

# **Factors affecting internal branding in private service holders in Bangladesh**

Asif-Un-Nahar

Department of Business Administration, Central Women's University

Shadrul Hassan Himel

Department of Marketing, University of Dhaka

## **ABSTRACT:**

*Internal branding is a crucial factor to ensure that employees are adequately motivated to play an effective role in revenue generation. A strong internal branding effort strengthens the company's effort and gives employees the opportunity to communicate effectively to the market on an ongoing basis. Gradually through this process employees become brand champions as internal branding is the best way to help employees to make a powerful emotional connection to the products and services. This study has made an attempt to investigate the relationship between role clarity of the employees, socialization of the employees and employee satisfaction with internal branding as a dependent variable. The findings of the study revealed that there is a significant relationship between internal branding and employee involvement related variables.*

**Key words:** Employees, brand equity, internal branding, human resource, corporate sector

## **INTRODUCTION**

Success in business depends a lot on the performance of the employees. Whatever industry a company is in, its employees are its biggest competitive advantage. They are the ones making the things happen – so long as their needs are being met. Undoubtedly branding of those employees becomes very important concern for the organizations. Internal branding is a corporate philosophy that focuses on bringing the company's core culture, identity and premise to its employees as well as its consumers, and usually looks to make workers at all levels ambassadors or true representatives of the company and its values (Aurand et al., 2005). The ultimate aim of internal branding is top class employee performance that fulfils customer expectations. We need to plan and execute a professional branding campaign to introduce and explain the messages and then reinforce them by weaving the brand into the fabric of the company. The messages should be directed at employees "touch points" the day to day interactions that influence the way people experience the workplace. Products and services are propagated by word of mouth and innovations come from within the organization's employees. Employees who are proud of where they work and the positive direction of a company will be some of the best advocates and brand delivery

vehicles. It's very important then to ensure that organization's brand personality, values and corporate culture are well aligned internally and externally. Key brand messages should be repeatedly reinforced and explained internally to expect best performance from the employees.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

To gain a clear insight into the definition of "branding", one must first clarify what this literary review refers to as "products". Referring to Baker (2000), one can consider a product as being anything that can satisfy the economic, psychological or functional needs of a potential customer. Baker (2000) furthers this definition by stating that the extent of which a "product" meets the above-mentioned needs, is determines the product's "value". Miles and Mangold (2004) defined employee branding as — the process by which employees internalize the desired brand image and are motivated to project the image to customers and other organizational constituents. The internalization of external branding strategies by organizations is a process that attempts to offer a guideline to all employees on how to live their organization's brand promise (Chong, 2007).

Kotler (1999), defines branding as a "name, term, sign, symbol or design, or a combination of these, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors." His research emphasizes the relationship between the product and the consumer as being instrumental to the branding process and the positioning of offerings within the social environment. He considers that a brand reflects a company's intangible guarantee that the product will meet consumers' expectations. Despite Kotler's initial definition seeming overtly simplistic, his expanded definitions and views on the various dimensions of brands, provide a deeper understanding of how branding can be so much more than simply symbols, designs and catchy slogans. Kotler establishes branding as the creation of a deep bond between the company and the consumer.

From an external market perspective, branding involves the creation of mental structures that help the target audience to organize their knowledge with respect to that particular product/organization (Keller, 1998). In doing so, the target audience is able to clarify their decision making with respect to that product/organization and, in turn, this process provides value to an organization through improved customer buying habits (Vargo, 2004). Branding, however, is not only an opportunity to shape customers' perceptions with respect to the organization; it is also an opportunity to shape employee perceptions as well. In fact, according to Jacobs, a brand represents the relationship an organization has with its employees just as much as it represents the relationship that it has with its customers.

It is true that brand identity is addressed to its users and prospects in order to win the battle over similar brands and ultimately achieve high profits; however, brands are "born among the people of their parent company" (Upshaw, 1995). Brands are created by and hopefully sustained with incessant and eager support from each and every employee working for that company. Employees are brand ambassadors in the sense that every time they communicate with outsiders and with each

other, whether it is at a mall, a party or a company event and no matter how casual, formal, spoken or behavioral the conversation is, they put across something about the brand. Thus, it is crucial to get going a favorable internal brand environment so as to ensure that each and every employee supports the brand with their attitude and actions in and out of the organization (Upshaw, 1995).

