



“Unveiling organizational appeal in Lithuania: A study on employee perceptions of organizational attractiveness as an employer”

AUTHORS	Rita Bendaravičienė  Tomas Vitkauskas
ARTICLE INFO	Rita Bendaravičienė and Tomas Vitkauskas (2024). Unveiling organizational appeal in Lithuania: A study on employee perceptions of organizational attractiveness as an employer. <i>Problems and Perspectives in Management</i> , 22(2), 182-196. doi: 10.21511/ppm.22(2).2024.15
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.22(2).2024.15
RELEASED ON	Tuesday, 07 May 2024
RECEIVED ON	Saturday, 24 February 2024
ACCEPTED ON	Tuesday, 23 April 2024
LICENSE	 This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
JOURNAL	"Problems and Perspectives in Management"
ISSN PRINT	1727-7051
ISSN ONLINE	1810-5467
PUBLISHER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”
FOUNDER	LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

51



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

11

© The author(s) 2024. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10,
Sumy, 40022, Ukraine
www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 24th of February, 2024

Accepted on: 23rd of April, 2024

Published on: 7th of May, 2024

© Rita Bendaravičienė, Tomas Vitkauskas, 2024

Rita Bendaravičienė, Doctor, Associate Professor, Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. (Corresponding author)

Tomas Vitkauskas, M.Sc., Management Department, Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania.



This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Conflict of interest statement:

Author(s) reported no conflict of interest

Rita Bendaravičienė (Lithuania), Tomas Vitkauskas (Lithuania)

UNVEILING ORGANIZATIONAL APPEAL IN LITHUANIA: A STUDY ON EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL ATTRACTIVENESS AS AN EMPLOYER

Abstract

In recent times of uncertainty, new post-COVID-19 reality, and fierce competition for talented employees, organizational attractiveness as an appealing employer has emerged as one of the paramount facets, deeply integrated into strategic processes within organizations. However, there are many considerable challenges in understanding employee perceptions and meeting their expectations to become an employer of choice.

The aim of the study is to examine Lithuanian employees' attitudes toward different organizational attractiveness attributes, offering empirical insights for organizations to enhance their organizational attractiveness. To explore the manifestation of organizational attractiveness in Lithuanian organizations, 464 employed residents were surveyed using convenience sampling. Their attitudes were measured through the dimensions of social value, benefit value, development value, engagement value, economic value, management/leadership value, and work-life balance value. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the questionnaire data.

The results indicated that employees emphasized social ($M = 7.44$), management/leadership ($M = 7.05$), engagement ($M = 6.80$), and work/life balance values ($M = 6.79$), while benefits ($M = 6.60$), development ($M = 6.54$), and economic ($M = 6.20$) values received comparatively lower evaluations. Practical recommendations include promoting social responsibility, providing work opportunities, investing in employee's development, fostering autonomy, improving leadership skills, and implementing systems for work-life balance and economic incentives. Upholding promises to employees is crucial for organizational credibility. By implementing these recommendations, organizations can enhance their attractiveness to both current and prospective employees. This study underscores the need for further research on sector-specific organizational attractiveness.

Keywords

organizational attractiveness, attractive employer, employer branding, employees' perceptions, Lithuania

JEL Classification

M12, M14, M19

INTRODUCTION

Many businesses aim to achieve profitability and a competitive advantage by leveraging their human resources effectively. Consequently, the concept of organizational attractiveness is gaining global importance, as is the case in Lithuania. One has explored the phenomenon of organizational attractiveness from various perspectives, including employer branding, attractive employer attributes, employer brand perception, and external employer image. Noteworthy contributions to this field have been made by Ambler and Barrow (1996), Cable and Graham (2000), Berthon et al. (2005), Bellou et al. (2015), Reis and Braga (2016), Bohlmann et al. (2018), Belinda et al. (2018), Slåtten et al. (2019), Guillot-Soulez et al. (2022), Lambert et al. (2019), Zhang et al. (2020), Frandsen (2017), Turker and Ece (2020), Soeling et al. (2022), and De Waal (2022).

Organizational attractiveness involves both internal and external dimensions, necessitating employers to cultivate societal recognition, maintain a positive image, demonstrate social responsibility, and create an appealing workplace environment (Agnihotri & Bhattacharya, 2022; Pisarska & Iwko, 2021). These efforts differentiate organizations from competitors, enhancing their competitive advantage as reputable, reliable, and socially responsible entities (De Waal, 2022). This aspect plays a pivotal role in fostering employee satisfaction and motivation, cultivating positive perceptions of the employer, and significantly contributing to business success and value creation (Shaikh et al., 2022; Pisarska & Iwko, 2021).

