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ABSTRACT

The research aims at examining the relationships between employer branding (functional and emotional aspects) and organizational competitiveness via talent management effectiveness and organizational attractiveness. It also explores the antecedent effects of employer branding. The model is tested using data collected from mail survey questionnaires of 86 Thai-Listed firms. The results of OLS regression analysis indicate that employer branding has a significant influence on organizational competitiveness both direct and indirect through talent management effectiveness and organizational attractiveness. However, unexpectedly, the findings reveal that employer image and reputation does not influence any relationships. Potential discussion with the research results is effectively implemented in the research. Contributions, conclusion and directions of the future research are highlighted.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the wake of global economic, business is faced with the challenge of competitive environment as rapid changes in technology, demography, nature of work and a knowledge-based economy. Michaels, Memon, Mangi and Rohra (2009) noted that people in the workplace is the main factor driving the success of the organization. To fulfill position and make a successful business, firms require employees with high efficiency superior to competitors in order to gain competitive advantage. Even though firms ordinarily emphasize brand management in the field of marketing toward developing product, brand can also use in the field of human resource management, in term of "employer branding" (Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004). Ployhart (2006) explains that the shortage of talent to meet the need of organization is one of the popularity issues in current competitive era. Due to these surroundings, the role of employer has become more critical and potential for hiring and retaining human capital by using employer brand as tool for creating competitive advantage (Berthon, Ewing and Hah, 2005). Employer branding is viewed as the process of placing an image of being a great place to work in the mind of potential employees (Cng, 2011). Likewise, Edwards (2010) argues that employer branding involves the firm's values, systems, policies, and behavior toward the aim of attracting, motivating, and retaining the current and potential employees. On the war of talent, recruitment and retention are burning issue for HR profession to hold human capital. In this vein, the role of employer brand become worth mentioning which can make organization to be the employer of choice. It can be said that employer branding is a crucial tool as strategic management of human capital and talent. That is why modern organizations pay more and more attention to employer branding. Despite the growing popularity of the employer branding practice, academic research on this topic in Thailand context is limited. However, there have been several questions about the values of the outcomes, such as: Do employer branding really contribute to achieving organizational competitiveness or not? What are the factors and the impact of the relationships?, and How does employer branding affect organizational competitiveness?. Consequently, it can be seen that action in employer branding of Thai-Listed firms have main lines for explanation.

The key objective of this research is to examine the relationships between employer branding and organizational competitiveness via talent management competitiveness and organizational attractiveness. Also, this research tests the factors such as job characteristics, organizational characteristic, employer image and reputation, and competitive challenge as antecedents in the relationships of the model. The main research question is how employer branding affects organizational competitiveness. This research is organized as follows. The first part presents the literature review on employer branding that leads to outcomes and the antecedents that affect employer branding. The second part details research methods,

สำเนาถูกต้อง
including data collection, measurement, and statistics. The results are discussed and shown. Consequently, contribution, limitations, future directions, and conclusion are described.

2. RELEVANT LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Resourced-based view of firm (RBV) is a theoretical framework that explains how resources and capability which is values, rare, non-substitute and non-imitate is often treated as building the capability to achieve competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Competitiveness or competitive advantage is normally defined as the ability to earn superior performance constantly above the average for the industry. When the strategies are successful in leveraging the firm’s rare, valuable and difficult-to-imitate resources, firm is likely to gain an advantage over its competitors in the market place and thus earn higher returns. In this research, RBV is applied to explain employer branding as a strategic success factor to enhance the competitive advantage of a firm (Aggerholm et al., 2011). Likewise, Berthon et al., (2005) claims that employer branding contribute to the organizational advantage and performance. In addition, this research expects that job characteristics, organizational characteristics, employer image and reputation, and competitive challenge are that factor that affect employer branding. Thus, a conceptual model of this research is shown in Figure 1.

