# The Mediate Effect of Employee Engagement on the Relationship between Perceived Employer Branding and Discretionary Effort

#### **Burawat Piyachat**

Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thanyaburi, Pathumthani, Thailand piyachatbu@gmail.com

#### Kuntonbutr Chanongkorn

Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thanyaburi, Pathumthani, Thailand dean\_bus.rmutt@hotmail.com

#### **Mechinda** Panisa

Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Thanyaburi, Pathumthani, Thailand mechinda.panisa@gmail.com

The purpose of this study is to test the relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort via the effect of employee expectation. A survey was conducted with 1,349 current employees working in Thai petroleum industry. The results indicated that there were strong positive relationships between employer branding and employee engagement, employee engagement and discretionary effort, employer branding and discretionary effort, employee engagement expectation, and employee expectation and employee engagement. The results further indicated that there was a partial effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation, while there was also a partial effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement.

#### JEL Classifications: M1; M2

*Keywords:* employer branding, employee engagement, discretionary effort, Expectancy Theory, Social Exchange Theory

In recent years, many CEOs and managers believe that the talent pool has not significantly grown, and they have difficulty in getting the right employees. Best employers are differentiated from competitors by a high level of employee engagement, which links to high discretionary effort and leads to high revenues, profits, and overall returns on investment resulting in a sustainable competitive company (Ritson, 2002; Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004; Barrow & Mosley, 2005). Thai petroleum companies with strong understanding of their employees' expectation could apply the notion of employee branding to increase the level of employee engagement and discretionary effort, which will in turn, lead to high performance.

Both academic researchers and practitioners are intensifying the level of interest in employees' relation with employers. Some studies revealed the relationship between employer branding and employee engagement while some studies revealed the relationship between employee engagement and discretionary effort. However, these relationships are regardless of the theories that engender these relationships. In addition, the study which confirmed the simultaneous relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort is scarce, especially in academic approach. Therefore, this study proposes to investigate the simultaneous relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort in the context of current employees. This study has seven research questions: (1) Is there a relationship between employer branding and employee engagement? (2) Is there a relationship between employee engagement and discretionary effort? (3) Is there a relationship between employer branding and discretionary effort? (4) Is there a relationship between employer branding and employee expectation? (5) Is there a relationship between employee expectation and employee engagement? (6) Is there an effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation? and (7) Is there an effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement?

# LITERATURE REVIEW

Since studies on the relationship of employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort are scarce in academic approach, the theoretical foundation is therefore ambiguous in that it does not fully explain why employees would respond to the conditions offered by the organization with different degrees of engagement and discretionary effort. However, Saks (2006) proposed that these varying degrees could be explained by social exchange theory while Vroom and Deci (1992) proposed that these varying degrees could be explained by expectancy theory. Social exchange theory is the relationship between parties into trusting, loyalty, and mutual commitment that evolve over time, as well as parties that dwell by certain reciprocity rule which is best known as an exchange rule (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Vroom (1995) explained that "given the opportunity a person will choose to work when the valence of outcomes that he expects to attain from working is more positive than the valence of outcomes that he expects to attain from not working" (p. 35).

## **Employer Branding**

Employer brand is defined as "the package of functional, economic, and psychological benefits provided by employment and identified with the employing company" (Ambler & Barrow, 1996, p. 187). This study developed Ambler and Barrow's (1996) three dimensions to four dimensions. First of all, employment dimension measured job characteristics and working conditions. Second, development and application dimension measured feeling valued and emotional motivation. The latter dimension was organizational reputation which measuring the organizational success, products or services, and external image. Finally, the economic dimension measured tangible motivation such as attractive compensation and benefit packages.

## **Employee Engagement**

Saks (2006) was the first researcher who separated engagement into job and organizational engagement which was explained through the social exchange theory. Moreover, Saks (2006) defined engagement as "a distinct and unique construct that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components associated with individual role performance" (p. 602). On one hand, cognitive dimensions were associated with commitment and satisfaction such as the value of a work goal, job enrichment, and work role fit. On the other hand, emotional dimensions were associated with feeling about the relationship with managers and coworkers, feeling able to show and employ one's self without fear of negative consequences. Lastly, behavioral dimensions were associated with an adaptive behavior such as behaviors that support organizational effectiveness and aim to encourage an innovation and change, discretionary effort, and retention.

