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Abstract
A comparative study has been performed between the public sector banks and the private sector banks to analyze the employees’ job performance and work motivation in the bank. The study focuses to understand, whether a relationship exists between the two defined variables, namely, job performance and work motivation. It was further studied that if a relationship exists between these variables, focus was to analyze the nature of the relationship. The research methodology used for analysis is quantitative analysis of the primary data collected. A sample size of 254 respondents is considered, out of which 138 are public bank employees and 116 are private bank employees. The data is collected through convenient sampling, using both offline as well as online modes. For the analysis of the data collected, statistical techniques Correlation and Regression were used. The overall implication of the study includes a detailed analysis of various parameters leading to employees increased work motivation and job performance. HR policy improvement HR practices can be devised by taking into consideration the significant findings of the present study.
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1. Introduction
The banking sector of any country is the backbone of its economy. Economic and social development of a nation can be measured and analyzed considering the sound health of its banking sector. The banking sector of India, in the post liberalization competitive era, has been faced with several challenges. This has lead to an internal evaluation and assessment among both private and public sector banks to review their existing policies and procedures. Analysis of the human resource management practices that are followed by the banks is also a crucial segment of this internal examination and analysis as banks today strive to attract, retain and motivate their employees. The existing Indian banking industry is assorted in its ownership structure and no single or common strategy can be expected to work and achieve solution to the challenges faced by human resource management. Hence, there is a need to develop a framework, through which, various human resource policy issues could be addressed suiting the ownership structure of the banks.

Banking being a services sector Human Resource plays a very vital role in carving the path for success of the banks. Work motivation to perform for assigned goals to the employees is the focus of almost all the organizations. Work Motivation is an important factor to study thus it has been well researched in the past. Similarly the second variable of the study, Job performance also holds an important place in services sector especially banking. The study has thus made and attempt whether a relationship exists between the two defined variables, namely, job performance and work motivation.

Review of Literature
Job Performance is a common human resource term and is used in reference to the performance of an employee in a job; however there is no universally accepted definition of this term (Kozlowski, 2012) [92]. Job performance is a multi-dimensional concept which has attracted researchers’ attention across the globe over the past two decades (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager, 1993; Roe, 1999) [21, 24, 170]. Debates in the various studies on measurement of job performance, on one end included scholars like Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, and Sager (1993) [24], Murphy and Cleveland1991), Rotundo and Sackett (2002) [155, 184].
According to them job performance should be viewed in terms of employees’ behaviour which is under the control of employees and relate to organizational goals (Kozlowski, 2012) [92], Campbell et al. (1993) [24] stressed that performance referred to only such behaviors which were goal-oriented i.e. whether the individual accomplished the organizational goal behind hiring the employee for that specific job role. Campbell et al. further established that as far as measurement of performance was concerned, at the most basic level, job performance could be differentiated in terms of either process or outcome of that performance. However, on the other end, in contrast to this group of authors, there are authors like Bernardin, Villanova, Hagan, and Kane (1998), [17] who did not agree that job performance, could be described as employees’ behaviors; they rather proposed that performance was something different and separated from the person doing it. These authors asserted that performance was the record of outcomes achieved by a person on a particular job assigned to him during a specified time period. It was also provided by these scholars that job performance is distinct from the characteristics of the person producing it (Kozlowski, 2012) [92].

Researchers have attempted to explore the reasons behind differences in individual performances on the same job. The performance of an individual in a job is an outcome of person-specific variables and situation-specific variables. Person-specific variables include cognitive abilities, knowledge, experience, non-cognitive abilities, and personality which bring a difference between performers and non-performers in the same job. Performance of an individual on a specific job is however not constant; it changes over time. Mitchell and James (2001) [141] highlighted the need for studies to systematically examine such fluctuations in individual performance. Situation-specific variables on the other hand include work characteristics, leadership, reward systems and job design which also have a bearing on individual job performance (Gerstner and Day, 1997; Podsakoff et al., 2006) [50,162].

Several theories and investigations have been developed and conducted to present a reasonable clarification identifying the factors that may motivate employees. Maslow’s hierarchy of needs theory described five distinctive basic needs including physiological, safety, belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization that flow bottom to the top in a hierarchical pyramid (Rue & Byars, 2008). [185] McClelland proposed achievement theories which categorized three motivating factors that drive people: affiliation, achievement, and power and also mentioned that each employee maintains all these needs, the “level of intensity varies among people” according to their position (Rue & Byars, 2008). [185] According to Vroom’s expectancy theory; employees are motivated when “the expectation of their action will produce certain results” and that the “worker makes an assessment of both their ability to perform a task and the probable reward type for successful performance”.

