EMPLOYER BRANDING AND WORK ENGAGEMENT IN NON-BANK FINANCING COMPANY

Laila Meiliyandrie Indah Wardani, Dhoni Oktafiansyah

Faculty of Psychology, Mercu Buana University
Jl. Meruya Selatan No. 01, Kembangan, Jakarta Barat

laila.meiliyandrie@mercubuana.ac.id

Abstract

This research was conducted to determine whether employer branding has a relationship with work engagement in a private company in the field of non-bank financing. The population of this research is the workers of a national private company engaged in the field of non-bank financing, especially the head office workers located in Jakarta. The number of samples of this study were 117 people, consisting of 62 men and 55 women with an age range of 20-67 years (Mean = 28.13; SD = 5.849). The method used is quantitative with stratified sampling technique. The research instrument used was the Employee Attractiveness Scale (EmpAt) (α = .956; 20 items). Whereas to measure the Work Engagement using Utrech Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (17 items; α = .896). The analysis carried out is a simple linear regression, t-test and one-way ANOVA. The results of this study found that Employer Branding had a significant positive effect on Work Engagement (F (1.115) = 50.333; β = .552, r = .552; R2 = .304; P <.001). Employer branding can be a strategy for companies to identify the needs of current and future workers, and build an image as a company of choice for work, so as to increase employee engagement with the company and its work.

Keywords: employer branding; work engagement; EmpAT; UWES

Abstrak

Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk mengetahui apakah *employer branding* memiliki hubungan dengan *work engagement* pada sebuah perusahan swasta bidang pembiayaan non bank. Populasi penelitian ini adalah pekerja sebuah perusahaan swasta nasional yang bergerak pada bidang pembiayaan non bank, khususnya pekerja kantor pusat yang berlokasi di Jakarta. Jumlah sampel penelitian ini sebanyak 117 orang, yang terdiri dari 62 orang laki-laki dan 55 orang perempuan dengan rentang usia 20-67 tahun (Mean = 28,13; SD = 5,849). Metode yang digunakan kuantitatif dengan teknik *stratified sampling*. Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan adalah *Employee Attractiveness Scale* (EmpAt) (α=0,956; 20 item). Sedangkan untuk mengukur *Work Engagement* menggunakan *Utrech Work Engagement Scale* (UWES) (17 item; α= 0,896). Analisa yang dilakukan adalah regresi linier sederhana, t-test dan one way ANOVA. Hasil dari penelitian ini didapatkan bahwa Employer Branding memberikan pengaruh positif yang signifikan terhadap *Work Engagement* (F (1,115) =50,334; β=0,552, r=0,552; R^2=0,304; P<0,001). *Employer branding* dapat menjadi strategi bagi perusahaan untuk melakukan identifikasi kebutuhan pekerja saat ini dan akan datang, serta membangun citra sebagai perusahaan pilihan untuk bekerja, sehingga dapat meningkatkan engagement pekerja terhadap perusahaan dan pekerjaannya.

Kata kunci : *employer branding; work engagement*; EmpAT; UWES, *engagement*

INTRODUCTION

Employee loyalty at work is arguable as an engagement towards something or a specific condition both, in physical forms such as compensation, gifts, and in non-physical forms, such as mind and attention. Erikson (Arnold, 2017) declares that engagement is a sort of commitment from someone's care, that is natural, which arises from the conflict between generativity and stagnation. At work, humans will bring all their inherent attributes, like education, skills, work experience, personality types, emotions or feelings, which can affect his attitudes towards work. Agarwal, Chaudhary, and Dixit (Munish & Argawal, 2017) argues that

work engagement is an essential issue for a company, even more in this time, the world needs to recover from the economic recession. Companies begin to realize that workers are the most substantial assets so that strategic steps are needed to increase work engagement.

Kahn (Bailey et al., 2015) is one of the pioneers who proposed the engagement theory related to the working world. He explained that the employees' involvement and connectedness in their work include physical-energetic, cognitive and emotional. Schaufeli and Bakker (2010), defines three dimensions of engagement based on Khan's engagement theory as follow (1) Cognitive, that is shown by trust and support providing for the goals achievements of the organization's vision and mission and corporate values; (2) emotional, which is indicated by a sense of belonging, proud feeling, and attached feeling to the company; (3) physical-energetic, which is indicated by the employee's willingness to work hard and the desire to stay in their workplace. These dimensions are consistent with Agarwal, Chaudhary, and Dixit (2010) opinion, which states that engagement is companies or organizations' method in winning workers with a willingness to give 'everything' to their work.

Work engagement refers to engagement and involvement in the relationship between workers and their work and also the relationship between workers and organizations or companies (Wardani, Wulandari, Triasti, & Sombuling, 2020). This is related to the state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption (Schaufeli, 2013). Meanwhile, according to Adryanto (2014), work engagement is the level of commitment of a company's workers towards something or someone in the company that makes him or herself work optimally and feels harsh in the company. Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzales-Roma, and Bakker (2002), explain the dimensions of work engagement, namely: (1).

Vigor (physical-energetic): Vigor or enthusiasm, is an emission of strong energy and mentality at work, reflects readiness in making the maximum effort and tends to endure difficulties, and strives to complete work until completion; (2). Dedication (emotional): Refers to a strong identification with work, the meaning of a job for someone, which includes feelings of enthusiasm, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride in the job tends to want to always work and be able to work for a long time; (3). Absorption (cognitive): Characterized by seriousness and full concentration in doing work, sometimes even difficult to escape when it comes to working time.

According to Merry (2013) work engagement will produce three elements, specifically, say (talk positively about the company), Stay (stay in the company), and Strive (motivated to work more seriously). Francis-Smythe and Robertson (Sharma & Kaur, 2014; Agušaj, Bazdan, & Krivić, 2018) believes that employees having work engagement will show enthusiasm; in other words, a form of desire and a real desire related to work and the company. Moreover Bakker and Leiter (2010), also suggests that when employees are engaged, they are motivated and strive to move forward towards success.

Work engagement conceptualization is a positive concept (Bakker, Schaufeli, Leiter, & Tarris, 2008). The positive direction of work engagement does not come only from a normative decision, but also from the number of conducted studies. The increasing number of studies and findings of work engagement indicate that work engagement is related to various aspects in individual functions development both in the organizations and communities (Moliner, Martínez-Tur, Ramos, Peiró, & Cropanzano, 2008; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010; Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2005; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2009). Halbesleben, Harvey, and Bolino (2009) shows that someone with a

high work engagement will produce positive things in the working environment. This argument shows that work engagement is something positive because people with work engagement will be enthusiastic and give their best to get the work done (Sonnentag, 2011). Wardani and Anwar (2019) stated that work engagement is a critical issue in achieving organizational effectiveness. Work engagement is one of the keys to improving employees' performance. Improvements can occur through work engagement because workers with high work engagement will work with more enthusiasm, endeavour, and provide positive things to improve performance (Wardani & Firmansyah, 2019; Wardani, Wulandari, Triasti, & Sombuling, 2020).