Obviously, getting employees to support the external branding efforts is not as easy and straightforward as it is said, and according to Schultz (2003), lately, there is a huge discussion going on about how to make them do it. Many organizations call it “living the brand,” but they do not necessarily attach the same meaning to it; some refer to it as employees’ merely being informed about and able to explicate a promotion to outsiders in order to encourage them to buy/use the brand, some refer to it as the aptitude to verbalize the company motto, and some refer to it as employees’ buying/using the brand (Schultz, 2003) which is not simple but necessary to do since an employee’s not using the brand that s/he is working for might be a question mark for everything the brand offers and promises to consumers.

Moreover, the majority of the employees who do not buy their brand have lower opinion about their company and brand, and they do not recommend it on, which is an indication of their lack of pride and faith in the brand in means of quality, value, prestige and reliability. In this sense, simply put, internal branding is what is needed to get employees to pass on the brand promise; it is internally creating a brand support system which is like a family the members of which believe that they are a part of something solid and permanent (Burmam et al., 2005). In Speak’s (2003) terms, adding a new dimension to brand management, internal branding is establishing brand loyalty inside the organization. Upshaw (1995) gives an example of FedEx employees who might not necessarily be able to pronounce the external brand positioning per se but obviously know that they are working for a “winner” brand which did not happen by accident and take pride in it. Employees who take on this sense of confidence and success will evidently have a great contribution to the prosperity of the respective brand. This is possible by the marketing team’s figuring out how close employees feel about their brand and what more could be done to make them an important part of the marketing, obviously, with the help of human resources department as being ‘employee/human experts’; as a matter of fact, Speak (2003) mentions that today management gurus are calling the human resources executive as the “chief inside marketing officer” or “inside brand manager.” Normative Commitment reflects a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employee commitment is important because high levels of commitment lead to several favorable organizational outcomes (Dixit et al., 2012).

According Schultz (2003), a branding programmed which aligns with corporate vision, corporate culture and corporate image could build a strong corporate brand. In addition, several authors (Ind, 2003; Tosti et al., 2001; Chernatony, 1998) mention the importance of coordinating internal and external branding programs. Ind (2003) advises organizations to use the “internal marketing of external campaigns” in order to ensure that branding campaigns can be supported easily by their employees. In addition, the idea of ‘inclusive branding’ suggests that the management of branding activities which pays attention to both internal and external stakeholders

can reduce the risk of treating any group of stakeholders in “an unacceptable, unproductive or neglectful way”. Moreover, if all the actions and messages of a company which are based on their brand values are consistently conveyed to both customers and people inside the company, the company will be able to produce products and services which match its strengths more precisely. Consequently, the company will be able to establish greater levels of trust and build stronger customer loyalty (Nonaka, 1991). Tosti and Stotz (2001) support the view that “external marketing and advertising efforts can attract customers, but it takes an entire company working together to keep those customers”. They therefore advise that ‘internal branding’ should also be applied (Tosti et al., 2001). According to Chernatony (1998), internal branding programs can facilitate brand supportive behavior by aligning employees’ behavior with the brand messages (brand promise) communicated to customers.

To influence employee attitudes and behavior so that they reflect organizational requirements, it is necessary to provide employees with direction. Such direction ensures employees are able to successfully carry out their roles and responsibilities (Jacobs, 2003). At a rudimentary level, the process must start with the transfer of brand-related information from the organization to the employee (Lings, 2004). On this basis, the organization must not only have an appreciation or understanding of the employee market with respect to the organization’s brand (information generation), it must also use this insight to disseminate brand knowledge in a meaningful and relevant manner (knowledge dissemination). The mentionable three dimensions involved into employee branding are discussed below:

Role clarity is defined as the level of clarity an employee has of their role as a result of having brand knowledge. To ensure that all employees have the opportunity to engage with brand related information pertinent for delivering the brand promise, knowledge dissemination is considered to be significant in influencing employee behavior. Furthermore, employee satisfaction is linked to retention of employees (Wernerfelt, 1984) and positive word of mouth communication (Henkoff, 1994). EBBE benefits, therefore, is defined as employee exhibition of brand consistent intentions and actions, incorporates brand citizenship behavior, employee satisfaction, employee intention to stay and positive employee word of mouth (Ramlall, 2004).

