

Proposal

**Employer branding, a tool for employee retention?
The impact of national cultures on HR policies and employer branding**

Chloé ASSOUS, Master Student, Specialisation HRM, IPAG Business School, Nice,
chloe.assous@ipag.fr

Hugo CABALLERO, Master Student, Specialisation HRM, IPAG Business School,
Nice, hugo.caballero@ipag.fr

Dr. Marie Jose SCOTTO, Associate Professor & Faculty Head of HRM, IPAG
Business School, Nice, m.scotto@ipag.fr

Dr. Jeanette McDONALD, Associate Professor of Marketing & Strategy, IPAG
Business School, Nice, j.mcdonald@ipag.fr

Abstract

The need to recruit and retain the best employable talents has become increasingly important. The cost of recruitment, not only in monetary terms, but also in the valuable use of human resources, is an investment that employers cannot afford to get wrong. The role of the employer and the Human Resource department has evolved. Companies are now seeing their commercial brand being used to attract and retain their workforce (Tripathi et al., 2020). This is arguably more complicated in cross-national and cross-cultural companies working with global brands and an international workforce. The aim of this research is to examine the influence of national culture and its impact on employee retention through employer branding. Cultural variables (Hofstede, 1980; Meyer 2014) along with Value dimensions (Berthon et al., 2015) provide a theoretical framework to support the research. Findings suggest a better understanding of how national culture may influence a company's HR policies and the elements that may impact employee retention through employer branding.

Keywords: Employer Branding, Retention, Employee Talent, HR policies, National Culture

Introduction

The need to recruit and retain the best employable talents has become increasingly important. The cost of recruitment, not only in monetary terms, but also in the valuable use of human resources, is an investment that employers cannot afford to get wrong. Today's workforce who offer experience, skills, and qualifications, benefit from influential information from other organisations and media communication. This creates opportunities for both young recruits and existing employees, generating a sense of competition in what is known as the war for talent Beechler & Woodward (2009).

This search for new and existing talent has encouraged employers to become more strategic with their human resources. The role of the employer and the Human Resource department has evolved with the offer of exchange between staff and management being somewhat more negotiable. Companies are now seeing their commercial brand being used to attract and retain their workforce (Tripathi et al., 2020). By using an employer brand, that denotes company values and pertains to a sense of trust, care and belonging for its staff, encourages a motivated and loyal workforce who wish to be part of that brand and therefore the company. The outcome is one of productivity with retained employees who are willing to invest and improve their talents, assisting their company and its brand to remain competitive in its challenges (Singh, 2021).

Since the 1990's much has been researched in relation to employer branding and its benefits in generating retention (Tripathi et al., 2020; Wolfswinkel & Enslin, 2020; Hadi & Ahmed, 2018; Al Badawy et al., 2017), creating brand attractiveness (Ambler & Barrow 1996; Berthon et al., 2005), the role of CSR (Mishra & Chakraborty, 2022) and diversity (Joly and Ouvrard, 2023). The importance of Human Resources is repeatedly highlighted through the literature, however there is a lack of discussion of the influence of specific HR policies on employer branding and employee retention from a diverse national cultural perspective. Therefore, the aim of this research is to address the following : "Is employer branding a tool for employee retention? The impact of national cultures on HR policies and employer branding." In order to answer this overall aim, two principle research questions were proposed;

- What are the elements impacting employee retention through employer branding?
- What is the impact of national culture on employer branding?

A sample of French and Dutch employees of the international employer Starbucks was interviewed. Starbucks represents a global brand that has successfully integrated in over seventy countries worldwide working with varied cultural contexts. The sample was primarily thanks to access with the different cultural characteristics providing a diverse and comparative research.

The Employer Brand

Berthon et al., (2005) define the employer brand as the reference to the functional, economical, and psychological advantages offered by the employer. Ambler & Barrow's (1996) definition stipulate that it allows the company to present itself as an employer, presenting a more personal use of the brand. A more recent description by Chiu et al., 2020 and Mouton & Bussin, 2019, respectively, states that employer branding is an approach used by companies to retain employees and attract new individuals to be part of the company. It is a value proposition and a one-job pledge for current and potential employees (Soulez & Guillot, 2011; Srivastava & Bhatnagar, 2010; Ewing et al., 2002).