Herzberg propounded motivation-hygiene theory and stated that there exist both motivation and hygiene factors to an individual’s job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1976; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959) [63, 70]. The motivation factor includes outcomes that can lead to high levels of motivation and job satisfaction and these results may prevent people from feeling dissatisfied with their jobs” (Lauby, 2005) [118]. It includes advancement, achievement, growth, recognition, responsibility, and nature of work. The hygiene factors are associated with the environment surrounding the job, and not the actual job. They include company policies, supervision, work conditions, salary, benefits, and relationships with coworker, personal life, status, and job security and their absence leads to dissatisfaction of an employee as identified by Herzberg motivational theory.

According to Muchinsky (2006) the job characteristics theory, is based on the theoretical foundation of Hackman & Oldham’s (1976) [63] work. These researchers explored that high motivation is based on experiencing three psychological states while working - meaningfulness of work, responsibility, and knowledge of job outcomes.

Adam’s equity theory is based on the principle of social comparison. This theory explains that an individual is motivated based on his/her perception of how well his/her work is compensated in comparison to others (Muchinsky, 2006).

Work motivation is quintessentially defined as the psychological processes that direct, energize, and maintain action toward a job, task, role, or project (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Kanfer, 1990) [63,82].

One of the most recent contributions to the theories of motivation is Self-determination theory explains that employees have three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000) [174]. Herein, autonomy refers to the feeling of preference and discretion, competence refers to feeling competent and efficacious, and relatedness refers to feelings of connectedness and sense of belongingness with others.

Self-determination theory has also made a valuable contribution in understanding of work motivation by expanding the purview of extrinsic motivation. Rather than viewing extrinsic motivation as a single construct, Ryan and Deci (2000) [174] proposed that extrinsic motivation is a matter of relative degree that varies along a continuum of autonomous regulation. These researchers identified four different types of extrinsic motivation that employees experience as sequentially less controlled and more autonomous: external; based on outside reward and punishment contingencies, interjected; based on internal reward and punishment contingencies, such as guilt and self-esteem; identified; based on consistency with a personal value, and integrated; assimilated into one’s system of values. (Grant, A. M., & Shin, J., 2011) [54].

Latham & Pinder (2005) [101], in a study on analysis of motivation theories, concluded that three theories dominate current motivation literature. These are, goal setting theory, social cognitive theory, and organizational justice theory. Goal setting theory is based on the idea that in order for a goal to increase performance, the goal must be defined as difficult to achieve and be very specific. Ambiguous or unclear goals do not seem to be as motivating as goals that are specific, clear, and communicate properly. This is very important for the employees in order for them to put their efforts in the right direction (Latham & Pinder, 2005) [101]. Saxena (2013) [179], has studied the effects of organizational commitment and motivation on the success or failure of an acquisition or a merger. A set of intrinsic behavioral components such as achievement, recognition, responsibility and advancement have been identified as precursors of motivation. Additionally, factors such as contentment, positive thinking, career goals and empowerment have been defined as crucial to boost organizational commitment in
changing times. According to Kanfer's taxonomy of motivation theories (1990), research comes within the field of cognitive choice theories, which studies the mechanism of motivation (Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick, 1970) [28] and is governed by Vroom's expectancy theory (1964). The model based on Vroom’s theory, created by Porter and Lawler (1968) [164] and Nadler and Lawler (1977) [156] explains the link between behavior and attitudes and in particular between efforts, which is the indicator of motivation and job satisfaction. This framework allows for a better differentiation between the concepts of work motivation and job satisfaction as compared to other possible approaches. Furthermore, expectancy theory clearly indicates the attitudinal factors which, during the motivational process, drive the individual to produce efforts to perform better.

Gagné & Deci (2005) [44], have described the self-determination theory and its relation with self-motivation and organizational behavior. The positive effects of autonomous motivation on performance, commitment, satisfaction have been reported and the overall well-being and the relation of extrinsic reward to intrinsic motivation were analyzed. It was concluded that rewards need to be presented in a manner that is not injurious or unfavorable to an employee’s individual intrinsic motivation.

