Chapter V

Analysis and Interpretation
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Descriptive Analysis of Sample

5.1.1 Demographic Details of the Respondents

5.1.1.1 Age

5.1.1.2 Gender

5.1.1.3 Educational Qualification

5.1.1.4 Marital Status

5.1.1.5 Designation

5.1.1.6 Job Type

5.1.1.7 Domain Area

5.1.1.8 Number of years of Experience in the field

5.1.1.9 Number of years of experience in the organisation

5.1.1.10 Monthly Income

5.1.2 Mean and Standard Deviation

5.2 Inferential Analysis of Sample

5.2.1 t-test and ANOVA

5.2.2 Chi-square Test

5.2.3 Friedman Test

5.2.4 Correlation Analysis

5.2.5 Multiple Regression Analysis of Employer Branding On Employee Retention
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Having completed an intense review of literature, tracing the conceptual framework and presenting the methodology of the study, the researcher presents an in depth discussion of data analysis, its interpretations and inferences drawn in this chapter.

Analysis and interpretation are central steps in the research process. The aim of the analysis is to organize, classify and summarize the collected data so that they can be better comprehended and interpreted to give answers to the questions that triggered the research. Interpretation is the search for the broader meaning of findings. Analysis is not fulfilled without interpretation; and interpretation cannot proceed without analysis. So, both are mutually inter-dependent.

In this chapter a detailed analysis of the collected data has been attempted. Descriptive analysis and inferential statistics were used for the analysis of the data gathered for the present study. The first part of this chapter discusses the demographic characteristics such as age, gender, educational qualification, marital status, designation, job type, domain area, number of years of experience in the field and in the organisation and monthly income of the respondents. It also identifies the respondent’s perceptions about the employer branding dimensions using descriptive statistics. T test and ANOVA were used for the same. The second part evaluates the descriptive statistics. Inferential analysis is drawn using chi-square analysis, regression and correlation analysis. Hypotheses were tested, interpretations and inferences were drawn. A conceptual model using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was tested and the Employer Branding-Employee Retention model developed from this study is presented in the last part.
PART I

5.1 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE

Descriptive statistics are useful for describing the basic features of data. Descriptive Statistics provide simple summaries about the sample and the measures. They form the basis of quantitative analysis of data.

5.1.1 Demographic Details of the Respondents

Employee demography can be defined as “the study of the composition of a social entity in terms of its members’ attributes (Pfeffer, 1983:303).” Demographics include such factors as age, gender, occupation, seniority, salary levels, marital and family status. The researcher normally includes those factors which are assumed to have explanatory value in the research. Employee demographics should be considered as it cannot be implicitly assumed that employees are a homogenous group with similar attributes and beliefs.

Several research studies find that demographic differences between employee groups exist, confirming Pfeffer’s (1985) belief that demography is an important consideration in research. Employee demographics are supposedly linked to employee attitudes and behaviour, developing understanding about areas of difference amongst employee groups has the potential to benefit the practitioners, policy-makers and academics. Demographic attributes have powerful predictive qualities for employee behaviour, so developing knowledge about areas of employee demographic difference has the potential to assist organisations by making them more cognizant of the ways in which different groups of employees may respond to them.

In order to provide background information about the 600 respondents who provided valid data, the descriptive statistics are calculated and presented below.

---

5.1.1.1 Age

Age is an important demographic variable in retention studies. Chronological age is often used as a proxy measure for age related individual human development (Physical, social, emotional and cognitive). Due to the age of the respondents, their experiences vary and these experiences affect the way they perceive the world around them. By and large, age indicates level of maturity of individuals, in that sense, age becomes more important to examine the response. Although most workplace-based resources are offered to all employees irrespective of their age, employees of different age groups may experience or utilize those resources differently. Hence, age can be considered as an important demographic variable.

The following table illustrates the distribution of sample IT employees in Chennai on the basis of age:

**Table 5.1.1 Frequency Distribution of Age of IT Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is found that 50.3% of the employees belong to the age group of 31-40 years followed by 32.5% of the employees belonging to the age group of Below 30 years. Only 17.2% of the employees belong to the age group of Above 40 years. It can be inferred from the above table that majority of the respondents belong to the age group of 31-40 years and more than 80% of the sample respondents are below 40 years of age. This can be attributed to several reasons. IT industry does not seem to have an ageing work force as the industry itself is a young one. From an employer branding context, mental balance and abilities are established in this age group. Scope for retention beyond 40 years of age is a rarity in this industry. Moreover, ability to withstand stress and HR policies
might not be conducive to this group. However, these employees (in the age group of above 40 years) should be given more opportunities as their rich and varied experiences would bring in the required competence to handle complex and challenging assignments.

5.1.1.2 Gender

While workforces have always had a degree of diversity in terms of age and skill, gender diversity has grown significantly over the last few decades. The number of women in the labour force has increased noticeably with the advent of a dynamic competitive global marketplace. Given the gender diversity in the workforce, it is rational to assume that differences in views and attitudes could exist, thus justifying the examining of gender demographics.

The following table exhibits the distribution of male and female respondents among IT employees in Chennai:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is found that 66% of the respondents are male and 34% of the respondents are female. It is understood from the above table that, women are yet to establish themselves as a major workforce in the IT companies. The reason for the low representation of women may be ascribed to causes described below. Shift system practiced by many IT companies acts as a deterrent factor for women to join them. Extended working hours to meet critical project deadlines also discourages women as their work life balance gets affected. Moreover, marriage and motherhood has a causal effect on women’s work and career patterns. Comparatively, men constitute the bulk of employees at IT companies and only when they are supportive to their women colleagues, this disparity can be bridged.
IT companies should also devise women friendly policies such as flexible timings, child care, work from home options etc. to attract and retain women employees.

5.1.1.3 Educational Qualification

Educational qualification is one of the most important attributes that might affect an individual’s attitudes. The response of an individual is likely to be influenced by his/her educational status and therefore it is crucial to understand the educational background of the respondents. To ascertain the educational qualifications and determine its influence on Employer Branding leading to Employee Retention, information is collected from respondents in three scales, viz., UG, PG and Professional.

The following table expresses the educational qualification of IT employees in Chennai:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is evident that 41.2% of the respondents have professional degrees followed by 36% of the respondents having UG degrees. The remaining 22.8% of the respondents have PG degrees. Therefore it is inferred that maximum numbers of IT employees have a professional degree. In a typical IT company, professionals are preferred. Career options are open for freshers who are taken on probation and their adaptability will be easier. The percentage of respondents who have a Post Graduate degree is less due to the reason that they are not inclined to pursue higher education for career progression as they get attractive salary in the infancy stage of their career graph. However, IT companies do
encourage their employees to study further by giving them opportunities and assistance in the form of sabbatical, sponsorship etc.

5.1.1.4 Marital Status

The perceptions and attitudes of the individuals can also differ by their marital status. Marriage might make individuals a little more responsible and matured in understanding. Being involved in family life also has an influence on the attitude and behaviour of individuals. In this context, marital status of IT employees has been surveyed.

The following table shows the distribution of IT employees in Chennai city on the basis of marital status:

Table 5.1.4 Frequency Distribution of Marital Status of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The above table indicates the marital status wise distribution of IT employees in the study. A majority of 75.7% of the employees are married and 24.3% of the employees are single. Therefore, it is inferred that maximum number of employees are married. Since the employees are offered better salaries, IT employees are most sought after in the marriage market. Having better salaries also enhances their standard of living which is required of a married individual. They can also access different types of loans and corporate discounts on purchases which are essential to run a family. Moreover, married people tend to have lots of commitments, financial and otherwise, which may be a motivating factor for their retention.
5.1.1.5 Designation

The designation of employees can be understood to be important in the context of their experiences that signifies the accretion of knowledge, competencies, skills and social capital related to a particular type of career or line of work. Insights of employees may vary according to the level of employment to which employees may belong. For example, senior level employees may look at a practice at a completely different perspective from that of a junior level employee. Hence, designation is considered in this study as an important demographic variable. Details of Designation are collected under three categories namely Senior level, Middle level and Junior level.

The table below indicates the distribution of IT employees on the basis of designation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior level</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior level</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it is found that 33.5% of the sample IT employees belong to the Senior level, 35.3% belong to Middle level and 31.2% belong to Junior level. Therefore it is inferred that the maximum number of IT employees belong to the middle level in this study. Age and experience are not the yardsticks for measuring performance in the IT industry. Even young people with relatively less experience but have the capability to perform have opportunities for growth in terms of level of employment. Thus, the above table does not show varied percentages with regard to levels of seniority.
5.1.1.6 Job Type

IT industry is characterized by three types of job namely Technical, Managerial and Techno-managerial. The type of job which an employee performs also determines his level of understanding within the context of employer branding. The employees performing different types of jobs may be exposed differently or may perceive differently the employer branding practices of their organisation. Hence, it is necessary to understand the acuities of employees according to their job type. The following table details the job type of IT employees in Chennai city:

**Table 5.1.6 Frequency Distribution of Type of job of IT Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techno-managerial</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The above table indicates that 77.3% of the employees hold technical jobs whereas 13.7% of the employees perform techno-managerial work. Only 9% of the employees hold managerial jobs. Therefore, it is deduced that the maximum number of employees perform technical work in IT companies in Chennai. For easier comprehension of the job type of IT employees, the researcher has categorized it into three types namely, technical, managerial and techno-managerial. In the context of IT sector, in terms of project revenue, a technical position always tilts in favour of an employee when compared to a managerial position. Hence, the categorization. However, in terms of employer branding, employees doing technical work are drifters and it is only those employees doing managerial and techno-managerial jobs remain with the organisation as they perceive employer branding practices in a better manner.
5.1.1.7 Domain Area

The IT industry has different business verticals also known as domain areas. Employees work in different domain areas. The major domain areas are Banking and Financial Services (BFS), Insurance, Manufacturing, Healthcare, Logistics and Supply Chain Management (SCM).

The following table reveals the distribution of IT employees in Chennai city according to their domain areas:

Table 5.1.7 Frequency Distribution of Domain Area of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFS</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics &amp; SCM</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The table above indicates that 16.5% of IT employees work in the BFS area, 13% in the Insurance area, 12.2% in Manufacturing, 9.3% in Health care, 13.8% in Logistics and SCM and 35.2% in areas other than the ones mentioned. Mostly, the employees remain in their domain area as they build their competencies in their domains. The ‘others’ category in the above table includes domain areas such as retailing, education etc.

5.1.1.8 Number of years of Experience in the field

Employees’ evaluation of their employment experiences varies as they gain experience in their field. Hence, this variable is chosen as a demographic variable in this study. The following table expresses the distribution of IT employees in Chennai on the basis of experience in the field:
Table 5.1.8 Frequency Distribution of Years of Experience of IT employees in the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years of Experience in the field</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The above table examines the total work experience of the respondents irrespective of the company they have served in. It has been categorized into three groups, namely, Below 10 years, 11-20 years and Above 20 years of experience so that the skill set of the respondents may be deciphered. From the above table, it can be understood that 48.8% of the employees have total experience of more than 20 years in the field, 31.2% of the employees have total experience between 11 and 20 years whereas 20% of the employees have experience below 10 years. It is intriguing to note that maximum number of respondents have over 20 years of field experience which would have exposed them to an array of work encounters to hone their technical and managerial skills.

5.1.1.9 Number of years of experience in the organisation

The number of years spent in an organisation measures the relationship between the individual and the organisation. The length of time spent in an organisation leads to the development of shared understandings and experience. This also indicates the strength of the retention strategies undertaken by the organisation. To establish the number of years of experience with their current organisation, information was collected under three categories: below 5 years, between 5 and 10 years, above 10 years.

The following table expresses the distribution of IT employees in Chennai on the basis of number of years of experience in the organisation:
Table 5.1.9 Frequency Distribution of Years of Experience in the organisation of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Years of Experience in the organisation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the above table, it was found that 177 employees (29.5%) have below 5 years of experience and 32.8% have been working for their current organisation for more than 10 years. It can be inferred from the above table that the maximum number of employees have between 5 and 10 years of experience in their current organisations for this study. Training may be given to employees having below 5 years of experience to upgrade their skillset. These employees should be given adequate orientation so that they are aligned with the vision of the organisation. The 32.8% of employees who have more than 10 years of experience in their current organisation account for the ‘loyalist’ category that have the traits of either cash cows or workhorses. In either case, the organisation stands to gain from their work performance. Hence, costs need not be incurred to orienting this category of employees as they are already attuned to the values and culture of the organisation. In fact, this group may act as employer brand ambassadors of their organisation as they would be having a positive perception about their organisation.

5.1.1.10 Monthly Income

Income of a person plays an important role in shaping the person’s standard of living which in turn influences his/her outlook and perceptions. Income also plays an important role in the retention of employees. Hence income is chosen as a demographic variable to be responded in four categories.

The following table depicts the distribution of IT employees on the basis of monthly income:
From the above table, it is found that 60.3% of the employees draw monthly salaries of more than Rs. 50,000 and 25.5% of the employees draw monthly salaries between Rs. 40,000 and Rs. 50,000. Only 9.3% of the employees have monthly salary between Rs. 30,000 and Rs. 40,000 whereas a meagre 4.8% of the employees draw monthly salaries below Rs. 30,000. Hence, it can be inferred that maximum number of employees draw salaries of more than Rs. 50,000, which is not surprising as it is well known that IT companies offer high salaries to their employees when compared to any other job with the same experience and qualification. The meagre percentage of 4.8% and 9.3% getting a salary of below Rs. 40,000 are either freshers or employees having less experience or poor skillset.