Based on a preliminary survey, a set of data about employees' distribution by the length of work and dynamic employees' turn over in the company for five months, from January to May 2018 was obtained. The working period is divided into three: 0 – 5, 5 - 10, and > 10 years of work experience. The data shows that the number of employees' work expereince periods are varying. The highest number of workers' experience period is from null to five years, while the smallest number of workers' experience period is more than ten years. The results of the interview means that the number of new workers with the experience period below or equal to five years is more than the number of workers with an experience period above five years or more than ten years. The smallest number is the workers with a experience period above ten years. In that five months survey period, the number of workers leaving was higher than the number of workers entering the company.

The data mentioned above describes the employees' engagement level in the company. Kurniawati (2014) states that an employee with a more extended experience period in a company has more information about the company than the new one and he/ she has more experience and dedication to the company. The length experience period can increase employees' work engagement (Mewengkang & Panggabean, 2016). The employees adapt himself to work in particular long enough time so that employees feel comfortable and find the appropriate work. It can be concluded that a more extended work period will make workers feel more comfortable and have more work engagement with the workplace (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2012).

Researchers obtain additional data by interviewing the human resource department. According to the interview, it was mentioned that company branding is also an issue for recruitment and engagement process in the company. Kusuma and Prasetya (2017) argues that employee's engagement toward a company is influenced by employer branding, and it is also one of the factors that impact the dynamics of employee turnover. The role of Human Resources Management is needed in order to create an excellent working atmosphere and increase the existing employees' engagement towards the company.

Employee turnover is an employee dynamic that is always experienced by all companies. The number of employees leaving the company should be balanced with the number of workers entering the company. The recruitment process also must meet the standard of requirement. In this global era, the labour market is very competitive. The companies keep maintaining the best employee and strive to improve employer branding. Improvement of employer branding needs to be done in order to attract talented and competent employees (Morya & Yadav, 2017). Employer branding has recently become very important in the labour market because it influences the recruitment process (Obala & Novita, 2017). Currently, the concept of employer branding is examined by the business leader, they need to get information about the benefit of employer branding besides toward

recruitment process and engagement (Hasyim & Nor, 2018).

Employer branding is also essential for talent management and human resource strategies. Arises where business leaders explore the needs and benefits of employer branding in human resources that are not only limited to recruitment and engagement but also in terms of talent management and human resource strategies. The employees' engagement does not discuss only achieving the company's goal but also about the efforts to ensure that the company reaches its vision and mission (Karsan & Kruse, 2011). Employer branding menjadi salah satu faktor yang mempengaruhi proses rekrutmen dan juga engagement terhadap perusahaan. Ambler and Barrow (Dabirian, Paschen, & Kietzmann, 2019) defines the employer branding as a set of functional, economic, and psychological benefits provided by the employer and is identified with the company. In general, Minchington suggests that employer branding is an essential part of human resource strategy, competitive market strategy, and successful leadership (Firgurska & Matsuka, 2016).

Rosethorn (2009) defines employer branding as a two-way agreement between the employees and the organizations as a reason to associate and remain in the company. Mosley (Mihalcea, 2017) explains employer branding as a critical quality for employees and prospective employees in identifying the organization as an employer. Through the employer branding, the employees recognize the company economically (compensation and benefits), functionally (new skills), and psychologically (status and identity). Chartered Institute of Professional Development (Christiansen & Chandan, 2017) describes employer branding as a set of attributes that makes an organization appear different from others. The unique attributes attracted prospective employees to join and contribute optimally to the organization. The Society for Human Resources Management (Rana & Sharma,

2018) further states that employer branding is the image of the organization as a good workplace for its employees and active and passive prospective employees and also customers.

Berthon, Ewing, and Hah (2005), constructed a scale for measuring the interest of prospective workers by integrating the dimensions of employer branding from Ambler and Barrow (1996). The scale consists of five primary dimensions (1). Interest Value is a work environment that challenges and stimulates innovation and creativity; (2) Social Value is a positive and pleasant social and interpersonal environment; (3) Economic Value is a work environment with high average wages, compensation, job security and promotion opportunities; (4) Development Value is a work environment that provides recognition, self-esteem & confidence, skills development, and career-enhancing experience; (5) Application Value is a work environment that provides opportunities to apply expertise and share knowledge with others, customer-oriented and humanitarian.

There is a ratio imbalance between the number of workers in each experience period and the high level of employee turnover in the company. This study focuses on the existing problems related to the influence of employer branding on work engagement in the company. The research questions are: Is there any influence of employer branding on work engagement in the company? Which employer branding dimensions give the most influential contribution to work engagement?

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach. Employer branding is the independent variable, and work engagement is the dependent variable. The population of the study is the employee of a national private company and engage in the field of non-bank financing company in Jakarta. The number of participants is 117 employees. From 120 distributed questionnaires, 117

questionnaires meet the criteria to be used as data. The data consist of 62 male and 55

female employees, with age, ranges from 20 – 67 years (Mean = 28.13 ; SD = 5.849).

Table 1.
Male's Respondents Profile

Age	Education	Work Experience	f	%
Early Adulthood (19-30)	Senior High School	< 5 Years	2	1.71
	Vocational Education	< 5 Years	2	1.71
	Diploma	< 5 Years	6	5.13
	Bachelor	< 5 Years	32	27.35
Late Adulthood (30-60)	Senior High School	5 - 10 Years	1	.85
		> 10 Years	2	1.71
	Vocational Education	< 5 Years	1	.85
		> 10 Years	1	.85
	Diploma	< 5 Years	1	.85
		5 - 10 Years	2	1.71
	Bachelor	< 5 Years	6	5.13
		5 - 10 Years	5	4.27
Elderly (> 60)	Bachelor	> 10 Years	1	.85

Tables 1 and 2 show the characteristics of respondents by gender, age, educational background, and years of experience. The majority of the male respondents are between 19 – 30 years; most of them have undergraduate education and less than five

years of experience. The highest percentage of female respondents aged between 19 – 30 years, most of them also have undergraduate education and have been less than five years working.

Table 2.
Female's Respondens Profile

Age	Education	Work Experience	f	%
Early Adulthood (19-30)	Senior High School	< 5 Tahun	1	.85
	Vocational Education	< 5 Tahun	2	1.71
	Diploma	< 5 Tahun	8	6.84
		5 - 10 Tahun	2	1.71
	Bachelor	< 5 Tahun	34	29.06
		5 - 10 Tahun	2	1.71
Late Adulthood (30-60)	SMA	5 - 10 Tahun	1	.85
	Diploma	5 - 10 Tahun	1	.85
	Bachelor	< 5 Tahun	1	.85
		> 10 Tahun	3	2.56

The sampling technique used in this study is a stratified random sampling technique. The sample is selected based on the position and the number of employees in each department.

The sample selection considered the comparative approach so that the sample represents the entire population. This research used two measuring instruments: the Utrecht

Work Engagement Scale (UWES) and Employer Attractiveness Scale (EmpAt).

a. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) was developed by Schaufeli & Bakker(2002) to measure work engagement. The questionnaire consists of 17 favourable items. A four-point Likert scale was used, and the alternative answer ranged from never to always.

