Author(s): Zhylinska, Oksana; Firsova, Svitlana; Bilorus, Tetiana; Aksom, Herman

Title: Employer brand management : methodological aspects

Year: 2021

Version: Published version

Please cite the original version:

Oksana Zhylinska,
Dr.Sc., Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID, 0000-0003-0848-1390
email: sfirsova@ukr.net

Svitlana Firsova,
Ph.D., Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
ORCID ID, 0000-0003-0848-1390
email: sfirsova@ukr.net

Tetiana Bilorus,
Ph.D., Associate Professor, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
email: t_bilorus@ukr.net
ORCID ID, 0000-0001-7620-4622

Herman Aksom,
Ph.D., Jyväskylä University School of Business and Economics, Finland
ORCID ID, 0000-0002-0566-2965
email: heaksom@student.jyu.fi

Correspondence author: zhylinska@ukr.net

EMPLOYER BRAND MANAGEMENT: METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Abstract. *The paper aims to develop applied aspects of the methodological support of a reasonable selection of the company responsible for the formation and promotion of the employer brand using the tools of multicriteria analysis and evaluation of the functionality of outsourcing companies based on the criteria that determine their competitive advantage. Consequently, the need to attract external resources to manage the employer brand has been substantiated. The authors schematized the decision-making process on a reasonable selection of outsourcing companies. The system of the criteria for the implementation of such a choice, which includes the requirements for both the outsourcing company and the future project: the rate of successful previous projects, the rate of customer satisfaction, the experience of work in Ukraine, the average cost of project development services, project development duration, the comprehensiveness of the developed recommendations for the employer brand promotion, project duration, project flexibility, the complexity level of project implementation, average monthly expenditures during the project period has been formed. Moreover, the paper systematizes the main metrics of outsourcing companies' projects on the employer brand formation and promotion, which include: a range of services for attracting, selecting, retaining, developing and evaluating staff; competitor analysis, HR-advertising, HR-marketing, systems of search engine management, leadership development programs, adaptation programs; differentiation of those organizational metrics that distinguish the customer company as an employer from the nearest competitors and separation of competitive advantages of the customer, values and the emotional component of the brand; development of its unique brand identification system – corporate style, brand book, etc.; formation of the key employer branding metrics: Employer Value Proposition (EVP), Employer Brand Personality, Employer Brand Positioning; insight formation - deep understanding of the relationship between the brand and the target audience, positioning and repositioning the employer brand on the labour market. The outsourcing company's direct selection is proposed to be based on multicriteria optimization, particularly using the analytical hierarchy methods (Saati, T.) to determine the weight coefficients of criteria and VIKOR to construct the resulting indicator. Thus, the method application result is to make justified ratings of outsourcing companies, which will allow customer companies to choose the best alternatives on the market of outsourcing services.*

Keywords*: employer brand, employer attractiveness, internal and external resources for the employer brand formation, outsourcing, project metrics, multicriteria analysis, VIKOR method.*

Introduction. In today's business environment, the employers who are interested in successful long-term operation, obtaining competitive advantages in the market, and improving profitability should make efforts in the direction of forming and developing their employer brand based on scientific developments resulting in improving the quality of service programs for attracting, use and retention of valuable employees. Many leading scientists have thoroughly researched the employer brand category's theoretical principles and the practical aspects of employer brand formation and development. Despite this fact, the paper updates the problems of developing methodical tools that enable companies to select the most appropriate alternatives for attracting internal and external resources to form the employer brand. The organizational support system for forming the employer brand represents an interrelated set of internal structural services and enterprise units, which provide development and adoption of managerial decisions on certain aspects of organization and formation of the employer brand, are responsible for the results of these decisions, as well as of possibilities of attraction of external resources for optimization of auxiliary business processes concerning the formation and promotion of the employer brand. Therefore, the need to work out the criteria that will enable domestic companies to develop an employer branding strategy and a team structure that supports it, primarily through the effective use of outsourcing, has been reviewed.

Literature Review. The evolution of the branding concept contributed to the transformation of ideas about the brand semantic field, which was expanded with corporate branding and internal marketing concepts that became the theoretical preconditions for forming the employer brand concept as a policy and practice management of company's human resources. In 1996, Ambler and Barrow (1996) were the first who used the employer brand term concerning the function of human resources management. In the first decade of the 21st century, leading scientists researched the parameters and attributes of the employer brand attractiveness (Berthon et al., 2005), the characteristics of successful employer brands (Moroko and Uncles, 2008), the role of inner branding in the employer brand implementation (Punjaisri and Wilson, 2007), the relationship between the corporate, the internal brand and the employer brand (Foster et al., 2010), the development and measurement of the employer brand (King and Grace, 2012), the application of the best brand management practices to the employer brand formation (Barrow and Mosley, 2011), the fixed assets created by the company as an employer (Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004), the conceptualization of the employer brand in stable organizations (Aggerholm, et al., 2011), the preconditions for a positive assessment of the employer brand (King, and Grace, 2012) and the implementation of its best version (Mangold and Miles, 2007). In further studies, Botha et al. (2011) identified the employer brand components that can be integrated into a prognostic model of the employer brand. Aggerholm et al. (2011) researched the process of employer branding in stable organizations by different parameters. Minchington (2015) proposed a model of the employer brand contact experience and a model of the employer brand capital (Minchington,2016).