It is important to note that maximum numbers of respondents are male in the age group of 31-40 years holding Professional Degrees doing technical work belonging to Middle level. Most of the respondents are married having more than 20 years of total work experience and less than 5 years of experience in their current organisation.
5.1.2 Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Encounters</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging work assignments.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring, interesting and enjoyable work.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied work experience.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work gives satisfaction.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful and personally rewarding tasks and value in work.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of resources to do the work.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation is supportive in completion of work assigned.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowered to take decisions.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides job security.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career enhancing experiences.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 5.1.11 reveals the Employment Encounters of IT employees. The mean score ranged from 4.34 to 3.56. The mean score for the variable “Availability of resources to do the work” is high at 4.34 with SD 0.79 followed by “Organisation is supportive in completion of work assigned” with mean score of 4.29 and SD 0.74. The third mean score is given to the variable “Challenging work assignments” with a mean score of 4.25 and SD 1.09. The least mean score is given to the statement “Empowered to take decisions” having mean score 3.56 and SD 1.52. This implies that IT employees in Chennai city are highly satisfied with the availability of resources to do their work and the support they receive from their organisation in completing the work assigned to them. They are moderately satisfied with regard to the varied work experience and empowerment in taking decisions.

Research indicates that employees want creative, challenging and useful work (Phillip & Connel, 2003). As the IT industry is dynamic in nature by being project based and using the latest technology in its operations and services, it offers

---

offer challenging work assignments to its employees. The companies are magnanimous in providing support to its employees to complete their work through making available resources, knowledge sharing, having an informal culture of learning, supportive teams and mentoring. Scientific resource planning takes care of optimum utilization of resources and the training support offered to its employees is phenomenal. Training is made mandatory and is linked to performance appraisal too. Though hierarchies are flat in IT organisations, in reality, employees are not empowered enough to take decisions. Centralized decision making and not following consultative decision making style affects the decision making process in IT companies. This angst is reflected in the study with the lowest mean scores being given to ‘Empowered to take decisions’. Since the demographic profile of the respondents indicates that close to 50% of the employees have less than 5 years of experience in their current organisation, they are unable to have any career enhancing experiences with their current employer. In order to improve the varied work experience, the concept of job rotation could be adopted in IT companies.

### Table 5.1.12 Mean and SD of Work Environment of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Environment</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fun working environment.</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress free environment.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive of employees.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well defined role.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work contributes to the overall organisational performance.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy of employees.</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New employees quickly take responsibility of their work.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationship between superiors and subordinates.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good inter-personal relation among employees in organisation.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive and encouraging colleagues.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected to team and organisation.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong team spirit among employees.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
Mean score and Standard Deviation of Work Environment of IT employees are presented in Table 5.1.12. The mean score ranged from 4.44 to 3.12. The highly rated mean item score is 4.44 for the variables “Connected to team and organisation” and “Strong team spirit among employees” with a SD of 0.66 and 0.70 respectively followed by “Supportive and encouraging colleagues” having mean score 4.41. The least mean score of 3.12 (SD 1.59) is given for the variable “Autonomy of employees” indicating that employees expect autonomy to perform their work in the organisation. This implies that IT employees are highly satisfied with their team and colleagues but are moderately satisfied with the working environment and autonomy.

It can be inferred from the above table that the items related to teams had high mean scores. The IT sector is project based and as such the projects are carried out by teams. Team based work is generally participative and collaborative in nature and team members are bound together by striving to achieve common goals. Also, IT employees are not differentiated by age, only knowledge matters. So, there seems to be a good relationship between employees, superiors and subordinates which is assisted by the existence of a strong lateral communication system. IT employees support and encourage colleagues by mentoring and having a participative and collaborative work environment. Moreover, peer suggestion and healthy criticisms are taken positively as they are open to learning. Research also proves that the need for autonomy and flexibility is felt more by employees along with the need for a caring, supporting/nurturing work environment (Phillips & Connell, 2003). The structured hierarchical levels with defined role clarity restrict the autonomy of the employees, as evident with the moderately satisfied score given to this item. IT companies should endeavour to support autonomy in its work environment in order to brand themselves in a better way.

### Table 5.1.13 Mean and SD of Values and Culture of IT Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values and Culture</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding organisation’s vision and mission</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value system in place.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Quality driven’ culture.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly and informal culture</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of innovation.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturing culture that identifies, recognises and rewards contributions.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of organisational flexibility.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit rather than seniority for advancement.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of employees equally and with respect.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of inclusion and a sense of community.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees set their own goals and solve problems within their ambit of authority and responsibility.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team is more important than individuals.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong professionalism in behaviour of employees.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation values commitment.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees are able to express themselves freely.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean scores and Standard Deviation of Values and Culture in IT organisations are presented in Table 5.1.13. The mean scores range from 4.49 to 3.28 with the variable “Quality driven culture” having the highest mean score of 4.49 and SD 0.70 followed by “Understanding organisation’s vision and mission” with mean score of 4.45 and “Strong professionalism in behaviour of employees” and “Treatment of employees equally and with respect” with mean scores of 4.40. Feeling treated with respect and recognition and appreciation encouraged employees to stay with their organisations, according to a study conducted by Harvard Business Review (2014). The variable having the least mean score of 3.28 is “Employees are able to express themselves freely”. This implies that the IT employees are highly satisfied with their organisation’s culture, vision and mission. They are also highly
satisfied with the professional behaviour of their fellow employees and being treated equally and with respect. However, the IT employees are only moderately satisfied with their organisation’s flexibility and policies for advancement. They are also moderately satisfied with their ability to express themselves freely.

IT services of India are of the best quality and highly competitive. This is evident in the high volume of exports of IT services to other countries. IT organisations are also characterized by precise documentation of work procedure, aiming at standardization as the mistakes tend to be costly. Hence, it is of no surprise that IT organisations have a quality driven culture. In order to work in such a quality driven culture, employees should understand and identify themselves with their organisation’s vision and mission. Induction programmes, town hall meetings communicate the organisation’s vision and mission to the employees. Once there is a fit between individual’s goals and organisation’s vision and mission, the organisation can thrive and succeed in any of its endeavours. Herein again, teams play an important role in achieving organisational objectives as IT industry supports team based working. Employees are treated equally and with respect due to the value based informal culture of IT companies. Opportunities to work in a global environment and exposure to ethical work practices across the globe have resulted in strong professionalism in the behaviour of employees. However, employees of IT companies feel that they are not able to express themselves freely which indicates that the culture of IT companies curtails two way communications. Such communication may be channelized and restrictive in nature. There might also be a natural and general fear of repercussions in the minds of the employees. IT companies must concentrate on improving its communication with its employees.
Table 5.1.14 Mean and SD of Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good career advancement opportunities.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mould careers in line with aspirations and areas of interest.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to learn new/latest developments in the field.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to teach others what is learnt.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to apply what is learnt.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities on a continuous basis.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching capability through competency mapping, training and counselling.</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous skill development.</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds competencies and creates value.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean score and SD of Career Progression, Training and Development of IT employees presented in table 5.1.14 reveals that the variable “Enriching capability through competency mapping, training and counselling” has the highest mean score of 4.48 (SD 0.80) followed by “Opportunities to learn new/latest developments in the field” with a mean score of 4.44 and SD of 0.75. The variable “Mould careers in line with aspirations and areas of interest” has the least mean score of 4.00. This implies that IT employees are highly satisfied with their career progression, learning and training offered to them by their organisation.

Generally, employees desire to acquire new skills and continuous development opportunities. IT companies map the skillset of employees to the job and need based training is offered based on the outcome of competency mapping. Moreover, training is mandatory and linked to performance management system in IT companies. Effectiveness of such training is evaluated to enable the companies to build employee competences. Knowledge sharing happens on a continuous basis and employees are encouraged to learn emerging technologies which help them to manage challenging assignments. There are a plethora of opportunities available and
individual growth is tremendous which is purely dependent upon the competence and skills of the employees rather than on age or on seniority. Employees’ perception about not being able to mould their careers in line with their aspirations and interests may be due to the long incubation time for using emerging technologies in current projects or the lack of availability of projects in their areas of interest due to the nature of business of their organisation.

Table 5.1.15 Mean and SD of Reputation of Employer of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reputation of Employer</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for excellence in the industry.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of being a good employer.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent organisational performance.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality services.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative products and services.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of pride and privilege.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved social status.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a positive impression to others.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling good by working in the organisation.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of belongingness.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good to have this organisation on resume.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of the management.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation cares for its employees.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation benchmarking.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to recommend to others.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 5.1.15 discloses the mean and SD of Reputation of Employer with the variable “High quality services” having the highest mean score of 4.46 (SD 0.65) followed by three variables “Reputation for excellence in the industry”, “Consistent organisational performance” and “Innovative products and services” having the same mean score of 4.42 and “Reputation of being a good employer” with mean score of 4.39. The results signify the importance that employees give to quality of products and services and the reputation of the organisation. The IT employees are highly satisfied with their organisation’s performance and the improved social status.
it gives them because of being employed with their organisation. They feel proud and privileged to be working for their organisation to a great extent.

Employees would prefer to be associated with organisations having good reputation and good quality products and services (Phillips & Connel, 2003). The IT industry has a quality driven culture which is evident from their high exports and contribution to the country’s economy. Quality is a key performance measure in IT companies. Hence, employees are highly satisfied with the quality of services. The IT industry is dynamic in nature and continually keeps evolving itself through innovations in service and its delivery by using latest technology and discovering innovative use of products and services. IT companies have better performance management systems, adhere to norms and take concerted efforts to achieve success. Due to motivated employees who run the extra mile, IT companies have a reputation of excellence. Specific practices ensure that companies achieve excellence. However, employees are not very comfortable in recommending their companies to others as they may feel that the others may not be able to adapt to their organisation or they may be mediocre or unfit or lack passion for the job.

Table 5.1.16 Mean and SD of Compensation and Location of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compensation and Location</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good annual compensation</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation is on par with industry pay package</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary is commensurate with experience and job.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation is linked to performance.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation offers employee stock options.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation provides international career opportunities.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 5.1.16 specifies the mean and standard deviation of Compensation and Location factor of Employer Branding. The mean score ranges from 4.33 to 3.22. The highest mean score of 4.33 is given to the variable “Good annual compensation”
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followed closely by “Compensation is on par with industry pay package” with a mean score of 4.32 and “Salary is commensurate with experience and job” with a mean score of 4.17 and SD 0.88. These scores indicate that the respondents are highly satisfied with their compensation which is also evident from the distribution of monthly income in table 4.1.10. However, many employees feel that they are not given opportunities to work in international locations apparent in the least score given to the variable “Organisation provides international career opportunities” and hence are moderately satisfied in this regard.

IT employees are the highest paid employee groups in the country and organisations offer competitive salaries to their employees to retain them. The employees do not seem to have any issues with the salary component which is offered to them. The IT industry offers better compensation than any other industry and is truly linked to performance. There is minimal pay discrepancy which is a time tested technique of retention. Employees negotiate while joining for best salaries due to the abundant opportunities available and this industry seems to be the only one that gives an option of negotiating. However, employees feel that they miss out on international opportunities. Not all projects require onsite visit and the employees need to understand the costs and benefits involved in sending employees on an onsite visit. Employers do send their employees abroad when it is absolutely necessary but they also fear that employees may switch over after their international assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Life Balance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees have a good work-life balance.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need-based flexible working hours policy.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work from home</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to address personal and family matters.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe and suitable work place.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life initiatives.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
Based on the mean scores of Work Life Balance of IT employees in table 5.1.17, “Ability to address personal and family matters” is the most important factor having mean score of 4.43 followed by “Employees have a good work-life balance” (4.38). “Safe and suitable work place” and “Work-life initiatives” have the same mean score of 4.35. The least factor is “Opportunity to work from home” with a mean score of 2.68 and SD 1.63. The mean scores indicate that the respondents are very happy with their work-life balance and highly satisfied with the work-life initiatives of their organisation such as health and fitness facilities, welfare programmes etc. The respondents are least satisfied with the opportunities to work from home.

From the above responses, it can be inferred that IT employees enjoy an enviable work life balance through the work-life initiatives provided by IT companies such as flexible working hours, compensatory off, five day working weeks, cafeteria, gym, cab services etc. They seem to manage their personal and family commitments due to the adequate personal leave and other leave available to them. They are also given comp off for working additional hours. IT companies have active Prevention of Sexual Harassment Cell to safeguard women employees from harassment. The least score is given to the item relating to opportunities to work from home. Though Work from Home opportunities would greatly enhance the work life balance of employees, it also depends upon the project that employees work in. If project details are to be kept confidential, then for security reasons many organisations do not offer such facilities. Or if work is done across different time zones, it may not be possible for employees to work from home even if organisations permit it. It may also depend upon the nature and business and network connectivity or other technical issues. Nevertheless, employers should consider this important factor to further enhance the work-life balance of their employees.
Table 5.1.18 Mean and SD of Communication of IT Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication with employees is important.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent, honest, open and two-way communication.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring and motivating top level communication.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear communication of expectations.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing inputs irrespective of education or background.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong communication network.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating honest feedback.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induction process.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

From the table above showing the mean scores and standard deviation of Communication in IT companies, the mean ranges between 4.40 and 3.80. “Strong communication network” has the highest mean score of 4.40 and “Inspiring and motivating top level communication” has the least mean score of 3.80 (SD 1.22). “Communication with employees is important” has a mean score of 4.31 followed by “Induction process” having a mean score of 4.21. This implies that employees are highly satisfied with communication in their organisation and the induction processes helps them to understand the value system of their organisation and are moderately satisfied with top level communication and clear communication of expectations.