Tabel 3.
Blueprint Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES)

Dimensions	Indicators	Sample of Item	Reliability Coefficient
Vigor	Have high energy and endurance. The desire to try, not easily tired, and be persistent in facing difficulties	At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well	.705
Dedication	Feel enthusiastic and proud of the work done, and feel inspired and challenged in the work	I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	.771
Absorption	Feeling happy to be involved in work, find it difficult to break away from work so that time feels fleeting	When I am working, I forget everything else around me	.837

b. Employer Attractiveness Scale (EmpAt) was developed by Berthon, dkk (2005). to measure employer branding. The instrument was constructed by integrating the dimensions of employer branding, as stated by Ambler & Barrow (1996). It consists of 20 favourable items. A four-point Likert Scale was used in this instrument. The four alternative answers are Very Not Important, Not Important, Important, and Very Important

Table 4.
Blueprint Employer Attractiveness Scale (EmpAt)

Dimensions	Indicators	Sample of Item	Reliability Coefficient
Interest value	A challenging work environment and stimulates innovation & creativity	The organization produces high-quality products and services	.840
Social Value	A positive and pleasant social and interpersonal environment	Having a good relationship with your colleagues	.853
Application Value	A work environment that provides opportunities to apply expertise and convey knowledge to others, customer oriented and humanitarian	Opurtunity to teach others what you have learned	.811
Economic Value	A work environment with above-average wages, compensation packages, job security, and promotion opportunities	An attractive overall compensation package	.843
Development Value	A work environment that provides recognition, self-esteem & confidence, skills development, and career-enhancing experience	Gaining career-enhancing experience	.785

These both instruments were adapted to reduce the cultural and linguistic bias, that is considered could have an impact on the measured variables (ITC, 2016). The International Test Commission guidelines for translating and adapting tests suggest that in the process of adaptation and translation of a psychological instrument, the cultural, language, and psychological differences should be evaluated by the competent experts (ITC, 2016). The adaptation process involved back-forward translation by two psychologists. These two psychologists master fluent and active English and Indonesian in their daily lives. The back-translation process was considered to be conducted because it facilitates the identification of problems in translation. The forward translation process is administrated to get the right results. This study expects that the translation can produce the same value as the original one so that the instrument can measure the variable correctly (ITC, 2016).

The validation process was conducted by measuring the content validity. In measuring the content validity, a panel of experts was involved. The experts evaluate and give the

justification about appropriateness between the definition of the dimension and the questionnaire content (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Three expertise from social psychology and industrial-organizational psychology were included in the panel. Panellists give the justification for the two measuring instruments. The results show

that all items can represent the content of the psychological instruments, and there was no significant difference between the adapted and the original questionnaire.

A tryout was conducted to measure the instrument reliability. Cronbach Alphas of .896 for UWES and .956 for EmpAt was obtained from the tryout. Both Alpha values indicate high reliabilities value for the psychological instruments. The data in this study were analyzed using inferential descriptive statistics. From the descriptive statistics analysis, an overview of the respondents and sample categorization was obtained. A simple regression analysis, as the inferential statistic, was used to analyze the contribution of employer branding on the work engagement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analysis

In order to categorize the respondent's scores, this study measured the hypothetical and empirical mean. The hypothetical categorization is analyzed based on the norms of measuring instruments and used as the basis of category points. For finding the empirical categories, the mean and standard deviation (SD) of the empirical data were calculated (Widhiarso, 2010). The respondent categorizations based on the hypothetical and empirical value of each variable are as follow:

Table 5.
Descriptive Analysis

Variable	SD		Xmax		Xmin		Mean	
	H	E	H	E	H	E	H	E
WE	8.5	8.7	68	68	17	27	47.5	45.87
EB	13.3	15.9	100	100	20	46	60	67.5

Notes: **H**= Hipotetic; **E**= Empiric; **SD**= Standard Deviation

Table 5 shows the possible standard deviation (SD) is 8.5, and the empirical

standard deviation (SD) is 8.7 both for work engagement. The hypothetical standard

deviation is smaller than the empirical. The Xmax for hypothetical and empirical are both the same, 68. Hypothetical Xmin (17) is smaller than the empirical Xmin (27). The value of hypothetical mean (47.5) is higher than the empirical mean (45.87).

The categorization for employer branding can be analyzed as follow. The hypothetical

SD (13.3) is smaller than the empirical SD (15.97). The hypothetical and empirical Xmax value for both is the same (100). Hypothetical Xmin (20) is smaller than empirical Xmin (46). The hypothetical mean value (60) is smaller than the empirical mean (67.5).

Table 6.
Hypothetical and Empirical Categorization Work Engagement

Category	Range		f		%	
	H	E	H	E	H	E
Low	27-44	27-42	53	41	45.3	35
Average	45-52	43-51	38	45	32.5	38.5
High	53-68	52-68	26	31	22.2	26.5

Notess: **H**= Hipotetic; **E**= Empiric; **f**= frequency

Table 6 shows a descriptive analysis of the work engagement categorization. The hypothetical value for the low category ranges from 27 – 44, medium 45 – 52, and the high category 53 – 68. The empirical value for the low category ranges from 27 – 42, medium 43 – 51, and the high category 52 – 68. Based on hypothetical values, the majority of the respondent 45.3% (38

peoples) has low work engagement, 32% (38 respondents) has moderate, and 22.2% (26 peoples) has the high work engagement. Based on the empirical data, the majority of the respondent, 38.5% (45 peoples) has a moderate work engagement, and 35% (41 peoples) has low engagement, and 26.5% (31 peoples) has high engagement.

Table 7.
Hypothetical and Empirical Categorization Employer Branding

Category	Range		F		%	
	H	E	H	E	H	E
Low	20-54	46-60	31	63	26.5	53.8
Average	55-67	67-76	41	17	35	14.5
High	68-100	77-100	45	37	38.5	31.6

Notes: **H**= Hipotetic; **E**= Empiric; **f**= frequency

Table 7 describes the categorization of the employer branding variable. The hypothetical values of low category range from 20 – 54, medium 55 – 57, and high 68 – 100. The empirical values for low category range from 46 – 60, medium 67 – 76, and high 77 – 100. Based on hypothetical value, the majority of respondents, 38.5% (45 peoples) perceive a high employer branding, 35% (41 peoples) perceive a moderate

employer branding, and 26.5% (31 peoples) perceive a low employer branding. However, the empirical value describes it differently. The majority of respondents (53.8%) perceive low employer branding, 31.6% (37 peoples) perceive high employer branding, and 14.5% (17 peoples) moderate employer branding. Empirical values describe it; differently, the majority of respondents have a low employer branding,

which is 63 people (53.8%), followed by a high of 37 people (31.6%), and moderate as many as 17 people (14.5%).

Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing was analyzed with simple linear regression. The test results showed R = .552; R2 = .304 and F (1,115) = 50.344; p =.001, The results indicate that employer branding provides a contribution of 30.4% in producing work engagement. The regressionequation was obtained as follows:

$$Work\ Engagement = 25.739 + .300\ Employer\ Branding$$

The coefficient for the employer branding variable is .300, and it is positive. The positive regression coefficient demonstrates a positive relationship between employer branding and work engagement. An increase in work engagement will follow an increasing level of employer branding and vice versa. An increasing point in employer branding by one, for example, will increase the amount of work engagement by .300 and vice versa, a decrease in employer branding by one point will reduce the amount of work engagement .300.