Using Employer Branding as a HR Tool

The importance and use of the employer brand and employer branding represent a real asset for companies. It (EB) is a powerful HR tool that enables companies to position themselves externally, and communicate to a selected group of the workforce, saving valuable resources in the recruitment process. The internal process of building the brand, communicating company values, its mission, its vision, and ongoing exchange of information, supports the retention and sustainability of current staff. Employees relate to psychological ownership (Chiang et al., 2013) of the brand, projecting positive attitudes and behaviour of the workforce. By using internal and external processes, organisations hope to employ the necessary resources for the development and growth of the company.

Employer brands can create a form of differentiation for companies, enabling competitive advantage in an array of sectors, when attracting candidates in their recruitment process and retaining their most talented employees (Subbarao et al., 2022; Gaddam, 2008). Companies use the internal branding process to develop themselves, in the inside, thus attracting the best people, making themselves stand out from other competitors in their field, and developing employee retention initiatives. This in turn has created a ranking system for companies, eager to obtain the position as the best company to work for or ideal employer (Charbonnier-Voirin & Vignolles, 2016).

Identifying what makes the brand attractive also assists in differentiating and retaining talent. Developed from research carried out initially by Ambler and Barrow (1996), Berthon et al., (2005) demonstrated how companies can benefit when understanding a set of five Values applied to Employer Branding. The first is the Interest value; this evaluates how the employer provides a working environment that encourages innovative and creative opportunities. Social Value assesses how the employer creates an environment that provides a team spirit and trustworthy relationships between coworkers. Economic Value measures the attractiveness of an employer who is offering a higher than the average income. Other advantages such as transportation contribution, private insurance etc. may also be considered. This factor is especially interesting to measure in an international context, as laws of specific countries may impact the expectations of employees. Development Value assesses the impact of the company's policies that offer recognition, confidence and a sense of being valued with promotional prospects. Finally, the Application Value, this estimates how an employer encourages employees to share their existing and learned knowledge. This is demonstrated at an integration and training level. The essence is that the application is done from a humanitarian and customer perspective. Applying and measuring these Values to an Employer's brand, enables companies to understand future and actual employees' expectations.

These Values encourage a sense of belonging, which can be beneficial for companies and employees. Being motivated by sharing, trust and sincerity, employees feel essential and wish to share the same vision and have the same common objectives. Employer branding is known to enhance employee engagement (Easa & Bazz, 2020; Charbonnier-Voirin & Vignolles, 2015; Kapoor & Meacham, 2010; Mandhanya & Shah, 2010; Ambler & Barrow, 1996), improve employee satisfaction (Gaddam, 2008) and motivation. It provides a strategic tool in the recruitment process, developing confident, create and innovate personnel as well as retaining existing talent who are happy, loyal and eager to see "their" company grow.

A sense of belonging is an important and efficient method in preventing risks. It can be developed by the workforce, the management of work, the work atmosphere, the link between professional life and personal life to name but a few. It prevents eventual demotivation and

discouragement that could result in significant repercussions for both the employees and the company. Monitoring psychosocial risks at work needs to be a matter of course within all companies in order to ensure development, efficiency and avoid absenteeism.

Although EB generates many favourable outcomes, the construction can be rather complex. Coherency between internal and external processes as well as agreed objectives may be difficult to manage between the array of stakeholders. The size, sector, activity of the company, as well as the number of departments and number of employees (especially those involved with the construction process) need to be considered. Company logistics such as geography, time difference, resources available (tangible and non-tangible) can arguably represent challenges (Joly and Ouvrard, 2021). It is important therefore that these factors of employer branding are considered in the construction of the employer brand at all levels of the company, nationally and internationally.