IT organisations have a strong internal communication network system in place. Communication takes place through employee engagement programmes, induction programmes, periodic team meetings, town hall meetings, retreats and routine meetings. All internal communication happens through their intranet. Communication in IT organisations is quite informal; there is upward, downward and lateral flow of communication. IT organisations are well known for their induction programmes which are mandatory for all new comers wherein the organisational vision, mission, objectives, values and expectations are communicated to its employees. The facilities that are offered and the appropriate
communication channels are also prescribed in the induction programmes. Yet, in spite of the above, employees feel that their organisations should concentrate on downward communication to make it more inspiring and motivating as expected by its employees. It should be reassuring and instil confidence in employees. The organisational structure does not ensure direct contact between the highest echelons of management and its lowest level of employees. Contributions of employees should be significant enough to the growth of the organisation to warrant recognition or acknowledgement from top management. Perhaps, practices such as ‘High Five Corner’, ‘Idea Board’, and ‘Power of one’ card would inspire and motivate employees.

Table 5.1.19 Mean and SD of Fair and Consistent Management Practices of IT companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair and consistent policies and practices.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear understanding of measurement of job performance.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive feedback about the quality of work.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and unbiased performance appraisals.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive performance appraisals.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The above table establishes the range of mean scores between 4.17 and 3.95 for the variable Fair and Consistent Management Practices of IT companies. The highest mean score is given to the variable “Organisation has fair and consistent policies and practices” with 4.17 (SD 0.68) followed by “Fair and unbiased performance appraisals” (4.16) and “Constructive feedback about the quality of work” with 4.14. The least score is given to “Sensitive performance appraisals” (3.95). This implies that IT employees are highly satisfied with their organisation’s policies, performance appraisals and how their performance is measured. However, they are only moderately satisfied with the sensitiveness with which performance appraisals happen.
Conducive HR policies, transparent management practices, usage of Human Resource Information Systems (HRIS) and not being gender biased help IT organisation to ensure that their management practices are fair and consistent with enough clarity. IT organisations, once known for their ‘Bell Curve’ performance appraisals, now understand the incongruity of the concept and are completely done away with. Instead, performance appraisals are made more transparent and unbiased through 360 degree performance reviews and using 3rd party vendors to collect feedback. Employees can get clarity from their superiors if there is dissatisfaction in the performance appraisal scores. It is interesting to note that though employees feel that their performance appraisals are fair and unbiased, it is not sensitive to their needs. Managers need to concentrate on this aspect to make employees more comfortable. Superiors may need to be trained in conducting performance appraisals which are sensitive in nature.

Table 5.1.20 Mean and SD of Leadership in IT companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The leaders inspire and motivate the employees.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work with thought leaders.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic succession planning.</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent managers.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility and accessibility of leaders.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary leaders.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The mean and SD of Leadership in IT companies reveals that “Competent managers” has the highest mean score of 4.43 followed by “The leaders inspire and motivate the employees” with mean score of 4.35 and two statements, “Visibility and accessibility of leaders” and “Visionary leaders” share the third position with mean score of 4.30. The least important item is “Opportunity to work with thought leaders” with 3.71 mean score. This implies that the IT employees are highly satisfied with their managers being competent, the visibility and accessibility of
leaders and the leaders’ capability to inspire and motivate the employees. The IT employees are moderately satisfied with the opportunities to work with thought leaders.

Maximum numbers of employees agree that they have competent managers. This is due to the fact that promotion as managers is based only on competence and not on seniority. The leaders of the organisation inspire and motivate employees in many ways. Leaders’ achievements at their personal level and team level are high due to which employees are inspired. Intrinsic motivators like appreciations, praise, and recognition are higher. The leaders of IT organisations adopt an informal way of working. They do not sit in their ivory towers; they step in when there are critical issues. These visionary leaders have guided the industry on a growth trajectory and have taken their organisation to the next level.

Although studies have revealed that leaders do not lead by example or be a role model to their employees (Employer Branding Survey, 2008), it is proved otherwise in this study due to global HR practices. It is interesting to note that most employees feel that they are not given opportunities to work with thought leaders. Normally, thought leaders strongly advocate succession planning and draw up plans to incorporate the same in their work structure. Hence, all employees may not get a chance to work with them. However, their ideas can cascade down to the lowest level which can motivate and inspire employees. A study conducted by Harvard Business Review (2014) also reveals that employees with a leader who communicated a clear and inspiring vision were 70% more satisfied with their jobs and 100% more likely to stay with their organisations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1.21 Mean and SD of Creativity of IT Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity is encouraged at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuing and making use of creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities which unleash creativity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
Mean scores and Standard Deviation of Creativity of IT employees are presented in table 5.1.21. The mean scores range from 4.50 to 4.40. The item “Valuing and making use of creativity” scores high (4.50) with SD 0.72 followed by “Creativity is encouraged at all levels” having a mean score of 4.49 and “Opportunities which unleash creativity” at 4.40. These scores indicate that creativity is highly valued in IT organisations as it is a knowledge based industry and the IT employees are highly satisfied with the creativity aspect of their work. Results from a study conducted by Kuscu & Okan (2010) reveal that ‘organisations valuing and making use of employees’ creativity’ was an important employer branding concept. Challenging assignments trigger creativity in employees of IT organisations. The informal culture adopted in IT organisations encourages creativity at all levels. The idea is important and not the level of employment. New and innovative ideas are appreciated openly in meetings and are well documented. New and fresh ways of rewarding ideas such as ‘Idea board’ encourage creativity in employees.

**Table 5.1.22 Mean and SD of Diversity in Work Place of IT Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity in Work Place</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal opportunities to both genders.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members of varied cultural backgrounds.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

The above table represents the mean and SD of the factor Diversity in Workplace. “Equal opportunities to both genders” has a score of 4.49 with SD 0.62 and “Team members of varied cultural backgrounds” has a score of 4.44 with SD 0.66. This implies that the IT employees are highly satisfied with the opportunities given to both the genders and teams consisting of people from varied cultural backgrounds.

Diversity in work place is very important as people from diverse backgrounds are able to bring better solutions and look at things differently. With
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women also joining the IT workforce in large numbers, there is much diversity with regard to gender. Women centric measures taken by IT organisations makes women feel safe to work in such environments. There is no discrimination on any basis. Only talent and skills matter here. Prevention of Sexual Harassment Cells make IT organisations a suitable work environment for women employees. IT companies can be called as a melting pot of all cultures as it is teeming with people from diverse cultures and nations.

Table 5.1.23 Mean and SD of Corporate Social Responsibility of IT Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Social Responsibility</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary and non-monetary contribution to the society.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on society.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive in undertaking social responsibility initiatives.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated to social commitment.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports the communities.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment friendly.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary social activities.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking part in CSR activities by providing paid leave etc.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean and Standard Deviation of Corporate Social Responsibility of IT companies is shown in the above table. Mean score ranges from 4.60 to 3.66. “Monetary and non-monetary contribution to the society” has the highest mean score of 4.60 followed by “Environment friendly” at 4.59 and “Impact on society” with a mean score of 4.49. The fourth and fifth mean score is measured by “Voluntary social activities” and “Supports the communities” with 4.47 and 4.40 respectively. The least mean score of 3.66 is supported by the item “Taking part in CSR activities by providing paid leave etc.” This implies that IT employees are highly satisfied with the contribution of their organisation to society, its impact on society and dedication to social commitment. They are also highly satisfied with their organisation being environment friendly and its voluntary social activities. But they feel moderately satisfied with the organisation providing paid leave for taking part in CSR activities.
Respondents feel that corporate social responsibility of organisations is an important attribute of an employer brand. Not only do they want their organisation to be socially responsible, they also want to take part actively in the CSR activities of their organisation. This is in line with the results from research which indicate that employees are attracted to organisations which promote socially responsible behaviour. Even before CSR was made compulsory, IT organisations in India contributed to this aspect by adopting villages, doing some kind of social work, providing scholarships to underprivileged students, adopting sustainability and rehabilitation programmes etc. The highest score given for CSR in the Australian Benchmark Study (2010) also indicates that employees expect their organisations to be an ethical employer who builds a relationship with its community. Their proper disposal of electronic waste, waste water management, efforts in conservation of resources, use of solar panels, advocating use of saplings, car-pooling etc. make them environment friendly.

**Table 5.1.24 Mean and SD of Employee Identification with the Organisation of IT Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Identification with the organisation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticism as a personal insult.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in what others think.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We’ rather than ‘they’.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embarrassment about story in media.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation’s successes as own successes.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praises as a personal compliment.</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Employee Identification with the Organisation is an important factor in Employee Retention literature. When employees identify themselves with the organisation, it leads to better productivity and improved rate of retention. It ensures that the employees have a sense of belongingness with their organisation. The table above denotes the mean and standard deviation of Employee Identification with the Organisation with mean scores ranging from 4.33 to 3.99. “Organisation’s successes as own successes” has the highest mean score of 4.33 with SD 0.78 indicating that
the employees feel oneness with their organisation followed by “Criticism as a personal insult” with mean score of 4.23. Two items, “We rather than they” and “Embarrassment about story in media” share the third mean score of 4.21. This sense of identification with their organisation leads to better retention.

**Table 5.1.25 Mean and SD of Employee Satisfaction with IT companies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending others for employment.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive workplace compared to other organisations.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated to perform the best.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean and Standard Deviation of Employee Satisfaction with IT organisations is shown in table 5.1.25. The mean ranges from 4.06 to 3.81. Two items, “Recommending others for employment” and “Motivated to perform the best” have the highest mean score of 4.06. “Attractive workplace compared to other organisations” has a mean score of 4.01 and “Overall satisfaction has a mean score of 3.81. A study conducted by Dale Carnegie Training in 2014 finds that when employees recommend their organisation to friends as a place of employment, it reinforces positive employer branding. When employees are highly satisfied with their organisations, they tend to recommend their organisation to others.

**Table 5.1.26 Mean and SD of Employer Brand Loyalty of IT Employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose to work in the same organisation if starting again.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best choice.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyal Employee.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak positively.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to encourage others.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
Based on the mean scores, “Loyal employee” has the highest mean score of 4.21 followed by “Speak positively” with mean score of 4.17 and “Choose to work in the same organisation if starting again. The highest rank given to “Loyal employee” indicates that the respondents feel strongly for their employer brand and loyalty of employees lead to retention of employees. It is interesting to note that the respondents would like to work in the same organisation if they have to start all over again indicating their loyalty with their organisation.

Table 5.1.27 Mean and SD of Employee Retention of IT Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love working for the organisation.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work that is being done is important.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future within the organisation.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for the next few years.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at possibilities within the organisation.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean score and Standard Deviation of Employee Retention of IT employees are represented in table 5.1.27. The mean scores range between 4.29 and 4.06. “Work that is being done is important” has the highest score of 4.29 with SD 0.69 followed by “Love working for the organisation” with mean score of 4.14 and “Working for the next few years” with mean score of 4.10. Retention can be measured by their intention to stay with the organisation. These high mean scores imply that employees would like to stay with their organisation voluntarily for the coming years. However, results indicate that if they wanted to do another job or function they would look outside of their organisation. Employers should take note of this aspect and plan for strategies such as job rotation to retain their employees.
### Table 5.1.28 Mean of Preferred Retention factors of IT Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred choice of retention</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment encounters</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working environment</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values and culture of the organisation</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in training and development</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for growth</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of employer</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive compensation package</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of performance</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and honest communication</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of management</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership team</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope for creativity</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in work place</td>
<td>12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility activities</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean and Standard Deviation of ranking of preferred choice of employees of retention is shown in table 5.1.28. The mean scores range from 3.01 to 12.95. While interpreting the mean scores for ranks, the lowest mean score is highly important and the highest mean score represents the least important factor. Accordingly, “Attractive Compensation Package” which has a mean score of 3.01 is the most important employer branding factor of retention of employees followed by “Opportunities for growth” with mean score of 4.45 and “Recognition of performance” with a score of 4.89. “Good working environment”, “Investment in training and development” and “Work-life balance” also influence the employees to stay with their current organisation. Though “Diversity in work place” and “Corporate Social Responsibility activities” is important, they are least ranked indicating that they do not much induce the employees to stay with their
organisation. This implies that IT employees are highly satisfied with their compensation package, opportunities for growth, good working environment, recognition of performance and training and development and work life balance. They seem to be moderately satisfied with values and culture of the organisation, employment encounters, reputation of employer and quality of management.

Empirical results from the study of Employer Branding also seem to coincide with the above results. Sokro (2012)\textsuperscript{24} and Strategicom (2010)\textsuperscript{25} find that compensation, career progression, recognition and appreciation, job security, work-life balance and company image were critical employer branding attributes which resulted in employee retention. The present study also finds that compensation, career progression, recognition and appreciation were the top three attributes of employer branding, in order of importance, which results in employee retention.

In an empirical study on employer branding, Rani & Kumar (2013)\textsuperscript{26} find that job description followed by salary and benefits were important to IT employees in India. Company image and flexible working hours were also important to these employees. The employee retention survey (2007 and 2008) finds that the top five reasons for employees to remain with the organisations were relationship with co-workers and managers, attractive compensation, desirable working hours and attractive benefits.

In order of importance, employees ranked healthy relationship with colleagues and peers, recognition from superiors, corporate social responsibility activities and availing locational advantages as vital for their retention (Pingle & Sodhi, 2011)\textsuperscript{27}. However, Navigos Employer Branding Survey’s (2011)\textsuperscript{28} results quite deviate from the results of this study as 76% of the respondents felt that leadership was the most important employer branding factor followed by good

\textsuperscript{25} www.strategicom.com
working environment and training and career growth of employees for employee retention.