Table 8.
Dimensions Correlations Matrix

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorbtion
Interest	.509**	.517**	.190*
Social	.541**	.541**	.215*
Application	.566**	.668**	.318**
Economic	.479**	.513**	.222*
Development	.483**	.557**	.227*

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In this study, a correlation matrix was made to determine the strongest relationship between the dimension of employer branding and work engagement. The results show that the dimensions of application and dedication value have the strongest relationship with a correlation value of .668 (p = .000). This result means that an increasing level of dedication value will follow the increasing level of application value. Reciprocally, if the application value decreases, the dedication value will also decrease. From the correlation matrix was also found the weakest relationship among the dimensions. The weakest relationship is the correlation between the interest value and absorption, with R = .190 (p = .040).

The independent t-test was conducted to determine the gender differences in two variables. The t-test result shows a value of t = 1.408 (p = .162) on variable employer branding. These results indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female employees in perceiving employer branding. In the work engagement variable, a t value of 2.277 (p = .025) was found. The result demonstrates that there is a significant difference between male and female employees in work engagement.

The majority of the respondent (72%) has a bachelor educational background, whereas the remaining respondent (28%) have a non-bachelor (graduate) educational background. The respondents with a bachelor's educational background have been working in the company for less than five years. They consist of 27% male and 29% female. 35% of them have a low level of employer branding and work engagement.

One-way Anova show significant differences with the value of mean square is 959.334 (F (3.113) = 4.061; p = .009) in perceiving employer branding among three groups based on educational background. Based on the Post-Hoc test results, indicates there are differences between respondents with high school and diploma education background (mean difference = 18.929; p = .006), and between respondents with high school and bachelor educational backgrounds (mean difference = 20.214; p = .001).

Similar with work engagement, One-way Anova was used to examine the work engagement differences in three groups of educational background. The results show differences in work engagement in three groups of educational backgrounds (mean square = 242.890; F (3.113) = 3.419; p = .020). The Post – Hoc test show a significant difference in work engagement between respondents with high school and diploma educational background (mean difference = 10.329; p = .006), and between respondents with high school and bachelor educational backgrounds (mean difference = 5.269; p = .013). However, the result shows that the work engagement of diploma graduate respondents is different from high school and bachelor graduates.

Moreover, the respondent's profile shows that 82.1% of respondents have fewer than five years of experience, 14.5% have a working experience of 5-10 years, and 3.4% have work experience of more than ten years. Furthermore, to find out whether there are differences in the three working experience groups, this study used a One-way Anova test to analyze. Based on the One-way Anova test, it was found a significant different in work engagement between the respondents based on work experience between < 5 years, 5 – 10 years, and > 10 years experiences (mean square = 507.198; F (2.114) = 5.106; p = .001). Furthermore, the results of post-hoc test showed that work engagement among workers with <5 years work experience is different from workers who have 5-10 years experiences (mean difference = 6.389; p = .004) and <10 years of experience (mean difference = 11.448; p = .008).

In employer branding also One-way Anova shows there is different employer branding based on work experience (mean square = 3102.651; F (2.114) = 10.949; p = .000). Moreover, the results of the post-hoc test showed that employer branding among workers with <5 years work experience is different from workers who have 5-10 years experience (mean difference = 17.430; p = .000) and <10 years of experience (mean difference = 24.313; p = .001).

Also, this study conducted a descriptive categorization test, based on the categorization, and it was found that the mean was relatively the samebetween empirical categorization and hypothetical categorization. From the categorization mentioned above, the employees in this company have a low work engagement (45.3%). Commonly, low engagement with the company could lead to a high level of employee turnover. On the other hand, the perception of employer branding is at a high level. The high level of employer branding means that the company has the right image of the employees. Unfortunately, the high level of employer branding does not succeed to lead the employees to get more engaged with their work.

The results of this study are following the development theory of Havighurst (Manning, 2002),. He explained about the developmental characteristic of early adult (young adulthood, early adulthood), with an age range of 18 – 30 years. At that age, young adults start to enter the working world, and commonly, they try to find fit social groups. In this range of age, young adults also actively perform physical, cognitive, and emotional activities, especially in finding, opening, and exploiting the existing opportunities. These developmental characteristics lead them to

find more information about life, and help them to make choices, determine the right direction in life. Work choices and places belong to their decision in life. According to Schumann and Sartain (2009), the underlying company challenges relate to the company strategies in finding the correct employees based on the criteria and needs. For example, a change in this millennial generation may also change generation habits. The technology explosion might alter the interaction habits of humans in the generation. They find a new way of accessing information, marketing talent, also they can find the first job market easily so that the availabilities of job choices are to find for them.

In the last two years, there has been a change of leadership along with its structure. These changes bring to several significant alterations, including leadership style, organizational culture, direction and objectives of the company, organizational structure. Through these changes, the organization dynamics are moving and changing. An example is the difficulties in equating the perceptions between the employees working for more than five years and employees working less than five years in one company. The new employees try to follow the new management rules, but they still bring the habits or methods from their former workplace, while in the new company the old worker still maintains the pre-existing rules, and it could be a problem. The next problem is the high level of employee turnover. The old employees sometimes cannot adjust to the new condition or new management rules. Commonly, they will leave, resign from the company, or they were laid off.

This resulting study suggests that factors outside the employer branding influence 69.6% of work engagement. Bakker (2011) suggests that job resources and personal resources are the main predictors of engagement. However, the results of this study are following previous studies

conducted by several researchers. The study results state that employer branding has a role in work engagement. The increase in employer branding points will be followed by increasing work engagement (Morya & Yadav, 2017; Park & Zhou, 2013; Pathardikar, Sahu & Maurya, 2013; Hanin, Stinglhamber & Delobbe, 2013, Syihabudhin, 2007; Lee, Kim & Kim, 2014). This research also provides information for employees. Nowadays, research about employer branding in the field of economic and management was conducted more often. Employer branding is considered to be an essential factor in raising work engagement, which is also essential for increasing company profits (Hadi & Ahmed, 2018; Urbancová & Hudácová, 2017; Tikson, Hamid, & Mardiana, 2018; Aldousari, Robertson, Yajid, & Ahmed, 2017; Theurer, Tumasjan, Welpe, & Lievens, 2018). Piyachat, Chanongkorn and Panisa (2014) found that employee engagement is a partial mediator of the relationship between perceived employer branding and discretionary effort on workers.

Similarly, research conducted by Sagita Arinatiar, Al-Musadieq, and Sulistyo (2018) also found that work engagement is a partial moderator of employer branding in impacting the turnover intention. Besides being a mediator for the relationship between employer branding with turnover intention and discretionary effort, work engagement also mediates the relationship between internal branding and brand experience (Ahmad, Iqbal, Kanwal, Javed, & Javed, 2014).. A research conducted by Syihabudhin (2007) demonstrates that employer branding and company culture affect employee commitment to the organization or company. All these researchers suggest that employer branding also affects the behaviour and attitude of the workers (Wahba & Elmanadily, 2015)

The employer branding develops from the company's goals, uniqueness, and benchmarks in setting the goals, and target

determination. The concept of employer branding is expected to be able to integrate the existing dimensions in creating work engagement. This study and other previous studies outside psychology are succeeded in proving the essential roles of employer branding.

