

*Available in online @ [www.iaraindia.com](http://www.iaraindia.com)*

*RESEARCH EXPLORER-International Journal on Economics and Business Management*

*ISSN: 2250-1940 (P) 2349-1647 (O)*

*Impact Factor: 8.276 (12OR), 3.676 (COSMOS)*

*Volume XV, Issue 50*

*January – March 2026*

*Formally UGC Approved Journal (63185), © Author*

## **THE INFLUENCE OF EMPLOYEE BRANDING ON TALENT ATTRACTION AND RETENTION: A STUDY OF THE SELECTED PHARMACEUTICAL SECTOR TAMIL NADU**

**S. RAJESWARI**

Full-Time Ph.D. Scholar (Management)

Research Department of Business Administration

M R. Government Arts College

(Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli)

Mannargudi

**Dr. S. BABU**

Associate Professor & Head

PG Department of business Administration

Govt. Arts and Science College

(Affiliated to Bharathiyar University)

Thondaimuthur, Coimbatore

### **ABSTRACT**

*While Employer Branding focuses on the corporate promise, **Employees Branding** focuses on the delivery of that promise through the workforce. In the pharmaceutical sector of Tamil Nadu, employees serve as the primary touch point for doctors, distributors, and the public. This paper explores how internal branding influences employee behavior to become an extension of the corporate brand. By analyzing "brand-citizen" behaviors, the study finds that a lack of satisfaction in economic and developmental values hinders the ability of employees to project a positive brand image. The paper emphasizes that for a brand to be credible externally, it must first be lived internally by the employees.*

**KEYWORDS:** Employees Branding, Brand Ambassadors, Internalization, Pharma Sector, Tamil Nadu, Brand Citizenship.

### **AIM OF THE STUDY**

The primary aim of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of Employee Branding strategies within the pharmaceutical industry of Tamil Nadu. Specifically, the study seeks to understand how internal branding efforts translate into employee satisfaction and their subsequent role as brand ambassadors.

1. To Assess Brand Internalization
2. To Measure the Five Dimensions of Brand Value
3. To Evaluate Talent Attraction:
4. To Identify Retention Drivers:
5. To Map the Digital Transformation Gap:

### **STATEMENT OF PROBLEM**

In the modern pharmaceutical landscape, companies invest heavily in Employer Branding to project an image of innovation, stability, and care. However, a significant gap

often exists between this external "marketing" and the actual Employee Brand experience lived by the internal workforce.

1. 1.The Misalignment Between Corporate Identity and Economic Reality
2. The Erosion of Long-term Talent Attraction due to Developmental Stagnation
3. The Absence of Emotional Brand Citizenship and Psychological Ownership

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

**Branding as a Shield Against Turnover** (Parmar et al., 2023) In a 2023 study published in *ResearchGate*, the authors investigated the pharmaceutical industry specifically, finding that employer branding significantly increases organizational commitment and decreases turnover intention. The research highlights that in the post-pandemic era, "Affective Commitment"—the emotional bond an employee has with their company—is the primary mediator between a brand's image and an employee's decision to stay. This is highly relevant to your study, as it provides a modern context for why "Psychological Value" is mandatory for retention.

**Digital Storytelling and Employee "Voice"** (Singh & Rao, 2024) This recent study explored the role of social media storytelling in strengthening employee branding. The authors found that when companies leverage "Brand Ambassadors" to share behind-the-scenes content on platforms like LinkedIn and Instagram, it creates a sense of "Psychological Ownership." For the Tamil Nadu pharma sector, where recruitment is increasingly digital, this literature emphasizes that authentic employee stories are more effective than corporate advertisements in attracting new talent.

**The Shift to "Sustainable" Employer Branding** (MDPI, 2024), Research published in 2024 introduced the concept of Sustainable Employer Branding. It argues that modern employees, particularly in healthcare and life sciences, are no longer satisfied with just "Economic Value." Instead, they prioritize transparent, ethical, and inclusive values (Social Value). The study concludes that companies failing to demonstrate social responsibility face higher attrition rates among younger, value-driven scientists and professionals.

