Comparative Analysis over the Employee Involvement, Employee Engagement and Employee Performance in the Indian Banking Sector

Sarveswara Rao Parasa ,

Research Scholar,

Department of Human Resource Management, Acharya Nagarjuna University

Dr.V.Srinivasa Prasad,

Director P.G & U.G (Un-Aided Courses),

V.R.S &Y.R.N.College, Chirala

Abstract

This research paper is emphasized to discover the impact of employee involvement, employee engagement and employee performance in the Indian banking sector. The study is also aimed to compare the public and private sector banks scenario with respect to the selected public and private sector banks. The results are presented well in this research paper.

Key Words:

Public sector banks, Private sector banks, Employee Involvement, Employee Engagement, Employee Performance and Indian Banking Sector

Introduction

Performance is defined as the accomplishment of the organization in respect to its predetermined goals. It covers outcomes attained or attained as a result of individuals' or teams' contributions to the organization's strategic goals. Both behavioral and economic outcomes are included in the definition of performance. Performance is viewed more thoroughly by Luthans et al. (2017), who address both actions and outcomes. It is thought that actions have inherent value and may be assessed independently of the outcomes. An impact is performance. Any administrator's responsibilities can be divided into three categories: related, doing, and being. Give careful thought to the management skills that are pertinent to their work. It is the manager mentally getting ready. The focus of doing is on administrative tasks that have varying degrees of effectiveness at various organizational levels and that have an impact on how other roles perform in relation to the administrative output and overall organizational performance. As it has been said, ideas are simple, enjoyable things. They need our cooperation to function.

A relationship depicts the type of relationship that exists between individuals, whether they are vertical, horizontal, or part of another network. The administration can open the door to a procedure for handling problems with manufacturing performance and other matters. There is a great deal of promise when it comes to assigning a set of tasks and meeting performance goals. The goal of performance management is to control employees' disinterested purpose, output, and happiness. A win-win campaign is dependable. The outcome will be crucial to the success of firms who follow the strategy in order to meet their objectives. It is important to note that, in terms of plan fulfillment, the administration of the ending performs more like a spiral, and that, in terms of the administration of the finishing, out of the potential of the entire year, it equals the balance and is the mainstream (Lyons et al, 2019). At the conclusion of the year, it also entails recognizing and rewarding achievement. The goal of performance

management, which connects these to each character's performance in the movie, is always to meet organizational objectives. generates profitable business According to Macey et al. (2018)[68], the performance management layer for action tends to lessen intra-organizational conflict.

Performance Management in India

a change in perspective in India, the industry's sacred ceremony, and increased competitiveness. On the one hand, multinational businesses that practice good governance and those that are characterized by allegations are attempting to strengthen their influence in the nation where they are subject to the law, but this is not happening quickly enough, and this is hurting India as its demand for their products grows. to remain competitive in order to keep a portion of the local market as businesses seek out the Indian coast for its top-notch goods and services at affordable costs. This necessitates comparing the charity's performance against that of the competition, as well as looking at signals and worldwide efficiency. There's a solitary workout. Businesses must keep an eye on employee performance and the HR variables that influence it in a proactive and useful manner. An analysis of the systems' evolution across all business domains involving human resources management (HRM) was conducted as part of the significant emerging plan (Carver et al., 2019).

Senior management needs to lay out expectations and objectives in detail. A new economic focus is on performance, without a doubt the motto "Make them perish (Hindustan Times, 2021). Amon, which is for democracy and the large emerging economies of India, we are looking for and modernize their institutions transform history so that This commitment to economic development. The globalization of privatization, the new policies of the government of India, India is the need for organizations changed in the execution of their systems of suffer human resources management, also in view of the globalization of the highest expectations of customers, in the next decade, organizations testified, and without equal, the operating pressure organizations innovate, will remain forever in the market to create value for its customers. Therefore, the focus is on performance, which means more than the other elements of the established steps motivate, given as reward in his own way, and for his great victory over us. Performance management is a continuous process administering recognized pig to measure performance and improve human organizations.

