

## **Recruitment: What Measurement Scale of the Employer's External Brand for Moroccan Talent**

### **Recrutement : Quelle Échelle De Mesure de la Marque Employeur Externe pour les Talents Marocains**

**Noura ETTAHIR, (PhD, Professor)**

*Management Science Research Team*

*Higher School of Technology of Salé, Mohammed V University of Rabat, Morocco*

**Keltoum RAHALI, (PhD, Professor)**

*Management Science Research Team*

*Higher School of Technology of Salé, Mohammed V University of Rabat, Morocco*

**Abdellatif ELOUALI, (PhD)**

*Management Science Research Team*

*Higher School of Technology of Salé, Mohammed V University of Rabat, Morocco*

**Mustapha KOUZER, (PhD)**

*Doctor in Quality and Sustainable Development*

*Laboratory agrophysiology, Biotechnology, Environment and Quality,*

*Faculty of Sciences, Ibn TOFAIL University in Kénitra*

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Correspondence address :</b> | Ecole Supérieure de Technologie de Salé,<br>B.P 227, 11000, Salé-Médina<br>University Mohammed V In Rabat, Morocco<br>Tel: (+212) 5 37881562, Fax: (+212) 5 37 881564<br>ests@um5.ac.ma<br>Faculty of Sciences, Ibn TOFAIL University in Kénitra, BP 133,<br>14000, MOROCCO<br>Tel: (+212) 5 37 32 94 00, mail: contact.fsk@uit.ac.ma               |
| <b>Disclosure Statement :</b>   | Authors are not aware of any findings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this study  |
| <b>Conflict of Interest :</b>   | The authors report no conflicts of interest.  |
| <b>Cite this article :</b>      | ETTAHIR, N., RAHALI, K., ELOUALI, A., & KOUZER, M. (2022). Recruitment: What Measurement Scale of the Employer's External Brand for Moroccan Talent. International Journal of Accounting, Finance, Auditing, Management and Economics, 3(4-1), 269-283. <a href="https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6611966">https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6611966</a> |
| <b>License</b>                  | <b>This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license</b>   |

Received: May 03, 2022

Published online : June 06, 2022

## Recruitment: What Measurement Scale of the Employer's External Brand for Moroccan Talent

### Abstract

Since its creation in 1990 by Simon Barrow, the employer brand has triggered great interest among researchers and practitioners (Chhabra & Mishra, 2008, Charbonnier-Voirin et al, 2014, Viot et al, 2014) due to the difficulties of attracting and retaining potential and existing employees. In Morocco, research work dealing with attracting and retaining employees is uncommon, especially with regard to the employer's brand.

The purpose of this study is to determine how the Moroccan university students perceive the employer brand, and its importance in the choice of the employer. To achieve this objective, a qualitative exploratory survey was carried out among the students of the professional license of the High School of Technology Salé (ESTS), and then a quantitative study has been conducted to define the dimensions of the employer brand retained by our sample. (Which consists of two hundred and seventy students (270 students)). The reviewing of the internal validity and stability of the factor structure promise good psychometric qualities to the tool.

The results of the quantitative survey show that the employer brand perceived by potential employees is a multidimensional construct. In addition, the measurement scale proposed in this research paper presents a rich and coherent set of five dimensions which offer the possibility of grouping and synthesizing the contributions of the literature devoted to the employer brand. And finally, the employer brand, according to the authors, remains an "untapped source of value" with its various stakeholders, namely consumers, investors, existing employees and even potential candidates.

**Keywords:** employer brand, employer brand management, creation of a measurement scale, students.

**JEL Classification :** M00, M31

**Paper type :** Empirical Research

### Résumé

À partir de sa création en 1990 par Simon Barrow, la marque employeur a stimulé un formidable engouement chez les chercheurs et des praticiens (Chhabra & Mishra, 2008 ; Charbonnier-Voirin et al, 2014 ; Viot et al, 2014) suite aux difficultés d'attractivité, de maintien et de fidélisation des salariés actuels et des candidats futurs. Au Maroc, les travaux de recherche qui traitent l'attractivité, le maintien et la fidélisation des salariés potentiels sont peu fréquents, spécialement concernant la marque employeur.

L'objectif de cette étude est de déterminer la manière dont les étudiants universitaires marocains perçoivent la marque employeur, et son importance dans le choix de l'employeur. Pour parvenir à cet objectif, une enquête qualitative exploratoire a été menée auprès des étudiants de la licence professionnelle de l'École Supérieure de Technologie de Salé - Maroc (ESTS), ensuite une étude quantitative a été réalisée pour définir les dimensions de la marque employeur retenues par notre échantillon qui est constitué de deux cent soixante-dix étudiants (270). L'examen de la validité interne et de la stabilité de la structure factorielle promet de bonnes qualités psychométriques à l'outil.

les résultats de l'enquête quantitative montrent que la marque employeur externe perçue par les employés potentiels est un construit multidimensionnel. En plus, l'échelle de mesure proposée, dans ce papier de recherche, présente un ensemble riche et cohérent de cinq dimensions qui offre la possibilité de regrouper et de synthétiser les apports de la littérature consacrée à la marque employeur. Et finalement, la marque employeur, selon les auteurs, demeure un « gisement de valeur inexploité » auprès de différentes ses parties prenantes à savoir les consommateurs, les investisseurs, les salariés existants et même les candidats potentiels.

