

EMPLOYER BRANDING AND EMPLOYEE LOYALTY IN HOTEL INDUSTRY

Vinay Chauhan*, Shilpa Mahajan**

Abstract *The increasing competition for hiring and retaining the best employees has led the organizations to strategize on building a strong brand name as an employer. Research evidences have shown that a strong brand can be a company's most valuable asset, by increasing employee loyalty leading to lowering turnover and helping employers to stand effectively in the increasingly competitive job market. Externally, the employer brand functions to attract employees and create positive associations and enhance corporate image whereas, internally the employer brand generates value by creating a unifying and strong culture as well as increased employee satisfaction and commitment finally leading to employee loyalty (Edwards, 2010).*

In fact, the employer brand is embedded within theory of psychological contract; it impacts employee organizational relationship and also job motivation and satisfaction (Backhaus and Tikoo 2004). Therefore, the correlation between employer branding and the loyalty is found to be positive based on the commitment of the employees towards employer. This assumption has led the researcher to conduct a research on the relationship between the employer branding and employee loyalty in one of its most relevant service sector i.e. hospitality industry representing Ashok Group of Hotels and Taj Group Hotels from Northern India. The present study has adopted employer branding as multidimensional construct and in context of hospitality sector, the research has explored six dimensions of employer branding, which is found to be efficiently practiced by the hotels under reference. The research also points out that employer branding impacts employee loyalty positively. The study also generates a scope for another comprehensive exploratory study for the identification of variables other than employer branding that influence the employee loyalty.

Keywords: *Employer Branding, Employee Loyalty, Hotel Industry*

INTRODUCTION

The growing importance of human capital has brought a paradigm shift in the business operations which in turn create a competitive advantage for long term sustenance of an organization in human intensified service organizations. Thus, it becomes very crucial for an organization to build a loyal employee base as these set of employees have sustainable impact on achieving overall business success. This has led to an increased competition for attracting and retaining competent employees as these committed employees are the critical success factor for the organizational success. The concept of talent management holds more relevance in service industry like tourism and hospitality industry where employee turnover is found to be highest besides facing a severe problem of talent crunch. In

consequence many hospitality organizations are focusing on building a strong brand name as an employer for addressing the identified challenges. The employer brand of an organization depicts the organization's credibility, culture, uniqueness, transparency and moral values to its internal customers i.e. the 'prospective' and 'current' employees. (Berry, George 1981 and 1990). Successful organizations are focusing upon idea of branding and the development of brand equity which have been applied to organization to improve their image as an employer (Krishnan and Hartline 2001). Research evidences have shown that a strong brand can be a company's most valuable asset, by increasing employee loyalty leading to lowering turnover and helping employers to stand effectively in the increasingly competitive job market.

* Associate Professor, The Business School, University of Jammu, Jammu. Email: chauhan_vinay1@rediffmail.com.

** Research Scholar, The Business School, University of Jammu, Jammu. Email: Shilpamahajan01@gmail.com

Brand loyalty has two dimensions: a behavioral one that relates to company organizational culture and an attitudinal one that describes the individual's degree of commitment towards the brand (Holbrook 2001). An employee loyalty means that brand-loyal employees remain with the firm even if other employers would be more attractive (Backhaus and Tikoo 2004). An employer brand might stimulate the initial decision to stay, but a truly strong brand will generate something much more powerful. When employees look around and see and feel that what has been promised was not just glitter but a true representation of the company's values, a personal affinity towards the organization will develop, making an employee loyal towards an organization (Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development 2008). Further, employer brand loyalty is mainly influenced by the degree of identification by which employee feel committed towards the organization. In fact an employee makes a personal connection to their organizational culture and its identity, to describe it as attractive or unique. This connection will not only promote a strong sense of membership but also lead to a sense of commitment to an employer to an extent that loyal employees won't leave the organization even under less ideal circumstances they can relate to their employer.