In order to measure the progress of differentiating between performance levels, millimeter training needs rewards, and validating the identification of employees for the promotion, it is hoped that systematic observations will be picked up by them. For four reasons, the need to address the effectiveness of the performance management process for Indian companies arises: first, global high-performance work systems have proven crucial to maintaining objective competitiveness and relying on them, our proper performance management process; second, it has been revealed in various studies that the process of past performance management in India.

Thirdly, the efficiency of working cultures in Indian organizations is the risk of the use of employee PAs, which appear to be more prone to the fact that they are not integrated into a competitive human resources management system to world level. Fourth, it has been criticized by the managers of India does not assume any competence in the performance management process. India, which took place in the absence of mutual power, passion, and especially the feedback of management employees, the skepticism provoked no resistance, and the implementation of formal performance management systems. Jeenings et al, (2013) see three main process of performance management, as it comprises - extended design and performance. Of course, these three can be taken out of the process from the point of view of performance management at all levels - of the entire organization, business unit, department, team, individual, etc. Johns (2014)[90] Phases of the cycle, the three proposed is the planning performance; performance evaluation; The acts of a cure, and that seems to drive actions. Jones (2015) also proposes a three-step process, planning, management and valuation.

Review of Literature

London (2015)[93] refers to the first three sets of each of which is distinct from the first, the first of which the experience of, and the interactions between the two are known. In other words, employees' knowledge and skills, which is not the role of factors that influence the outcome. Kahn (2010) also mentions three other things: planning, counting up to support and carry it out, and putting the battle in the opinion that the employee for the common

destiny of the writings of what the idea of the expectation of the common; About the direct participation of the authors use it as a common means used to obtain it. The support to the first, to declare that it corresponds to the finish, of which he rightly ordered love in a certain way, or that that part has in the game, that is to recognize the performance.

According to Lopez et al. (2020), an enhancer system is one that influences an individual's performance indirectly through firsthand influence. It has been demonstrated that enhancers involve an individual and the office of a council leader who can develop the process and movement of men. In other words, an individual can have multiple effects, such as influencing multiple factors simultaneously, such as the setting of objectives and the feedback of information and motivation effects.

Ledford and Lawler observed anguish, workplaces, ceased to be Wagner definition and service to share says it has little positive effect on what is necessary: limited effect Press participation. Further defended the conceptualization and service of 'high participation' essentially a generalized war throughout the organization. Despite the worker's participation in the performance management function, the author of the letter notes that the performance of the effects of some dispute improves. So, the price is worth the meta-analytical expression for review in the EU Luthans et al, (2006) concluded that participation would not have a positive effect on performance (and satisfaction) had suggested, but the magnitude of these effects are so light as to be of limited practical importance.

Furthermore, a later meta-analytic review of the EU's sharing policies in the context of performance evaluation found that shares (of all kinds) are connected to a variety of outcomes, including trial performance. Similarly, the effects of fees (payment for performance management performance on an important part of many organizations) are not always favorable. Researchers looked at the interventions and discovered that they lead to increased variability and psychology.

The findings of a recent review by Luthans et al. (2022) said that "the link between cause and subsequent performance merit pay, as of yet, has not produced positive results. While in order to choose the activities certain core includes managing performance, it is important to capture systems perspective (Denise, 2000) and that recognize the core activities interact not only among themselves but also with other functions of human resources and the various factors that make up the system performance environment. Luthans et al., (2006), argue that "the feedback is more than daily or informal feedback from the trial that occurs in a session of the annual or semiannual performance in terms of its impact on job performance and attitudes."

Research gaps

Indian banks are always attempting to incentivize their employees because they think that a motivated staff will provide quality work. There has also been a lot of research done on general topics or the performance of employees in the manufacturing or service sectors. Furthermore, the relevant studies are conducted both outside and in India. Certain research have primarily aimed to uncover the characteristics that impact employee performance. Numerous studies have demonstrated the significance of employee motivating factors and their influence on worker performance. A few more research concentrated on the organizational aspects. These studies held that beneficial outcomes in terms of employee performance would arise from an effective workplace environment. Several writers' earlier research contributions have also demonstrated that successful HR components have a direct impact on employee performance.