The desire to build Employee Based Brand Equity (EBBE) is embedded in the view that such internal brand management efforts derive benefit to the organization, which, ultimately, contribute to the organizations overall effectiveness and success. In consideration of the role clarity literature, there is significant support for the relationship between an employee understanding the requirements of their role as represented by role clarity, and employee satisfaction (Pappu et al., 2005). Individuals who were highly committed and involved in decision making were most likely to move towards organizational goals and were less likely to be turned out of the organization (Pfeffer, 1999). They will never get involved in a specific job which will only full fill their own self-interest, but they will also get involved because they will let their inner emotions play a role in their involvement in different decision-making process. When an individual gets highly

involved in a specific job it is often due to his/her emotional needs. Individuals are very sociable who through job involvement gains the emotional experience as well. Thus, it seems that these individuals should consider their career as success. Hence, Organizational socialization is the learning content and process that involves an individual's acquisition of the social knowledge and skills necessary to assume an organizational role. In lay terms, it is the "learning of the ropes" by an individual. Organizational socialization theory describes the process by which an individual is taught and learns the behaviors and perspectives that are acceptable within his or her workplace and which are not (Webster, 1992). Thus, organizational socialization is the primary process by which individuals adapt to their new position and role within an organization (Kunda et al., 2004).

## **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

### Broad Objective

To analyze the factors, influence on employee branding among private corporate persons of Bangladesh.

### Specific Objectives

- To analyse current status of internal branding
- To explore different approach of internal branding in corporate world
- To assess the importance of internal branding based on practical illustrations and
- To propose specific approaches to enhance employee branding.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study is descriptive in nature where quantitative data has been analyzed to fulfill the objective of the research. The data has been collected from both primary and secondary sources. The secondary data sources are related articles from online and offline journals, websites, and books. Primary data has been collected using questionnaire from the private companies comprising four sectors including banking, education, insurance and local firms (domestic firms focusing on fast moving consumer goods such as Square, Pran, Akij). Convenient sampling is used as sampling technique of this study to select the companies as well as employees of the companies as respondents. There are 100 respondents selected as per the convenience of the researchers from the employee list of selected companies. The sample consists of 25 employees from Bank Asia, Dhaka Bank and Prime Bank, 25 employees from East West University, Southeast University, Dhaka International University, City College and Central Women's University, another 25 employees from Rupali Insurance, Sonali Life Insurance and Metlife Insurance and last but not least 25 employees from Square, Pran, Akij group of companies. The sample consisted of experienced employees of private companies in Bangladesh who have knowledge, experience, passion to do job, corporate sense, etc. The online and offline questionnaire was developed to

collect data from the sample of the study after reviewing some of the previous literatures (references have been given in the literature review part) addressing each of the variables examined in the study. The questionnaire contains some domains of questions where the first group is about demographic questions about the study sample, all other questions help to determine the answer on fifteen variables (Skill & knowledge, Communication, Regular meeting, Clarity of behavior pattern, Clarity of handling problems, Clarity of information, Ambiance, Interesting task, Feelings of contribution, Participation in developing new customers, Involvement in organizational initiatives, Participation in feedback, Job training, Assistance from coworkers, Job environment). Several related articles have been studied to justify the validity of the study. To justify the questionnaire, pilot sample survey has been conducted. After pilot survey, some of the questions were modified or deleted. A 5-point likert scale was applied in the questionnaire for measuring the study variables which is organized as Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, and Strongly Agree = 5. For the purpose of the study, factor analysis and multiple regression analysis have been used to analyze the data.

#### Null Hypothesis

H0.1: There is no significant relationship between internal branding and role clarity among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

H0.2: There is no significant relationship between internal branding and organizational socialization among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

H0.3: There is no significant relationship between internal branding and employee satisfaction among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

#### Alternative Hypothesis

H1.1: There is significant relationship between internal branding and role clarity among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

H1.2: There is significant relationship between internal branding and organizational socialization among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

H1.3: There is significant relationship between internal branding employee satisfaction among private corporate people of Bangladesh.