The relevance of this research lies in the intensifying “war for talent,” therefore more and more organizations are realizing that their future success strongly depends on whether they can attract, recruit, and retain employees with the desired qualifications (Black & van Esch, 2021). Success in competition for talented individuals will likely be achieved only by employers, who can effectively create a good workplace image by communicating their strengths inside and outside the organization (Whysall et al., 2019). Additionally, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic raises many new challenges and its effects on organizational attractiveness (AL-Abrow et al., 2021).

Thus, organizations should focus on understanding employees’ perceptions, feedback, and responses (Dabirian et al., 2017). This idea resonates throughout scholarly literature discussing attractive organizations, spanning management, marketing, psychology, organizational philosophy, and industry-specific considerations within the business sector. Hence, the research problem is raised in the form of questions on how Lithuanian employees perceive organizational attractiveness as employers.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

Attractive organizations, as defined by Slåtten et al. (2019), fulfill individuals’ needs and preferences, influencing both consumer decisions and employee choices regarding career prospects, organizational culture, reliability, social responsibility, and sustainability. Reis and Braga (2016) emphasized the alignment of organizational benefits with the priorities of customers and employees, recognizing the subjective nature of organizational attractiveness. They stressed the importance of tailoring offerings to meet diverse stakeholder needs and exhibit desirable characteristics that can be viewed as excellent employment prospects (Slåtten et al., 2019). While an attractive organization is linked to consumer perception and product/service quality, this perspective only partly captures its essence. Zhang et al. (2020) argued that a comprehensive portrayal of an attractive organization includes the proper treatment of employees and consumers, commitment to public welfare, social responsibility, and cultivating relationships to enhance reputation. It should be noted that attractive organizations are not solely defined by public perception, but also by employees’ views. Bohlmann et al. (2018) advocated aligning organizational activities with employee values and goals, social responsibility, and environmen-

tal friendliness, proposing a comprehensive understanding of organizational attractiveness. The growing emphasis in contemporary organizational missions on social responsibility, environmental stewardship, and societal awareness indicates that organizational attractiveness is increasingly associated with employees’ desire to be socially responsible members of society beyond merely aligning benefits with individual values (Belinda et al., 2018). Employees who perceive their organization as socially responsible are more motivated, exhibit greater dedication to their tasks, and are more likely to engage in organizational activities. Moreover, these employees tend to take pride in their organization and its initiatives, whereas potential candidates perceive it as the organization’s prestige, emphasizing the significance of the organization’s social and environmental initiatives. Attractive organizations benefit from talent attraction as labeled by the public and incorporating appealing branding phrases like “a great place to work” or “ecologically/socially responsible” (Guillot-Soulez et al., 2022).

The reviewed scientific literature shows that organizational attractiveness is linked to societal, customer, and employee perceptions, aligned with organizational benefits, reputation, social responsibility, and environmentally friendly initiatives,

which are also associated with employee efficiency and reduced turnover rates. An attractive organization is not merely one where employees desire to work but also where they feel compelled to recommend it to others (Lambert et al., 2019). This positive endorsement not only enhances operational efficiency but also contributes to the organization's growth by attracting reliable employees through word-of-mouth recommendations. Furthermore, employees' commitment to the organization tends to remain high, fostering a culture of dedication and engagement (Held & Bader, 2018). Potential employees evaluate organizations based on their societal image and benefit alignment (Held & Bader, 2018). Regardless of external recommendations, potential employees evaluate an organization based on their criteria, initially assessing its societal image before scrutinizing its benefits. Only when an organization's image aligns with the benefits potential employees make informed decisions about whether to pursue employment with the organization, considering other job opportunities in the market (Held & Bader, 2018). In addition, an attractive organization can be viewed as a reflection of employer branding, and conversely, employer branding can serve as a descriptor of an attractive organization (Verčič & Ćorić, 2018).