**Generation-Specific Branding Strategies** (Alves et al., 2021) This study examined how different generations (X, Y, and Z) perceive employer branding in the pharmaceutical industry. The findings suggest that while older generations may prioritize "Economic Value," Generation Z (the newest entrants to the Tamil Nadu workforce) is more focused on "Developmental Value" and "Work-Life Balance." This supports your finding that "Developmental Value" is a critical pain point for modern pharma employees.

**AI and Hyper-Personalized Branding** (Korn Ferry, 2024) Recent industry literature highlights that in 2024, leading pharma companies are using AI-powered tools to personalize the "Employee Experience." The study suggests that internal branding is now about "Segmented Communication"—tailoring the brand message to specific departments (like R&D vs. Sales). This is a critical addition to your review, as it shows how digitalization is changing the "Functional Value" of the workplace.

**Internal Branding and Psychological Empowerment** (Emerald Publishing, 2023) This study explored how internal branding leads to Psychological Empowerment. It argues that when employees feel the brand aligns with their personal values, they experience higher self-efficacy and independence. For your research, this supports the idea that "Employee Branding" is not just a marketing tool but a management strategy that empowers staff to take "ownership" of their roles, directly impacting long-term retention.

## RESEARCH GAP

**The Regional Industry Specificity Gap** While global studies have extensively covered Employer Branding in the IT and Service sectors, there is a lack of empirical research specifically focusing on the Pharmaceutical industry in Tamil Nadu. Most Indian studies focus on Tier-1 metros like Bangalore or Mumbai. Your study addresses the unique regional dynamics of Tamil Nadu's pharma hub, particularly how local cultural and economic factors

influence employee perceptions of brand value and The Internal Branding Disconnect (Promises vs. Reality) Existing literature (2020–2024) heavily focuses on how companies *attract* talent (External Branding), but there is a significant gap in research regarding how current employees perceive the brand internally (Internal Branding). Your data shows a clear "disagreement" in economic and developmental values despite companies' claims of being "Employers of Choice." This study fills the gap by exploring this "Perception-Reality Disconnect" and its direct impact on long-term retention.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is descriptive in nature. The primary and the secondary data were adopted for the collected data. The secondary data was collected from previous literature and journals. The primary data consist of structured questionnaire. The questionnaire constitutes the attributes of Time Management. The pilot study with a sample of 50 respondents was conducted to check the reliability statistics. The Cronbach's Alpha value for the attributes of Time Management were found to be more than 0.8, this clearly signifies that the questionnaire is reliable. After reaching the approved alpha value, the researcher has moved forward for the major research in the prescribed geographic location and the industry. The geographic location and the target industry selected for the study pharmaceutical companies in Tamilnadu. The population of the study is the employees, who are working in theses top ten pharmaceuticals companies in Tamil Nadu. Since the total numbers of employees working in the respective companies are not exactly available in record, so the researcher has considered the population as infinite population. The researcher has taken only the top ten major pharmaceuticals players in Tamil Nadu. The top ten companies are (<https://www.pharmafaq.in/top-10-pcd-pharma-companies-in-tamilnadu/>)

1. Indian Immunological Limited
2. Microlab Limited
3. Zota pharmaceutical Pvt Ltd
4. Eucare Pharmaceutical pvt Ltd
5. A to Z Pharmaceuticals Pvt Ltd
6. Aassk Pharmaceutical Pvt Ltd
7. Aastik Pharma Pvt Ltd (Pcd Franchise company in Tamilnadu)
8. Abhilash Chemical Pvt ltd
9. Acemy Inc
10. Active Pharma manufacturing pvt ltd