In the research (Bilorus and Firsova, 2018), the authors conducted online surveys among the leaders of domestic companies to find out to what extent they understand not only the need to work out an employer brand strategy but also to gather the team that will support and develop the employer brand. The selected companies were from the same industries and sectors of the economy from which HeadHunter Ukraine annually selects them for the Best Employer of the Year competition. According to the online survey results, the most expedient alternatives for companies to attract internal and external resources for the formation and development of the employer brand are the following: hiring a qualified freelancer to perform the duties of an employer brand manager – 12% of the respondents; assigning a company's department of marketing and public relations to form and promote the employer brand – 18% of the respondents; gathering a company's inter-functional team of specialists of the personnel department, marketing, public relations and communications, branding, etc. who will jointly solve the issues of the formation and promotion of the employer brand – 27% of the polled; attraction of an

outsourcing company specializing in the formation and promotion of the employer brand (signing an outsourcing contract) – 24% of the respondents; assigning the company's HR department to form and promote the employer brand –s 19% of the respondents.

The issue of organizational support for the formation and development of the employer brand should be of a systematic nature, which determines the need for independent work based on the use of certain methodological support. It is expedient to solve this issue using modern methods of multicriteria analysis.

Methodology and research methods. HeadHunter Ukraine conducts the contest «Employer of the Year» and defines domestic companies' ratings from all industries and sectors of the economy. This rating aims to examine the preferences that employees have in mind when they search for employers, what they are looking for and value when they search for a new working place, and which employer is currently the most attractive on the labor market according to job seekers respectively. As such, this rating's primary purpose deals with the attitudes and judgments job seekers express towards their potential employers. The last survey's target audience included active job seekers: students and young specialsits in their respective domains with the work experience from 1 to 2 years and respondents whose working experience exceeds 3 years. An online survey among respondence and experts has been conducted from 10 September 2018 till 16 December 2018. It included three «waves» of questionnaire sending. The first wave occurred between September-October (1430 respondents); the second wave October-November (1490 respondents); the third wave December (7 experts). In the final calculating employers' final rating, search engineers and experts' opinion was taken into account in the ratio of the weight of the assessment to 60:40. According to the results of the «Best Employer of the Year» competition, sponsored by Headhunter Ukraine in 2018, the most popular areas among job seekers were: IT sector – 41%, media, PR, advertisement – 21%, finances, banking, investments – 17%, trade – 15%, FMCG – 14%. The dataset was obtained from the reports of the Employer Rating of 2018: HeadHunter Ukraine survey results.

In May 2019, authors conducted an online survey among the managers of domestic companies in those industries and sectors which have been selected by job seekers in the top ranking of employees according to HeadHunter Ukraine in 2018. The survey questionnaire contained 10 closed multivariate questions. The survey's main task was to identify the most appropriate alternatives for companies for attracting internal and external resources for the formation and development of the employer's brand, which was identified in the framework of the previous study presented in the paper. The dataset was obtained from the reports of the   Employer Rating of 2018: HeadHunter Ukraine survey results. 250 questionnaires were sent, the percentage of returned questionnaires was approximately 53%. Among the returned questionnaires, a deterministic proportional sample was made according to the percentage of those industries and spheres of activity identified by job seekers as the most popular. According to the results of the heads of domestic enterprises' questionnaire, the departments responsible for managing the employer's brand in the section of the most popular industries were identified (Table 1).

Table 1. Results of an online survey of domestic companies managers, %

Responsible for employer branding	IT sector	Media, PR, advertisement	Finances, banking, investments	Trading	FMCG
HR-department	10	15	10	19	16
Marketing department	5	10	12	15	18
CEO		2	2	3	3
Functional directors				2	1
Board of directors		1	1		
HR-department, marketing department, communication department of branding	18	13	17	24	18

Continued Table 1

HR department, marketing department	**5**	**5**	**4**	**8**	
HR-department, communication department	5	12	10	7	6
Communication department		8	5	2	4
Branding department		2	3	5	8
Talent management department	2	1			
Freelancers	28	15	13	3	4
Outsourcing company	27	16	20	12	22
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Sources: developed by the authors.