Additional research has demonstrated the significance of human resource factors, such as employee attributes or individual characteristics. The research findings indicate that managerial factors have the potential to influence employee performance within organizations. There is a strong correlation between employee engagement and employee motivational variables, according to certain research findings. The relevant research provided an overview of the relationship between the organizational performance-influencing elements and employee engagement levels. Furthermore, a moderating influence of employee involvement in the degree of change in employee engagement levels was noted in other studies. Additionally, the research findings indicate that motivated staff members have the ability to contribute positively to the workplace and may even lead to improved performance inside the company.

Regarding this, it is thought that not much research has been done on the knowledge, perceptions, feelings, emotions, and satisfactions related to employee performance in Indian organizations. The influence of performance-influencing elements, such as organizational, motivational, HR, and management factors, on employee engagement and the moderating presence of employee involvement has not been thoroughly studied. From that point on, no research has examined the influence of employee engagement on worker performance. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine whether employee involvement has a moderating effect on performance factors that affect employee engagement, which in turn affects employee performance.

Research Design

With the limited data that is currently available on the factors influencing employee performance, employee involvement, and employee engagement in the context of the Indian banking sector, the researcher made the assumption that both qualitative and quantitative approaches would be used to clarify the research problem. Through the moderating effect of employee involvement, the research study attempted to explore and examine the relevant factors influencing performance in the Indian banking scenario, namely organizational factors, motivational factors, HR factors, and managerial factors on employee engagement. Finally, the impact of employee engagement on employee performance in the Indian banking sector was tested.

This research has been broadly divided into two phases: the phase of qualitative analysis and the phase of quantitative analysis. Using a qualitative technique, the researcher determined which elements are influencing performance. These components are referred to as managerial, organizational, motivational, and HR factors. Additionally, the study used the assumption that staff involvement would highlight employee engagement, which may then contribute to employee performance.

Comparative Analysis over Employee involvement:
Employees of banks, including those at SBI, Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks, have had their impressions of the variable employee participation tested. The study takes into account the four banks in question, and the findings are reported in the accompanying tables. Out of the 600 samples, 150 samples from each of the aforementioned banks have been taken into consideration. The model's descriptive statistics are shown in the table below. The study's findings revealed the average ratings of every bank. The findings showed that the mean score for SBI Bank was 1.5267; the mean score for Union Bank of India Bank was 2.0067; the mean score for UCO Bank was 3.4533; and the mean score for Punjab National Bank was 3.4667. According to the test's standard deviation figures, SBI Bank's standard deviation is 0.50096. The standard deviation for the Union Bank of India is 1.08372. The standard deviation for UCO Bank is 0.49949. Ultimately, the standard deviation is 0.50056, according to the Punjab National Bank.

The Standard Error values were also obtained using this model. 0.04090 is the standard error figure for SBI Bank. The standard error value was recorded as 0.08849 by Union Bank of India. The standard error values obtained for UCO Bank and Punjab National Bank are 0.04078 and 0.04087, respectively. The concerned model's boot strapping results are likewise displayed in the table. According to SBI Bank's bootstrapping results, the maximum control limit is 1.6075 and the lower control limit is 1.4458. According to the bootstrapping values provided by Union Bank of India, the highest control limit is 2.1815 and the lower control limit is 1.8318. According to UCO Bank's bootstrapping results, 3.5339 is the upper bound limit and 3.3727 is the lower control limit. The bootstrapping findings obtained for Punjab National Bank indicate that the maximum control limit is 3.5474 and the lower bound value is 3.3859. But since the bootstrapping results' lower and upper bound values do not equal zero, it can be said that the model's mean scores in question are significant. Based on these data, we can say that the employee involvement variable's descriptive statistics are reliable.

Table: - 1 Descriptive Statistics of the model over Employee involvement

Descriptives								
Employee involvement								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
SBI	150	3.5267	.500	.040	3.4458	3.607	3.00	4.00
Union Bank of India	150	3.2467	.674	.055	3.1378	3.355	2.00	4.00
UCO Bank	150	2.4933	.501	.040	2.4124	2.574	2.00	3.00
Punjab National Bank	150	2.4867	.501	.040	2.4058	2.567	2.00	3.00
Total	600	2.9383	.715	.029	2.8810	2.995	2.00	4.00

The study's ANOVA statistics showed that the model is significant since its significant value, which is less than 0.05, is discovered to be 0.000. It is discovered that the total of squares between the groups is 447.400. In the model, the degrees of freedom between groups are represented by 3. The model's mean square value between its groups is represented as 149.133. The model's F-Value is determined to be 309.814. The statistics within the group were also prompted by the data. The model's degrees of freedom are seen to be 596, and the sum of squares values among groups is discovered to be 286.893.

