IJFANS INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES
ISSN PRINT 2319 1775 Online 2320 7876
 Journal UGC CARE Listed (Group-I) Volume 11, Iss 03 2022

Exploring Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness: The Role of Age, Gender, Education and Work Experience

Ms. Deepali Mandalia[*1], Dr. Harishchandra Singh Rathod[2], Dr. Radhika Gaurang Shah[3]

[1]Research Scholar, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad (Gujarat)
deepalihmorwani@gmail.com
[2]Director, Shri Jairambhai Patel Institute of Business Management and Compute, Applications, Gandhinagar (Gujarat), drhsrathod@gmail.com
[3]Assistant Professor, Gujarat Technological University, Ahmedabad (Gujarat).
radhikags1987@gmail.com

Abstract

The study focuses on relationship between dimensions of institute attractiveness and demographic variables in higher education institutions. The research evaluates five dimensions of institute attractiveness: Economic Value (EV), Development Value (DV), Social Value (SV), Interest Value (IV) and Application Value (AV) with demographic variables such as gender, type of employment, experience, qualification and tenure in organisation. To study this relationship, descriptive single cross sectional research design was used. The sampling method was non-probability convenience sampling and sample size was 73 teachers from higher education institutions. Findings of the study indicate that there is no significant difference in perceived importance for dimensions of institute attractiveness between male and female. Results highlight significant differences in the perceived importance of dimensions. Social and Application Values are found more critical among five dimensions. Significant differences were found based on type of employment, qualification, experience and tenure. This highlights perceptions for institute attractiveness across respondent demographics. These findings can be useful for higher education institutions to enhance their appeal as an employer.

Key Words: Employer Attractiveness, Institute Attractiveness, Employer Branding, Demographic Variables

Introduction

As per All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2020-2021, there are 15,51,070 total number of faculty members/teachers of which about 57.1% are males and 42.9% are females[1]. As per the All India Survey on Higher Education (AISHE) 2020-21 report, out of the total 5,43,135 faculty positions available in universities, 4,09,711 positions have been filled, leaving 1,33,424 positions vacant. This represents a vacancy rate of approximately 24.57%, highlighting a considerable gap in faculty recruitment.

The shortage of well-trained faculty in universities has been a longtime problem in India. The reasons behind these problems are limited budgets, delays in recruitment, and a lack of appealing incentives for skilled candidates. The high vacancy rate is matter of concern because it affects the quality of education and research in universities. To solve this issue, efforts are

[1] https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1894517

required to take. Such efforts can be to increase funding, simplify recruitment processes, and offer better incentives to attract talented faculty[2].

Aiman-Smith et al. (2001) noted organizational attractiveness is defined as "an attitude or expressed general positive affect toward an organization and toward viewing the organization as a desirable entity with which to initiate some relationship." Employer attractiveness can be explained as an organization's ability to attract and retain talent as a result of its reputation and attractiveness as an employer. It is the image perceived by possible and current employees of the company as a place to work as well as a place that offers benefits, values and culture[3].

Berthon, Ewing and Hah (2005) said that the internal marketing concept specifies that an organization's employees are its first market. On of the goal off internal marketing is to build 'employer branding' or explicitly 'employer attractiveness'. An Employer attractiveness is defined as the intended benefits that a potential employee perceives in working for a specific organization. It is a blend of an important concepts in the contexts where attracting employees with superior skills and knowledge comprises a key source of competitive advantage. Thus, the question is what attracts or matters for an employee to join or stay with an organization. They developed scale of employer attractiveness and identified dimensions namely social value, economic value, development value, application value and interest value.

Literature Review

Kalinska-Kula and Staniec (2021) studied employer branding and organisational attractiveness for currently employed employees. They found that employer branding could change employees' perception about organisational attractiveness. Alnıaçık & Alniacik (2012) studied dimensions of employer attractiveness and effect of gender, age and employment status on them. The study found significant differences in how respondents of different genders perceived the importance of employer attractiveness dimensions. But no differences were observed based on age or current employment status. It was also understood from the data analysis that out of all dimensions of employer attractiveness, "social value dimension" was considered most important dimensions among the respondents. Female respondents were showing higher importance to social value and application value dimensions compared to males.

Pingle & Kaur (2019) have done comparative analysis of employer attractiveness between MBA students and working professionals. The study concluded that perceptions differ significantly between current and potential employees, as well as between males and females. Current employees prioritize recognition and appreciation from management, while potential employees give importance to opportunities for career-enhancing experiences the most. **F**urther findings suggest that there is no significant differences in terms of the perceived levels of importance for dimensions of employer brand between male and female.