Table 1 demonstrates respondents' answers in the context of each popular industry. An alternative to the most interesting ones for the authors of this study is highlighted in italics. Thus, the percentage of companies that attract internal and external resources for the formation and development of the employer's brand varies depending on the sectoral distribution. Therefore, freelance auditors prefer the 28% of respondents from the IT sphere and only 3% from the trade sector. Formation of an employer brand using outsourcing company services requires 27% of IT respondents, 22% of respondents to the FMCG segment, 20% finance, banks, investment, 12% of the trade, 16% of media, PR, and advertising. Almost 20% of domestic companies' top managers prefer outsourcing for employer branding design and development in their organizations. The methodological support of implementing a reasonable choice of a company-outsourcer based on the criteria that determine their competitive advantage with the use of multicriteria analysis tools becomes even more important. Methodical provision of the process of making a reasonable selection of the company, which will deal with the issues of the formation and promotion of the employer brand, has been developed by the authors and presented in Figure 1 in the form of an algorithm for making such a decision VIKOR method almost at full extent meets the criteria of simplicity, universality, informativeness, and ranking (Opricovic,1998; Opricovic and Tzeng, 2002, 2004, 2007). This method is widely used by its authors, their students, and experts involved in the evaluation of complex processes using multicriteria methods of analysis (Tzeng et al., 2005; Lin et al., 2010; Liou et al., 2011, Sanayei et al., 2014; Bazzazi et al., 2011); Wang and Tzeng, 2012; Chiu et al., 2013; Yazdani and Graeml, 2014; Bausys and Zavadskas, 2015; Tavana et al., 2016; Chatterjee and Kar, 2017) VIKOR method involves solving an urgent multicriteria optimization problem: let there be a plurality of alternative variants of a system, each of which is characterized by a set of indicators evaluating the system's functioning. For each of the indicators, the weight coefficient is defined that characterizes its importance. It is assumed that each of the indicators has either a monotonically increasing or a monotonically decreasing target function. According to such data, it is necessary to build a priority set of available alternatives according to the degree of their relative advantage. In contrast to the well-known and similar TOPSIS multicriteria analysis method, in the VIKOR method, in addition to determining the shortest distance to the ideal positive decision and the longest one from the negative decision, the relative importance of these distances is also taken into account. The article aims to develop the applied aspects of methodological support of the process of making a reasonable selection of the company responsible for the issues of the formation and promotion of the employer brand of a financial and credit institution using the tools of multicriteria analysis and evaluation of the functionality of outsourcing companies based on the criteria that determine their competitive advantage.

Results. Outsourcing of business processes is a general tool in the practice of business entities' activity. Currently, several companies are specializing in the formation and development of the employer

brand in the Ukrainian market of services. The essence of their offers and the cost of services are quite diverse.

1.Selection and justification of the system of the criteria for the selection of an outsourcing company: $K_1, K_2, \ldots K_n$

↓

2. Determination of the weight coefficients of the criteria for the selection of an outsourcing company (using the hierarchy analysis method) : $w_1, w_2, \ldots w_n$

2.1. Construction of the comparison matrix based on Saati T. scale	→	2.2. Calculation of the weight coefficients of the criteria	→	2.3. Checking the level of consistency: $J \leq 0.1 \cdot J$?

\+

3. Obtaining estimates of each company by the defined criteria and building a decision matrix (m is the number of outsourcing companies to be compared; N is the total number of evaluation criteria)

↓

3.1.Normalization of the decision matrix: $r_{ij} = \dfrac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2}}$

↓

3.2. Determination of artificial alternatives: an ideal positive and an ideal negative decision

↓

3.3. Calculation of the indicator S_i, for each i-th alternative, which characterizes its proximity to the best point

↓

3.4.Calculation of the indicator R_i, for each i-th alternative, which characterizes its maximum distance from the best point by the indicator with the greatest distance

↓

3.5. Calculation of the value of the generalized preference indicator Q_i, for each i-th alternative: $Q_i = v * \left(\dfrac{S_i - S^+}{S^- - S^+}\right) + (1 - v) * \left(\dfrac{R_i - R^+}{R^- - R^+}\right)$

↓

3.6. Ranking of alternatives according the calculated values Q_i (the higher the value is Q_i, the «weaker» the alternative is and vice versa)

Figure 1. Decision-making algorithm for selecting an outsourcing company
Sources: developed by the authors.

To make an optimal choice of a potential outsourcer, the proposals of five indicative outsourcing companies with strong market positions, best responses, and well-known clients have been analyzed. Here is a brief description of each of the offered projects for the employer brand development and their component metrics. For convenience, the companies will be defined as future alternatives for multicriteria analysis.