#### **Discretionary Effort**

Yankelovich and Immerwahr (1983) defined discretionary effort as "the difference between the maximum amount of effort and care an individual could bring to his or her job and the minimum amount of effort required to avoid being fired or penalized; in short, the portion of one's effort over which a job holder has the greatest control" (p. 1). Despite, discretionary effort in organizational behavior has emphasized extra-role behavior. Entwistle (2001) critiqued that it has emphasized only extra-role behavior that the narrow scope, and further proposed that discretionary effort scale should be measured in two categories: inrole and extra-role. In-role discretionary effort referred to an effort that an individual is exerting to fully perform the role requirement. In contrast, extra-role discretionary effort referred to an effort beyond the level required to fully meet role requirements.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The competing model (Figure 1) is to test the direct effects of employer branding on employee engagement, discretionary effort, and employee expectation. Meanwhile, the proposed theoretical model (Figure 2) is to test the mediate effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation, and the mediate effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### Samples and Procedure

The population for the study consisted of current employees from nine organizations in Thai petroleum industry. Free parameter is not constrained and is to be estimated using observed data (Weston & Gore, 2006). The preferred ratio of sample size to number of free parameters would be 10:1 (Bentler & Chou, 1987). Number of free parameters equaled 134, therefore, the minimum sample size is 1,340. A total of 1,349 samples were collected from current employees from February to April, 2013 by using three sampling methods: quota sampling (186 respondents), simple random sampling (476 respondents), and



*Figure 1.* The competing model.



*Figure 2.* The proposed theoretical model.

snowball sampling (687 respondents). In the first method quota sampling method the heads of HR department were contacted and were provided with the letters authorized by the university. Permissions to send the paper survey to their employees were requested.

There was a low level of response rate for quota sampling, thus, simple random sampling and snowball sampling were conducted. The simple random sampling method was an interview method wherein the random respondents were interviewed by highly experienced interviewers. The last method was a snowball method wherein after observing the initial subject, the researcher asked for assistance from the subject to help identify people with a similar trait of interest.

## Instruments

The design of this study was a quantitative approach, which was done by using questionnaires composed of four parts: employer branding (EB), employee engagement (EE), discretionary effort (DE), and employee expectation (EXP).

# Structure Equation Model (SEM)

Wright (1921) defined that SEM is a statistical technique for testing and estimating causal relations using a combination of statistical data and qualitative causal assumptions. This study was comprehensive by the following seven hypotheses: (H1) There is a positive relationship between employer branding and employee engagement; (H2) There is a positive relationship between employee engagement and discretionary effort; (H3) There is a positive relationship between employer branding and discretionary effort; (H4) There is a positive relationship between employer branding and employee expectation; (H5) There is a positive relationship between employee expectation and employee engagement; (H6) There is an effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation; and (H7): There is an effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement. This study was to determine the appropriate research model related to seven indicators. The relationships among variables were determined by t-test related to critical ratios (C.R.) and *p*-value.

# Table 1.

Values of Skewness and Kurtosis

Factor	Item	Range of skewness values	Range of kurtosis values
Employment	EMP1-EMP10	-0.910 to -0.456	-0.648 to 0.181
Development & Application	DA1-DA7	-1.400 to -0.677	0.280 to 2.710
Organizational Reputation	ORG1-ORG13	-1.287 to -0.672	0.421 to 1.932
Economic	ECO1-ECO3	-1.344 to -1.112	1.163 to 2.077
Job Engagement	JEE1-JEE9	-0.652 to -0.095	-0.609 to 0.169
Organization Engagement	OEE1-OEE6	-0.399 to -0.181	-0.546 to 0.298
In-Role Discretionary Effort	IRDE1-IRDE7	-0.768 to 0.210	-1.295 to 0.765
Extra-Role Discretionary Effort	ERDE1-ERDE4	-0.640 to -0.235	0.073 to 0.821
Functional Expectation	FEXP1-FEXP8	-0.715 to -0.549	0.211 to 0.696
Economic Expectation	EEXP1-EEXP4	-0.969 to -0.701	0.118 to 1.236
Psychological Expectation	PEXP1-PEXP6	-0.634 to -0.350	0.056 to 0.965

# RESULTS

The results indicated the values of skewness range from -1.400 to 0.210 and the values of kurtosis range from -1.295 to

2.710 (Table 1). Meanwhile, the Pearson's bivariate correlations of all relationships were significant. Thus, it could be concluded that the rule of normal distribution and linearity were satisfied.

