Chapter 3
Methodology and Design

3.1 The Study Design

The study is exploratory and descriptive in nature that provide the insight and an understanding of concept related to employee branding and brand image creation. Study has proven its validity on the ground of available literatures. The study extends the new ways of utilizing intellectual assets for brand promotion in much realistic and live manner. The exploration of new phenomena gives better understanding and new strategic use of research issues. The study is primarily based on primary data that is collected from the field through questioning the respondents with the help of structured questionnaire based on five point likert scale.
### Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per the research design four subgroups have been identified for the study i.e.

1. **a** = Respondents of public banks
2. **b** = Respondents of private banks
3. **c** = Respondents of public insurance
4. **d** = Respondents of private insurance
3.2 The Sampling Plan

3.2.1 Universe: Customers of public and private banks & insurance companies.

3.2.2 Sampling Unit: For the research total 400 respondents were collected from the respondents. The responses were collected in two groups: First ‘Bank’, Second ‘Insurance’. For both the groups 200 responses each is collected. Further, each group is categories into ‘Private’ & ‘Public’ for them 100 each response is secured.

The initial sample was collected from Indore, Bhopal and Jabalpur.

**Bank (200 responses)** : 100 (Private Bank)  
100 (Public Bank)

**Insurance (200 Responses)** : 100 (Private Insurance)  
100 (Public Insurance)

3.2.3 Sampling Method: For data collection ‘Stratified Sampling Technique’ is used. To avoid non response, incomplete responses or response error 5% extra responses were
gathered. Unfilled/partially filled responses were dropped to avoid errors. The extraneous factors that may affect the responses or may lead to bias result were controlled by randomization and elimination.

3.2.4 Sample Size: For the research 400 questionnaires were distributed to the target respondents that covered customers of public and private banks & insurance companies. Further, obtained data were refined by using median method. In this method median of whole data (400 responses) was calculated i.e. Median = 86. Then, responses carrying sum of 85, 86 and 87 were dropped out (upper limit = 85, median = 86, lower limit = 87) to refine the data for further analysis.

Types of Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Organizations</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>100 (84)</td>
<td>100 (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Branding</td>
<td>100 (90)</td>
<td>100 (87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total 345 respondents)
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was applied to check sampling adequacy of the sample. The test suggests 0.50 is to be considered accepted level of sample adequacy. KMO measure of sample adequacy was found 0.798 > 0.50 (KMO acceptable range) that means sample used in the research is adequate for study. (Refer appendix I, Table 2)

3.3 The Tools

3.3.1 For Data Collection: Questionnaire technique is used to collect primary data from the targeted respondents. Numbers of factors were identified from the available literatures and prepare questions on them. These questions were sent to the experts to review and for their remarks. Many questions were dropped out due to irrelevancy and some were clubbed together because of the similarity. Series of review were taken by subject experts and finally we reached and concluded with 23 relevant questions. The questionnaire was at five point likert scale with all close ended type questions.

Cronbach’s Alpha Test (Cronbach, 1951) was applied to check reliability before the questionnaire was administered for the final survey. An Alpha Coefficient of 0.60 is considered to be good reliability estimate of the instrument. In the present study, the Alpha Coefficient Value is found to be 0.79. (Refer appendix I, Table 1)
**Part I** of the questionnaire covered five demographic variables including name, age, occupation, gender and category (for which the responses are given like for private bank or insurance and so on). In this part of the questionnaire respondents were requested to put a mark in the box a side of relevant field to choose the option.

**Part II** respondents were given 23 statements on how an employee can become a brand ambassador or create a favorable brand image of the organization in the mind of the customers with the help of various key factors taken for the study. The statements were at five point likert scale (1= strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree).

**3.3.2 For Data Analysis:** Once the response is collected it was converted into the useful data that can be used for statistical analysis by using SPSS software. Further, to meet the objectives of the research various statistical tools such as:

1. Test of normality (Skewness and Kurtosis)
2. Test of reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha)
3. Factor analysis (Using SPSS)
4. Independent sample t-test (Using SPSS)
5. ANOVA (Using SPSS)
First Test of Normality

As the subsequent experiments required assumption of normal distribution of the same as the pre requisite for the analysis, it became necessary to test the veracity of the assumption of normal distribution of collected data. Normality test statistics by ‘Kolmogorov-Smirnov test’ and ‘Shapiro-Wilk test’ assesses that whether a particular distribution differs significant from normal distribution (Carver & Nash, 2006). Thus the responses were tested for veracity of the assumption of normal distribution by K-S test and Shapiro Wilk test for the total score of Employee Branding. The significant value (p-value) for K-S test was found to be 0.255 (greater than 0.05) and for Shapiro-Wilk test was found to be 0.326 (greater than 0.05). This indicated that the distribution of final points does not differ significantly from normal distribution. This inferred that the assumption of normality with respect to the sample chosen was valid. (Refer appendix I, Table 3a)