Ambler and Barrow (1996, p. 187) introduced the concept of employer branding in marketing research. They defined it as a comprehensive package comprising the functional, economic, and psychological benefits provided and associated with an organization. Employer branding serves a crucial role in enabling consumers and potential employees to gain a clearer understanding and form opinions about the prospective workplace, its advantages, and the services it offers. Essentially, it can be perceived as a tangible "benefits package" offered by the organization to both consumers and employees (Verčič & Ćorić, 2018). This interplay between employer branding and organizational attractiveness underscores the importance of strategic branding efforts in shaping perceptions both internally and externally. An organization's attractiveness is related to job applicants' perceptions of the organization's image, its brand and reputation, and the conformity of its values (Soeling et al., 2022). Organizational attractiveness also refers to employers' branding strategies and the ability to communicate a company's strengths to the

labor market by attracting talent (Turker & Ece, 2020). Employer branding increases the value of organizations by integrating two important organizational areas – branding and human resources – while providing insights and understanding of the most effective way to attract and retain the right employees (Sthapit & Shrestha, 2020). Thus, employer branding should be viewed as an ongoing process that is central to employee experience, ensuring employee-organizational touchpoints that begin with initial employer brand awareness and continue throughout the employment period (Uma et al., 2013). Employer branding is related to authenticity, which is an indicator of employer attractiveness (Kumar, 2023). Importantly, several research findings suggest a positive correlation between appealing employer brands and employee well-being (Benraïss-Noailles & Viot, 2021), which allows one to affirm that organizational attractiveness and employee well-being are closely related and mutually influence each other (Parker & DeCotiis, 1983; Saaranen et al., 2007; Bendaravičienė, 2014; Gustainienė et al., 2014; Šorytė & Pajarskienė, 2014; Dassler et al., 2022). In attractive organizations, employees exhibit higher levels of efficiency, readily endorse others, display heightened motivation and dedication, exhibit lower turnover rates, and are more inclined to engage in supplementary activities that correspond to their priorities and needs. The attention is consistently drawn to meeting the needs of both customers and employees, thereby ensuring competitive advantage through the satisfaction and alignment of human capital needs (Bortnikas, 2017). Therefore, an attractive organization (employer) can effectively cultivate its brand, align its values with employee preferences, emphasize creativity and development, manage its reputation, promote well-being and growth opportunities, demonstrate commitment to sustainability and diversity, meet individual expectations, provide a supportive environment with competitive compensation, and foster engagement and well-being.

Despite the myriad perspectives on organizational attractiveness found in the literature, this study explores this through the lens of being an attractive employer. A consensus among many authors indicates that the attributes of an attractive employer encompass a wide array of areas and characteristics that are managed by human resource manage-

ment. These characteristics are primarily focused on employee human capital and strategically designed to attract, engage, and retain top talent. This approach aims to achieve mutual benefits through exchanges between the organization and its employees. It is essential to elucidate the frequently used term “talented employee,” which encompasses numerous personal attributes of an individual. These characteristics, as outlined by Mazurkiewicz (2017), include strong internal motivation, high flexibility, alignment with the organization’s goals, productivity, dedication, responsibility, creativity, commitment to continuous improvement, self-realization at work, and the application of available experience and competencies in the workplace. A talented employee embodies a combination of these traits, contributing significantly to their effectiveness and val-

ue within the organization. The importance of participating in the “war for talent,” where organizations strive to become the employer of choice to attract, recruit, and retain highly skilled human capital, is crucial for organizations, leading them to address employee needs through tailored benefits packages to foster loyalty and retention (Hadi & Ahmed, 2018). This explains the abundance of dimensions described in the literature to outline the most attractive employer features. Table 1 provides an overview of the organizational attractiveness dimensions introduced in the studies by different authors and the specific attributes associated with each dimension for their measurement.

In addition, several factors that influence an organization’s ability to attract and retain employees