Quite contrary to the results depicted in Table no. 5.1.28, Bhaskar (2013)\textsuperscript{29} finds that challenging tasks, good reference for future career, international career opportunities, financial benefits and work life balance formed the top five factors that motivated employees to stay with the organisation. Mortensen (2010)\textsuperscript{30} finds that career development is the most important factor for retention followed by work practices, diversity in work place and working environment.

Thus, it can be inferred that though several studies across the world find different factors of employer branding as leading to employee retention, most of the above mentioned studies find that compensation, career progression and recognition of performance were the most important factor to retain employees in the organisation, which is also substantiated in this study.

Based on quartiles, the total score of all factors are converted into Low, Moderate and High. If the score is below 1st quartile, it is called Low. If the score is above 3rd quartile, it is called High and if the score lies between 1st and 3rd quartile, it is called Moderate.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Employer Branding Constructs</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Employment Encounters</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Work Environment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Values and Culture</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Compensation &amp; Location</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Work Life Balance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Communication</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Fair &amp; Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Leadership</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Creativity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data
Table 5.1.29 reveals the levels of satisfaction of IT employees on various employer branding constructs. Out of the sample size of 600 employees of IT organisations, the percentage of respondents who expressed a moderate level of satisfaction over the employer branding factors of their current organisation is higher than those who expressed low and high level of satisfaction except for the dimension of creativity where the percentage of moderate and high level of satisfaction was the same.

Table 5.1.30 Frequency Distribution of Level of Employee Retention Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Employee Retention Constructs</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Employee Retention</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Table 5.1.30 reveals the levels of satisfaction of IT employees on various employee retention constructs. Out of the sample size of 600 employees of IT organisations, the percentage of employees who expressed a moderate level of satisfaction over the employee retention constructs of their current organisation is higher than those who expressed low and high level of satisfaction.
Overall mean score and standard deviation of the constructs of Employer Branding are presented in table 5.1.31. The mean scores range from 64.04 to 8.93. “Reputation of Employer” has the highest mean score of 64.04 with SD 9.03 followed by “Values and Culture” with a mean score of 62.67 and “Work Environment” with a mean score of 49.46. “Employment Encounters” (40.30) and “Career progression, learning, training and development” (39.33) occupy the fourth and fifth place followed by “Corporate Social Responsibility” with a mean score of 34.76. The least scores are given to the factors “Creativity” (13.39) and “Diversity in Work Place” (8.93). It is interesting to note that “Compensation and Location” is not ranked that high. The table shows that employees feel that Employer Branding attributes such as Reputation, Work environment, values and culture are more important than compensation. Offering high salary alone will not satisfy the employees to be attracted enough to stay with the organisation. Other factors mentioned above should be given more importance to make the employer brand succeed in retaining the employees.
### Table 5.1.32 Mean and SD of Constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary data

Mean scores and standard deviation of the constructs of Employee Retention are shown in table 5.1.32. The mean scores range from 24.23 to 15.20. “Employee Identification with the Organisation” has the highest mean score of 24.23 with SD 5.93 followed by “Employee Retention” with mean score 20.65 and “Employer Brand Loyalty” with mean score of 20.49. “Employee Satisfaction” has the least mean score of 15.20 with SD 4.55. The high score given to “Employee Identification with the Organisation” shows that the respondents have a strong feeling of belongingness with their organisation due to the employer branding attributes of their organisation. Likewise, the respondents feel that they will stay with their organisation for the coming years as the retention score is also high.

### PART II

#### 5.2 INFERENTIAL ANALYSIS ON SAMPLE

Inferential analysis allows for the use of samples to make generalizations about the populations. It helps assess the strength of relationship between independent and dependent variables. Inferential analysis includes t-test, Chi-square test, ANOVA, Correlation Analysis, Regression Analysis, Structural Equation Model (SEM), to name a few. Differences between two groups in the mean scores of variables studied using Student t-test are discussed in this section. Also ANOVA followed by Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), Friedman test, Correlation analysis and Multiple Regression Analysis are used to verify the hypothesis stated in the first chapter.
5.2.1 t-test and ANOVA

The first segment of the Inferential analysis deals with t-test and ANOVA applied on select demographic variables and constructs of Employer Branding and Employee Retention. t-test and ANOVA has been done at both 1% and 5% levels of significance. Based on the above, the following have been carried out.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the demographic variables and the constructs of Employer Branding.

H0.1: There is no significant difference between genders with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.1 t test for significant difference between genders with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>41.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>49.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>63.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>38.89</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>40.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>62.81</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>66.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>23.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>24.17</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>24.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>33.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>21.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>29.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>35.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed data

Note: 1. ** denotes significant at 1% level
2. * denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the dimension of Employment Encounters, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer and Fair and Consistent Management Practices.
Management Practices. Hence, there is significant difference between male and female employees with regard to the dimension of Employment Encounters, Career Progression, Learning, Training & Development, Reputation of Employer and Fair and Consistent Management Practices. The mean score level of female employees on employer branding dimensions is higher than the male employees.

Since $P$ value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Communication and Creativity. Hence there is significant difference between male and female employees with regard to Communication and Creativity. The mean score level of female employees is slightly higher than the male employees. This shows that male and female employees view these dimensions differently and their expectations are also in a different plane.

There is no significant difference between male and female respondents with regard to the dimensions of Work Environment, Values and Culture, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance, Leadership, Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility since $P$ value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Work Environment, Values and Culture, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance, Leadership, Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility. The results indicate that with regard to the above dimensions of employer branding, both male and female employees feel the same way. For example, the dimension of Work-life balance, which was hitherto related only to female employees is now applicable to male employees too as they would also like to have a balance between work and life.

The results match the results of Alnaick & Alnaick (2012)\textsuperscript{31} wherein there were no significant differences with regard to gender in economic value, i.e., compensation and location and work environment whereas there was a significant difference in gender with regard to social value, application value and co-operative value which also overlaps with this study where there is a significant difference between genders with respect to reputation, career progression, communication and management practices and no significant differences in gender with regard to compensation and location and work environment.

The exploratory study conducted by Kuscu and Okan (2010) revealed that males valued cultural and economic dimensions such as salary whereas women valued social dimensions such as good relationships etc. In a study conducted by Sutherland et al (2002) between genders, there was significant variation with regard to pay and training opportunities but not in career progression and work environment. However, in a study conducted by Babcanova et al (2010), work life balance and work environment were important for women; leadership and culture were important for men, which is also partially supported in this study.

H₀1.2: There is no significant difference between marital status with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

![Table 5.2.2 t test for significant difference between marital status with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>Married: 41.09</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>Single: 37.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.696</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>Married: 49.53</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>Single: 49.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>Married: 63.36</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>Single: 60.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Married: 39.60</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>Single: 38.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.754</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>Married: 64.00</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>Single: 64.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>Married: 24.49</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>Single: 23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.377</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>Married: 24.37</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>Single: 23.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>0.039*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Married: 33.24</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Single: 32.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Married: 20.80</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>Single: 19.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Married: 29.62</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>Single: 28.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.348</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Married: 13.38</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>Single: 13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>Married: 8.87</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Single: 9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.093</td>
<td>0.037*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>Married: 34.85</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Single: 34.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Computed data
Note: 1. ** denotes significant at 1% level
      2. * denotes significant at 5% level

---


Since P value is less than 0.01, null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance with regard to the dimension of Employment Encounters, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Compensation and Location and Fair and Consistent Management Practices. Hence, there is a significant difference between married and single individuals with regard to the dimension of Employment Encounters, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Compensation and Location and Fair and Consistent Management Practices. The mean score level of married employees is higher than that of single employees. Since married employees have more responsibilities towards their families, they differ significantly in the dimensions of Compensation and Location, Career Progression etc.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance with regard to Work Life Balance, Leadership and Diversity in Work Place. Hence, there is a significant difference between married and single employees with regard to Work Life Balance, Leadership and Diversity in Work Place. The mean scores of married employees are higher than that of single employees in the case of Work Life balance and Leadership. The mean score of married employees is lower than that of single employees in the case of Diversity in Work Place. Married employees prefer to spend more time with their families than single employees and that may be the reason that they differ significantly with respect to Work Life Balance.

There is no significant difference between married and single respondents with regard to the dimensions of Work Environment, Reputation of Employer, Communication, Creativity and Corporate Social Responsibility, since the P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Work Environment, Reputation of Employer, Communication, Creativity and Corporate Social Responsibility. Marital status does not affect the employees’ perception of these factors.
H₀1.3: There is no significant difference among age groups with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.3 ANOVA for significant difference among age groups with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Above 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>39.26</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>5.264</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.64)</td>
<td>(5.91)</td>
<td>(5.67)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>50.30</td>
<td>2.788</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.10)</td>
<td>(6.98)</td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>61.91</td>
<td>62.92</td>
<td>63.38</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.48)</td>
<td>(7.55)</td>
<td>(6.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>39.54</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.89)</td>
<td>(4.10)</td>
<td>(3.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>64.15</td>
<td>64.10</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.89)</td>
<td>(9.03)</td>
<td>(7.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>24.46</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>4.878</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.95)</td>
<td>(3.57)</td>
<td>(3.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.08)</td>
<td>(3.16)</td>
<td>(2.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>33.20</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.26)</td>
<td>(4.48)</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.72)</td>
<td>(4.05)</td>
<td>(3.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td>1.010</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.64)</td>
<td>(6.27)</td>
<td>(6.03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
<td>(2.05)</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.61)</td>
<td>(5.02)</td>
<td>(4.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD  
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level  
3. Different alphabet among Age group denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the dimension of Employment encounters, Compensation and location and Diversity in Work place. Hence, there is a significant difference between age groups with regard to the dimension of Employment experience, Compensation and location and Diversity in Work place. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), age group of below 30 differed significantly with age group of above 40 at 5% level but there is no significant difference between the age group of below 30 and age group of 31 to 40 and also between age group of 31-40 and above 40 in Employment Encounters. Age group of below 30 differed significantly with age groups 31-40 and above 40 at 5% level of significance but there is no significant difference between age groups 31-40 and above 40 in Compensation and location. Age group of above 40 differed significantly with age groups below 30 and 31-40 at 5% level of significance but there is no significant difference between the age groups below 30 and 31-40 in Diversity in Work Place. The study proves that employees below age group of below 30 are more interested in compensation whereas employees belonging to the age groups of above 40 are more interested in getting better employment experience and compensation becomes secondary to them. This result follows Maslow’s Theory of Hierarchy of Needs wherein, only when the basic needs are satisfied, the other needs are realised.

There is no significant difference between age groups with regard to dimensions of Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer, Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity and Corporate Social Responsibility, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to dimension of Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer, Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity and Corporate Social Responsibility. Employees of different age groups feel the same way with regard to the above dimensions of employer branding. Employees of IT companies require training, they would like to scale high in their careers, need balance between work and life and have similar
views on reputation of their employer, communication and corporate social responsibility irrespective of their age.

The above results correspond partially with the results of Alnaick & Alnaick (2012)\(^{35}\) wherein there were no significant differences between age groups except for market value dimension. However, in a study by Babcanova et al (2010)\(^{36}\), for younger age groups below 30 years of age, work environment was important whereas it was not so for older age groups. As age increases, employees were not interested much in rewards. Sutherland et al also find that there is a significant difference across age groups with regard to the employer branding dimension of career growth, work environment, compensation and personal development. This was not validated in this study where the results indicated that there is a significant difference between age groups with respect to compensation. With regard to career progression and work environment, this study concurs with the results of Babcanova et al (2010)\(^{37}\) in that there is no significant difference between age groups with regard to the said dimensions.


\(^{36}\) Babcanova D, Babcan M & Odlerova E (2010). Employer Branding- Source of competitiveness of the industrial plants. No. 20, Research papers, Faculty of Materials Science and Technology in Trnava, Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava, pp 55-61

\(^{37}\) Babcanova D, Babcan M & Odlerova E (2010), op. cit.
H₀1.4: There is no significant difference among Educational Qualification with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.4 ANOVA for significant difference among Educational Qualification with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Professio nal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.82³</td>
<td>41.12³</td>
<td>41.13³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.26)</td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
<td>(5.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.67³</td>
<td>48.55³</td>
<td>50.66³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.92)</td>
<td>(8.52)</td>
<td>(6.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.31³</td>
<td>62.39³</td>
<td>64.89³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.07)</td>
<td>(6.64)</td>
<td>(6.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>39.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.22)</td>
<td>(3.92)</td>
<td>(3.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63.14³</td>
<td>65.76³</td>
<td>63.87³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.70)</td>
<td>(6.18)</td>
<td>(8.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.52³</td>
<td>24.38³</td>
<td>24.71³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.21)</td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
<td>(3.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>24.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.58)</td>
<td>(4.12)</td>
<td>(2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.57³</td>
<td>34.02³</td>
<td>33.23³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.18)</td>
<td>(4.09)</td>
<td>(3.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.94³</td>
<td>21.04³</td>
<td>20.75³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.56)</td>
<td>(2.97)</td>
<td>(3.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.30³</td>
<td>28.93³</td>
<td>30.32³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.41)</td>
<td>(5.95)</td>
<td>(5.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.95)</td>
<td>(2.31)</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.29³</td>
<td>8.66³</td>
<td>8.77³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(1.67)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.36³</td>
<td>33.99³</td>
<td>35.55³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.84)</td>
<td>(5.62)</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Educational Qualification denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the dimensions of Employment encounters, work environment, values and culture, compensation and location, communication, leadership, diversity in work place and corporate social responsibility. Hence, there is significant difference between educational qualifications of IT employees with regard to the above mentioned dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees with UG degrees differ significantly with employees with PG and Professional degrees at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between employees with PG and Professional degrees in Employment encounters. Employees with UG degrees and PG degrees differ significantly with employees having professional degrees at 5% level of significance, but there is no significant difference between employees with UG and PG degrees in Work Environment. Employees having different educational qualification differ significantly with each other at 5% level of significance in values and culture.