The importance of HR Management in a Cultural context

Classic HRM functions, such as recruitment, socialisation, training, and development are determined by different conceptions of the role and nature of management effectiveness. These conceptions are underpinned by related cultural values (Sparrow & Wu, 1998). For cross-national and cross-cultural companies, understanding the expectations of the employee is not only key to satisfying current employees with present HRM policies, but also in attracting new talents. Human capital is the whole knowledge, skills, innovative capacity and know-how of the employees, it is also the values, culture, and philosophy of a society (Edvinsson, 1999). The challenges for cross-cultural companies in implementing HRM policies become harder when a company must respond to the codes of different national cultures, with different philosophies and different values. The employer has the responsibility to provide the tools, implement the right policies and use the right management for the employee to be able to create a positive experience in their work. For this concept, HR policies and management methods would need to consider the different needs and expectations of employees, regarding their national culture (de Mooij & Hofstede, 2010). The culture of the employees has an important impact on the global performance of the company, as well as on the brand image. Expectations are different from employees, according to their national culture and no one will act and react the same towards HR policies and managerial practices, even within the same company. The improvement made by companies has raised the expectations of potential new employees, and previous HRM policies are no longer sufficient to satisfy the current workforce. This is even more true in an international context, as globalisation directly impacts the expectations of employees as well as the number of competitors a company now has to face. Employees are not passive actors, the brand experience is created by the employer with the impact of the choices and actions of the employee (Pezet et al., 2013).

High and low context cultures

The message that is often sent by the management or the HR department of a company will be interpreted differently if employees come from a high or low context culture. In a high context culture, the relation between individuals in society is linked to a predefined role those individuals must play in the society, the culture of a country defines the organization of a society. (Hall, 1959). The notion of politics is almost nonexistent in low context cultures. Culture affects the relations and communication between individuals, and the perception of hierarchical relations inside the social group. This directly impacts the internal communication implemented by companies. Communication transmits both information and emotions. Low context cultures expect clear and direct communication. It gives less importance to informal factors of communication, such as nonverbal communication. To be understood, communication with

hierarchical superiors and managers will be clear, honest, and direct. In a high context culture environment, people tend to value more, the sense of belonging to a community (Hall, 1959). Communication is influenced by nonverbal expressions, physical and social settings. Individuals tend to be more reflective, intuitive, and concerned with the overall community. Employees would equally expect a clear and honest discourse from the hierarchy, however, how the communication is transmitted, and the wording used may have more relevance. To succeed in employer branding, it is imperative that employers understand the characteristics of each cultural setting and relate to employees within that setting.

Methodology

A qualitative constructivist approach was applied to the interviews of ten Starbucks employees. These were divided into five from France and five from the Netherlands, respectively. The majority, 70% have been employed for less than two years and included managers, frontline employees and employees working in the office. The data was collected via video recording, with an average duration of 45 minutes and approximately 4000 words per interview. Starbucks was chosen primarily due to sample access. The company's global brand status (presented in 76 countries), provide an international context, enabling a cultural comparison for this research.

In answering the overall aim of the research “Is employer branding a tool for employee retention? The impact of national cultures on HR policies and employer branding.” the following two research questions were asked:

- What are the elements impacting employee retention through employer branding?
- What is the impact of national culture on employer branding?

The five Values (Berthon et al., 2005) Interest, Social, Economic, Development and Application, measuring attractiveness and retention by was adapted for this research. Erin Meyer's (2014) Culture map, using the variables; Communicating, Evaluating, Leading, Deciding and Trusting were aligned to compare the cultural differences between France, The Netherlands and the US, respectively.

Results and Discussion

When evaluating the Interest Value, the French employees considered “personal development” as receiving new skills and the opportunity to grow professionally, inside or outside the company. The Dutch employees defined personal development as their relations with their colleagues, the opportunities regarding their personal life and the life quality Starbucks would provide to them. The French employees defined themselves as being part of the Starbucks community, where they can demonstrate their skills and provide added value to the company. The Dutch however believed that they could bring more to the company and that their skills were not used to their maximum capacity. This resonates with the Deciding scale in Meyers (2014) Culture Map. When linked to the Interest Value, the Dutch demonstrate that decisions should be consensual, with perhaps more negotiation. Whereas the French are driven by top-down decisions, being influenced by hierarchy. For the French, the well established status quo seemed harder to contradict than for the Dutch associates.

The Interest Value where companies provide innovative and creative opportunities, could be perceived to be the success of Starbucks. Giving employees the feeling of making a difference is directly related to Charbonnier-Voirin & Vignolles's (2015) work that reveals the connection between employer branding and employee engagement. Innovation and creative opportunities improve satisfaction (Gaddam, 2008) and motivation (Mandhanya & Shah, 2010). Employer

branding provides a stimulus for employees and new recruits towards an organisation (Benraiss-Noailles & Voit, 2007).