# Table 2.

The Minimum Criterion of Reliability Analysis and Validity Analysis

Analysis detail	Threshold/Minimum criterion
Reliability Analysis	
- Cronbach's alpha	- is above 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994)
- Composite reliability	- is above 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994)
Validity Analysis	
- IOC	- was tested by four raters, all items of questionnaire that the
	IOC score was less than 0.5 were eliminated (Rovinelli &
	Hambleton, 1977)
<i>- p</i> -value	- <i>p</i> -value associated with each loading should be significant
	(Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994)
- Factor loading	- is above 0.6 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994)
- Average variance extracted (AVE)	- is above 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981)
- Discriminant validity (DV)	- AVE for each construct is greater than its shared variance
	with any other construct (Fornell & Larcker, 1981)

# Table 3.

The Minimum Criterion of Model Fit Indices

Model fit index	Threshold/Minimum criterion
χ2 or CMIN	- should not be significant at a 0.05 threshold (p>0.05) (Hu & Bentler, 1999)
$\chi^2/df$ or CMIN/df	- should be less than 5.0 to judge the fitness of the model (Bentler, 1989)
CFI	- should be greater than 0.9 to judge the good fit (Bentler & Bonett, 1980)
IFI	- should be greater than 0.9 to judge the good fit (Bentler & Bonett, 1980)
AGFI	<ul> <li>should be greater than 0.9 to judge the good fit (Jöreskog &amp; Sörbom, 1996)</li> <li>AGFI of 0.8 is sometimes proposed as sufficient as recommended cut-off (Chau &amp; Hu, 2001)</li> </ul>
PGFI	- should be greater than 0.5 to judge acceptable fit (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998)
RMSEA	- should be less than 0.05 to judge good fit and between 0.05 and 0.08 to judge reasonable fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993)

# Table 4.

Characteristics of the Majority of Respondents

Characteristics	Percent
Collected from 1,349 current employees	
Response rate	49.13%
Male	56.1%
30-35 years old	26.5%
Single	55.7%
Bachelor's degree	54.4%
Working experiences above 10 years	40.3%
Operation employee	70.0%
Engineering department	16.5%
Plan to work with current company in next 3 years	80.5%

#### Table 5.

Reliability and Validity Assessment of Instruments

Factor	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE	Highest (correlation) <sup>2</sup>	Discriminant validity
Employment	0.929	0.924	0.577	0.549	1.050
Development & Application	0.909	0.902	0.606	0.573	1.057
Organizational Reputation	0.933	0.932	0.578	0.573	1.009
Economic	0.860	0.867	0.688	0.558	1.232
Job Engagement	0.817	0.829	0.550	0.408	1.347
Organization Engagement	0.916	0.909	0.666	0.408	1.635
In-Role Discretionary Effort	0.871	0.856	0.666	0.327	2.037
Extra-Role Discretionary Effort	0.851	0.848	0.878	0.327	2.685
Functional Expectation	0.910	0.905	0.657	0.333	1.974
Economic Expectation	0.870	0.858	0.604	0.333	1.815
Psychological Expectation	0.864	0.851	0.535	0.333	1.606

Considering the IOC score, the results indicated that the IOC score of all items were above 0.5. Meanwhile, the results indicated that all *p*-values associated with each loading were significant, and all factor loading values were above 0.6. Moreover, all average variance extracted (AVE) from all dimensions were above 0.5, and the discriminant validity (DV) scales of all dimensions were above 1.0 (Table 5). Thus, it could be concluded that these instruments are reliable scale for the measurement of employer branding, employee engagement, discretionary effort, and employee expectation. In order to test the concurrent criterion validity, 200 employees from the automobile industry and the banking industry were asked to envision and evaluate the perceived employer branding, employee engagement, discretionary effort, and employee expectation of working for the petroleum industry. The results showed that all *p*-values associated with each loading were significant which have similar results with the petroleum industry. Therefore, it could be concluded that all four instruments are supported by the concurrent criterion validity.

