

Internal Marketing Practices and Its impact on Brand Building: A Dyadic Analysis on Private and Government Management Institutions of Assam

¹Dr.V .T. Vasagan, ²Prof. Amalesh Bhowal
¹Assistant Professor, ²Professor
¹ICFAI University Nagaland, Dimapur,
²Assam University

Abstract - Elevation in the level of the competition among Management Education Institutions spurred them to adopt generally agreed best practices to build brand. Management Education Institutions could build brand with the help of employees [Internal Customers] since they deliver best services directly to the Students [External Customers]. Hence, execution of Internal Marketing Practices deserves special attention. This research attempts to explore whether the internal marketing practices have significant contribution in building brand of Management Education Institutions. This research conducted a survey in 5 management institutions of Government and Private each. The primary data were collected from employees, teachers and students from both Private and Govt. management institutions. The considered hypotheses were tested and it was observed that there is a variation of impact of Internal Marketing Practices on Internal Brand Building for Internal Customers and External Brand Building for External Customers in respect of Government and Private Management Institutions. This point to the poor implementation of internal marketing practices from all the concerned players. This shortcoming needs urgent attention.

keywords - Internal Marketing Practices, Internal Customers, External Customers, Brand Building, Management Education Institutions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Management Education Institutions are marketing themselves more aggressively to increase their market share (Becker & Palmér, 2009). Elevation in the level of the competition among Management Education Institutions spurred them to adopt generally agreed best practices to build brand. Internal Marketing Practices create scope in building brand for management institutions. Brand of management institutions is lays in the practices of internal marketing. Hence, execution of Internal Marketing Practices deserves special attention.

II. MEANING OF INTERNAL MARKETING

According to Berry (1981), internal marketing is the process of “viewing employees as internal customers, viewing jobs as internal products that satisfy the needs and wants of those internal customers while addressing the objectives of the organization.” This concept clearly indicates that internal marketing practices have a bearing on the delivery of quality services.

III. COMPONENT OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES

According to, Berry and Parasuraman (1991), “Internal marketing as the process of “attracting, developing, motivating and detaining qualified employees through job-products that satisfy their needs.” To build a strong brand image has always been an important aspect of product and brand management. The more the stronger brand is created, the greater will be the revenue generation both in short and long term (Kapferer, 2004; Keller 1993). So, efforts should be to create brands that last for decades (Aaker, 1997). The value creation in service lays in the adoption of internal marketing practices.

IV. LITERATURE GAP

Literature review shows that sufficient amount of research work is done on internal marketing in different field of corporate business [Zeithaml et al (1993) Sanchez et al (2006), Hale (1998)]. (Kotler, 1972). Dülgeroğlu & Taşkın (2015), (Jawet et al 2010), Griffin (2002). Many variables, such as attracting; developing, motivating, coordinating, training, communicating, program, planned efforts were considered as internal marketing practices (Berry 1981, Woodruffe, Helen, (1992), Al.Hawary et al 2013, Guven et al 2012, Kameswari et al 2012, Gronroos 2007). In this direction Naude et al (2003) identified the determinants of internal marketing in the component of 7Ps of marketing mix. 7P's considered for the present study includes [a] Process of Services (involves a particular flow like the supply chain management, and starts with preparation and ends with result. Under the most commonly perceived process with least span of process centers, involves: [a] Goals/Objectives—[b] Syllabus—[c] Lesson Preparation – [d] Teaching – [e] Testing --- [f] Evaluation – [g] Result – [h] employability - [i] Employment. Here, in each stage internal customers' involvement is required) [b] Product in the form of Service Pack (includes value addition to external customers through the value addition of internal customers from unemployable to readily-employable condition using different academic programmes (syllabus, skilling programmes, training (on the job, off the job), [c] Pricing of Service (includes price charged to external customers for the service rendered to them, and price paid to internal customers for their services and

products to the external customers as well as the organization, matching between these inflow of fund and out flow of fund and generation of fund for growth from within), [d] Promotion of Services (includes advertising, word of mouth, press reports, incentives, commissions and awards directed towards both internal customers as well as external customers), [e] Place of Services (refers to the point of sale which could be off line, on-line or both [i.e. neat and clean and hygienic working place, adequate technological infrastructure, physical conditions, and internal customers' safety, external customers' safety). [f] People of Services (includes quality of Internal customers), [g] Physical Evidence of Services (includes the physical facilities, class rooms, materials provided to the internal customers and external customers brand image of the Alumni). But research gap exists for Internal Marketing Research in the context of Management education service providing organizations in general and brand building in particular resulting from internal marketing practices

V. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Given the survey of literature and scope, the following objective established for the purpose of the study is:

1. To review the impact of Internal Marketing Practices in Internal Brand Building and External Brand Building.

VI. HYPOTHESES

Given the objectives, survey of literature and scope, the following hypotheses are established for the purpose of the study is:

- H1: There is no significant impact of Internal Marketing Practices on Internal Brand Building as perceived by the teachers.
- H2: There is no significant impact of Internal Marketing Practices on External Brand Building as perceived by the students

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A survey was conducted in 5 management institutions of both Govt. and Private of Assam. The data were collected with two sets questionnaire with the help of 5 Points Likert Scale, for Internal Marketing Practices and Brand Building. 100 samples of internal customers and 510 samples of external customers were considered (detailed in Table No:1).

| SINo | Name of the Institutes | Teachers | Students |
|-------------------|--|----------|----------|
| Private | | | |
| 1 | Bosco Institute of Management | 10 | 40 |
| 2 | Royal School of Management | 10 | 60 |
| 3 | Assam Kaziranga University | 12 | 53 |
| 4 | Girijananda Chowdhury Institute of Management | 9 | 38 |
| 5 | North Eastern Regional Institute of Management | 18 | 70 |
| Government | | | |
| 3 | Guwahati University | 5 | 63 |
| 4 | Dibrugrah University | 11 | 50 |
| 6 | Tezpur University | 10 | 40 |
| 7 | Assam Institute of Management | 10 | 56 |
| 10 | Assam University | 5 | 40 |
| Total | | 100 | 510 |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

VIII. Latent variable considered for the study

[a] **Degree of 'Internal Marketing Practices'** - this variable has been considered to measure the degree of or intensity of internal marketing practices adopted by the 'Management Education Institutions' for brand building, both from the perspective of internal customers (Items considered are in ANNEXURE-1). and external customers (Items considered are in ANNEXURE-2).

[b] **Degree of External Branding** - this has been used in the sense of measuring the degree of External Branding achieved by the Management Education Service providing Organizations at least as perceived by external customers (Items considered are in ANNEXURE-3).

[c] **Degree of Internal Branding** - this has been used in the sense of measuring the degree of Internal Branding achieved by the Management Education Service providing Organizations at least as perceived by Internal customers (Items considered are in ANNEXURE-4).

IX. Results & Discussion

[a] Impact of Internal marketing practices on External branding

| Name of the institution | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | | | Durbin-Watson |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-----|-----|---------------|---------------|
| | | | | | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change | |
| AIM | .012 _a | .000 | -.018 | 5.63339 | .000 | .007 | 1 | 54 | .932 | 2.142 |
| AU | .074 _a | .006 | -.021 | 7.82350 | .006 | .211 | 1 | 38 | .649 | 1.877 |
| DBIM | .323 _a | .104 | .081 | 5.12813 | .104 | 4.433 | 1 | 38 | .042 | 1.702 |
| DU | .231 _a | .054 | .034 | 6.86261 | .054 | 2.714 | 1 | 48 | .106 | 2.049 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------------|------|-------|---------|------|-------|---|----|------|-------|
| GIMT | .129 _a | .017 | -.011 | 5.72193 | .017 | .608 | 1 | 36 | .441 | 1.248 |
| GU | .198 _a | .039 | .024 | 6.59158 | .039 | 2.497 | 1 | 61 | .119 | 1.656 |
| KU | .037 _a | .001 | -.019 | 6.72927 | .001 | .068 | 1 | 50 | .795 | 1.276 |
| NERIM | .097 _a | .009 | -.005 | 5.55305 | .009 | .646 | 1 | 68 | .424 | 1.616 |
| RGI | .076 _a | .006 | -.011 | 6.69715 | .006 | .338 | 1 | 58 | .563 | 1.418 |
| TU | .027 _a | .001 | -.026 | 6.01617 | .001 | .028 | 1 | 38 | .868 | 1.570 |

