An Examination on the Impact of Internal and External Environment Strategies Oncorporate Branding

FuatOktay

Office of the Undersecretary of the Prime Ministry of Turkey, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract: *Especially after the Second World War, Strategic management approach has emerged as an important tool to keep the organizations ahead in the competitive environment.Strategic planningcovers all the process thathelps us to identify where the institution want to be in the future and how to carry the institution into that desired future by calculating the corporate resources, the organizations' internal and external potentials. It also contributes to the success of the institution in accordance with the adoption rate within the organization's internal staff. In this context, the branding of the institution as a component of strategic management and the good understanding of the brand identity by the internal staff are the important indicators in terms of organizational development.This study aims to investigate AFAD employees' perceptions of the Internal and External Environment Strategy andthese perceptions effect on corporate branding perception. The research was conducted with quantitative research design and the research group was composed of 234AFAD employees in total; 189 male participants (%80, 8) and 45 female participants (%19, 2). With this study, it is found out that there is a correlation between the sub-dimensions of internal and external strategies and the institutional branding, and it also reveals that the organization's internal and external environment strategies help to predict the institutional branding perception of the internal staff to a considerable extent.*
Keywords: *Strategy, Management, Internal Image, Organization.*

I. Introduction

1.1. Strategic Managament

The use of strategy and strategic management in enterprises goes back to very ancient times.Over the last fifty years, planning as one of the management function has undergone a change in definition respectively as follows: long-term planning, corporate planning, strategic planning and strategic management (Ülgenand Mirze, 2010).Plan is defined as "deciding mediums and strategies to attain the goals and roughly determine how to do what you want" (Eren, 2002, p. 17), and Planalso "involves an individual making a decision about his future from today, where to get and what to realize in the future" (Koçel, 2007, p. 93), and "planning is defined as an analysis of mediums and goals to attain the desired end" (Betz, 2001). As a term, strategy has begun to take place in the social sciences and the economical field since 1939-1940s. Although in some works it is possible to come across the strategy as a term, the term was first coined and used in its exact etymology as an economical term byboth economist and mathematician scientists, Neuman and Morgenstern (Dinçer, 2007, p.17). Both scientists define the strategy term by "comparing it to the two artists' rational behaviors to achieve maximum personal interest" (Akgemciand Güleş, 2010).

According to Eren (2002), strategy involves mutual action and reaction relationship between the pre-determined goals and the mediums that help to attain these goals. The strategy of an enterprise determines how and how much enterprises' activities are satisfying to attain the intended vision and mission. According to Dinçer (2007, 21), "strategy is a process giving the business direction and determining adaptive objectives by making a continuous analysis of the business environment, planning the activities and reorganizing the required tools and resources to ensure competitive edge".

Betz (2001) argues that strategy is a central mental activity management and a long-term perspective on change. Yip (2003) maintains that each business lines of an enterprise must have its own core strategy, and in order to create the strategy, it is essential to make the description of the work properly.

The most important factors that make up the definition best are the customer portfolio of services given, and services and products offered.

1.1.1 Strategic Planning

Strategic Planning started off, especially after the Second World War when the institutions' obligatoryimplementations of long term planning studies were put into practice.(Ülgen and Mirze, 2010). Although the origin of strategic planning was based on the military, from the mid-1960s and until the mid-1970s, it has become an issue of importance in the business world. The institutions strives to develop a strategic plan but mostly the strategic plan works for the day is not given place in the taken decisions, and therefore; it does not prove successful, effective, or satisfactory. In fact, according to the research by (Timothy and

Richardson,2011), more than %70 of strategic plans in business field are not put into practice. In 1960   s,   the Ansoff enterprises brought an analytical approach to the long term strategic planning. According to this approach, the events are examined with rational and analytical way of thinking, and as a result of this analytical thinking, the future has started to take form (ÜlgenveMirze, 2010).Eren (2010, p,4) described the strategy as "long term plans made by the top management to attain the organizations' expected purposes and mission". Aktan (2008) defines strategy as "the ways pursued to achieve the intended goals of an organization". Snell (2002, p.115) explains that" strategy is a series of plans to take decision regarding the long-term targets and strategies of an organization."

1.1.2 Strategic Method

Drucker sees strategic management as a continuous process consisting of three elements that constantly clash with each other. 1) to take existing entrepreneur decisions in a systematic way and with a greater knowledge of the future, 2) to enact these decisions, the attempts are arranged systematically, 3) To measure the results against expectations of these decisions through systematic feedback.(Akt. Luhanga, Mkude, Mbwette, Chijoriga, Ngirwa, 2003). Luhangaet al. (2003, p.51) claim that "strategic management is both interventional and operational. John M. Bryson argues thatstrategic management is a management technique that tells about what an organization do, the reason for its existence, and its future targets". (Aktan, 2008). Strategic planning, within the context of strategic management, can be taken as an executive activity (Sönmez, 2010, p. 22). Dinçer (2007, pp. 36-38) defines the strategic management by taking characteristics of general management into consideration as follows:" (1)Before everything else, strategic management is a function of top management , (2) it is related with future and the enterprises' long term goals, (3) it takes the enterprise as an open system, and accepts it as a whole composed of parts in   mutual interactions and interdependent to each other, (4) it maintains the coordination between different units and hierarchic ranks of the enterprise, (5) it guides Junior administrative officers, (6) it distributes the sources effectively, (7) the sources and the data used in decision-making are various, (8) the purposes the enterprise and societal interests are tackled as a whole and from this perspective, it would not be wrong to sat that the strategic management holds social responsibility towards the exterior environment.Snell (2002, pp. 118-122), describes five stages in strategic management: The first step is identifying the company's mission, vision and goals and makes an environmental analysis. The second step is analyzing the opportunities and threats that may come from the outside. The mission of the organization, affecting the achievement of the goals and strategy, and groups or individuals affected by the success that stakeholders are considered. As it is shown in the table below, financial,human resources, marketing, business (manufacturing) process and other institutions inside analysis performed in this step. The fourth step is determining strategies based on the results of SWOT analysis. The implementation of strategies in the fifth step and the sixth step is passing to the strategic control stage. These strategies are controlled to make corrective moves for theorganization's assessment of its own strategy.