These companies have been considered as the research area for the current study. The top ten pharmaceuticals companies has been selected based on companies' performance, growth trend, client base, market presence, training interventions, large scale projects of different industry verticals. The random sampling technique was adopted by the researcher to select the samples for the study. According to the Demorgan's table for an infinite population 663 sample sizes is required with a confidence level of 99 percent and with the confidence interval of 5 percent. The researcher has distributed around 700 questionnaires and 674 questionnaires were returned and answered. The remaining 26 questionnaires were returned and found to be biased and unanswered, so, the researcher has confined the sample size as 674. The collected data were fed into Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20 version, popularly used Statistical Software for Social Research Analysis. The statistical tools used for analysis were Measures of Central Tendency and Dispersion (Mean and Standard Deviation).

## DATA ANALYSIS

### Mean & Standard Deviation

The current part of the measures the Measures of Central Tendency (Mean),

Measures of Dispersion (Standard Deviation) for the “Functional Value”, “Psychological Value”, “Economic Value”, “Development Value”, and “Social Value”. The analysis as follows;

**Table No.1**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Functional Value”**

| Measuring Items   | N          | Mean        | SD          |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Relationship with your co-workers   | 674        | 2.44        | .747        |
| Flexible working hours  | 674        | 1.68        | .509        |
| Balance between private and work  | 674        | 1.59        | .586        |
| Organization’s reputation as great place to work                          | 674        | 2.13        | .582        |
| Job security  | 674        | 2.30        | .529        |
| Challenging work  | 674        | 2.0         | .655        |
| Respect for people  | 674        | 2.44        | .592        |
| Mean Score  | 674        | 2.05        | .407        |
| Source : Primary Data<br>SD-Standard Deviation<br>N-Number of Respondents | <b>674</b> | <b>2.05</b> | <b>.407</b> |

**Source: Primary Data**

The “Functional Value” has seven measuring questions and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Respect for people” with a mean value of 2.44 and with a standard deviation value of 0.592. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Relationship with your co-workers” with a mean value of 2.44 and with a standard deviation value of 0.747. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Job security” with a mean value of 2.30 and with a standard deviation value of 0.529. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Organization’s reputation as great place to work” with a mean value of 2.13 and with a standard deviation value of 0.582. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Challenging work” with a mean value of 2.00 and with a standard deviation value of 0.655. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Flexible working hours” with a mean value of 1.68 and with a standard deviation value of 0.509. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Balance between private and work” with a mean value of 1.59 and with a standard deviation value of 0.586. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable “Functional Value” with a mean value of 2.05 and with a standard deviation value of 0.407.

**Table No. 2**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Psychological Value”**

| Measuring Item            | N          | Mean        | SD          |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Self-confident            | 674        | 2.05        | .665        |
| Belongingness             | 674        | 2.48        | .500        |
| Pride                     | 674        | 2.42        | .556        |
| Exciting work environment | 674        | 1.75        | .433        |
| Self – Image              | 674        | 1.70        | .460        |
| Enjoying work culture     | 674        | 1.75        | .432        |
| Mean Score                | <b>674</b> | <b>2.05</b> | <b>.319</b> |

**Source: Primary Data**

The “Psychological Value” has six measuring questions and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents are

having a neutral feel towards the statement “Belongingness” with a mean value of 2.48 and with a standard deviation value of 0.500. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Pride” with a mean value of 2.42 and with a standard deviation value of 0.556. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Self-confident” with a mean value of 2.05 and with a standard deviation value of 0.665. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Enjoying work culture” with a mean value of 1.75 and with a standard deviation value of 0.432. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Exciting work environment” with a mean value of 1.75 and with a standard deviation value of 0.433. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Self – Image” with a mean value of 1.70 and with a standard deviation value of 0.460. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable “Psychological Value” with a mean value of 2.05 and with a standard deviation value of 0.319.