Thus the need and relevance of employer branding as a response mechanism to address the challenges leading to employee loyalty and retention necessitates the need to conduct a study on employer branding and its relationship with employee loyalty.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The increasing global competition for the 'best' employees has brought about the shortfall in new workforce entrants in many advanced economies that makes organizations to ensure that their employees will keep on working for them. However, a large, and perhaps growing, number of employees nowadays do not want a traditional career within one company (Burke and Ng 2006). Consequently, they are less loyal and more opportunistic than workers in the past (Burke and Ng 2006; Hiltrop 1999). Most of the time when these employees move, they migrate to competing organizations with the knowledge and trade secrets acquired from their former employers thereby creating an even more critical situation for the latter (Abassi and Hollman 2000). Empirical studies such as (Stovel and Bontis 2002) have shown that employees, on average switch employers every six years. Ironically, young generation employees tend to change job much more frequently, which challenges the organizations in terms of retaining key employees (Lodberg 2011). The scenario is more critical in hospitality sector, where the industry is continuously losing employees at an alarming rate and the sector has already started facing more pressure for the hiring and retaining talented employees.

The hotel industry managers also admit that one of the most difficult aspects of their jobs is the retention of key employees in their organizations (Litheko 2008). Concerns of managers in the hotel industry often involve high annual turnover rates, ranging from 50%-250% and decreased availability of employees (Woods and Macaulay 1989; Sneed, 1988; Schuster 1999). It is generally accepted that employee loyalty and retention are the biggest problems being faced by hospitality operators. For a hospitality manager, it is becoming harder to find good employees and even harder to keep them on the job. Quail and Williams (1999) agreed that talent shortages were plaguing hotel industry even when the industry employed more than 10 million people. The industry is directing its attention toward increasing employee loyalty by recruiting and training more effectively, as well as hiring from less traditional talent pools (Quail and Williams 1999). The hotel industry in general continues to have one of the highest turnover rates across industries because of wages, shift schedules and social perceptions of entry level jobs (Hurst 1997). According to research conducted by the American Hotel and Motel Association, average annual employee turnover ranges from around 60 to 300 percent and employee turnover costs range between 25 percent and 250 percent of annual salary per exiting employee depending on the job type. These challenges foster a shortage of employees and intensify the war for talent retention in the organizations.

Subsequently, to cope with these challenges organizations need to increase focus on strategies to retain the talented and highly skilled employees. In this context employer branding has become a vital tool in the war for talent to ensure that organizations develop long-term commitment and loyalty among the employees. Externally, the employer brand functions to attract employees and create positive associations and enhance corporate image. Internally, the employer brand generates value by creating a unifying and strong culture as well as increased employee satisfaction and commitment finally leading to employee loyalty (Edwards 2010). Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004., Gaddam 2008). Moreover, an important purpose of employer branding is to encourage employees to identify themselves with the organization and thereby increasing employee commitment and loyalty (Edwards 2011). The employer brand is embedded within theory of the psychological contract, its impact on the employee organizational relationship, on job motivation and satisfaction (Backhaus and Tikoo 2004). Therefore, the correlation between employer branding and the loyalty is found to be positive based on psychological motives and commitment of the employees toward employer. This assumption has led the researcher to conduct a research on the relationship between the Employer Branding and Employee Loyalty in one of its most relevant service sector i.e. Hospitality Industry. Within the Hospitality sector, two major hotel chains of India namely Ashok Group of Hotels

and Taj Group hotels of have been selected for the study, with an understanding that the select hotel chains represents both public and private hospitality sector

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A clear distinctive research methodology gives a purposeful direction to the research which results in determining the objectivity of research. An insight into the previous studies and identified gap therein has led the researchers to develop following research questions and assumptions.

OBJECTIVES

1. To examine the existing employer branding practices undertaken by the select hotel organizations.
2. To measure the employee loyalty in terms of employees intentions to stay with the organization under reference.
3. To explore the underlying factors of employer branding in Hospitality Sector.
4. To conduct an impact assessment of employer branding on employee loyalty.
5. To suggests the options for using employer branding as a strategic tool for enhancing employee loyalty.

Hypothesis

H1: Significant difference exists for employer branding across the organizations under study.

H2: Employer branding impacts employee loyalty positively.