![Conceptual Model of the Antecedents and Consequences of Employer Branding](image)

2.1 Employer Branding

The definitions and dimensions of employer branding have been used by several scholars. Ambler and Barrow (1996) initially introduced employer branding to HRM discipline and defined the employer brand as "the package of functional, economic and psychological benefits provided by employment, and identified with the employing company". Moreover, Lloyd (2002) argues that employer branding is "sum of a company's effort to communicate to existing and prospective staff that it is a desirable place to work". Likewise, employer branding is viewed as the company's image as seen through the eyes of its associates and potential hires to which it is like to work with (Katoen and Macioschek, 2007). It can explain that employer branding considers current and potential employees as branding targets. In this research, employer branding refers to all processes of placing an image of being a great place to work by recruiting, attracting, motivating and retaining employees to contribute to firm performance. Ambler and Barrow (1996) argue that employer branding includes functional, economic and psychological benefits. Furthermore, Berthon et al., (2005) classified employer branding into five dimensions namely, social, development, application, interest and economic values. On the other hand, the study of Lieveens et al., (2003) classifies employer branding into two elements including: Instrument attributes and symbolic attributes. Furthermore, Schlegel et al., (2011) develops a framework for employer branding as economic, development, social, diversity, and reputation values. This research measures functional aspects and emotional aspects in the study by Lieveens et al., (2003) and Only, (2014). This measure these two practices represent the attributes of employer branding as objective and subjective aspects to better
reflect the current and potential employees. For the relationship between employer branding and organizational competitiveness, several studies reveal that employer branding has a positive impact on organizational competitiveness via talent management (Chapman et al., 2005; Yaqub and Khan, 2011) and organizational attractiveness (Davies, 2008; Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004). In order to clearly investigate the relationship between employer branding and competitiveness, this research describes employer branding as follows:

**Functional Aspect of Employer Branding** refers to the objective or tangible attributes that characterize in job or organization such as pay, compensation, location, opportunities for advancement, career program and benefits that determine the attractive of the firm (Ong, 2011). Talent management depends on various HR practices such as search of talent, talent hunt, develop human capital, and retain potential employees. Schlager et al., (2011) concluded that functional values such as good salary, reasonable benefits, and quality workplace affect potential employee attitude. Moreover, both monetary and non-monetary benefits are the most obvious factors in a person’s choice of workplace and are mentioned as an important determinant of employer attractiveness (Weathington, 2008). Similarly, literatures outlines that a better talent management and retention can play an important role for organizational success (Bhatnagar, 2007). Likewise, Foster et al., (2010) argue that employer brand by using brand image in the market enhance talent management effectiveness. Similarly, Chapman et al., (2005) states that employer branding is directly related to talent management. Consequently, previous studies state that employer branding in functional attributes such as high salary, fair compensation, reasonable benefits and quality workplace is directly related to talent management (Schlager et al., 2011; Yaqub and Khan, 2011; Ong, 2011). In most research it is assumed that employer branding is positively related to on organizational attractiveness (Berthon et al., 2005; Lievens et al., 2005; Lievens et al., 2007) and employee productivity (Backhaus and Tikoo, 2004). As such, employer brand has great power to serve as a platform for designing talent strategies to increase performance. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** **Functional aspects of employer branding is positively related to (a), organizational competitiveness, (b) talent management effectiveness and (c) organizational attractiveness.**

**Emotional Aspect of Employer Branding** refers to subjective or intangible attribute that characterize in job and organizational such as innovativeness, competence, prestige, communication, and excitement which is importance of engaging employee commitment, satisfaction and loyalty that lead to firm performance (Ong, 2011). To this vein, organizations must create a work environment in which employees feel a sense of pride, accomplishment, unity, and image, which enables their organization to succeed. To manage employer branding in emotional aspects, company should build HR practices by training opportunities, empowering employees, creating creativity environment, empowerment, and building a social culture. In this way, employer brands also support an organization’s ability to have an easier time attracting, developing and retaining quality people, and leading to increased performance (Barrow, 2005). Moreover, perceived organizational support, promotion opportunity, strong team spirit, and challenge task are known as good reputation that strongly related to employee attitude in attracting new high-potential and current employee (Schlager et al., 2011). The study of Davies (2008) reveals that the emotional of employer branding influences employee satisfaction, affinity, and loyalty. Slaughter et al. (2004) focused on the symbolic image dimensions and confirmed that they were related to organizational attractiveness. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 2:** The emotional aspects of employer branding is positively related to (a), organizational competitiveness, (b) talent management effectiveness and (c) organizational attractiveness.