Consequently, to determine the resultant indicator to rate the outsourcing companies, one of the methods of multicriteria analysis of alternatives, the authors selected the VIKOR method. The matrix of the criteria values and the vector of their weight coefficients present the output data for the VIKOR method.

Table 2. The essence of outsourcing companies' offers on the formation and promotion of the employer brand

Company	Core metrics
A1	Full range of services in commodity and corporate branding, creation of Internet projects and presentations, development of complex solutions for business, advertising, marketing promotion. The result will include focusing on what the organization is planning to do (formulation of the strategy, mission, vision, and brand essence) and how it does it (analysis of the market situation and positioning of the brand, value, style, corporate culture). Potential and existing employees will be able to see the tangible benefits offered by the company stability in following general corporate norms and values over a long time.
A2	Full range of services for attracting, selecting, maintaining, developing, and evaluating staff. Competitors analysis, HR-advertising, HR-marketing, search engine management systems, leadership development programs, adaptation programs. Formation of the key employer branding metrics: Employer Value Proposition (EVP); Employer Brand Personality; Employer Brand Positioning. Creation of a holistic employer brand.
A3	Insight formation is a profound understanding of the relationship between the brand and the target audience, positioning, and repositioning of the employer brand on the labor market. The work will answer the following questions: What is a new idea of the brand and its content? What targeted brands will the updated brand work with? From what key attributes will it consist, and what changes will it bring? What new benefits will it provide to the buyer/user?
A4	Differentiation of those organizational metrics that distinguish it as an employer from the nearest competitors and distinguish the competitive advantages of the customer, values and emotional components of the brand, the development of its unique brand identification system – brand identity, brandbook, etc. As a result, the following goals will be achieved: creating a positive image of the company, its values; formation of the customer communication system with the consumer; development of the concept of positioning the brand on the market; creation of visual and verbal identification of the service; definition of the concept of an advertising campaign and advertising media.
A5	Familiarization of the main target groups with the brand characteristics. Creation of a media plan, grouped according to advertising directions, indicating the contractors, parameters, and recommendations for launching one or another advertisement. Analysis of the advertising quality, links, the effectiveness of selected media, and the proposal of an alternative advertising strategy work with Internet sources: sites for job search, promotion, and development of its own customer company career site.

Sources: developed by the authors.

In the opinion of the authors, the system of criteria for selecting an outsourcing company to develop a project for the employer brand formation and promotion should include the following indicators (criteria): K1 – the rate of successful previous projects (%): K2 – the rate of customer satisfaction (%); K3 – the experience of work in Ukraine (in years); K4 – the average cost of outsourcing company services for project development (% of total project cost); K5 – thr project development duration (in months); K6 – comprehensiveness of the developed recommendations for promoting the employer brand (points – 10); K7 – project duration (in months); K8 – project flexibility (points – 10); K9 – complexity level of project implementation (points – 10); K10 – average monthly expenditures during the project period (% of total project cost).

Table 3 presents the generated input data for multicriteria analysis based on the above criteria analysis. To determine these criteria' weight coefficients, Saaty (1980, 1982) suggested using the hierarchy analysis method.

The first step is to construct a matrix of pairwise comparisons of the selected criteria (performed using the Saati scale) based on the principle of discrimination and the comparison of judgments.

Table 3. Input data for multicriteria analysis

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10
A1	90	84	5	18	2	8	24	7	9	4,2
A2	87	81	3,5	20	2,5	9	18	6	7	5,6
A3	85	83	2,5	17	1,5	6	12	8	6	8,3
A4	85	75	3	18	3	8	24	6	8	4,2
A5	92	78	4,5	15	2	7	18	7	7	8,3
	max	max	max	min	min	max	max	max	min	min

Sources: developed by the authors.

The following is to define the weight coefficients using the formula:

$$w_i = \frac{\sqrt[n]{a_{i1} \times a_{i1} \times \ldots \times a_{iN}}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \sqrt[n]{a_{k1} \times a_{k1} \times \ldots \times a_{kN}}} \tag{1}$$

where w_1, $w_2 \ldots w_n$ − a set of true relative values of each element of the criteria range, a_{iN}− estimation of the relative preference of K_i criterion over K_j, i = 1, 2…N, a_{kN} − estimation of the relative preference by N-th criterion.

Table 4 presents the calculation results of the weight coefficients of the criteria for selecting alternatives.

Table 4. Weight coefficients of the criteria for selecting alternatives

Criterion	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10
W_i	0,06	0,06	0,02	0,09	0,11	0,26	0,02	0,02	0,15	0,21

Sources: developed by the authors.