The Chi-square is essential statistic. However, a statistical significance test is sensitive to sample size which means that the Chi-square statistic nearly always rejects the model when large samples are used (Bentler & Bonnet, 1980; Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996). Therefore, several authors indicated that a model could also be accepted if the majority of fit indices show good adoption measures and only a few are less than the required threshold (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

Although the Chi-square statistic of the second order CFA provided a significant result at a 0.05 threshold, the remaining results were above the minimum criterion (Table 6). Thus, it could be concluded that the structure of employer branding, employee engagement, discretionary effort, and employee expectation were appropriated to explain the interrelationships among items and latent variables.

Since the remaining results of the competing and the proposed models were above the minimum criterion, it could be concluded that both models appropriated to explain the relationships among variables (Table 7). According to above results, the model fit statistics of the proposed theoretical model was better than the competing model. Thus, it could be concluded that the relationships among employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort were greater explained by an effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation and an effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement.

According to Garson (2005), random sample variables with standard normal distributions, estimates with critical ratios (C.R.) more than 1.96 are significant at the 0.05 level. Thus, each endogenous variable's C.R. value was assessed with a statistical significance supported by those greater than 1.96. Meanwhile, p-value less than 0.05 was at the significant at 0.05 level, p-value less than 0.01 was at the significant at 0.01 level, and p-value less than 0.001 was at the significant at 0.001 level (Arbuckle, 2011). The value of t-test revealed that all standardized estimated values were positive values and all critical ratios (C.R.) more than 1.96 indicated that there were positive relationships among variables (Table 8). Therefore, it could be concluded that H1, H2, H4, and H5 were supported at a significance level of 0.001. Meanwhile, H3 was supported at a significance level of 0.05.

#### Table 6.

Model fit statistics	Employer branding model	Employee engagement model	Discretionary effort model	Employee expectation model
χ2 or CMIN	1642.645	105.118	41.766	284.327
<i>p</i> -value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
df	354	24	9	67
$\chi 2/df$ or CMIN/df	4.640	4.380	4.641	4.244
CFI	0.959	0.989	0.994	0.981
IFI	0.959	0.989	0.994	0.982
AGFI	0.898	0.968	0.972	0.954
PGFI	0.746	0.524	0.519	0.620
RMSEA	0.052	0.050	0.052	0.049

Model Fit Statistics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Order CFA

-	Model Fit Indexes of	f the Co	ompeting	Model	and the	Proposed	Theoretical	Model
---	----------------------	----------	----------	-------	---------	----------	-------------	-------

Model fit index	<b>Competing model</b>	Proposed theoretical model
χ2 or CMIN	7439.927 at $p = 0.000$	7174.304 at $p = 0.000$
df	1627	1625
$\chi^2/df$ or CMIN/df	4.573	4.415
CFI	0.905	0.909
IFI	0.905	0.909
AGFI	0.810	0.816
PGFI	0.759	0.763
RMSEA	0.051	0.050

# Table 8.

Hypotheses Testing of the Proposed Theoretical Model

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	<i>p</i> -value
H1: Employer branding	>	Employee engagement	0.191	0.031	6.052	***
H2: Employee engagement	>	Discretionary effort	0.719	0.066	10.973	***
H3: Employer branding	>	Discretionary effort	0.067	0.034	2.005	0.045
H4: Employer branding	>	Employee expectation	0.514	0.030	16.927	***
H5: Employee expectation	>	Employee engagement	0.570	0.055	10.391	***

\*\*\**p*-value< 0.001 (*p*-value less than 0.001 was at the significant at 0.001 level)

# Table 9.

Standardized Direct, Indirect, and Total Effect of the Competing Model

			Standardized direct effect	Standardized indirect effect	Standardized total effect
Employer branding	>	Employee engagement	0.746	0.000	0.746
Employer branding	>	Discretionary effort	0.661	0.000	0.661
Employer branding	>	Employee expectation	0.787	0.000	0.787
Regarding the resu	lts (Tal	ble 9), the equations	ZEE =	= 0.746 EB	(2

for the competing model were conducted.