**Mots clés :** marque employeur ; gestion de la marque employeur ; création d'une échelle de mesure, étudiants.

**Classification JEL:** M00, M31

**Type de l'article :** Recherche appliquée

## 1. Introduction

At the moment, Morocco is experiencing a downturn characterized by a slowdown in the growth rate which has finally forced the number of unemployed to be revised upward, only in urban areas, with an unemployment rate of 10.4% to 10.7% at the same national level and 15.0% to 15.7% in urban areas (according to the Office of the High Commissioner for Planning (HCP)), job interviewers are in the need to rethink their parameters of choice of their employer including the employer brand.

Indeed, the employer brand is decisive both in attracting potential candidates and in the involvement and loyalty of employees. It can even intensify the latter, hence its categorization as a real marketing dimension for the management of human capital.

Since its creation in 1990 by Simon Barrow, the employer brand has generated great interest among researchers (Chhabra & Mishra, 2008, Ewing et al, 2002, Knox & Freeman, 2006, Charbonnier-Voirin et al, 2010, 2014;) following the difficulties of attracting and loyalty of current candidates and employees. To this end, we all agree that the "Recruitment" function is seen as a key function that must be successful if we wish to achieve the performance of the company. Recruitment processes as explained by Steffen Eckhard, Yves Steinebach (2021) can be relevant merit criteria that are capable of ensuring the sustainability of the company through a good representation of the image of the brand of it.

To this end, multiple rankings have developed, highlighting the companies that potential candidates prefer to work "where it is good to work" (Kapoor, 2010). Among these rankings, we quote: on the international program, the ranking of Fortune magazine of the most admired companies, the Universum Ranking (2011), Top Employer France, the list of the Best Employers in Morocco (since 2011).

The purpose of this study is to determine how future employees perceive the employer brand, and its importance in choosing the employer. In order to achieve this goal, a qualitative exploratory survey was carried out among students of ESTS-Morocco professional licenses, then a quantitative study was carried out to define the dimensions of the employer brand retained by our sample.

Through this study, we will present the concept of the Employer Brand as well as the scales of measures relating to this concept. The methodology adopted would be discussed later, as well as a presentation of the results and discussion.

## 2. Employer Brand: Theoretical Content

In a context where the talent shortage is worsening, the Human Resources Marketing strategy makes it possible to manage "two main challenges for recruiters over a three-year horizon: the development of their employer brand and the improvement of 'candidate experience' (Apec, 2019a).

In effect, the employer brand is referred to by two Anglo-Saxon expressions which are "Employer Brand". This concept is perceived, according to the researchers, from various angles, namely: advantages and benefits, communication practice and finally a process to manage.

### 2.1. Perception of the employer brand as benefits and benefits

The employer brand is defined, according to Ambler and Barrow (1996), as "the set of functional, economic and psychological benefits in the context of the employment relationship with which the enterprise, as an employer, is identified. These three dimensions of the employer brand are the functional benefits that correspond to the usefulness and the interest of the work and the development activities for the employee; economic, financial and material benefits; and the psychological benefits that refer to feelings of belonging and control. Similarly, Lievens & Highhouse (2003) argue that the employer brand has instrumental and symbolic benefits, the

former corresponds to objective, concrete and factual characteristics related to the position or organization and the second correspond to subjective and intangible attributes. Which describes the position or organization and the specific traits that the candidates attribute to the organization. Soulez et al. (2011), for their part, recognized three symbolic attributes and seven instrumental attributes. As a result, the employer brand simultaneously includes the Instrumental and symbolic attributes of work and organization perceived by company staff (internal employer brand) and potential candidates (external employer brand) (Lievens & Highhouse, 2003).

These authors have highlighted the constituent dimensions of the employer brand which are the functional, economic and psychological advantages or the instrumental and symbolic benefits.

## **2.2. Perception of the employer brand as a communication practice**

The employer brand, according to Mayo (2001), "is what is consciously or unconsciously communicated to every present or future employee of the company". While Ruch (2002) identifies it as the image of the company seen through the eyes of employees and potential applicants. Collins and Stevens (2002) recognized that businesses use four marketing activities that can positively influence their employer brand: 1) Advertising about the company, 2) Communication by the company, 3) Sponsorship; and finally, 4) positive word of mouth. This last tool influences the perceptions of potential candidates of the characteristics of the employer brand and presents a certain source of information on business practices and working conditions within it (Keeling et al., 2013). The study carried out Charbonnier-Voirin et al. (2016) showed the empirical validation of the positive influence of word of mouth on the employer brand. It is an effective communication and promotion tool for the employer brand (Collins & Stevens, 2002). Potential employees would rely first and foremost on interpersonal communications and the opinions and testimony of employees to assess job opportunities, prior to institutional communication. In fact, employees are considered as the main ambassadors of the employer brand from the outside because they present the company with personality traits, and that candidates tend to be seduced by organizations with traits. like theirs. These employees establish the credibility and consistency of the messages communicated by the company (Berthon et al., 2005, Charbonnier-Voirin et al., 2016, Kapoor, 2010, Slaughter, 2004).