Table 1. Measurement of organizations as attractive employers: A study overview

Study	Dimensions	Specific Attributes
Ambler and Barrow (1996)	Functional benefits Psychological benefits Economic benefits	Functional benefits focus on employee development and improvement, enhancing skills and capabilities for professional growth. Psychological benefits foster a sense of belonging and purpose within the organization, motivating alignment with its goals. Economic benefits include monetary rewards like salary and bonuses for recognizing employee contributions.
Highhouse et al. (2003)	General organizational attractiveness Employee intentions Prestige	The organization is a great place for me to work. Commitment and future intentions, with inquiries about loyalty and willingness to pursue opportunities. Reputation and status, including questions about the organization’s standing and societal perceptions.
Berthon et al. (2005)	Value of interest Value of development Social value Value of application Economic value	Attractive working conditions and innovative practices. Career advancement through learning opportunities, skill-building, and professional growth. Positive work environment fostering teamwork and camaraderie. Employee expression, knowledge-sharing, and contribution to innovation. Competitive salaries and benefits and job security to enhance overall satisfaction
Dabirian et al. (2017)	Management value Work/Life balance	Effective leadership and management practices, providing guidance, support, and opportunities for professional growth. Flexible work arrangements are important to maintain a healthy balance between work and personal life, reducing stress and enhancing overall well-being.
Hadi and Ahmed (2018)	Psychological benefit or value	Sense of security and freedom from life-threatening risks that employees experience in the workplace.
Bohlmann et al. (2018)	Triple bottom line	Social, economic, and environmental values.
Biswas and Suar (2016)	Employer branding Job description alignment Organizational support Pay equity Organizational trust Leadership quality Psychological contract and Organizational commitment Corporate social responsibility (CSR) Non-profit activities Environmental friendliness	Talent attraction and retention strategies. Matching organizational activities with job descriptions. Clear and understandable support for employees. Fair compensation practices. Building trust for employee satisfaction. Effective leadership. Fostering loyalty through commitment. Commitment to CSR. Philanthropic involvement. Embracing environmentally friendly practices.

Table 1 (cont.). Measurement of organizations as attractive employers: A study overview

Study	Dimensions	Specific Attributes
Bendaravičienė (2014)	Organizational culture	Collegial work environment, good atmosphere, creativeness, and initiative.
	Fairness and trust	Clear and objective standards for remuneration and promotion.
	Teamwork	Good relationships with colleagues and cooperation.
	Academic environment	High work standards and quality.
	Strategic management	Organizational, departmental, and employee integrity.
	Job satisfaction	Interesting and meaningful job.
	Supervisor relationship	Supporting and guiding supervision.
	Compensation and benefits	Effective employee incentive scheme.
	Training and development	Opportunities for personal growth.
	Work-life balance	Flexibility at work.
Working conditions	Safe and comfortable working environment.	

are safety in the work environment and higher-than-average salary (Minh Ha et al., 2021), flexible work schedules and remote work (Kroll et al., 2021), environmental factors and effective management (Liu & Nemoto, 2021), social responsibility (Belinda et al., 2018), ecological management of human resources (Umrani et al., 2022), information about ecological certificates (Guillot-Soulez et al., 2022), creative workspaces (Maier et al., 2022), cultural contexts, including religious and legal norms (Alshathry et al., 2014), ethical use of artificial intelligence (Sekiguchi et al., 2023), and authenticity (Turker & Ece, 2020). Organizations must adapt to changing environments, address these dimensions to attract and retain talent, and gain a competitive edge as their preferred employer. A motivated, responsible, and creative workforce facilitates the achievement of organizational goals.

Summarizing insights from various authors, the characteristics of an attractive organization encompass diverse factors crucial for employees. They are consolidated into seven main dimensions that will be adopted as a methodological framework for the current research on Lithuanian employees' perceptions of organizational attractiveness:

1. Social value: Focus on societal contributions and corporate social responsibility;
2. Value of benefits: Attractiveness of compensation, perks, and incentives;
3. Development value: Opportunities for growth, skill enhancement, and career advancement;
4. Engagement value: Level of employee motivation and commitment to organizational goals;

5. Economic value: Financial stability, competitive compensation, and advancement opportunities;
6. Management/Leadership value: Effective leadership and positive organizational culture;
7. Work/Life balance value: Support for maintaining a healthy work-life balance through flexibility and wellness programs (Vitkauskas, 2022).

Therefore, the aim of this paper is to examine Lithuanian employees' attitudes toward different organizational attractiveness attributes, offering empirical insights for organizations to enhance their organizational attractiveness.

To achieve this aim, the following research objectives were set:

- 1) to introduce a methodological framework for the research of Lithuanian employees' attitudes toward organizational attractiveness;
- 2) to propose guidelines for organizations to enhance their organizational attractiveness based on research results.

2. METHOD

After reviewing the scientific literature on organizational attractiveness, a quantitative study was conducted ($N = 464$). The primary data for calculations and analysis were sourced from a survey administered to employed Lithuanian habitants to evaluate employees' perceptions of the attractiveness of Lithuanian organizations as employ-

ers (Vitkauskas, 2022). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and content analysis. Finally, guidelines for managerial solutions were established based on the results of empirical research.