Prakash, Yadav, Singh & Aarti. (2022) studied employer attractiveness in higher educational institutions. The study concludes that five dimensions of employer attractiveness such as economic value, social value, developmental value, interest value and application value

[2] https://educationforallinindia.com/aihes-status-of-higher-education-india/
[3] https://www.m-work.co/en/glossary-terms/attractivite-employeur

significantly contribute to higher educational intuitions' attractiveness as an employer. There is a significant difference found between male and female potential employees of higher education institutions based on application value. The other dimensions (economic, social, developmental and interest) do not significantly differ. Terjesen, Vinnicombe and Freeman, C. (2007) studied importance preference for organisational attributes between male and female of Gen Y graduates. They found that gender differences exist in the importance of organisational attributes.

There is a huge gap between demand and supply of qualified and talented teachers in education sector. It is required to study relationship between demographic variables (age, gender, education and employment type) and dimensions of employer attractiveness to fill the gap and attract the talent. The present study is an attempt to understand relationship between demographic variables and dimensions of institute attractiveness in colleges of Gujarat state.

Research Methodology

In the present study, independent variables are gender, age, education and employment type while dimensions of institute attractiveness (employer attractiveness) such as social value, economic value, development value, interest value and application values are dependent variables. The primary objective of the study is to understand relationship between demographic variables and dimensions of institute attractiveness. In the present study, research type is fundamental research and research design is single cross-sectional design (Cooper and Schindler, 2014). Primary data was collected through systematically designed interviewer administered questionnaire. The secondary data was collected from past research work, articles, comments etc. from various sources. Non-probability Convenience Sampling method was used for data collection (Kothari & Garg, 2014). Total 73 responses were collected from teachers of different colleges of Gujarat. To study the difference among the dimensions of institute attractiveness, paired sample test was performed. To study role of demographic variables, t-test and ANOVA test were performed. The dimensions of institute attractiveness were measured on five-point Likert scale where 1 = very unimportant to 5 = Very Important (Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, 2010). The scale was adopted from the Berthon, P. & Ewing, Michael & Hah, L.L (2005).

Data Analysis and Findings

Respondents Profile

Table No. 1 Respondents Profile (N=73)

Demographic Variable	Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
Age	24-29	13	17.8
	30-35	25	34.2
	36-41	20	27.4
	42-47	10	13.7
	48-53	3	4.1
	54-59	2	2.7
Gender	Male	35	47.9
	Female	38	52.1
Qualification	Post Graduation	37	50.7

	PhD	34	46.6
	Others	2	2.7
Total Experience	Less than Five Years	13	17.8
	6-10 Years	26	35.6
	11-15 Years	17	23.3
	16 - 20 Years	9	12.3
	21-25 Years	6	8.2
	More than 25 Years	2	2.7
Tenure in Current Organisation	Less than one year	20	27.4
	2-4 Years	33	45.2
	5-7 Years	10	13.7
	8-10 Years	3	4.1
	More than 10 Years	7	9.6

Table 1 depicts the profile of the respondents. The highest number of respondents belong to the age group of 30–35 years (34.2%), followed by 36–41 years (27.4%), with fewer individuals aged 48 and above (6.8%). The sample shows a balanced gender distribution, with 52.1% being female and 47.9% male. Regarding educational qualifications, most respondents have completed post-graduation (50.7%), while 46.6% have earned PhDs, and only 2.7% fall into other categories. In terms of professional experience, the largest group has 6–10 years of experience (35.6%), followed by 11–15 years (23.3%). Only 2.7% have more than 25 years of experience. For tenure in the current organization, 45.2% have been employed for 2–4 years, and 27.4% have less than one year of tenure. A smaller proportion has more than 10 years of tenure (9.6%).

Assessment of Scale: Institute Attractiveness

Table No. 2 Assessment of Scale for Institute Attractiveness

No. of Items	Items	Mean	S. D.	Factor Loading	Cronbach Alph
1. Economic Value					
1	Pay as per UGC	3.9	1.43	0.84	0.97
2	Overall Compensation as per Industry	3.99	1.46	0.84	
3	Regular Increment	3.18	1.48	0.84	
4	Fringe Benefits	3.25	1.42	0.85	
5	Gratuity Benefits	3.05	1.54	0.87	
6	EPF	3.48	1.52	0.75	
7	Performance Incentive	3.64	1.40	0.81	
8	Incentives for R&D	3.7	1.41	0.86	
9	Travel Grants	3.68	1.42	0.79	
10	Other Allowance	3.73	1.47	0.88	
2. Development Value					
1	T&D Opportunity	4.23	1.30	0.83	0.94
2	Promotion Opportunity	4.15	1.28	0.80	
3	Assigns Challenging Responsibility	4.24	1.27	0.89	
4	Administrative Responsibility	3.98	1.30	0.88	
5	Awards and Recognition for Good Performance	4.15	1.39	0.80	
6	Believes in Inclusivity	4.14	1.38	0.86	