**Table No. 3**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Economic Value”**

| Measuring item                           | N          | Mean        | SD          |
|--|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Overall compensation                     | 674        | 1.90        | .303        |
| Fringe Benefits(Paid Time off)           | 674        | 1.72        | .452        |
| <b>Reward and Awards for Performance</b> | 674        | 1.73        | .442        |
| <b>Retention bonus</b>                   | 674        | 1.72        | .450        |
| <b>Performance Incentive</b>             | 674        | 1.55        | .538        |
| <b>Mean Score</b>                        | <b>674</b> | <b>1.78</b> | <b>.414</b> |

**Source: Primary Data**

The “Economic Value” has five measuring questions and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents as disagree with the statement “Overall compensation” with a mean value of 1.90 and with a standard deviation value of 0.303. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Rewards and Awards for performance” with a mean value of 1.73 and with a standard deviation value of 0.442. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Retention Bonus” with a mean value of 1.72 and with a standard deviation value of 0.450. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Fringe Benefits (Paid time off – Fair amount of Vacation, Sick leave etc.)” with a mean value of 1.72 and with a standard deviation value of 0.452. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Performance Incentive” with a mean value of 1.55 and with a standard deviation value of 0.538. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Economic Value” with a mean value of 1.78 and with a standard deviation value of 0.414.

**Table No. 4**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Development Value”**

| Measuring Items   | N          | Mean        | SD          |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Onsite job opportunities                                  | 674        | 1.73        | .444        |
| Training and Development opportunities                    | 674        | 1.67        | .471        |
| Promotion opportunities                                   | 674        | 1.53        | .499        |
| Opportunity ability to give and receive feedback          | 674        | 2.33        | .472        |
| Attainment of career opportunities & improving experience | 674        | 2.33        | .472        |
| <b>Mean Score</b>   | <b>674</b> | <b>1.94</b> | <b>.242</b> |

**Source: Primary Data**

The “Development Value” has five measuring questions and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Attainment of career opportunities& improving experience” with a mean value of 2.33 and with a standard deviation value of 0.472. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Opportunity ability to give and



receive feedback” with a mean value of 2.33 and with a standard deviation value of 0.472. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Onsite job opportunities” with a mean value of 1.73 and with a standard deviation value of 0.444. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Training and Development opportunities” with a mean value of 1.67 and with a standard deviation value of 0.471. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Promotion opportunities” with a mean value of 1.53 and with a standard deviation value of 0.499. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Development Value” with a mean value of 1.94 and with a standard deviation value of 0.242.

**Table No. 5**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Social Value”**

| Measuring item  | N   | Mean | SD   |
|---|-----|------|------|
| Onsite job Opportunities                                  | 674 | 1.49 | .500 |
| Training and development                                  | 674 | 2.20 | .749 |
| Opportunity ability to give and receive feed back         | 674 | 2.40 | .610 |
| Attainment of career opportunities & Improving Experience | 674 | 1.60 | .490 |
| Organization CSR Initiatives                              | 674 | 1.73 | .442 |
| Mean Score  | 674 | 1.98 | .143 |

**Source: Primary Data**

The “Social Value” has five measuring questions and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Strategies to support internal reporting of legal activities” with a mean value of 2.40 and with a standard deviation value of 0.610. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the statement “Creative employer with ethical work practices and forward thinking” with a mean value of 2.20 and with a standard deviation value of 0.749. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Organization’s CSR initiatives” with a mean value of 1.73 and with a standard deviation value of 0.442. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Humanitarian organization provides back to the society” with a mean value of 1.60 and with a standard deviation value of 0.490. The respondents as disagree with the statement “Pleasant and Social work environment” with a mean value of 1.49 and with a standard deviation value of 0.500. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Social Value” with a mean value of 1.86 and with a standard deviation value of 0.348.