With regard to compensation and location, employees with UG degree differ significantly with employees having PG and Professional degrees at 5% significance but do not significantly differ between PG and Professional degrees. Regarding communication, employees having UG degree differ significantly with employees having PG degrees at 5% level but do not differ significantly with employees having professional degrees. Employees with UG degree and PG degree differ significantly with employees having professional degree at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees having UG and PG degree in leadership and corporate social responsibility. With regard to Diversity in Work Place, employees having UG degrees differ significantly with employees having PG and professional degrees at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between employees with PG and professional degrees. Different levels of educational qualifications bestow different experiences and expectations on the employees and this may be the reason for their opinions to differ on the different employer branding dimensions.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Reputation of employer and fair and consistent management practices. Hence, there is significant difference between educational qualifications
of IT employees with regard to the two dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having UG and Professional degrees differ significantly with employees having PG degree at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between employees having UG and Professional degrees with regard to reputation of employer. Regarding fair and consistent management practices, employees with UG degrees differ significantly with employees having PG degree at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between employees having UG degree and professional degree and between PG degree and professional degree. The results indicate that employees having UG degree differ in their outlook about the two dimensions.

There is no significant difference between educational qualification of IT employees with regard to Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Work Life Balance and creativity, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard the above mentioned employer branding dimensions. The results show that irrespective of their educational qualifications, employees feel the same way regarding work life balance, show interest in learning and develop their career.
H₀1.5: There is no significant difference among Designation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.5 ANOVA for significant difference among Designation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior level</td>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>Junior level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>41.82b (4.37)</td>
<td>40.69b (6.02)</td>
<td>38.21a (7.32)</td>
<td>18.272</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>50.52b (6.79)</td>
<td>49.08a (6.53)</td>
<td>48.75a (7.05)</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>0.023*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>63.77b (5.60)</td>
<td>63.01b (7.04)</td>
<td>61.11a (9.98)</td>
<td>6.121</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>39.13 (2.92)</td>
<td>39.68 (3.82)</td>
<td>39.15 (5.66)</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>64.34 (7.01)</td>
<td>64.38 (8.89)</td>
<td>63.34 (10.94)</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>24.67b (2.83)</td>
<td>24.77b (3.91)</td>
<td>23.07a (3.94)</td>
<td>13.492</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>23.99a (3.59)</td>
<td>25.15b (2.83)</td>
<td>23.44a (2.51)</td>
<td>16.974</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>33.51 (3.77)</td>
<td>33.02 (4.84)</td>
<td>32.98 (4.27)</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>21.08b (3.17)</td>
<td>20.68b (3.93)</td>
<td>19.75a (5.10)</td>
<td>5.303</td>
<td>0.005**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>29.97a (4.96)</td>
<td>29.39ab (6.35)</td>
<td>28.41b (7.51)</td>
<td>2.988</td>
<td>0.050*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>13.31 (1.78)</td>
<td>13.27 (2.22)</td>
<td>13.61 (2.05)</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>8.67a (1.49)</td>
<td>8.91b (1.09)</td>
<td>9.25c (0.94)</td>
<td>11.389</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>35.10 (4.74)</td>
<td>34.37 (4.89)</td>
<td>34.84 (4.66)</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Designation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance with regard to the dimensions of Employment Encounters, Values and Culture, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance, Fair and Consistent Management Practices and Diversity in Work Place. Hence, there is significant difference between designations of IT employees with regard to the stated dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), senior level and middle level employees differ significantly with junior level employees at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between senior and middle level employees for employment encounters, values and culture, compensation and location and fair and consistent management practices. With regard to work life balance, senior and junior level employees differ significantly with middle level employees at 5% but there is no significant difference between employees at senior and junior level. Regarding diversity in work place, employees at all levels differ significantly with each other at 5% level.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Work Environment and leadership. Hence, there is a significant difference among employees of different designations regarding the above cited dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), senior level employees differ significantly with middle and junior level employees at 5% level but there is no significant difference between middle and junior level employees in work environment. Regarding leadership, senior level employees differ significantly with junior level employees at 5% level but there is no significant difference between senior and middle level and also middle and junior level employees.

There is no significant difference between designations with regard to Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer, Communication and creativity, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to the above dimensions. It is apparent that employees, regardless of their level of employment, have the same expectations about career development, learning, and training and expect clear two way communication in their organisations.
\(H_01.6\): There is no significant difference among Job type with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th></th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>39.63(^a)</td>
<td>43.15(^b)</td>
<td>42.21(^b)</td>
<td>12.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.62)</td>
<td>(2.63)</td>
<td>(3.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>48.97(^a)</td>
<td>52.50(^b)</td>
<td>50.22(^a)</td>
<td>7.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.34)</td>
<td>(4.00)</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>62.30(^a)</td>
<td>65.30(^b)</td>
<td>63.01(^a)</td>
<td>3.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.25)</td>
<td>(4.90)</td>
<td>(5.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>39.47</td>
<td>39.52</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>2.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.49)</td>
<td>(2.62)</td>
<td>(3.51)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputations of Employer</td>
<td>63.58</td>
<td>65.94</td>
<td>65.41</td>
<td>2.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.84)</td>
<td>(4.88)</td>
<td>(5.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>24.05(^a)</td>
<td>24.13(^b)</td>
<td>25.12(^a)</td>
<td>2.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.82)</td>
<td>(3.57)</td>
<td>(2.65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.24)</td>
<td>(2.46)</td>
<td>(2.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>33.11(^a)</td>
<td>34.89(^b)</td>
<td>32.41(^a)</td>
<td>5.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.30)</td>
<td>(2.55)</td>
<td>(5.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>2.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.53)</td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
<td>(2.47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>29.54</td>
<td>29.23</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.62)</td>
<td>(4.13)</td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.18)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>9.02(^b)</td>
<td>8.56(^a)</td>
<td>8.70(^b)</td>
<td>5.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>34.62(^a)</td>
<td>36.43(^b)</td>
<td>34.46(^a)</td>
<td>3.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.75)</td>
<td>(3.85)</td>
<td>(5.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Type of job denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the employer branding dimensions of Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Communication and Diversity in Work Place. Hence, there is a significant difference between job types of IT employees with regard to the dimensions mentioned here. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having technical jobs differ significantly with employees doing managerial and techno-managerial jobs at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between employees doing managerial and techno-managerial jobs for Employment encounters. In the case of work environment and communication, employees doing technical and techno-managerial jobs differ significantly from employees doing managerial jobs at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees doing technical and techno-managerial jobs. In Diversity in work place, employees doing technical jobs differ significantly with employees doing managerial jobs at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees doing technical job and techno-managerial jobs and also managerial job and techno-managerial jobs.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to the dimensions of Values and Culture, Compensation and Location and corporate social responsibility. Hence, there is a significant difference between job types for the above mentioned dimensions of employer branding. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees doing technical and techno-managerial jobs differ significantly with employees doing managerial jobs at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees doing technical and techno-managerial jobs for the dimensions of values and culture and corporate social responsibility. Regarding compensation and location, employees do not differ significantly. It is evident that employees doing related jobs have the same views regarding values and culture and corporate social responsibility. It is interesting to note that regarding compensation, all employees have taken the same stance.

There is no significant difference between job types of IT employees with regard to the dimensions Work Life Balance, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership and Creativity, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the
null hypothesis is accepted with regards the above mentioned dimensions of employer branding. Results indicate that these dimensions are important to employees of different job types and employers would benefit if these dimensions are strengthened in their employer brand.

**H₀1.7: There is no significant difference among Years of Experience in the field with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.**

**Table 5.2.7 ANOVA for significant difference among Years of Experience in the field with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Experience in years in the field</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.39ᵃ</td>
<td>39.80ᵇ</td>
<td>41.40ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.84)</td>
<td>(6.30)</td>
<td>(5.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>49.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.71)</td>
<td>(6.48)</td>
<td>(7.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.86</td>
<td>62.03</td>
<td>63.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.99)</td>
<td>(9.87)</td>
<td>(6.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>39.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.13)</td>
<td>(5.49)</td>
<td>(3.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.58</td>
<td>63.52</td>
<td>64.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.86)</td>
<td>(9.91)</td>
<td>(8.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.06ᵃ</td>
<td>24.04ᵇ</td>
<td>24.78ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.36)</td>
<td>(3.63)</td>
<td>(3.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.33ᵃ</td>
<td>24.25ᵇ</td>
<td>24.58ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.85)</td>
<td>(2.30)</td>
<td>(3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.83</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.77)</td>
<td>(4.36)</td>
<td>(4.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>20.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.23)</td>
<td>(4.84)</td>
<td>(3.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.78</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>29.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.05)</td>
<td>(7.17)</td>
<td>(5.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.03)</td>
<td>(2.11)</td>
<td>(1.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.07ᵇ</td>
<td>9.16ᵇ</td>
<td>8.73ᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.09</td>
<td>34.72</td>
<td>34.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.23)</td>
<td>(4.55)</td>
<td>(5.12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the field denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level for the dimensions of Employment Encounters, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance and Diversity in Work Place. Hence, there is significant difference between employees’ experience in the field with regards the stated dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having different years of experience in the field differed significantly in the dimension of employment encounters at 5% level. Regarding compensation and location and work life balance, employees having experience of below 10 years differed significantly at 5% level, with employees having experience above 10 years. In the case of diversity in work place, employees having experience above 20 years differed significantly with employees having experience below 20 years at 5% level. Evidently, perceptions of employees regarding the employer branding dimensions keep changing as they gain experience.

There is no significant difference between employees having different years of experience in the field with regard to the dimensions of Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity and Corporate Social Responsibility since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted regarding the above cited dimensions of employer branding. Regardless of the years of experience the employees gain, these are the dimensions that they give importance to during the entire period of their careers. However, a white paper on employer branding suggests that there are significant differences between employees with different years of experience with regard to the dimensions of career progression, compensation and work-life balance, which partially supports this study.
H₀1.8: There is no significant difference among Years of Experience in the organisation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.8 ANOVA for significant difference among Years of Experience in the organisation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Experience in years in the organisation</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Above 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.80ᵃ</td>
<td>41.26ᵇ</td>
<td>43.25ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.97)</td>
<td>(5.33)</td>
<td>(2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.22ᵃ</td>
<td>50.25ᵇ</td>
<td>51.92ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.31)</td>
<td>(6.83)</td>
<td>(2.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.11ᵃ</td>
<td>63.97ᵇ</td>
<td>64.87ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.29)</td>
<td>(5.81)</td>
<td>(4.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.25ᵃ</td>
<td>39.41ᵇ</td>
<td>39.40ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.04)</td>
<td>(3.57)</td>
<td>(2.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.92ᵃ</td>
<td>65.47ᵇ</td>
<td>64.16ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.02)</td>
<td>(6.79)</td>
<td>(4.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.59ᵃ</td>
<td>24.50ᵇ</td>
<td>25.74ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.81)</td>
<td>(3.71)</td>
<td>(2.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.24ᵃ</td>
<td>24.07ᵇ</td>
<td>24.62ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.80)</td>
<td>(3.58)</td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.78ᵃ</td>
<td>33.67ᵇ</td>
<td>33.23ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.89)</td>
<td>(3.72)</td>
<td>(3.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.72ᵃ</td>
<td>21.43ᵇ</td>
<td>20.95ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.11)</td>
<td>(2.90)</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.35ᵃ</td>
<td>30.03ᵇ</td>
<td>30.65ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.16)</td>
<td>(5.50)</td>
<td>(4.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.48ᵃ</td>
<td>13.35ᵇ</td>
<td>13.17ᶜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.23)</td>
<td>(1.82)</td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.18ᵇ</td>
<td>8.75ᵃ</td>
<td>8.52ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.36ᵃ</td>
<td>34.81ᵇ</td>
<td>36.18ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.00)</td>
<td>(4.77)</td>
<td>(3.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level for the dimensions of Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture, Reputation of Employer, Compensation and Location, Fair and Consistent
Management Practices, Leadership and Diversity in Work Place. Hence, there is a significant difference between employees having different years of experience in the organisation with regard to the above mentioned dimensions of employer branding. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having different years of experience in the organisation differ significantly at 5% level with regard to Employment Encounters, Work Environment and Compensation and Location. Regarding values and culture and fair and consistent management practices and leadership, employees having experience below 5 years differed significantly at 5% level with employees having experience of more than 5 years in the organisation. Regarding reputation of employer, employees having below 5 years of experience differed significantly at 5% level with employees having 5-10 years of experience but there was no significant difference with employees having above 10 years of experience in the organisation. In the case of diversity in work place, employees with below 5 years of experience differed significantly at 5% level with employees having experience above 5 years. Evidently, as employees work for more number of years in the same organisation, they tend to get more awareness about the values and culture, work environment and employment experience. Employers should match their employer branding activities based on the years that the employees put in with their organisations.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Corporate Social Responsibility. Hence, there is a significant difference among employees having different years of experience in the organisation regarding Corporate Social Responsibility. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having less than 10 years of experience differ significantly with employees having more than 10 years of experience in the organisation at 5% level.

There is no significant difference between the years of experience the employee has in the organisation with regard to Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Work Life Balance, Communication and Creativity, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to the above stated dimensions. The results indicate that notwithstanding the number
of years of experience of employees in their current organisation, the above mentioned factors will always be important.

