TITLE: THE ROLE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN

CREATING AN EMPLOYER BRAND: THE EXAMPLE OF FAST CONSUMING RETAILING

AUTHORS: Anil DEGERMEN,Maryam MOHAMMADABBASI

PAGES: 221-241

ORIGINAL PDF URL: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/2849160

# DOĞUŞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ DERGİSİ
## DOGUS UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

# THE ROLE AND EFFECTIVENESS OF HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT IN CREATING AN EMPLOYER BRAND: THE EXAMPLE OF FAST CONSUMING RETAILING

## İNSAN KAYNAKLARI YÖNETİMİNİN İŞVEREN MARKASI OLUŞTURMASINDAKİ RÖLÜ VE ETKİNLİĞİ: HIZLI TÜKETİM PERAKENDE ÖRNEĞİ

H. Anıl DEĞERMEN [(1)], Maryam MOHAMMADABBASİ [(2)]

**Abstract:** Human resource management refers to the deployment and development of an organization's human resources in the most accurate, efficient, and effective way to accomplish the organization's goals. The application of branding concepts in human resource management is known as "employer branding". Yet, there are few empirical studies on HR management in connection with an employer brand. In this context, the aim of this research is to discuss the significance and role of human resources management in terms of brand value. It is also aimed to investigate the utilization of employer branding as a tool in the selection and placement of suitable people for the business in the process of personnel selection in the setting of human resources management. A Relational screening model is used in this study. In accordance with the purpose of the research, the effectiveness of the human resource management practices scale and the employer branding practices scale were used. The research universe consists of personnel working in different departments of Migros store. A total of 472 participants, 104 women, and 368 men working at Migros in the provinces of Istanbul, Izmir, and Ankara participated in the research. SPSS 22.0 was used to analyze the data that was obtained. The findings of this study show that human resources is the unit that plays the biggest role in selecting qualified employees, which is important for branding the business. As a result of the study, it can be said that human resource management practices are effective in shaping the employer brand, which aims to create the perception that the company is a good place to work.

**Keywords:** Human Resources, Employer Brand, Business, Fast Consuming Retailing

**JEL:** M00, M100, M210

*Öz: İnsan Kaynakların Yönetimi, bir kuruluşun insan kaynaklarının, kuruluşun hedeflerine ulaşmak için en doğru, verimli ve etkili şekilde sağlanması ve geliştirilmesini ifade eder. İnsan kaynakları yönetiminde marka kavramlarının uygulanması "işveren markası" olarak bilinir. Ancak, bir işveren markasıyla bağlantılı olarak İK yönetimine ilişkin çok az ampirik çalışma bulunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda bu araştırmanın amacı, insan kaynakları yönetiminin marka değeri açısından önemini ve rolünü tartışmaktır. Ayrıca insan kaynakları yönetimi ortamında personel seçimi sürecinde işletmeye uygun kişilerin seçilmesi ve yerleştirilmesinde işveren markasının bir araç olarak kullanımının araştırılması*

[(1)] İstanbul Üniversitesi, İktisat Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü; degermen@istanbul.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0003-4799-9619
[(2)] İstanbul Üniversitesi, İktisat Fakültesi, İşletme Bölümü; maryam.mohammadabbasi@ogr.iu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-7003-4033

*amaçlanmaktadır. Bu araştırmada ilişkisel tarama modeli yer almaktadır. Araştırmanın amacı doğrultusunda insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamalarının etkililiği ölçeği ve işveren markalaşma uygulamaları ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Araştırma evrenini Migros mağazasının farklı departmanlarında görev yapan personel oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmaya İstanbul, İzmir ve Ankara illerinde Migros bünyesinde çalışmakta olan 104 kadın 368 erkek olmak üzere toplam 472 katılımcı katılmıştır. Bu çalışmanın bulguları, işletmenin markalaşması için önemli olan nitelikli çalışanların seçiminde en büyük rolü oynayan birimin insan kaynağı olduğunu göstermektedir. Çalışma sonucunda, şirketin çalışmak için iyi bir yer olduğu algısını yaratmayı amaçlayan işveren markasının şekillenmesinde insan kaynakları yönetimi uygulamalarının etkili olduğu söylenebilir.*

***Anahtar Kelimeler:*** *İnsan Kaynakları, İşveren Markası, İşletme, Hızlı Tüketim Perakendecilik*

## 1. Introduction

Various studies and studies suggest that the strategic capability of an organization depends on the capability of its human resources. For this reason, the strategic management of human resources is not only about hiring employees of appropriate quality and quantity, continuing to work with them and maintaining this cooperation for a long time, but also selecting and training employees who are suitable for the strategic and cultural structure of the organization. The human resources strategy enables the organization to acquire, retain and use the employees it needs effectively and efficiently (Armstrong, 2006: 142-172).