### 2.2 Talent Management Effectiveness

The study of Babio and Rodriguez (2010) proposed talent management as the additional management processes and opportunities that are made available to people in the organization who are considered to be talented. Talent management strategies focus on five primary areas: attracting, selecting, engaging, developing and retaining employees. In this research, talent management effectiveness refers to the ability of firm to recruit, select, develop, and retain potential employee according to organization’s needs.
In recent competitive era, talent management is very important for business to create competitive advantage over competitor. Recent study shows that effective talent management provides one of the most critical points of strategic leverage today that increase bottom lines (Kehinde, 2012). Huges and Rog (2008) assert that core job of talent management by developing high potentials make the organization attractive for the potential employees. Likewise, Yaqub and Khan (2011) argue that talent management is a useful tool for employer to strengthen the brand of organization which can improve organizational attractiveness. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3:** Talent management effectiveness is positively related to (a), organizational attractiveness and (b) organizational competitiveness.

### 2.3 Organizational Attractiveness

Ehrhart and Ziegert (2005) define organizational attractiveness as a degree to which getting potential candidates to view the organization as a positive place to work whereas Highhouse et al. (2003) suggests that organizational attractiveness is viewed as individual’s affective and attitudinal thought about particular companies as potential places for employment. In this research, organizational attractiveness refers to the ability of firm to attract potential employee and the candidates both internal and external organization to join with. Carless and Imber (2007) stated that organizational attractiveness is influenced the recruitment process and job offer. Attractiveness can be described based on two elements namely familiarity and reputation which direct positive relationship with financial performance (Lievens et al., 2005; Bondarouk, 2012). Griepentrog et al., 2012 found that organizational attractiveness significantly predict withdrawal behavior. In addition, Cable and Turban (2001) argue that organizational attractiveness can gain competitive advantage for employer through required skills and competency. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 4:** Organizational attractiveness is positively related to organizational competitiveness.

### 2.4 The Influence of Antecedents

**Job Characteristics** refer to the job design that results in three psychological states namely meaningfulness of the work performed, responsibility for work outcomes and knowledge of the results of work performed that bring about positive work outcomes (Hackman and Oldham, 1975). In addition, Job characteristics can explain in five core works such as: 1) skill variety 2) task identity 3) task significance 4) autonomy and 5) feedback from the job (Bondarouk, et al., 2012). Job activities for create organizational branding can viewed as challenging and interesting work, freedom to do the work your own way, new learning experiences, variety in activities, (Cable & Turban, 2003; Schuler, 2004). The study of Foster et al., (2010) noted that employees’ perceived functional aspects with challenging task, variety of tasks and unique opportunity of employment increase brand employer values. In addition, Backhaus and Tikoo (2004) have described that the interesting job characteristics drive a positive employees’ attitude with the company to be a good place to work. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 5:** Job characteristics are positively related to (a) functional aspects of employer branding and (b) emotional aspects of employer branding.

**Organizational Characteristics** refers to the design of structure, systems, process and policy, leadership and regulation which influence the behavior of people in organizations and the nature of their relationships with other people while doing their job. The degree to which decision-making is centralized or decentralized is a key indicator of the manner in which an organization allocates resources and determines policies and objectives. Lievens et al., (2007) and Edwards (2010) state that the designs of good reward and fair incentive structure are related to employer values. In addition, the simplify and continuous improvement of organizational process by eliminating unnecessary procedures and keeping the process relevant and simple can help to improve a new ways of working which motivate potential employee to work with and ultimately, increase employer branding (Berthon et al., 2005). Moreover, the study of Backhaus and Tikoo (2004) state that employer branding can be shaped by organizational culture that related to organizational identity and in turn affect employer appeal and brand values. When organizations clarify and carefully manage their employment experiences, they also help create values and influence which specific and unique for employment offering. Moreover, Berthon et al., (2005) assert that
Hypothesis 6: Organizational characteristics are positively related to (a) functional aspects of employer branding and (b) emotional aspects of employer branding.

Employer Image and Reputation refers to a set of perceptions that people have of organization (Heilmann, 2010). In addition, the company employment image can be viewed as an impression of the organization as a good place to work. The study of Lemmink et al., (2003) indicated that a good image can generate an advantage of attracting better job applicants’ intentions. It can be said that the perception of what kind the organization is as an employer. Previous study argues that the image and reputation of organization is an important factor to create employer branding (Lieven et al., 2007; Schlager et al., 2011). A key finding from Turban and Green (1996) indicated that when organizations were rated higher on a full range of social responsible feature, they tended to seen as more attractive as potential employer branding. Likewise, Edwards (2010) argued that good image and reputation of organization are important for potential recruit and retain which has an existing positive to employer branding. In addition, Kim et al., (2011) show that corporate image can influence employment brand equity. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 7: Employer image and reputation is positively related to (a) functional aspects of employer branding and (b) emotional aspects of employer branding.