Schneider (2003) defined the employer brand as "a name, a term, a sign, an expression, a symbol or a combination of these features whose purpose is to identify the goods and services of the employer organizing with job seekers ". The goal of the employer brand is to generate positive emotions for the organization and to define the "employee experience" in the workplace. The company makes efforts to promote, within and outside the organization, a clear view of what makes it different and how attractive it is as an employer (Roy, 2008; Berthon et al., 2005; Charbonnier-Voirin & Vignolles, 2011, Soulez et al, 2011). So, the company ultimately seeks to develop an identity and an image specific to its employer function with existing employees and potential candidates.

So, the image of the employer brand is to define the personality of the organization with job interviewers and employees. Viot & Benraïss-Noailles (2014) identified three aspects of the image of the employer brand that are empirically validated by Lievens et al. (2007) and Knox & Freeman (2006): the internal image - that which is perceived by the staff of the company; the external image - perceived by potential employees - and the interpreted external image that refers to the idea that existing employees make of the image perceived by people outside the company.

The communication practices, according to Backhaus and Tikoo (2004), highlighting the employer brand lead to valuing the strategies and behaviors of the company with the aim of making them attractive, motivating to retain potential candidates. These authors have highlighted three characteristics of the employer brand namely: 1) The value proposition: the

working conditions granted to employees; 2) The marketing of the organizational value proposition to job seekers 3) The promise of "employee experience" and cultural values.

Slogan, sign, culture, values ... express in one way or another the employer brand of a company, it is the set of benefits communicated through different channels of a clear idea internally and externally. Indeed, the employer brand provides a means of communication with job market candidates and current employees about the benefits of working for this company and what makes it different from its competitors (Kapoor, 2010).

It is a communicative practice to the extent that there is a sender who is the organization, a receiver who is the current employee and or the potential employee, the message is the Human Resources offer, the channels of transmission that are the mouth by ear, the media, social networks, current employees (ambassadors of the organization).

### **2.3. Perception of the employer brand as a process to manage**

Lievens (2007) and Chhabra and Mishra (2008) defined the employer brand as a particular form of corporate identity management by designing, simultaneously internally and externally, an image of the employer brand. In addition, these authors argue that the employer brand management process aims to persuade current and potential employees to work for the company. In fact, the employer brand is built, according to these authors, in a three-phase process: 1). The identification of "its value proposition": offer related to the characteristics of the work and the values of the organization; 2). Communication of the "value proposition" offer to potential candidates and its employees using the usual tools of marketing (Collins & Stevens, 2002, Kapoor, 2010, Liger, 2007, Martin et al., 2005); 3). The alignment of the internal and external employer brand so that the discourse is consistent with what is really experienced by employees. So, the external employer brand must be a real reflection of the work and the organization.

For S. Panczuk and S. Point (2008) present the employer brand as "a process by which employees internalize the desired brand image and are motivated to project that image to customers and other organizational parts".

Through all that is said, researchers have identified different processes that manage the employer brand, 1). Employer brand construction process; 2). Image management process of the employer brand; 3). Communication process with its customers; 4). The recruitment process (Lievens et al., 2007, Soulez et al., 2015, Collins & Stevens, 2002, Kapoor, 2010, Liger, 2007, Martin et al., 2005) A successful process will be a real lever for development for the employer brand, on the other hand, a poorly managed or failed process can quickly be detrimental to the company's reputation, and these processes need to be continually improved given the context of instability experienced by employees.

In conclusion, the employer brand is a concept that encompasses all the means and practices used by companies to attract, select, develop and retain the best potential and current employees who occupy high strategic positions (Vaiman et al, (2012 Bonneton et al., 2020). The definition of this concept has evolved with the integration of new terms and expressions according to time and the development of the nature of societies. These different interpretations reveal the complexity of harmonizing the "employer brand" concept. Three main ideas, therefore, emerge from the synthesis following the reading of the various definitions of this concept. A first group of authors defined the employer brand as "functional, economic and psychological benefits or instrumental and symbolic benefits"; while the second group of authors presents it as a communicative practice, it is all that can be communicated by the company or by its employees of its values; of its culture; of his product, ...; And finally, the third group identifies it as a set of processes to manage, namely the process of constructing the employer brand, the process of managing the image of the employer brand, the process of communicating with its customers, the recruitment process .

### **3. Scales of measurement of the employer brand**

The scales of measurement developed, from the many definitions of the employer brand, do not agree on the number of dimensions and characteristics of this concept. Indeed, we observe a multiplication of scales of measurement of this notion.

For example, Collins and Stevens (2002) measured the employer brand using two dimensions proposed by Keller (1993): the 1st dimension represents the general attitude of the potential candidate towards the firm and the second is the perceived work attributes of ten measured by four items from the Harris and Fink (1987) and Powell (1991) scales.

The first operationalization of the employer brand was designed by Berthon et al. (2005), they measured the employer brand by five dimensions that are: 1. The interest of the work that manifests itself in an attractive and interesting environment, new work practices and recourse to innovation and creativity employees; 2. The relational aspect that is manifested by good working relationships and the development of team spirit; 3. The economic benefits that are rewards, security, job stability and good career management; 4. Personal development is encouraged by recognition, trust and an evolving career; The transmission of knowledge is an opportunity for the employee to convey what he knows.

