















school diploma, 48.0% with vocational school diploma, 21.0% with undergraduate degree and 7.8% with graduate diploma. Having looked at their professional work experience, 1-3 years' experience consist of 25.5% of all the participants, 39.2% of all have 4-6 years' experience, 15.7% of the participants have 7-9 years' experience, 8.8% of all have 10-12 years' experience, and 10.8% of all have work experience for 12 years or more.

#### 4.6.2. Percentage distribution on employer brand, arithmetic average and standard deviations

Table 3 shows the percentage distribution on employer brand, arithmetic average and standard deviations.

When the arithmetic averages in Table 3 examined, the first numbered one is "Job security of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working" with 3.59, and "Corporate reputation/image of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working" is in the second one with 3.53, and the third one is "Universal job opportunities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working" with 3.43. On the employer brand "Flexible working system of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working" statement has the lowest average with 2.84.

#### 4.6.3. Percentage distribution on employee satisfaction, arithmetic average and standard deviations

When the arithmetic averages in Table 4 examined, "I am happy with the size of the place I work at, suitability for aims and its hygiene" is at the top with 3.31; the average of "We have social experiences with my colleagues" is 3.19 in the second; "Trainings are carried out to provide me professional and personal development" statement is on the third with 3.16. Under this dimension, "Considering my education, position and the works I deal with, I believe that I get a fair salary" is at the lowest level with 2.74.

#### 4.6.4. Correlation analysis

Without considering that variables are dependent or independent, correlation means the statistical method used for defining the level of relations and their directions. P value is to be more than 0.05 in order to approve  $H_0$  hypothesis. When  $H_0$  hypothesis is approved, there is no directional relation between the variables; when  $H_0$  hypothesis is denied ( $P < 0.05$ ), it is decided that there is a directional relation between two variables. Pearson correlation coefficient is valued between -1 and +1 ( $-1 \leq r \leq +1$ ). r coefficient gives the direction and strength of the relation. If r coefficient had- in values, the relation is inversely proportional; if not (namely, +), the relation is directly proportional (Durmuş, 2013. p. 143).

When the correlation between Employer Brand and Employee Satisfaction, hypothesis 1  $H_0$  is denied with  $r = 679$  and significant  $0.000 < 0.05$ . Accordingly, there is a positive directional relation between these two variables.

#### 4.6.5. Regression analysis

Regression analysis tries to define how a variable (dependent) is explained by the other variable(s) (independent) (Durmuş, 2013. p. 143).

$$Y = A + B * X$$

Here in;

Y = Dependent variable

X = Independent variable

A = Stability coefficient

B = Independent variable coefficient was defined.

$$\text{Employee satisfaction} = 0.818 + 0.691 * \text{employer brand}$$

As a result of regression analysis, it is seen that employer brand can explain 46.1% of employee satisfaction.

Employer brand meaningfully affect (significant  $0.001 < 0.005$ ) employee satisfaction. The effect of employer brand is 0.691 at the employee level. When the components of employer brand is increased one unit, employee satisfaction rate will go up with 0.691. In the regression analysis carried out with the aim of the level of effect on employee satisfaction, it is determined that employer brand affects employee satisfaction ( $\beta = 0.818$ ) in a positive way.

#### 4.6.6. T-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) results

T-test is a statistical method to analyze whether two independent groups' averages are different from each other or not. One way ANOVA is used for analyzing more than two independent groups regarding whether there are any difference or not (Durmuş, 2013. p.143).

Gender variable; when t test results examined, there is not a meaningful difference ( $P = 0.285 > 0.05$ ) for employee satisfaction according to their genders. Therefore, Hypothesis 2  $H_0$  is accepted.

Marital status variable; when t-test results examined, there is not a meaningful difference ( $P = 0.523 > 0.05$ ) for employee satisfaction according to their marital status. Therefore, Hypothesis 4  $H_0$  is accepted.