The increase in national and global competition causes organizations to make continuous efforts to create competitive products. Such an effort requires attracting, developing, motivating and continuing to work with high-quality human resources (Zeinali Nami, 2016). Meanwhile, it is essential to create and strengthen a corporate identity and a strong employer brand. The employer brand is defined as "the package of functional, economic and psychological benefits offered by employment" (Ambler and Barrow, 1996: 185-206). Employer branding is a strategy that human resources managers can use to help differentiate their organizations and services while increasing their brand value (Boyd and Sutherland, 2006: 9-20).

Human resource management has long been the focus of management literature, however, particularly in Turkey, this focus has not yet been properly explored in relation to employer brand.

## 2. Literature Review

In today's world, where it is extremely difficult to compete, businesses must implement a strategy that creates positive perceptions in customer's minds as well as providing goods or services to them. The factor that will establish a significant relationship between companies and their customers is expressed as a brand.

### 2.1. Employer Brand

Brands can be mentioned as one of the most precious assets of a company, and therefore brand management is a fundamental action for companies. Although the goal of organizations for branding usually concentrates on product development, branding can also apply to the field of human resource management. Using branding assumptions in human resources management is labeled "employer branding".

Today, companies increasingly apply employer branding to appeal to professional and qualified employees and ensure that the current staff is loyal to the values of the firm (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004: 501-517).

In the past, companies were evaluated according to the products and services they provided, but today in the context of global competition, the image of organizations as an employer (employer brands) has also received considerable attention. If an organization has an appealing employer image, it can attract the most professional and qualified employees according to its values. As a result, the efficiency of human resources increases and this accordingly increases the competitive power of the organization. In fact, one way to attract talent in today's competitive workforce environment is employer branding, which will make the organization a more desirable place for labor (Figurska and Matuska, 2013: 35–51). The employer brand and its value emerged over a thousand years when it became obvious that a new business age had arisen that was mostly based on "knowledge". Under this circumstance, while human resources become very important for obtaining operational efficiency, the lack of professional staff can lead to excessive competition between firms. In order to prevent such a situation, new tools were grown in human resource management. While the aim of such tools is to attract the most committed business talents, employees' perception of the employer brand gains great importance in the employment market (Kargas and Tsokos, 2020: 17). The employer brand notion is an excellent image of the mixture of marketing and human Resources. Ambler and Barrow in their article defined the employer brand as follows: "the package of functional, economic and psychological benefits provided by employment and identified with the employing company", still attracts attention from academicians in human resources marketing (Noailles and Viot, 2021: 605–613).

Employer branding is not limited to, hiring activity. It is mostly driven by the hiring function, but it involves various human resources processes to create a complex image of the business as a preferred employer in the labor market (Parmar, 2014: 201-225). The main concentration of the employer brand idea is to assure that the same transparency and integrity apply to employees in the definition and management of the organization's offer as it is commonly used in the definition and management of the customer's offer. Attention to this approach has been created due to the extensive competition in the labor market for the qualified staff needed by organizations to realize their corporate targets. If, as Jim Collins said, "You need to get the right people on the bus to deliver your strategic intent; you first need to ensure that you make your bus attractive to the right people" (Mosley, 2007: 123-134).

The way the workforces experience the employer brand is a remarkably different way from customers' experience of the products or corporate brands. For example, staff members get a salary for their knowledge and skills, and they have a larger share in the sustained benefit of the company than the average customer. Hence, counting on success factors that are taken only from the theory of consumer and corporate brand is not sufficient without examining the success of the employer brand (Moroko and Uncles, 2008: 160-175).

### 2.2. Human Resource Management and Employer Branding

According to Watson Wyatt's definition of an employer brand, an employer brand refers to the place of the organization in the labor market, which shows an image of the organization's brand for existing and future employees. It comprises two dimensions; external and internal brands. An external brand is formed for the prospective workforce to encourage them to cooperate with the company and create a good image of the work environment within the organization. An internal brand is created for the existing employees of the organization, which includes the promises that the company fulfills for the employees, which includes not only the company's relationship with workforce, but also the fact that the firm can provide ideal work experiences for current and potential workforce (Chunping and Xi, 2011: 2087–2091). Many executives believe that external marketing is complicated without identifying the implication of "internal customer", and does not reach the desired result. The concept of the internal market infers that the employees of the organization are the first market of the organization. Kotler (1994) describes internal marketing as "the task of successfully hiring, training and motivating able employees to serve the customer well'." Employees are at the heart of the company's branding process, and their actions can either reinforce a brand's goals or, in case of discrepancy with these goals, diminish the brand's validity.   Therefore, it is very essential that the behavior and values of employees are in line with the behavior and values declared by the organization (Berthon et al., 2005: 151-172).

One task of the human resources department in a company is to perform the hiring process and the employer brand can be implemented to attract professional laborers to the organization.   Therefore, employer brand development is often the responsibility of the human resources department. According to Barrow (2008), the human resource management department is the most appropriate part for the development of the employer brand because they have an overview of the company and managerial insights. Moroko and Uncles (2008) consider that the Human Resource department has responsibility for attracting and preserving proper staff and suggest that recruitment experience should be seen as a product, showing that the human resource department has the task of development and management. The duty of the human resource department, in the area of employer brand, should be to establish the basis of the employer brand and its relationship with prospective and current staff in order to sustain growth in the company (Jonze and Öster, 2013).