Table: - 2 ANOVA Statistics of the model over Employee involvement

ANOVA					
Employee involvement					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	447.400	3	149.133	309.814	0.000
Within Groups	286.893	596	.481		
Total	734.293	599			

These outcomes were also supported by the Multiple Comparisons. The variable of employee involvement is compared amongst the banks in relation to this aspect. The staff involvement of SBI Bank is far higher than that of Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks. The Union Bank of India and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is 0.09748, and the mean difference is 0.48000. The model's bootstrap results showed that 1.2275 is the upper bound value and 0.07325 is the lower bound. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The mean difference between SBI Bank and UCO Bank is determined to be 1.92667, the model's standard error is indicated as 0.0576, and the significance value is determined to be 0.000. The model's bootstrap results showed that the upper limit value is 3.7724 and the lower bound value is 2.0759. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The Punjab National Bank and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is 0.05782, and the mean difference is 1.94000. The model's bootstrap results

showed that the upper limit value is 3.7906 and the lower bound value is 2.0894. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful.

Table: - 3 Multiple Comparisons of the model over Employee involvement

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee involvement						
Games-Howell						
(I) Name of the Bank	(J) Name of the Bank	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SBI	Union Bank of India	0.48000*	.09748	0.000	0.7325	1.2275
	UCO Bank	1.92667*	.05776	0.000	2.0759	3.7774
	Punjab National Bank	1.94000*	.05782	0.000	2.0894	3.7906
Union Bankoff India	SBI	0.48000*	.09748	0.000	0.2275	0.7325
	UCO Bank	1.44667*	.09743	0.000	1.6990	1.7943
	Punjab National Bank	1.46000*	.09747	0.000	1.7124	1.9076
UCO Bank	SBI	1.92667*	.05776	0.000	1.7774	2.0759
	Union Bank of India	1.44667*	.09743	0.000	1.1943	1.6990
	Punjab National Bank	0.01333	.05774	0.000	-.1625	.1358
Punjab National Bank	SBI	1.94000*	.05782	0.000	1.7906	2.0894
	Union Bank of India	1.46000*	.09747	0.000	1.2076	1.7124
	UCO Bank	0.01333	.05774	0.000	-.1358	.1625
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

Comparative Analysis over Employee engagement:

Employees of banks, including SBI, Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks, have had their opinions of the variable staff engagement tested. The study takes into account the four banks in question, and the findings are reported in the accompanying tables. Out of the 600 samples, 150 samples from each of the aforementioned banks have been taken into consideration. The model's descriptive statistics are shown in the table below. The study's findings revealed the average ratings of every bank. The findings showed that the mean score for SBI Bank was 3.5067; the mean score for Union Bank of India Bank was 3.1533); the mean score for UCO Bank was 2.5333; and the mean score for Punjab National Bank was 2.5400. According to the test's Standard Deviation figures, SBI Bank's standard deviation is 0.50163. The standard deviation for the Union Bank of India is 0.68284. The standard deviation for UCO Bank is 0.50056. Ultimately, the standard deviation is 0.50007, according to the Punjab National Bank.

The Standard Error values were also obtained using this model. 0.04096 is the standard error value found for SBI Bank. The standard error value was recorded as 0.05575, according to Union Bank of India. The standard error values obtained for UCO Bank and Punjab National Bank are 0.04087 and 0.04083, respectively. The table also displays the concerned model's boot strapping results. According to SBI Bank's bootstrapping results, the maximum control limit is 3.5876 and the lower control limit is 3.4257. According to the bootstrapping values provided by Union Bank of India, the highest control limit is 3.2635 and the lower control limit is 3.0432. According to UCO Bank's bootstrapping results, the top bound limit is recorded as 2.6141 and the lower control limit is determined to be 2.4526. The bootstrapping findings obtained for Punjab National Bank yielded an upper control limit of 2.6207 and a lower bound value of 2.4593. But since the bootstrapping results' lower and upper bound values do not equal zero, it can be said that the model's mean scores in question are significant. Based on these data, we can say that the employee engagement variable's descriptive statistics are reliable.