When ANOVA test results are examined based on the age variables, there is not a meaningful difference ( $P = 0.185 > 0.05$ ) for employee satisfaction according to their ages. Therefore, Hypothesis 3  $H_0$  is accepted.

When ANOVA test results are examined based on the educational level variables, there is not a meaningful difference ( $P = 0.054 > 0.05$ ) for employee satisfaction according to their ages. Therefore, Hypothesis 5  $H_0$  is accepted.

When ANOVA test results are examined based on the work experience, there is not a meaningful difference ( $P = 0.253 > 0.05$ ) for employee satisfaction according to their work experience. Therefore, Hypothesis 6  $H_0$  is accepted.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this research, a positive directed meaningful relation between the employer brand and the employee satisfaction was



**Table 3: Percentage distribution on employer brand, arithmetic average and standard deviations**

	Totally disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Not sure (%)	Agree (%)	Totally agree (%)	Arithmetic average (%)	SD (%)
Statements on employer brand							
1. Corporate culture and values of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	4.9	24.5	16.7	48.0	5.9	3.25	1.05
2. Wages and vested benefits of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	28.4	16.7	41.2	7.8	3.16	1.10
3. Training and professional development facilities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	28.4	21.6	38.2	5.9	3.09	1.06
4. The fact that the employer brand is innovative affect my decision on working	5.9	27.5	28.4	34.3	3.9	3.02	1.00
5. Giving challenging responsibilities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	25.5	34.3	33.3	1.0	2.98	0.93
6. The communication between executives and employees of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	4.9	20.6	27.5	42.2	4.9	3.21	0.99
7. Appraisal system of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	8.8	19.6	42.2	26.5	2.9	2.95	0.96
8. Leadership of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	6.9	23.5	34.3	30.4	4.9	3.02	1.00
9. Career opportunities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	7.8	25.5	33.3	28.4	4.9	2.97	1.02
10. Job security of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	4.9	9.8	23.5	44.1	17.6	3.59	1.04
11. Corporate reputation/image of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	4.9	9.8	24.5	48.0	12.7	3.53	1.00
12. Providing time for social life of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	6.9	13.7	23.5	43.1	12.7	3.41	1.09
13. Universal job opportunities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	15.7	20.6	45.1	12.7	3.43	1.08
14. Social responsibility activities of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	19.6	25.5	41.2	7.8	3.25	1.05
15. Sectoral attractiveness of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	7.8	14.7	24.5	40.2	12.7	3.35	1.12
16. Product/service quality of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	15.7	25.5	43.1	9.8	3.35	1.04
17. Location of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	5.9	14.7	24.5	44.1	10.8	3.39	1.05
18. Competitive position of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	4.9	15.7	29.4	41.2	8.8	3.33	1.00
19. Flexible working system of the employer brand where I work for affect my decision on working	9.8	36.3	17.6	32.4	3.9	2.84	1.10