### **DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

To test the reliability and internal consistency of the sample we calculate Cronbach alpha coefficients. The results indicate that the survey has good internal consistency, with Cronbach alpha coefficients of .922. The value above .70 indicates the scale is reliable with the sample. (Pallant, 2001)

Initially, the data are collected from respondents on the basis of 15 variables. The correlation matrix and KMO test have been used to test the multi co-linearity among the variables. The correlations matrix is given below:

(S&k= Skill & knowledge, Cn= Communication, Rm= Regular meeting, Cbp= Clarity of behavior pattern, Chp= Clarity of handling problems, Ci= Clarity of information, Am= Ambiance, It= Interesting task, Fc= Feelings of contribution, Pdnc= Participation in developing new customers, Ioi= Involvement in organizational initiatives, Pf= Participation in feedback, Jt= Job training, Acw= Assistance from coworkers, Je= Job environment)

### Correlations Matrix

	S&k	Cn	Rm	Cbp	Chp	Ci	Am	It	Fc	Pdnc	Ioi	Pf	Jt	Acw	Je
S&k	1.00														
Cn	.215	1.00													
Rm	.839	.379	1.00												
Cbp	.764	-.045	.636	1.00											
Chp	.621	.258	.566	.438	1.00										
Ci	.436	.758	.468	.378	.477	1.00									
Am	.331	.170	.692	.774	.604	.457	1.00								
It	.308	.313	.169	.034	.313	.141	.798	1.00							
Fc	.305	.218	.449	.441	.677	.695	.612	.587	1.00						
Pdnc	.465	.412	.672	.524	.213	.524	.706	.658	.777	1.00					
Ioi	.832	.219	.738	.722	.561	.455	.686	.262	.538	.677	1.00				
Pf	.773	.154	.802	.671	.575	.486	.666	.344	.518	.727	.821	1.00			
Jt	.484	.851	.401	.465	.394	.506	.353	.216	.511	.545	.596	.587	1.00		
Acw	.073	.723	.115	-.125	.192	.612	-.018	.095	.088	.104	.138	.101	.037	1.00	
Je	.481	.036	.640	.591	.352	.533	.677	.038	.354	.506	.558	.634	.368	-.065	1.00

From above correlation matrix it is evident that variables are highly correlated with each other so multi co-linearity is a problem. To solve this problem at first, we need to conduct factor analysis. Moreover, the result of KMO test suggests that factor analysis is appropriate as the value is greater than 0.5 (Malhotra et al., 2010).

In conducting factor analysis, we have used principle component analysis. The eigenvalues for a factor indicates the total variance attributed to that factor. As a rule of thumb, the total variance accounted by all the 15 variables is 15 which is equal to the numbers of variables. Factor 1 account for a variance of 7.671 or 51.139% of total variance. Likewise, the second factor account for 11.333% of total variance. The third factor account for 7.873% total variance. These three factors combined account for 70.345% of total variance.

<b>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</b>			
Factor	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.671	51.139	51.139
2	1.700	11.333	62.472
3	1.181	7.873	70.345

There are many ways to determine the number of factors. We used eigen value and percentage of variance to determine the number of factors. In case of deciding the number of factors based on eigenvalue only the factors having eigen value greater than 1 are retained. From the above table we can see that only three factors have eigen value greater than 1. Moreover, the percentage of variance shows that three factors account for 70.345% of total variance. So, three factors appeared to be reasonable for our study. (Malhotra et al., 2010)



**Rotated factor matrix**

	Component		
	1	2	3
Skill & knowledge	.860	.252	.180
Communication	-.042	.812	.200
Regular meeting	.817	.257	.125
Clarity of behavior pattern	.894	.024	-.175
Clarity of handling problems	.568	.360	.222
Clarity of information	.380	.728	-.333
Ambiance	.314	.265	.523
Interesting task	.106	.413	.682
Feelings of contribution	.413	.491	.819
Participation in developing new customers	.244	.374	.650
Involvement in organizational initiatives	.854	.251	.173
Participation in feedback	.859	.241	.140
Job training	.493	.650	-.033
Assistance from coworker	.026	.712	.317
Job environment	.413	.143	.772

From the above rotated matrix, we can see that skill & knowledge, regular meeting, clarity of behavior pattern, involvement in organizational initiatives, participation in feedback, clarity of handling problems are correlated with factor 1; communication, job training, assistance from co-workers and clarity of information are correlated with factor 2. Ambiance, feelings of contribution, participation in developing new customers, job environment and interesting task are correlated with factor 3. We can interpret the factors in following ways: factor 1- role clarity, factor 2- socialization, factor 3- employee satisfaction.

