### CHAPTER – V

### INTERNAL MARKETING AND BRAND BUILDING

#### 5.1. Introduction

Management Education service providing organization must build brand name for organization to be successive in service render. Brand may be name, symbol, trade mark letter that make the customers to identify the organization in simple way. The popularity of the organization through with specific identity which was developed through quality product or service which built the reputation of organization is denoted as brand. Brands make the user to trust the product or service sold by the organization. When the organizations have brand name for its product or service, enable them to sell their product or service easily. It produce generic value added product or service which worth for the money the buyers pay. Organizations which are having brand name are quite familiar to customer earned trust and beliefs.

Greene,et al<sup>253</sup> (1994) in their article in Journal of Services Marketing, declare that the firms that do not or will not embrace the issues of internal marketing and incorporate those ingredients into their strategic marketing plan will see their market share and profit base eroding. The article titled, Building brand values through Internal Marketing, shows that quality of service is central to building brand differentiation within industries that do not produce tangible products. Internal marketing is an effective way of drawing attention to service, and encouraging staff in various ways to give the best of them.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>253</sup> Walter E. Greene, Gary D. Walls, Larry J. Schrest, (1994) "Internal Marketing: The Key to External Marketing Success", Journal of Services Marketing, Vol. 8 Iss: 4, pp.5 - 13

### 5.2. Internal Brand Building

The concept of internal branding is viewed as function of the quality of internal customers, and its importance, to the overall Brand Management is outlined, as its relationship with the field of reputation management **Bergstrom et al<sup>254</sup> (2002).** Internal customer can build brand name by acquiring more skills & knowledge in the field of service delivery to the external customers by attending and presenting research papers in seminars, by participating in conference and involving themselves in various research work and projects. According to Vallaster, C & Chernatony, L.255 (2006), internal brand building is necessary for quality services. Internal brand building evolves from leadership quality of internal customers. Since internal customer's deals with external customers, they must possess leadership quality. This leadership quality is possible through internal development. The adequate involvement in research, seminars, workshop develops internal quality of employees. According to research scholar, instead of employees searching job, the organization will have to search them. This will be possible if the employees develop qualities and become branded employees. If they are brand employees, definitely, they will be able to provide quality service. Thus internal brand building must be a component of internal marketing.

Internal Brand Building is a new component which is added in this study by taking several factors into account. The concept of internal branding is reviewed and its importance to the overall brand engagement is outlined, as its relationship with the field of reputation management Bergstrom et al<sup>256</sup> (2002). According to Vallaster C &, Chernatony<sup>257</sup>, (2006),

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>254</sup> Bergstrom, A, Blumenthal, D & Crothers, S (2002) "Why Internal Branding Matters: The Case of Saab", Corporate Reputation Review, Vol. 5, NOS 2/3, pp. 133-142.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>255</sup> Vallaster, C. and de Chernatony, L. (2006), "Internal brand building and structuration: the role ofleadership", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 40 Issues: (7/8), Pp.761 - 784.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>256</sup> Bergstrom, A, Blumenthal, D & Crothers, S (2002) "Why Internal Branding Matters: The Case of Saab", Corporate Reputation Review, Vol. 5, NOS 2/3, Pp. 133-142.

in his research states that internal brand building is necessary for quality services. Internal brand building develops leadership quality of employees. Since internal customer's deals with external customers, they must poise leadership quality, which is possible through internal development. The adequate involvement in research, seminars, workshop develops internal quality of employees. According to research scholar, instead of employees searching job, the organization will have to search them. This will be possible if the employees develop qualities and become branded employees. If they are brand employees, definitely, they will be able to provide quality service. Thus internal brand building must be a component of internal marketing.

### 5.3 Internal Marketing Practices and External Customer Brand Building

Internal Marketing Practices are adapted in the organization for external success only. As the organization adapt and implement internal marketing component, gain competitive advantage and popularity which is shared by the external customer. External customers study from IIM share the brand name of the organization. This is proved by **Greene et al** <sup>258</sup>(1994) in their studies that internal marketing is key factor for external marketing success

### 5.4. Objective

[4] To ascertain relationship between 'The internal marketing Practices' in one hand and 'Internal Brand Building', 'External Brand Building' on the other hand.