SD: Standard deviation

**Table 4: Percentage distribution on employee satisfaction, arithmetic average and standard deviations**

	Totally disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Not sure (%)	Agree (%)	Totally agree (%)	Arithmetic average (%)	SD (%)
Statements on employee satisfaction							
1. I feel happy and proud of having a work life here	3.9	23.5	31.4	34.3	6.9	3.16	0.99
2. Job definition and authority distribution is suitable for organizational aims	4.9	26.5	32.4	32.4	3.9	3.03	0.97
3. Trainings are carried out to provide me professional and personal development	6.9	22.5	24.5	39.2	6.9	3.16	1.07
4. My opinions are taken in the decision process of my unit	7.8	22.5	28.4	35.3	5.9	3.08	1.06
5. I am happy with the size of the place I work at, suitability for aims and its hygiene	6.9	17.6	24.5	39.2	11.8	3.31	1.10
6. I do not experience lack of communication between personnel and managers	7.8	23.5	26.5	34.3	7.8	3.10	1.09
7. The works are balanced or fair distributed	9.8	28.4	35.3	22.5	3.9	2.82	1.01
8. I can display my talents and abilities at work	6.9	26.5	26.5	34.3	5.9	3.05	1.06
9. The works I deal with provides me with prestige in addition to new professional knowledge and abilities	8.8	21.6	32.4	34.3	2.9	3.00	1.01
10. Considering my education, position and the works I deal with, I believe that I get a fair salary	14.7	23.5	36.3	23.5	2.0	2.74	1.04
11. I feel that my managers are ready to help me in the works I do	8.8	21.6	34.3	33.3	2.0	2.98	0.99
12. When I have a question, want or suggestion, I can always meet my managers	6.9	19.6	36.3	31.4	5.9	3.09	1.00
13. In the organization I work for, the employees have mutual understanding, respect and rapport	8.8	20.6	34.3	34.3	2.0	3.00	0.99
14. We have social experiences with my colleagues	3.9	18.6	34.3	40.2	2.9	3.19	0.91
15. I appreciate personnel policies towards its employees in this organization	8.8	23.5	41.2	24.5	2.0	2.87	0.95

**Table 5: Hypothesis 1 correlation**

		Employer brand	Satisfaction
Employer brand	Pearson correlation	1	0.679**
	Significant (two-tailed)		0.000
	N	102	102

\*\*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

found. This result is explained like this: The better the employer brand components are, the more the employee satisfaction is. Those employer brand components shaping the employer brand are different advantages presented the employees by the employer. These advantages consist of some components such as corporate culture and their values, wages and appraisal policies, trainings and career development facilities, universal job opportunities, corporate innovative approach and values given to the employees, the organization's location, its field of activity, product, service quality, its name, its reputation. Therefore, to develop these components leads for example by placing and practicing some

components to strength functional and symbolic benefits giving pleasure to the employees in corporate cultural values, by placing salary policies, by structuring career opportunities at a universal level, by structuring work process for increasing corporate reputation, product and services. At the same time, a strong employer brand gives importance to its employees' social development, puts some policies into human resources policies to make them have a qualified and joyful time except the working hours.

The social facilities of the employer brand are another determinant component for both current and potential employees. In addition to them, the image of the employer brand also have importance for current and potential employees. A positive employer brand consists of a strong social responsibility conscious. Nowadays, not only the consumers but also employees follow through the firm's social responsibility activities, they accept that all the activities contributing to firm reputation and image and so they are proud of working at such places. At this point, employer brand communication is not just important for consumer, but also for

**Table 6: Regression analysis results**

Model summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	Standard error of estimate	
1	0.679 <sup>a</sup>	0.461	0.456	0.61129	
ANOVA <sup>a</sup>					
Model	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Significant
Regression	31.987	1	31.987	85.601	0.000 <sup>b</sup>
Residual	37.367	100	0.374		
Total	69.354	101			
Model	Unstandardized coefficients	Standardized coefficients	t	Significant	
	$\beta$	Standard error	Beta		
1 Constant	0.818	0.248		3.298	0.001
Employer brand	0.691	0.075	0.679	9.252	0.000

a,b, As a result of regression analysis, it is seen that employer brand can explain 46.1% of employee satisfaction, model is meaningful with 0.000 significant value, ANOVA: Analysis of variance

**Table 7: T-test results of employee satisfaction according to their gender**

Demographic variable	Dependent variable	Groups	t	df	Significant
Gender	Employee satisfaction	Female	1.076	100	0.285
		Male			

**Table 8: T-test results of employee satisfaction according to marital status**

Demographic variable	Dependent variable	Groups	t	df	Significant
Marital status	Employee satisfaction	Married	0.641	100	0.523
		Single			

**Table 9: ANOVA test results of employee satisfaction according to age variables**

Variables	Variance source	Sum of squares	df	Average of squares	F	Significant
Employee satisfaction	Intergroup	3.314	3	1.105	1.639	0.185
	Intragroup	66.040	98	674		
	Total	69.354	101			

ANOVA: Analysis of variance

current and potential employees. Therefore, at what level social responsibility is essential at the basis of a strong employer brand positioning.