Table: - 4 Descriptive Statistics of the model over Employee engagement

Descriptives								
Employee engagement								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
SBI	150	3.506	.50163	.0409	3.425	3.5876	3.00	4.00
Union Bank of India	150	3.153	.68284	.0557	3.043	3.2635	2.00	4.00
UCO Bank	150	2.533	.50056	.0408	2.452	2.6141	2.00	3.00
Punjab National Bank	150	2.540	.50007	.0408	2.459	2.6207	2.00	3.00
Total	600	2.933	.69018	.0281	2.878	2.9887	2.00	4.00

The study's ANOVA statistics showed that the model is significant since its significant value, which is less than 0.05, is discovered to be 0.000. It is discovered that the total of squares between the groups is 103.773. In the model, the degrees of freedom between groups are represented by 3. 34.591 is the mean square value between the model's groupings. It is discovered that the model's F-Value is 113.551. The statistics within the group were also prompted by the data. The model's degrees of freedom are seen to be 596, and the sum of squares values among groups is discovered to be 181.560.

Table: - 5: ANOVA Statistics of the model over Employee engagement

ANOVA					
Employee engagement					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	103.773	3	34.591	113.55	0.000
Within Groups	181.560	596	0.305		
Total	285.333	599			

These outcomes were also supported by the Multiple Comparisons. The variable pertaining to employee engagement is compared amongst the institutions. Significant differences are observed in employee

involvement between SBI Bank, Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks. The Union Bank of India and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is 0.06918, and the mean difference is 0.35333. The model's bootstrap results showed that 0.1745 is the lower bound value and 0.5322 is the upper bound value. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The comparison between SBI Bank and UCO Bank yields the following results: a mean difference of 0.97333, a standard error of the model of 0.05786, and a significance value of 0.000. The model's bootstrap results showed that the top limit value is 1.1228 and the lower bound value is 0.8238. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The Punjab National Bank and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is 0.05783, and the mean difference is 0.96667. According to the model's bootstrap results, the upper limit value is 1.1228 and the lower bound value is 0.8172. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful.

Table: - 6 Multiple Comparisons of the model over Employee engagement

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee engagement						
Games-Howell						
(I) Name of the Bank	(J) Name of the Bank	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SBI	Union Bank Of India	.35333[*]	.06918	0.000	.1745	.5322
	UCO Bank	.97333[*]	.05786	0.000	.8238	1.1228
	Punjab National Bank	.96667[*]	.05783	0.000	.8172	1.1161
Union Bank of India	SBI	.35333[*]	.06918	0.000	0.5322	0.7745
	UCO Bank	.62000[*]	.06913	0.000	.4413	.7987
	Punjab National Bank	.61333[*]	.06911	0.000	.4347	.7920
UCO Bank	SBI	.97333[*]	.05786	0.000	1.1228	2.8238
	Union Bank of India	.62000[*]	.06913	0.000	0.7987	1.4413
	Punjab National Bank	.00667	.05777	0.000	0.1559	0.2426
Punjab National Bank	Sbi	.96667[*]	.05783	0.000	1.1161	2.8172
	Union Bank of India	.61333[*]	.06911	0.000	0.7920	1.4347
	UCO Bank	.00667	.05777	0.000	0.1426	0.1559
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

Comparative Analysis over Employee performance:

Employees of banks, including those at SBI, Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks, are asked about their impressions of fluctuating employee performance. The study takes into account the four banks in question, and the findings are reported in the accompanying tables. Out of the 600 samples, 150 samples from each of the aforementioned banks have been taken into consideration. The model's descriptive statistics are shown in the table below. The study's findings revealed the average ratings of every bank. The findings showed that the mean score for SBI Bank was 4.4933; the mean score for Union Bank of India Bank was 4.3333; the mean score for UCO Bank was 2.4933; and the mean score for Punjab National Bank was 1.4467. According to the test's Standard Deviation figures, SBI Bank's standard deviation is 0.50163. The standard deviation for the Union Bank of India is 1.40310. The standard deviation for UCO Bank is 0.50163. Ultimately, the standard deviation was determined to be 0.49881 by the Punjab National Bank.