### **5.5 Hypothesis**

[4] .There is no significant association between 'The internal marketing Practices' in one hand and 'Internal Brand Building, 'External Brand Building' on the other hand.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>257</sup> Vallaster, C. and de Chernatony, L. (2006), "Internal brand building and structuration: the role ofleadership", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 40 Issues No (7/8), Pp.761 - 784.

Walter E. Greene, Gary D. Walls, Larry J. Schrest, (1994) "Internal Marketing: The Key to External Marketing Success", Journal of Services Marketing, Vol. 8 Issue No: 4, Pp.5 - 13

### 5.6. Latent Variables considered for Chapter 5 and purpose theirof

[a] **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. In other words, it is expected to measure the brand of the Management Education Service providing Organizations as perceived by the External customers i.e. External customers.

[b] **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. In other words, it is expected to measure the brand of the Management Education Service providing Organizations as perceived by the Internal customers i.e. Internal customers.

[c] **Degree of Internal marketing Mix Impact on Internal marketing** - this variable has been considered to measure the degree of/ intensity of the Internal marketing practices followed by management of the 'management Education service providing Organizations' as perceived by the internal customers. It has been used in this chapter in line with what has been done in previous chapter.

### 5.7. Scale Development for chapter 5

### [1] Degree of Internal Branding

[a] Item selection for scales

In order to achieve the fourth objectives items of the scale were identified from literature relating to the latent variable under consideration. Responses are measured in 5 point scale.

Table No: 5.1
Internal Branding as perceived by Internal Customers

S.No.	Statement
17.1	Institution is known for its salary.

17.2	Institution is known for its fringe benefits.		
17.3	Institution is known for providing opportunities for employees' growth.		
17.4	Institution is known for its employees career planning.		
17.5	Institution is known for its reputation in education industry.		
17.6	Institution is known for its target based service.		
17.7	Institution is known for its experienced service in the industry.		
17.8	Institution is known for its additional benefits for additional services.		
17.9	Institution is known for recognizing individual branding.		

**Source: Questionnaire** 

# [b] Reliability of Scales

[i] Over all reliability of scale including all institutions

Table No: 5.2					
Over all Reliability Statistics of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal					
	Customers				
Name of the	Name of the Cronbach's Cronbach's Alpha Based on No of Items				
Institutions Alpha Standardized Items					
	.911	.911	9		

Source: based on Survey data

Table No: 5.3 Summary Item Statistics of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal Customers							
Name of the	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum	Variance	No of
Institutions					/ Minimum		Items
Item Means	3.536	3.100	4.180	1.080	1.348	.109	9
Item	.937	.715	1.137	.423	1.591	.021	9
Variances							

Source: based on Survey data

[ii] Institute wise reliability of scale

Table No: 5.4 Institute wise Reliability Statistics of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal					
	Customers				
Name of the Cronbach's Cronbach's Alpha Based No of Items					
Institution	Alpha	on Standardized Items			

AIM	.943	.945	9
AU	1.000	1.000	9
DBIM	.787	.770	9
DU	.931	.929	9
GIMT	.859	.864	9
GU	.517	.601	9
KU	.926	.927	9
NERIM	.908	.912	9
RSM	.883	.890	9
TU	.583	.651	9

From the above Table No. 5.5 it is observed that scale considered for the study is reliable since calculated Cronbach's Alpha values are more than 0.70.

### [c] Interpretation of the Scale Developed

The more is the scale value; more is the degree of Internal Branding by Internal Marketing Practices of Management Education Service Providing Organization and vice versa.

### [d] Descriptive Statistics of the scale

[i] Overall mean score of degree of internal branding as perceived by internal customers.

Table No: 5.5						
Overall Scale Statistics of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal Customers						
Mean Score	Mean Score Variance Std. Deviation No of Items					
31.82 44.250 6.652 9						

Source: based on Survey data

From the above it is observed that the overall mean score of degree of internal branding as perceived by internal customers is 31.82

[ii] Institute wise mean score of degree of Internal Branding as perceived by internal customers.