 Working alongside with line managers, the performance of human resources in an organization is identifying talent that most effactually contributes to the strategic goals of that organization. Employer-branding movements, driven by human resources and marketing directors, could be helpful in bringing and maintaining top staff, especially if they engaged workforces in this process (Cascio and Graham, 2016: 182-192). Human resources have a great impact on building an employer brand. Here are some of the human resources tasks to create an employer brand:

•        Primary labor organizing.

•        Enforcing efficient hiring methods.

•        Reducing and predicting drops in staff turnover.

•        Persuading top management to help HR practices.

•        Building capacity for employment.

•        Creating a proper atmosphere to work, which must contain liberty, institutional environment, payments, learning and career development, challenges and duties, flexible scheduling, work-life justice, and more (Gaddam, 2008: 45–55).

## 3. Methodology

In the research, a descriptive relational scanning model was used to examine FMCG (Fast-Moving Consumer Goods) retailing in the role and effectiveness of human resources management in creating an employer brand. The purpose of survey research is to collect the obtained data to determine certain characteristics of a group.

### 3.1. Research Hypothesis

The main hypothesis and sub-hypothesis of the research are as follows:

- Main hypothesis:

H1: Human resource management positively affects the employer brand.

H2: Human resource management negatively affects the employer brand.

- Sub-hypothesis:

H3: The choice of workforce positively affects the employer brand.

H4: The choice of workforce negatively affects the employer brand.

H5: Education positively affects the employer brand.

H6: Education negatively affects the employer brand.

H7: Performance appraisal positively affects the employer brand.

H8: Performance appraisal negatively affects the employer brand.

H9: Wage management positively affects the employer brand.

H10: Wage management negatively affects the employer brand.

### 3.2. Universe and Sample

The population of the study is Migros staff in the provinces of Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara. In order to represent the universe, it was deemed appropriate to determine the number of samples with a non-random sample. While forming the sample, questionnaires were sent to Migros general directorate and applied by them. In this context, a questionnaire was applied to 472 Migros employees in the three cities of Istanbul, Izmir and Ankara.

### 3.3. Data Collection Tools

The research questionnaire containing questions about the participants participating in the study was collected online. The questionnaire used in the research comprises 3 parts. The study's participants' demographic data are presented in the first part. In the second part, the effectiveness of HRM practices was evaluated. First the effectiveness of workforce selection, placement, training, performance evaluation, and remuneration were evaluated and then the Labor force selection and placement were evaluated with 5 variables, performance evaluation with 4 variables, education

with 5 variables, and remuneration with 3 variables. Job description effectiveness was measured with 2 variables. The effectiveness of employee participation, which is included in the effectiveness of HRM, was evaluated with 4 statements in the study of Yılmaz (2012). The assessment of the scale was a 5-point Likert scale, and the participants were asked to rank the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In the third part, the Employer Brand Practices scale was prepared by İçergen (2016).

The sample size of the research calculated to be 472, taking into account the data that indicated some scale items were left blank and that some respondents gave more than one response. The data considered invalid are data that are filled in incorrectly and incompletely. These data were deemed invalid because they disturbed the reliability and normality of the study.

### 3.4. Analysis of Data in Research

The data obtained from this study, which was conducted in order to investigate the role and effectiveness of HRM in creating an employer brand, was analyzed using SPSS 22.0 software (social science statistical package) in a computer environment.

Frequency (N) and percentages (%) were measured to determine distributions considering demographic information. Item totals, averages and reliability analysis of the scales and their sub-dimensions were found. In the research, t-test and (ANOVA) analyzes were conducted to discover whether the demographic information varies according to the effectiveness of human resources management practices and employer branding practices.

### 3.4.1. Reliability Analysis

The reliability of scales and sub-dimensions in the study was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha analysis. The Alpha coefficient, which is found by proportioning the total variances of the questions in the test to the general variance, is a weighted standard average of the change. To determine if the questionnaire's questions make up a coherent whole, Cronbach's alpha is evaluated. The intervals in which the alpha coefficient can be found and the reliability of the scale are given below (Büyüköztürk, 2010: 182).

If $0.00 \leq \alpha < 0.40$, the test is not reliable,

If $0.40 \leq \alpha < 0.60$, the test is low reliability,

If $0.60 \leq \alpha < 0.80$, the test is quite reliable,

If $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, the test is a highly reliable test.

In this research, the validity and reliability of the study were provided with the pre-application.

**Table 1. Reliability Analysis of the Research**

| Scale | Cronbach's Alpha | N |
|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | ,874 | 17 |

| Employer Branding Applications | ,895 | 23 |
|---|---|---|

As indicated in the table above, the scale reliability level of the study is quite high. For this reason, it proves to be a reliable survey.