Employer branding is the development of organizational culture communication in overcoming the market share (Ambler & Barrow, 1996). According to Sullivan (Rajesh, 2018), employer branding is a target of a long-term strategy in managing the employees' awareness and perception, potential employees, and stakeholders. This process is called a process of building a unique identity of a company (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004). Besides, according to Jenner and Taylor (Firguska & Matuska, 2013), employer branding is a form of company effort in expressing the expectation of internal and external stakeholders and communicate the feature of the company. Martin (Wilska, 2014) defines employer branding as a company method to attract talented people to enter the company and ensure that existing employees and prospective employees can identify the company (brand, mission), and eventually, they can provide the company's expectations. Through the parallel objectives, values, and initiatives between the two parties, employer and employees, the employee trust is built, and reciprocally, the employees deliver their work engagement (Martin, dalam Wilska, 2014). If the agreement can be achieved, the employee develops work engagement, and it will appear in employees' positive attitude (Priyadarshi, 2011). If the employer branding is achieved, the employees will actively and fully involve in the work and organization (Lee et al., 2014). Employer branding can also be used as a management strategy in obtaining financial benefits by involving sociopsychological work engagement; thereby, the employees build trust in the company and pride in being part of the company (Figurska & Matuska,

2013). Thus, employee turnover can be suppressed.

Work engagement in a company is often used as a benchmark of happiness and job satisfaction in the workplace (Torp, Grimsmo, Hagen, Duran, & Gudbergsson, 2012). Therefore, work engagement cannot be created by itself. Work engagement can occur if the company could provide support. Support brings up the employees' worth feeling, and they are provided many opportunities by the company (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Baek-Kyoo & Insuk, 2017; Teo, Bentley, & Nguyen, 2019). Supports is received through employer branding, because employer branding describes the advantages, culture, and benefits that will be provided by the company for the employees (Wilden, Gudergan, & Lings, 2010). A right image will make the employees feel comfortable, valued, and it gives the worker a permanent reward (Raj, 2018; Sharif & Islam, 2017; Backhaus, 2016).. Workers feel that they are contributing and are worthy of respect. The good feeling will encourage workers to be more involved in various jobs in the company, especially jobs related to career and personal development (Tikson, Hamid, & Mardiana, 2018). Workers will feel more confident in presenting their work and indirectly become an ambassador for their company, providing useful feedback for the company. Employees with excellent work engagement will feel happier and satisfied with their workplace (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008; Garg, Dar, & Mishra, 2018; Rayton, Yalabik, & Rapti, 2019; Sartono & Ardhani, 2015; Baek-Kyoo & Insuk, 2017). If workers are happy and satisfied with their work and place of work, it motivates the employees to be more productive and committed to their workplace (Harrington, 2014; Rayton et al., 2019; Wardani & Noviyani, 2020).

Previous research conducted by Van der Ende (2016) using the qualitative action research methodology produced points summarized in the dimensions of employer

branding theory (Ambler & Barrow, 1996): creative, admirable, reliable/safe, a sound / pleasant place to work and a place, where individuals can pursue their own goals. In another study, it was mentioned that employer branding could be one of the strategies in increasing work engagement. Kunerth and Mosley (2011) research's at the Coca-Cola Hellenic company states that employer branding is not only an initiation and use by the HR department, but it has become a necessity in leadership management. Even though employer branding is not a novel concept for the company, it is so, that in implementing employer branding, a significant commitment from top management to subordinate is needed, and the management has to always be dynamic and adaptive in every circumstance.

In this study, a correlation matrix between dimensions was conducted to determine the most magnificent dimensions relationship of work engagement. The result shows that the dimensions of application and dedication value have a strong relationship. This result means that workers will give high dedication to their work if the work environment provides an opportunity for workers to apply their ability, and also allow transferring their knowledge to others. The open opportunity to implement their knowledge produces an enthusiastic and proud feeling from the employees. These opportunities also motivate, inspire, and challenge the employee to be more engaged with his work. This explanation is in line with one of the work engagement factors proposed by Schaufeli (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008), namely the personal resource factor. Personal resource factor refers to the employees' characteristics, which are related to the self-efficacy that reflects confidence in the ability to manipulate, control, her/ himself, and give a positive impact on the environment. As there is a personal resource, the employees can perceive that they have the ability and potential to perform optimally, feel more

engage, and have an essential part in their work (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

In the analysis results, it can also be seen that the weakest relationship in the two variables is the interest value dimension and absorption. A challenging work environment stimulates innovation and creativity. The results show that challenges, innovation and creativity produce the work engagement among the employees. Baker et al. (Mustosmaki, Antilla, & Oinas, 2013) suggest that job resources could trigger work engagement in dealing with high job demands. However, the job demands produce an ambiguous engagement and directly and indirectly lead to a decrease in employee's well-being (Mustosmaki et al., 2013).

The result of the Anova Oneway Test and Post-hoc tests on employer branding and work engagement show that there are differences based on year of experience among the employees with more than 10, less than five years, and 5 – 10 years of experience. The difference for the employer branding variable based on the working period of 5 -10 years and above ten years, is caused by differences in perceiving the dimension of the employer branding in the company. The employees with more extended working period tend to give more value to their work and less value to the extrinsic rewards (Reis & Braga, 2016). In the work world, one's years of work experience or experience have a good influence on one's level of knowledge and behavior (World Health Organization, 1984). The longer a person works, the better knowledge and experience he gets from work.

The results of the respondent's data analysis showed that 82% of the respondents have a working period of under five years. 54% of them have low employer branding and low work engagement. Conversely, the minority respondents (3.4%) with years of experience above ten years, 32% has a high level of

employer branding, and 27% has a high work engagement. So, it can be concluded that the majority of workers are 19-30 years old and the minority of workers (22%) are 30-60 years old, and 60 years and above. They have a different level of work engagement and employer branding.

In the working world context, humans will bring all the attributes attaching in him, from education, skills, work experience, personality types, emotions, or feelings, which can affect his attitudes towards work. This attitude will later determine work performance, dedication, engagement, and commitment to work that is charged to workers. According to Erikson (Gilleard & Higgs, 2016), engagement is a form of commitment to one's natural caring, which arises from the conflict between generativity and stagnation.

Based on the educational background and work experience, the majority of respondents (72%) has a bachelor degree, and the remain respondents (28%) have a non-graduates (non-bachelor) degree. The respondent with a bachelor degree has a working period of fewer than five years. 27% of them are male and 29% female. 35% of the respondent with bachelor degree have low employer branding, and low work engagement as well. Difference employer branding and work engagement in groups with different educational background were proved in this study. The respondent perceived the employer branding differently. The majority of the respondent with high school or vocational high school background perceive more in social and development value of employer branding dimensions. This study's results indicate that differences in educational backgrounds are determinants of a worker's attitude.

One dimension of employer branding theory, namely interest value, states that a challenging work environment can stimulate innovation and creativity. The statement indicates that positive and pleasant social

and interpersonal environments are needed by young adults. The results of this study are in line with Reis and Braga (2016) research which states that generations, aged 19-30 years will consider more on the work environments that provide opportunities in applying the skills and knowledge. Reis and Braga (2016) also states that the older the age of a person is, the more respectful is the person toward the work they have. The employee will give less value to extrinsic rewards. By appreciating the work, they already have, it can be predicted that the engagement of the workers at that age will also increase.