Some authors such as Alniaçik and Alniaçik (2012) as well as Bodderas et al. (2011) used the following dimensions to evaluate perceived benefits of working for an organization. The first authors retained the dimensions: 1. Value of knowledge applications; 2. Cooperation 3. Working environment; 4. Value in the market; 5. Social value; 6. Economic value. The second ones have kept the dimensions: 1. The value of diversity, 2. The social value, 3. The economic value, 4. The value of development, and finally 5. The value of a reputation.

Lievens (2007); Lievens et al. (2007) identified eight components of the instrumental dimension and applied this theoretical framework to the Belgian army which are opportunities for social/team activities, opportunities for physical activity, a good salary, opportunities for advancement, job security, variety of tasks, opportunities to work in a structured environment and to travel. For the symbolic dimension, the items are generated from the Lievens, Vanhoye and Schreurs (2005) scale, which is itself relevant to the Aaker (1997) brand personality scale that measures the sincerity of the army, excitement, skill, sophistication and robustness.

Roy (2008) has attached two items to the measurement scale of Berthon and his colleagues (2005), a strong and clear corporate culture and an ethical organization and has returned eight dimensions, including the previous five to which are added an ethical dimension (composed of the 2 items), a psychological dimension and a career opportunity dimension. This author suggests that the dimensions of the employer brand are likely to vary according to the sector studied.

Kapoor (2010), based on the work of Barrow (2003), points out that the essential attributes of the employer brand are the compensation system, the work environment, personal development, reputation, performance management, communication, recruiting and welcoming new employees, corporate personality, equity and cooperation, policies and values, vision and leadership, the post-employment relationship. The study of this author, targeted 57 HR managers in India, the results of this study indicate that some attributes are recognized as necessary and important by respondents, to retain the talents that are mission, vision and values, performance management and leadership.

Soulez and Guillot-Soulez (2011), add another criterion that is the generation effect and show, through their study developed in 2011, that generation Y prefers symbolic benefits to functional benefits. Similarly, Lievens and Highhouse (2003) and Lievens (2007) have borrowed the distinction between instrumental and symbolic benefits from the branding literature. This distinction has been empirically approved at the level of recruitment, the symbolic dimension of a job or organization outweighs the instrumental dimension in explaining the perceived attractiveness of a company as an employer.

We find through the literature that there is a variety of measuring tools to simply reading the names given to the scales presented as measuring the employer brand: the attractiveness of the employer; determinants of the employer brand; image of the employer; reputation of the employer; knowledge about the employer; image-employment of the firm; and dimensions of the employer brand.

Finally, overlaps could be made with the employer brand attributes presented in the literature: development and career opportunities; professional environment, including work environment, work interest and monetary benefits. It appears that there is no agreement on the dimensions that make up the employer brand. In addition, several attributes have remained vague and lack of clarification, this causes a certain ambiguity between some concepts close to, but different from the employer brand which causes a problem (for example, to consider the attitude towards the company, reputation of the organization or culture as part of the employer brand). As a result, the creation of an Employer Brand Scale is a real challenge to guide future research and help specialists better manage their employer branding process.

## **4. Research Methodology**

### **4.1. Study Process**

In order to develop a standardized measurement tool, we will adopt the approach advocated by the Churchill paradigm (1979). The aim of this approach is to incorporate the knowledge of measurement theory as well as the appropriate techniques to improve it in an automatic procedure. Likewise, it offers the possibility of rigorously designing multiscale questionnaire-type measuring instruments.

For this, we have found it appropriate to use, first of all, a qualitative approach to explore the characteristics of the employer brand. The data collection technique adopted is the semi-directive interview. This instrument is privileged given its great flexibility and the wealth of information it can generate (Miles & Huberman, 2003). Based on the literature, we developed an interview guide consisting of questions that focused on identifying the respondent, their age, gender, and questions about the determinants of the employer brand; the notoriety of Moroccan companies and finally the expectations of potential candidates vis-à-vis their future employer. The purpose of all these questions is to understand how the employer brand is perceived by the candidates, and consequently to identify the different attributes of the external employer brand. Ten interviews of an average duration of 20 minutes were conducted with the students of the professional license. The sample is characterized by a female predominance (6 women and 4 men), the average age of academics is 19 years. Afterwards, we used the quantitative method. Indeed, we have formulated items from the set of items used in the various studies identified in the literature and the attributes collected after processing interview information (the results of the qualitative analysis will be the subject of another research work). Thus, a first version of the questionnaire was developed, then it was examined by two teacher researchers in management sciences, and finally, it was tested with 10 students. The feedback collected made it possible to improve our questionnaire (for example: translation of some words from French to Arabic, adoption of the Likert scale from 1 to 5 instead of 1 to 7 because there was a confusion between "agree" and "somewhat agree", also "somewhat disagree" and "disagree" with the majority of respondents).

These remarks allowed us to highlight our latest version of the questionnaire which is represented by a battery of 51 items on a five-point Likert scale. As recommended by Devellis, we used only positive statements.

Data is collected electronically and in paper form from ESTS academics. 270 usable questionnaires were returned. The representative population of the control sample is 49% male

and 51% female. All respondents belonging to the age group <23 years old], that is, a population belonging to Generation Y.

**Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the sample**

|       | Gender | Percentage |
|-------|--------|------------|
| Woman | 138    | 51%        |
| Man   | 132    | 49%        |
| Total | 270    | 100%       |

*Source: authors*

## 4.2. Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to build our measurement scale several phases will be respected. In a first step, it is essential to ensure the validity of the content of the scale of measurement of the employer brand in the Moroccan context. The objective of the validity tests of the content is to check whether the different items of the questionnaire are a good representation of the phenomenon studied: such as Evrard et al. (2009) have noted, are we really measuring what we want to measure? For this purpose, as previously explained, we reviewed the academic literature in order to accompany and guide us in the development of the questionnaire and to reach a scale of measurement of the external employer brand before purification.

Indeed, the large number of items making up the measurement scale (51 items), their heterogeneity and the way out of the dimensions, offering the scientist the opportunity to select between three types of analysis:

- 1-examine each element independently by selecting a single item by them;
- 2-Aggregate all the items into one scale;
- 3-Conduct a factor analysis to identify the different underlying dimensions (Campoy et al., 2006).

We decided to introduce all the items in one scale without distinguishing between the dimensions at the questionnaire level, and this to test the stability of the factor structure of the scale of measurement we use.

The factor structure and the psychometric qualities of the employer brand scale were analyzed under the SPSS 20 software. The data were subjected to principal component analysis with Varimax rotation in order to test the dimensionality of the construct. Principal component analyzes (PCAs) are considered desirable in the development phase of a questionnaire in order to reduce the number of variables in a few factors and to keep only a sufficient number of items to characterize the phenomenon (Costello & Osborne, 2005 Fabrigar et al., 1999, Roussel, 1996).

The purification of the unsatisfactory items was carried out based on the following elimination parameters: rejection of items with a factor score below 0.3 and those with a high factor score on several factors (Roussel, 2005). The internal coherence reliability of the scale and its different dimensions was evaluated by Cronbach's alpha analysis as well as the correlation level for the two-item dimensions.

## 6. The results

We took the exploratory approach to determine the dimensions of the employer brand. First, we prepared the number of variables, types of variables and finally the sample size. Secondly, we made sure of the inter-item correlations. Next, we measured Bartlett's sampling adequacy (KMO) and sphericity test.



The results showed that the KMO index is 0.786. He is described as good. This index tells us that the correlations between the items are of good quality. Then, the result of Bartlett's sphericity test is significant since  $p < 0.0005$  (Table 2).

**Table 2: KMO Index and Bartlett's Sphericity Test for the employer brand**

|  |                  |          |
|--|------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index for measuring sampling quality. |                  | ,786     |
| Bartlett Sphericity Test                                 | Khi-two approx.. | 7663,291 |
|  | ddl              | 1225     |
|  | Bartlett Meaning | ,000     |

*Source: authors*

In order to extract the right number of factors for our scale, we first analyzed the table of the total variance explained and found that 13 components have a higher eigenvalue than 1. The 13 factors account for 68.88% variance (Table 3). These factors are considered significant factors.

**Table 3: Total variance explained for the employer brand**

| Component | Initial Eigen Values |                   |             |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------|
|           | Total                | % of the variance | % cumulated |
| 1         | 13,383               | 26,767            | 26,767      |
| 2         | 3,087                | 6,174             | 32,941      |
| 3         | 2,534                | 5,069             | 38,009      |
| 4         | 2,197                | 4,394             | 42,403      |
| 5         | 2,091                | 4,183             | 46,586      |
| 6         | 1,909                | 3,819             | 50,405      |
| 7         | 1,553                | 3,105             | 53,510      |
| 8         | 1,455                | 2,909             | 56,419      |
| 9         | 1,389                | 2,778             | 59,197      |
| 10        | 1,303                | 2,607             | 61,804      |
| 11        | 1,241                | 2,481             | 64,285      |
| 12        | 1,187                | 2,374             | 66,659      |
| 13        | 1,111                | 2,222             | 68,881      |

*Source: authors*

Secondly, for more certainty, we made a graph using SPSS, based on eigenvalues. Through, the collapse plot, and after examination of the Cattell elbow break. We noticed that there is a change after the sixth factor. For this purpose, we retain only 6 factors that lie before the abrupt change in the slope of Cattell's elbow fracture for the analysis, since this criterion is more rigorous than that of the eigenvalues.

**Table 4: Total variance explained through**

| Component | Initial Eigen Values |                   |             |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------|
|           | Total                | % of the variance | % cumulated |
| 1         | 13,383               | 26,767            | 26,767      |
| 2         | 3,087                | 6,174             | 32,941      |
| 3         | 2,534                | 5,069             | 38,009      |
| 4         | 2,197                | 4,394             | 42,403      |
| 5         | 2,091                | 4,183             | 46,586      |
| 6         | 1,909                | 3,819             | 50,405      |

*Source: authors*

The six factors accounted for 50.405% (Table 3) of the total variance for a KMO of .786 (Table 4).

The exploratory analysis (Table 5) shows six (06) factors according to the Kaiser rule (1958), which leads to selecting the number of factors whose eigenvalue is greater than or equal to 1. A clear factorial solution appears, without overlap. The factors are easily interpretable.