### 3.4.2. Normality Analysis

In order to decide on which technique to use among parametric or non-parametric analysis techniques, normality analysis of the obtained data is required. To be able to examine the scores of the scales in the normal distribution, the primary process is to calculate the skewness and kurtosis values. The kurtosis and skewness values obtained between +3 and -3 are considered sufficient in terms of a normal distribution (Hopkins & Weeks, 1990: 717-729). In this context, the scale scores show a normal distribution. On the other hand, histograms, graphics, and coefficients of variation for the aforementioned scale and scale dimensions were also examined, and it was determined that they were also suitable for normal distribution. Thus, parametric techniques were taken into account while performing the analysis.

**Table 2. Normality Analysis of the Study**

| Test | Mean | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | 3,9990 | ,37162 | -,415 | -,442 |
| **Workforce Selection and Placement** | 4,2614 | ,34732 | ,246 | -,744 |
| **Education** | 3,9394 | ,53764 | -1,212 | 1,081 |
| **Performance Evaluation** | 4,0641 | ,33899 | -,047 | -,669 |
| **Pricing** | 3,5742 | ,64043 | -,842 | -,054 |
| **Employer Branding Applications** | 3,8338 | ,44888 | -,202 | -1,105 |

## 4. Results

In this part of the research, the demographic information of the participants participating in the study and the distribution of the answers they gave to the questions related to the research, the comparison of the demographic information of participants, and the table regarding the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses are included.

### 4.1. Distribution of the Demographic Information of the Participants

In this section, the distribution of demographic information of the participants is mentioned. 104 (22.0%) of the research participants were female and 368 (78.0%) were male. The majority of the study consists of male individuals. 113 (23.9%) of the participants were between the ages of 18-24, 123 (26.1%) were between the ages of 25-34, 128 (27.1%) were between the ages of 35-44, 83 (17.6%) are between the ages of 45-54, 25 (5.3%) are 55 years old and over. The educational background of the participants participating in the study was 149 (31.6%) high school graduates, 281 (59.5%) university graduates, and 42 (8.9%) graduate/doctorate education. The majority of the study consists of university graduate individuals. 86 (18.2%) of the participants worked in the institution for less than 1 year, 235 (49.8%) between 2-10 years, 119 (25.2%) between 11-15 years, and 32 of them (6.8%) have been working for more than 16 years. The majority of the study consists of individuals who have been working for 2-10 years. 55 (11.7%) of the participants of the research are in retail operations, 35 (7.4%) in marketing, 40 (8.5%) in investment development, 15 (3.2%) in construction, 120 (25.4%) in distribution centers and logistics, 65 (13.8%) in information technologies and business development, 70 (14.8%) in human resources and industrial relations, 72 (15%, 3) works in financial affairs. The majority of the study consists of individuals working in distribution centers and logistics.

### 4.2. Comparison of Demographic Information of Participants

The results regarding the participants' human resources management practices effectiveness scale and sub-dimensions and the gender variable are shown in table 3.

**Table 3. Results Regarding Participants' Human Resources Management Practices Effectiveness Scale and Sub-Dimensions and the Gender Variable**

|  | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | Woman | 104 | 4,0990 | ,39730 | ,03896 | ,031 |
|  | Men | 368 | 3,9707 | ,35958 | ,01874 | |
| **Workforce Selection and Placement** | Woman | 104 | 4,4058 | ,43485 | ,04264 | ,000 |
|  | Men | 368 | 4,2207 | ,30688 | ,01600 | |
| **Education** | Woman | 104 | 4,0827 | ,58167 | ,05704 | ,471 |
|  | Men | 368 | 3,8989 | ,51822 | ,02701 | |
| **Performance Evaluation** | Woman | 104 | 4,0649 | ,30963 | ,03036 | ,001 |
|  | Men | 368 | 4,0639 | ,34723 | ,01810 | |
| **Pricing** | Woman | 104 | 3,6603 | ,63853 | ,06261 | ,100 |

| | Men | 368 | 3,5498 | ,63973 | ,03335 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

* Independent- Samples T-test

According to the T-test analysis conducted to determine the relation between the human resource management effectiveness scale and its sub-dimension, the labor selection, placement, and performance evaluation level, and the gender variable of the research contributors, there was a significant relationship between the gender variable of the participants and the effectiveness of HRM practices and the sub-dimension level of labor selection, placement, and performance evaluation (p =, 031, 000, 001). Accordingly, in terms of the perceptions of men and women, the effectiveness scale of human resource management and labor force placement, which is its sub-dimension, is not at the same level.

According to the T-test analysis performed to determine the relationship among the education, and remuneration level of the participants included in the study and the gender variable, no significant relationship was found between the gender variable of the participants and their education and remuneration level (p =, 471, 100). Accordingly, the levels of education and remuneration are at the same level in terms of perceptions of male and female individuals.

The results regarding the employer brand applications of participants and the gender variable are shown in table 4.