Competitive Challenge
Competitive challenge is defined as the desire and determination to confront with serious and unused threat competition to attain outcomes over competitor (Jirawuttinunt and Ussahawanitchakit, 2011). Competitive challenge also reflects managerial willingness in being alternative in method of competing. Company today faces with critical business challenge such as globalization, technology and intellectual capital that make organization pay attention to adapt competitive action. Many prior studies found that the competitive environment impacts firm’s strategic development (O’cass and Ngo, 2007). The challenge for manager is to be the ones that focus most of attracting, developing, and retaining employee by using best-suited internal practices as competitive advantage. From now on, the role of HR is to acquire new skill, knowledge and capabilities to ensure business. Thus, employer branding is a process that address the competitive challenge facing as a whole by leveraging HR as worthy of company. In summary, competitive challenge concerns intensity of competition that is a factor contributing to develop an image of being a great place to work in recruiting, attracting, motivating and retaining employees. Thus, these ideas lead to posit the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 8: Competitive challenge is positively related to (a) functional aspects of employer branding and (b) emotional aspects of employer branding.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Sample Selection and Data Collection Procedure
Thai-listed firms are selected to be population and sample in this research for hypotheses testing because Thai-listed firms which are large firms tend to implement employer branding. Database in this research is gathered from The Stock Exchange of Thailand on its website: http://www.set.or.th. Based on SET database, there are 570 listed firms as of March 19, 2013. As a result, this research obtained a master list of 570 Thai listed firms identified by the industry. The key participants in this study are human resource directors or human resource managers of each firm. A mail survey was used for data collection. The questionnaires were sent to 570 firms, from which 89 responses were received. Due to three incompleteness and response errors in some questionnaires, they were deducted from further analysis. Of the surveys completed and received, only 86 surveys are usable.

Finally, the non-response was tested for two independent samples. A comparison of early responses and late responses data is recommended by Armstrong and Overton (1977). T-tests comparing the first 43
survey responses received with the last 43 survey responses across a firm's four characteristics (i.e. number of employees, number of years in business, amount of capital invested, and sale revenue per year) did not find any significant differences between the two groups. Thus, it appears that non-response bias does not pose a significant problem for this research.

3.2 Variables
In the conceptual model, all of the variables were measured on five point Likert scale, ranging from '1 = strong disagree' to '5 = strong agree', except control variables. The variable measurements of dependent, independent, moderator, and control variables are described below:

Organizational competitiveness is the dependent variables of this research. It is measured by sales growth, profitability, market share, new product, outstanding service over competitor and customer acceptance. This construct is adapted from Oral and Reisman (1988) including six-item scale. Employer Branding is measured by two aspects as follows: Functional Aspects of Employer Branding is measured by Lieven and Highhouse (2003) and Berthon et al., (2005) including four-item scale. Emotional Aspects of Employer Branding is measured by job and organizational attributes such as innovativeness, competence, prestige, and excitement This construct is developed from Lieven and Highhouse (2003) and Berthon et al., (2005) including five-item scale. Talent management effectiveness is measured by the ability of firm to recruit, select, develop, and retain potential employee according to organization's needs. This construct is developed from Zheng (2009) including four-item scale. Organizational attractiveness is measured by the ability of firm to attract potential employee and the candidates both internal and external organization to join with. This construct is developed from literatures including four-item scale. Job characteristics is measured by meaningfulness of the work performed, responsibility for work outcomes and knowledge of the results of work performed that bring about positive work outcomes including three-item scale. Organizational characteristics is measured by the design of structure, systems, process and policy, leadership and regulation which influence the behavior of people in organizations and the nature of their relationships with other people while doing their job. This construct is developed from literatures including four-item scale. Employer Image and reputation is measured by perceptions that people have of organization. This construct is adapt from Schlagter et al., (2011); and Lemmink et al., (2003) including three-item scale. Competitive challenge is measured by the perception of the desire and determination to confront with serious and unused threat competition to attain outcomes over competitor. This construct is developed from Jirawuttiunt and Ussahawanitchakit (2011) including four-item scale.