Assessment methodologies, specifically questionnaires, were adapted to gather primary data on organizational attractiveness. These methodologies were identified and deemed appropriate for further investigation based on a literature analysis. The quantitative research questionnaire was developed using the Organizational Attractiveness Extraction Scale (OAES) questionnaire by Bendaravičienė (2014), which demonstrated high reliability with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.985 and was later adapted by Bakanauskiene et al. (2017). The organizational attractiveness scale comprises seven subscales (Appendix A), consisting of 37 statements with high internal and general reliability (Table 2).

The questionnaires were non-binding and anonymous, and each respondent could choose to participate in the research. The questionnaire was developed in a native Lithuanian language on a website dedicated to conducting quantitative research (www.apklausa.lt). To ensure a diverse representation of the target population, the questionnaire survey was distributed online via Facebook. This approach aimed to reach all employed residents who were willing and able to participate. The survey was accompanied by engaging content designed to attract as many interested respondents as possible and foster positive associations with participation in the research. Respondents were required to answer all questions in the questionnaire except for one open-ended question.

To mitigate prejudice, bias, and inertia effects, statements were presented randomly. Employees

Table 2. Distribution of dimensions (subscales) of organizational attractiveness scale and their reliability

Subscales	Numbering of the statements	Number of Statements	Reliability Cronbach's Alpha	Sources
Social value	1, 30, 24, 25, 23	5	0.76	Bendaravičienė (2014)
Value of benefits	2, 18, 26, 31, 22	5	0.76	
Development value	4, 41, 27, 47, 21	5	0.82	
Engagement value	5, 29, 28, 40, 20, 19	6	0.85	
Economic value	6, 43, 39, 32, 44, 42	6	0.80	
Management/Leadership Value	7, 46, 38, 33, 17, 16	6	0.92	Bakanauskiene et al. (2017)
Work/Life Balance Value	8, 15, 34, 14	4	0.63	
Total number of statements in scale:		37	0.90	

rated the statements on a 10-point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (10). To assess current perceptions of employer attractiveness, employees were rated on a scale ranging from very unattractive (1) to very attractive (10). Respondents were queried about their likelihood of recommending the organization as an attractive place to others, rated from 1 (not recommended at all) to 10 (strongly recommended).

The study population was comprised of all employed individuals in Lithuania. Referring to the 2021 Labor Market Report by the Department of Statistics of Lithuania, which indicated an average of 1,280,207 employees, the sample size was determined using Paniotto's formula (Kardelis, 2017), aiming to interview 384 people. Ultimately, a total of 464 questionnaires were completed. Based on the calculated representativeness formula, the study achieved a reliability of 95% with a margin of error of 4.55%. This quantitative study was conducted in February 2022 after the COVID-19 pandemic. Therefore, it is important to address these important questions and contribute new insights to the field. Table 3 presents the respondents' demographic characteristics.

Table 3. Demographics of the sample

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Female	382	82.3
Male	79	17.0
Other	3	0.6
Age		
18-23	61	13.1
24-30	121	26.1
31-40	142	30.6
41-50	95	20.5
>51	45	9.7
Education		
University degree	232	50.0
College	91	19.6

Table 3 (cont.). Demographics of the sample

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Professional	75	16.2
High school	66	14.2
Responsibility		
Managers	95	20.5
Non-managers	369	79.5
Sector		
Public	204	44.0
Private	260	56.0

3. RESULTS

The subscale ratings for organizational attractiveness ranged from 1 to 10, with notably large standard deviations indicating a broad range of responses within the sample. Table 4 displays the scores for the social value subscale of organizational attractiveness. The overall arithmetic mean was high, with a value of 7.44.

When assessing the sample’s responses regarding social values, several statements exceeded the arithmetic mean of the investigated dimension, highlighting positive aspects. Statements concerning agreement with colleagues ($M = 8.67$) and the organization’s reputation in society ($M = 7.69$) were particularly noteworthy. Conversely, statements regarding employee turnover, sustainable development, and adherence to social responsibility in organizations received lower ratings.

The data suggest that employees recognize and value organizations that prioritize creating a safe and supportive work environment, fostering effective communication among colleagues. High ratings for organizational image ($M = 7.69$) indicate the importance placed by the studied sample on working for an organization with a positive reputation, allowing employees to align themselves with their values and activities.

In theory, adherence to the principles of social responsibility and sustainable development are considered key factors in defining an attractive employer in society. However, the study results ($M = 6.67$) suggest that not all organizations prioritize these aspects. It appears that some organizations may not fully prioritize cultivating social responsibility and sustainability initiatives.