1.2 Corporate Brand Image

In the beginning,the brand concept focuses on the tangible products both in practice and academic field (Morgan and Pritchard, 1999). However, today the brand concept has started tocover such a wide area that theapplication area is not only limited to goods and services but italso encompasses issues, such as; individuals, ideas, facts and place (country, region, city) (Freire, 2005). Brand concept is applied to the countries (Malaysia, New Zealand), the cities (London, Barcelona, New York, Istanbul) and even some districts of a city (Nisantasi, Sisli). Today, many things have begun to be remembered with its brand; among these are shops, institutions, universities, singers, athletes and politicians (Anholt and Hildreth, 2004). Brand hasbecome so powerful concept that there is almost left nothing non-branded (Kotler and Armstrong, 2006). The use of idea of brand has been expanded from products to services,and from the services, it has expanded in such a way that it starts to represent the institution itself (Forman and Argentina, 2005).

According to Aaker (1996), the first step for creating a strongbrand is to determine brand identity. Because the brand identity provides the brand with direction, purpose and meaning (Ponder and Barnes, 2004). One of the features of a powerful brand is clear and well-defined brand identity (McCormack and others, 2004). Encompassing a person's attitudes, behaviors, and feelings, thoughts towards any product or the institution, the ***Brand Image*** is considered as a reflection of the emotional impressions of the corporate stakeholders. In fact, nowadays when preferring a brand, people attach importance to the brand image. People do not choose a brand only for its cognitive functions butthe symbolical meanings the brands carry such as personal and social status (Gardner and Levy, 1955), prestige and self-esteem (Pohlman and Mudd, 1973) are also effective in people's preferences. ***Brand personality*** is formed through an attribution of the characteristics belong to human beings. Brand personality is a set of human characteristics; the core humanitarian values, associated with the brand (Aaker, 1997, p. 347). A brand may reflect humanistic values such as modern, hearty, lively, exotic, and rude (Vaidya et al., 2009, p. 59). Brand personality can be examined by asking questions to the customers the

following questions: "If x brand were a person, what would he do? What would he look like?,where would he live?, What would he wear ?, with whom would he talkif he went to a party? ,Whichnewspaper would he read?,Where would he go to holiday?" (Davies et al., 2001). Brand personality requires recognition of the brand as a human.

Corporate branding is a broad concept that encompasses corporate reputation, identity and image (Davies et al., 2001). These concepts interact with each other. A strong identity, indicates a strong corporate brand image and reputation. Although these concepts are used interchangeably in the literature (Rosson and Brooks, 2004), in fact, they connate different meanings, and these concepts are examined in details below.

Corporate Reputation: The concept of reputation, which is usually used inthe same sense as the concept of the image, is actually separated from the concept of image in terms of time perception. Image evokes a person's perception of time while the reputation is a concept that is created with time and evolves (Mahon and Wartick, 2003). Reputation emerges as a result of the institution's behaviorand rises with the impressions and images of corporate reputation and thestakeholders, and that does not occur in a short period of time (Barney, 2002). Corporate reputation represents general and comprehensive opinionsof people outside the institution (Carmeli et al., 2006). The reputation are seen as a collective judgment on the organization's actions and achievements of institutions of the people outside the institution (Rosson and Brooks, 2004), and if the reputation is positive, it is deemed as an entity that provides the institution with competitive advantage. (Fombr, 1996). A strong corporate reputation will provide sustainable competitive advantage because it is very difficult to be imitated by the other organizations, and it only provides that institution with a unique ability (Kowalczyk and Pawlish, 2002)

Corporate Identity: In Literature, there is a general perception that the institution of corporate branding process starts with the institution's identity (Hultberg, 2006). In fact, by branding and giving something a name, it is intended to teach "who" is the branded (Keller, 2003). The primary objective of the concept of corporate brand is to define the institution to the stakeholders. But the corporate brandcovers all the values that represent the institution. In the literature, a wide variety of abstract and concrete definitions are available on the corporate identity. Identity is the first step in creating a strong corporate brand. One of the features of a powerful brand is clear and well-defined identity (McCormack et al., 2004). Corporate identity is about the perception of the institution's stakeholders which is constituted as a result of words, symbols, ideas and associations associated with the brand (Gardner and Levy, 1955).

Corporate Image: Whilecorporateidentity is related with the organization's own truth, how to shape the self and how it expresses it, the corporate image is concerned with interpretations of the external stakeholders (Hatch and Schultz, 2002). In other words, the corporate identity develops within the institution while its image and reputation develops through the perceptions come from outside the institution (Steiner, 2003). While the image is only in the minds of external stakeholders, the corporate identity provides the basis for the message to be used in communications with stakeholders (Smith et al., 2006). The corporate image reflects the created and reflected perception of identity, and therefore; it would not be wrong to say that image and identity are in interaction with each other (Rosson and Brooks, 2004).

1.2.1 Corporate Brand Personality

Since the 1980s, the importance of emotional bonds between brands and stakeholders has been emphasized. The brands' functions; differentiation, distinctiveness and awareness-raising have begun to be built through symbolic and emotional values (Rojas et al., 2004). In line with this, the perspectives on the brands have begun to changeand the brands have begun to take on other meanings except its function as a commodity. Now, the brands are perceived as a living presence and even they arerecognized and accepted as a human (Fournier, 1998).The focus of the institutionshas now becometo make thebrand gain thecharacteristics similar to that of human (Purkayasth in 2009).

The identity of the institution is formed through the culture of the institutions, their features, attitudes, habits, andtheir attitudes towards their stakeholders (Davies et al., 2001). Martine (1958) was the first person who introduced the concept of brand personality in literature. Over time, the works on the brand identity have increased, and in 1997 Jennifer Aaker(1996) developed a universal scale for measuring brand personality.The scale is used to measure both the product and the personality of the corporate brand. Aaker (1997) developed a scale that is based on the idea that the brand identity can be defined with the appropriate adjectives. The scale developed for this purpose notes 42 adjectives and 5 dimensions related to the brand personalitywhich are grouped as follows: sincerity, excitement, talent, sophistication and arduousness.