**Table 4. Results Regarding the Employer Brand Applications of Participants and the Gender Variable**

| | Gender | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Employer Branding Applications** | Woman | 104 | 3,8445 | ,42456 | ,04163 | ,003 |
| | Men | 368 | 3,8308 | ,45602 | ,02377 | |

* Independent- Samples T-test

According to the T-test analysis performed to determine the relationship among the employer brand applications of the contributors included in the study and the gender variable, a significant relationship was found between the gender variable of the participants and the level of employer branding practices (p =, 003). Accordingly, the perception of the employer's brand is not the same for males and females.

The results regarding the participants' human resources management practices effectiveness scale and sub-dimensions and age variable are shown in table 5.

**Table 5. Results Regarding Participants' Human Resources Management Practices Effectiveness Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Age Variable**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18-24 | 113 | 3,9625 | ,37129 | ,03493 | ,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | 25-34 | 123 | 3,8761 | ,37248 | ,03358 |
| | 35-44 | 128 | 3,9246 | ,27531 | ,02433 |
| | 45-54 | 83 | 4,2374 | ,36173 | ,03971 |
| | 55+ | 25 | 4,3576 | ,26412 | ,05282 |
| | Total | 472 | 3,9990 | ,37162 | ,01711 |
| **Workforce Selection and Placement** | 18-24 | 113 | 4,2301 | ,41077 | ,03864 |
| | 25-34 | 123 | 4,2000 | ,33875 | ,03054 |
| | 35-44 | 128 | 4,2156 | ,23626 | ,02088 |
| | 45-54 | 83 | 4,4120 | ,34831 | ,03823 | ,000 |
| | 55+ | 25 | 4,4400 | ,37417 | ,07483 |
| | Total | 472 | 4,2614 | ,34732 | ,01599 |
| **Education** | 18-24 | 113 | 4,0195 | ,55611 | ,05231 |
| | 25-34 | 123 | 3,7415 | ,57871 | ,05218 |
| | 35-44 | 128 | 3,8328 | ,48067 | ,04249 |
| | 45-54 | 83 | 4,1687 | ,43447 | ,04769 | ,000 |
| | 55+ | 25 | 4,3360 | ,14967 | ,02993 |
| | Total | 472 | 3,9394 | ,53764 | ,02475 |
| **Performance Evaluation** | 18-24 | 113 | 3,8850 | ,21660 | ,02038 |
| | 25-34 | 123 | 3,9329 | ,22423 | ,02022 |
| | 35-44 | 128 | 4,1758 | ,36635 | ,03238 |
| | 45-54 | 83 | 4,2470 | ,35462 | ,03892 | ,000 |
| | 55+ | 25 | 4,3400 | ,37417 | ,07483 |
| | Total | 472 | 4,0641 | ,33899 | ,01560 |
| | 18-24 | 113 | 3,5251 | ,50945 | ,04792 | ,000 |
| | 25-34 | 123 | 3,4851 | ,51790 | ,04670 |

| **Pricing** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 35-44 | 128 | 3,2578 | ,72719 | ,06428 |
| | 45-54 | 83 | 4,0482 | ,47749 | ,05241 |
| | 55+ | 25 | 4,2800 | ,12472 | ,02494 |
| | Total | 472 | 3,5742 | ,64043 | ,02948 |

\* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the relationships among the human resource management effectiveness scale and the sub-dimension level, and the age variable of the participants included in the study, a significant correlation was found between the age variable of the participators and the effectiveness of HRM practices and the sub-dimension level (p =, 000). From this result, the effectiveness and sub-dimension levels of HRM applications are not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals of different ages.

The results regarding the employer brand applications and age variables of participants are shown in table 6.

**Table 6. Results Regarding Employer Brand Applications and Age Variables of Participants**

| Age | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18-24 | 113 | 3,7811 | ,23621 | ,02222 | |
| 25-34 | 123 | 3,7193 | ,46105 | ,04157 | |
| 35-44 | 128 | 3,6675 | ,44257 | ,03912 | |
| 45-54 | 83 | 4,1739 | ,42955 | ,04715 | ,000 |
| 55+ | 25 | 4,3583 | ,17895 | ,03579 | |
| Total | 472 | 3,8338 | ,44888 | ,02066 | |

\* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the relationships among employer brand practices and the age variable of the participants included in the study, a significant correlation was found between the age variable of the participators and the level of employer branding practices (p =, 000). From this result, the level of employer brand implementation is not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals of different ages.

The results regarding the participants' human resources management practices effectiveness scale and sub-dimensions and their working time in the institution are shown in table 7.