Differences in work engagement between Bachelor and non-Bachelor's educational backgrounds can occur. The educational background of an individual can determine the number of available jobs offers to them. Respondents with a Bachelor's educational background will have fewer workplace choices. Educational background has a significant influence on work competence, especially intellectual competencies. Intellectual competence also impacts one's work engagement (Wardani & Fatimah, 2020). The Bachelor's degree is nowadays the standard for work admission. Workers with non-bachelor backgrounds tend to work and stay in the company where they work now because they do not have many workplace choices.

Age is also a determining factor for work engagement and employer branding differences among the respondent. Older employees tend to be more engaged in their work, feel they have high energy, are more dedicated to work, are fully immersed at work, have better resilience (Ramos, Jenny, & Bauer, 2016), and better emotional regulation than younger workers (Sousa, Ramos, & Carnvalho, 2019; Haley, Mostert, & Els, 2013; Kim & Kang, 2016; Johnson, Machowski, Holdworth, Kern, & Zapf, 2017). Kim and Kang (2016) stated that work engagement occurs because older workers are more skilful and have more

experience in managing their volume of work. In addition, work engagement is carried out as a form of compensation to the workplace because the company still employs them and makes them as a long-term investment (Sousa et al., 2019).

This study shows that there is no difference in employer branding between male and female workers. This finding is contradictory to previous research which states that there are differences in employer branding based on gender. The results of the study show that women integrate the importance of social value, market value, application value, and cooperation value in the workplace compared to male workers (Alnıaçık & Alnıaçık, 2012). In the work engagement variable, there are differences between men and women. According to Rothbard (Gulzar & Teli, 2018), the difference occurred because of the differences approach between men and women in engaging roles at work. Men are considered easier in showing work engagement compared to women (Banihani, Lewis, & Syed, 2013). Reissová, Šimsová, and Hášová (2017) research shows that women are more loyal to the workplace than men because men tend to be more confident and more independent.

This research has significant implications in the field of industrial and organizational psychology. Research with the theme of work engagement and employer branding are still rarely conducted in Indonesia. Research on employer branding is needed because, through the research results, employers get information on developing the quality of work at the company from the employees' perspective and organizational effectiveness. Employer branding is conducted by communicating the company culture to build good employees' perception of the company. If a good employer branding is achieved, the worker will fully involve in the company. According to Halbesleben, et. al. (2009) empirical evidence shows that individuals with high work engagement will produce positive things in the workplace. Workers will be more enthusiastic and try optimally to complete the work so that better results can be achieved (Sonnentag, 2011). Furthermore, Bakker (2011) revealed that if workers are engaged, the workers will be more open to new information, more productive, willing to work extra, and more proactive towards changes in the work environment. In this study, it was found that if the work environment provides the opportunity to the employees to apply their skills and are allowed to transfer their knowledge to others, the employees will feel enthusiastic and proud in completing their work. The opportunity presented by the company inspires and becomes a challenge for these employees. All the open opportunities can build work engagement on employees for their work. The results of this study can be integrated with previous studies to form a new model that can be used to develop work engagement for workers. Work engagement is critical to improving the performance of companies or organizations.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to examine the relationship between work engagement and employer branding in company workers. The results of the hypothesis test stated that the proposed hypothesis in this study was accepted. Employer branding has an important role and a positive relationship with work engagement. The higher the level of employer branding is, the higher is the level of work engagement among workers, and vice versa. Research on employer branding has become an organizational requirement nowadays and in the future. The research results provide information about method in building an excellent organizational image, which is worthy of being a workplace choice. With good employer branding, the work engagement of company workers will increase.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

Adryanto, M. (2014). *Engaging talents: Meningkatkan kontribusi produktif karyawan secara strategis, etis, dan bertanggung jawab*. Jakarta: Prasetiya Mulya Publishing.

Agarwal, R., Chaudhary, M., & Dixit, S. (2010). The innovative technique at Thomson. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, *2*(2), 189-193. doi: 10.3844/ajebasp.2010.189.193

Agušaj, B., Bazdan, V., & Krivić, N. (2018). Impact of time congruity on work engagement and job performance. In I. N. Braje, B. Jaković, & I. Pavić (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference an Enterprise Odyssey: Managing Change to Achieve Quality Development* (pp. 95-96)

Ahmad, N., Iqbal, N., Kanwal, R., Javed, H., & Javed, K. (2014). The mediating role of employee engagement in relationship of internal branding and brand experience: Case of service organizations of Dera Ghazi Khan. *International Journal of Information, Business, and Management*, *6*(4), 26-41.

Aldousari, A. A., Robertson, A., Yajid, M. S. A., & Ahmed, Z. U. (2017). Impact of employer branding on organization performance. *Journal of Transnational Management*, *22*(3), 153-170. doi: 10.1080/15475778.2017.1335125.

Alnıaçık, E., & Alnıaçık, U. (2012). Indentifying dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding: effect of age, gender, and current employment status. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *58*(2012), 1336-1343. Doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1117.

Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, *4*(3), 185-206. doi: 10.1057/bm.1996.42

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. USA: American Educational Research Association.

Arnold, M. E. (2017). Supporting adolescent exploration and commitment: Identity formation, thriving, and positive youth development. *Journal of Youth Development*, *12*(4), 1-15. doi: 10.5195/jyd.2017.522

Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, *9*(5), 501-517. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430410 550

Backhaus, K. (2016). Employer branding revisited. *Organization Management Journal*, *13*(4), 193-201. doi: 10.1080/15416518.2016.1245128

Baek-Kyoo, J. & Insuk, L. (2017). Workplace happiness: Work engagement, career satisfaction, and subjective well-being. *Evidence-Based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, *5*(2), 206-221. doi: 10.1108/EBHRM-04-2015-0011.

Bailey, C., Madden, A., Alfes, K., Robinson, D., Fletcher, L., Holmes, J., Buzzeo, J., & Currie, G. (2015). Evaluating the evidence on employee engagement ant its potential benefits to NHS staff: A narrative synthesis of the literature. *Health Services and Delivery Research*, *3*(26). doi: 10.3310/hsdr03260

Bakker, A. B. (2011). An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Current Direction in Psychological Science*, *20*(4), 265-269. doi: 10.1177/0963721411414534.

Bakker, A. B, Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P, & Tarris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organisation*, *22*(3), 187-200. doi: 10.1080/02678370802393649.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, *13*(3), 209-223. doi:10.1108/13620430810870.

Bakker, A. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2010). *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*. London: Psychology Press. doi: 10.4324/9780203853047

Banihani, M., Lewis, P., & Syed, J. (2013). 'Is work engagement gendered?'. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, *28*(7), 400-423. doi: 10.1108/GM-01-2013-0005.

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

10.1080/02650487.2005.11072912.

Christiansen, B., & Chandan, H. C. (2017). *Handbook of research on human factor in contemporary workforce development*. USA: IGI Global.