Indeed, the various factors, constituting our scale, contain at least three items, except for the 4th factor which is composed of only two items. This component will be excluded from our scale because it is generally recommended to have a minimum of three indicators per dimension. Therefore, we will retain only five dimensions to build our scale of employer brand measurement.

The selected items appear to adequately represent the employer brand in terms of content. Moreover, the first factor "development value" consists of five items. These represent the involvement and interest of the company in sustainable development, continuous improvement, increased visibility and the reputation of the company in the socio-economic environment.

The second factor "The work environment" is composed of three items. The latter are linked to the freedom to work on one's own initiative, gives it autonomy in the work, and finally the possibility of working and "moving" in the organization, that is working in the different departments and departments of the organization. In fact, the company today is not only looking for the satisfaction of its customers, but wants to satisfy its employees by offering them a good quality of their life at work and the best being in the world. organization.

The third factor is "Knowledge Transfer & Product Image and / or Service". This factor is composed of three items that manifest themselves, first, by the opportunity given to employees to pass on what they have learned in previous experiences to their colleagues and, second, the production of innovative and quality products and services.

While the fourth factor "Location & Diversity of Experiences" manifests itself through opportunities to travel and to benefit from a variety of work experiences. In addition, the proximity of the employment of the residence of the employee.

As for the last factor "management style & support of colleagues" is represented by the guarantee offered by the company to its staff a team work with colleagues on whom to count in good conditions. Indeed, human relations are at the center of the concerns of today's business. The latter wants the internal relations that is to say the relations between the collaborators are good and characterized by mutual help. In addition, the company, through its trust in its staff, even if they are new recruits, gave him the responsibility very early.

**Table 5: Principal Component Analysis (Varimax Rotation of the Employer Brand Scale (n = 270))**

| Items  | Components |       |       |       |       | Factors  |       |
|--|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|-------|
|  | 1          | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     |  |       |
| is ethical   | 0,688      |       |       |       |       | Development value  |       |
| manages the impact of its activity on the environment (water, soil, air)   |            | 0,534 |       |       |       |  |       |
| has a good reputation  |            | 0,552 |       |       |       |  |       |
| adopts quality management  |            | 0,638 |       |       |       |  |       |
| is successful in the market  |            | 0,563 |       |       |       |  |       |
| gives freedom to work on your own initiative   |            | 0,691 |       |       |       | The work environment                                       |       |
| gives autonomy in the work   |            |       | 0,62  |       |       |  |       |
| offers the opportunity to work and "move" in the organization and to work in different departments / departments |            |       | 0,524 |       |       |  |       |
| allows the employee to apply what he has learned in previous experiences   |            |       | 0,641 |       |       | Transmission of Knowledge & Product Image and / or Service |       |
| offers innovative products and services  |            |       |       | 0,601 |       |  |       |
| offers quality products and services   |            |       |       | 0,418 |       |  |       |
| offers the opportunity to travel   |            |       |       | 0,632 |       | Localization & Diversity of experiences"                   |       |
| is near you  |            |       |       |       | 0,552 |  |       |
| allows you to benefit from a variety of work experiences   |            |       |       |       | 0,44  |  |       |
| gives responsibilities very early  |            |       |       |       | 0,499 | Management style & support from colleagues                 |       |
| employs employees (colleagues) on whom to rely   |            |       |       |       |       |  | 0,425 |
| Guaranteed a job characterized by "teamwork"   |            |       |       |       |       |  | 0,464 |

*Source: authors*

The reliability of internal consistency for each of the dimensions seems satisfactory since the Cronbach alpha coefficients of .92 for the dimension "development value"; .90 for the component "The work environment"; .87 for the dimension "Transmission of Knowledge & Product Image and / or Service"; .75 "Localization & Diversity of experiences" and finally .70 for the "management style & support of colleagues" dimension (Table 6).

Table 6. Cronbach's alpha coefficients

| Components   | Cronbach's alpha values |
|--|-------------------------|
| Development value  | 0.92                    |
| The work environment                                       | 0.90                    |
| Transmission of Knowledge & Product Image and / or Service | 0.87                    |
| Localization & Diversity of experiences"                   | 0.75                    |
| Management style & support from colleagues                 | 0.70                    |

Source: authors

## 7. Discussion

Based on an effort to integrate theoretical input and a major effort of conceptualization, this article is an essential first step to a better understanding of the concept of the employer brand. It clarifies the multidimensional construct of the employer brand, by proposing a measurement scale of the external employer brand (for students of the professional licenses of the Higher School of Technology Salé-Morocco).

In this work, we first described the phases of the data collection, then we explained the method of administration of the questionnaire.

After setting out the methods of analysis used and the criteria chosen, we proceeded to the purification and validation of the measuring instruments created. The scale of the employer brand was thus the subject of an exploratory factor analysis on a sample of 270 students.

The scale created presents quite satisfactory results, close to the theoretical structure proposed by the academic literature.

Regarding the measurement instruments translated and adapted to the Moroccan context, the exploratory phase highlighted results confirming the factorial structures proposed by the theoretical models.

