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Abstract

Employer branding is the most recent and current trend in every organization today. Due to lack of employer branding organizations are facing lots of problems in retaining talented workforce especially in industries. The primary objective is to study on employer branding with special reference to Hirotec India Private Limited, Coimbatore. This study would help the Hirotec India Private Limited professionals to focus on the need for the development and exploration of effective Employer-Branding techniques and strategies/ interventions. In the present research, deductive research method has been followed. The field survey method was employed to collect the primary data from 219 respondents through a well framed questionnaire. The result indicated that the development value in employer branding influenced the employee’s turnover intention. The resultant framework is useful in providing a better understanding on how to improve an effective human resource management from an administrative perspective. The findings would make obtainable for the organizations’ management to improve their strategic planning to preserve their valuable employees, thus, building the human assets for the organization.
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1. Introduction

Employer branding is the most recent and current trend in every organization today. Due to lack of employer branding organizations are facing lots of problems in retaining talented workforce especially in industries. This research is focused on finding out the attractiveness dimensions of
employer branding of Hirotec India Private Limited imparting technical education. For a long time, branding has merely been concerned with endearing customers to a product/service and sustaining brand loyalty. It was taken for granted that a strong brand requires efficient employees who work seamlessly to actualize the brand’s vision. The issue for employers thus becomes, how to strategically attract and engage employees who believe in the goals and aspirations of the organization and are efficient enough to bring their resources into ensuring the success of the brand. In order to understand the employer branding stages and processes in Hirotec India Private Limited, this study will be more helpful to the management as well as the concern HR team.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

1) To study on employer branding with special reference to Hirotec India Private Limited, Coimbatore
2) To identify the factors influencing the employer branding in Hirotec India Private Limited.
3) To know about the work environment and organizational management style in Hirotec India Private Limited.
4) To know the level of satisfaction of the employees on quality of work life (qwl) in Hirotec India Private Limited.
5) To identify the constraints faced by the employees in Hirotec India Private Limited.
6) To give feasible solutions based on the findings analyzed and interpreted.

1.2. Need of the Study

1) This study would help the Hirotec India Private Limited professionals to focus on the need for the development and exploration of effective Employer-Branding techniques and strategies/ interventions.
2) The awareness towards effective Employer-Branding would be enhanced among professionals and the policy-makers.

1.3. Scope of the Study

The main scopes of the study are as follows,
1) The findings would shed light on how to cut expenses of Hirotec India Private Limited by analyzing employee branding related expenditures.
2) Exploration of employer branding as a long-term strategy of effective hiring (recruitment and selection)
3) The study will be the provision of an insight to future researchers and managers, concerning the role of employer image in recruiting.
4) The provision of insight and orientation to recruiters on the importance of efficient and well-organized recruitment process.
5) This is an effective solution to the problem of talent retention within an organization. This is due to the fact that the employer branding is the only available solution to the corporate recruiters in maintaining the flow of talent within some organization.
6) Last but not the least providing the empirical scenario of employer branding in Hirotec India Private Limited.

2. Research Methodology

The present research focuses on Employer Branding in Hirotec India Private Limited. The philosophy that is used in this research is realism. For this the researcher uses acceptable knowledge in the field of factors influencing the employer branding, work environment, organizational management style, quality of work life and constraints faced by the employees to understand the Employer branding in Hirotec India Private Limited. The researcher collects and analyses data using acceptable knowledge for the purpose of answering the research question, so the research is more inclined towards realism.

2.1. Research Approach

In the present research, deductive research method has been followed. A set of hypotheses has been formulated related to objectives of employer branding that need to be confirmed or rejected during the research process.

2.2. Research Strategy

The investigator has adopted the survey method in this study. In this method, collecting and analyzing the data are the basic steps. The survey method gathers data from a relatively large number of cases at a particular time. It is not concerned with characteristics of the individual, but is concerned with the generalized statistics that results when data are abstracted from a number of individual cases. The information is collected through a detailed questionnaire. It provides factual information about the employer branding in the area of study. It gathers data from relatively large number of cases at a particular time and focuses attention upon the needs that would remain unnoticed.