The second value to be measured was the Social Value. A key element that was immediately identified was the impact of colleagues on their own professional experience; every employee described their connection to their colleagues and the relationship that they had with them. The relations and atmosphere with manager were described as cordial or even friendly. For the Dutch employees it appeared to be natural to describe relations with their managers as being cordial and close relations were considered “normal”. The French employees however seemed more eager, even surprised about this closeness with management at all levels. This closeness was welcomed very positively, especially by the French employees.

The results also brought to light that the external brand image of Starbucks was perceived positively in both the Netherlands and France. This positive external brand image gave employees, a feeling of pride and a sense of belonging to the Starbucks community. This was especially true for the French employees denoting a sense of community, confirming the characteristics of a high context culture (Hall, 1959). A sense of belonging also stimulates employee engagement (Easa & Bazz, 2020), developing loyalty and encouraging motivation.

With reference to the Economic Value, the French employees perceived Starbucks financial benefits as low with a rather standard compensation package. This resonates with France being considered a feminine culture, where values such as equality and quality of life are considered to be important (Hofstede Insights, 2023). Starbucks is known to provide rather low wages to French personnel, although the compensation package is implemented to further reward the workforce, the French are less satisfied with it than the Dutch. The Dutch personnel also positioned Starbucks financial offer as low, but found the compensations package attractive. In the French context, economic value was the main reason employees would leave, if not satisfied. This could be explained by the difference between the social achievements of the two countries and also by their expectations. The interviews conducted with the French employees showed the importance of social achievements in the culture, however these gains proved to be less important in the Netherlands, employees had fewer expectations about the company and were therefore less impacted by the policy put in place by Starbucks.

When referring to the Development Value, recognition policies were noted as being unusual and uncommon in the French and Dutch cultures. It was noted that 100% of the sample responded that the recognition policies were extraordinarily developed, compared to other companies that they had worked for, or heard about. The findings brought to light that employees from France and the Netherlands showed a positive attitude and much enthusiasm towards toward Starbucks HR policies. This importation of the US culture on the French and Dutch denotes a positive outcome on the internal branding strategy of Starbucks. The US brand nevertheless, does not adapt its HR internal policies to the national cultures of its markets abroad, confirming the country-of-origin effect, defined by Ferner, (1997).

The US culture, based on indirect negative feedback and motivated by direct positive feedback is far from both the French and Dutch cultures (Meyer, 2014). American and Dutch cultures tend to base trust on facts, whereas the French culture relies on relationships, denoting possible bias and favoritism. This may arguably have an influence on employee recognition and development opportunities. A French employee may feel that they have less opportunities to earn recognition if there is a breakdown in their relations with their superiors. For the Dutch culture, closer to the American one on this topic, employees believe that recognition is given

by both colleagues and managers, on the professional performance of an employee, regardless of relations. This relates to Hofstede's (1980) power of distance where the French culture is a hierarchical society, and hierarchy is implemented vertically. The Dutch culture scores low in the power of distance, meaning that society is perceived as egalitarian, relating to a horizontal hierarchy.

Another aspect of the development value is the perception of growth in the company. The qualitative research showed that those employees who worked at Starbucks for more than five years felt that they had grown within the company. The recognition program at Starbucks, is well established and processed, which creates added value, assessing the career-enhancing experience and the opportunities given by the employer. Organisations who monitor their HR practices and see their employees as individuals communicate their role as an employer (App et al., 2012; Goldberg & Allen, 2008). Focusing on HR practices is a principal objective for companies. By investing and developing their practices, employers will encourage loyalty (Gonring, 2008) and significantly improve their attractiveness and therefore, retain employees.

The concept of training employees, in the Application Value, is considered more developed in the US than France or the Netherlands. Starbucks resonates with the norms of American businesses, where employees are autonomous and demonstrate initiative. Training is provided, where then employers can expect expertise and reliability (Hofstede Insights, 2023). The value of application is also supported by Zeithaml et al., (2006) who highlight the importance of training and supporting their employees to deliver.