An important step is to test the expert opinion consistency using the consistency index:

$$J = \frac{|n^* - n|}{n-1} \tag{2}$$

where J – consistency index, n^* − largest eigenvalue, а n – number of criteria or alternatives.

Considering that the matrix rank is equal to 10, all elements of such a matrix should be close to 10. The result is as follows:

n^*= (8,73 + 12,26 + 10,63+10,8+11,02+12,23+10,89+11,29+12,05+11,24) / 10
n^*= 111,14 / 10 = 11,114

Thus, the consistency (organicity) index equals:

$$J = \frac{|n^* - n|}{n-1} = \frac{|11.114 - 10|}{10 - 1} = 0.12338 \tag{3}$$

The standard value of J^* consistency index for N = 10 equals to 1,49 (32). The expert opinion is considered to be consistent if $J \leq 0,1^*J^*$. Checking it out is: *J= 0,1238; 0,1*J* = 0,1*1,49 = 0,149*; thus, *0,1238 < 0,149*, that is *J< 0,1*J**. Consequently, the expert opinion is consistent.

Having all the source data to use the VIKOR method, an algorithm that contains the following steps can be applied (Opricovic and Tzeng, 2002):

Stage 1. Normalization of the decision matrix. r_{ij} element of the normalized matrix is calculated from the output decision matrix by the formula:

$$r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2}} \tag{4}$$

First, the values X_{kj}^2, $\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2$ та $\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2}$ should be calculated:

Table 5. Decision matrix interim calculations

X_{kj}^2	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10
A1	8100	7056	25	324	4	64	576	49	81	17,64
A2	7569	6561	12,25	400	6,25	81	324	36	49	31,36
A3	7225	6889	6,25	289	2,25	36	144	64	36	68,89
A4	7225	5625	9	324	9	64	576	36	64	17,64
A5	8464	6084	20,25	225	4	49	324	49	49	68,89
$\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2$	38583	32215	72,75	1562	25,5	294	1944	234	279	204,42
$\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2}$	196,43	179,49	8,53	39,52	5,05	17,15	44,09	15,3	16,70	14,30

Sources: developed by the authors.

Then, the normalized decision matrix should be composed by calculating its values by the formula:

$$r_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} x_{kj}^2}}$$ (thus, r_{11} = 90 / 196,43 = 0,4582 etc.):

Table 6. Normalized decision matrix D

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10
A1	0,4582	0,468	0,5862	0,4555	0,3960	0,4665	0,5443	0,4575	0,5389	0,2937
A2	0,4429	0,451	0,4103	0,5061	0,4950	0,5248	0,4083	0,3922	0,4192	0,3916
A3	0,4327	0,462	0,2931	0,4302	0,2970	0,3499	0,2722	0,5229	0,3593	0,5804
A4	0,4327	0,418	0,3517	0,4555	0,5941	0,4665	0,5443	0,3922	0,4790	0,2937
A5	0,4684	0,435	0,5275	0,3796	0,3960	0,4082	0,4083	0,4575	0,4192	0,5804

Source: developed by the authors.

Stage 2. For each indicator, based on the data given in the normalized matrix $[r_{ij}]$, two artificial alternatives of an ideal positive A^+ and an ideal negative A^- the decision should be defined, consequently:

$$A^+ = \{(\ r_{ij} \ | j \in J^{max}), (min \ r_{ij} | j \in J^{min}), i = 1,2,...,m\} = \{r_1^+, r_2^+, ... r_N^+\}, \tag{5}$$

$$A^- = \{(\ r_{ij} \ | j \in J^{max}), (max \ r_{ij} | j \in J^{min}), i = 1,2,...,m\} = \{r_1^-, r_2^-, ... r_N^-\}, \tag{6}$$

where

$$J^{max} = \{j | j = 1,2,...,N | \ should \ be \ maximized \ by \ j\} \tag{7}$$

$$J^{min} = \{j|j = 1,2, \ldots, N|should \ be \ minimised \ be \ j\} \tag{8}$$

Table 7. Artificial alternatives of an ideal positive A^+ and an ideal negative A^- decision

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10
	max	max	max	min	min	max	max	max	min	min
A^+	r_1^+	r_2^+	r_3^+	r_4^+	r_5^+	r_6^+	r_7^+	r_8^+	r_9^+	r_{10}^+
	0,4684	0,4680	0,5862	0,38	0,2970	0,525	0,5443	0,5229	0,3593	0,2937
A^-	r_1^-	r_2^-	r_3^-	r_4^-	r_5^-	r_6^-	r_7^-	r_8^-	r_9^-	r_{10}^-
	0,4327	0,4179	0,2931	0,506	0,5941	0,350	0,2722	0,3922	0,5389	0,5804

Sources: developed by the authors.