$\wedge$			$\wedge$		
Z DE	= 0.661 EB	(1)	Z EXP	= 0.787 EB	(3)

Regarding the results (Table 10), the equations for the proposed theoretical model were conducted.

$$Z DE = 0.711 EE + 0.617 EB$$
  
+ 0.411 EXP .....(4)  
 $Z EE = 0.727 EB + 0.578 EXP$  .....(5)

$$Z EXP = 0.763 EB$$
 .....(6)

Considering the competing model, the standardized direct effect between employer branding and employee engagement was 0.746. In contrast, the results from the proposed theoretical model showed that standardized direct effect between employer branding and employee engagement was 0.286 while the standardized indirect effect was 0.441, and standardized total effect was 0.727. Considering the competing model, the standardized direct effect between employer branding and discretionary effort was 0.661. On the other hand, the results from the proposed theoretical model indicated that the

standardized direct effect between employer branding and discretionary effort was 0.100, and the standardized indirect effect was 0.517 whereas the standardized total effect was 0.617 (Table 10). Accordingly, the standardized direct effect of the proposed theoretical model was less than that of the competing model. Therefore, it could be concluded that there is an effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation, and there is an effect of employee branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement. As a result of better model fit statistics and the low level of the standardized direct effect, it could be concluded that H6 and H7 were supported.

# **DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS**

## Hypothesis 1

The result reported that there is a positive relationship between employer branding and employee engagement and further reported that development and application is the most important dimension, followed by employment,

## Table 10.

Standardized Direct, Indirect, and Total Effect of the Proposed Theoretical Model

			Standardized direct effect	Standardized indirect effect	Standardized total effect
Employment	>	Employer branding	0.938	0.000	0.938
Development & application	>	Employer branding	0.984	0.000	0.984
Organizational reputation	>	Employer branding	0.859	0.000	0.859
Economic	>	Employer branding	0.725	0.000	0.725
H6: Employer branding	>	Employee engagement	0.286	0.441	0.727
Employee engagement	>	Discretionary effort	0.711	0.000	0.711
H7: Employer branding	>	Discretionary effort	0.100	0.517	0.617
Employee expectation	>	Discretionary effort	0.000	0.411	0.411
Employer branding	>	Employee expectation	0.763	0.000	0.763
Employee expectation	>	Employee engagement	0.578	0.000	0.578

organizational reputation, and economic respectively, which supported the results of the previous studies. For example, the study of Aon Hewitt (2011) reported that the best employer is differentiated by high level of engagement. Meanwhile, Gibbon (2006) proposed that emotional drivers had four times more impact on individual's engagement than other factors such as pay.

#### Hypothesis 2

The result indicated that there is a strong positive relationship between employee engagement and discretionary effort which supported the results of previous studies. For example, the results of the study of Aon Hewitt (2011) about a global engagement revealed that engaged employees delivered the discretionary effort while Anand and Banu (2011) further confirmed that there are positive relationships between employee engagement variables and discretionary effort.

#### Hypothesis 3

The result revealed that there is a strong positive relationship between employer branding and discretionary effort which supported the result of previous studies. For example, the study from The Work Foundation (2009) proposed that the organization which offers attractive contracts would get back more contributions such as high performance, flexibility, expertise, and discretionary effort. Besides, Neil (2012) argued that great employer brands are aligned to corporate direction and they should make it granular clear why talented employees should put in discretionary effort in order to encourage organizational goals and success.

#### Hypothesis 4

The result revealed that there is a strong positive relationship between employer branding and employee expectation. No research findings explored this relationship in the context of current employees. Although a previous study was interested in the context of prospective employees, the results were corresponding with the result of this study. For example, Harris and Fink (1987) conducted pre-interview and post-interview from job seekers and found that job seekers intend to accept a job with an organization when they perceived attractive job offer, compensation, and company image. Consistently, Rose (2006) revealed that job seekers in Queensland tend to apply for job with the organization according to perceived competitive pay image, attractive job image, and good organization image.

#### Hypothesis 5

The result revealed that there is a strong positive relationship between employee expectation and employee engagement which supported the result of previous studies. For example, Macleod and Clarke (2009) found that employees' perception of their career development opportunities and supportive procedure have a substantive impact on the level of employee engagement. In addition, the study from IPSOS Mori (2006) suggested that employees' perceptions of corporate values, community commitment, favorable pay, and feeling of friend and family member have significant impacts on employee engagement.