Research Methodology

Keeping in view the nature of the research, the study is primarily based on primary data, however study has also made use of secondary data. The primary data for the study is collected through a structured a questionnaire. The questionnaire is comprised of three sections, Section A consisting of 33 items to determines the existence of employer branding and one additional item is included to know the 'overall existence of employer branding' in the organization while section B has 11 items which determines the employee loyalty with an additional item to determine the overall loyalty among employees towards their respective organizations. Section C describes the Demographic profile of the respondents. To measure the existence of the employer branding the responses of the statements in the section A is recorded on 5 point likert scale where 1=Highly inexistent, 2=Inexistent, 3=Neither inexistent nor existent, 4=Existent, 5=Highly existent. The section B which measures the employee loyalty in terms of employees' intentions to

stay, 5-point likert scale has been used to know the level of agreement where 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree,5=Strongly agree. To make the study representative, the data was collected from the employees of Taj and Ashok group of hotels from different location of Northern India, Viz. Hotel Ashoka- Jammu, Hotel Samrat- New Delhi, Hotel Ashok- Chandigarh, Vivanta by Taj- Ambassador- New Delhi, Taj-Chandigarh and Taj View- Agra. Cronbach Alpha and split half as a test of reliability (Malhotra 2008, p. 285) have been worked on total number of respondents(N=200). The data have proved reliable in terms of split half reliability as mean obtained from both halves of respondents are satisfactory (Group I=4.18 and Group II= 4.15). Moreover, Cronbach's Alpha value of (.973) also proved reliability as it is greater than the threshold value of .70 (Table1).

Table 1. Split half Reliability and Cronbach Alpha

Group	Mean & Alpha
Group I	4.18
Group II	4.15
Cronbach's Alpha	.973

The Content and Construct Validity was duly assessed through review of literature and discussions with the experts representing both academia and practicing managers of representative areas. The statistical techniques used for the analysis of the data include Percentage method, Mean, Standard Deviation, 't' test, Correlation and Multiple Regression. The percentage method is used for explaining the description of the respondents. Mean and Standard Deviation are used to explain the Employer Branding and Employee Loyalty of the employees collected on five point Likert scale. The 't' test is used as a test of significance for the significantly different scores of the explored dimensions on the basis of hotel chains. The multiple correlation and multiple regression techniques have been applied to study the joint influence of selected group variables of Employer Branding on the Employee Loyalty.

ANALYSIS, FINDING AND CONCLUSION

Profile of the Respondents

The profiles of the respondent employees have been discussed on the basis of their respective percentage values which are summarized in the Table 2.

Out of the total respondents of 200, the number of respondents falling 156 (78%) in the age group of 20-40 years is the highest followed by respondents 44(22%) in the age group of 41-60 years. The number of male respondents

Table 2. Profile of the respondents

Description	No of respondents	Percentage of respondents
a) Age		
20-40	156	78
41-60	44	22
b) Gender		
Male	151	75.5
Female	49	24.5
c) Marital status		
Married	89	44.5
Unmarried	111	55.5
d) Years of experience		
0-20	180	90
21-40	20	10
e) Education		
Undergraduate	28	14
Graduate and above	172	86
f) Organization		
Taj group	100	50
Ashok group	100	50

figured higher 151 (75.5%) than their female counterparts 49 (24.5%). More than half of the total respondents are unmarried 111(55.5%) and 89(44.5%) are married. Majority of the respondents 180 (90%) have work experience between 0-20 years while as (10%) have work experience of 21-40 years. Most of the respondents are graduate and above 172(86%) while as 28(14%) are undergraduate. Out of total

200 respondents, 100(50%) are from Taj group of hotels and 100(50%) are from Ashok group of hotels.

EMPLOYER BRANDING IN HOTEL INDUSTRY

The existing practices of employer branding have been represented in Table 3.

Variable	Description	Taj	Ashok	Grand Mean
		Mean	Mean	
EEB1	Good relationship with colleagues	4.32	4.28	4.30
EEB2	Job security within the organization	4.33	4.23	4.28
EEB3	Good relationship with superiors	4.25	4.17	4.21
EEB4	An attractive overall compensation package	4.20	4.29	4.25
EEB5	Organizational culture for successful team work	4.25	4.22	4.23
EEB6	The organization has customer oriented philosophy	4.25	4.13	4.19
EEB7	Good reference for your future career	4.24	4.12	4.18
EEB8	Opportunities for inter-departmental work experience	4.20	4.12	4.16
EEB9	Fair and consistent salary at par with the industry standards	4.13	4.02	4.08
EEB10	Organization has an environment of openness and trust	4.19	4.15	4.17
EEB11	Attractive geographical location of the organization	4.39	4.18	4.29
EEB12	Tasks that mean bigger challenges	4.36	3.98	4.17
EEB13	Effective plans and policies for employees in the organization	4.43	3.96	4.20
EEB14	Organizational initiatives to create a feel good at work place	4.26	4.02	4.14
EEB15	Transparency in communication channels	4.38	3.97	4.17
EEB16	Employees are kept aware of the developments	4.25	4.06	4.15