7	Empowering Environment	4.15	1.33	0.87	
3. Social Value					
1	Pleasant Work Environment	4.27	1.35	0.78	0.97
2	Ethical Work Practices	4.36	1.33	0.77	
3	Humanitarian organization	4.27	1.34	0.82	
4	good relationships with peers	4.66	1.32	0.79	
5	good relationships with Superior	4.35	1.27	0.82	
6	Team Building Activities	4.25	1.34	0.84	
7	Recognition/appreciation for better performance	4.21	1.45	0.82	
8	Equality Practices	4.34	1.42	0.82	
9	Socialization	4.28	1.32	0.87	
10	Safety and Security	4.42	1.28	0.82	
11	Problem Solving Approach	4.27	1.34	0.88	
4. Interest Value					
1	Room for Creativity	4.12	1.22	0.78	0.94
2	Allows novel work practices	4.14	1.18	0.73	
3	Provides Vibrant Work Environment	4.23	1.27	0.79	
4	Stakeholders' Satisfaction	4.29	1.33	0.86	
5	Promotes Innovative Pedagogy	4.53	1.17	0.79	
5. Application Value					
1	Importance to skill-based approach	4.45	1.12	0.81	0.96
2	Knowledge Sharing	4.41	1.22	0.80	
3	Opportunity for Mentoring and Coaching	4.38	1.33	0.82	
4	Believes in Organisational Learning	4.47	1.28	0.81	
5	Inculcate Transfer of Learning	4.36	1.23	0.84	
6	Opportunity for Inter-departmental Experience	4.29	1.23	0.75	

Table 2 evaluates institute attractiveness on a 5-point scale, with all dimensions showing high reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.94–0.97) and strong factor loadings (≥ 0.73). The skewness values for the Institute Attractiveness scale ranged from -0.733 to 0.291, indicating a relatively symmetric distribution (Field, 2013). The kurtosis values ranged from -1.493 to -0.435 suggesting a platykurtic distribution with fewer outliers (West, Finch, & Curran, 1995). These results show that the data is close to normal, with no significant skewness or excess kurtosis.

Under Economic Value, the highest-rated item is "Overall Compensation as per Industry" (M = 3.99, SD = 1.46), while "Gratuity Benefits" received the lowest mean score (M = 3.05, SD = 1.54). For Development Value, "Assigns Challenging Responsibility" achieved the highest mean (M = 4.24, SD = 1.27), reflecting its perceived importance, whereas "Administrative Responsibility" scored slightly lower (M = 3.98, SD = 1.30).

In Social Value, the highest mean score was for "Good Relationships with Peers" (M = 4.66, SD = 1.32), emphasizing its importance to institute attractiveness, followed by "Safety and Security" (M = 4.42, SD = 1.28). The Interest Value dimension saw "Promotes Innovative Pedagogy" as the most significant item (M = 4.53, SD = 1.17), with all items maintaining relatively high mean scores. Lastly, under Application Value, "Believes in Organisational Learning" (M = 4.47, SD = 1.28) emerged as a key contributor to this dimension.

Paired Samples Tests of Institute Attractiveness for its Perceived Importance Levels

H0a: There is no significant difference in the mean perception scores between the paired dimensions of institute attractiveness.

Table no. 3 Paired Samples Statistics of Institute Attractiveness

		Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Economic Value	3.92	1.28	-2.61	72	0.01
	Development Value	4.15	1.13			
Pair 2	Economic Value	3.92	1.28	-4.36	72	0.00
	Social Value	4.33	1.17			
Pair 3	Economic Value	3.92	1.28	-3.42	72	0.00
	Interest Value	4.26	1.11			
Pair 4	Economic Value	3.92	1.28	-4.78	72	0.00
	Application Value	4.39	1.13			
Pair 5	Development Value	4.15	1.13	-2.41	72	0.02
	Social Value	4.33	1.17			
Pair 6	Development Value	4.15	1.13	-1.43	72	0.16
	Interest Value	4.26	1.11			
Pair 7	Development Value	4.15	1.13	-3.15	72	0.00
	Application Value	4.39	1.13			
Pair 8	Social Value	4.33	1.17	1.01	72	0.32
	Interest Value	4.26	1.11			
Pair 9	Social Value	4.33	1.17	-0.82	72	0.42
	Application Value	4.39	1.13			
Pair 10	Interest Value	4.26	1.11	-1.88	72	0.06
	Application Value	4.39	1.13			

Table 3 provides the paired samples statistics for Institute Attractiveness dimensions, comparing mean differences across pairs. Significant differences ($p < .05$) were observed in most comparisons, highlighting variations in the perceived importance of these dimensions.