Stage 3. For each *i*-th alternative, the value of S_i indicator, which characterizes its approximation to the best point, should be calculated by the formula:

$$S_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left| \frac{w_j * (r_j^+ - r_{ij})}{r_j^+ - r_j^-} \right|, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, N, j = 1, \ldots, m \tag{9}$$

The value $\left| \frac{w_j * (r_j^+ - r_{ij})}{r_j^+ - r_j^-} \right|$ for each *j*-th criterion is presented in the table:

Table 8. S_i indicator value calculation

	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5	K6	K7	K8	K9	K10	
	max	max	max	min	min	max	max	max	min	min	S_i
W_i	0,06	0,06	0,02	0,09	0,11	0,26	0,02	0,02	0,15	0,21	
A1	0,0171	0,000	0,000	0,054	0,0367	0,087	0,000	0,010	0,15	0,000	**0,3545**
A2	0,0429	0,020	0,012	0,090	0,0733	0,000	0,010	0,020	0,05	0,072	**0,3899**
A3	0,060	0,0067	0,020	0,036	0,000	0,260	0,020	0,000	0,00	0,210	**0,6127**
A4	0,060	0,060	0,016	0,054	0,110	0,087	0,000	0,020	0,10	0,000	**0,5067**
A5	0,000	0,040	0,004	0,000	0,0367	0,173	0,010	0,010	0,05	0,210	**0,5340**

Sources: developed by the authors.

Stage 4. For each *i*-th alternative, the value of R_i indicator, which characterizes its maximum distance from the best point by the indicator with the greatest distance, should be calculated by the formula:

$$R_i = \max_j \left[\left| \frac{w_j * (r_j^+ - r_{ij})}{r_j^+ - r_j^-} \right| \right] \tag{10}$$

Table 9. R_i indicator value

	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5
R_i	0,150	0,090	0,260	0,110	0,1733

Sources: developed by the authors.

Stage 5. For each *i*-th alternative, the value of Q_i generalized index of preference should be calculated by the formula:

$$Q_i = v * \left(\frac{S_i - S^+}{S^- - S^+} \right) + (1 - v) * \left(\frac{R_i - R^+}{R^- - R^+} \right) \tag{11}$$

$$S^+ = \min_i S_i, \ S^- = \max_i S_i, \ R^+ = \min_i R_i, \ R^- = \max_i R_i, \qquad (12)$$

where v – balanced coefficient from $[0, 1]$ interval, which takes into account the contribution to the value of Q_i indicator for *i*-th alternative, its approximation to the best point and the distance from the best point by the indicator with the greatest distance.

The value of the Q_i-indicator should be calculated for the several values of v coefficient.

The value v from $[0, 1]$ interval leads to a different contribution to the value of the generalized indicator of components of the formula for its calculation.

There is a calculation of the value of Q_i for three values of $v = 0,4; v = 0,5; v = 0,6$. Basic formula components defined in the preceding stages are as follows:

$$S^+ = \min_i S_i = 0,3545 \ ; \quad S^- = \max_i S_i = 0,6127$$

$$R^+ = \min_i R_i = 0,090 \ ; \quad R^- = \max_i R_i = 0,1733$$

Table 10. Q_i generalized indicator of preference

	$v = 0,4$	$v = 0,5$	$v = 0,6$
	Q_i	Q_i	Q_i
A1	0,4322	0,3601	0,2881
A2	0,0548	0,0686	0,0823
A3	1,6245	1,5204	1,4163
A4	0,3798	0,4148	0,4497
A5	0,8781	0,8476	0,8171

Sources: developed by the authors.

Stage 6. Ranking alternatives according to the calculated values of Qi (the greater the value of Qi is, the «weaker» an alternative is and vice versa).

If the value of $v = 0,4$: A2→A4→A1→A5→A3;
If the value of $v = 0,5$: A2→A1→A4→A5→A3;
If the value of $v = 0,6$: A2→A1→A4→A5→A3.

Thus, based on the results of the calculations performed based on the authors' algorithm using Saati and VIKOR methods, the best alternative is the A2 outsourcing company. It offered a full range of services for attracting, selecting, retaining, developing, and evaluating staff. The positive features of this outsourcing company's offerings are the following: one of the highest rate of the comprehensiveness of the developed recommendations for the employer brand promotion – 9 points, one of the lowest level of the project implementation complexity – 7 points and one of the lowest rate of the project duration – 18 months. Among the negative criteria that did not affect the company's leadership, it is worth noting the highest cost of project development services – 20% of the project's total cost and one of the longest project development time – 2.5 months.