# Hypothesis 6

The result found that there is a partial effect of employer branding on employee engagement through employee expectation. Considering the result of this study, it was revealed that when employees judged that their perceived employer branding is above than their expectation, they would thus intend to respond well and repay to their company by increasing their performance and engagement, especially Thai culture which is normally sympathetic and considerate culture. Consequently, the results indicated the strong correlation. For example, employees who worked with Esso (Thailand) Public Company Limited strongly expected that their company will provide adequate facilities and resources and opportunities to work with competent and sociable co-workers. However, they perceived employer branding less than expected. Therefore they decided to not engage in both job and organization. In contrast, employees who worked with Thai Oil Public Company Limited strongly expected that their company will provide a strong job security, adequate facilities and resources, above attractive compensation and benefits package, job that fits with their life style, and supervisor who they can work with. They believe that perceived employer branding is above than their expectation, so they tend to engage in both job and organization.

# Hypothesis 7

The result indicated that there is a partial effect of employer branding on discretionary effort through employee engagement which was explored by academic approach. Even though the previous study came from practitioner approach, the results were corresponding with the result of this study. For example, Minchington (2009) proposed that the organization develop a world class employer brand by improving capacity to recruit new employees, engaging and retaining talented employees, increasing employee discretionary effort and customer satisfaction, and making a distinction from their competitors. Practitioners from Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (2008) suggested that employer brand could play a role in developing engagement in persuading employees to put discretionary effort in work, beyond the required minimum to get the job done, in a term of the extra time effort and brain power.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

# Implications for Future Research

The findings provided several implications for researchers. First, we proposed that the future research would be to investigate other potential antecedents and consequences of employer branding. Second, the study applied to the notion of employee engagement developed from Saks (2006). Nevertheless, there are other notions which might provide also better understanding about engagement in the complex organizational phenomena. Regarding the fact, the relationship between various antecedents and engagement tend to be stronger for employees with a strong exchange tradition. As a result, the future research would be to test the moderate effects of exchange tradition on the relationship between antecedents and engagement. Third, the future research might investigate the extent to which interventions could create a sense of obligation for leading employees to respond with the higher engagement levels. Finally, the future research should apply qualitative method to understand more insight information so that the company could provide good benefits suitable for their employees and the organization context.

# **Implications for Practice**

The findings provide numerous implications for the organization, especially those who are working in human resource department and management. The result showed that development and application is the most important dimension, followed by senior management, employment, organizational reputation, and economic. Thus, the organizations should emphasize more on emotional rather than economic drivers. Considering the second implication for practice, the organizations wishing to improve employee engagement should focus on the expectations of employees regarding the received offerings. Furthermore, the organizations should understand that employee engagement and discretionary effort are a long-term and continuous process requiring continued interactions over time to create the obligations and a state of mutual interdependence (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). Finally, the result revealed that all items of the instruments have concurrent validity which means these instruments could be applied to the context of current employees' work in the other industry.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Several potential limitations were expected in this study. The first limitation included the effect of extraneous variables which may affect employer branding, employee engagement, and discretionary effort such as macroeconomics and economic crisis. Second, the data collection of the study involved a snowball approach rather than a random sampling method. As a result, some cautions are required in generalizing the results to the larger population. Moreover, since the study used cross-sectional and self-report data, the conclusions could not only make causal inferences but also raises some concerns about common bias. Therefore, a longitudinal study is required to provide more definitive conclusions. The final limitation was the findings explaining behaviors and emotions of Thai employees which may not be corresponding with foreign employees.

## **SUMMARY**

Even though employer branding is one of the most interesting strategies in business firms and practitioners, an academic study is scarce (Backhaus & Tikoo, 2004) which is similar to employee engagement (Robinson, Perryman, & Hayday, 2004) and discretionary effort (Entwistle, 2001). Due to the lack of present time, it is likely to be a challenge for the future research to explore both independent and dependent variables which lead to better understandings of the concepts and applications. In addition, the future research can further explore the possible variables into the model, which could be moderators and/or mediators, that can lead to a better understanding about the complex organizational phenomena relating to employees' behavior and performance. Finally, the study and the other additional future researches may continue to explore how human resource management could enhance the wellbeing and productive behaviors of employees who are the most valuable assets of the organization leading to an organizational success.