**Table 7. Results Regarding Participants' Human Resources Management Practices Effectiveness Scale and Sub-Dimensions and Their Working Time in the Institution**

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | Less than 1 year | 86 | 3,9986 | ,36339 | ,03919 |  |
|  | 2-10 years | 235 | 3,9680 | ,35670 | ,02327 |  |
|  | 11-15 years | 119 | 4,0588 | ,37494 | ,03437 | ,193 |
|  | More than 16 years | 32 | 4,0055 | ,46853 | ,08283 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 3,9990 | ,37162 | ,01711 |  |
| **Workforce Selection and Placement** | Less than 1 year | 86 | 4,2326 | ,42494 | ,04582 |  |
|  | 2-10 years | 235 | 4,1889 | ,32352 | ,02110 |  |
|  | 11-15 years | 119 | 4,4185 | ,22245 | ,02039 | ,000 |
|  | More than 16 years | 32 | 4,2875 | ,47093 | ,08325 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 4,2614 | ,34732 | ,01599 |  |
| **Education** | Less than 1 year | 86 | 4,0721 | ,55384 | ,05972 |  |
|  | 2-10 years | 235 | 3,8783 | ,51440 | ,03356 |  |
|  | 11-15 years | 119 | 3,9563 | ,55489 | ,05087 | ,036 |
|  | More than 16 years | 32 | 3,9688 | ,54974 | ,09718 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 3,9394 | ,53764 | ,02475 |  |
| **Performance** | Less than 1 year | 86 | 3,8866 | ,21233 | ,02290 | ,000 |
|  | 2-10 years | 235 | 4,0319 | ,25538 | ,01666 |  |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation** | 11-15 years | 119 | 4,2962 | ,35649 | ,03268 | |
| | More than 16 years | 32 | 3,9141 | ,56657 | ,10016 | |
| | Total | 472 | 4,0641 | ,33899 | ,01560 | |
| **Pricing** | Less than 1 year | 86 | 3,6357 | ,41422 | ,04467 | |
| | 2-10 years | 235 | 3,6638 | ,49306 | ,03216 | |
| | 11-15 years | 119 | 3,3137 | ,84181 | ,07717 | ,000 |
| | More than 16 years | 32 | 3,7187 | ,93559 | ,16539 | |
| | Total | 472 | 3,5742 | ,64043 | ,02948 | |

* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the workforce selection, placement, education, performance evaluation and remuneration levels of the participator included in the research, and their working time in the institution, a significant relationship was found between the working hours of the participants in the institution and the sub-dimension level of labor selection placement, education, performance evaluation and remuneration. (p =, 000, 036, 000, 000). According to this, the levels of workforce selection, placement, education, performance evaluation and remuneration are not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals with different working hours in the institution.

According to the ANOVA analysis performed to investigate the relationship between the human resource management practices effectiveness scale of the research participants and their working time in the institution, no significant relationship was found between the working time of the participants in the institution and the human resource management practices effectiveness Scale (p =, 193). Accordingly, the effectiveness levels of HRM practices are at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals who have different working hours in the institution.

The results regarding the employer brand applications of participants and their working time in the institution are shown in table 8.

**Table 8. Results Regarding the Employer Brand Applications of Participants and Their Working Time in the Institution**

|  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Less than 1 year** | 86 | 3,7791 | ,20176 | ,02176 | |
| **2-10 years** | 235 | 3,8810 | ,41419 | ,02702 | |
| **11-15 years** | 119 | 3,6511 | ,56171 | ,05149 | ,000 |
| **More than 16 years** | 32 | 4,3139 | ,25006 | ,04421 | |
| **Total** | 472 | 3,8338 | ,44888 | ,02066 | |

\* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the relationship between employer branding practices of the research participants and their working time in the institution, a significant relationship was found between the working hours of the participants in the institution and the level of employer branding practices (p =, 000). According to this, the level of employer branding practices is not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals who have different working hours in the institution.

The results regarding the participants' human resources management practices effectiveness scale and sub-dimensions and in which department they work are shown in table 9.

**Table 9. Results Regarding Participants' Human Resources Management Practices Effectiveness Scale and Sub-Dimensions and in Which Department They Work**

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | Retail operations | 55 | 3,9080 | ,06279 | ,00847 | |
| | Marketing | 35 | 4,4454 | ,23105 | ,03906 | |
| | Investment development | 40 | 4,0647 | ,20325 | ,03214 | |
| | Construction | 15 | 3,5922 | ,51640 | ,13333 | ,000 |
| | Distribution centers and logistics | 120 | 4,2382 | ,22799 | ,02081 | |
| | Information technology and business | 65 | 3,9683 | ,26060 | ,03232 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | development | | | | |
| | Human resources and industrial relations | 70 | 4,0101 | ,33932 | ,04056 |
| | Financial affairs | 72 | 3,5180 | ,27866 | ,03284 |
| | Total | 472 | 3,9990 | ,37162 | ,01711 |
| **Workforce Selection and Placement** | Retail operations | 55 | 4,0291 | ,07116 | ,00960 |
| | Marketing | 35 | 4,8114 | ,35295 | ,05966 |
| | Investment development | 40 | 4,1500 | ,35301 | ,05582 |
| | Construction | 15 | 4,3867 | ,20656 | ,05333 |
| | Distribution centers and logistics | 120 | 4,4933 | ,10980 | ,01002 |
| | Information technology and business development | 65 | 4,1969 | ,25123 | ,03116 |
| | Human resources and industrial relations | 70 | 4,2886 | ,26948 | ,03221 |
| | Financial affairs | 72 | 3,8528 | ,21492 | ,02533 |
| | Total | 472 | 4,2614 | ,34732 | ,01599 |
| **Education** | Retail operations | 55 | 4,0000 | ,00000 | ,00000 |
| | Marketing | 35 | 4,5314 | ,35955 | ,06078 |
| | Investment development | 40 | 4,0850 | ,13502 | ,02135 |
| | Construction | 15 | 3,1600 | ,92952 | ,24000 |
| | Distribution centers and logistics | 120 | 4,2117 | ,19105 | ,01744 |
| | Information technology and business development | 65 | 3,9662 | ,35981 | ,04463 |
| | Human resources and industrial relations | 70 | 3,9686 | ,53907 | ,06443 |