EEB17	Organization is responsive towards individual needs	4.39	4.20	4.30
EEB18	Employees are treated with fairness and respect	4.46	4.19	4.33
EEB19	Opportunity to be a part of task/specialized group outside the core job responsibilities	4.32	4.09	4.21
EEB20	Organization culture recognizes and values diversity	4.24	4.12	4.18
EEB21	Ethical organization with high moral standards	4.36	4.20	4.28
EEB22	Organization acknowledges employees contribution that synchronizes it with the objectives of the organization	4.45	4.08	4.27
EEB23	Organization culture of promoting employees creativity.	4.18	4.03	4.11
EEB24	Organization promotes work-life balance	4.29	4.15	4.22
EEB25	Freedom to interact with people while doing job.	4.36	4.27	4.31
EEB26	Independence to put forward your thoughts	4.33	4.29	4.31
EEB27	Environmental concern of the organization	4.36	4.13	4.24
EEB28	Continuous reconnection and follow-up of your work	4.30	4.15	4.23
EEB29	Good leadership in the organization	4.36	4.26	4.31
EEB30	Sustainable growth rate of the organization	4.25	4.20	4.22
EEB31	Organization provide health and related benefits	4.38	4.37	4.38
EEB32	Well planned leave system in the organization	4.23	4.45	4.34
EEB33	Management orientation that empowers employees to take responsibility and authority	4.32	4.34	4.33
EEB34	Employer branding as an overall process,what is its existence in your organization	4.47	4.35	4.41

The analysis of employer branding has shown that employees of Taj have rated the item 'Organization acknowledges employees contribution that synchronizes it with the objectives of the organization' with highest mean value of (4.45) while as the item 'Fair and consistent salary at par with the industry standards' has been rated lowest with mean value (4.13). Interestingly, all the items of employer branding have been rated above a mean value of 4 which shows that there is high existence of employer branding in Taj group. Similarly, the employees of Ashok group have given highest mean value to the statement 'Well planned leave system in the organization' (4.23) and lowest mean value to 'Transparency in communication channels' (3.97). Most of the items by Ashok group have been rated above a mean value of 4 except for items like 'Tasks that mean bigger challenges' having mean value (3.98) and the item 'Effective plans and policies for employees in the organization' with a mean value (3.96). Moreover item 'Organization provide health and related benefits' have been rated highest by both the organization with mean (4.38) while as the statement 'Fair and consistent salary at par with the industry standards' is rated lowest by both the organization with mean value (4.08). Also the Taj group have rated 'Employer branding as an overall process, what is its existence in your organization' with mean value (4.47) indicating high existence of employer branding followed by Ashok group with mean value (4.35). Therefore, it can interpreted from the above findings that there is high existence of employer branding in both the organizations.

EMPLOYEE LOYALTY IN HOTEL INDUSTRY

Employee loyalty has been measured in terms of intention to stay with the organization, the results of the same is depicted in the table 4.

Employee loyalty has been measured in terms of intention to stay with the organization. The analysis of the responses indicates that in Taj group of hotels, 11 variables of employee loyalty have found to have mean value more than 4 on 5-point scale indicating that employees are loyal towards the organization and they intend to continue with the Taj group of hotels. However, the statement 'It doesn't matter whether I'm working for this organization or another, as long as I have work' have recorded a mean value less than 4 indicating that for employees, it does matter for which organization they are working. Similarly, in case of Ashok group of hotels, most of the items have mean value above 4 except for statement 'I am not planning to work for another organization for a period of next three years' having mean value (3.62) and for statement 'If I receive an attractive job offer from another organization, I will consider for a change' with mean value (3.55). The highest mean value of statement 'If I want to do another job, I will first look at the possibilities within this organization' (4.23) reflects that the employees are loyal towards their organization and will look for opportunities within their respective organizations. Further, the Mean value of statement 'Finally it can be concluded that in near future, I will remain loyal with this organization' shows that there exist a high loyalty among employees of Taj and Ashok group of hotel.