If it is advisable to check the stability of the scale structure on other samples, the proposed scale shows, at this stage of development, relatively satisfactory psychometric qualities. A rich and coherent set of five dimensions: The value of development, the work environment, the transmission of knowledge & the image of products and/or services, location & diversity of experience, Management style & support from colleagues, make it possible to group and synthesize the contributions of the literature devoted to the employer brand in the Moroccan context.

In the end, Viot and Benraïss-Noailles (2014) argued that the employer brand remains an "unexploited value deposit" among different stakeholders, namely consumers, investors, existing employees and even potential candidates.

Conclusion:

All companies nowadays must devote more attention to the performance of their human capital, which is the only one capable of ensuring its sustainability and durability. Indeed, faced with the various developments: economic, social and technological, with which Moroccan companies are confronted, they must get involved, even more, in this dimension of the employer brand. It must be used as a means of communication in order to attract the maximum potential in performance and productivity.

We live in a very open world without borders where Man, through social networks, can give his opinion, his appreciation and his evaluation of all the environment that surrounds him.

In the Moroccan company, the value of development (0.92), the work environment (0.90), the transmission of knowledge & the image of products and/or services (0.87), location & diversity of experiences, Style of management & support of colleagues (0.75) through their respective values show that they measure the dimension of the employer brand with future Moroccan talents.

## References

- (1) Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing research*, 34 (3), 347-356.
- (2) Alniaçık, E., & Alniaçık, Ü. (2012). Identifying dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding: effects of age, gender, and current employment status. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 1336-1343.
- (3) Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employerbrand. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 4, 185-206.
- (4) Apec (2019). Employabilité de demain et explore les futurs possibles du marché de l'emploi. Rapport annuel 2019-2020, <https://corporate.apec.fr/home/actualites/rapport-annuel-2019-2020.html>
- (5) Arachchige, B. J., & Robertson, A. (2011). Business Student Perceptions of a Preferred Employer: A Study Identifying Determinants of Employer Branding. *IUP Journal of Brand Management*, 8(3).
- (6) Backhaus, K., & Tikoo, S. (2004). Conceptualizing and researching employer branding. *Career Development International*, 9 (5), 501-517.
- (7) Barrow, S., & Mosley, R. (2005). *The employerbrand*. England: John Wiley&Sons Ltd, 132-145.
- (8) Barrow, S., & Mosley, R. (2005). *The employerbrand*. England: John Wiley&Sons Ltd, 132-145.
- (9) Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24 (2), 151-172.
- (10) Bodderas M., Cachelin J -L, Maas P., Schlager T., 2011, "The influence of the employer brand on employee attitudes relevant for service branding: an empirical investigation", *Journal of Services Marketing*, 25, 7, pp. 497 -508.
- (11) Bonneton, D., Festing, M., & Muratbekova-Touron, M. (2020). Exclusive Talent Management: Unveiling the Mechanisms of the Construction of an Elite Community. *European Management Review*. 1-21. doi:10.1111/emre.12413
- (12) Cable, D. M., & Turban, D. B. (2003). The value of organizational reputation in the recruitment context: A brand-equity perspective. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 33, 2244-2266.
- (13) Charbonnier-Voirin, A. et Vignolles, A. (2010), « Proposition d'un modèle intégrateur de la marque employeur », 28ème Congrès de l'Association Française de Marketing, Le Mans.
- (14) Charbonnier-Voirin, A., & Vignolles, A. (2016). « Enjeux et outils de gestion de la marque employeur: point de vue d'experts ». *Recherches en Sciences de Gestion*, (1), 153-172.
- (15) Charbonnier-Voirin, A., Laget, C., & Vignolles, A. (2014). « L'influence des écarts de perception de la marque employeur avant et après le recrutement sur l'implication affective des salariés et leur intention de quitter l'organisation ». *Revue de gestion des ressources humaines*, (3), 3-17.
- (16) Chhabra, N. L., & Mishra, A. (2008). Talent Management and Employer Branding: Retention Battle Strategies. *ICFAI Journal of Management Research*, 7 (11), 50-61.
- (17) Churchill, G.A. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- (18) Collins, C. J., & Stevens, C. K. (2002). "The relationship between early recruitment-related activities and the application decisions of new labor-market entrants: a brand equity approach to recruitment". *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(6), 1121.
- (19) Collins, Christopher J. (2007). « The Interactive Effects of Recruitment Practices and