Dabirian, A., Paschen, J., & Kietzmann, J. (2019). Employer Branding: Understanding employer attractiveness of IT Companies. *IT Professional*, *21*(1): 82-89. doi: 10.1109/MITP.2018.2876980

Figurska, I., & Matuska, E. (2013). Employer Branding as A Human Resources Management Strategy. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, *7*(2), 35-51. Retrieved from https://frcatel.fri.uniza.sk/hrme/archi.html

Garg, K., Dar, I. A., & Mishra, M. (2018). Job Satisfaction and work engagement: A study using private sector bank managers. *Advance in Developing Human Resources*, *20*(1), 58-71. doi: 10.1177/1523422317742987.

Gilleard, C., & Higgs, P. (2016). Connecting life span development with the sociology of the life course: A new direction. *Sociology*, *50*(2), 301-315. doi: 10.1177/0038038515577906

Gulzar, S., & Teli, M. R. (2018). Gender and work engagement: A study of academic staff higher education. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, *8*(2). Retrieved from https://www.hilarispublisher.com/abstract/gender-and-work-engagement-a-study-of-academic-staff-in-higher-education-21727.html

Hadi, N. U., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Role of employer branding dimensions on employee retention: evidende from

educational sector. *Administrative Sciences*, *8*(44), 1-15. doi: 10.3390/admsci8030044.

Halbesleben, J. R. B., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conversation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(6), 1452-1465. doi: 10.1037/a0017595.

Haley, L., Mostert, K., & Els, C. (2013). Burnout and work engagement for different age groups: examining group-level differences and predictors. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, *23*(2), 283-295. doi: 10.1080/14330237.2013.10820625.

Hanin, D., Stingljamber, F., & Delobbe, N. (2013). The impact of employer branding on employees: the role of employment offering in the prediction of their affective commitment. *Psychologica Belgica*, *53*(4), 57-83. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/pb-53-4-57.

Harrington, E. (2014, September 25). How employer branding, employee engagement and productivity work together. Retrieved from https://bluivygroup.com/employer-branding-employee-engagement-productivity-work-together/.

Hasyim, R. A., & Nor, M A., M. (2018). Employer branding and employee engagement of furniture retailer in klang valley. *SHS Web of Conference*, *56*, 1-8. doi: 10.1051/shsconf/20185602003.

International Test Commission. (2016). *ITC guidelines for translating and adaptating test (Second edition)*. Retrieved from https://www.psyssa.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ITC-Guidelines-Translating-and-Adapting-Tests-v2-3.pdf

Johnson, S. J., Machowski, S., Holdsworth, L., Kern, M., & Zapf, D. (2017). Age, emotion regulation strategies, burnout, and engagement in the service sector: Advantages of older workers. Revista de Psicologia del Trabajo y de Las Organizaciones, *33*(3), 205-216. doi: 10.1016/j.rpto.2017.09.001

Karsan, R. & Kruse, K. (2011). *We: How to increase performance and profits through full engagement*. Hoboken, NJ: Willey.

Kim, N., & Kang, S. (2016). Older and more engaged: The mediating role of age-linked resources on work engagement. *Human Resource Management, 56*(5), 731-746. doi: 10.1002/hrm.21802.

Kreitner, R & Kinicki, A. (2012). *Organizational behavior* (10th Edition) New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Kunerth, B. & Mosley, R. (2011). Applying employer brand management to employee engagement. Strategic *HR Review, 10*(3), 19–26. doi: https://doi.org/10.1108/147543911111218.

Kurniawati, I. D. (2014). Masa kerja dengan engagement kerja pada karyawan. Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan, *2*(2), 311-324. Retrieved from http://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/jipt/article/view/2005

Kusuma, T. C., & Prasetya, A. (2017). Penerapan strategi employer branding dan employee value proposition untuk menciptakan employee engagement (studi pada PT. Bank Central Asia Tbk.). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis, 50*(5), 143-151. Retrieved from

http://administrasibisnis.studentjournal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jab/article/view/2067

Lee, Y. K., Kim, S., & Kim, S. Y. (2014). The impact of internal employer branding on employee engagement and outcome variables in the hotel industry. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, *19*(12), 1359-1380.doi: 10.1080/10941665.2013.863790

Manning, M. L. (2002). Havighurst's developmental tasks, young adolescents, ad diversity. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *76*(2), 75-78. doi: 10.1080/00098650209604953.

Merry, J. (2013). Aon Hewitt's 2013 trends in global engagement: where do organizations need to focus attention? *Strategic HR Review*, *13*(1), 24-31. doi: 10.1108/SHR-07-2013-0073

Mewengkang, M. & Panggabean, Ha. (2016) Work engagement pada karyawan MRN terhadap implementasi aplikasi data dan analisis SDM. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi MANASA*, *15(*1), 1-14. Retrieved from http://ejournal.atmajaya.ac.id/index.php/Manasa/article/view/182

Mihalcea, A. D. (2017). Employer branding and talent management in the digital age. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, *5*(2), 289-306. doi: 10.25019/MDKE/5.2.07.

Moliner, C., Martínez-Tur, V., Ramos, J., Peiró, J. M., & Cropanzano, R. (2008). Organizational justice and extrarole customer service: The mediating role of well-being at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *17*(3), 327-348. doi: 10.1080/13594320701743616

Morya, K. K., & Yadav, S. (2017). Employee engagement & internal employer branding: A study of service industry. *Jharkhand Journal of Development and Management Studies*, *15*(4), 7557-7569. Retrieved from https://www.xiss.ac.in/JJDMS/Vol15/Issue4/Issue4ab6.php

Munish & Agarwal, R. (2017). An analytical study on employee's engagement and its relationship with job outcomes: A case of tata consutancy services (TCS). *Asian Journal Management*, *8*(3), 745-752. doi: 10.5958/2321-5763.2017.00118.4

Mustosmaki, A., Antilla, T., & Oinas, T. (2013). Engaged or not? A comparative study on factors inducing work engagement in call center and service sector work. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, *3*(1), 49-67.doi: 10.19154/njwls.v3i1.2520

Obala, T., & Novita. (2017). Pengaruh dimensi-dimensi pembentuk merek perusahaan pemberi-kerja terhadap niat melamar pekerjaan dengan reputasi perusahaan sebagai peubah pemediasi. *Jurnal Magister Management*, *9*(1), 81-105.doi: 10.30813/jbam.v9i1.896

Park, H. J., & Zhou, P. (2013). Is there a correlation for companies with a strong employment brand between employee engagement levels and bottomline results? Article Publication. Cornell University ILR School. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/student/24/

Pathardikar, A. D., Sahu, S., & Maurya, K. K. (2013). Leadership and employer branding: Where do employee engagement and psychological attachment stand? *Tenth AIMS*

International Conference on Management, *India, 87-98.*

Piyachat, B., Chanongkorn, K. & Panisa, M. (2014). The mediate effect of employee engagement on the relationship between perceived employer branding and discretionary effort. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, *24*(1), 59-72. Retrieved from https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/6piyachat-072214.pdf

Priyadarshi, P. (2011). Employer brand image as predictor of employee satisfaction, affective commitment & turnover. The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, *46*(3), 510-522. Retrived from http://www.publishingindia.com/ijir/22/employer-brand-image-as-predictor-of-employee-satisfaction-affective-commitment-turnover/105/783/

Raj, A. B. (2018). Employee well-being trough internal branding: An integrated approach for achieving employee-based brand outcomes. *Global Business Review*. doi: 10.1177/0972150918779161.