2.3. Data Collection - Primary Data

The major source of the data used to carry out the analysis is primary data. The field survey method was employed to collect the primary data from 219 respondents through a well framed questionnaire. The respondents with varying background in Employees based on their demographic aspects like Age, Gender, Marital Status, Level of Education, Designation, Monthly Income, Department, Shift timing of working and experience were selected for the study. The second section consisted of questions related to employer branding based on the objectives designed. In order to answer the research questions on the factors related to the employer branding factors, the respondents were guided by a 5 point Likert scale (Strongly agree to strongly disagree, High preference to No preference). Data which has already gone through the process of analysis or were used by someone else earlier is refers to secondary data.
2.4. Research Design

Since Employer Branding is an extensive term a descriptive type of research was undertaken. The research aim was to study on Employer branding in Hirotec India Private Limited. Initial literature review was carried out, wherein various research papers related to employer branding published were gone through. The objectives were set. The targeted population was Employees in Hirotec India private Limited. A questionnaire was compiled taking into account the various aspects of Employer Branding, its meaning or interpretations. A structured form of questionnaire having all close ended questions was prepared.

### Table 1: Distribution of Samples based on Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.NO</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&lt;25 years</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 -35 years</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35 – 45 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Graduate</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>Below 10th</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of father</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Monthly Income</td>
<td>Below Rs.5000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.5000- Rs.15000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rs.15000- Rs.20000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Above Rs.20000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Database</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Testing the Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant association between age and compensation

Table 2: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of Age and Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE (in years)</th>
<th>COMPENSATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 25 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.512</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 2, the calculated value 11.512 is less than the table value 15.507 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus it can be inferred that there is no significant association between age and compensation.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant association between gender and superior relationship

Table 3: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of Gender and Superior Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>SUPERIOR RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 3, the calculated value 3.513 is less than the table value 9.488 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus it can be inferred that there is no significant association between gender and relationship.
Hypothesis 3: There is no significant association between marital status and Personnel development

Table 4: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of marital status and Personnel development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARITAL STATUS</th>
<th>PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.357</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 4, the calculated value 5.357 is less than the table value 9.488 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus it can be inferred that there is no significant association between marital status and personnel development.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant association between educational qualification and growth & Development

Table 5: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of educational qualification and growth & Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION</th>
<th>GROWTH &amp; DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Graduate</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.866</td>
<td>21.026</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 5, the calculated value 27.866 is greater than the table value 21.026 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between educational qualification and growth & development.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant association between present designation and job security
Table 6: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of present designation and job security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT DESIGNATION</th>
<th>HIGHLY SATISFIED</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>HIGHLY DISSATISFIED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.195</td>
<td>31.410</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 6, the calculated value 37.195 is greater than the table value 31.410 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between present designation and job security.

**Hypothesis 6:** There is no significant association between monthly income and rate of pay

Table 7: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of monthly income and rate of pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>RATE OF PAY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highly satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Rs 5000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs5000-15000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs15000-20000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 20000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>21.026</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 7, the calculated value 135.00 is greater than the table value 21.026 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between monthly income and rate of pay.

**Hypothesis 7:** There is no significant association between department and work group functioning
Table 8: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of department and work group functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Highly Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Highly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.045</td>
<td>24.996</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 8, the calculated value 29.045 is greater than the table value 24.996 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between department and work group functioning.

**Hypothesis 8:** There is no significant association between shift timings and job satisfaction

Table 9: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of department and work group functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shift Timings</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 am-5 pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30pm-11.59pm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.732</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 9, the calculated value 32.732 is greater than the table value 15.507 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between shift timings and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 9:** There is no significant association between working experience and reward system
Table 10: CrossTabulation and Chi-Square Result of working experience and reward system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Experience</th>
<th>Highly Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Highly Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 1 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHI SQUARE TEST RESULT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED VALUE</th>
<th>TABLE VALUE</th>
<th>D.F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.665</td>
<td>21.026</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 10, the calculated value 40.665 is greater than the table value 21.026 at the level of 5% significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus it can be inferred that there is a significant association between working experience and reward system.

**Hypothesis 10:** There is no significant association between age and safety & healthy working condition

Table 11: ANOVA - Age and Safety & Healthy working condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE AND SAFETY &amp; HEALTHY WORKING CONDITION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>146.808</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147.680</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

From the table 11, it is concluded that there exists no significant difference between age and safety & healthy working condition.

**Hypothesis 11:** There is no significant association between Gender and Job Satisfaction

Table 12: ANOVA - Gender and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER AND JOB SATISFACTION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>104.395</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table 12, it is concluded that there exists no significant difference between gender and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 12:** There is no significant association between Marital status and Working environment

Table 13: ANOVA - Marital status and Working environment

From the table 13, it is concluded that there exists no significant difference between marital status and working environment.

**Hypothesis 13:** There is no significant association between Educational qualification and training & development.

Table 14: ANOVA - Educational qualification and training & development.
Hypothesis 14: There is no significant association between Present designation and chance of promotion

Table 15: ANOVA - Present designation and chance of promotion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SUM SQUARES</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>SIG.</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.924</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>161.103</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168.027</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

From the table 15, it is concluded that there exists no significant difference between present designation and chance of promotion.