**H$_0$1.9: There is no significant difference among Monthly Income with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.**

### Table 5.2.9 ANOVA for significant difference among Monthly Income with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 30,000</td>
<td>30,000 - 40,000</td>
<td>40,000 - 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.45$^a$</td>
<td>40.04$^{bc}$</td>
<td>38.64$^{ab}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.15)</td>
<td>(4.89)</td>
<td>(7.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>45.21$^a$</td>
<td>50.41$^b$</td>
<td>48.61$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.45)</td>
<td>(4.15)</td>
<td>(6.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>58.76$^a$</td>
<td>64.20$^a$</td>
<td>60.08$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.25)</td>
<td>(5.15)</td>
<td>(10.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and</td>
<td>40.10</td>
<td>40.54</td>
<td>38.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>(5.11)</td>
<td>(3.47)</td>
<td>(6.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>59.03$^a$</td>
<td>67.04$^c$</td>
<td>63.76$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.70)</td>
<td>(4.68)</td>
<td>(10.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>20.76$^b$</td>
<td>24.25$^{bc}$</td>
<td>23.48$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.67)</td>
<td>(3.12)</td>
<td>(4.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>24.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.04)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(2.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>34.31$^a$</td>
<td>34.30$^b$</td>
<td>31.94$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.40)</td>
<td>(3.49)</td>
<td>(4.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>19.83$^a$</td>
<td>21.46$^b$</td>
<td>19.62$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.33)</td>
<td>(3.82)</td>
<td>(5.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>28.62$^{ab}$</td>
<td>30.95$^c$</td>
<td>27.44$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.31)</td>
<td>(4.88)</td>
<td>(8.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>12.59$^a$</td>
<td>13.93$^b$</td>
<td>13.59$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.72)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
<td>(2.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>8.83$^a$</td>
<td>9.27$^b$</td>
<td>9.18$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>34.66$^a$</td>
<td>36.91$^b$</td>
<td>33.40$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.90)</td>
<td>(3.33)</td>
<td>(5.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Monthly Income denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the dimensions of Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture, Reputation of Employer, Compensation and Location, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility. Hence, there is a significant difference between Monthly Income of employees with regard to the stated constructs. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having different ranges of monthly incomes differ significantly with each other at 5% level with regard the above cited dimensions. They also do not differ significantly in some cases such as employment encounters, reputation of employer, compensation and location, fair and consistent management practices, leadership and diversity in work place.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level for Creativity. Hence, there is a significant difference between employees having different ranges of monthly incomes for creativity. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having monthly income below 30,000 differ significantly at 5% with employees having monthly income above 30,000 having no significant differences between employees having monthly income of 30,000-40,000, 40,000-50,000 and above 50,000.

There is no significant difference between employees belonging to different ranges of monthly income with regard to dimension of Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development and Work Life Balance, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to the above mentioned constructs of employer branding. Employees belonging to different monthly income ranges do not view the above dimensions differently. Hence, the level of income does not matter in the above attributes of employer branding. All employees need to be offered career development opportunities, training and work life balance in order to be retained.
Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the demographic variables and the constructs of Employee Retention.

H₂₀.₁: There is no significant difference between genders with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention.

Table 5.2.10 t test for significant difference between genders with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>23.93</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>21.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>21.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. **denotes significant at 1% level  
2. * denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to the dimensions of Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention. Hence, there is a significant difference between male and female employees with regard to Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention. Based on mean scores, female employees are better satisfied with regard to dimensions of Employee Retention.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance with regard to Employee Satisfaction. Hence, there is a significant difference between male and female employees with regard to Employee Satisfaction. The mean scores of female employees are higher than male employees. Since men and women view things differently, their perception towards Employee satisfaction is also different.

There is no significant difference between genders with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the
null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation. Both the genders have the same level of identity or belongingness with their organisations.

H₀₂.₂: There is no significant difference between marital status with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention.

Table 5.2.11 t test for significant difference between marital status with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>23.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.53</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.58</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>19.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. ** denotes significant at 1% level
      2. * denotes significant at 5% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance with regard to the dimension of Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employee Retention. Hence, there is a significant difference between married and single employees with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employee Retention. Mean scores of married employees are higher than mean scores of single employees.

There is no significant difference between married and single employees with regard to the dimension of Employer Brand Loyalty, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Employer Brand Loyalty. This means that both married and single employees have similar levels of Employer Brand Loyalty with their organisation.
H$_{02.3}$: There is no significant difference among age groups with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.12 ANOVA for significant difference among age groups with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>Above 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>23.37$^a$ (6.36)</td>
<td>24.62$^{ab}$ (5.83)</td>
<td>24.72$^b$ (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.48$^a$ (4.94)</td>
<td>15.55$^b$ (4.43)</td>
<td>15.54$^b$ (3.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.35 (4.29)</td>
<td>20.67 (3.98)</td>
<td>20.20 (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.41 (4.18)</td>
<td>20.82 (3.91)</td>
<td>20.58 (3.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction. Hence, there is a significant difference among employees in different age groups with regard to the above stated employee retention constructs. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees in the age group of below 30 years differ significantly with employees above 40 years at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees below 30 and 31-40 and also between 31-40 and above 40 years for Employee Identification with the Organisation. Regarding Employee Satisfaction, employees in the age group of below 30 differ significantly at 5% level with employees in the age groups of 31-40 and above 40 but there is no significant difference among employees of the age group of 31-40 and above 40.

There is no significant difference between age groups of IT employees with regard to the dimension of Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to the dimensions of Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention.
**H₀2.4:** There is no significant difference among Educational Qualification with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.13 ANOVA for significant difference among Educational Qualification with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Educational Qualification</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>23.36ᵃ (6.52)</td>
<td>24.04ᵇᵃ (6.03)</td>
<td>25.09ᵇ (5.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.41ᵃ (4.97)</td>
<td>15.17ᵇᵃ (4.50)</td>
<td>15.91ᵇ (4.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.10ᵃ (4.77)</td>
<td>21.03ᵇ (3.92)</td>
<td>20.52 (3.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>19.88ᵃ (5.02)</td>
<td>21.23ᵇ (3.44)</td>
<td>20.99ᵇ (3.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD  
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level  
3. * denotes significant at 5% level  
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance with regard to the employee retention dimensions of Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employee Retention. Hence, there is significant difference between educational qualifications of employees with regard to the above stated dimensions. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees with UG degree differ with employees with professional degree at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees with UG degree and PG degree and also employees with PG degree and professional degree in Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee satisfaction. In the case of Employee Retention, employees with UG degree significantly differ at 5% with employees having PG and professional degrees but there is no significant difference between employees having PG and professional degrees.
There is no significant difference between educational qualifications of IT employees with regard to Employer Brand Loyalty as P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Employer Brand Loyalty.

H₀₂.5: There is no significant difference among Designation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.14 ANOVA for significant difference among Designation with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior level</td>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>Junior level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>24.85ᵇ (5.42)</td>
<td>24.39ᵃᵇ (5.59)</td>
<td>23.38ᵃ (6.71)</td>
<td>3.120</td>
<td>0.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.79ᵇ (4.06)</td>
<td>15.29ᵃᵇ (4.34)</td>
<td>14.47ᵃ (5.17)</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.63ᵃᵇ (3.06)</td>
<td>20.89ᵇ (3.75)</td>
<td>19.88ᵃ (4.97)</td>
<td>3.405</td>
<td>0.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>21.19ᵇ (2.63)</td>
<td>21.02ᵇ (3.99)</td>
<td>19.63ᵃ (4.94)</td>
<td>9.084</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD  
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level  
3. * denotes significant at 5% level  
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level for Employee Retention. Hence, there is significant difference between designations of employees for the dimension of Employee Retention. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), junior level employees differ significantly at 5% level with middle and senior level employees but there is no significant difference between middle and senior level employees.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level for Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty. Hence, there is significant difference between
designations of employees for the above stated constructs of employee retention. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), there is a significant difference among junior level employees and senior level employees at 5% level, but there is no significant difference between middle level and junior level employees and also middle level and senior level employees for Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction. In the case of Employer Brand Loyalty, junior level employees differed significantly with middle level employees at 5% level, but there was no significant difference between junior level employees and senior level employees and also middle level and senior level employees.

H2.6: There is no significant difference among job types with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.15 ANOVA for significant difference among job types with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Type of job</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>Techno-managerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>24.08 (6.21)</td>
<td>25.91 (3.94)</td>
<td>23.98 (5.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.06 (4.76)</td>
<td>16.43 (2.96)</td>
<td>15.18 (4.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.34 (4.34)</td>
<td>20.78 (1.67)</td>
<td>21.13 (2.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.41$a$ (4.30)</td>
<td>21.20$b$ (1.91)</td>
<td>21.60$ab$ (2.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. * denotes significant at 5% level
3. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level for Employee Retention. Hence, there is significant difference between job types of employees regarding Employee Retention. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees doing different jobs do not differ significantly with regard to Employee Retention.
There is no significant difference between job types of employees with regard to the dimensions of Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), there is significant difference between employees doing technical jobs and managerial jobs but there is no significant difference between employees performing technical and techno-managerial jobs and also between employees performing managerial and techno-managerial jobs.

H₂ô.7: There is no significant difference among Years of Experience in the field with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.16 ANOVA for significant difference among Years of Experience in the field with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Experience in years in the field</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>Above 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.49 (6.00)</td>
<td>24.13 (6.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.43 (4.52)</td>
<td>15.23 (4.84)</td>
<td>15.50 (4.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.61 (4.21)</td>
<td>20.55 (4.60)</td>
<td>20.40 (3.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.47 (3.59)</td>
<td>20.76 (5.13)</td>
<td>20.64 (3.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD

There is no significant difference between IT employees’ experience in the field with regard to all the dimensions of Employee Retention, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to all the dimensions of Employee Retention.
Hₐ2.8: There is no significant difference among Years of Experience in the organisation with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

Table 5.2.17 ANOVA for significant difference among Years of Experience in the organisation with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Experience in years in the organisation</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>Above 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>23.21ᵃ</td>
<td>25.05ᵇ</td>
<td>25.77ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.62)</td>
<td>(5.48)</td>
<td>(3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.32ᵃ</td>
<td>16.00ᵇ</td>
<td>16.25ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.14)</td>
<td>(4.03)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.83)</td>
<td>(3.33)</td>
<td>(1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>20.16ᵃ</td>
<td>21.05ᵇ</td>
<td>21.31ᵇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.97)</td>
<td>(2.86)</td>
<td>(1.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction. Hence, there is a significant difference between employees’ experience in the organisation with regard to Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having experience below 5 years differ significantly at 5% level with employees having experience above 5 years but there is no significant difference between employees having experience of 5-10 years and above 10 years for Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction.

Since P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level with regard to Employee Retention. Hence, there is a significant difference between
employees experience in the organisation with regard to Employee Retention. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having below 5 years’ experience differ significantly with employees having experience of 10 years and above but both are not significant with employees having experience between 5 and 10 years for Employee Retention.

There is no significant difference between employees’ experience in the organisation for Employer Brand Loyalty, since P value is greater than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted with regard to Employer Brand Loyalty.

\( H_02.9: \) There is no significant difference among Monthly Income with respect to the constructs of Employer Branding.

**Table 5.2.18 ANOVA for significant difference among Monthly Income with respect to the constructs of Employee Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employee Retention</th>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>F value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below 30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>21.17(^a) (7.27)</td>
<td>25.57(^c) (4.67)</td>
<td>23.05(^{ab}) (6.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>12.34(^a) (5.17)</td>
<td>16.16(^c) (3.57)</td>
<td>14.39(^b) (5.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>18.45(^a) (4.82)</td>
<td>21.66(^c) (2.86)</td>
<td>20.21(^b) (5.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>19.79(^a) (3.17)</td>
<td>21.09(^a) (2.91)</td>
<td>19.76(^a) (5.47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The value within brackets refer to SD
2. ** denotes significant at 1% level
3. * denotes significant at 5% level
4. Different alphabet among Years of Experience in the organisation denotes significant at 5% level using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT).