Analyzing the second dimension, the value of benefits (Table 5), it is evident that organizations prioritize adequately providing and setting up workplaces ($M = 7.92$). Additionally, respondents positively rated the aspect of engaging in work ($M = 7.75$), which is theoretically recognized as having a significant impact on the perception of an attractive employer.

Statements regarding the opportunity to implement new ideas in organizations ($M = 5.97$) and the ability to change the direction of activity ($M = 5.09$) received moderate ratings. These results suggest that organizations may not prioritize provid-

Table 4. Statistics of social value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
24. I get along well with my colleagues.	464	8.67	1.767
1. I work in an organization with a good image and reputation in society.	464	7.69	2.242
23. Our organization has created a safe working environment.	464	7.48	2.726
25. There is no high turnover of employees in our organization.	464	6.69	2.889
30. The organization adheres to the principles of sustainable development and social responsibility.	464	6.67	2.839
Total mean average		7.44	

Table 5. Statistics of benefits value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
2. My workplace is properly equipped.	464	7.92	2.210
26. My job is interesting.	464	7.75	2.407
18. My work tasks are non-routine.	464	6.27	3.055
31. At work, I can implement new ideas and realize my potential.	464	5.97	3.079
22. The organization has opportunities to change the direction of activity.	464	5.09	3.183
Total mean average		6.60	

ing employees with the autonomy and flexibility to realize their potential or opportunities for re-orientation to retain existing employees.

In the third dimension, which assessed the value of development, the average rating was moderate, with an overall arithmetic mean of $M = 6.54$ (Table 6).

The highest-rated statements pertained to training ($M = 7.05$) and the application of new technologies in organizations ($M = 6.79$). Conversely, the lowest-rated statement was related to innovative projects and their implementation in organizations ($M = 5.96$). In summary, regarding the development dimension, organizations seem to recognize the importance of training and adopting new technologies that employees value to improve qualifications and facilitate tasks. However, to align with the theoretical model of an attractive employer, organizations should prioritize the implementation of innovative projects. Doing so not only enhances employee skills but also fosters an environment conducive to personal growth and development, thus potentially reducing turnover.

Observing the overall average perception of the value of engagement (Table 7), this aspect received one of the highest scores ($M = 6.80$).

This dimension highlighted that in many organizations, job assignments align with employees'

available competencies ($M = 7.87$), and a significant portion of individuals can autonomously make decisions at work ($M = 7.27$). Notably, there was a distinct separation in responses regarding opportunities to participate in crucial decisions within organizations, likely influenced by the fact that 79.5% of the research sample held non-leadership positions.

Organizations appear to prioritize employee engagement, allowing for the autonomy and utilization of skills and experiences. However, enhancing employees' engagement in critical decisions can bolster employer credibility.

Next, the economic value dimension (Table 8) generally scored the lowest across the entire organizational attractiveness scale ($M = 6.20$).

The results indicate that most organizations prioritize encouraging employees to achieve their best ($M = 7.12$) and recognize high-performing individuals ($M = 7.00$). However, the additional incentive system receives the lowest rating ($M = 4.89$).

The results highlight a notable discrepancy among the assessed dimensions of organizational attractiveness. While many organizations encourage top performance and recognize good employees, concerns about inadequate compensation, limited promotion opportunities, and inefficient incentive systems may indicate potential dissatisfaction

Table 6. Statistics of development value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
21. I have enough training to do my job well.	464	7.05	2.791
41. My organization uses new technologies.	464	6.79	2.844
4. My work environment is creative.	464	6.49	2.735
27. There are opportunities for growth and development in the organization.	464	6.41	2.913
47. The organization carries out innovative (advanced, modern) projects.	464	5.96	3.031
Total mean average		6.54	

Table 7. Statistics of engagement value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
19. My work corresponds to my competencies.	464	7.87	2.406
40. I can make decisions independently in my work.	464	7.27	2.640
5. I can realize myself at work.	464	7.26	2.551
29. I can do significant work for the organization.	464	6.71	2.971
20. In the implementation of goals, employee cooperation is encouraged.	464	6.69	2.843
28. I can participate in making important decisions for the organization.	464	5.01	3.241
Total mean average		6.80	

Table 8. Statistics of economic value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
44. The organization encourages achieving the highest/best results.	464	7.12	2.882
42. In my organization, good employees are recognized.	464	7.00	2.878
32. At work, there is an opportunity to receive salary supplements and bonuses.	464	6.47	3.362
43. I am adequately compensated for the work I do.	464	6.21	2.950
39. There are opportunities to be promoted at work.	464	5.52	3.201
6. There is an effective employee incentive system and fringe benefits system (e.g., mobile phone, car, etc.) at work.	464	4.89	3.282
Total mean average		6.20	