Aaker (1997) has shaped the brand personality scale similar to the big five about human personality in psychology. However, Aaker (1997) suggested that the brand personality is not exactly the same as the human personality. Hestates, while the human personality is comprehended through thebehaviours, physical characteristics, attitudes and beliefs, the brand personality is formed through the people's contact with the brand. That is to say, some aspects of human personality can be reflected to the brand, some do not.

Azoulay and Kapferer (2003, 151) describes the brand identity as a set of characteristics related with the brand and applicable to the brand. Yet, although the phrase "personality" is used, the human personality and brand personality is not the same. According to Azoulay and Kapferer, except for all the features related to the product, all the other features must take place in the brand personality. Therefore they state that the brand personality should be redefined as more restrictive and open.

Madrigal and Boushi (2008) has criticized the lack of social responsibility dimension in the scale proposed by Aaker (1997).People expectthe institutions to be responsible and sensitive to the social issues. Accordingly, the people exhibit positive attitudes towards the corporate brand acting socially responsible and sensitive. Therefore, the social responsibility that is absent in Aaker's (1997) scale is in fact extremely important for the brands.

Despite these criticisms Aaker's (1997) scale that consists of five dimensions of brand personality still bears the distinction of being the most reliable and valid instrument.In addition, Smith et al (2006) applied Aaker's scale in an organization of non-profit membership institution, and they state that Aeker's scale is a valid and reliable scale to measure the brand personality of non-profit institutions. The researches on the brand identity made in various areas of the country show that Aaker's brand personality scale is a reliable scale (Zentes, et al., 2008).

Aaker's (1997) scale has been the subject of research on the corporate brand identity, and yet, there are also scales developed separately for theprofit and non-profit institutions' brand identity. The developed scales bear similarities Aaker's scale to a considerable extent. As well as strong commercial corporate brand identities, there are also the brands for non-profit institutions. For instance, UNICEF and Greenpeace are among the strongest brands in non-profit organizations. For non-profit organizations, the corporate brand identity has become an issue of importance to build up distinctive and strong relationships with their stakeholders. (Voeth and Herbst, 2008).

The fundamental aspect that separates the corporate brand from the brand product brand is the corporate brand's attachinghigh importance to the relationship with his stakeholders. While the brand product just focuses on the consumers ,the corporate brand,which is a close relationship with a wide variety of internal and external stakeholders, addresses both to the internal and the external stakeholders and pays attention to their emotions and feelings. However since the external stakeholders' impressions about the corporate brand identity is shaped generally by the internal stakeholders, the corporate brand identity puts emphasizes on the role of the internal stakeholders. In corporate brand concept, employees in the category of the internal stakeholders are seen as representative of the brand (Hultberg, 2006). In particular, people working in service sector is perceived as the most reliable source of information, and thanks to them, the external stakeholders are able to understand whether the brand promise is realized or not (Dorton, 2006).

In this context, this research points out AFAD, the non- profit and public service provider institution's employees' assessment regarding brand value is crucially important. In this respect, the study concentrates on the relationship between AFAD employees' perceptions of the Strategic Management and their perception of the brand. The purpose of this research is to examine AFAD employees' perceptions of the Internal and External Environment Strategies impact on the corporate branding perception.

II. Method

2.1. Research Model

In the research, the relational and descriptive screening models were used. The screening models aim to describe the event of the research, subjects and objects in their own conditions without any change and influence. The relational screening models aim to determine "between two or more variables' changes and / or the degree" (Karas,1999). In these models, the relationship between the variables can be obtained in two ways: correlational and comparative. In the relational screening model, the Correlational study points out whether the variables changes together, and if they change, it determines how whereas the comparative study finds out at least two variables, and according to one of the variables (the independent variable that is intended to be tested), the group is created, and then according to the other variable (the dependent variable), the differentiation between the two variables is examined.

In this study, the Impact of Internal and External Environment on Corporate Branding Strategy was examined.Firstly, the relationship between Internal and External Environment Strategy on Corporate Branding was analyzed using Pearson correlation, then with multiple regression analysis , the organizational cultures 'potential to predict the organizational structure was investigated. The relations were examined with the following model: The Data presented in Table 1 shows that the "gender" distribution of the sample as 189 male (%80, 8) and 45 female (%19, 2) out of 234 subjects. And the sample's distribution according to the "status" consists of 47 unit chief (%17,5), 5 Group president (%2,1), 48 Group member (%20,5) and 140 Other (%59,8)

Data Collection Tools

In the study, the scale developed by Birinci (2012) gathered the organization's internal and external environment analysis under 7 subscales, and Internal Environment Strategy Analysis Scale, which consisted of 55 Likert-type surveys, was used. Internal Environment Analysis and Strategic Analysis Scale (STMG) consist of the following subscales: External Environment Internal Environment, Planning, Implementation, Control, Flexibility and Performance. The scale called Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (CMO)'s proficiency value is 0,981, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient value of the subscales and Composite Reliability coefficients were found to be higher than the set threshold value of 0,70.

In the study, in order to collect data on corporate brand, the brand personality scale developed by Aaker (1997) was used. However, as the corporate brand personality scale did not have an internal image sub-heading, 4 Items was added to the data collection tool with the aim of evaluating the internal image. The brand personality scale developed by Aaker (1997) was adapted to Turkish by Demir (2010). The scale collected 5 factors and is composed of 5- point Likert type 40 surveys. 4 more Items regarding internal image size were added by the researcher to the Brand Personality scale which is composed of Arduousness, Excitement, Sincerity, Sophisticated and Ability subscales.

Since the Scales are 5- point Likert-type, the score intervals were defined as follows: 1.00 to 1.80: Very low, 1.80 -2.60, Low level, 3.40 2.61: Intermediate, 3, 41 to 4.20: High level, 4, 21-5 , 00: very high.

Findings

Descriptive Statics

As presented in the Table 2, the perceptions of employees of AFAD towards the subscales of the Strategic Management are at medium-level in all subscales.