Economic Value dimension scored significantly lower than Development Value ($M = 3.92$ vs. $M = 4.15$, $t = -2.61$, $p = .01$), Social Value ($M = 3.92$ vs. $M = 4.33$, $t = -4.36$, $p < .001$), Interest Value ($M = 3.92$ vs. $M = 4.26$, $t = -3.42$, $p = .001$), and Application Value ($M = 3.92$ vs. $M = 4.39$, $t = -4.78$, $p < .001$), suggesting these values are rated higher in importance.

Similarly, Development Value scored significantly lower than Social Value ($M = 4.15$ vs. $M = 4.33$, $t = -2.41$, $p = .02$) and Application Value ($M = 4.15$ vs. $M = 4.39$, $t = -3.15$, $p = .002$). However, no significant difference was found between Development Value and Interest Value ($p = .16$). Comparisons between Social Value, Interest Value, and Application Value yielded no significant differences ($p > .05$), indicating these dimensions are perceived as relatively similar in importance.

Perceived Importance Levels of the Employer Attractiveness Dimensions Between Male and Female

H_{0b}: There is no significant difference in perceived importance levels of the employer attractiveness dimensions between male and female.

Table No. 4 Perceived Importance Levels of the Employer Attractiveness Dimensions Between Male and Female

	Gender	Mean	S. D.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Economic Value	Male	3.81	1.31	-0.788	71	0.433
	Female	4.03	1.26			
Development Value	Male	4.1	1.14	-0.337	71	0.737
	Female	4.2	1.13			
Social Value	Male	4.14	1.21	-1.453	71	0.151
	Female	4.52	1.12			
Interest Value	Male	4.13	1.16	-1.011	71	0.316
	Female	4.39	1.07			
Application Value	Male	4.38	1.11	-0.121	71	0.904
	Female	4.4	1.16			

Table 4 presents the results of t-tests comparing gender differences in perceived importance across various employer attractiveness dimensions. The t-test results show no significant gender differences across all dimensions, as indicated by the p-values being greater than the 0.05 threshold. The results indicate that gender does not significantly influence the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions.

One-way ANOVA - Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents

H_{0c}: There is no significant difference in perceived importance levels of the employer attractiveness dimensions across the different characteristics of respondents.

Table No. 5 ONEWAY ANOVA - Economic Value: one of the Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Qualification of Respondents	6.135	2	3.067	1.919	0.154
Type of Employment	1.733	2	0.867	0.522	0.04
Experience of Respondents	5.608	5	1.122	0.668	0.043
Tenure in Current Organisation	10.185	4	2.546	1.606	0.018
ONEWAY ANOVA - Development Value: One of the Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents					
Qualification of Respondents	9.516	2	4.758	4.071	0.021
Type of Employment	0.914	2	0.457	0.354	0.703
Experience of Respondents	3.36	5	0.672	0.512	0.028
Tenure in Current Organisation	1.593	4	0.398	0.302	0.876
ONEWAY ANOVA - Social Value: One of the Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents					
Qualification of Respondents	8.992	2	4.496	3.484	0.036
Type of Employment	0.616	2	0.308	0.218	0.804
Experience of Respondents	5.897	5	1.179	0.846	0.522

Tenure in Current Organisation	4.451	4	1.113	0.797	0.043
ONEWAY ANOVA - Interest Value: One of the Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents					
Qualification of Respondents	8.37	2	4.185	3.617	0.032
Type of Employment	0.725	2	0.362	0.286	0.752
Experience of Respondents	5.452	5	1.09	0.871	0.505
Tenure in Current Organisation	5.028	4	1.257	1.014	0.041
ONEWAY ANOVA - Application Value: Dimensions of Institute Attractiveness and Characteristics of Respondents					
Qualification of Respondents	7.637	2	3.818	3.191	0.047
Type of Employment	0.701	2	0.35	0.271	0.034
Experience of Respondents	6.141	5	1.228	0.965	0.445
Tenure in Current Organisation	2.035	4	0.509	0.387	0.817