Training was positively welcomed by the French employees, who saw it as a way to connect and to transmit or collect knowledge. This developed for them a feeling of being useful, and having a meaning to their job, signifying the needs of belonging to a community (Hall, 1959). The Dutch employees however believed that the formation was not efficient nor satisfying. This could be due to the different cultural perceptions of the role of a manager. For France, which is a hierarchical and collectivist society, it is the role of a manager to "help" his/her team to develop, to accompany them in their work and provide them with the tools they need to succeed in their Job. On the other hand, the Dutch individualist and egalitarian culture, managers consider themselves at the same level as the employees, and do not consider the development of their team as a priority.

Conclusions, limits and perspectives

The aim of this research was to examine the influence of national culture and its impact on employee retention through employer branding. Based on the literature findings of employer branding, its role as a strategic HR tool and national cultural influences, the research justified further investigation into the national cultural influences on employer branding retention.

Dutch and French national cultures were applied to the international brand Starbucks, evaluating their HR policies and employer branding strategy. To understand the impact of national culture on employer branding, Hofstede, (1980); Hofstede Insights, (2023), as well as Meyer's (2014) Culture Map were used. To evaluate the elements impacting employee retention, five empirically tested values (Ambler & Barrow, 1996; Berthon et al., 2005) were assessed.

A general preliminary consensus is that both the Dutch and French employees recognise Development Value as being the most likely to retain employees at Starbucks. This was predominantly due to the successful recognition programme and the perspective of growth in the company. Results demonstrated that through each Value dimension (Berthon et al., 2005),

national culture had some impact on the elements of employer branding. To conclude, it was demonstrated that not all HR policies were transferable, as defined by Ferner (1997).

The initial primary findings of this research contribute to a better understanding of how national culture may influence a company's HR policies and the elements that may impact employee retention through employer branding. The results constitute the benefits and the challenges that International companies operating in a highly diverse environment, may face. They also provide realistic recommendations that may be implemented in an employer's branding strategy for retaining talent and therefore personnel stability.

Finally, the main limitations of this work are the logistics of the data collection and the number of given interviews. The videoconference method did not enable more in depth discussion to take place and with only 10 interviews, the results are arguably exploratory in nature. Therefore, further quantitative research, using a larger sample, with a more diverse group may provide more reliable results.

Bibliography

Al Badawy, T. A., Fahmy, V. M., & Magdy, M. M. (2017). Can employer branding raise the retention and motivation of Egyptian employees? *Journal of Competitiveness Studies*, 25(3/4), 250-265.

Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of brand management*, 4, 185-206.

App, S., Merk, J., & Büttgen, M. (2012). Employer branding: Sustainable HRM as a competitive advantage in the market for high-quality employees. *Management revue*, 262-278.

Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career development international*, 9(5), 501-517.

Beechler, S., & Woodward, I. C. (2009). The global "war for talent". *Journal of international management*, 15(3), 273-285.

Benraiss-Noailles, L., & Viot, C. (2017). Attractivité des entreprises low-cost: le rôle du Capital-Marque Employeur. *Revue française de gestion*, (5), 89-109.

Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International journal of advertising*, 24(2), 151-172.

Brakus, J. J., Schmitt, B. H., & Zarantonello, L. (2009). Brand experience: what is it? How is it measured? Does it affect loyalty? *Journal of marketing*, 73(3), 52-68.

Charbonnier-Voirin, A., & Vignolles, A. (2015). Marque employeur interne et externe-Un état de l'art et un agenda de recherche. *Revue française de gestion*, 41(246), 63-82.

Chiang, H. H., Chang, A., Han, T. S., & McConville, D. (2013). Corporate branding, brand psychological ownership and brand citizenship behaviour: Multilevel analysis and managerial implications. *Journal of General Management*, 39(1), 55-80.