As demonstrated in Table 3, the perceptions of employees of AFAD towards the subscales of corporate brand are at medium-level in all subscales.

The Relationship between the Internal and External Environment Strategies (STGM) and Corporate Branding (CM)

As seen in Table 4, as a result of the Pearson product moment correlation, which was employed to test the relationship between Internal and External Environmental Strategies (STMG) and Corporate Branding (CM), astatistically high relationshipas p<0,001 was identified among all the subscales. In order to examine the details of the direction and intensity of the relationship, multiple regressions analyzes were performed and the findings are presented as follows:

The Regression Findings with regard to the Internal and External Strategies and Corporate Branding

As shown in Table 5, the following results were obtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Sincerity subscale:

The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Sincerity subscale was found % 62, and the regression model was deemed statistically highly significant as p<0,001.

The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding Sinceritysubscale is presented as below:

The Table 6 presents %26 of CM Sincerity subscale scores could be explained with STMG Planning subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically significant asp<0,01. The %29 of CM Sincerity subscale scores could be explained by STMG Control subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically significant asp<0,01. 29% of CM Sincerity subscale scores could be described negatively withSTMG Performance subscale scores, and it was determined that the ratio was found statistically highly significant asp<0,001.

Yet, the study indicated that CM Sincerity subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscaleswasnot statistically significant.

As shown in Table 7,the following results were obtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Excitement Subscale.

The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Excitement was found % 63, and the regression model was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.

The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding Excitement subscale is presented as below:

The Table 8 presents that %18 of CM Excitement subscale scores could be explained with STMG Internal and External Environment subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically significant asp<0,05. The %24 of CM Excitement subscale scores could be explained by STMG Flexibility subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically highly significant asp<0,001. 28% of CM Excitement subscale scores could be described

negativelywith STMG Performance subscale scores, and it was determined that the ratio was found statistically highly significant asp<0,001.
Yet, the study revealed that CM Excitement subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant.

Table 9: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Scores of Strategic Management subscales predictive power for Corporate Branding's Ability Subscale

Predictor	Predicted	R	R²	R_che	F_che	p
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Ability	,821ᵃ	,674	,674	66,821	,000

As demonstrated in Table 9,the following results were obtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Ability Subscale.
The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Ability subscalewas found % 67, and the regression model was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.
The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding Ability subscale is presented as below:

Table 10: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Ability

Independent Variable			standardize		
	B	Sh	β	t	p
(Sabit)	2,233	,331		6,746	,000
STMGExternalEnvironment	-,032	,081	-,030	-,391	,696
STMG Internal Environment	,201	,078	,208	2,583	**,010**
STMG Planning	,328	,088	,322	3,746	**,000**
STMG Application	-,163	,098	-,165	-1,670	,096
STMG Control	,098	,106	,092	0,928	,355
STMG Flexibility	,183	,060	,176	3,040	**,003**
STMG Performance	-,364	,058	-,332	-6,334	**,000**

The Table 10 presents that %20 of CM Ability subscale scores could be explained with STMG Internal and External Environment subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically significant as p<0,05. The %32 of CM Ability subscale scores could be explained by STMG Planning subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001. The %17 of CM Ability subscale scores could be explained by STMG Flexibility subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically significant as p<0,01.33% of CM Ability subscale scores could be described negatively with STMG Performance subscale scores, and it was determined that the ratio was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.
Yet, the study revealed that CM Ability subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant.

Table 11: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Strategic Management subscale scores' predictive power for Corporate Branding's SophisticatedSubscale

Predictor	Predicted	R	R²	R_che	F_che	p
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Sophisticated	,730ᵃ	,532	,532	36,748	,000

As shown in Table 11,the following results wereobtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Sophisticated Subscale:
The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Excitement subscale was found %53, and the regression model was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.
The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding "Sophisticated" subscale is presented as below:

Table12: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Sophisticated

Independent Variable			standardize		
	B	*Sh*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Sabit)	1,900	,352		5,405	,000
STMG ExternalEnvironment	,071	,086	,074	,820	,413
STMG Internal Environment	,122	,083	,143	1,484	,139
STMG Planning	,128	,093	,142	1,375	,171
STMG Application	-,061	,104	-,070	-0,589	,556
STMG Control	,115	,112	,123	1,028	,305
STMG Flexibility	,139	,064	,150	2,164	**,032**
STMG Performance	-,278	,061	-,286	-4,555	**,000**

The Table 12 presents %15 of CM Sophisticated subscale scores could be explained with STMG Flexibility subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically significant as p<0,05. The %28 of CM Sophisticated subscale scores could be explained by STMG Performance subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001. Yet, the study demonstrated that CM Sophisticated subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant.

Yet, the study revealed that CM Sophisticated subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant

Table 13: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Strategic Management subscale scores' predictive power for Corporate Branding's Arduousness Subscale

Predictor	Predicted	*R*	*R²*	*R_che*	*F_che*	*p*
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Arduousness	,674[a]	,454	,454	26,895	,000

As presented in Table 13, the following results were obtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Arduousness Subscale:

The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Arduousness subscale was found %45, and the regression model was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.

The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding Arduousness subscale is presented as below:

Table14: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Arduousness

Independent Variable			standardize		
	B	*Sh*	*β*	*t*	*p*
(Sabit)	2,021	,413		4,891	,000
STMG ExternalEnvironment	,079	,101	,076	,780	,436
STMG Internal Environment	,130	,097	,140	1,339	,182
STMG Planning	,171	,109	,174	1,561	,120
STMG Application	-,022	,122	-,023	-0,177	,859
STMG Control	-,172	,132	-,168	-1,307	,193
STMG Flexibility	,324	,075	,323	4,311	**,000**
STMG Performance	-,266	,072	-,251	-3,699	**,000**

The Table 14presents %33 of CM Arduousness subscale scores could be explained with STMG Flexibility subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001. The %25 of CM Sophisticated subscale scores could be explained by STMG Performance subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.

However, the study demonstrated that CM Arduousness subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant.