- Product Awareness on Job Seekers' Employer Knowledge and Application Behaviors », *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 92, no 1, p. 180-190.
- (20) Costello, A.B. & Osborne, J.W. (2005). Best practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9.
- (21) Devellis. R.F. (2003). *Scale development Theory and Applications*, Applied Social Research Methods Series Volume 26, SAGE Publications,
- (22) Evrard, Y., B. Pras and E. Roux (2009), *Market : Etudes et Recherches en Marketing*, Dunod, Paris
- (23) Ewing, M. T., Pitt, L. F., de Bussy, N. M., & Berthon, P. (2002). Employment branding in the knowledge economy. *International Journal of Advertising*, 21 (1), 3-22.
- (24) Fabrigar L.R., Wegener D.T., MacCallum R.C. & Strahan E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, n° 4, 272-299.
- (25) Franca, V. (2012). The strength of the employer brand: Influences and implications for recruiting. *Journal of Marketing and Management*, 3(1), 78.
- (26) Girard A., Fallery B. et Rodhain F. (2011). « L'apparition des médias sociaux dans l'e-GRH : gestion de la marque employeur et e-recrutement », *16e Congrès de l'AIM*, St Denis de La Réunion, (pp. 1-18)..
- (27) Harris, M. M., & Fink, L. S. (1987). A field study of applicant reactions to employment opportunities: does the recruiter make a difference? *Personnel Psychology*, 40 (4), 765-784.
- (28) Highhouse S., Zickar M., Thorsteinson T., Stierwalt S., Slaughter J., (1999), "Assessing Company Employment Image: An Example in the FastFood Industry," *Personnel Psychology*, 52, pp. 151–172.
- (29) Kaiser, H.F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 23 (3),187-200.
- (30) Kapoor, V. (2010). Employer Branding: A Study of Its Relevance in India. *Journal of Brand Management*, 7 (1/2), 51-75.
- (31) Keeling, K. A., McGoldrick, P. J., & Sadhu, H. (2013). Staff Word-of-Mouth (SWOM) and retail employee recruitment. *Journal of Retailing*, 89(1), 88-104.
- (32) Keller, K. L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Managing Customer-Based Brand Equity", *Journal of Marketing*, 57 (1): 1-22.
- (33) Knox, S., & Freeman, C. (2006). Measuring and Managing Employer Brand Image in the Service Industry. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 22 (7/8), 695-716.
- (34) Lemmink, J., Schuijf, A. and Streukens, S. (2003) The role of corporate image in explaining application intentions. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 24 (1): 1–15.
- (35) Lievens, F. (2007). Employer branding in the Belgian Army: The importance of instrumental and symbolic beliefs for potential applicants, actual applicants, and military employees. *Human Resource Management*, 46 (1), 51-69.
- (36) Lievens, F., & Highhouse, S. (2003). The relation of instrumental and symbolic attributes to a company's attractiveness as an employer. *Personnel Psychology*, 56 (1), 75-102.
- (37) Lievens, F., Van Hoyer, G. & Schreurs, B. (2005). Examining the relationship between employer knowledge dimensions and organizational attractiveness: An application in a military context. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 78 (4), 553-572.
- (38) Lievens, F., Van Hoyer, G., & Anseel, F. (2007). Organizational Identity and Employer Image: Towards a Unifying Framework. *British Journal of Management*, 18, 45-59.
- (39) Lievens, Filip, Greet Van Hoyer et Bert Schreurs, 2005 « Examining the relationship between employer knowledge dimensions and organizational attractiveness: An

- application in a military context », *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78, 4: 553-572.
- (40) Liger, P. (2007). *Le marketing des RH, Attirer, motiver et fidéliser les salariés*. Dunod.
- (41) Martin, G., Beaumont, P., Doig, R., & Pate, J. (2005). Branding: A new performance discourse for HR? *European Management Journal*, 23 (1), 76-88.
- (42) Mayo, A., 2001. *The Human Value of the Enterprise: Valuing People as Assets: Monitoring, Measuring, Managing*, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, London.
- (43) Miles, S. J., & Mangold, G. (2004). A conceptualization of the employee branding process. *Journal of relationship marketing*, 3(2-3), 65-87.
- (44) Panczuk, S., & Point, S. (2008). *Enjeux et outils du marketing RH*. Paris: Édition d'Organisation Groupe Eyrolles.
- (45) Powell, G. N. (1991). Applicant reactions to the initial employment interview: Exploring theoretical and methodological issues. *Personnel Psychology*, 44 (1), 67-83.
- (46) Roussel, P. (1996). *Rémunération, motivation et satisfaction au travail*. Paris : Economica, collection Recherche en gestion.
- (47) Roussel, P. (2005). Méthodes de développement d'échelles pour questionnaires d'enquête. In P.
- (48) Roy, S. K. (2008). Identifying the dimensions of attractiveness of an employer brand in the Indian context. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 15 (4), 110-130.
- (49) Ruch, W. (2002). *Employer Brand Evolution: A Guide To Building Loyalty in Your Organization*, [http.2002](http://www.branding.com).
- (50) Schneider, L. (2003), "What is branding and how is it important to your marketing strategy?", <http://marketing.about.com/cs/brandmktg/a/whatisbranding.htm> .
- (51) Slaughter, J. E., Zickar, M. J., Highhouse, S., & Mohr, D. C. (2004). Personality trait inferences about organizations: Development of a measure and assessment of construct validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89 (1), 85-103.
- (52) Soulez, S., & Guillot-Soulez, C. (2011). *Marketing de recrutement et segmentation générationnelle: regard critique à partir d'un sous-segment de la génération Y*. *Recherche et Applications en Marketing (French Edition)*, 26(1), 39-57.
- (53) Srivastava, P., & Bhatnagar, J. (2010). Employer brand for talent acquisition: an exploration towards its measurement. *Vision*, 14(1-2), 25-34.
- (54) Vaiman, V., Scullion, H., & Collings, D. (2012). Talent management decision making. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 925–941. doi: 10.1108/00251741211227663
- (55) Viot, C., & Benraïss-Noailles, L. (2014). Employeurs démarquez-vous! La marque employeur, un gisement de valeur inexploité?. *Management international/International Management/Gestión Internacional*, 18(3), 60-81.