Recently, around the world there have been various studies on formulating a scale for measurement of work motivation. Tremblay et al. (2009) [217] has researched the characteristic properties and the effectiveness and reliability of the Work Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation Scale (WEIMS) in different work environments. WEIMS was found to be a constructive measure for “positive and negative organizational criteria” in addition to being a crucial catalyst for motivation at workplace. The study further proposes future research to study the effects and inter-relation of “personal characteristics on different motivational orientations”. The study has a limited scope due to the sole “usage of self-reports and a cross-sectional design” which can introduce the limitation of social desirability and the reluctance of individuals to confess deviant behaviors.

Gagné et al. (2010) [45], have created and assessed the structure of MAWS (Motivation at Work Scale) in two different languages, British and French. They further compared autonomous motivation and controlled motivation and their impact on an individual’s job satisfaction. They observed that on one hand, autonomous motivation had a positive impact on factors such as job satisfaction and affective commitment, while on the other, it had a negative effect on psychological distress and turnover intentions. Controlled motivation was found to be unrelated to matters that are deemed important by organizations. They concluded with the fact that autonomous motivation yields better and more positive results as compared to controlled motivation.

The article by Roe et al. (2000) [171] is a comparative study on the effects of commitment and involvement of workers in their jobs in Bulgaria, Hungary and the Netherlands. Furthermore, using the results, a work motivation model was developed and included “job characteristics, opportunities to satisfy needs, and extrinsic work factors as determinants of job involvement and organizational commitment”. The authors found differences as well as similarities in the outcomes of the three nations leading to the conclusion that different living environments and conditions initiate different precursors for motivation in an individual but the end result remains the same.

Wright (2004) [237], has studied the effect of the kind of work and the individual’s role in the organization on his/her motivation in an organization. The model presented evaluates “aspects of the organizational work context, such as greater goal conflict, procedural constraints, and goal ambiguity, and their impact on work motivation”. The study concluded that although a sole factor, work motivation was a crucial employee performance dynamic, and, on the contrary, unspecific and vague targets along with organizational goal conflict can prove to be damaging for work motivation. It was also observed that if the tasks given to public sector employees are focused on benefitting the society, the employees take their work to be more significant and serious. Thus, based on the literature review, a comparative study is designed based on the following important variables – Work Motivation and Job Performance. They will be compared in the Public and Private Banks of India.

Research Methodology
To bridge these gaps certain variables were identified for present research. Based on the variables identified, the basic aim of the current study will be to compare the job performance and work motivation levels of the employees. This study is designed as a comparative analysis between Public Sector Banks and Private Sector Banks with respect to Job Performance and Work Motivation Level of the employees.

Job performance has been defined on the basis of the BANKSERV Model proposed by Akviran (1999) [11]. This model included the measurement of employee’s attitude and perception on the basis of four major factors viz., Employee’s Conduct with Customers & Peers, Credibility of Employee in front of their customers and peers, Communication of Employees with Bank, Customers and Peers, and Access to Teller Services. Work Motivation defined as the psychological processes that direct, energize, and maintain action toward a job, task, role, or project (Campbell & Pritchard, 1976; Kanfer, 1990) [63, 82].

Hypothesis of the study are:

H1.0: There is no significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Job Performance.

H1.a: There is a significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Job Performance.

H2.0: There is no significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Work Motivation.

H2.a: There is a significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Work Motivation.

In the present study 254 completely filled questionnaires by banks employees’ as respondents to understand their responses on their Job Performance and Work Motivation were analyzed.

Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Demographic Profile of the Respondents
This segment analyses the findings pertaining to the demographic characteristics of the respondents involved in the study based on the frequency analysis conducted on the data through the SPSS software. The demographic
characteristics include age, gender, position in the present banking organization, qualifications, designations and total experience.

1.2 Age of the Respondents
The distribution of the data related to Age of the respondent is presented in Figure 1

The frequency analysis of age of the respondents indicate towards the dominance of the young blood in the banking sector employment with majority of the respondents, i.e. 50 percent falling into the age group bracket of 26-35 years and 30 percent falling into the age group bracket of below 25 years. 11 percent of the respondents were from the age group bracket of 36-45 years, 8 percent from the age group bracket of 46-55 years and only 1 percent from the age group bracket of 56 years and above. Out of the respondents, 138 belong to the public sector banks while 117 belong to the private sector banks. The age analysis shows more or less a similar picture amongst the various age group brackets.