Table 4. Employee Loyalty in Hotel Industry

Variable	Description	Taj	Ashok	Grand
		Mean	Mean	Mean
EL1	I am not planning to work for another organization for a period of next three years.	4.14	3.62	3.88
EL2	I see a good future for myself within this organization.	4.29	4.04	4.17
EL3	It doesn't matter whether I'm working for this organization or another, as long as I have work	3.97	3.33	3.65
EL4	Keeping in view the brand image, i will definitely work for this organization for the next three years	4.08	4.02	4.05
EL5	If I could start over again, I would choose to work for same organization.	4.21	4.08	4.14
EL6	If I receive an attractive job offer from another organization, I will consider for a change	4.16	3.55	3.85
EL7	I feel privileged as a part of this organization	4.15	4.15	4.15
EL8	If it is up to me, I will definitely be work for this organization for the next three years	4.19	4.05	4.12
EL9	The work I am doing is very important to me	4.20	4.21	4.20
EL10	If I want to do another job,I will first look at the possibilities within this organization	4.33	4.13	4.23
EL11	Within this organization my work gives me satisfaction	4.20	4.17	4.18
EL12	Finally it can be concluded that in near future, I will remain loyal with this organization	4.33	4.28	4.30

The Underlying Factors of Employer branding

For exploring the underlying factors of the EB, exploratory factor analysis is applied to the identified statements of the EB. The overall mean score of all the identified dimensions is (4.23) indicating high level of employer branding existence in the select hotels. The total variance explained for employer branding is 65.46%.The employer branding came up with the six factors viz. Compensation and empowerment, Growth and Benefits, Responsibility and Development, Work environment, Culture, Social and Location.

The explored factors and their variable along with the variance explained is given below;

Factor 1- Compensation and Empowerment (CE):The first factor comprised of seven items with eigen value 14.15 and variance explained b (13.16) . The item ‘Opportunities for inter-departmental work experience’ (EEB8) has the highest factor loading (.740) indicating high association with this factor. The item ‘Organizational culture for successful team work’(EEB5) having the least factor loading (.521) and therefore stands least associated with this factor

Factor 2-Growth and Benefits (GB): The second factor comprised of seven items with Eigen value (1.99) and the variance explained (12.85). The item ‘Organization provide health and related benefits to the employees’(EEB31) is having factor loading(.746) and therefore this item stands highly associated with this while as item ‘continuous reconnection and follow up of your work’ has lower factor loading of (.590) indicating low association with the factor.

Factor 3-Responsibility and Development (RD) The third factor comprised of six statements having Eigen value (1.685) and variance explained (11.914). The item ‘Employees are kept aware of the developments in the organization’ (EEB16) has the highest factor loading (.752) and therefore this item is considered highly associated with this factor. The item ‘Organizational initiatives to create a feel good at work place’ (EEB14) has the lowest factor loading (.533) and therefore stands least associated with this factor.

Factor 4-Work environment(WE)The fourth factor comprised of five statements with Eigen value (1.399) and variance explained (11.249) The item ‘Opportunity to be a part of task/specialized group outside the core job responsibilities’ (EEB19) have highest value of factor loading(.705) showing a high association with the factor while as item ‘Independence to put forward your thoughts while performing job’(EEB26) have the least factor loading (.592)showing a low association with the factor

Factor 5-Organizational culture(OC):The fifth factor comprised of four items with eigen value(1.263) and variance explained(8.813) The item ‘Freedom to interact with people while doing job’(EEB) have high factor loading(.705) while as item ‘Independence to put forward your thoughts while performing job’(EEB26) have low factor loading (.592) indicating low association with the factor.

Factor 6-Social and Location (SL): The sixth factor have four items with eigen value(1.01) and variance explained is (7.471) The item ‘Good relationship with colleagues in the organization’(EEB1) have the highest factor loading(.724) indicates high association with the factor. The item ‘Good relationship with superiors in the organization’ (EEB3) have