Rajesh, M. (2018). Employer branding – A new strategic dimension of retention in IT Industry [Special Issue]. *International Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, *118*(20), 801-812.

Ramos, R., Jenny, G., & Bauer, G. (2016). Age-related effects of jpb characteristics on burnout and work engagement. *Occup Med*, *66*(3), 230-237. doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqv172.

Rana, S., & Sharma, R. (2018). Overview of employer branding with special reference to Indian Organization. In Mehdi. K (Eds.), *Brand Culture and Identity: Concepts, Methodology,*

Tools, and Applications (pp. 1-13). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Rayton, B., Yalabik, Z. Y., & Rapti, A. (2019). Fit perceptions, work engagement, satisfaction and commitment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *34*(6), 401-414. doi: 10.1108/JMP-02-2018-0074.

Reis, G. G. & Braga, B. M. (2016). Employer attractiveness from a generational perspective: Implications for employer branding. *Revista de Administração*, *51*(1), 103-116. doi: 10.5700/rausp1226

Reissová, A., Šimsová, J., & Hášová, K. (2017). Gender differences in employee engagement. *Littera Scripta*, *10*(2), 84-94. Retrieved from https://www.littera-scripta.com/gender-differences-in-employee-engagement/

Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *53*(3), 617-635. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2010.51468988

Rosethorn, H. (2009). *The employer brand: Keeping faith with the deal*. Farnham: Gower Publising Limited.

Sagita M, Arinatiar R., Al Musadieq, M., & Sulistyo, M. C. W. (2018). Pengaruh Employer Branding terhadap turnover intention dengan employee engagement sebagai variable mediasi (studi pada karyawan tetap Bank X BUMN cabang Barawijaya Malang). *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis, 60* (2), 74-83. Retrieved from http://administrasibisnis.studentjournal.ub.ac.id/index.php/jab/article/view/2508

Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Peiró, J. M. (2005). Linking organizational

resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*(6), 1217-1227. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1217

Sartono, H., & Ardhani, M. (2015). Work engagement, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction among employees of a coal mining company in South Borneo. *International Research Journal of Business Studies*, *8*(2), 107-122. doi: 10.21632/irjbs.8.2.107-122.

Schaufeli, W. B. & Bakker, A. B. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In Arnold. B, & Michael, L (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research and research* (pp.10-24). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout a two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71-92. doi: 10.1023/A:10156309

Schaufeli, W.B. (2013). *Employee engagement in theory and practice*. London: Routledge.

Schumann, M., & Sartain, L. (2009). *Brand for talent: Eight essentials to make your talent as famous as your brand*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sharma, S. K., & Kaur, S. (2014). An introspection of employee engagement: a quantitative content analysis approach. The IUP Journal of organizational behavior, *13*(2), 38-57. Retrieved from https://www.iupindia.in/1404/Organizational%20Behavior/An_Introspection.html

Sonnentag, S. (2011). Research on work engagement is well and alive. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20*(1), 29-38. doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2010.510639.

Sousa, I. C., Ramos, S., & Carvalho, H. (2019). Age-diversity practices and retirement preference among older workers: a moderated mediation model of work engagement and work ability. *Front Psychology*. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01937.

Sharif, A. M., & Islam, M. T. (2017). Branding for successful employment: A practical approach. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research: Administration and Management*, *17*(3), 18-28. Retrieved from https://journalofbusiness.org/index.php/GJMBR/article/view/2402

Syihabudhin. (2007). Pengaruh budaya dan citra perusahaan terhadap komitmen organisasi karyawan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Modernisasi*, *3*(2), 72-85. Retrieved from http://ejournal.unikama.ac.id/index.php/JEKO/article/view/932

Teo, S. T. T., Bentley, T., & Nguyen, D. (2019). Psychosocial work environment, work engagement, and employee commitment: A moderated, mediation model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.102415

Theurer, C. P., Tumasjan, A., Welpe, I. M., & Lievens, F. (2018). Employer branding: A brand equity-based literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *20*(1), 155-179. doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12121.

Tikson, S. D. S., Hamid, N., & Mardiana, R. (2018). Employer branding as a strategy to attract potential workforce. *International Journal of Administrative Science & Organization*, *25*(3), 114-119. Retrieved from http://journal.ui.ac.id/index.php/jbb/article/viewArticle/9968

Torp, S., Grimsmo, A., Hagen, S., Duran, A., & and Gudbergsson. (2012). Work engagement: a practical measure for workplace health promotion? *Health Promotion International*, *28*(3), 387-396. doi: 10.1093/heapro/das022.

Urbancová, H., & Hudácová, M. (2017). Benefits of employer brand and the supporting trends. *Economics and Sociology*, *10*(4), 41-50. doi: 10. 14254.2071.789X.2017/10-4/4.

Van der Ende, E. (2016). *Employer branding and work engagement at Agency Leroy* (Master's thesis, Haaga-Helia University of Applied Science). Retrieved from http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:amk-201604194586

Wahba, M., & Elmanadily, D. (2015). Employer branding impact on employee behavior and attitudes applied study on pharmatecual in Egypt. *International Journal of Management and Sustainability*, *4*(6), 145-162. doi: 10.18488/journal.11/2015.4.6/11.6.145.162

Wardani, L. M. I., & Anwar, M. S. (2019). The role of quality of work life as mediator: Psychological capital and work engagement. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(6), 447-463. doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.7670

Wardani, L. M. I., & Fatimah, S. (2020). Kompetensi pekerja dan efeknya

terhadap work engagement: riset pada pekerja dengan horizontal education mismatch. *Jurnal Psikologi Sosial*, *18*(1), 73-85. doi: 10.7454/jps.2020.09.

Wardani, L. M. I., & Firmansyah, R. (2019). The work-life balance of blue-collar workers: The role of employee engagement and burnout. *Jurnal Psikologi Ulayat*, *6*(2), 227-241. doi: 10.24854/jpu02019-238

Wardani, L. M. I., & Noviyani, T. (2020). Employee well-being as a mediator of correlation between psychological capital and psychological climate. *Journal of educational, Health, and Community Psychology*, *9*(2), 47-63. doi: 10.12928/jehcp.v9i2.14357

Wardani, L. M. I., Wulandari, S. S., Triasti, P., & Sombuling, A. (2020). The effect of psychological capital on work engagement: Employee well-being as a mediator. *Test engineering and Management*, *83*, 17220-17229. Retrieved from https://www.testmagzine.biz/index.php/testmagzine/article/view/10137

Widhiarso, W. (2011; June 5). Membuat kategori skor hasil pengukuran dari skala [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://widhiarso.staff.ugm.ac.id/wp/membuat-kategori-skor-hasil-pengukuran-dari-skala/

Wilden, R., Gudergan, S., and Lings, I. (2010). Employer branding: Strategic implications for staff recruitment. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 26(1-2), 56-73. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/02672570903577091

Wilska, E. (2014). Employer branding as an effective tool in acquiring talents. *Journal of Positive Management*, 5(3), 45-54. doi: 10.12775/JPM.2014.019

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *82*(1), 183-200. doi: 10.1348/096317908X285633