Skewness and Kurtosis as the measure of deviation from normality were also calculated. It helps to identify whether the data lies under the acceptance region or not. The value suggested by the test is +2 to -2 is acceptable region (George and Mallery, 2009). If the test result’s value fall under the range of +2 to -2 is considered that the data does not
deviate much from the normal curve and can be said the data is normally distributed. The test result is found favorable as the value of ‘Skewness = -0.760’ and ‘Kurtosis = 1.801’ which lies under the acceptance area. Hence, the data used for analysis is normal. (Refer appendix I, Table 3b)

**Second- Test of Reliability**

Once the test of normality is applied and result is found normal that ensure the data is normally distributed test of reliability was carried out on whole data collected. The reliability of the scale developed for the study was determined by Chronbach’s Alpha method. The closer the reliability co-efficient alpha (α) is to 1.00, the greater internal consistency of items in the instrument being assessed. The content and construct validities of the scale assessed qualitatively by the panel of judges. Initially 28 questions were taken for the Employee branding Scale but 5 questions were dropped by the panel of judges. The validity of the scale in quantitative terms was assessed by reliability index (square root of reliability co-efficient). (Refer appendix I, Table 1)
**Third- Factor Analysis**

The outcome of brain storming sessions and discussions with subject experts were done with 23 relevant factors on which research questionnaire was designed. To reach up to more specific results and to be more confined we reduced the factors with help of factor analysis (using SPSS). Further, 23 factors were reduced to seven potential factors that have a significant influence on consumers’ mind pertaining to a positive brand image of the brand/organization.

Factor analysis is primarily used for data reduction and summarization. Instead, the whole set of interdependent relationship among variables are examined factor analysis facilitate us the group of variables (most common with each other) to study and describe variability among observed & correlated variables in terms of potentially lower number of unobserved variable called ‘Factors’.

**Fourth- Independent t-test**

Seven hypotheses were assumed (based on factors identified through factor analysis) taking each factor into consideration to calculate the mean difference in ‘Banking’ and ‘Insurance’ sector with respect to brand image creation. For testing assumed hypothesis
independent t-test was applied and tests whether the hypotheses are accepted or not accepted at assumed parameters.

**Fifth-ANOVA (Analysis of Variance)**

To study the applicability of ‘Employee Branding’ concept on two different ‘Sectors’ (Public & Private) and ‘Industry’ (Bank & Insurance) one way ANOVA was applied. One-way ANOVA is used to test for variance among two or more independent groups of data, in the instance that the variance depends on a single factor. The ANOVA summary table generated through SPSS takes the following form:
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Where,

**Sum Sq (between)** - The sum of squared deviations between the grand mean and each group mean weighted (multiplied) by the no. of subjects in each group.

**Sum of Sq (within)** - The sum of square deviations between the mean for each group and observed values of each subject within that group.

**Degree of Freedom**

**Df (between)** - No. of groups minus one

**Df (within)** - No. of subjects minus one

**Mean Sq** - Sum of Sq. divided by df

**F-Ratio** - Between groups mean sq divided by within groups mean

**Sig** - Value of significance ‘p’

The ANOVA table results into ‘F’ and ‘Sig’ values when significant value (‘p’- value) is less than 0.05 it means there is statistically significant association between the dependent and independent variable. If the corresponding value of significance is found less than 0.05 then null hypothesis is rejected at 5% level of significance otherwise accepted.
3.4 Research Hypotheses

First: Factor based hypotheses

$H_{01}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Employees’ Selling Skills.

$H_{02}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Self Monitoring.

$H_{03}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Employees’ Enthusiasm.

$H_{04}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Employees’ Credibility.

$H_{05}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Employees’ Loyalty.

$H_{06}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Customer Centric Behavior.

$H_{07}$: There is no significant difference in brand image creation with respect to Banking & Insurance industry in terms of Trust Worthy.
Second: Matrix (2 x 2) based hypotheses

\(H_{08}: \) There is no significant difference between public bank & private bank with respect to employee branding.

\(H_{09}: \) There is no significant difference between public bank & public insurance with respect to employee branding.

\(H_{010}: \) There is no significant difference between public bank & private insurance with respect to employee branding.

\(H_{011}: \) There is no significant difference between public insurance & private bank with respect to employee branding.

\(H_{012}: \) There is no significant difference between private insurance & private bank with respect to employee branding.

\(H_{013}: \) There is no significant difference between public insurance & private insurance with respect to employee branding.
Third: ANOVA based hypotheses

$H_{04}$: The applicability of employee branding in banking industry do not differ from insurance industry for brand image creation.

$H_{05}$: The applicability of employee branding in public sector do not differ from private sector for brand image creation.

$H_{06}$: Type of industry and type of sector do not interact to affect the functionality of employee branding with respect to brand image creation.