Table No: 5.6						
Institute wise n	nean score So	cale Statistics o	of degree of Internal	Branding as		
	perceiv	ed by Interna	l Customers			
Name of the	Name of the Mean Variance Std. Deviation No of Items					
Institution						
AIM	37.30	37.122	6.093	9		
AU	43.20	16.200	4.025	9		
DBIM	32.00	26.250	5.123	9		
DU	26.27	67.218	8.199	9		
GIMT	30.33	20.000	4.472	9		
GU	28.80	18.700	4.324	9		
KU	30.75	53.295	7.300	9		
NERIM	31.61	30.252	5.500	9		
RSM	30.18	25.164	5.016	9		
TU	32.90	11.656	3.414	9		

Here, highest mean score 43.20 in respect of Assam University and least score is 28.80 in respect of Guwahati University; thus, there exists variation in respect of the **of** degree of Internal Branding in MESPOs as Perceived by internal customers.

### [a] Normality Test of the Distribution of the data of the scale

# [i] Overall data

Table No: 5.7 Overall data One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Degree of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal customers			
N 100			
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup> Mean		31.8200	
	Std. Deviation	6.65207	
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.094	
	Positive	.079	

	Negative	094
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.944
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.335
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

# [ii] Institute wise data

		Table No: 5	.8
Institu	ute wise data One-	Sample Kolmogo	rov-Smirnov Test for Degree of
	Internal Brand	ling as perceived	by Internal customers
Name of the	he Institutions		Degree of Internal Branding as
			perceived by Internal customers
AIM	N		10
	Normal	Mean	37.3000
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	6.09280
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.197
	Differences	Positive	.184
		Negative	197
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.622
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.833
AU	N		5
	Normal	Mean	43.2000
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	4.02492
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.473
	Differences	Positive	.327
		Negative	473
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.057
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.214
DBIM	N		9
	Normal	Mean	32.0000
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	5.12348
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.207
	Differences	Positive	.121
		Negative	207
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.622
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.834
DU	N		11

	Normal	Mean	26.2727
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	8.19867
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.172
	Differences	Positive	.116
		Negative	172
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.569
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	ailed)	.902
GIMT	N		9
	Normal	Mean	30.3333
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	4.47214
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.219
	Differences	Positive	.219
		Negative	190
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.656
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	ailed)	.783
GU	N		5
	Normal	Mean	28.8000
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	4.32435
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.209
	Differences	Positive	.141
		Negative	209
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.468
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	railed)	.981
KU	N		12
	Normal	Mean	30.7500
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	7.30037
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.187
	Differences	Positive	.124
		Negative	187
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.646
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	railed)	.798
NERIM	N		18
	Normal	Mean	31.6111
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	5.50015
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.231
	Differences	Positive	.164
		Negative	231
	Kolmogorov-Sm	nirnov Z	.980
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	ailed)	.292
RSM	N		11

	Normal	Mean	30.1818
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	5.01634
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.253
	Differences	Positive	.253
		Negative	172
	Kolmogorov-Sm	irnov Z	.840
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	ailed)	.480
TU	N		10
	Normal	Mean	32.9000
	Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Std. Deviation	3.41402
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.188
	Differences	Positive	.188
		Negative	118
	Kolmogorov-Sm	irnov Z	.596
	Asymp. Sig. (2-t	ailed)	.870
a. Test dist	ribution is Normal.		
b. Calculate	ed from data.		

Since the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) values computed above are more than 0.50, it is concluded that data in the population follow normal distribution. This is true for over all data as well as institute wise data. From the above it is discerned that both at collective level as well as institution level data follow normal distribution

### [2] Degree of External Branding

### [a] Item selection for scales

The second set of questions focused on the level of External Branding by Internal by Internal Marketing Practices as perceived by internal customers. The set of questions were prepared with the help of literature review and interviewing many experienced faculty members and External customers of management education service providing organizations.