The control variables are also likely to affect the relationships. In this research, there are two of them including firm age and firm capital; because different age may present different organizational attributes and resource deployment (Chen and Huang, 2009). This study defines firm age as the number of years the firm has been established. Also, firm capital may impact the capacity of a firm to implement business strategies in order to achieve superior performance (Ussahawanitchakit, 2007). It is measured by amount of capital invested.

3.3 Validity and Reliability
With respect to the confirmatory factor analysis, this analysis has a high potential to inflate the component loadings. Thus, a higher rule-of-thumb, a cut-off 0.40, was adopted (Nunnally and Berstein, 1994). All factor loadings are greater than the 0.40 cut-off and are statistically significant. Second, the reliability of the measurements in this research was evaluated by Cronbach alpha coefficients. In the scale reliability, Cronbach alpha coefficients are greater than 0.70 (Nunnally and Berstein, 1994). The scale of all measurement appears to produce internally consistent results; thus, these measures are deemed appropriate for future analysis because they express an accepted validity and reliability. Table 1 shows the results for both factor loadings score between 0.78-0.93, indicating that there is construct validity, and Cronbach alpha coefficients for all variables between 0.81-0.93 are considered acceptable.

สุดาษฎาภูทักษ์
TABLE 1
RESULTS OF MEASURE VALIDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Competitiveness (ORC)</td>
<td>.83-.92</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Aspects of Employer Branding (FEB)</td>
<td>.86-.93</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Aspects of Employer Branding (EEB)</td>
<td>.86-.90</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Management Effectiveness (TME)</td>
<td>.78-.91</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness (OAT)</td>
<td>.85-.95</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics (JCH)</td>
<td>.78-.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics (OCH)</td>
<td>.83-.88</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Image and Reputation (CIR)</td>
<td>.83-.89</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Challenge (COC)</td>
<td>.79-.89</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Statistic Test
The Ordinary Least Square (OLS) is utilized to assess all hypotheses in this research because both dependent and independent variables in this study were neither nominal data nor categorical data, OLS is an appropriate method for examining the hypothesized (Hair et al., 2006). After all is said and done, the model of the relationships mentioned above is shown below.

**Equation 1: ORC**  
$\beta_{ORC} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 FEB + \beta_4 EEB + \varepsilon$

**Equation 2: TME**  
$\beta_{TME} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 FEB + \beta_4 EEB + \varepsilon$

**Equation 3: OAT**  
$\beta_{OAT} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 FEB + \beta_4 EEB + \varepsilon$

**Equation 4: JCH**  
$\beta_{JCH} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 TME + \varepsilon$

**Equation 5: ORC**  
$\beta_{ORC} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 TME + \beta_4 OAT + \varepsilon$

**Equation 6: FEB**  
$\beta_{FEB} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 JCH + \beta_4 OCH + \beta_5 CIR + \beta_6 COC + \varepsilon$

**Equation 7: EEB**  
$\beta_{EEB} = \beta_1 FA + \beta_2 FC + \beta_3 JCH + \beta_4 OCH + \beta_5 CIR + \beta_6 COC + \varepsilon$

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The descriptive statistics and correlation matrix for all variables are shown in Table 2. The research examines possible multicolinearity problems by studying correlation between the variables included in the regression analysis. In this way, by means of Pearson's correlation coefficient, we can measure the degree of linear association between every pair of variables as shown in Table 2. With respect to possible problems relating to multicolinearity, all the correlation coefficients of independent variables are smaller than 0.8, and all the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values are smaller than 10. The problem of multicolinearity of independent variables in this model is therefore not significant (Hair et al., 2006). Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was used to check multicolinearity problems among independent variables. The VIF ranged from 1.18 - 5.35 are below the cut-off value of 10 recommended by Hair et al. (2006), meaning that the independent variables are not correlated with each other. Therefore, there are no substantial multicolinearity problems encountered in this study. In addition, Table 2 shows the correlation matrix for all variables used in the regression analysis.