Table 16: Mean Average Score On Constraints Faced By The Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>MEAN SCORE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary and bonus constraints</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints related to allowances and other benefits</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working environment constraints</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints in timing</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints on superior and subordinate relationship</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate break time/Time of interval</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Primary Data

From the table 16, the mean average score on mean average score on various constraints faced by the employees is high with respect to Constraints on superior and subordinate relationship and lowest with respect to ‘Adequate break time/Time of interval ’ and ‘Constraints related to allowances and other benefits’.

4. Results

4.1. Findings

- Personal Information
  Among the 219 respondents, 68% of them are between the age group of 25 to 35 years of age, 94.5 % of them were Male, 52% of them are unmarried, With respect to their education, 58% of them are Under Graduate and 32.4% of them are in Diploma, 7.3% of them are Post graduate and 2.3% of them are School level. 46.8% of them are worker, 27.4% of the respondents are office staff and 15.5% of them are supervisor.

- Job Profile of the employees
  Among the 219 respondents, 86.8% of the respondents earning monthly income ‘Above Rs.20000’. 80.4% of the respondents are from production department, 92.7% of the respondents
working in shift timings ‘9.00 AM - 6.00 PM’. 57.1% of the respondents having ’1-5 years’ of experience level.

- **Level of Factors Influencing the Employer Branding in Hirotec India Pvt Ltd**

**Under SALARY COMPENSATION,**
- Majority 55.7% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘adequate salary and fair compensation is given for my work’.
- Majority 47.5% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘the management provides dearness allowance and other benevolent benefits’.

**Under SAFETY & HEALTHY WORKING CONDITION,**
- Majority 51.6% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘the working condition of my job is free from risk of illness and injury’.
- Majority 62.1% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Safety measures provided by the management’.

**Under GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT,**
- Majority 58.6% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Opportunity to work on interesting tasks’.
- Majority 55.3% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Have opportunities at work to learn and grow’.

**Under SUPERIOR RELATIONSHIP,**
- Majority 55.3% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘my superior highly motivates me’.
- Majority 57.1% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘my superior is concerned about the welfare activity of the employees’.

**Under JOB SATISFACTION,**
- Majority 71.2% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘my work gives me a feeling of accomplishment and pride’.
- Majority 63.9% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘my views and participation are valued’.

- **Level of Opinion to Identify the Work Environment and Organizational Management Style in Hirotec India Pvt Ltd**

**Under PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT,**
- Majority 67.6% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Working experience provided by the company improves my ability’.
- Majority 61.2% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘The company provides opportunity for my career development’.
Under WORKING ENVIRONMENT,
- Majority 58.4% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Physical environment in the organization is comfortable’.
- Majority 52.5% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Working environment facilities services that helps you to do good jobs’.

Under ORGANIZATION CULTURE AND CLIMATE,
- Majority 57.1% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Duty and responsibilities are well scheduled in our organization’.
- Majority 40.2% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘The management and union has good relation to ensure important decision for the employees’.

Under RELATION AND CO-OPERATION,
- Majority 69.9% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Harmonious relationship with colleagues in the workplace’.
- Majority 60.3% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Good relationship with your superior in the organization’.

Under TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT,
- Majority 55.3% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘The training programs help employees to achieve the required skill for performing the job efficiently’.
- Majority 56.6% of the respondents stated ‘Agree’ with the factor ‘Training programs develops the efficiency of the job to control the wastage’.

- Level of Satisfaction of the Employees on Quality of Work Life (QWL)

Under RATE OF PAY,
- Majority 47% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the pay and benefits such as pension, medical housing which cover their expenses and needs.
- Majority 41.6% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the way in which their pay is sufficient reward in relation to their skills and the effort they put in their job.

Under CHANCE OF PROMOTION,
- Majority 40.2% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the promotion policy adopted in their organization like result/output competency, work experience, seniority and performance.
- Majority 50.2% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the individual recognition from the superior management which evaluates to chance of promotion.

Under WORK GROUP OF FUNCTIONING,
- Majority 60.3% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the extent to which members are involved when a decision has to be made and committed to the group and team work.
- Majority 57.5% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the way planning and coordination of effort is done in the work group.
Under JOB SECURITY,
- Majority 63.9% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the present job.
- Majority 50.7% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with organizational support for continuing employment in future.

Under EQUIPMENT ADEQUACY,
- Majority 60.3% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the manner and ease with which equipment is obtainable to make it possible for them to do their job.
- Majority 63.5% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the way in which equipment is maintained.