Table 5. Factors of Employer branding

Factors	Variables	VM	SD	FL	C	MF	EV	VE
Compensation and Empowerment(CE))	EEB8	4.16	.871	.740	.724	4.18	14.158	13.16
	EEB9	4.08	.913	.662	.638			
	EEB4	4.25	.824	.649	.616			
	EEB10	4.17	.845	.645	.577			
	EEB6	4.19	.841	.633	.599			
	EEB7	4.18	.906	.611	.619			
	EEB5	4.23	.750	.512	.724			
Growth and Benefits(GB)	EEB31	4.38	.746	.746	.649	4.29	1.996	12.853
	EEB30	4.22	.823	.699	.713			
	EEB33	4.33	.796	.690	.627			
	EEB32	4.34	.798	.678	.611			
	EEB29	4.31	.853	.616	.650			
	EEB27	4.24	.793	.591	.686			
	EEB28	4.23	.829	.590	.673			
Responsibility and Development(RD)	EEB16	4.15	.809	.784	.752	4.21	1.685	11.914
	EEB17	4.30	.813	.667	.673			
	EEB13	4.20	.843	.590	.725			
	EEB18	4.33	.743	.585	.687			
	EEB15	4.17	.859	.579	.669			
	EEB14	4.14	.815	.533	.618			
Work Environment(WE)	EEB19	4.21	.898	.758	.740	4.22	1.399	11.249
	EEB20	4.18	.801	.710	.651			
	EEB21	4.28	.886	.707	.679			
	EEB22	4.27	.830	.685	.680			
	EEB12	4.17	.880	.536	.596			
Organization Culture(OC)	EEB25	4.31	.741	.705	.728	4.23	1.263	8.813
	EEB23	4.11	.847	.682	.693			
	EEB24	4.22	.834	.636	.689			
	EEB26	4.31	.690	.592	.612			
Social and Location(SL)	EEB1	4.30	.783	.724	.604	4.27	1.101	7.471
	EEB2	4.28	.809	.692	.670			
	EEB11	4.29	.759	.590	.687			
	EEB3	4.21	.774	.540	.578			
		Grand Mean (4.23)				Total Variance explained 65.46%		

VM = Variable Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, FL= Factor Loadings, C= Commonalities, MF= Mean of Factor, , EV= Eigen Values, VE= Variance Explained

least factor loading (.540) indicating low association with the factor.

Test of Difference on the basis of Employer Branding Dimensions

The table 6 indicates significantly different scores of explored factors of Employer Branding the basis of hotels under study.

On the basis of explored dimensions of the EB, it is found that Taj Group is relatively practicing better EB practices in comparison to Ashok Group of hotels. Interestingly, both the hotel chains have recorded the mean value more than 4 on 5 point scale, which is encouraging and implies that hotels under reference understand the importance of Employer branding for strategic talent management. However, to examine the test of significance, t test is used and the calculated values of 't' indicates that there exists a significant difference for RD, WE and SL on the basis of

two hotels under study. For, SL calculated value is 1.98, with $p < 0.05$, whereas for RD ($t=3.25$) and WE ($t=2.65$), is found to be significant at $p < 0.01$

Table 6. Difference on the basis of Employer Branding Dimensions

Factor	Taj Group		Ashok Group		't'
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
CE	4.20	0.42	4.14	0.81	0.61
GB	4.31	0.50	4.27	0.71	0.48
RD	4.36	0.41	4.06	0.80	3.25**
WE	4.34	0.51	4.09	0.81	2.65**
OC	4.29	0.53	4.18	0.72	1.15
SL	4.32	0.47	4.21	0.68	1.98*

* - $p \leq 0.05$, ** - $p \leq 0.01$

Impact of various factors on overall employer branding

The table 7a shows a positive but very less degree of correlation between selected explored factors of employer branding. The regression model used in the analysis is $EL = \alpha + \beta_1 CE + \beta_2 WE + \beta_3 GB + \beta_4 RD + \beta_5 OC + \beta_6 SL$, where, $\alpha + \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ and β_4 are the parameters of Employee Loyalty line, wherein Compensation and Empowerment(CE)Growth and Benefits(GB), Responsibility and Development(RD), Work Environment(WE), Organization Culture(OC) and Social and Location(SL) have been taken as independent variables and Employee Loyalty is taken as Dependent variable.

Table 7b shows the strength of relationship between the dependent variable EL and all the independent variables taken together and also the impact of these independent variables on EL.

The value of the standardized coefficients reveals that when Compensation and Empowerment (CE) is increased by one unit, the Employee Loyalty (EL) increases by 0.027.