Model fit: The final step of factor analysis is to determine the model fit. Model fit can be determined from rotated correlation matrix. The lower left triangle contains the rotated correlation matrix and the upper right triangle contains the residuals. The diagonal (a) contain communalities.

(S&k= Skill & knowledge, Cn= Communication, Rm= Regular meeting, Cbp= Clarity of behavior pattern, Chp= Clarity of handling problems, Ci= Clarity of information, Am= Ambiance, It= Interesting task, Fc= Feelings of contribution, Pdnc= Participation in developing new customers, Ioi= Involvement in organizational initiatives, Pf= Participation in feedback, Jt= Job training, Acw= Assistance from coworkers, Je= Job environment).

**Reproduced Correlation**

Internal Branding for Turning Employees into Brand Champions: an Empirical Study on Private 102 Service Holders in Bangladesh

	S&K	Cn	Rm	Cbp	Chp	Ci	Am	It	Fc	Pdnc	Ioi	Pf	Jt	Acw	Je
S&K	<b>.835<sup>a</sup></b>	.011	.020	.021	.037	-.014	.020	.026	.010	-.076	.003	-.052	-.048	-.044	.019
Cn	.204	<b>.701<sup>a</sup></b>	.011	.009	.021	.050	-.015	-.114	.005	.003	.017	.006	.002	.002	.004
Rm	.819	.368	<b>.749<sup>a</sup></b>	.005	.012	.013	.003	.020	-.094	.011	.030	.021	-.113	-.005	.048
Cbp	.743	-.054	.631	<b>.830<sup>a</sup></b>	.045	-.037	.044	.014	.046	-.039	.010	.004	.007	-.005	.011
Chp	.584	.237	.554	.393	<b>.582<sup>a</sup></b>	.010	.069	.007	.036	.023	.027	.006	.045	-.024	.035
Ci	.450	.708	.455	.415	.467	<b>.785<sup>a</sup></b>	.047	.040	.045	.029	.006	.030	.011	.027	.034
Am	.311	.185	.689	.730	.535	.410	<b>.733<sup>a</sup></b>	.045	.034	.026	.025	.018	.012	.003	.045
It	.282	.427	.149	.020	.306	.101	.753	<b>.414<sup>a</sup></b>	-.039	.025	.027	.032	.009	.014	.035
Fc	.295	.213	.543	.395	.641	.650	.578	.548	<b>.797<sup>a</sup></b>	.054	.006	.033	.028	.072	.038
Pdnc	.726	.409	.659	.563	.190	.495	.680	.633	.724	<b>.767<sup>a</sup></b>	.038	.014	.028	.040	.005
Ioi	.829	.202	.708	.712	.534	.449	.661	.235	.532	.639	<b>.822<sup>a</sup></b>	.002	.068	.012	.037
Pf	.825	.148	.781	.667	.569	.456	.648	.312	.485	.713	.819	<b>.817<sup>a</sup></b>	.059	.014	.024
Jt	.532	.849	.514	.458	.420	.495	.341	.207	.483	.517	.528	.528	<b>.447<sup>a</sup></b>	.057	-.058
Acw	.11	.72	.18	.18	.18	.72	.22	.22	.22	.22	.22	.22	.22	<b>.669<sup>a</sup></b>	.013
Je	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	.4	-.078	<b>.604<sup>a</sup></b>
	Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate										
	1	.725	<b>.676</b>	.631	.84455										

From the above table it is seen that few residuals are larger than .05 which indicates an acceptable model fit. (Malhotra et al., 2010). Based on these three factors multiple regression analysis has been conducted to identify the variables' impact on internal branding process.

**Model Summary**

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	75.967	3	25.322	35.503	.000 <sup>a</sup>
Residual	68.473	96	.713		
Total	144.440	99			

The regression model for our study is given below:

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + e_i$  (Error term Or we can write the equation in following way:

Internal branding =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Role clarity}) + \beta_2(\text{Socialization}) + \beta_3(\text{Employee satisfaction}) + e_i$

$R^2$  suggest the strength of association between dependent variable and independent variables. When the value of  $R^2$  exceeds .5 then it suggests a moderate association between dependent variables and independent variables. The value of  $R^2$  above .8 suggests strong association between dependent variables and independent variables.