Under REWARD SYSTEM,
- Majority 49.8% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the degree to which the organization’s reviewed system allows for members to be recognized and rewarded for good work.
- Majority 42.5% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ about the recognition given to an individual or group as they are rewarded.

Under OVERALL SATISFACTION,
- Majority 61.2% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the experience the quality of their work life in general.
- Majority 62.6% of the respondents stated ‘Satisfied’ with the level of satisfaction on quality of work in the organization.

I. CONSTRAINTS FACED BY THE EMPLOYEES
- Majority 42% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the Salary & Bonus Constraints.
- Majority 53.4% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the Constraints related to allowances and other benefits.
- Majority 40.2% of the respondents stated ‘Neutral’ with the working environment constraints.
- Majority 32.9% of the respondents stated ‘High’ with the constraints in timing.
- Majority 42% of the respondents stated ‘High’ with the constraints on superior and subordinate relationship.
- Majority 43.4% of the respondents stated ‘Low’ with the adequate recreation facilities.
- Majority 35.2% of the respondents stated ‘Low’ with the adequate break time.

II. CHI SQUARE ANALYSIS
- There is no significant association between age and compensation.
- There is no significant association between gender and relationship.
- There is no significant association between marital status and personnel development.
- There is a significant association between educational qualification and growth & development.
- There is a significant association between present designation and job security.
- There is a significant association between monthly income and rate of pay.
There is a significant association between department and work group functioning
There is a significant association between shift timings and job satisfaction
There is a significant association between working experience and reward system

III. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

- There exists no significant difference between age and safety & healthy working condition.
- There exists no significant difference between gender and job satisfaction.
- There exists no significant difference between marital status and working environment.
- There exists no significant difference between Educational qualification and training & development.
- There exists no significant difference between present designation and chance of promotion.

IV. MEAN SCORE ANALYSIS

The mean average score on various constraints faced by the employees is high with respect to Constraints on superior and subordinate relationship and lowest with respect to ‘Adequate break time/Time of interval’ and ‘Constraints related to allowances and other benefits’.

4.2. Suggestions

The following suggestions are recommended based on the study by the researcher
- It is recommended to the company that proper allocation of work to the employees will help to avoid overtime work and leads to more satisfied work environment.
- Effective management of workload should be thought to the employees working in the service delivery
- It is recommended that the employees of the company should be given incentives like monetary benefits, promotion, etc for the employees whose performance is excellent will help to develop more satisfied workers.
- Grievance redressed system can be improved.
- The company should conduct performance appraisals in regular intervals so that the company can find performances and the non farmers and then the company can take the necessary action
- Effective strategic HR policies and procedure are essential to govern and provide excellence quality work life among employees
- It is recommended that the company should provide on the job training facilities, so that the work will be completed in stipulated time period and the performance of the employees will also improve.
- Appropriate training programs can be conducted to all cadre of employees which will enhance quality of work life
• It is suggested that the working conditions of employees should be improved by good ventilations, lighting drinking water facilities, hygienic working conditions, will help to improve more quality of work life in the company.
• Emotional intelligence program can be conducted to middle management employees to improve their emotional and mental state.
• Attitude surveys can be collected once in six months to analyze the suggestion of employees.
• It is suggested that the company should provide good recreation facilities like canteens and organize programs for employees make satisfied employees and make the environment in good condition

4.3. Conclusion

The present study is an attempt to know about the study on employer branding in Hirotec India Private Limited focused on various objectives such as analyzing the factors influencing the employer branding, work environment and organizational management style, to analyze the level of satisfaction of the employees and analyze the problems faced by the employees in the company. On the basis of the findings of the study, some practicable and viable suggestions are given.

Today, an active employee value proposition and employer brand is a key for increasing upper hand. Increasingly, Indian companies are revolving out to be decisively calculated to use the employer brand to attract and retain talent for the development. The expanding concentrate on upper hand is driving numerous Indian firms to reevaluate their employer brands. The result indicated that the development value in employer branding influenced the employee’s turnover intention. The resultant framework is useful in providing a better understanding on how to improve an effective human resource management from an administrative perspective. The findings would make obtainable for the organizations’ management to improve their strategic planning to preserve their valuable employees, thus, building the human assets for the organization. It may also support the organizations’ management in determining the value of certain HRM practices and expanding them to the solution in reducing employees’ turnover intentions.

4.4. Scope for Further Study

Future research on the topic of EMPLOYER BRANDING IN HIROTEC INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED should continue to examine various factors related to employee branding adhered by the Hirotec India Private Limited. Due to the time constraint the study has been limited to only 219 respondents in Coimbatore city. Further the research may be carried for a national or zonal level covering 5 to 8 companies.
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