Table-3 ANOVA_a of Regression Model of Internal marketing practices on External branding

| Name of the institution | Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| AIM | Regression | .232 | 1 | .232 | .007 | .932 _b |
| | Residual | 1713.697 | 54 | 31.735 | | |
| | Total | 1713.929 | 55 | | | |
| AU | Regression | 12.902 | 1 | 12.902 | .211 | .649 _b |
| | Residual | 2325.873 | 38 | 61.207 | | |
| | Total | 2338.775 | 39 | | | |
| DBIM | Regression | 116.588 | 1 | 116.588 | 4.433 | .042 _b |
| | Residual | 999.312 | 38 | 26.298 | | |
| | Total | 1115.900 | 39 | | | |
| DU | Regression | 127.839 | 1 | 127.839 | 2.714 | .106 _b |
| | Residual | 2260.581 | 48 | 47.095 | | |
| | Total | 2388.420 | 49 | | | |
| GIMT | Regression | 19.896 | 1 | 19.896 | .608 | .441 _b |
| | Residual | 1178.657 | 36 | 32.740 | | |
| | Total | 1198.553 | 37 | | | |
| GU | Regression | 108.472 | 1 | 108.472 | 2.497 | .119 _b |
| | Residual | 2650.385 | 61 | 43.449 | | |
| | Total | 2758.857 | 62 | | | |
| KU | Regression | 3.075 | 1 | 3.075 | .068 | .795 _b |
| | Residual | 2264.156 | 50 | 45.283 | | |
| | Total | 2267.231 | 51 | | | |
| NERIM | Regression | 19.931 | 1 | 19.931 | .646 | .424 _b |
| | Residual | 2096.869 | 68 | 30.836 | | |
| | Total | 2116.800 | 69 | | | |
| RGI | Regression | 15.178 | 1 | 15.178 | .338 | .563 _b |
| | Residual | 2601.406 | 58 | 44.852 | | |
| | Total | 2616.583 | 59 | | | |
| TU | Regression | 1.016 | 1 | 1.016 | .028 | .868 _b |
| | Residual | 1375.384 | 38 | 36.194 | | |
| | Total | 1376.400 | 39 | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: DEGREE OF EXTERNAL BRANDING [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | | |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Table-4 Coefficients_a of Regression Model of Internal marketing practices on External branding

| Name of the institution | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | Tolerance | VIF |
| AIM | (Constant) | 50.091 | 5.254 | | 9.535 | .000 | | |
| | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .012 | .134 | .012 | .086 | .932 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| AU | (Constant) | 42.271 | 9.671 | | 4.371 | .000 | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|--------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .113 | .245 | .074 | .459 | .649 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| DBIM | 1 | (Constant) | 57.606 | 5.595 | | 10.296 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -.317 | .150 | -.323 | -2.106 | .042 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| DU | 1 | (Constant) | 33.565 | 7.333 | | 4.577 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .323 | .196 | .231 | 1.648 | .106 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| GIMT | 1 | (Constant) | 39.296 | 8.214 | | 4.784 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .164 | .210 | .129 | .780 | .441 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| GU | 1 | (Constant) | 53.307 | 5.501 | | 9.690 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -.235 | .149 | -.198 | -1.580 | .119 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| KU | 1 | (Constant) | 43.683 | 9.822 | | 4.447 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .066 | .253 | .037 | .261 | .795 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| NERIM | 1 | (Constant) | 50.865 | 5.346 | | 9.515 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -.110 | .136 | -.097 | -.804 | .424 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| RGI | 1 | (Constant) | 49.192 | 6.548 | | 7.513 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -.094 | .162 | -.076 | -.582 | .563 | 1.000 | 1.000 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|
| TU | 1 | (Constant) | 46.767 | 9.203 | | 5.082 | .000 | | |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .039 | .233 | .027 | .168 | .868 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: DEGREE OF EXTERNAL BRANDING [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | | | | | |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

| Name of the institution | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [PERCEIVED BY EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | DEGREE OF EXTERNAL BRANDING |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| AIM | .855 | .839 |
| AU | .867 | .895 |
| DBIM | .822 | .781 |
| DU | .822 | .829 |
| GIMT | .836 | .813 |
| GU | .847 | .843 |
| KU | .708 | .844 |
| NERIM | .813 | .764 |
| RGI | .858 | .842 |
| TU | .726 | .841 |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

From the above tables-2,3,4 and5, it is discerned that there is no significant impact of **Internal Marketing Practices** on **External Brand Building** as perceived by the EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS. This needs urgent attention on the part of the management of these management education service providing organizations.