Table 5 presents the results of Oneway ANOVA comparing various dimensions of institute attractiveness (economic, development, social, interest, and application value) based on respondent characteristics (qualification, type of employment, experience, tenure). Economic Value: Significant differences were found based on type of employment ($p = 0.04$), experience ($p = 0.043$), and tenure ($p = 0.018$). No significant differences were observed based on qualification ($p = 0.154$). Development Value: Significant differences were noted for qualification ($p = 0.021$) and experience ($p = 0.028$). No significant differences were found for type of employment ($p = 0.703$) or tenure ($p = 0.876$). Social Value: Significant differences were found based on qualification ($p = 0.036$) and tenure ($p = 0.043$). No significant differences were observed for type of employment ($p = 0.804$) or experience ($p = 0.522$). Interest Value: Significant differences were found for qualification ($p = 0.032$) and tenure ($p = 0.041$). No significant differences were observed for type of employment ($p = 0.752$) or experience ($p = 0.505$). Application Value: Significant differences were observed for qualification ($p = 0.047$) and type of employment ($p = 0.034$). No significant differences were found for experience ($p = 0.445$) or tenure ($p = 0.817$).

Summary of Results

The findings reveal that different dimensions of institute attractiveness vary significantly in their perceived importance. Social Value and Application Value were rated highest, indicating that respondents place substantial emphasis on workplace relationships, safety, skill-based approaches, and opportunities for organizational learning. Economic Value was consistently rated lower, reflecting a shift in priorities towards non-monetary factors of employment. The paired samples t-tests confirmed significant differences between Economic Value and other dimensions, such as Social, Interest, and Application Values. Similarly, Development Value was rated significantly lower than Social and Application Values, emphasizing the growing importance of workplace relationships and practical applications in higher education settings.

Gender comparisons revealed no significant differences across all dimensions, indicating that perceptions of institute attractiveness are consistent between male and female respondents. One-way ANOVA analysis highlighted significant differences across respondent characteristics, including qualifications, employment type, experience, and tenure. These

results suggest that demographic factors influence the prioritization of institute attractiveness dimensions.

Conclusion

This research underscores the critical importance of non-economic factors in shaping the attractiveness of higher education institutions. Dimensions such as Social Value and Application Value resonate most strongly with respondents, suggesting that institutions should prioritize creating a collaborative and innovative work environment alongside opportunities for skill development and knowledge sharing. While Economic Value remains relevant, it is secondary to developmental and social considerations. The study also highlights demographic influences on perceptions of institute attractiveness. In the line of present study, further research can explore the impact of organizational size on the perceived importance of employer attractiveness dimensions. In addition, research on how these dimensions impact employee satisfaction, retention, and overall performance would provide deeper insights into the implications of employer branding strategies.

References

1. Aiman-Smith, Lynda & Bauer, Talya & Cable, Daniel. (2001). Are You Attracted? Do You Intend to Pursue? A Recruiting Policy-Capturing Study. Journal of Business and Psychology. 16. 219-237. 10.1023/A:1011157116322.
2. Alnıaçık, Esra & Alniacik, Umit. (2012). Identifying Dimensions of Attractiveness in Employer Branding: Effects of Age, Gender, and Current Employment Status. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 58. 1336-1343. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1117.
3. Berthon, P. & Ewing, Michael & Hah, L.L.. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. International Journal of Advertising. 24. 151-172. 10.1080/02650487.2005.11072912.
4. Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2014). Business Research Methods. New York: McGraw Hill Irwin.
5. Field, A. (2013). Discovering statistics using SPSS (4th ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
6. Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010) Multivariate Data Analysis. 7th Edition, Pearson, New York.
7. Kothari, C. (2004). Research Methodology Methods & Techniques. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
8. Magdalena Kalinska-Kula, Iwona Staniec (2021). Employer Branding and Organizational Attractiveness: Current Employees' Perspective, European Research Studies Journal Volume XXIV Issue 1, 583-603
9. Pingle, S. S., & Kaur, R. (2019). Employer Attractiveness: A Comparative Analysis of Professionals &MBA Students' Perceptions. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 55(1), 153–166. https://www.jstor.org/stable/27124705
10. Prakash, C., Yadav, R., Singh, A., & Aarti. (2022). An Empirical Investigation of the Higher Educational Institutions' Attractiveness as an Employer. South Asian Journal of Human Resources Management, 9(1), 130-148. https://doi.org/10.1177/23220937221078118
11. Terjesen, S., Vinnicombe, S., & Freeman, C. (2007). Attracting Generation Y graduates: Organisational attributes, likelihood to apply and sex differences. Career development international, 12(6), 504-522.
12. West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications (pp. 56-75). SAGE Publications.