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level with regard to all the dimensions of Employee Retention. Hence, there is a significant difference between monthly income ranges of employees with regard to
all the dimensions of Employee Retention. Based on Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT), employees having monthly income of below 30,000 differ significantly with employees having monthly income of 30,000-40,000 at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees having income below 30,000 and 40,000-50,000 and also between 30,000-40,000 and above 50,000 for Employee Identification with the Organisation. In the case of Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty, there is significant difference at 5% level between employees having monthly income of below 30,000, 30,000-40,000, 40,000-50,000 at 5% level but there is no significant difference between employees having income above 50,000 and 30,000-40,000 and 40,000-50,000. Results indicate that income does play an important role in retention of employees.
5.2.2 Chi-square Test

Hypothesis 3: There is no association between the constructs of Employer Branding and Employee Retention

Table 5.2.19 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Employer Branding Constructs and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.1</td>
<td>Employment Encounters and Employee Retention</td>
<td>135.843</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.2</td>
<td>Work Environment and Employee Retention</td>
<td>196.925</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.3</td>
<td>Values and Culture and Employee Retention</td>
<td>141.299</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.4</td>
<td>Career Progression, learning and Training and Development and Employee Retention</td>
<td>74.127</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.5</td>
<td>Reputation of employer and Employee Retention</td>
<td>104.138</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.6</td>
<td>Compensation and Location and Employee Retention</td>
<td>85.216</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.7</td>
<td>Work Life Balance and Employee Retention</td>
<td>16.729</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.8</td>
<td>Communication and Employee Retention</td>
<td>156.029</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.9</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices and Employee Retention</td>
<td>228.495</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.10</td>
<td>Leadership and Employee Retention</td>
<td>199.668</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.11</td>
<td>Creativity and Employee Retention</td>
<td>199.712</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.12</td>
<td>Diversity in Work Place and Employee Retention</td>
<td>83.046</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀3.13</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Retention</td>
<td>31.190</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Table 5.2.19 shows that there is significant association between the levels of Employer Branding Constructs namely Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of Employer, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility and level of Employee Retention since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. The study establishes a strong relationship between the Employer Branding constructs and Employee Retention. This implies that employer branding strongly predicts Employee Retention.
Hypothesis 4: There is no association between the constructs of Employer Branding

Table 5.2.20 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Employment Encounters and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.1</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Work Environment</td>
<td>142.817</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.2</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Values and Culture</td>
<td>97.305</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.3</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Career Progression, learning, training and development</td>
<td>50.615</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.4</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Reputation of employer</td>
<td>26.256</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.5</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Compensation and Location</td>
<td>99.000</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.6</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Work Life Balance</td>
<td>16.143</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.7</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Communication</td>
<td>56.912</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.8</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Fair and consistent management practices</td>
<td>87.782</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.9</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Leadership</td>
<td>59.018</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.10</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Creativity</td>
<td>91.848</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.11</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Diversity in work place</td>
<td>62.169</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.12</td>
<td>Employment Encounters Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>18.366</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Denotes significant at 1% level
The above table reveals a significant association between level of Employment Encounters and levels of Employer Branding constructs since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. The study accomplishes a strong relationship between Employment Encounters and other Employer Branding Constructs and indicates that Employment Encounters strongly predict the other Employer Branding constructs.
Table 5.2.21 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Work Environment and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.13</td>
<td>Work Environment Values and Culture</td>
<td>119.877</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.14</td>
<td>Work Environment Career Progression, learning, training and development</td>
<td>47.836</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.15</td>
<td>Work Environment Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>41.705</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.16</td>
<td>Work Environment Compensation and Location</td>
<td>75.225</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.17</td>
<td>Work Environment Work Life Balance</td>
<td>9.932</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.05)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.18</td>
<td>Work Environment Communication</td>
<td>110.218</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.19</td>
<td>Work Environment Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>149.394</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.20</td>
<td>Work Environment Leadership</td>
<td>145.380</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.21</td>
<td>Work Environment Creativity</td>
<td>112.246</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.22</td>
<td>Work Environment Diversity in Workplace</td>
<td>47.847</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.4.23</td>
<td>Work Environment Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>12.645</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.05)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level  
* denotes significant at 5% level
Table 5.2.21 reveals a significant association between levels of Work Environment and levels of Values and Culture, Career Progression, learning, training and development, Reputation of employer, Compensation and location, Communication, Fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity and Diversity in Work place since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. As P value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance for the associations between Work Environment and Work life balance and Corporate Social Responsibility. This study corroborates a strong relationship between Work Environment and other Employer Branding constructs. The above table also indicates that Work Environment strongly predicts the other Employer Branding variables.

Table 5.2.22 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Values and Culture and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H0.24</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Career Progression, learning, training and development</td>
<td>69.463</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.25</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>78.901</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.26</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Compensation and Location</td>
<td>59.769</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.27</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Work Life Balance</td>
<td>6.534</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>Not Significant (P value is more than 0.05)</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.28</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Communication</td>
<td>72.903</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.29</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>113.530</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.30</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Leadership</td>
<td>85.347</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.31</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Creativity</td>
<td>86.841</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.32</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>147.133</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H0.33</td>
<td>Values and Culture, Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>29.830</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Table 5.2.22 shows that there is significant association between level of Values and Culture and levels of Career progression, learning, training and development, Reputation of employer, Compensation and location, Communication, fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in workplace and Corporate Social Responsibility since P value is less than 0.01 and that null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. This analysis established a strong relationship between the above mentioned variables. The above table also reveals that there is no significant association between Values and Culture and Work Life Balance as the P value is more than 0.05. The null hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance.
Table 5.2.23 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.34$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>83.231</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.35$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Compensation and Location</td>
<td>24.145</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.36$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>22.031</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.37$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>29.396</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.38$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>64.591</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.39$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>68.459</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.40$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>69.258</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.41$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Diversity in Workplace</td>
<td>51.736</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04.42$</td>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>35.116</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Table 5.2.23 shows that there is significant association between the level of Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development and levels of employer branding constructs since P value is less than 0.01. Hence, the null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance and this analysis established a strong relationship between Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development and the other Employer Branding variables. This analysis authenticates that Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development is a strong predictor of Reputation of employer, Compensation and location, Communication, fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility.

**Table 5.2.24 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Reputation of Employer and other employer branding constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.43</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Compensation and Location</td>
<td>27.508</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.44</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Work Life Balance</td>
<td>42.570</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.45</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Communication</td>
<td>43.803</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.46</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>35.951</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.47</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Leadership</td>
<td>17.985</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.48</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Creativity</td>
<td>52.007</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.49</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>88.022</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.50</td>
<td>Reputation of Employer Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>14.344</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Table 5.2.24 reveals a significant association between levels of Reputation of Employer and levels of Employer Branding constructs since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. The study accomplishes a strong relationship between the said variables and indicates that Reputation of Employer strongly predicts Compensation and location, Communication, fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility.

**Table 5.2.25 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Compensation and Location and other employer branding constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.51</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Work Life Balance</td>
<td>45.885</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.52</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Communication</td>
<td>45.386</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.53</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Fair and consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>120.124</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.54</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Leadership</td>
<td>114.076</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.55</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Creativity</td>
<td>48.916</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.56</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>31.140</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.57</td>
<td>Compensation and Location Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>17.595</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Table 5.2.25 reveals a significant association between levels of Compensation and Location and levels of Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. The study authenticates a strong relationship between the said variables. This indicates that Compensation and Location strongly predicts the employer branding constructs.

Table 5.2.26 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Work Life Balance and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.58</td>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>77.869</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.59</td>
<td>Work Life Balance Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>30.133</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.60</td>
<td>Work Life Balance Leadership</td>
<td>17.133</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.61</td>
<td>Work Life Balance Creativity</td>
<td>50.564</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.62</td>
<td>Work Life Balance Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>24.009</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀4.63</td>
<td>Work Life Balance Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>21.669</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

The above table shows that there is significant association between the level of Work Life Balance and levels of Employer Branding constructs, since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses is rejected at 1% level of significance and this study establishes a strong relationship between level of Work Life Balance and Communication, Fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility.
Table 5.2.27 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Communication and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0.64$</td>
<td>Communication Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>158.161</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant ($P$ value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0.65$</td>
<td>Communication Leadership</td>
<td>204.892</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant ($P$ value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0.66$</td>
<td>Communication Creativity</td>
<td>120.929</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant ($P$ value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0.67$</td>
<td>Communication Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>42.193</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant ($P$ value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0.68$</td>
<td>Communication Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>22.812</td>
<td>$&lt;0.001^{**}$</td>
<td>Significant ($P$ value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{**}$ denotes significant at 1% level

The above table reveals a significant association between level of Communication and levels of Fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility since $P$ value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. The study accomplishes a strong relationship between Communication and Fair and consistent management practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility.
Table 5.2.28 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Fair and Consistent Management Practices and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀,4.69</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>226.075</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀,4.70</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>125.122</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀,4.71</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>47.391</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀,4.72</td>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>15.683</td>
<td>0.003**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

As P value is less than 0.01, the null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance and it is accomplished that there is significant association between the level of Fair and Consistent Management Practices and levels of Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility. Thus, this study corroborates a strong relationship between the above examined variables. The results indicate that there is a strong link between Fair and Consistent Management Practices and other Employer Branding constructs.
Table 5.2.29 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Leadership and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_{0}.73$</td>
<td>Leadership Creativity</td>
<td>149.994</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_{0}.74$</td>
<td>Leadership Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>58.149</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_{0}.75$</td>
<td>Leadership Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>23.094</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

Table 5.2.29 shows that there is significant association between level of Leadership and Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility since P value is less than 0.01. The null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance and this analysis established a strong relationship between the said variables. Thus, this analysis authenticates that Leadership is a strong predictor of Creativity, Diversity in work place and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Table 5.2.30 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Creativity and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H$_{0}.76$</td>
<td>Creativity Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>75.882</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H$_{0}.77$</td>
<td>Creativity Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>22.088</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypotheses are rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence, it is concluded that there is a significant association between level of Creativity and levels of Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility. This study establishes a strong relationship between the analyzed variables and authenticates that Creativity strongly predicts Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility.

Table 5.2.31 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Diversity in Work Place and other employer branding constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀:4.78</td>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>454.305</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence, it is concluded that there is a significant association between level of Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility. This study establishes a strong relationship between Diversity in Work Place and Corporate Social Responsibility and indicates that Diversity in Work Place is a strong predictor of Corporate Social Responsibility.
Hypothesis 5: There is no association between the levels of Employee Retention Constructs

Table 5.2.32 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Employee Identification with the Organisation and other Employee Retention constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_0 \ 5.1$</td>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>849.472</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0 \ 5.2$</td>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>271.883</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_0 \ 5.3$</td>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>233.364</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

The above table reveals a significant association between levels of Employee Identification with the Organisation and other Employee Retention constructs since P value is less than 0.001. The null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. This indicates that there is a strong link between Employee Identification with the Organisation and other Employee Retention constructs and that Employee Identification with the Organisation predicts Employee Satisfaction, Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention.
Table 5.2.33 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Employee Satisfaction and other Employee Retention constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀.5.4</td>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>219.974</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₀.5.5</td>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>180.694</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

The above table reveals significant associations between levels of Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention since P value is less than 0.01. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. The study accomplishes a strong relationship between Employee Satisfaction and levels of Employee Retention constructs. Employee Satisfaction strongly predicts Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention.

Table 5.2.34 Results of hypothesis testing using Chi-square test for association between Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses stating no association between</th>
<th>Chi-square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision regarding null hypotheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₀.5.6</td>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>661.574</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
<td>Significant (P value is less than 0.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** denotes significant at 1% level

The above table reveals the significant association between Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention since P value is less than 0.001. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. The above result establishes the fact that Employer Brand Loyalty results in Employee Retention and is a strong predictor of the same.
5.2.3 Friedman Test

Friedman test is a non-parametric (distribution free) test that is used to compare observations repeated on the same subjects. This is also called non-parametric randomized block analysis of variance. Unlike the parametric repeated measures such as ANOVA or paired t-test, this non-parametric test makes no assumptions regarding the distribution of data (eg. normality). This test is an alternative to the repeated measures of ANOVA, when the assumption of normality or equality of variance is not met. This like many non-parametric tests uses the ranks of the data, rather than their raw values to calculate the statistic. In this study, the test is used to rank the most preferred choice of employer branding factors of employees to stay with their organisations.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference among mean ranks towards the most preferred choice of IT employees for staying with their organisation

Table 5.2.35 Friedman Test for significant difference among mean ranks towards the most preferred choice of IT employees for staying with their organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred choice for staying with the organisation</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment encounters</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working environment</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core values and culture of the organisation</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in training and development</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for growth</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of employer</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive compensation package</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of performance</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and honest communication</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of management</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership team</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope for creativity</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in work place</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate social responsibility activities</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Denotes significant at 1% level
Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference among mean ranks towards the preferred choice of IT employees for staying with their organisation. Rank 1 is the most preferred factor of employer branding for the employees to stay with their organisation and rank 15 is the least preferred factor of employer branding for the employees to be retained in their organisations. Accordingly, the least mean rank in the mean rank score is the most preferred choice of IT employees to be retained in the organisation. Based on the mean ranks, Attractive compensation package (3.03), being the least mean rank is the most preferred choice of IT employees to stay with their organisation followed by Opportunities for growth (4.47) and Recognition of performance (4.92) as the preferred choice of Employer Branding dimension that makes IT employees remain with their organisations. This implies that among the different dimensions of Employer Branding, organisations should focus on improving the above three most preferred factors to retain their employees. This is also supported by empirical evidence. The above results coincide with the results of Kuscu & Okan (2010)\textsuperscript{38} where employees were more concerned about overall compensation package and good promotion opportunities within the organisation.

Employer Branding Survey & Poll of IT and ITES organisations in India by \textit{Hewitt Associates and Accor Services (2006)}\textsuperscript{39} reveals that compensation, career progression and nature of work were the top three attributes of employer branding, which is also partially supported by this study.

Employees considered work-life balance, work environment, opportunities for development followed by financial rewards and benefits to be highly important for remaining with their organisation at Edx, which is quite contradictory to the results of this study. In a similar vein, the \textit{Employer Branding Survey 2012}\textsuperscript{40} reveals that the key factors of employer brand which contributes to employee

retention are flexible work practices, salary and benefits followed by career planning and progression which is partially coinciding with the present study.

Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference among mean ranks towards the factors of employer branding.

Table 5.2.36 Friedman Test for significant difference among mean ranks towards the factors of employer branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Employer Branding</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values and Culture</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Location</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Denotes significant at 1% level

Since P value is less than 0.01, the null hypothesis is rejected at 1% level of significance. Hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference among mean ranks towards the constructs of employer branding. Based on mean ranks, Creativity (8.78) is an important employer branding factor followed by Corporate Social Responsibility (8.19) and Career Progression, Learning and Training and Development (8.15). Though employees rate compensation and location as the most preferred factor of employer branding which influences them to stay with their organisation, employees feel very strongly about dimensions such as creativity, corporate social responsibility, career progression, learning and training and development and these are the most important dimensions of employer branding.
5.2.4 Correlation Analysis

Hypothesis 8: There is no significant relationship between Employer Branding constructs.