สำรวจภูตต้อง
TABLE 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS AND CORRELATION MATRIX FOR ALL CONSTRUCTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>EEB</th>
<th>TME</th>
<th>OAT</th>
<th>JCH</th>
<th>OCH</th>
<th>CIR</th>
<th>COC</th>
<th>ORC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEB</td>
<td>.765*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TME</td>
<td>.766*</td>
<td>.763*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAT</td>
<td>.771*</td>
<td>.780*</td>
<td>.779*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCH</td>
<td>.694*</td>
<td>.738*</td>
<td>.808*</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCH</td>
<td>.716*</td>
<td>.716*</td>
<td>.677*</td>
<td>.680*</td>
<td>.790*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>.597*</td>
<td>.580*</td>
<td>.617*</td>
<td>.606*</td>
<td>.774*</td>
<td>.771*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>.721*</td>
<td>.704*</td>
<td>.755*</td>
<td>.710*</td>
<td>.794*</td>
<td>.774*</td>
<td>.800*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>.686*</td>
<td>.790*</td>
<td>.732*</td>
<td>.791*</td>
<td>.693*</td>
<td>.639*</td>
<td>.571*</td>
<td>.734*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01, *p < .05

4.1 Influence of Employer Branding and the outcomes
Table 3 presents the OLS regression analysis of employer branding (functional aspect and emotional aspect) and the outcomes. The results reveal that functional aspect of employer branding has no significant positive impact on organizational competitiveness (b₂ = 0.088, p > .10) but has a positive effect on talent management effectiveness (b₇ = 0.449, p < .01), and organizational attractiveness (b₁ = 0.527, p < .01), Therefore, Hypotheses 1b and 1c are supported whereas Hypothesis 1a is not. The unaccepted result of functional employer branding on organizational competitiveness can explain by the research of Schlegier et al., (2011) which shows that perceived economic values of employer branding has no significant with employee response. Next, the findings show that emotional aspect of employer branding has a significant positive impact on and organizational competitiveness (b₄ = 0.350, p < .01), talent management effectiveness (b₈ = 0.342, p < .01), and organizational attractiveness (b₁₃ = 0.249, p < .05). Therefore, Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c are supported. All in all, Hypothesis 2 is fully supported. Consequently, the empirical results support the hypothesis of significantly positive effect of talent management effectiveness on organizational attractiveness (b₇ = 0.747, p < .01) and organizational competitiveness (b₈ = 0.557, p < .01), similar to prior literatures. Thus, Hypothesis 3 is supported. Then, the results show that organizational attractiveness has a positive impact on organizational competitiveness (b₈ = 0.350, p < .01). Thus, Hypothesis 4 is supported. These results are consistent with prior studies which indicate that employer branding is able to continuously enhance organizational competitiveness, talent management effectiveness and organizational attractiveness (Khanyapuss et al., 2010; Aggerholm et al., 2011; Heilmann, 2010).

4.2 Influence of the Antecedents and Employer Branding
Next, Hypotheses 5, 6, 7, and 8 predict a positive influence of job characteristics, organizational characteristics, organizational image and organizational culture on employer branding. The results in Table 3 show that job characteristics have a significant positive influence on functional aspect (b₂₁ = 0.359, p < .05) and emotional aspect of employer branding (b₂₁ = 0.410, p < .01) supporting prior literatures. Therefore, Hypotheses 5a and 5b are supported. Consequently, organizational characteristics have a significant positive influence on functional aspect (b₂₂ = 0.268, p < .10) and emotional aspect of employer branding (b₂₂ = 0.255, p < .10), similar to previous studies. Therefore, Hypotheses 6a and 6b are supported. Then, organizational image and reputation has no significant influence on both functional aspect (b₂₃ = 0.121, p > .10) and emotional aspect of employer branding (b₂₃ = 0.198, p > .10). This contrast evidence demonstrates by Schlegier (2011) who reveals that reputation values have no direct effect on employee response. Therefore, Hypotheses 7a and 7b are not supported. Organizational competitive challenge has a significant positive influence on functional aspect (b₂₄ = 0.340, p < .05) and emotional aspect of employer branding (b₂₄ = 0.294, p < .10), consistent with literature proposed. Therefore,
Hypotheses 8a, and 8b are supported. As a whole, Hypotheses 5, 6 and 8, are supported whereas Hypothesis 7 is not.

For the control variables, firm capital and firm age have an impact on some relationships among those with the meaning that the number of years operated and the amount of capital invested have influence on talent management effectiveness and organizational attractiveness.