In the research carried out, the components making the employees satisfied are divided into two, such as personal and corporate. Herein, the employer brand is an important corporate factor. A strong employer brand component consists of the relation and communication of manager-employee providing employee satisfaction, career, wage policies, authority distribution, job security, social components, firm reputation, and its name the ones are proud of. Accordingly, the relation between the employer brand and the employee satisfaction, and the employer brand affects the employee satisfaction as a result of the research findings. In this research, there is not a meaningful difference between demographic factors and employee satisfaction. In the

**Table 10: ANOVA test results of employee satisfaction according to educational level variables**

Variables	Variance source	Sum of squares	df	Average of squares	F	Significant
Employee satisfaction	Intergroup	5.172	3	1.724	2.632	0.054
	Intragroup	64.182	98	0.655		
	Total	69.354	101			

ANOVA: Analysis of variance

**Table 11: ANOVA test results of employee satisfaction according to work experience variables**

Variables	Variance source	Sum of squares	df	Average of squares	F	Significant
Employee satisfaction	Intergroup	3.690	4	0.922	1.363	0.253
	Intragroup	65.664	97	0.677		
	Total	69.354	101			

ANOVA: Analysis of variance

circumstances a strong brand creates satisfaction in the eye of all the employees.

## REFERENCES

- Aggerholm H.K, Andersen S.E, Thomson C. (2011), "Conceptualising Employer Branding in Sustainable Organisations", Corporate Communications: An International Journal Vol. 16 No. 2,105-123.
- Aktuğlu, I.K. (2011), Marka Yönetimi, Güçlü ve Başarılı Markalar İçin Temel İlkeler. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.
- Arklan, Ü., Başdemir, E. (2010), Kurum İçi Halkla İlişkiler. İstanbul: Literatür Yayınları.
- Backhaus, K and Surinder T, (2004), "Conceptualizing and Researching Employer Branding", Career Development International, Vol 9, No 5, 501-517.
- Bakan, İ. (2011), Örgütsel Bağlılık-Kavram, Kuram, Sebep ve Sonuçlar. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Barrow, S., Mosley, R. (2007), The employer brand: Bringing the best of brand management to people at work. Book Reviews, Journal of Brand Management, 15, 150-151.
- Baş, T. (2011), İşveren Markası, Yüksek Nitelikli Çalışanları Çekmenin ve Elde Tutmanın Anahtarı. İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.
- Başaran İ.E (1991), Örgütsel Davranış İnsanın Üretim Gücü, Gül Yayınevi: Ankara.