Table 5.2.37 Pearson Correlation between constructs of Employer Branding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values &amp; Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.466**</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.165**</td>
<td>0.301**</td>
<td>0.469**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.180**</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.248**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.480**</td>
<td>0.216**</td>
<td>0.523**</td>
<td>0.663**</td>
<td>0.537**</td>
<td>0.360**</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.373**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Location</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.392**</td>
<td>0.355**</td>
<td>0.462**</td>
<td>0.499**</td>
<td>0.251**</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.277**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td>0.213**</td>
<td>0.138**</td>
<td>0.342**</td>
<td>0.281**</td>
<td>0.244**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td>0.644**</td>
<td>0.315**</td>
<td>0.215**</td>
<td>0.426**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair &amp; Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.723**</td>
<td>0.326**</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.435**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.313**</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.461**</td>
<td>0.256**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.281**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Work Environment is 0.653, which indicate 65.3 percentage positive relationship between Employment Encounters and Work Environment at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Values and Culture is 0.684, which suggests 68.4 percentage positive relationship between the two variables at 1% level of significance. Similarly, the correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development is 0.469, which denote a 46.9 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Reputation of Employer is 0.591, indicating a 59.1 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance.

Likewise, the correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Compensation and Location is 0.490 implying a 49.0 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Work Life Balance is 0.207 revealing a 20.7 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Communication is 0.450 indicating a 45.0 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance.

Similarly, the correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Fair and Consistent Management Practices is 0.643 showing a 64.3 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Leadership is 0.562 denoting a 56.2 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions of employer branding at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Creativity is 0.315 specifying 31.5 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions at 1% level of significance. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Diversity in Work Place is 0.042 revealing a 4.2 percentage positive relationship between the two dimensions which is not significant at 5% level.
The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Corporate Social Responsibility is 0.464 indicating a 45.4 percentage positive relationship between the two factors of Employer Branding at 1% level of significance. In the same way, the other factors are positively correlated with each other except Communication and Diversity in Work Place which is not correlated. The results of correlation succeeds in indicating that there exists a positive relationship between the different dimensions of Employer Branding suggesting that all these factors are necessary for the employer brand to be successful in employee retention.

**Hypothesis 9: There is no significant relationship between constructs of Employee Retention.**

**Table 5.2.38 Pearson Correlation between constructs of Employee Retention**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Employee Identification with the organisation</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employer Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Identification with the Organisation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.976**</td>
<td>0.685**</td>
<td>0.620**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.680**</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Brand Loyalty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.843**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Retention</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient between Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Satisfaction is 0.976 which indicate 97.6 percentage positive relationship between Employee Identification with the organisation and Employee Satisfaction which is significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employer Brand Loyalty is 0.685 which indicate 68.5 percentage positive relationship between Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employer Brand Loyalty, significant at 1% level. Likewise, the correlation coefficient between Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Retention is 0.620 which indicate
62.0 percentage positive relationship between Employee Identification with the Organisation and Employee Retention, significant at 1% level.

Similarly, the positive relationship between the other factors are also established. Also, the correlation coefficient between Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention is 0.843 which indicate 84.3 percentage positive relationship between Employer Brand Loyalty and Employee Retention.

**Hypothesis 10: There is no significant relationship between constructs of Employer Branding and Employee Retention.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Retention Constructs</th>
<th>Employee Identification with the Organisation</th>
<th>Employee Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employer Brand Loyalty</th>
<th>Employee Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Branding Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employer Branding Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employer Branding Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employer Branding Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employer Branding Constructs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Encounters</td>
<td>0.739**</td>
<td>0.743**</td>
<td>0.663**</td>
<td>0.662**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.743**</td>
<td>0.727**</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td>0.484**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values &amp; Culture</td>
<td>0.781**</td>
<td>0.791**</td>
<td>0.637**</td>
<td>0.647**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Progression, Learning, Training &amp; Development</td>
<td>0.559**</td>
<td>0.552**</td>
<td>0.458**</td>
<td>0.437**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of Employer</td>
<td>0.706**</td>
<td>0.699**</td>
<td>0.730**</td>
<td>0.661**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation &amp; Location</td>
<td>0.596**</td>
<td>0.560**</td>
<td>0.516**</td>
<td>0.429**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Life Balance</td>
<td>0.347**</td>
<td>0.321**</td>
<td>0.283**</td>
<td>0.107**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.673**</td>
<td>0.664**</td>
<td>0.485**</td>
<td>0.502**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair &amp; Consistent Management Practices</td>
<td>0.753**</td>
<td>0.752**</td>
<td>0.680**</td>
<td>0.664**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.755**</td>
<td>0.737**</td>
<td>0.600**</td>
<td>0.559**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>0.447**</td>
<td>0.436**</td>
<td>0.367**</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Work Place</td>
<td>0.197**</td>
<td>0.189**</td>
<td>0.109**</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>0.593**</td>
<td>0.592**</td>
<td>0.402**</td>
<td>0.379**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Employee Identification with the Organisation is 0.739, which indicates a 73.9 percentage positive relationship between Employment Encounters and Employee Identification with the Organisation, significant at 1% level. The correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Employee Satisfaction is 0.743, which implies a 74.3 percentage positive relationship between Employment Encounters and Employee Satisfaction, significant at 1% level. Similarly, the correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Employer Brand Loyalty is 0.663, which denotes a 66.3 percentage positive relationship between Employment Encounters and Employer Brand Loyalty, significant at 1% level. Likewise, the correlation coefficient between Employment Encounters and Employee Retention is 0.662, which suggests a 66.2 percentage positive relationship between Employment Encounters and Employee Retention, significant at 1% level.

Similarly, the other dimensions of Employer Branding are positively correlated with Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employee Retention, all values significant at 1% level. However, the factor Diversity in Workplace alone is negatively correlated with the factor Employee Retention. This accomplishes the fact that all dimensions of Employer Branding such as Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture etc. have a positive relationship with Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and finally, Employee Retention.

5.2.5 Multiple Regression Analysis of Employer Branding On Employee Retention

Regression is the determination of statistical relationship between two or more variables. In simple regression two variables are used. One variable (independent) is the cause of the behaviour of another one (dependent). When there are more than two independent variables the analysis concerning relationship is known as multiple correlations and the equation describing such relationship is called as the multiple regression equation.
Regression analysis is concerned with the derivation of an appropriate mathematical expression is derived for finding values of a dependent variable on the basis of independent variable. It is thus designed to examine the relationship of a variable Y to a set of other variables X₁, X₂, X₃…………Xₙ, the most commonly used linear equation in Y=b₁ X₁ + b₂ X₂ +……+ bₙ Xₙ + b₀

Here Y is the dependent variable, which is to be found. X₁ , X₂ ,… and Xₙ are the known variables with which predictions are to be made and b₁, b₂ ,…..bₙ are coefficient of the variables.

In this study, the dependent variable is Employee Retention, Independent variables are Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of employer, Compensation and location, Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in work, Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction, Employer Brand Loyalty and analysis are discussed as follows:

Dependent variable : Employee Retention (Y)

Independent variables : 1. Employment Encounters (X₁)
2. Work Environment (X₂)
3. Values and Culture (X₃)
4. Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development (X₄)
5. Reputation of Employer (X₅)
6. Compensation and Location (X₆)
7. Work Life Balance (X₇)
8. Communication (X₈)
9. Fair and Consistent Management Practices (X₉)
10. Leadership (X₁₀)
11. Creativity ($X_{11}$)  
12. Diversity in Work ($X_{12}$)  
13. Corporate Social Responsibility ($X_{13}$)  
14. Employee Identification with the Organisation ($X_{14}$)  
15. Employee Satisfaction ($X_{15}$)  
16. Employer Brand Loyalty ($X_{16}$)  

Multiple R value : 0.884  
R Square value : 0.782  
F value : 130.660  
P value : <0.001**  

Table 5.2.40 Variables in the Multiple Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>SE of B</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>5.089</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>3.982</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>4.529</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>3.285</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>0.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{11}$</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{12}$</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>1.906</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{13}$</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{14}$</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{15}$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{16}$</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>20.791</td>
<td>&lt;0.001**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** Denotes significant at 1% level
The multiple correlation coefficient 0.884 measures the degree of relationship between the actual values and the predicted values of Employee Retention. Because the predicted values are obtained as a linear combination of Employment Encounters (X_1), Work Environment (X_2), Values and Culture (X_3), Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development (X_4), Reputation of Employer (X_5), Compensation and Location (X_6), Work Life Balance (X_7), Communication (X_8), Fair and Consistent Management Practices (X_9), Leadership (X_{10}), Creativity (X_{11}), Diversity in Work (X_{12}), Corporate Social Responsibility (X_{13}), Employee Identification with the Organisation (X_{14}), Employee Satisfaction (X_{15}) and Employer Brand Loyalty (X_{16}), the coefficient value of 0.884 indicates that the relationship between Employee Retention and the sixteen independent variables is quite strong and positive.

The Coefficient of Determination R-square measures the goodness-of-fit of the estimated Sample Regression Plane (SRP) in terms of the proportion of the variation in the dependent variables explained by the fitted sample regression equation. Thus, the value of R square is 0.782 simply means that about 78.2% of the variation in Employee Retention is explained by the estimated SRP that uses Employment Encounters, Work Environment, Values and Culture, Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, Reputation of the Employer, Compensation and Location, Work Life Balance, Communication, Fair and Consistent Management Practices, Leadership, Creativity, Diversity in Work Place, Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Identification with the Organisation, Employee Satisfaction and Employer Brand Loyalty as the independent variables and R square value is significant at 1 % level.

The multiple regression equation is

\[
Y = 2.669 + 0.109 X_1 + 0.081 X_2 + 0.074 X_3 + 0.014 X_4 + 0.001 X_5 + 0.005 X_6 + 0.137 X_7 + 0.091 X_8 + 0.081 X_9 + 0.032 X_{10} + 0.084 X_{11} + 0.151 X_{12} + 0.012 X_{13} + 0.008 X_{14} + 0.054 X_{15} + 0.725 X_{16}
\]

Here, the coefficient of X_{10.109} represents the partial effect of Employment Encounters on Employer Branding, holding other variables as constant. The
estimated positive sign implies that such effect is positive that Employee Retention score would increase by 0.109 for every unit increase in Employment Experience and this coefficient value is not significant at 5% level. The coefficient of $X_2 0.081$ represents the partial effect of Work Environment on Employer Branding, holding other variables as constant. The estimated positive sigh indicates that such effect is positive and Employee Retention score would increase by 0.081 for every unit increase in Work Environment, the coefficient value being significant at 1% level.

The coefficient of $X_3, 0.074$ typifies the partial effect of Values and Culture on Employer Branding, other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign indicates that such effect is positive that Employee Retention score would increase by 0.074 for every unit increase in Values and Culture, the coefficient value being significant at 1% level. The coefficient of $X_4, 0.014$ denotes the partial effect of Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development on Employer Branding, other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign indicates that such effect is positive that Employee Retention score would increase by 0.014 for every unit increase in Career Progression, Learning, Training and Development, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level.

The coefficient of $X_5, 0.001$ signifies the partial effect of Reputation of Employer on Employer Branding, other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that Employee Retention score would increase by 0.001 for every unit increase in Reputation of Employer, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level. Similarly, the coefficient of $X_6, 0.005$ illustrates the partial effect of Compensation and Location on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign indicates the positive effect that Employee Retention score would increase by 0.005 for every unit increase in Compensation and Location, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level.

The coefficient of $X_7, 0.137$ represents the partial effect of Work Life Balance on Employer Branding, other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that would increase the Employee Retention
score by 0.137 for every unit increase in Work Life Balance, the coefficient value being significant at 1% level. Likewise, the coefficient of $X_8$, 0.091 stands for the partial effect of Communication on Employer Branding, other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that would increase the Employee Retention score by 0.091 for every increase in Communication, the coefficient value being significant at 1% level.

The coefficient of $X_9$, 0.081 denotes the partial effect of Fair and Consistent Management Practices on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that would increase Employee Retention score by 0.081 for every increase in Consistent Management Practices, the coefficient value being significant at 5% level. Similarly, the coefficient of $X_{10}$, 0.032 stands for the partial effect of Leadership on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.032 for every increase in Leadership, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level.

The coefficient of $X_{11}$, 0.084 signifies the partial effect of Creativity on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign confirms the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.084 for every increase in Leadership, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level. The coefficient of $X_{12}$, 0.151 denotes the partial effect of Diversity in Work Place on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign displays the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.151 for every increase in Diversity in Work Place, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level.

The coefficient of $X_{13}$, 0.012 characterizes the partial effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign expresses the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.012 for every increase in Corporate Social Responsibility, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level. The coefficient of $X_{14}$, 0.008 denotes the partial effect of Employee Identification with
the Organisation on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign indicates the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.008 for every increase in Employee Identification with the Organisation, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level.

The coefficient of $X_{15}$, 0.054 characterizes the partial effect of Employee Satisfaction on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign shows the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.054 for every increase in Employee Satisfaction, the coefficient value being not significant at 5% level. The coefficient of $X_{16}$, 0.725 represents the partial effect of Employer Brand Loyalty on Employer Branding, the other variables being constant. The estimated positive sign illustrates the positive effect that would result in increased Employee Retention score by 0.725 for every increase in Employer Brand Loyalty, the coefficient value being significant at 1% level.

Based on standardized coefficient, Employer Brand Loyalty (0.724) is the most important factor to extract Employee Retention score, followed by Employment Encounters (0.168) and Values and Culture (0.144).

The current chapter has analysed and interpreted the results of the study in an elaborate manner. Tests are used to establish hypotheses stated. The next chapter establishes the relationship between employer branding and employee retention through structural equation modeling.