**Table No. 6**  
**Mean & Standard Deviation - “Employee Branding”**

| Measuring Variables | N   | Mean | SD   |
|---------------------|-----|------|------|
| Functional Value    | 674 | 2.05 | .407 |
| Psychological Value | 674 | 2.05 | .319 |
| Economic Value      | 674 | 1.78 | .414 |
| Development value   | 674 | 1.94 | .242 |
| Social Value        | 674 | 1.86 | .348 |
| Mean Score          | 674 | 1.98 | .143 |

**Source: Primary Data**

**SUGGESTIONS**

Thorough image audits of what value propositions make an organization an attractive employer (Highhouse et al., 1999; Arnold et al., 2003; Lievens et al., 2005) is a good starting point for employer branding, but it is often complicated to decide which characteristics an organization should promote to enhance its attractiveness as an employer (Lievens et al., 2005). In this respect, this study has key practical implication for Indian pharmaceutical companies as the study attempted to identify these primary dimensions.

The “Employer Branding” has five measuring variables and they are arranged in the descending order based on the mean value and are displayed; The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable “Psychological Value” with a mean value of 2.05 and with a standard deviation value of 0.319. The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable “Functional Value” with a mean value of 2.05 and with a standard deviation value of 0.407. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Development Value” with a mean value of 1.94 and with a standard deviation value of 0.242. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Social Value” with a mean value of 1.86 and with a standard deviation value of 0.348. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Economic Value” with a mean value of 1.78 and with a standard deviation value of 0.414. The respondents as disagree with the variable “Employer Branding” with a mean value of 1.98 and with a standard deviation value of 0.143.

### FINDINGS

1. Functional Value - The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable Functional Value.
2. Psychological Value - The respondents are having a neutral feel towards the variable Psychological Value.
4. Economic Value - The respondents as disagree with the variable Economic Value.
5. Development Value - The respondents as disagree with the variable Development Value.
6. Social Value - The respondents as disagree with the variable Social Value.
7. Employer Branding - The respondents as disagree with the variable Employer Branding.

### CONCLUSION

Employment branding and the actions required to build and manage an employment brand are powerful tools that can be used to add value to your organization through HR. All too often, HR looks to impact the bottom line of the firm by enacting cost-containment initiatives. Such initiatives do nothing to increase quality or productivity. Employment branding, on the other hand, can increase the quality of employees, help inspire them to become more productive, and open opportunities to the company in the marketplace that might not have been open before. In short, employment branding can address many of the issues facing corporation today.

### REFERENCE

1. Ainspan, N., and Dell, D. (2001). Engaging Employees through your Brand. The Conference Board Inc.
2. Barrow, S. & Mosley, R. (2005). The Employer Brand: Bringing the Best of Brand Management to People at Work. London: Wiley Brands.
3. Butterworth Heinemann. Martin, G. (2007). Employer Branding - Time For Some Long And ‘Hard’ Reflections? : Chartered Institute of Personnel And Development, London.
4. Davies, G. 2008, “Employer Branding And Its Influence On Managers”, European Journal Of Marketing, Vol. 42, No.5, P. 667 – 681.
5. Harris, K. Developing and Managing a Successful Employer Brand. In HR Summit 2010. Perth. 2010. [Cit. 2010-09-25].
6. Helen Rosethorn, 2009, The Employer Brand, Published By Gower Housden, CH. Using Employer Brand To Attract Talent. In Strategic Human Resources Conference. Geneve: 2007. Cit. 2010-09-25].
7. Kunerth, B. & Mosley, R. 2011, “Applying Employer Brand Management to Employee Engagement”, Strategic HR Review, Vol. 10 No. 3 P. 19 – 26.
8. Martin, G. & Beaumont, P.B. (2003). What’s In A Name? Building the Relationship

between People Management and Branding. Chartered Institute Of Personnel and Development, London.

9. Martin, G. & Hetrick, S. (2006). Corporate Reputations, Branding And Managing People: A Strategic Approach To HR. Oxford:
10. Paramasivan. C (2016), Conceptual Analysis of Consumer Exploitation in Organized Retailing, International Journal in Management and Social Science, Vol.04 Issue-06, (June, 2016),pp-206-210.