## REFERENCES

- Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3), 185–206.
- Anand, V. V., & Banu, C. (2011). Employee engagement: A research study with special reference to Rane Engine Valve Ltd. (Plant-I), Chennai, India. *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 2(2), 117-135.
- Aon Hewitt. (2011). Trends in global employee engagement. Retrieved May 26, 2012, from http://www.aon.com/attachments/ thoughtleadership/Trends\_Global\_Employee\_ Engagement\_Final.pdf
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2011). *IBM SPSS AMOS 20 user 's guide*. Armonk, NY: IBM Corporation.
- Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, 9(5), 501-517.
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, T. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 16(1), 74-94.
- Barrow, S., & Mosley, R. (2005). *The employer brand: Bringing the best of brand management to people at work.* England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bentler, P. M. (1989). *EQS structural equations* program manual. Los Angeles: BMDP Statistical Software.
- Bentler, P. M., & Bonett, D. G. (1980). Significance tests and goodness of fit in the analysis of covariance structures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 88(3), 588-606.
- Bentler, P. M., & Chou, C. (1987). Practical issues in structural modeling. *Sociological Methods* & *Research*, 16, 78-117.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2008). *Employer branding: A no-nonsense approach*. Retrieved September 23, 2011, from www.cipd.co.uk
- Chau, P. Y. K., & Hu, P. J. E. (2001). Information technology acceptance by individual professionals: A model comparison approach. *Decision Sciences*, *34*(4), 699-719.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900.
- Entwistle, G. H. (2001). Measuring effort expended in the workplace: Discretionary effort and its relationship to established organizational commitment and attachment dimensions (Doctoral dissertation). Boston University, Boston, MA.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Garson, G. (2005). Structural equation modeling example using WinAMOS. Retrieved May 23, 2011, from http://www2.chass.ncsu.edu/ garson/pa765/semAMOS1.htm
- Gibbons, J. (2006). *Employee engagement: A review of current research and its implications*. New York, NY: The Conference Board, Inc.
- Hair, J. R., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L.,
  & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data* analysis (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall International Inc.
- Harris, M., & Fink, L. (1987). A field study of applicant reactors to employment opportunities: Does the recruiter make a different?. *Personnel Psychology*, 40(4), 765-784.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55.
- IPSOS Mori. (2006). Engaging employee through corporate responsibility. Retrieved May 23, 2012, from http://www.ipsos-mori.com/ researchpublications/publications/1380/
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1996). LISREL8: User's Reference Guide. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International Inc.

- Macleod, D., & Clarke, M. (2009). Engaging for success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement. Retrieved May 3, 2011, from http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/ file52215.pdf
- Minchington, B. (2009). *Developing a world class employer brand*. Retrieved September 23, 2011, from http://employerbrandinternational. com/site/list.php?c=consulting
- Neil, H. (2012, February 27). Organizational leadership and their role in employer branding process. Retrieved July 7, 2012, from http:// employerbrandingadvantage.blogspot. com/2012 02 01 archive.html
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ritson, M. (2002, October 24). Marketing and HR collaborate to harness employer brand power. *Marketing, October, 18.* Retrieved May 23, 2011, from http://search.proquest.com/docvie w/214988658?accountid=32078
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The drivers of employee engagement*. Brighton, UK: Institute for Employment Studies
- Rose, N. M. (2006). Influences of organizational image on applicant attraction in the recruitment process (Master's thesis). Queensland University of Technology, Queensland, Australia.
- Rovinelli, R. J., & Hambleton, R. K. (1977). On the use of content specialists in the assessment of criterion-referenced test item validity. *Dutch Journal of Educational Research*, *2*, 49-60.
- Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- The Work Foundation. (2009). *Deal or no deal? An exploration of the modern employment relationship.* Retrieved May 23, 2011, from www.theworkfoundation.com
- Vroom, V. H. (1995). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vroom, V. H., & Deci, E. L. (1992). *Management and motivation* (2nd ed.). London: Penguin Books.

- Weston, R., & Gore, P. A. (2006). A brief guide to structural equation modeling. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(5), 719-751.
- Wright, S. S. (1921). Correlation and causation. Journal of Agricultural Research, 20, 557–585.
- Yankelovich, D., & Immerwahr, J. (1983). *Putting the work ethic to work*. New York: Public Agenda Foundation.