[b] Impact of Internal marketing practices on Internal Branding

| Name of the institution | Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| AIM | 1 | .013 _a | .000 | -.125 | 7.13122 |
| AU | 1 | .408 _a | .167 | -.111 | 6.35085 |
| DBIM | 1 | .403 _a | .163 | .043 | 7.33661 |
| DU | 1 | .213 _a | .045 | -.061 | 6.03711 |
| GIMT | 1 | .329 _a | .108 | -.019 | 7.63913 |
| GU | 1 | .642 _a | .412 | .216 | 9.66811 |
| KU | 1 | .695 _a | .484 | .432 | 5.38843 |
| NERIM | 1 | .690 _a | .477 | .444 | 4.76991 |
| RSM | 1 | .626 _a | .391 | .324 | 5.09368 |
| TU | 1 | .139 _a | .019 | -.103 | 4.97130 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS]

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

| Name of the institution | Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------------------------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| AIM | Regression | .066 | 1 | .066 | .001 | .972 _b |
| | Residual | 406.834 | 8 | 50.854 | | |
| | Total | 406.900 | 9 | | | |
| AU | Regression | 24.200 | 1 | 24.200 | .600 | .495 _b |
| | Residual | 121.000 | 3 | 40.333 | | |
| | Total | 145.200 | 4 | | | |
| DBIM | Regression | 73.219 | 1 | 73.219 | 1.360 | .282 _b |
| | Residual | 376.781 | 7 | 53.826 | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------|---------|----|---------|--------|-------------------|
| | | Total | 450.000 | 8 | | | |
| DU | 1 | Regression | 15.616 | 1 | 15.616 | .428 | .529 _b |
| | | Residual | 328.020 | 9 | 36.447 | | |
| | | Total | 343.636 | 10 | | | |
| GIMT | 1 | Regression | 49.506 | 1 | 49.506 | .848 | .388 _b |
| | | Residual | 408.494 | 7 | 58.356 | | |
| | | Total | 458.000 | 8 | | | |
| GU | 1 | Regression | 196.383 | 1 | 196.383 | 2.101 | .243 _b |
| | | Residual | 280.417 | 3 | 93.472 | | |
| | | Total | 476.800 | 4 | | | |
| KU | 1 | Regression | 271.899 | 1 | 271.899 | 9.364 | .012 _b |
| | | Residual | 290.351 | 10 | 29.035 | | |
| | | Total | 562.250 | 11 | | | |
| NERIM | 1 | Regression | 331.578 | 1 | 331.578 | 14.574 | .002 _b |
| | | Residual | 364.033 | 16 | 22.752 | | |
| | | Total | 695.611 | 17 | | | |
| RSM | 1 | Regression | 150.126 | 1 | 150.126 | 5.786 | .040 _b |
| | | Residual | 233.510 | 9 | 25.946 | | |
| | | Total | 383.636 | 10 | | | |
| TU | 1 | Regression | 3.890 | 1 | 3.890 | .157 | .702 _b |
| | | Residual | 197.710 | 8 | 24.714 | | |
| | | Total | 201.600 | 9 | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | | | |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

Table-8 Coefficients_a for Regression Model of Internal marketing practices on Internal branding

| Name of the institution | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | T | Sig. | |
|-------------------------|-------|--|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | | |
| AIM | 1 | (Constant) | 48.425 | 14.726 | | 3.288 | .011 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -.014 | .390 | -.013 | -.036 | .972 |
| AU | 1 | (Constant) | 22.000 | 34.200 | | .643 | .566 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .611 | .789 | .408 | .775 | .495 |
| DBIM | 1 | (Constant) | 22.771 | 16.384 | | 1.390 | .207 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .590 | .506 | .403 | 1.166 | .282 |
| DU | 1 | (Constant) | 35.177 | 6.383 | | 5.511 | .000 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .152 | .233 | .213 | .655 | .529 |
| GIMT | 1 | (Constant) | 20.794 | 18.495 | | 1.124 | .298 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL | .556 | .604 | .329 | .921 | .388 |

| | | BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--------|--------|-------|--------|------|
| GU | 1 | (Constant) | 77.465 | 32.484 | | 2.385 | .097 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | -1.620 | 1.118 | -.642 | -1.449 | .243 |
| KU | 1 | (Constant) | 16.809 | 7.018 | | 2.395 | .038 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .681 | .223 | .695 | 3.060 | .012 |
| NERIM | 1 | (Constant) | 12.895 | 6.743 | | 1.912 | .074 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .803 | .210 | .690 | 3.818 | .002 |
| RSM | 1 | (Constant) | 15.506 | 9.812 | | 1.580 | .149 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .772 | .321 | .626 | 2.405 | .040 |
| TU | 1 | (Constant) | 35.865 | 16.046 | | 2.235 | .056 |
| | | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] | .193 | .485 | .139 | .397 | .702 |
| a. Dependent Variable: DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNALCUSTOMERS] | | | | | | | |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

| Table-9 Reliability Statistics [Cronbach's Alpha] | | |
|---|--|--|
| Name of the institution | DEGREE OF INTERNAL MARKETING PRACTICES [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNALCUSTOMERS] | DEGREE OF INTERNAL BRANDING [AS PERCEIVED BY INTERNAL CUSTOMERS] |
| AIM | .899 | .943 |
| AU | .950 | .960 |
| DBIM | .895 | .787 |
| DU | .695 | .931 |
| GIMT | .855 | .859 |
| GU | .929 | .517 |
| KU | .842 | .926 |
| NERIM | .934 | .908 |
| RSM | .845 | .883 |
| TU | .637 | .583 |

Source: Compiled from Survey Data

From the above tables-6,7,8 and 9, it is discerned that there is no significant impact of **Internal Marketing Practices** on **Internal Brand Building** as perceived by the INTERNAL CUSTOMERS. This needs urgent attention on the part of the management of these management education service providing organizations.

X. Limitations

This research paper did not considered any feedback from the managers involved in Internal marketing Practices of Management Institutions regarding brand building. Hence, 360 degree view may be missing.

XI. Conclusions

Internal Marketing Practices are new benchmark strategies adopted by corporate industries to build brand against their competitors. In the line of corporate organizations, management education institutions would have to adopt generally agreed best practices to build brand even to facing new challenges. It is discernible that (a) there appears to be the poor implementation of internal marketing practices from all the concerned players, and (b) to attract best Internal Customers, External Customers, and Employers, these management education providing organizations shall have to adopt the best practices relating to Internal marketing or else their survivability and sustainability will be at stake.

| S.No. | (ANNEXURE-1 Statement |
|-------|---|
| 1.1 | Employees are consulted in formation of strategic decisions for implementations |
| 1.2 | Employees are consulted while constructing tactical decisions. |
| 1.3 | Employees are consulted in implementing tactical decisions. |
| 1.4 | Employees involvement in day to-day activities implementation are consulted . |
| 1.5 | Employees 'collective demands to management are properly addressed. |
| 1.6 | Employees participation in Organization's Management are encouraged |
| 1.7 | Employees participation in the Board of Studies are encouraged. |
| 1.8 | Employees participation in Departmental Meetings are encouraged |
| 1.9 | Decisions are clearly and timely communicated between employees and management. |
| 1.10 | Decisions are clearly and timely communicated between departments. |
| 1.11 | Decisions are clearly and timely communicated between employees. |

| S.No. | ANNEXURE-2 Statement |
|-------|--|
| 1.1 | Employees' involvement in taking strategic decisions and implementations for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.2 | Employees' involvement in taking tactical decisions for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.3 | Employees' involvement in implementing tactical decisions for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.4 | Employees involvement in day to-day activities for the benefit of the students is satisfactory.. |
| 1.5 | Employee's involvement in day to-day activities implementation for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.6 | Employees represent student's demands to management which are properly addressed for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.7 | Employees participate in Organization's Management for the benefit of the students is satisfactory.. |
| 1.8 | Employees participate in the Board of Studies for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.9 | Employees participate in Departmental Meetings for the benefit of the students is satisfactory. |
| 1.10 | Decisions which are clearly and timely commutated between employees and management for the benefit of the students is satisfactory.. |

| S.No. | ANNEXURE-3 Statement |
|-------|---|
| 1.1 | Institution is known for its systematic admission procedure. |
| 1.2 | Institution is known for its guidance and counseling. |
| 1.3 | Institution is known for its good syllabus. |
| 1.4 | Institution is known for its imparting education through seminar and workshops/ guest lectures. |
| 1.5 | Institution is known for its innovative method of imparting lessons. |
| 1.6 | Institution is known for its placement for students. |
| 1.7 | Institution is known for its reasonable fees structure. |
| 1.8 | Institution is known for its quality of teachers. |
| 1.9 | Institution is known for its target based service. |
| 1.10 | Institution is known outside for its excellence. |
| 1.11 | Institution is known for its quality service. |
| 1.12 | Alumni are well placed. |

