.02	3.78	1	5
from Rs.30001/- to Rs. 50000/-	165	3.43	1.152	0.182	3.06	3.79	1	5
More than Rs. 50000/-	120	3.62	0.942	0.175	3.26	3.98	2	5
Total	500	3.46	1.126	0.102	3.26	3.67	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1B _{5b} Role in sync with mission					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	0.963	3	0.321	0.249	0.862
Within	151.119	117	1.292		
Total	152.083	120			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .0862 which is greater than 0 .05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to their income.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of Employees on ‘Role Is In Sync with Mission’ With Respect to the Qualifications:

Table No. 1.1B _{6a} Perception on Role in sync with mission Descriptives								
Qualifications 1: Graduate 2: Post graduate 3: Professional qualifications	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	277	3.50	1.134	0.189	3.12	3.88	1	5
2	100	3.62	1.121	0.311	2.94	4.29	2	5
3	123	3.75	0.775	0.194	3.34	4.16	2	5
Total	65	3.58	1.044	0.130	3.33	3.84	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1B _{6b} Perception on Role in sync with mission					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	0.708	2	0.354	0.318	0.729
Within	69.077	62	1.114		
Total	69.785	64			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was .0729 which is greater than 0 .05 indicating that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on their role in sync with mission with respect to their qualifications.

Considering the analysis of all the above mentioned aspects based on the tables 1.1B_{1a}, 1.1B_{6b} null hypothesis H1B0 was accepted i.e., there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on ‘role in sync with mission of the bank’ with respect to their gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualifications.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on ‘I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job’ With Respect to their Gender:

Table No. 1.1.C _{1a} Descriptives: Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job								
Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Female	183	3.66	0.883	0.101	3.46	3.86	1	5
Male	317	3.46	1.098	0.095	3.27	3.65	1	5
Total	500	3.53	1.027	0.071	3.39	3.67	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA					
Table No. 1.1.C _{1b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job					
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	2.023	1	2.023	1.928	0.166
Within	218.243	208	1.049		
Total	220.267	209			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.166 which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on ‘I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job’ with respect to their gender.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on ‘I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job’ With Respect to their Age:

Table No. 1.1.C _{2a} Descriptives : Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job								
Age s	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		

between 20 to 24	16	3.17	0.753	0.307	2.38	3.96	2	4
between 23 to 30	214	3.87	0.798	0.088	3.69	4.04	1	5
between 31 to 40	173	3.41	1.265	0.156	3.10	3.72	1	5
40 plus	97	3.41	1.040	0.171	3.06	3.75	1	5
Total	500	3.60	1.046	0.076	3.45	3.75	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA

Table No. 1.1.C _{2b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job						
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Between	10.727	3	3.576	3.390	0.019	
Within	197.231	187	1.055			
Total	207.958	190				

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.019 which was smaller than 0.05. Therefore, there was significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job' with respect to their age.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on 'I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job' With Respect to their Job Levels:

Table No. 1.1.C _{3a} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job Descriptives								
Job levels	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Semi-skilled	204	3.55	0.973	0.092	3.37	3.73	1	5
Personal banker/loan assistant	188	3.59	1.011	0.099	3.39	3.78	1	5
Supervisory	105	3.67	1.082	0.142	3.39	3.96	1	5
Executive	3	5.00	0.000	0.000	5.00	5.00	5	5
Total	500	3.60	1.012	0.061	3.48	3.72	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA

Table No. 1.1.C _{3b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job						
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Between	4.541	3	1.514	1.486	0.219	
Within	277.979	273	1.018			
Total	282.520	276				

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.219 which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job' with respect to their job levels.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on 'I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job' With Respect to their Banks:

Table No. 1.1.C _{4a} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job Descriptives								
Banks	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Private	345	3.79	1.255	0.139	3.52	4.07	1	5
Public	155	3.19	1.101	0.181	2.82	3.56	1	5
Total	500	3.61	1.237	0.113	3.38	3.83	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA

Table No. 1.1.C _{4b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job						
Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	

Between	9.286	1	9.286	6.348	0.013
Within	171.151	117	1.463		
Total	180.437	118			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.013 which was smaller than 0.05. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job' with respect to the different types of banks they were associated with.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on 'I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job' With Respect to their Income:

Income s	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Less than Rs. 15000/-	50	3.75	1.138	0.329	3.03	4.47	2	5
from Rs.15001/- to Rs.30000/-	165	3.30	1.137	0.180	2.94	3.66	1	5
from Rs.30001/- to Rs. 50000/-	165	3.30	1.181	0.187	2.92	3.68	1	5
More than Rs. 50000/-	120	3.31	1.137	0.211	2.88	3.74	1	5
Total	500	3.35	1.145	0.104	3.14	3.55	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA

Table No. 1.1.C_{5b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job

Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	2.165	3	0.722	0.544	0.653
Within	155.257	117	1.327		
Total	157.421	120			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.653 which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job' with respect to their income.