1.3. Tenure in the Present Organization
The distribution of the data related to Tenure of the respondent is presented in Figure 3

The analysis of the tenure of respondents in their present organization shows that there is reasonable stability with majority of the respondents being with their organization for more than 2 years. 28 percent of the respondents are with their current employer bank with 2-3 years and 29 percent from 3-7 years of association. 18 percent have been associated for less than 1 year and 16 percent with 7-15 years and only 9 percent with 15 years and above association with the current banking organization. The results of cross tabulation analysis reveal that while most of the public sector employees were working in the same bank for more than 7 years as reflected by 47 respondents. While in case of private

banks only 16 respondents indicated that they were working in the same bank for more than 7 years. One of the factors for this can be that government jobs are highly desired and employees of the public sector banks seem to be more stable with their current banks.

1.5. Job Position in the Present Organization
The distribution of the data related to Job Position of the respondent is presented in Figure 5

The analysis of the data obtained on hierarchical job positions of the respondents show that majority of the respondents are working at the junior management level. 61 percent of the respondents are working at the junior level while 34 percent are working at middle level management and only 5 percent of the respondents work at the senior level management in the banking sector organizations. The probable reason of the maximum number of respondents are from Junior Management level because the data was collected from various retail branches of banks where, there is just one branch head and rest of the employees are of Junior Management Level.

| Demographic Profile of the Respondents |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age             | Frequency       |
| <25 YEARS       | Public 29, Private 47 |
| 26-35 YEARS     | Public 75, Private 53 |
| 36-45 YEARS     | Public 17, Private 11 |
| 46-55 YEARS     | Public 15, Private 6 |
| 55 YEARS<       | Public 2, Private 0 |
H10: There is no significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Job Performance.

H1a: There is a significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Job Performance.

Table 2: Position/Level of respondents in their respective organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position In Organisation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public (Males)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Management Positions</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management Positions</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management Positions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the comparison of job performance levels of public and private Banks’ Employees, the Mann-Whitney test ($U = 4.50$, $p = .000$) was found to be significant at 0.01 level. This signifies that Job Performance varies amongst the employees of Private Bank and Public Bank. Higher mean rank of Private Banks’ Employees (196.46) also suggests that they are better performers as compared to the Public Banks’ Employees (69.53). Thus, the data does not support the Null Hypothesis for Job Performance amongst different Banks’ Employees.

H2.0: There is no significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Work Motivation.

H2a: There is a significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees on the basis of Work Motivation.

Table 3: Results of Mann Whitney Test: Comparison of mean ranks of the defined variables for Public Bank and Private Banks’ Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>z-test value</th>
<th>Sig. (.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>9595.50</td>
<td>-13.761</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SPPS 19

For comparison of work motivation levels of public and private Banks’ Employees, the Mann-Whitney test ($U = 5.50$, $p = .000$) was found to be significant at 0.01 level. This signifies that Work Motivation varies amongst the employees of Private Bank and Public Bank. Higher mean rank of Private Banks’ Employees (196.45) also suggests that they are highly motivated towards their job as compared to the Public Banks’ Employees (69.54). Thus, the data does not support the Null Hypothesis for Work Motivation amongst different Banks’ Employees.

Job Performance Evaluation in Public Banks versus Private Banks: There is an annual job performance evaluation mechanism set-up in the Public Banks. The good performers are entitled to appear in the internal exams of the Fast track promotion scheme and on the contrary non-performers are not entitled for fast track promotion scheme and also are not promoted beyond scale IV or V depending on the bank’s promotion policy. The major issue of Job Satisfaction can be resolved through adequate evaluation of Job Performance. Private Bank Policy is already evaluating the Job Performance from time to time and is providing good platform for the Employees to be well satisfied with the complete process.

Conclusion
In the present study it may be concluded that there was a significant difference reported in the Job performance levels in public versus private bank employees. Also, for work motivation levels of the employees significant difference was reported.

There is a significant difference between Public Banks’ and Private Banks’ Employees. Higher mean rank of Private Banks’ Employees suggests that they are better performers as compared to the Public Banks’ Employees.

Work Motivation varies amongst the employees of Private Bank and Public Bank. Higher mean rank of Private Banks’ Employees suggests that they are highly motivated towards their job as compared to the Public Banks’ Employees.

Future scope and limitations of the study
The study was conducted on public and private banks of Indian origin only however the same study can be conducted in the future by including foreign banks. The study may also be conducted on other sectors. The study was limited to Delhi & NCR only. The study did not include clerks.
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