From the above table we can see that value of  $R^2$  is .676 which means that dependent variable is moderately associated with independent variables. 67.6 % of variance in dependent variable is explained by independent variables (Malhotra and Dash, 2010). The value of F test is 35.503 which is significant at .05 level. So, the null hypothesis that independent variables do not impact the dependent variable is rejected. Using the values from the coefficients table given below the regression model becomes following:

Internal branding =  $3.340 + .317(\text{Role clarity}) + .731(\text{Socialization}) + .364(\text{Employee satisfaction}) + e_i$ .

**Standardized Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.340	.084		39.548	.000
Role clarity	.317	.085	.262	3.735	.000
Socialization	.731	.085	.605	8.613	.000
Employee satisfaction	.364	.085	.301	4.287	.000

Standardized coefficients calculated for each predictor variables, showing the percentage of variation in the dependent variable caused by the individual independent variables. The above table shows that role clarity, socialization and employee satisfaction are significant at 5% level. The standardized beta coefficient of role clarity is .262 which means it is an important determinant of internal branding. The standardized beta coefficient of socialization and employee satisfaction are .605 and .301 respectively. So these factors are also important determinants for internal branding.

In the previous studies, it was found that several variables (such as Skill & knowledge, Communication, Regular meeting, Clarity of behavior pattern, Clarity of handling problems, Clarity of information, Ambiance, Interesting task, Feelings of contribution, Participation in developing new customers, Involvement in organizational initiatives, Participation in feedback, Job training, Assistance from coworkers, Job environment) can affect the performance of the employees. But this study specifies the nature of impact on the performance because of maintaining and utilizing these variables. Moreover, this study specifies three major factors (Role

clarity, Socialization, Employee satisfaction) based on these variables and their effect on the performance of the employees, which ultimately named as internal branding process. So, this study will help the managers of the organization to emphasize on the specific area on which an organization can effectively conduct the internal branding process.

## **RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS**

Organizational messages are supposed to be cautiously planned and designed in the similar way the mission and vision statements are planned and designed. Other specific managerial implications are as follows-

- The organizational messages are supposed to be a sign of the organization's mission as well as standards.
- Messages aimed at outer public are required to be in line with the messages directed towards the workforce.
- Messages intended for outer public must be sent within the organization too.
- The plan of staffing and selection systems is supposed to include messages that constantly and cyclically reveal the brand name and organizational image.
- The reimbursement system is supposed to include messages that constantly and cyclically reveal the brand and organizational image. Such as, executives in organizations that give importance to training ought to be held responsible when they do not succeed to train and develop their workforce.
- Training and development systems must facilitate executives and workforce to internalize their organization's mission and values as well as assist them in knowing how the mission and values are relevant to their responsibilities in the organization. This should allow them to more successfully draft messages that regularly reflect the brand name and organizational image.
- Marketing and public relations systems are supposed to write messages that repeatedly and without fail reflect the brand name and organizational image.
- Executives must be taught the significance of sending messages that are steady with their organization's mission, vision, guiding principles, and practices.
- Precise as well as unambiguous job samples must be provided to new workers so that rational hopes are included into their psychological agreements.
- Corporate traditions - such as objects, different activities and behaviors, administration standards, standards and viewpoint - should strengthen the messages workforce get.

- Individual productivity must be considered and evaluated to find out if there are 'message associated' issues on the departmental, divisional, or organizational levels.

## **LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH SUGGESTION**

This study is conducted on the data collected from only 100 respondents which as sample size is really small. It is difficult to draw the inferential statistical conclusion based on this sample size. In addition to this, this study is conducted on only four sectors such as banking, education, insurance and other local firms of Bangladesh. There are many other sectors on which this type of study can be conducted to get more fruitful outcome. Moreover, this study is based on private organizations. So, there is a scope for the researchers to carry out the research on this aspect in the public organizations as well as a comparative analysis among different sectors can be conducted.