Table 15: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Strategic Management subscale scores' predictive power for Corporate Branding's Internal Image Subscale

Predictor	Predicted	R	R²	R_che	F_che	p
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Internal Image	,704[a]	,495	,495	31,535	,000

As presented in Table 15, the following results were obtained from the Multiple Regression Analysis which was performed to assess the predictive power of Strategic Management Subscale scores for Corporate Branding's Internal Image Subscale:

The Strategic Management subscales' predictive power for CM Internal Image subscale was found %50, and the regression model was found statistically highly significant as p<0,001.

The stabilized and standardized values table regarding the Strategic Management scale's predictive power for Corporate Branding Internal Image subscale is presented as below:

Table16: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Internal Image

Independent Variables			standardize		
	B	Sh	β	t	p
(Sabit)	1,873	,444		4,215	,000
STMG ExternalEnvironment	-,017	,109	-,015	-,157	,875
STMG Internal Environment	,189	,105	,182	1,803	,073
STMG Planning	,358	,118	,327	3,044	**,003**
STMG Application	-,229	,132	-,215	-1,744	,083
STMG Control	,209	,141	,184	1,481	,140
STMG Flexibility	,146	,081	,130	1,803	,073
STMG Performance	-,236	,077	-,200	-3,058	**,002**

The Table 16   presents %32 of CM Internal Image subscale scores could be explained with STMG Planning subscale scores, and this ration was found statistically significant as p<0,01. The %20 of CM Internal Image subscale scores could be explained by STMG Performance subscale scores, and this ratio was found statistically significant as p<0,01.

However, the study demonstrated that CM Internal Image subscale scores' explanation by the other STMG subscales was not statistically significant.

The summary table about the Internal and External Strategies (STMG) subscales' prediction of Corporate Branding's subscales is presented below. In the table, Strategic Management subscale score'spredictive values (β) in relation to Corporate Branding subscales are presented at least as p <0.05.

TheInternal and External Strategies (STMG) subscale scores that influences the Corporate Branding (CM) subscales statistically significant and the Predictive Power (β)SummaryTable					
	CM Sincerity	CM Excitement	CM Ability	CM Sophisticated	CM Arduousness	CM Internal Image
STMG ExternalEnvironment						
STMG Internal Environment		0,187	0,208			
STMG Planning	0,262		0,322			0,327
STMG Application						
STMG Control	0,299					
STMG Flexibility		0,244	0,176	0,150	0,323	
STMG Performance	-0,290	-0,285	-0,332	-0,286	-0,251	-0,200

According to Table 17, The Internal and External Strategies (STMG) subscale scores prediction of Corporate Branding (CM) subscales was found statistically insignificant:

STMGInternal Environment predicts CM Excitement and Abilitysubscales.

- *STMG Planning* predicts CM Ability and Internal Image subscales,
- *STMGFlexibility , C*M Excitement,Ability, Sophisticated and Arduousnesssubscales
- *STMG Performance* predicts all subscales negatively.
- *STMG External Envıronmentand Application*do not predictany of the Corporate Brand subscales.

III.   The Results And D□scuss□on

According to the descriptive statistics results of the research, AFAD employees' perceptions of strategic management are at medium-level in all subscales. AFAD employees' perceptions of Corporate Brand subscales

are also at medium-level. As a concept being both interventional and operational, (Luhang, et al., 2003), strategic management has an integrated structure that is future-oriented, interactive, and it allows for effective use of resources and provides guidance function coordination within a hierarchical structure. In this respect, when the importance of strategic management is taken into consideration, then it becomes even more essential that the AFAD employees should be equipped with a high level understanding of strategic management. Regarding the Corporate Brand, Davies et al. (2001) put great emphasizes on the corporate reputation, identity and image concepts. These concepts, which are in constant interaction with each other, are also perceived to be employed interchangeably in the body of literature. In this context, when AFAD employees of perception's effect on corporate reputation, image, identity of the corporate brand is concerned, then it would not be wrong to argue that the perception towards the corporate brand should be raised to the high level. In this research, it is revealed that the strategic management subscalesconsiderably predict the corporate branding sincerity, excitement, talent, sophisticated, arduousness and internal image subscales. The some of the most significant dimensions of corporate branding are brand identity (McCormack and others, 2004; Ponder and Barnes, 2004), personal and social status affect the brand image (Gardner and Levy, 1955), and the prestige and self-esteem (Pohlman and Mudd, 1973) factors and it also the brand personality (Aaker, 1997). It can be said that these dimensions are closely related with the internal image and ability. The brand identity is considered to represent the idea of the people within the institutionwhile the image is concerned with the outside representation of the institution.(Smith, et., 2002). This study concludes that corporate branding is related with internal and external to environment. In this respect, it is shown that the research findings support the body of literature.According to the other result of the study, the sincerity subscale of the corporate branding can be explained by the strategic management planning, control and performance sub-scales. The strategic management internal environment, flexibility and performance subscales can explain the corporate branding excitement subscale to a certain extent. The ability subscale of the corporate branding can also be explained by the strategic management internal environment, planning, flexibility and performance subscales to a certain degree. In addition, the corporate branding sophisticated subscale can be explained by the strategic management, flexibility and performance subscales to a certain degree. The arduousness subscale of the corporate branding can be explained by the strategic management, flexibility and performance subscales to a certain degree. The corporate branding internal image subscale can be explained by the strategic management planning and performance subscales to a certain degree. Lastly, the conclusions that were inferred from this study recommend the responsible people to take the necessary requirements for raising the AFAD employees' perceptions of strategic management and corporate branding.