Table 7 a. Correlation Matrix

	CE	GB	RD	WE	OC	SL
CE	1					
GB	0.43	1				
RD	0.50	0.32	1			
WE	0.42	0.38	0.34	1		
OC	0.43	0.47	0.43	0.38	1	
SL	0.40	0.32	0.42	0.31	0.34	1

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.693 ^a	.480	.464	.565

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.335	.334		1.003	.317
	CE	.032	.099	.027	.324	.746
	WE	.131	.085	.115	1.542	.125
	GB	.632	.097	.513	6.538	.000
	RD	-.075	.100	-.064	-.747	.456
	OC	.128	.095	.107	1.348	.179
	SL	.105	.092	.081	1.143	.255

a. Predictors: (Constant), SL, WE, GB, CE, RD

b. Dependent Variable: EL 12

For one unit increase in Work Environment (WE), the EL perception increases by 0.115. When Growth and Benefits (GB) is increased by one unit, EL increases by 0.51, which is significant at 0.001 level. Further, when one unit is increased in Responsibility and Development (RD) leads to a 0.74 decrease in EL. Moreover, one unit increase in Organization Culture (OC) and Social and Location (SL), the EL increases by 0.101 & 0.81. The multiple correlation coefficient between the dependent variable EL and independent variables; ($R = 0.69$) indicates that EL is influenced by independent variables. It is also evident from the value of $R^2=0.48$ of variation in EL is accounted by the joint variables of Growth and Benefits (GB), Responsibility and Development (RD), Work Environment (WE), Organization Culture (OC) and Social and Location (SL).

CONCLUSION, LIMITATION AND SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The concept of employer branding has received considerable academic attention in the past few years. The present study has adopted employer branding as multidimensional construct and in context of hospitality sector, the research has explored six dimensions of Employer Branding as Compensation and Empowerment (CE) Growth and Benefits (GB), Responsibility and Development (RD), Work Environment (WE), Organization Culture (OC) and Social and Location (SL). The study also reveals that there is high level of existence of employer branding in both the organizations under reference. The study also examines Employee loyalty in terms of intention to stay with the organization, and the findings shows that majority of the loyalty variables have shown mean value more than 4 on 5 point scale and even remaining variables have recorded mean value more than 3 on 5 point scale that implies that the employees of both the group hotels are loyal and intend to stay with their respective brands. In terms of the the difference of EB dimensions among the hotel groups, three of the six dimensions namely RD, WE and SL were found significantly different whereas remaining three dimensions were found insignificant.

The results of the multiple regression reveals that 48 per cent of variation in EL is accounted by the joint variables of Growth and Benefits(GB), Responsibility and Development(RD), Work Environment(WE), Organization Culture(OC) and Social and Location(SL). The value of R^2 which is lower than 0.50, indicates that there exists a positive relationship between EB and EL but overall employee loyalty is also a function of a number of variables other than the selected group variables taken in the study. Therefore, the present study generates a scope for another comprehensive exploratory study for the identification of variables influencing the Employee Loyalty.

Limitation of the study and Future Research

No study is without any limitations so does it hold for the present research. Firstly the sample has been taken from six hotels i.e. three of Taj group and three from Ashok group in India, with the responses of only 200 employees; hence the results are not completely generalized. Secondly we have relied on the respondents of two employers working in two different environment sets which cannot be generalized and comparable.

However, in spite of its limitations, the study gives valuable insights into the concept of employer branding and its dimensions in context of the hospitality sector in India. The findings can be used by employers in the hotel industry to improve employee loyalty towards the organization. For further research it would be very interesting to see how the Employer Branding provides competitive advantage for talent attraction as well.

Lastly, in addition to the findings from the study, there are some important observations and suggestions given by some of the senior employees while discussions during the data collection process. Some opined that there is a need for an effective and transparent Employee loyalty Program for especially hotel Ashok Group. It was suggested that employee programs should be designed in a way that they engage, motivate every person because in a competitive economy, loyalty programs can ensure employee well-being in today's work environment that requires regular and consistent programs to focus on enhancing employee morale and company well-being. Hotel Ashok employees also point out the limitation of working in a public sector organization where there is no environment for innovation and creativity, Employee performance and measurement programmes. In contract, Employees of Taj group were appreciative of the Employee loyalty program called S.T.A.R.S (Special Thanks and Recognition System) is the in-house employee recognition system.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*. Free Press, New York, NY.
- Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Building Strong Brands*. Free Press: New York, NY.
- Aaker, D. A. (2001). *Strategic Market Management*, 6th edn. Wiley: New York.
- Abbasi, S., & Hollman, K. (2000). Turnover: The real bottom-line. *Public Personnel Management*, 29(3), 333-342.
- Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, 9(5), 501-517.