The Standard Error values were also obtained using this model. A 0.0409 standard error value is obtained for SBI bank. The standard error value was recorded as 0.1145 by Union Bank of India. The standard error values obtained for UCO Bank and Punjab National Bank are 0.0409 and 0.0407, respectively. The concerned model's boot strapping results are likewise displayed in the table. According to SBI Bank's bootstrapping results, the maximum control limit is 1.5743, while the lower control limit value is 1.4124. According to the bootstrapping values provided by Union Bank of India, the maximum control limit is 2.5597 and the lower control limit is 2.1070. According to UCO Bank's bootstrapping results, the maximum bound limit is 4.5743 and the lower control limit is 4.4124. The bootstrapping findings obtained for Punjab National Bank yielded an upper control limit of 4.5271 and a lower bound value of 4.3662. But since the bootstrapping results' lower and upper bound values do not equal zero, it can be said that the model's mean scores in question are significant. We may infer from these data that the employee performance variable-related descriptive statistics are reliable.

Table: - 7 Descriptive Statistics of the model over Employee performance

Descriptives								
Employee performance								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
SBI	150	4.493	.50163	.0409	1.4124	1.5743	1.00	2.00
Union Bank of India	150	4.333	1.40310	.1145	2.1070	2.5597	1.00	5.00
UCO Bank	150	2.493	.50163	.0409	4.4124	4.5743	4.00	5.00
Punjab National Bank	150	1.446	.49881	.0407	4.3662	4.5271	4.00	5.00
Total	600	3.191	1.54993	.0632	3.0674	3.3159	1.00	5.00

The study's ANOVA statistics showed that the model is significant since its significant value, which is less than 0.05, is discovered to be 0.000. It is discovered that the total of squares between the groups is 1033.565. In the model, the degrees of freedom between groups are represented by 3. 344.522 is the mean square value between the groups in the model. It is discovered that the model's F-Value is 506.508. The statistics within the group were also prompted by the data. The model's degrees of freedom are seen to be 596, and the sum of squares values among groups is discovered to be 405.393.

Table: - 8 ANOVA Statistics of the model over Employee performance

ANOVA					
Employee performance					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1033.565	3	344.522	506.508	0.000
Within Groups	405.393	596	0.680		
Total	1438.958	599			

These outcomes were also supported by the Multiple Comparisons. In relation to employee performance, the banks compare the variable employee performance. Significant differences are seen in the staff performance of SBI Bank when compared to Union Bank of India, UCO Bank, and Punjab National Banks. The Union Bank of India and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is indicated as 0.1216, and the mean difference is 0.84000. The model's bootstrap results showed that the upper limit value is 2.5246 and the lower bound value is 0.1554. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The model's standard error is indicated as 0.0579, the significance value is determined to be 0.000, and the mean difference between SBI Bank and UCO Bank is found to be 3.0000. The model's bootstrap results showed that the upper limit value is 2.8504 and the lower bound value is 1.1496. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful. The Punjab National Bank and SBI Bank are compared, and the results show that the significance value is 0.000, the model's standard error is indicated as 0.0577, and the mean difference is 2.95333. The model's bootstrap results showed that the upper limit value is 2.8041 and the lower bound value is 0.1026. But since there isn't a zero value in any of the bootstrapping findings, the model is deemed meaningful.

Table: - 9 Multiple Comparisons of the model over Employee performance

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Employee performance						
Games-Howell						
(I) Name of the Bank	(J) Name of the Bank	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
SBI	Union Bank of India	.3533[*]	.06918	0.000	.1745	.5322
	UCO Bank	.9733[*]	.05786	0.000	.8238	1.1228
	Punjab National Bank	.9666[*]	.05783	0.000	.8172	1.1161
Union Bank of India	SBI	.3533[*]	.06918	0.000	0.5322	0.7745
	UCO Bank	.6200[*]	.06913	0.000	.4413	.7987
	Punjab National Bank	.6133[*]	.06911	0.000	.4347	.7920

UCO Bank	SBI	.9733*	.05786	0.000	1.1228	2.8238
	Union Bank of India	.6200*	.06913	0.000	0.7987	1.4413
	Punjab National Bank	.0066	.05777	0.000	0.1559	0.2426
Punjab National Bank	SBI	.9666*	.05783	0.000	1.1161	2.8172
	Union Bank of India	.6133*	.06911	0.000	0.7920	1.4347
	UCO Bank	.0066	.05777	0.000	0.1426	0.1559
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.						