One Way Anova to Identify the Perception of the Employees on 'I Receive Recognition or Praise Regularly for Good Job' With Respect to Qualifications:

Qualifications 1: Graduate 2: Post graduate 3: Professional qualifications	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1	277	3.31	1.261	0.210	2.88	3.73	1	5
2	100	3.85	0.801	0.222	3.36	4.33	2	5
3	123	3.25	1.000	0.250	2.72	3.78	1	5
Total	500	3.40	1.129	0.140	3.12	3.68	1	5

Source: Questionnaire administered

ANOVA

Table No. 1.1.C_{6b} Perception on receiving recognition or praise regularly for good job

Analysis of Anova	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	3.269	2	1.634	1.294	0.282
Within	78.331	62	1.263		
Total	81.600	64			

Source: Questionnaire administered

Interpretation:

From the Anova table p value was 0.282 which was greater than 0.05. Therefore, there was significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job' with respect to their qualifications.

Based on the Anova tables 1.1.C_{1a}-1.1.C_{6b} on the perception of employees regarding 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job', it was observed that there was no significant difference with respect to gender, job levels, income and qualifications. Therefore null hypothesis H1C0 was accepted with respect to those variables.

It was observed that there was significant difference with respect to the employees', types of banks and qualifications. As a result, null hypothesis was rejected with respect to these variables. Therefore alternative hypothesis H1C1 was accepted with respect to working tenure, age, types of banks and qualifications.

Conclusion:

This study explored influence of demographic variables such as gender, age-group, job levels, banks, income and qualification son post-merger bank employees' perception of about their role. Based on the analysis it can be concluded that majority of the respondents believed that post-merger they knew what was expected of their roles, their roles were in sync with mission' and they received recognition or praise regularly for good job' Based on the analysis and interpretation it can be stated that all these statements mentioned above were true for majority of the respondents. Also it was observed that there was no significant difference in the perception of employees on 'I know what is expected' with respect to their with respect to gender, age-group, job levels, types of banks, income and qualifications. Regarding 'I receive recognition or praise regularly for good job', it was observed that there was no significant difference with respect to gender, job levels, income groups and qualifications; whereas there was significant difference with respect to the employees' age groups, types of banks and qualifications.

References:

1. Arindam Banerjee and Sanjeev Kumar (2006), 'Bank Mergers: Better Means towards Value Creation', In Vandana Shajan, Sandipa Lahiri Anand ed. Mergers in the banking industry: A Global Perspective. P. 28-29. ICFAI University Press.
2. Appelbaum, S.H., Gandell, J., Shapiro, B.T., Belisle, R, and Hoeven, E. (2000). Anatomy of a merger: Behavior of organizational factors and processes throughout the pre, during, and post-stages. *Management Decision*, 38: 674-680.
3. Bellou, V. (2007). Psychological contract assessment after a major organizational change. The case of merger and acquisition. *Journal of employee relations*. Vol. 29 ISS:1 pp68-88.
4. Cartwright, S., and Cooper, C.L. (1995). Organizational marriage: Hard versus soft issues? *Personnel Review*, 24(3): 32-42.
5. Ivancevich, J.M., Schweiger, D.M., and Power, F.R. (1987). Strategies for managing human resources during mergers and acquisitions. *Human Resource Planning*, 70(1): 19-35. Lau, C.M., Wong K. M. & Eggleton I.R.C. (2008). Fairness of performance evaluation procedures and job satisfaction: the role of outcome-based and non-outcome based effect, *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 38, No.2, pp. 121-135
6. Marks, M.L., and Mirvis, P.H. (1985). Merger syndrome: Stress and uncertainty. *Mergers and Acquisitions*, 20: 70-76.
7. Rafferty, A.E., and Restubog (2010). The impact of change process and context on change reactions and turnover during a merger. *Journal of Management*, 36(5): 1309-1338.
8. Seo, G.S., and Hill, N.S. (2005). Understanding the human side of merger and acquisition: An integrative framework. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*, 47(4): 422-443.
9. Schweiger, D.M., and DeNisi, A.S. (1991). Communication with employees following a merger: A longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 110-135.
10. Wickramasinghe, V, and Karunaratne, C. (2009). People management in mergers and acquisitions in Sri Lanka: Employee perceptions. *Int. Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(3): 694-715.
11. <https://www.ft.com/content/0e9afdce-cdb6-11e6-b8ce-b9c03770f8b1>
12. <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/industry/banking/finance/banking/sbi-pushes-merger-of-5-associate-banks-bmb-to-next-fiscal/articleshow/56295671.cms>