References

[1]. Aaker, D.A. (1996). *Building strong brands*. New York: The Free Press.
[2]. Aaker J.L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, 347-356.
[3]. Akgemci, T., &Güleş, H.K. (2010). *İşletmelerdestratejikyönetim*. İstanbul: GaziKitapevi.
[4]. Aktan,C.C. (2008). *Stratejikyönetimvestratejikplanlama*. http://www.ceis.org.tr/dergiDocs/makale132.pdf. Erişimtarihi: 02.05.2016.
[5]. Anholt, S., &HildrethJ.. (2004). Let freedom and cash registers ring: America as a brand. *Brand America: The mother of all brands* (ss. 164-172). Cyan Books.
[6]. Azoulay A., &Kapferer J.N., (2002). Do brand personality scales really measure brand personality?.*Journal Brand Management*, *11*(2) 143-155.
[7]. Barney J. B. (2002). Strategic management: From informed conversation to academic discipline. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *16*(2)53-57.
[8]. Betz, F. (2001). *Yönetimstratejisi "stratejikyönetimveenformasyonteknolojisi"*. (Çev. Ü. Şensoy). Ankara: SistemOfsetBasımYayım.
[9]. Birinci, M. (2012). Türkiye'deüniversitelerinstratejikyönetimuygulamalarınınkurumsalperformansaetkileri: devletvevakıfüniversite lerininkarşılaştırmalıanalizi. (YayınlanmamışDoktoraTezi). İstanbul: BeykentÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsü.
[10]. Carmeli A., Gilat G., & Weisberg J., (2006). Perceived external prestige, organizational ıdentification and affective commitment: a stakeholder approach. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *9*(1), 92-104.
[11]. Davies G., Chun R., & da Silva R.V., (2001). The personification metaphor as a measurement approach corporate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review. 4 (*2), 113-127.
[12]. Demir, Z. G. (2010). Akademikörgütlerdekurumsalmarkakişiliği: AkdenizÜniversitesiüzerinebiraraştırma. (YayınlanmamışYüksekLisansTezi). Antalya: AkdenizÜniversitesiSosyalBilimlerEnstitüsü.
[13]. Dinçer, Ö. (2007). *Stratejikyönetimveişletmepolitikası*(8.Baskı). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
[14]. Dortok A., (2006). A managerial look at the ınteraction between ınternal communication and cor
[15]. porate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review,. 8*(4), 322-338.
[16]. Eren, E. (2002). *Stratejikyönetimveişletmepolitikası*(6. Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
[17]. Eren, E. (2010). *Stratejikyönetimveişletmepolitikası*(8.Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık.
[18]. Fombrun C, (1996). *Reputation: Realising value from the corporate image*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
[19]. Forman J., &Argenti P.A. (2005). How corporate communication ınfluences strategy ımplementation, reputation and the corporate brand: An exploratory qualitative study. *Corporate Reputation Review, 8*(3), 245-264.
[20]. Fournier S. (1998). Consumers and their brands: Developing relationship theory in consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 24*, 343-373.
[21]. Freire R.J., (2005). Geo-Branding, Are we talking nonsense? A theoretical reflection on brands applied to place. *Place Branding, 1*(4), 347-362.
[22]. Gardner B.B., & Levy S.J., (1955). The product and the brand. *Harvard Business Review,. 33*(2), 33-39.
[23]. Hatch M.J., & Schultz M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human Relations,. 55*, 989-1018.

[24]. Hulberg J. (2006). Integrating corporate branding and sociological paradigms: A literature study. *Brand Management, 14 (*1/2), 60-73.

[25]. Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimselaraştırmayöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

[26]. Keller K.L. (2003). Brand synthesis: The multi-dimensionality of brand knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Research,. 29,* 595-600.

[27]. Koçel, T. (2007). *İşletmeyöneticiliği*(11.Baskı). İstanbul: ArıkanYayınları,

[28]. Kotler P., & Armstrong G., (2006). *Principles of marketing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall,

[29]. Kowalczyk S.J., &Pawlish M.J. (2002). Corporate branding through external perception of organizational culture. *Corporate Reputation Review,. 5*(2/3), 159-174.

[30]. Luhanga, M., Mkude, D.J. Mbwette, T.S.A., Chijoriga, M.M., &Ngirwa, C.A. (2003). *Strategic planning and higher education management in Africa: The University of Dar es Salaam Experience*. Tanzania: Dar Essalaam University Press.

[31]. Madrigal R., &Boush D.M. (2008). Social responsibility as a unique dimension of brand personality and comsumers' willingess to reward. *Psychology & Marketing, 25*(6), 538-564.

[32]. Mahon J.F., &Wartick S.L. (2003). Dealing with stakeholders: How reputation, credibility and framing influence the game. *Corporate Reputation Review, Vol. 6*, 1-19.

[33]. Martineau, P. (1958). The personality of a retail store. *Harvard Business Review, 36*(1), 47-55.

[34]. McCormack J.P., Cagan J. & Vogel C.M. (2004). Speaking the buick language: Capturing, understanding, and exploring brand identity with shape grammars. *Design Studies,. 25 (1)*.

[35]. Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. (1999), Editorial. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 5*(3), 213-214.

[36]. Pohlman A., &Mudd S. (1973). Market ımage as a function of consumer group and product type - quantitative approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology,. 57*(2), 167-171.

[37]. Ponder N., & Barnes, C. (2004). The underlying dimensions of brands and their contribution to customer value: an exploratory examination. *Marketing Management Journal*, 24-35.

[38]. Purkayastha S. (2009). Brand personality: An empirical study of four brands in India. *The Icfain Journal of Management Research,. 8* (4), 7-20.

[39]. Rojas-Mendez J.I., Erenchun-Podlech I., & Silva-Olave E. (2004). The ford brand personality in Chile. *Corporate Reputation Review, 7* (3), 232-251.

[40]. Rosson P., & Brooks M.R., (2004). M&As and corporate visual identity: An exploratory study. *Corporate Reputation Review,. 7* (2), 181-194.

[41]. Smith A.C.T., Graetz B.R., &Westerbeek H.M., (2006). Brand personality in a membership-based organisation. *International Journal Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Marketing,. 11*, 251-266.

[42]. Snell, B. (2002). *Management: Competing in the New Era*. (5.Baskı). New York: Von Hoffman Press, Inc.

[43]. Sönmez, E. (2010). *Eğitimdestratejikplanlama. eğitimdestratejikplanlama: Makaleler. 1, 21-25*. Ankara: MEB Yayınları.

[44]. Steiner L. (2003). Roots of ıdentity in real estate industry. *Corporate Reputation Review,.6*(2), 178-196.