Conclusions. The last decade has shown an increase in the demand for expert knowledge and world experience in creating and implementing an employer brand. At the same time, leading Ukrainian companies view and implement their brand strategy in different ways. Domestic companies' leadership understands that they have to develop an employer brand strategy and the team's structure to support it. But who should be responsible for this: the department of personnel, marketing, all together or there is a need to attract external resources (freelancers, outsourcing companies, etc.)? Therefore, the necessity of attracting external resources for the formation of the employer brand has been substantiated; the criteria

system for a reasonable selection of outsourcing companies has been formed. The company's direct choice is proposed to be based on multicriteria optimization, particularly on using the analytical hierarchy methods (Saaty, 1980; 1982) to determine the criteria weight coefficients and VIKOR to construct the resulting indicator. The method application result is to make justified ratings of outsourcing companies, which will allow the companies looking for outsourcing services to choose the best alternatives.

Among the research's promising areas is to find out the relevance of introducing in companies an employer brand manager position and formulation of the official duties. The employer brand manager has to be able to apply the principles of the employer brand concept based on the formation, support, and positioning of the unique image of the company as an employer in the labor market, attractive for both potential and actual staff, which will enable companies to operate in modern conditions successfully.

Authors Contributions: conceptualization T. B. and S. F.; methodological issue by S. F.; software T. B. and S. F.; analysis and investigation T. B. and S. F.; resources T. B.; writing and original draft – T. B.; revision – S. F.; formatting – T. B. and S. F.

References

Aggerholm, H. K., Andersen, S. E., & Thomsen, C. (2011). Conceptualising employer branding in sustainable organisations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. The Journal of Brand Management, 4, 185—206. Retrieved from [Link]

Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career development international*, 9(5), 501 – 517. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Barrow, S., & Mosley, R. (2011). The employer brand: Bringing the best of brand management to people at work. John Wiley & Sons. [Google Scholar]

Bausys, R., & Zavadskas, E. K. (2015). Multicriteria decision making approach by VIKOR under interval neutrosophic set environment. *Infinite Study*. [Google Scholar]

Bazzazi, A. A., Osanloo, M., & Karimi, B. (2011). Deriving preference order of open pit mines equipment through MADM methods: Application of modified VIKOR method. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38(3), 2550-2556. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

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

Bilorus T. V., & Firsova S. G. (2018). The Organizational Support for the Formation and Development of an Employer's Brand. *Business-Inform*, 7, 314–326. Retrieved from [Link]

Botha, A., Bussin, M., & De Swardt, L. (2011). An employer brand predictive model for talent attraction and retention. *SA journal of human resource management*, 9(1), 12. [Google Scholar]

Chatterjee, K., & Kar, S. (2017). Unified Granular-number-based AHP-VIKOR multicriteria decision framework. *Granular Computing,* 2(3), 199-221. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Chiu, W. Y., Tzeng, G. H., & Li, H. L. (2013). A new hybrid MCDM model combining DANP with VIKOR to improve e-store business. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 37, 48-61. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Foster, C., Punjaisri, K., & Cheng, R. (2010). Exploring the relationship between corporate, internal and employer branding. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 19(6), 401-409. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

King, C., & Grace, D. (2010). Building and measuring employee-based brand equity. *European Journal of marketing*, 44(7/8), 938-971. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

King, C., & Grace, D. (2012). Examining the antecedents of positive employee brand-related attitudes and behaviours. *European Journal of Marketing*, 46(3/4), 469-488. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Lin, C. L., Hsieh, M. S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2010). Evaluating vehicle telematics system by using a novel MCDM techniques with dependence and feedback. *Expert systems with applications*, 37(10), 6723-6736. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Liou, J. J., Tsai, C. Y., Lin, R. H., & Tzeng, G. H. (2011). A modified VIKOR multiple-criteria decision method for improving domestic airlines service quality. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 17(2), 57-61. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Mangold, W. G., & Miles, S. J. (2007). The employee brand: Is yours an all-star? *Business horizons*, 50(5), 423-433. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Minchington, B., & Morris, L. G. (2015). In Employer branding experience is everything. Employer brand international: Global *Trends Whitepaper Series*. Retrieved from [Link]

Minchington, B. (2011). Build employer brand equity: international waters-employer branding. *HR Future*, 2011(Jan 2011), 13-14. [Google Scholar]

Moroko, L., & Uncles, M. D. (2008). Characteristics of successful employer brands. *Journal of brand management*, 16(3), 160-175. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Opricovic, S. (1998). Multicriteria optimization of civil engineering systems. *Faculty of Civil Engineering, Belgrade*, 2(1), 5-21.

Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2002). Multicriteria planning of post-earthquake sustainable reconstruction. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 17(3), 211-220. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2004). Compromise solution by MCDM methods: A comparative analysis of VIKOR and TOPSIS. *European journal of operational research*, 156(2), 445-455. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Opricovic, S., & Tzeng, G. H. (2007). Extended VIKOR method in comparison with outranking methods. *European journal of operational research*, 178(2), 514-529. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Punjaisri, K., & Wilson, A. (2007). The role of internal branding in the delivery of employee brand promise. In Advances in corporate branding (pp. 91-108). Palgrave Macmillan, London. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Saaty, T. L. (1980). The analytical hierarchy process, planning, priority. Resource allocation. RWS publications, USA.

Saaty, T. L.(1982) .Decision Making for Leaders: The Analytical Hierarchy Process for Decisions in a Complex World.Wadsworth.

Sanayei, A., Mousavi, S. F., & Yazdankhah, A. (2014). Group decision making process for supplier selection with VIKOR under fuzzy environment. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 37(1), 24-30. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Tavana, M., Mavi, R. K., Santos-Arteaga, F. J., & Doust, E. R. (2016). An extended VIKOR method using stochastic data and subjective judgments. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 97, 240-247. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Tzeng, G. H., Lin, C. W., & Opricovic, S. (2005). Multicriteria analysis of alternative-fuel buses for public transportation. *Energy policy,* 33(11), 1373-1383. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Wang, Y. L., & Tzeng, G. H. (2012). Brand marketing for creating brand value based on a MCDM model combining DEMATEL with ANP and VIKOR methods. *Expert systems with applications*, 39(5), 5600-5615. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Yazdani, M., & Graeml, F. R. (2014). VIKOR and its applications: A state-of-the-art survey. *International Journal of Strategic Decision Sciences* (IJSDS), 5(2), 56-83. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef]

Оксана Жилінська, д.е.н., професор, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Україна
Світлана Фірсова, к.е.н., доцент, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Україна
Тетяна Білорус, к.е.н., доцент, Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка, Україна
Герман Аксьом, Ph.D., Школа бізнесу та економіки університету Ювяскюля, Фінляндія

Управління брендом компанії-роботодавця: методичні аспекти

У статті обґрунтовано необхідність залучення зовнішніх ресурсів для управління брендом роботодавця. У роботі авторами було схематизовано процес прийняття рішення щодо обґрунтованого вибору компаній аутсорсерів. При цьому сформовано систему критеріїв здійснення такого вибору, що включає як вимоги до компанії-аутсорсера, так і вимоги до майбутнього проекту: рівень вдалих попередніх проектів; рівень задоволеності клієнтів; досвід роботи в Україні; середня вартість послуг аутсорсингової компанії з розробки проекту; термін розробки проекту; комплексність розроблених рекомендацій щодо просування бренду роботодавця; термін дії проекту; гнучкість проекту; рівень складності впровадження проекту; середній рівень щомісячних витрат в період дії проекту. Авторами систематизовано основні метрики проектів аутсорсингових компаній по формуванню й просуванню бренду роботодавця компаній замовників, які включають: комплекс послуг з залучення, відбору, утримання, розвитку та оцінки персоналу; аналіз конкурентів, HR-рекламу, HR-маркетинг, системи управління пошукачами, програми розвитку лідерства, адаптаційні програми; диференціювання тих організаційних метрик, які відрізняють компанію замовника як роботодавця від найближчих компаній-конкурентів та виокремлення конкурентних переваг замовника, цінностей та емоційної складової бренду; розроблення своєї унікальної системи ідентифікації бренду – фірмовий стиль, брендбук і т.д.; формування ключових метрик брендингу компанії-роботодавця – ціннісної пропозиції компанії-роботодавця (Employer Value Proposition – EVP), індивідуальності бренду роботодавця (Employer Brand Personality), позиціонування бренду роботодавця (Employer Brand Positioning); формування інсайту (глибинного розуміння зв'язку між брендом і цільовою аудиторією); позиціювання та репозиціювання бренду роботодавця на ринку праці. У ході дослідження запропоновано здійснювати безпосередній вибір компанії аутсорсера на основі багатокритеріальної оптимізації, зокрема на використанні методів аналітичної ієрархії (Т. Сааті) – для визначення коефіцієнтів вагомості критеріїв та VIKOR – для побудови результуючого показника. Результатом застосування методики стало здійснення обґрунтованого рейтингування компаній аутсорсерів, що дозволяє компаніям замовникам аутсорсингових послуг обрати кращу з альтернатив.

Ключові слова: бренд роботодавця, привабливість роботодавця, внутрішні й зовнішні ресурси формування бренду роботодавця, аутсорсинг, метрики проектів, багатокритеріальний аналіз, метод VIKOR.