**TABLE 3**

RESULTS OF OLS REGRESSION ANALYSIS *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Aspects of</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.527***</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Branding (FEB)</td>
<td>(.127)</td>
<td>(.121)</td>
<td>(.125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Aspects of Employer</td>
<td>.704***</td>
<td>.342***</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding (EEB)</td>
<td>(.075)</td>
<td>(.075)</td>
<td>(.075)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Management</td>
<td>.747***</td>
<td>.567***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.069)</td>
<td>(.069)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness (TME)</td>
<td>(.143)</td>
<td>(.143)</td>
<td>(.143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Attractiveness (OAT)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Characteristics (JCH)</td>
<td>.390**</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Characteristics (OCH)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td>(.144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Image and</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation (CIR)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td>(.132)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Challenge (COC)</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td>(.134)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td>(.141)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum VIF</td>
<td>3.806</td>
<td>3.806</td>
<td>3.806</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>2.849</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>5.347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beta coefficients with standard errors in parentheses, *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.10.

5. CONTRIBUTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR RESEARCH

5.1 Theoretical Contribution
This research is intended to expand the theoretical contributions on previous knowledge and literature of employer branding (functional and emotional aspects) on organizational competitiveness, talent management effectiveness, and organizational attractiveness. Moreover, resource-based view of firm is integrated explaining the overall association of variables in the model. Also, this research provides a clearer understanding of the relationships among employer branding (functional and emotional aspect) on organizational competitiveness, talent management effectiveness, and organizational attractiveness. In addition, the research examines the antecedent effects on employer branding including job characteristics, organizational characteristics, employer image and reputation, and competitive challenge. As such, this research has assessed the importance of successful employer branding relative to organizational competitiveness in Thai-listed firm.

5.2 Managerial Contribution
This research provides some relevant managerial implications. The results suggest that when firms create talent management for achievement of effectiveness, firms should focus on employer branding. For Thai-listed firm, they should understand, manage, and give priority to employer branding to improve business performance via talent management and organizational attractiveness to recruit and retain potential employees. The executives must put more emphasis on factors of employer branding that aligns with strategic goal by focusing on HR value to motivate the staff for maximizing potential. In this research, the
most interesting aspect of these results of Thai-listed firm is the manners in which both functional and emotional aspects of employer branding are critical component to create organizational competitiveness both direct and indirect way via talent management and organizational attractiveness. In addition, the antecedents are tested and assert that job characteristics, organizational characteristics and organizational culture strongly influenced employer branding whereas organizational image appears to be effortless. Thus, the executives should clearly understand and exploit them within the organization to concentrate on these factors for gaining employer branding in order to continuously develop and increase competencies which generate the levels of competitive advantage.

5.3 Limitations and Future Research Directions
This research has some limitations that should be mentioned. Firstly, this research is conducted by cross-section data. Therefore, a longitudinal study that tracks employer branding and business performance overtime is needed. Secondly, this research uses the questionnaire for collecting data from only businesses in Thai-Listed firm. Future research should focus on other businesses which might provide different results from the findings of this research. Thirdly, the impact of small response rate may impact the results. Finally, future research may identify the other statistical analysis to confirm employer branding phenomenon with larger response rates. Surprisingly, in this research, corporate image and reputation are not the effective factor influence employer branding that needs future research to apparently examine.

6. CONCLUSION
The purpose of this research is to examine the effects of employer branding on organizational competitiveness of Thai-Listed firms via talent management and organizational attractiveness. Employer branding includes two aspects: functional and emotional aspects. In addition, it examines the antecedents of employer branding. The model is tested using data collected from mail survey of 86 Thai-Listed firms. The results reveal partial support for hypotheses are derived from the conceptual model. In general, it provides empirical evidence that some emotional employer branding has a strong influence both direct on organizational competitiveness and indirect through talent management and organizational attractiveness. However, functional employer branding has indirect effect on organizational competitiveness via talent management and organizational attractiveness. It is obvious that organizations with great employer branding concentration are likely to enhance talent management, organizational attractiveness and ultimately, organizational competitiveness. However, corporate image and reputation has no influence on employer branding which is not consistent with literatures. Thus, further study may consider finding practical reasons why some constructs found no relationships supporting hypotheses by reviewing extensive literature, or collecting data from a larger sample. In summary, this research contributes an understanding of how Thai-Listed firms generate employer branding to increase organizational competitiveness and explains the factors that affect employer branding in Thailand context.
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