- Berthon, P., Ewing, M., Hah, L.L. (2005), Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151-172.
- Bozkır, S. (2014), Dönüşümcü Liderlik ile İş Tatmini Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi: Kamu ve Özel Sektör Çalışanlarına Yönelik Bir Araştırma Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Bozkurt, İ. (2004), İletişim Odaklı Pazarlama. İstanbul: Mediacat Yayınları.
- Davies G. (2008), "Employer Branding and Its Influence on Managers", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 42, No 5/6, 667-681.
- Durmuş, B. (2013), Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS'le Veri Analizi. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Erdil, O., Keskin, H., İmamoğlu, S.Z., Erat, S. (2004), Yönetim tarzı ve çalışma koşulları, arkadaşlık ortamı ve takdir edilme duygusu ile iş tatmini arasındaki ilişkiler: Tekstil sektöründe bir uygulama. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 5(1), 17-26.
- Erdil, S., Uzun, Y. (2010), Marka Olmak. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayın.
- Eroğluer, K. (2011), Örgütsel iletişim ile iş tatmini unsurları arasındaki ilişki: Kuramsal Bir İnceleme. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 11(1), 121-136.
- Ewing, M., Bussy, N., Berthon, P. (2002), Employment branding in the knowledge economy. *International Journal of Advertising*, 21(1), 3-21.
- Gülakan, G. (2013), Kamu Hizmet Sektöründe Çalışan Memnuniyeti: Yalova Örneği, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yalova: Yalova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Foster C, Khanyapuss P, Ranis C, (2010), "Exploring the Relationship Between Corporate Internal and Employer Branding", *Journal of Products and Brand Management*, 19/6, 2010, 401-409.
- Gülner, B. (2007), Örgütlerde İletişim ve İş Doyumu. İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık. p166-168.
- Güney, S. (2012), Örgütsel Davranış. İstanbul: Nobel Yayın.
- Hemsley, S. (2008), Competing With The Big Boys For Talent, Special Report: Smaller Companies Competing Big Ones, 2.
- Hollis, N. (2011), Küresel Marka. İstanbul: Brandage Yayınları.
- Işık, G.Ü. (2014), Sağlık Hizmetlerinde Kalite ve Çalışan Memnuniyeti: Diyarbakır Kadın Doğum ve Çocuk Hastalıkları Hastanesi Örneği", Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul: Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Kara, M.N. (2013), İşveren Markası ile Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişki, Bilişim Sektöründe Bir Uygulama, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Bursa: Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Keller, L. (2003), Strategic Brand Management. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kotler, P. (2011), A'dan Z'ye Pazarlama, Çev: Aslı Kalem Bakkal. İstanbul: Mediacat Yayınları.
- King C and Grace D (2010), "Building and Measuring Employee Based Brand Equity", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 44, No 7/8, 938-971.
- Moroko, L., Uncles, M. (2008), Characteristics of successful employer brands. *Journal of Brand Management*, 16, 160-175.
- Mosley, R. (2007), Customer experience, organizational culture and the employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 15, 123-134.
- Mucuk, İ. (2007), Pazarlama İlkeleri. İstanbul: Türkmen Kitabevi.
- Oğuz, N. (2012), İşveren Markası ve Kabiliyeti Cezbetme Üzerine Etkisi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İzmir: Ege Üniversitesi: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Öksüz, B. (2012), İşveren markası yönetimi sürecinde iletişimin önemi. *Selçuk İletişim Dergisi*, 7(2), 14-31.
- Ören, K., Yüksel, H. (2012), Marka işveren' veya 'işveren markası' kavramı: Bu kavramın insan kaynakları yönetimi bağlamında ve işçi devir hızı kapsamında değerlendirilmesi. *Kamu/İş*, 12(3), 31-52.
- Schlager T, Mareika B, Maas P, Gachelin J.L (2011), "The Influence of the Employer Brand On Employee Attitudes Relevant For Service Branding: An Emprical Investigation", *Journal of Services Marketing* 25/7, 497-508.
- Swaroop, P., Agrawal, R. K. (2009), "Effect of Employer Brand Image on Application Intentions of B-School Undergraduates", *The Journal of Business Perspective*, Vol: 13, No:3, 44.
- Pinkess, A. (2008), "Show You Really Care to Win Staff", *Brand Strategy*, 38-39
- Thomas, J., Jenifer, C. (2016), Measurement model of employer brand personality a scale construction. *The Journal-Contemporary Management Research*, 10(1), 58-78.
- Vatansever C.(1994), "İnsan Kaynaklarına Yönelik Tutumların Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi: Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
- Yılmaz, E. (2011), Marka İmajı-Alışveriş Merkezlerine İlişkin Bir Araştırma. İstanbul: Türkmen Kitabevi.
- Zhu, F., Wang, Z., Yu, Q., Hu, T., Wen, Y., Liu, Y. (2014), Reconsidering the dimensionality and measurement of employer brand in the Chinese context. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 42(6), 933-948. <http://tdk.gov.tr>, Retrieved: 04.02.2017. <http://www.employerbrandinginternational.com>: 09.02.2017