[45]. Sullivan, T. M., & Richardson, E. C. (2011): Living the plan: Strategic planning aligned with practice and assessment. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *59* (1), 2-9 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2011.54975E: 02.05.2016.

[46]. Ülgen, H., &Mirze, S.K. (2010). *İşletmelerdestratejikYönetim*(5.Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Yayınları. Vildan, A. (2008). *YükseköğretimdeİlkeveYönelimlerNelerOlmalı?*http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos_mak/articles/2008/19/valtınok.pdf. E:02.05.2016.

[47]. Vaidya R., Gandhi P., &Aagja J. (2009). Brand personality and perception measures of two cities: Surat and Ahmedabad. *The Icfai University Journal of Brand Management, 6 (*1), 57-73.

[48]. Voeth M., &Herbst U. (2008). The concept of brand personality as an ınstrument for advanced non-profit branding-an emprical analysis. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 19(*1), 71-97.

[49]. Yip, G.S. (2003). *Total global strategy II* (II. Baskı)*. New Jersey : Pearson International Education.

[50]. Zentes J., Morchett D., & Schramm-Klein H. (2008). Brand personality of retailers-an analysis of ıts applicability and ıts effect on store loyalty. *The International Review of Retail,. 18* (2), 167-184.

[51]. Gardner B.B., & Levy S.J., (1955). The product and the brand. *Harvard Business Review,. 33*(2), 33-39.

[52]. Hatch M.J., & Schultz M. (2002). The dynamics of organizational identity. *Human Relations,. 55*, 989-1018.

[53]. Hulberg J. (2006). Integrating corporate branding and sociological paradigms: A literature study. *Brand Management, 14 (*1/2), 60-73.

[54]. Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimselaraştırmayöntemi: Kavramlar, ilkeler, teknikler*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

[55]. Keller K.L. (2003). Brand synthesis: The multi-dimensionality of brand knowledge. *Journal of Consumer Research,. 29,* 595-600.

[56]. Koçel, T. (2007). *İşletmeyöneticiliği*(11.Baskı). İstanbul: ArıkanYayınları,

[57]. Kotler P., &Armstrong G., (2006). *Principles of marketing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall,

[58]. Kowalczyk S.J., &Pawlish M.J. (2002). Corporate branding through external perception of organizational culture.*Corporate Reputation Review,. 5*(2/3), 159-174.

[59]. Luhanga, M., Mkude, D.J.Mbwette, T.S.A., Chijoriga, M.M., &Ngirwa, C.A. (2003). *Strategic planning and higher education management in Africa: The University of Dar es Salaam Experience*. Tanzania: Dar Essalaam University Press.

[60]. Madrigal R., &Boush D.M. (2008). Social responsibility as a unique dimension of brand personality and comsumers' willingess to reward. *Psychology & Marketing, 25*(6), 538-564.

[61]. Mahon J.F.,&Wartick S.L. (2003). Dealing with stakeholders: How reputation, credibility and framing influence the game. *Corporate Reputation Review, Vol. 6*, 1-19.

[62]. Martineau, P. (1958). The personality of a retail store. *Harvard Business Review, 36*(1), 47-55.

[63]. McCormack J.P., Cagan J. & Vogel C.M. (2004). Speaking the buick language: Capturing, understanding, and exploring brand identity with shape grammars.*Design Studies,. 25 (1)*.

[64]. Morgan, N., &Pritchard, A. (1999), Editorial. *Journal of Vacation Marketing, 5*(3), 213-214.

[65]. Pohlman A., &Mudd S.(1973).Market ımage as a function of consumer group and product type - quantitative approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology,. 57*(2), 167-171.

[66]. Ponder N., &Barnes, C. (2004). The underlying dimensions of brands and their contribution to customer value: an exploratory examination. *Marketing Management Journal*, 24-35.

[67]. Purkayastha S. (2009). Brand personality: An empirical study of four brands in India. *The Icfain Journal of Management Research,. 8* (4), 7-20.

[68]. Rojas-Mendez J.I., Erenchun-Podlech I., & Silva-Olave E. (2004). The ford brand personality in Chile. *Corporate Reputation Review, 7* (3), 232-251.

[69]. Rosson P., & Brooks M.R., (2004). M&As and corporate visual identity: An exploratory study. *Corporate Reputation Review,. 7* (2), 181-194.

[70]. Smith A.C.T., Graetz B.R., &Westerbeek H.M., (2006). Brand personality in a membership-based organisation. *International Journal Nonprofit Voluntary Sector Marketing,. 11*, 251-266.

[71]. Snell, B. (2002). *Management: Competing in the New Era.* (5.Baskı). New York: Von Hoffman Press, Inc.

[72]. Sönmez, E. (2010). *Eğitimdestratejikplanlama. eğitimdestratejikplanlama: Makaleler. 1, 21-25.* Ankara: MEB Yayınları.

[73]. Steiner L.(2003).Roots of ıdentity in real estate industry. *Corporate Reputation Review,.6(2)*, 178-196.

[74]. Sullivan, T. M., &Richardson, E. C. (2011): Living the plan: Strategicplanning aligned with practice and assesSTMGent.*The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *59* (1), 2-9 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07377363.2011.54975E: 02.05.2016.

[75]. Ülgen, H., &Mirze, S.K. (2010).*İşletmelerdestratejikYönetim*(5.Baskı). İstanbul: Beta Yayınları. Vildan, A. (2008). *YükseköğretimdeİlkeveYönelimlerNelerOlmalı?*http://www.sosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/sos_mak/Items/2008/19/valtınok.pdf. E:02.05.2016.

[76]. Vaidya R., Gandhi P., &Aagja J. (2009). Brand personality and perception measures of two cities: Surat and Ahmedabad. *The Icfai University Journal of Brand Management, 6 (*1), 57-73.

[77]. Voeth M., &Herbst U. (2008). The concept of brand personality as an ınstrument for advanced non-profit branding-an emprical analysis.*Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing, 19(*1), 71-97.

[78]. Yip, G.S. (2003). *Total global strategy II* (II. Baskı). New Jersey : Pearson International Education.