Table 9. Statistics of management/leadership value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
33. I can get advice from my supervisor.	464	7.99	2.626
38. The leader of my organization is trustworthy.	464	7.55	2.719
16. I feel supported by my supervisor.	464	7.21	2.723
17. My supervisor gives me feedback on my work.	464	6.86	2.833
46. The management of my organization cares about the employees.	464	6.42	2.936
7. There is smooth internal communication in my organization.	464	6.25	2.731
Total mean average		7.05	

among employees. This could lead to feelings of insecurity about salaries, and ultimately prompt employees to seek alternative employment.

Overall, management/leadership value received a relatively high mean score ($M = 7.05$) (Table 9).

The results indicate that employees highly value opportunities to consult with managers ($M = 7.99$) and perceive managers as reliable ($M = 7.55$) in most organizations. However, smooth internal communication received the lowest rating on this subscale ($M = 6.25$), suggesting a potential lack of internal communication in some organizations.

Employees' positive attitudes toward management and leadership underscore the importance of effective managerial practices. Dabirian et al. (2017) suggest that poor management can lead to higher employee turnover rates. Thus, organizations may benefit from prioritizing smooth internal communication and employee well-being to foster greater respect and trust among employees.

The results for the work/life balance subscale are shown in Table 10. The overall average work/life balance score was $M = 6.79$, with three statements rated above $M = 7.22$. However, the statement regarding working conditions at home received a notably low score ($M = 5.01$). This suggests that working from home may not be widely adopted or popular in many organizations.

The significance of the organizational attractiveness subscales is reflected in their overall mean values. Based on the assessment of the research sample, it appears that employees prioritize social ($M = 7.44$), management/leadership ($M = 7.05$), engagement ($M = 6.80$), and work/life balance values ($M = 6.79$) while providing lower evaluations of benefits ($M = 6.60$), development ($M = 6.54$), and economic ($M = 6.20$) values. However, all the investigated values of organizational attractiveness are important, as supported by an analysis of the literature.

When asked to evaluate their respective companies (Q69. Would you recommend the organiza-

Table 10. Statistics of work/life balance value subscale

Statements	N	M	SD
15. I have enough time to do my work.	464	7.46	2.584
34. Work can be combined with personal life needs.	464	7.46	2.581
14. I have enough freedom and flexibility at work.	464	7.22	2.525
8. I can work from home.	464	5.01	3.943
Total mean average	464	6.79	

tion you are currently working for as an attractive place to work for others, on a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 would not recommend at all and 10 would highly recommend?), the majority of respondents rated their organizations positively as attractive workplaces ($M = 6.89$; $SD = 2.615$), with a similarly positive assessment of their current employer's attractiveness ($M = 6.83$; $SD = 2.742$) (Q70. Rate from 1 to 10 the attractiveness of the employer in the organization where you currently work: 1 – Not at all attractive, 10 – Very attractive).

Next, the statistically significant relationships between all demographic variables and the subscales of the studied phenomena were tested. Statistical significance was set at $p = 0.05$. The results showed no statistically significant relationship between organizational attractiveness and demographic variables.

4. DISCUSSION

This study observed the number of insights across different dimensions of organizational attractiveness, which revealed some consistencies and differences. Lithuanian employees highly valued a positive organizational reputation ($M = 7.69$) and agreeable work environments ($M = 8.67$), consistent with the findings of Dabirian et al. (2017). Lower ratings for factors related to sustainability and social responsibility ($M = 6.67$) indicate potential discrepancies between organizational values and employee perceptions. Employees prioritized attractive workplace conditions ($M = 7.92$) and interesting job roles ($M = 7.75$), aligning with Bohlmann et al. (2018). Lower ratings for factors related to sustainability and social responsibility ($M = 6.67$) indicate potential discrepancies between organizational values and employee perceptions. Employees value training opportunities ($M = 7.05$) and the integration of new technologies ($M = 6.79$), in line with Lambert et al. (2019).