Table No: 5.9
External Branding as perceived by External Customers

Ī	S.No.	Statement
		~

18.1	Institution is known for its systematic admission procedure.
18.2	Institution is known for its guidance and counselling.
18.3	Institution is known for its good syllabus.
18.4	Institution is known for its imparting education through seminar and workshops/ guest lectures.
18.5	Institution is known for its innovative method of imparting lessons.
18.6	Institution is known for its placement for External customers.
18.7	Institution is known for its reasonable fees structure.
18.8	Institution is known for its quality of Internal customers.
18.9	Institution is known for its target based service.
18.10	Institution is known outside for its excellence.
18.11	Institution is known for its quality service.
18.12	Alumni are well placed.

Source: Questionnaire

# [b] Reliability of Scales

[i] Overall reliability of scale including all institutions

Table No: 5.10					
Overall Reliability Statistics of External Branding as perceived by External					
	Customers				
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based	No of Items			
on Standardized Items					
.851	.856	12			

Source: based on Survey data

Table No: 5.11 Summary Item Statistics of External Branding as perceived by External Customers							
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum	Variance	No of
					/ Minimum		Items
Item	3.878	3.763	3.964	.202	1.054	.005	12
Means							
Item	.765	.605	.933	.328	1.542	.009	12
Variances							

Source: based on Survey data

### [ii] Institute wise reliability of scale

Table No: 5.12						
Institute wise Reliability Statistics of External Branding as perceived by						
	Extern	nal Customers				
Name of the	Cronbach's	Cronbach's Alpha Based	No of Items			
Institution	Alpha	on Standardized Items				
AIM	.856	.859	12			
AU	.904	.909	12			
DBIM	.804	.799	12			
DU	.857	.863	12			
GIMT	.830	.844	12			
GU	.855	.865	12			
KU	.869	.872	12			
NERIM	.776	.801	12			
RGI	.868	.864	12			
TU	.851	.855	12			

Source: based on Survey data

From the above Table No. 5.12 it is observed that scale considered for the study is reliable since calculated Cronbach's Alpha values are more than 0.70.

### [c] Interpretation of the Scale Developed

The more is the scale value; more is the degree of internal branding by internal marketing practiced as perceived by external customers of management education service providing organizations and vice versa.

### [d] Descriptive Statistics of the scale

[i] Overall mean score of degree of internal branding by internal marketing practiced as perceived by external customers of management education service providing organizations.

Table No: 5.13					
Overall Scale Statistics of degree of External Branding as perceived by External					
	Customers				
Mean score Variance Std. Deviation No of Items					
46.5415	41.781	6.46386	12		

From the above it is observed that overall mean score of degree of internal branding by internal marketing practiced as perceived by external customers of management education service providing organizations is 46.54.

[ii] Institute wise mean score of degree of internal branding by internal marketing practiced as perceived by external customers of management education service providing organizations.

Table No: 5.14							
Institute wise mean score Scale Statistics of degree of External branding as							
Name of the	Perceived by External Customers.  Name of the Mean Variance Std. No of Items						
Institutes	2720022	,	Deviation	1,0 01 10011			
AIM	50.5357	31.162	5.58232	12			
AU	46.6750	59.969	7.74394	12			
DBIM	45.9500	28.613	5.34910	12			
DU	45.5400	48.743	6.98164	12			
GIMT	45.6579	32.393	5.69151	12			
GU	44.7143	44.498	6.67066	12			
KU	46.1200	45.904	6.77522	12			
NERIM	46.6912	28.844	5.37061	12			
RGI	45.4167	44.349	6.65949	12			
TU	48.3000	35.292	5.94073	12			

Source: based on Survey data

Here, highest mean score 50.53 in respect of Assam Institue of Management and least score is 44.71 in respect of Guwahati University; thus, there exists variation in respect of

degree of internal branding by internal marketing practiced as perceived by external customers of management education service providing organizations.

# [a] Normality Test of the Distribution of the data of the scale

## [i] Overall data

Table No: 5.15 Overall data One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for External Branding as perceived by External Customers.				
Degree of External Branding  (as perceived by External  customers)				
N	510			
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	46.3255		
	Std.	7.59019		
	Deviation			
<b>Most Extreme Differences</b>	Absolute	.056		
	Positive	.056		
	Negative	056		
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.269		
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.080		
a. Test distribution is Normal.				
b. Calculated from data.				