Conclusions:

The study's conclusions gave readers a clear picture of how Indian banking industry personnel handle their employees' performance. It is determined that all three influencing factors organizational, motivational, and HR are being given the attention they deserve within the organization. Employees at the organization have long held the belief that it continuously delivers motivating elements. They concluded that the organization is quite concerned about a number of issues, including pay, job security, employee advancement, independence, and proper training, among other things.The study's consideration of HR issues, which have a significant impact on employee performance, is also crucial. Employees in the Indian banking sector have prioritized helping their colleagues become more environmentally motivated. The organization is taking the necessary precautions to instill the different parts, which include goal-setting, job assistance, mentorship, workplace incentives, rule congruity, and supervisor support.

Employees in the Indian banking industry have a long-term goal of developing their staff members' skills. The organization constantly aims to foster a culture that fosters the need for success within the organization. It is imperative that organizations create more programs like this one that help employees grow as individuals. Finally, it is said that the study's empirical analysis supported the aforementioned claims as well. The findings showed that the participants are appropriately concerned about motivating factors. After that, the respondents expressed the opinion that managers have a major role in the hiring decisions made by Indian bank employees, with human resources playing a secondary role. This phenomenon unmistakably shows that employees in the Indian banking sector are most concerned about motivating elements, moderately concerned about managerial aspects, and least concerned with human resources. Employees in the Indian banking sector are therefore obliged to design such initiatives that can aid in establishing a believable workplace atmosphere that fosters productive employee performance.

References

1. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2017). Psychological capital: Investing and developing positive organizational behavior. In D. L. Nelson & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Positive organizational behavior (pp. 9−24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
2. Lyons, J. B., & Schneider, T. R. (2019). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. The Leadership Quarterly, 20, 737−748.
3. Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2018). The meaning of employee engagement. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1, 3−30.
4. Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. (2019). Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage. Malden, WA: Wiley- Blackwell.
5. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2018). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 498−512.

6. Rousseau, D. M. (2021). The idiosyncratic deal: Flexibility versus fairness. Organizational Dynamics, 29, 260−273.

7. Saks, A. M. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21, 600−619.

8. Saks, A. M., & Gruman, J. A. (2020). Socialization resources, PsyCap and employee engagement. Unpublished raw data.

9. Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2014). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25, 293−315.

10. Schaufeli, W., & Salanova, M. (2017). Work engagement: An emerging psychological concept and its implications for organizations. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), Managing social and ethical issues in organizations (pp. 135−177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

11. Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Salmela-Aro, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2019). Young managers drive to thrive: A personal work goal approach to burnout and work engagement. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75, 183−196.

12. Jennings, D. F., Rajaratnam, D., & Lawrence, F. B. (2013). Strategy–performance relationships in service firms: A test for equifinality. Journal of Managerial Issues, 2, 208−220.

13. Johns, G. (2014). Absenteeism estimates by employees and managers: Divergent perspectives and self-serving perceptions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 229−239.

14. Jones, T. W. (2015). Performance management in a changing context: Monsanto pioneers a competency-based, developmental approach. Human Resource Management, 34, 425−442.

15. Armstrong, M. (2020). Performance management: Key strategies and practical guidelines. London, UK: Kogan Page Limited.

16. Ashford, S. J., & Black, J. S. (2016). Proactivity during organizational entry: The role of desire for control. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(2), 199−214.

17. Atwater, L. E., Brett, J. F., & Cherise-Charles, A. (2017). Multisource feedback: Lessons learned and implications for practice. Human Resource Management, 46, 285−307.

18. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). The job demands–resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22, 309−328.

19. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2018). Towards a model of work engagement. Career Development International, 13, 209−223.

20. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2014). Using the job demands–resources model to predict burnout and performance. Human Resource Management, 43, 83−104.

21. Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2013). Self-concordance at work: Toward understanding the motivational effects of transformational leaders. Academy of Management Journal, 46, 554−571.

22. Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., Miller, C. J., & Fulford, D. (2019). Optimism. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), Oxford handbook of positive psychology (pp. 303−311). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

23. Hyvönen, K., Feldt, T., Salmela-Aro, K., Kinnunen, U., & Mäkikangas, A. (2019). Young managers drive to thrive: A personal work goal approach to burnout and work engagement. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75, 183−196.

24. Jennings, D. F., Rajaratnam, D., & Lawrence, F. B. (2013). Strategy–performance relationships in service firms: A test for equifinality. Journal of Managerial Issues, 2, 208−220.

25. Johns, G. (2014). Absenteeism estimates by employees and managers: Divergent perspectives and self-serving perceptions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 229−239.

26. Jones, T. W. (2015). Performance management in a changing context: Monsanto pioneers a competency-based, developmental approach. Human Resource Management, 34, 425−442.

27. Kahn, W. A. (2010). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33, 692−724.

28. London, M. (2015). Giving feedback: Source-centered antecedents and consequences of constructive and destructive feedback. Human Resource Management Review, 5, 159−188.

29. Lopez, S. J., Floyd, R. K., Ulven, J. C., & Snyder, C. R. (2020). Hope therapy: Helping clients build a house of hope. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), Handbook of hope (pp. 123−150). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

30. Luthans, F. (2022). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23, 695−706.

31. Luthans, F. (2022). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. Academy of Management Executive, 16, 57−72.

32. Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. J. (2006). Psychological capital development: Toward a micro-intervention. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27, 387−393.

33. Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Patera, J. L. (2018). Experimental analysis of a web-based training intervention to develop positive psychological capital. Academy of Management Learning and Education, 7, 209−221.

34. Luthans, F., & Jensen, S. M. (2012). Hope: A new positive strength for human resource development. Human Resource Development Review, 1, 304−322.

35. Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2017). Emerging positive organizational behavior. Journal of Management, 33, 321−349.

36. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2011). Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology, 52, 397−422.

37. Masson, R. C., Royal, M. A., Agnew, T. G., & Fine, S. (2018). Leveraging employee engagement: The practical implications. Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1, 56−59.

38. May, D. R., Gilson, R. L., & Harter, L. M. (2014). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77, 11−37.

39. Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2012). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61, 20−52.

40. Miller, D. B. (2017). How to improve the performance and productivity of the knowledge worker. Organizational Dynamics, 5, 62−80.

41. Moliner, C., Martínez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiró, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2018). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of wellbeing at work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 17, 327−348.

42. Mone, E. M., & London, M. (2020). Employee engagement through effective performance management: A practical guide for managers. New York: Routledge.

43. Pulakos, E. D. (2019). Performance management: A new approach for driving business results. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

44. Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2020). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85, 612−624.

45. Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2018). Enhancing work engagement through the management of human resources. In K. Näswall, J. Hellgren, & M. Sverke (Eds.), The individual in the changing working life (pp. 380−402). New York: Cambridge University Press.

46. Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of Happiness Studies, 3, 71−92.

47. Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2020). Positive psychology: An introduction. American Psychologist, 55, 5−14.

48. Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2019). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 482−497.

49. Sheldon, K. M., & Kasser, T. (2018). Pursuing personal goals: Skills enable progress but not all progress is beneficial. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 546−557.

50. Singh, P. (2018). Job analysis for a changing world. Human Resource Management Review, 18, 87−99.

51. Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., & Sigmon, D. R. (2015). Hope theory: A member of the positive psychology family. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), Handbook of positive psychology (pp. 257−276). New York: Oxford University Press.

52. VerWeire, K., & Van Den Berghe, L. (2014). Integrated performance management: New hype or new paradigm? In K. Verweire & L. Van Den Berghe (Eds.), Integrated performance management (pp. 1−14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

53. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2019). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82, 183−200.

54. Parzefall, M. -R., & Hakanen, J. (2020). Psychological contract and its motivational and health-enhancing properties. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25, 4−21.
55. Pfeffer, J. (1998). The human equation: Building profits by putting people first. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.