Note: The significance values ",000" appear in the far-right column aligned with the Workforce Selection and Placement block and the Education block.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Financial affairs | 72 | 3,1806 | ,43399 | ,05115 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 3,9394 | ,53764 | ,02475 |  |
| **Performance Evaluation** | Retail operations | 55 | 3,7864 | ,08895 | ,01199 | ,000 |
|  | Marketing | 35 | 4,1857 | ,12636 | ,02136 |  |
|  | Investment development | 40 | 3,9875 | ,25913 | ,04097 |  |
|  | Construction | 15 | 3,6500 | ,38730 | ,10000 |  |
|  | Distribution centers and logistics | 120 | 4,4500 | ,15063 | ,01375 |  |
|  | Information technology and business development | 65 | 3,9077 | ,29171 | ,03618 |  |
|  | Human resources and industrial relations | 70 | 4,1214 | ,26832 | ,03207 |  |
|  | Financial affairs | 72 | 3,7882 | ,19072 | ,02248 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 4,0641 | ,33899 | ,01560 |  |
| **Pricing** | Retail operations | 55 | 3,7152 | ,11860 | ,01599 | ,000 |
|  | Marketing | 35 | 4,0381 | ,13459 | ,02275 |  |
|  | Investment development | 40 | 3,9917 | ,19226 | ,03040 |  |
|  | Construction | 15 | 2,9111 | 1,20493 | ,31111 |  |
|  | Distribution centers and logistics | 120 | 3,5750 | ,79325 | ,07241 |  |
|  | Information technology and business development | 65 | 3,6718 | ,61940 | ,07683 |  |
|  | Human resources and industrial relations | 70 | 3,4667 | ,58538 | ,06997 |  |
|  | Financial affairs | 72 | 3,1620 | ,39557 | ,04662 |  |
|  | Total | 472 | 3,5742 | ,64043 | ,02948 |  |

* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis conducted to determine the relationship between the HRM practices effectiveness scale and the sub-dimension level of the research participants and the department they work in, a significant relationship was found between the department in which the participants work in and the effectiveness and sub-dimension level of HRM practices (p =, 000). From this result, the effectiveness and sub-dimension levels of HRM applications are not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals in different departments.

The results regarding in which department participants work with employer branding applications are shown in table 10.

**Table 10. Results Regarding in Which Department Participants Work With Employer Branding Applications**

| | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Retail operations** | 55 | 3,9328 | ,15470 | ,02086 | |
| **Marketing** | 35 | 3,6857 | ,44139 | ,07461 | |
| **Investment development** | 40 | 4,0098 | ,38594 | ,06102 | |
| **Construction** | 15 | 3,4580 | ,54400 | ,14046 | |
| **Distribution centers and logistics** | 120 | 3,9069 | ,55962 | ,05109 | ,000 |
| **Information technology and business development** | 65 | 4,1124 | ,20935 | ,02597 | |
| **Human resources and industrial relations** | 70 | 3,8366 | ,33739 | ,04033 | |
| **Financial affairs** | 72 | 3,4348 | ,32050 | ,03777 | |
| **Total** | 472 | 3,8338 | ,44888 | ,02066 | |

* One-Way ANOVA

According to the ANOVA analysis performed to determine the association between the employer brand applications of the research participants and the department they work in, a significant relationship was found between the department they work in and the level of employer branding practices (p =, 000). From this result, the level of employer branding practices is not at the same level in terms of the perceptions of individuals in different departments.

The results regarding the relationship between human resources management practices effectiveness and its sub-dimensions and employer branding practices are shown in table 11.

**Table 11. The Relationship Between Human Resources Management Practices Effectiveness and Its Sub-Dimensions and Employer Branding Practices**

|  |  | HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale | Workforce Selection and Placement | Education | Performance Evaluation | Pricing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **HRM Practices Effectiveness Scale** | Pearson Correlation | 1 | ,742 | ,945 | ,762 | ,758 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 |
|  | N | 472 | 472 | 472 | 472 | 472 |
| **Employer Branding Applications** | Pearson Correlation | ,584 | ,358 | ,529 | ,238 | ,688 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 |
|  | N | 472 | 472 | 472 | 472 | 472 |

\* One-Way ANOVA

In order to determine whether there is a meaningful relationship between the effectiveness of HRM practices and sub-dimensions and employer branding practices of the participants participating in the research, a meaningful relationship was found between the human resource management practices effectiveness and sub-dimensions and employer branding practices based on the outcomes of the correlation test (p =, 000).