Source: based on Survey data

# [ii] Institute wise

Table No. 5.16 Institute wise One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for External Branding as perceived by External Customers.				
Name of the institution			Degree of External Branding as perceived by External customers	
AIM	N		56	
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	45.6964	
		Std.	7.07086	
		Deviation		
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.068	

	Differences	Positive	.055
	2	Negative	068
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.512
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.956
AU	N		40
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	44.2000
		Std.	7.63998
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.112
	Differences	Positive	.112
		Negative	091
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	' · · ·	.711
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.693
DBIM	N		40
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	45.1250
		Std.	5.62589
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.094
	Differences	Positive	.094
		Negative	078
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.594
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.873
DU	N		50
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	45.6600
	- , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Std.	7.66548
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.118
	Differences	Positive	.092
		Negative	118
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Z	.832
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.493
GIMT	N		38
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	44.6316
		Std.	7.61727
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.124
	Differences	Positive	.073
		Negative	124
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.764
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.604

GU	N		63
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	46.8254
		Std.	8.65194
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.095
	Differences	Positive	.064
		Negative	095
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Z	.757
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.616
KU	N		52
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	46.8654
		Std.	6.00009
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.098
	Differences	Positive	.098
		Negative	089
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.707
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.699
NERIM	N		70
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	44.6714
		Std.	7.32817
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.082
	Differences	Positive	.082
		Negative	061
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.686
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.735
RGI	N		60
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	47.4167
		Std.	8.19734
		Deviation	
	Most Extreme	Absolute	.101
	Differences	Positive	.081
		Negative	101
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Z	.780
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.577
TU	N		40
	Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	52.7750
		Std.	6.28179
		Deviation	

	Most Extreme	Absolute	.164
	Differences	Positive	.125
		Negative	164
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.039
	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.230
a. Test distribution is Normal.			
b. Calculated from data.			

Since the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) values computed above are more than 0.50., it is concluded that in the population follow normal distribution. This is for overall data as well as institute wise data.

#### **5.8.** Data Set Generation

For the purpose of the statistical test the average scores based on the above mentioned reliable scales in respect of the above parameters of all the management education service providing institutes were developed and resulted into the following

Table No: 5.17

Data Set Generation for Internal Marketing Practices and Internal and External

Branding

Name of Institutions	Degree of Internal Marketing Practices as perceived by Internal customers	Degree of Internal Branding as perceived by Internal customers	Degree of External Branding as perceived by External customers
AIM	130.00	37.30	50.5357
AU	94.40	43.20	46.6750
DBIM	124.11	32.00	45.9500
DU	107.73	26.27	45.5400
GIMT	117.33	30.33	45.6579
GU	111.80	28.80	44.7143
KU	117.50	30.75	46.1200
NERIM	120.50	31.61	46.6912
RSM	120.64	30.18	45.4167
TU	119.90	32.90	48.3000

Source: based on Survey data

# **5.9.** Hypothesis Testing in Chapter 5

# A. Internal Marketing Practices and Internal Brand Building

Corollary hypotheses are:

# H<sub>4a</sub>: Internal Marketing Practices do not lead to Internal Brand Building

- [a] Application of the Parametric / Non Parametric Test for
- [i] Overall data

Table No: 5.18					
Pearson Correlations between Degree of Internal Marketing Practices and Degree of					
	Internal Branding				
		Degree of Internal	Degree of Internal		
		Marketing Practices	Branding as		
		as perceived by	perceived by		
Internal customers Internal custo					
Degree of Internal	Pearson	1	282		
Marketing Practices	Correlation				
as perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)		.430		
Internal customers	N	10	10		
Degree of Internal	Pearson	282	1		
Branding as	Correlation				
perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)	.430			
Internal customers	N	10	10		