- Chiu, J. L., Fajardo, J. J., Lopez, P. N., & Miranda, J. L. F. (2020). The effect of employer branding on turnover intention and employee satisfaction of the utility industry in the Philippines. *Management Review: An International Journal*, 15(2), 53-76.
- Chhabra, B., & Mishra, M. (2022). Fair and Square: Impact of Hospitality Employees' Justice Perceptions and Job Embeddedness on Citizenship Behavior during COVID-19. *Organizations and Markets in Emerging Economies*, 13(2), 357-383.
- De Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2010). The Hofstede model: Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research. *International Journal of advertising*, 29(1), 85-110.
- Easa, N. F., & Bazzi, A. M. (2020). The influence of employer branding on employer attractiveness and employee engagement and retention: Ten years of literature. *International Journal of Customer Relationship Marketing and Management (IJCRMM)*, 11(4), 48-69.
- Edvinsson, L., & Malone, M. (1999). Le Capital immatériel de l'entreprise: Identification, Mesure. *Management, Maxima, Laurent de Mesnil Editions*.
- Ewing, M. T., Pitt, L. F., De Bussy, N. M., & Berthon, P. (2002). Employment branding in the knowledge economy. *International Journal of advertising*, 21(1), 3-22.
- Franca, V., & Pahor, M. (2012). The strength of the employer brand: Influences and implications for recruiting. *Journal of Marketing & Management*, 3(1).
- Ferner, A. (1997). Country of origin effects and HRM in multinational companies. *Human resource management journal*, 7(1), 19.
- Gaddam, S. (2008). Modeling Employer Branding Communication: The Softer Aspect of HR Marketing Management. *ICFAI Journal of Soft Skills*, 2(1).
- Goldberg, C. B., & Allen, D. G. (2008). Black and white and read all over: Race differences in reactions to recruitment web sites. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management*, 47(2), 217-236.
- Gonring, M. P. (2008). Customer loyalty and employee engagement: an alignment for value. *Journal of Business Strategy*.
- Hadi, N. U., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Role of employer branding dimensions on employee retention: Evidence from educational sector. *Administrative sciences*, 8(3), 44.
- Hall, E. T. (1959). *The Silent Language*. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, (Sage; Newbury Park, CA).
- Hofstede Insights (2022). Country Comparision. Retrieved April 2023 from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com>

Joly, C & Ouvrard, M. (2023) Diversité, Inclusion et Marque employeur : comment les faire dialoguer ? Association française des managers de la diversité (afmd). Retrieved March 2023 from [https : www.afmd.fr/marque_employeur](https://www.afmd.fr/marque_employeur)

Kapoor, S., & Meachem, A. (2012). Employee Engagement-A Bond between Employee and Organisation. *Amity Global Business Review*, 7.

Mandhanya, Y., & Shah, M. (2010). EMPLOYER BRANDING-A TOOL FOR TALENT MANAGEMENT. *Global Management Review*, 4(2).

Meyer, E. (2016). The Culture Map: Decoding How People Think. *Lead, and Get Things Done Across Cultures*, 61.

Mishra, N., & Chakraborty, T. (2021). Employee Perception and Corporate Social Responsibility: A Step toward Employer Branding. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 50(2).

Mouton, H., & Bussin, M. (2019). Effectiveness of employer branding on staff retention and compensation expectations. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 22(1), 1-8.

Pezet E., Poujol F.J. et Pignault A. (2013), « Le management de la marque employeur », in Michel G. (Coord.), *Management transversal de la marque: Une exploration au cœur des marques*, Dunod, p. 89-94

Singh, R. P. (2021). Employer Branding Literature Review. *Feedforward: Journal of Human Resource*, 1(2), 105-112.

Soulez, S., & Guillot-Soulez, C. (2011). Marketing de recrutement et segmentation générationnelle : regard critique à partir d'un sous-segment de la génération Y. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)*, 26(1), 39-57.

Sparrow, P., & Wu, P. C. (1998). Does national culture really matter? Predicting HRM preferences of Taiwanese employees. *Employee Relations*.

Subbarao, N. V., Chhabra, B., & Mishra, M. (2022). Social media usage behavior in job search: Implications for corporate image and employer branding. *Managing Disruptions in Business: Causes, Conflicts, and Control*, 51-79.

Tripathi, V., Srivastava, A., & Tripathi, A. (2020). Employer Branding: A Strategic Tool for Employee Retention in IT Industry. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 17(1).

Wolfswinkel, M.B., & Ensline, C. (2020). Talent attraction and retention through brand building: An exploration of practices in companies that are top South African brands. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*

Zeithaml, V. A., Bolton, R. N., Deighton, J., Keiningham, T. L., Lemon, K. N., & Petersen, J. A. (2006). Forward-looking focus: can firms have adaptive foresight?. *Journal of Service Research*, 9(2), 168-183.