| S.No. | ANNEXURE-4 Statement |
|-------|---|
| 1.1 | Institution is known for its salary. |
| 1.2 | Institution is known for its fringe benefits. |

| | |
|-----|---|
| 1.3 | Institution is known for providing opportunities for employees growth. |
| 1.4 | Institution is known for its employees career planning. |
| 1.5 | Institution is known for its reputation in education industry. |
| 1.6 | Institution is known for its target based service. |
| 1.7 | Institution is known for its experienced service in the industry. |
| 1.8 | Institution is known for its additional benefits for additional services. |
| 1.9 | Institution is known for recognizing individual branding. |

References

- [1] Aaker, J. (1997) Dimensions of brand personality, *Journal of marketing research*, 34, 347-356
- [2] Al-Hawary et al.(2013), "The Impact of Internal Marketing on Employee's Job Satisfaction of Commercial Banks in Jordan", *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(9), 811-826
- [3] Berry L.L. (1981), "The employee as customers", *Journal of Retail Banking*, 3(3), 8-25
- [4] Berry, L. L., & Parasuraman A. (1991), "Marketing Services: Competing Through Quality", New York: The Free Press.
- [5] Becker, C., & Palmér, S. (2009). Branding in Universities: identity versus image. Published master dissertation, Lulea University of Technology.
- [6] Davis, K., Newstrom, J. W. (1997): *Human Behaviour at Work: Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- [7] Dodi W. Irawanto (2015). Employee Participation in Decision-Making: Evidence From A State-Owned Enterprise In Indonesia, *Management*, 120 (1), 159-172
- [8] Dülgeroğlu & Taşkin (2015). Internal Marketing In Public Service Sector and Its Effect on Job Satisfaction, *Electronic Journal of Vocational College* 1-5
- [9] Griffin Charles P, (2002), "Strategic Planning for the Internal Marketing and Communication of Facilities Management", *Journal of Facilities Management*, 1(3), 237 - 246.
- [10] Grönroos, C., 2007, "Service Management and Marketing: Customer Management in Service Competition", 3rd Edition, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., England, P. 483
- [11] Guven, A & Sadaklioglu, H.(2012), "Internal Marketing approach in human resources management: A case study on the establishment", *International Research Journal of Finance & Economics*, 98(5), 106-118
- [12] Hales, C. and Klidas, A. (1998) 'Empowerment in five star hotels: choice, voice or rhetoric?', *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 10(3), 88-95.
- [13] Horsford, M. (2013). Active employee participation in the public service decision making process: A public servant perspective. *JOAAG*, 7(2), 1-10.
- [14] Kameswari, A & Rajyalakshmi, S (2012). Role of internal marketing in job satisfaction of employees in commercial bank, *Asian Journal of Research in Banking and Finance*, 2(7), 16-32.
- [15] Kapferer, J.-N. (2004), *The New Strategic Brand Management: Creating and Sustaining Brand Equity Long Term*, Kogan Page, London.
- [16] Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring, and managing customer-based brand equity", *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 1-22.
- [17] Kotler, P. (1972). A generic concept of marketing, *Journal of Marketing*, 36(2), 46-54
- [18] Kuye, O. L and Suilaman A. A. (2011). Employee involvement in decision making and firms performance in the manufacturing sector in Nigeria. *Serbian journal of management*. 6(1), 1-15.
- [19] Lamboy, J. V. (2011). Implications of branding initiatives in higher education among trademarked institutions in California.
- [20] Naude, P., Desai, J. and Murphy, J. (2003), "Identifying the determinants of internal marketing orientation", *European Journal of Marketing*, 37(9), 1205-20, (3)S, pp. 363-77.
- [21] Sánchez J, Callarisa LLJ, Rodríguez RM, Moliner MA (2006). Perceived value of the purchase of a tourism product. *Tour. Manage.*, 27(4), 394-409.
- [22] Saul, J. (2010). *Social Innovation, INC. Strategies for driving business growth through social change*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- [23] Woodruffe, Helen, (1992), "Service Marketing", UK: Longman Group.
- [24] Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). *Service marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (4th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.