Source: based on Survey data

Table No: 5.19 Spearman's rho Correlations between Degree of Internal Marketing Practices and Degree of Internal Branding				
			Degree of	Degree of
			Internal	Internal
			Marketing	Branding as
			Practices as	perceived by
			perceived by	Internal
			Internal	customers
			customers	
Spearman's	Degree of Internal	Correlation	1.000	.285
rho	<b>Marketing Practices</b>	Coefficient		

as perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)	•	.425
	N	10	10
Degree of Internal	Correlation	.285	1.000
Branding as	Coefficient		
perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)	.425	
Internal customers	N	10	10

### [b] Decision from the Hypothesis Tests applied / conducted

From the above it is observed that there exists very low level of negative relationship between [a] Internal Marketing Practices and [2] Internal Brand Building both in the sample as well as in the population. In other words, Internal Marketing Practices followed in Management Education Service Providing Organization as perceived by internal customers i.e. Internal Customers do not lead to Internal Brand Building of the Management Education Service Providing Organization as perceived by internal customers i.e. Internal Customers.

### B. Internal Marketing Practices and Organizations Brand Building

Internal Marketing Practices adapted by the organization gain competitive advantage in the service industries and becomes a branded organization which is proved by **Nicoleta-Dorina and Sorina-Diana**,(2001), in their study on "Is It The Right Time For Internal Marketing And Employer Branding". Even **Norbani Che Ha**, **Raida Abu Bakar & Syed Izzaddin Syed Jaafar 2007** also point out the same facts in their studies, Internal Marketing Issues in Service Organization for brand building.

### H<sub>4b</sub>: Internal Marketing Practices do not lead to External Brand Building

[a]application of the Parametric / Non Parametric Test for

[i] Overall

Table No: 5.20
Pearson Correlations between Degree of Internal Marketing Practices and Degree of
External Branding

		Degree of Internal Marketing Practices as perceived by Internal customers	Degree of External Branding as perceived by External customers
Degree of Internal	Pearson	1	.429
<b>Marketing Practices</b>	Correlation		
as perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)		.216
Internal customers	N	10	10
Degree of External	Pearson	.429	1
Branding as	Correlation		
perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)	.216	
<b>External customers</b>	N	10	10

Table No:5.21 Spearman's rho Correlations between Degree of Internal Marketing Practices and Degree of External Branding					
9			Degree of Internal Marketing Practices as perceived by Internal	Degree of External Branding as perceived by External customers	
Spearman's	Degree of Internal	Correlation	customers 1.000	.370	
rho	Marketing Practices	Coefficient			
	as perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)		.293	
	Internal customers	N	10	10	
	Degree of External	Correlation	.370	1.000	
	Branding as	Coefficient			
	perceived by	Sig. (2-tailed)	.293		
	<b>External customers</b>	N	10	10	

Source: based on Survey data

### [C] Decision from the Hypothesis Tests applied / conducted

From the above, it is observed that there exists a moderate level of positive association between [a] the level of Internal Marketing Practices and [b] the level of External Brand Building both in respect of sample considered as well as in the population. In other words,

Internal Marketing Practices followed in Management Education Service Providing Organizations [ as perceived by the internal customers i.e. Internal customers] do lead to little External Brand Building of the Management Education Service Providing Organizations [ as perceived by the external customers i.e. External customers].

#### **5.10.** Conclusion

Given the objective, hypothesis and methodology, there exists very low level of negative relationship between [a] Internal Marketing Practices and [2] Internal Brand Building both in the sample as well as in the population. In other words, Internal Marketing Practices followed in Management Education Service Providing Organization as perceived by internal customers i.e. Internal Customers do not lead to Internal Brand Building of the Management Education Service Providing Organization as perceived by internal customers i.e. Internal customers

Given the objective, hypothesis and methodology, there exists a moderate level of positive association between [a] the level of Internal Marketing Practices and [b] the level of External Brand Building both in respect of sample considered as well as in the population. In other words, Internal Marketing Practices followed in Management Education Service Providing Organizations [as perceived by the internal customers i.e. Internal customers] do lead to little External Brand Building of the Management Education Service Providing Organizations [as perceived by the external customers i.e. External customers].

It is observed that **There is no significant association between** 'The internal marketing Practices followed in Management Education Providing Organization in one hand and 'Internal Brand Building, 'External Brand Building' on the other hand in respect of Management Education Service Providing Organizations.