## **CONCLUSION**

In today's global market nearly everything is branded, from cars, electronics to clothing and soda brands. Even schools are branding themselves to be unique and keep their brand name to themselves. To have a good brand name is the first stage in the business world in order to become successful, but should not make companies to overlook employee attitude towards achieving this goal, to keep customers loyalty The key is in the attitude of our company employee towards their work and their attitude towards the company brand. Most reliable employees will do what is expected of them, the aspects of their work that the employer and customer expect. Employees have no option when it comes to the aspects of their job description, but it is the optional effort that makes the real difference in terms of increasing concert and productivity inside, and delighting the customer externally. As an interesting implication, Corporate Brand Managers may have to accept that the notion of one corporate culture may be difficult to achieve in large corporations or corporations with spread-out workforces. Instead, it is likely that recognizing various subcultures within the organization and utilizing their respective strengths in brand building (although within a main cultural framework) would increase the brand's strength internally, and thus also increase its external strength.

## **REFERENCES**

- Aurand, T. W., Gorchels, L. and Bishop, T. R. (2005). Human resource management's role in internal branding: An opportunity for cross-functional brand message synergy. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 14(2/3),163–169.
- Baker, M. (2000). *The marketing book*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Burmam, C. and Zeplin, S. (2005). Building brand commitment: A behavioural approach to internal brand management. *Journal of Brand Management*, 12(4), 279–300.
- Chernatony, L. and Dall'Olmo Riley, F. (1998). Modeling components of the brand. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(11/12), 1074–1090.
- Chong, M., (2007). The role of internal communication and training in infusing corporate values

- and delivering brand promise, Singapore airlines, experience. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 10(3), 201-212.
- Dixit, V. and Bhati, M. (2012). A study about employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in Indian auto-component industry. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 40.
- Henkoff, R. (1994) 'Service is everybody's business', *Fortune*, 129(13), 48–54.
- Ind, N. (2003). Inside out: How employees build value. *Journal of Brand Management*, 10(6), 393
- Jacobs, R. (2003). Turn employees into brand ambassadors. *ABA Bank Marketing*, 35(3), 22–26.
- Keller, K. L. (1998). *Strategic Brand Management*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Kotler, P. (1999). *Principles of Marketing*, 2nd Edition. Europe: Prentice Hall.
- Kunda, S. C. and Vora, J. A. (2004). Creating a talented workforce for delivering service quality. *Human Resource Planning*, 27(2), 40.
- Lings, I. N. (2004). Internal market orientation: Construct and consequences. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(4), 405–413.
- Malhotra, N. K. and Dash, S. (2010). *Marketing Research-An Applied Orientation*, 6th edition. Dorling Kindersley Pvt. Ltd., IN.
- Miles, S. J. and Mangold, G. (2004). A conceptualization of the employee branding process. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 3(2/3), 65.
- Nonaka, I. (1991). The knowledge-creating company. *Harvard Business Review*, 69, 96–104.
- O'Reilly, C. and Pfeffer, J. (2000). Unlocking the hidden value in organizations. *Employment Relations Today*, 27(2), 63–80.
- Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival Manual*. NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Pappu, R., Quester, P. G. and Cooksey, R. W. (2005). Consumer-based brand equity: Improving the measurement—empirical evidence. *The Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 14 (2/3), 143–154.
- Pfeffer, J. and Veiga, J. (1999). Putting people first for organisational success. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(2), 37–48.
- Pfeffer, J. (1995). People, capability and competitive success. *Management Development Review*, 8(5), 6–11.
- Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 52–63.
- Schultz, D. E. (2003). Live the brand: Creating a brand-supportive culture isn't easy, but it's possible. *Marketing Management*, 12(4), 8-9.
- Schultz, D. E. (2003). So you want to be a brand guru. *Marketing Management*, 12(2), 8.
- Speak, K. D. (1998). Brand stewardship. *Design Management Journal*, 9(1), 32-37.
- Speak, K. D. (2003). Human resources: The inside brand manager. Brand Tool Box. Retrieved February 15, 2016, from <http://www.brandnetwork.com>.
- Tosti, D. T. and Stotz, R. D. (2001). Brand: Building your brand from the inside out. *Marketing Management*, 10(2), 28–33.

- Upshaw, L.B. (1995). Building brand identity: A strategy for success in a hostile marketplace. New York: John Wiley
- Vargo, S. L. and Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 1–17.
- Webster, C. (1992). What kind of marketing culture exists in your service firm? An audit. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 6(2), 54.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984) 'A resource-based view of the firm', *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 171–180.