The results regarding the acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses are shown in table 12.

**Table 12. Research Hypotheses**

| Hypotheses | Accepted | Rejected |
|---|:---:|:---:|
| Human resource management positively affects the employer brand. | ✓ | |
| Human resource management negatively affects the employer brand. | | ✓ |
| The choice of workforce positively affects the employer brand. | ✓ | |
| The choice of workforce negatively affects the employer brand. | | ✓ |
| Education positively affects the employer brand. | ✓ | |
| Education negatively affects the employer brand. | | ✓ |
| Performance appraisal positively affects the employer brand. | ✓ | |
| Performance appraisal negatively affects the employer brand. | | ✓ |
| Wage management positively affects the employer brand. | ✓ | |
| Wage management negatively affects the employer brand. | | ✓ |

As shown in Table 15, the hypotheses of human resource management, workforce selection, education, performance and remuneration positively affect the employer brand were accepted and the negative effects hypotheses were rejected.

## 4. Conclusion

This study examines the importance of human resource management in terms of employer branding. In this context, it can be stated that human resources is the unit that plays the most effective role in the selection of qualified staff, which is important for branding the organization. The HR department creates a clear and real-content recruitment message that will reflect the corporate identity and culture, in attracting qualified and suitable candidates to the business. The Human Resource unit implements the employer brand within the organization and ensures that it is in contact with potential candidates and current employees. The human resources managers of the companies shape the employer brand management strategies and

practices according to the needs and expectations within and outside the company. As a result of the study, it can be said that human resource management practices play a major role in establishing a balance between individual and corporate goals, as well as increasing employee productivity. It is considered within the scope of the result of this study that effective human resource management practices contribute to organizational success by reducing an employee's intention to leave. This research is a guiding study for future studies, because it evaluates employer brand and human resource management practices together, which is rare in previous studies. The study was carried out on 472 Migros employees. In future studies, expanding it with a larger sample with different demographic and social characteristics, taking into account different mediating variables, will be more meaningful in terms of evaluating the results of the study.

## References

Ambler, T. and Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, *4*(3), 185-206.

Armstrong, M. (2006). *Strategic human resource management* (3rd ed.). Kogan Page London.

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

Barrow, S. (2008). A brand new view. *People Management, February*, 7-8.

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

Boyd, G. and Sutherland, M. (2006). Obtaining employee commitment to living the brand of the organisation. *South African Journal of Business Management*, *37*(1), 9-20.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Data analysis handbook for social sciences.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Cascio, W. F., & Graham, B. Z. (2016). New strategic role for HR: Leading the employer-branding process. *Organization Management Journal*, *13*(4), 182-192.

Chunping, Y., & Xi, L. (2011). The study on employer brand strategy in private enterprises from the perspective of human resource management. *Energy Procedia*, *5*, 2087-2091.

Figurska, I. and Matuska, E. (2013). Employer branding as a human resources management Strategy. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics, 7*(2), 35–51.

Gaddam, S. (2008). Modeling employer branding communication: The softer aspect of HR marketing management. *ICFAI Journal of Soft Skills, 2*(1), 45–55.

Hopkins, K. D. and Weeks, D. L. (1990). Tests for normality and measures of skewness and kurtosis: Their place in research reporting. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 50*(4), 717-729.

İçergen, H. (2016). *The effects of employer brand and human resources management practices on intention to leave: A study on the tourism sector* (Master Thesis). Baskent University, Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Jonze, J. and Öster, Ö. (2013). *Employer branding human resource management* (Bachelor thesis). Uppsala University, Department of Business Administration, Sweden.

Kargas, A. and Tsokos, A. (2020). Employer branding implementation and human resource management in Greek telecommunication industry. *Administrative Sciences, 10*(1), 17.

Kotler, P. (1994). *Analysis, planning, implementation, and control.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Englewood Cliffs.

Moroko, L. and Uncles, M. D. (2008). Characteristics of successful employer brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, *16*(3), 160-175.

Mosley, R. W. (2007). Customer experience, organizational culture and the employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, *15*(2), 123-134.

Noailles, L. and Viot, C. (2021). Employer brand equity effects on employees well-being and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research, 126*, 605–613.

Parmar, A. (2014). The role of HR department in employer branding at public and private sector. *Journal of Human Resources Management and Labor Studies, 2*(2), 201-225.

Yılmaz T. (2012). *The effect of high performance HRM practices on individual and organizational performance* (Unpublished master's thesis). Turkish Military Academy, Institute of Defense Sciences, Ankara.

Zeinali Nami, R. (2016). *The evaluation of human resources management processes current situation; Bank refah kargaran, based on 34000 standard of human resources transcendence* (Doctoral dissertation). Tehran university, Faculty of Management, Tehran.