[79]. Zentes J., Morchett D., &Schramm-Klein H.(2008). Brand personality of retailers-an analysis of ıts applicability and ıts effect on store loyalty. *The International Review of Retail,. 18* (2), 167-184.

Table 1: The Research Model about the effect of Internal and External Strategies on the Corporate Branding

Table 1: The Research Group's distribution according to socio-demographic features				
Socio-demographic Variables	Sub-groups	*f*	*%*	*Cumulative %*
Location	AFAD Headquarters	41	17,5	17,5
	Provincial Directorate of AFAD	182	77,8	95,3
	Search and Rescue Team Directorate of AFAD	11	4,7	100,0
Gender	Male	189	80,8	80,8
	Female	45	19,2	100,0
Staff Status	Permanent Staff	225	96,2	96,2
	Temporary Staff	9	3,8	100,0
Educational Status	Primary/Secondary School	1	,4	,4
	High School/Vocational High School	11	4,7	5,1
	Associate Degree	29	12,4	17,5
	Bachelor Degree	156	66,7	84,2
	M.A. Degree	31	13,2	97,4
	PhD. Degree	6	2,6	100,0
The Last Employment before AFAD	AFAD first employment experince	23	9,8	9,8
	General Directorate of Civil Defence	46	19,7	29,5
	General Directorate of Natural Disasters	15	6,4	35,9
	Provincial Directorate of AFAD	3	1,3	37,2
	Another Private Institution	61	26,1	63,2
	Private Sector	57	24,4	87,6
	Other	29	12,4	100,0
Title in the Institution	Other	87	37,2	37,2
	Head of Department, Consultant, Manager et.	29	12,4	49,6
	Expert	11	4,7	54,3
	Assistant Expert	11	4,7	59,0
	Engineer / Architect / Urban Planner	35	15,0	73,9
	Teacher	1	,4	74,4
	Technician	19	8,1	82,5
	Accountant	6	2,6	85,0
	DPCO	14	6,0	91,0
	ECR	21	9,0	100,0
Status in the Institution	Unit Chief	41	17,5	17,5
	Group President	5	2,1	19,7
	Group Member	48	20,5	40,2
	Other	140	59,8	100,0
	Total	234	100,0	

Table 2: Average Values ofSub-factors in relation to Strategic Management Scale

Items	N	Min	Max	M	SE	SD
STMG External Environment	234	1,00	5,00	2,96	,06	1,04
STMG Internal Environment	234	1,00	5,00	2,79	,07	1,161
STMG Planning	234	1,00	5,00	3,14	,07	1,10
STMG Application	234	1,00	5,00	2,99	,07	1,13
STMG Control	234	1,00	5,00	2,95	,06	1,06
STMG Flexibility	234	1,00	5,00	3,04	,07	1,07
STMG Performance	234	1,00	5,00	3,18	,06	1,02

Table 3: Average Values of Sub-factors in relation to Corporate Management

Items	N	Min	Max	M	SE	SD
CM Sincerity	234	1,00	5,00	2,89	,06	1,06
CM Excitement	234	1,00	5,00	2,83	,06	1,04
CM Ability	234	1,00	5,00	2,93	,07	1,12
CM Sopisticated	234	1,00	5,00	2,54	,06	,99
CM Ardousness	234	1,00	5,00	2,72	,07	1,08

Table 4: The Pearson Product Moment Correlation table that tests the correlative relationship between Internal and External Environment Strategies (STMG) and Coorporate Branding (CM)

		CM Sincerity	CM Excitement	CM Ability	CM Sophisticated	CM Ardousness	CM Internal Image
STMG Internal Environment	R	,634**	,645**	,644**	,605**	,530**	0,570
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG External Environment	R	,685**	,705**	,721**	,648**	,580**	0,624
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG Planning	R	,712**	,690**	,729**	,639**	,562**	0,646
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG Application	R	,655**	,644**	,648**	,599**	,506**	0,568
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG Control	R	,703**	,657**	,678**	,626**	,505**	0,608
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG Flexibility	R	,610**	,671**	,662**	,593**	,593**	0,570
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233
STMG Performance	R	-,668**	-,670**	-,710**	-,629**	-,560**	-0,573
	p	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000	,000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	233

Table 5: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Scores of Strategic Management subscales predictive power for Corporate Branding's Sincerity Subscale

Predictor	Predicted	R	R^2	R_{che}	F_{che}	p
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Sincerity	,788[a]	,620	,620	52,751	,000

Table 6: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Sincerity

Independent Variable			standardize		
	B	Sh	β	t	p
(Stable)	2,075	,337		6,150	,000
STMG ExternalEnvironment	-,007	,083	-,007	-,089	,929
STMG Internal Environment	,130	,079	,143	1,644	,101

STMG Planning	,252	,089	,262	2,823	**,005**
STMG Application	-,154	,100	-,165	-1,548	,123
STMG Control	,299	,108	,299	2,784	**,006**
STMG Flexibility	,071	,061	,073	1,162	,247
STMG Performance	-,300	,059	-,290	-5,117	**,000**

Tablo 7: The Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis made to assess the Scores of Strategic Management subscales predictive power for Corporate Branding's Excitement Subscale						
Predictor	**Predicted**	**R**	**R²**	**R_che**	**F_che**	**p**
STMG Performance, STMG Flexibility, STMG External Environment, STMG Application, STMG Internal Environment, STMG Planning, STMG Control	CM Excitement	,791[a]	,626	,626	53,981	,000

Table 8: The Regression Relationship Predictions regarding Strategic Management Subscales and CM Excitement					
Independent Variable			standardize		
	B	**Sh**	**β**	**t**	**p**
(Stable)	1,958	,328		5,965	,000
STMGExternalEnvironment	,052	,081	,053	,648	,517
STMG Internal Environment	,167	,077	,187	2,162	**,032**
STMG Planning	,161	,087	,171	1,852	,065
STMG Application	-,017	,097	-,018	-0,175	,862
STMG Control	,000	,105	,000	0,001	,999
STMG Flexibility	,235	,060	,244	3,937	**,000**
STMG Performance	-,289	,057	-,285	-5,061	**,000**