- Barney, J. B. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bennet, R., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2004). Customer satisfaction should not be the only goal. *Journal of Service Marketing*, 18(7), 514-523.
- Bennet, R., & Rundle-Thiele, S. (2005). The brand loyalty life cycle: Implications for marketers. *Brand Management*, 12(4), 250-263.
- Berry, L. L. (1981). Perspectives on the retailing of services, in Stampfl, R.W. and Hirschman, E.C. (eds). *Theory in Retailing: Traditional and Non-traditional Sources*.
- Chicago, I. L: American Marketing Association, 9-20.
- Burke, R. J., & Ng, E. S. W. (2006). The changing nature of work and organisations: Implications for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16(2), 86-94.
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2008). *Employer Branding - A No-Nonsense Approach*. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. B. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.2.81.18255>
- Corporate Leadership council. (1999). *The Employment Brand: Building Competitive Advantage in the Labour Market*. Washington D.C: Corporate Leadership council.
- Edwards, M. R. (2010). An integrative review of employer branding and OB theory. *Personnel Review*, 39(1), 5-23.
- Gaddam, S. (2008). Modeling employer branding communication: The softer aspect of HR marketing management. *The Icfai Journal of Soft Skills*, 2(1), 2. The Icfai University Press.
- George, W. R. (1990). Internal marketing and organizational behavior: a partnership in developing customer-conscious employees at every level. *Journal of Business Research*, 20(1), 63-70.
- Hiltrop, J. M. (1999). The quest for the best: human resource practices to attract and retain talent. *European Management Journal*, 17(4), 422-430.
- Holbrook, A. C. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: the role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(2), 81-93.
- Howard, T. (1997). Industry of choice: If you treat workers fairly, they will stay. *Nations Restaurant News*, 42.
- Hurst, A. (1997). Emerging trends in college and university foodservice. *Journal of College and University Foodservice*, 3(3), 17-32.
- Kapferrer, J. N. (2004). *The New Strategic Brand Management*. Kogan Page, London, UK
- Kimpakaron, N., & Tocquer, G. (2009). Employees commitment to brands in the service sector: Luxury hotel chains in Thailand. *Journals of Brand management*, 16, 532-544.
- Krishnan, B. C., & Hartline, M. D. (2001). Brand equity: is it more important in services?. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 15(5), 328-342.
- Lodberg, R. (2011). Ch. 7: Employer branding. På opdagelse i en ny branding-disciplin. In *Håndbog i strategisk public relations*. Red. Henrik Mørkelsen. Samfundslitteratur, 2. Edition. 157-178.
- Litheko, E. (2008). Training them young is the way to up the skills base. *Sunday/Business Times*, 26.
- Malhotra, N. (2008). *Marketing Research: An Applied Orientation*. Fifth Ed, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001). Is the resource based view a useful perspective for strategic management research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26, 22-40.
- Quail, J., & Williams, M. (1999). Study reveals good training creates good Environment. *Supermarket News*, 27.
- Schuster, K. (1999). Perks that work. *Food Management*, 8, 34-38.
- Sneed, J. (1988). Job characteristics and job satisfaction of school foodservice employees. *School Foodservice Research Journal*, 12(2), 65-68.
- Stovel, M., & Bontis, N. (2002). Voluntary turnover: Knowledge management—friend or foe? *J. Intell. Cap.* 3(3), 303-322.
- Suvillian, J. (2004). Building an employment brand. Retrieved from <http://drjohnsuvillian.com>
- Sullivan, J. (2004). Eight elements of a successful employment brand. *ER Daily*.
- Sullivan, J. (2002). Crafting a lofty employment brand: A costly proposition. *ER Daily*, Retrieved from www.erechange.com/articles/db/9856ED899A524
- The Conference Board. (2001). Engaging employees through your brand. *The Conference Board*, New York, NY.
- Vallen, G. K. (1993). Organizational climate and burnout. *The Cornell H.R.A. Quarterly*, 34(1), 54-59.
- Woods, R. H., & Macaulay, J. F. (1989). Rx for turnover: Retention programs that work. *The Cornell H.R.A. Quarterly*, 30(1), 79-90.