The study revealed lower ratings for innovative project implementation ($M = 5.96$), suggesting potential gaps in organizational approaches to fostering employee creativity and advancement. Lithuanian employees valued autonomy ($M = 7.26$) and decision-making opportunities in the workplace ($M = 7.27$), as emphasized by Held and

Bader (2018) and Krekel et al. (2019). Employee autonomy received high ratings, involving employees in important organizational decisions ($M = 5.01$). Surveyed employees highly valued recognition for top performance ($M = 7.12$), consistent with the findings of Biswas and Suar (2016) and Belinda et al. (2018). However, lower ratings for additional incentive systems ($M = 4.89$) suggest opportunities to enhance employee motivation through improved compensation practices. Research participants value consultation with managers ($M = 7.99$) and perceive them as reliable ($M = 7.21$), which is supported by Reis and Braga (2016). Lower ratings for internal communication ($M = 6.25$) suggest potential opportunities for managers to improve transparency and communication within organizations. Lithuanian employees highly valued positive work/life balance ($M = 7.46$), reflecting the findings of Verčič and Čorić (2018). Lower ratings for remote work opportunities ($M = 5.01$) suggest the need to improve flexibility policies to accommodate employee needs.

Investigating the overall mean values of the aforementioned dimensions, it was interesting to note that, in this study, social value was evaluated most favorably ($M = 7.44$), which supports the findings of Dabirian et al. (2017). The value of benefits was below the overall arithmetic mean when compared to the subscales of organizational attractiveness ($M = 6.60$), which, in contrast, was evaluated in second place by importance by Dabirian et al. (2017). The economic value had the lowest estimated dimension ($M = 6.20$). Dabirian et al. (2017) and Suen et al. (2020) show that it is the most attractive aspect for which employees choose organizations, and among the top three reasons why employees leave organizations. Biswas and Suar (2016), Belinda et al. (2018), and Krekel et al. (2019) have shown that organizations need to emphasize and manifest themselves by creating a positive psychological environment and culture, as well as additional benefits.

Dabirian et al. (2017) also observed that the value of development is less often perceived as high or fostered in organizations, and the overall mean of the subscale of this value did not exceed the arithmetic mean of the subscales of organizational attractiveness ($M = 6.54$). Finally, it could be agreed,

according to these research findings and literature analysis, that highly evaluated management/leadership ($M = 7.05$), engagement ($M = 6.80$), and work/life balance ($M = 6.79$) values are important facets of organizational attractiveness in Lithuanian organizations and more perceived as meeting the needs and expectations of employees.

Overall, while this study aligns with previous research in many aspects, it also highlights specific areas where organizations can enhance their attractiveness as employers by addressing potential discrepancies and implementing improvements in social responsibility, career development opportunities, and compensation practices.

CONCLUSION

This study aimed to examine Lithuanian employees' attitudes toward different organizational attractiveness attributes, offering empirical insights for organizations to enhance their organizational attractiveness. Through quantitative research, an anonymous questionnaire survey was conducted to assess employees' attitudes toward social, benefit, development, engagement, economic, management/leadership, and work-life balance value dimensions. The research findings indicate that employees see social, management/leadership, engagement, and work/life balance values as central, indicating their significant influence on organizational attractiveness. Although the values of benefits, development, and economic value received lower overall ratings, there were still positively evaluated statements for each subscale. Despite the lower ratings on certain subscales, all studied values remained important, as supported by the conclusions drawn from the literature analysis. Therefore, organizations aspiring to be attractive employers should focus on improving benefits, development opportunities, and economic value alongside other key values.

This study contributes to the broader understanding of organizational attractiveness as an employer phenomenon and its manifestation in Lithuanian organizations, as perceived by employees. Based on the results of this study, companies must prioritize several key factors to bolster overall organizational attractiveness. First, it is essential to foster a culture of respect, inclusion, and integrity. This involves promoting diversity and equity, creating a safe and supportive work environment, and demonstrating a commitment to ethical practices and social responsibility. Additionally, organizations should strive to provide meaningful work opportunities that challenge and engage employees. This can be achieved by offering diverse projects, opportunities for skill development and advancement, and a supportive feedback culture that encourages innovation and learning. Furthermore, competitive compensation and benefit packages play crucial roles in attracting and retaining top talent. Ensuring fair and equitable pay, offering comprehensive benefits such as healthcare and retirement plans, and providing opportunities for bonuses and incentives can significantly enhance an organization's attractiveness as an employer. Moreover, effective leadership is the key to creating a positive work environment. Strong leadership, characterized by transparency, communication, and empathy, fosters trust and confidence in employees. Leaders should actively listen to employee feedback, provide support and guidance, and lead by example to inspire and motivate their teams. Finally, promoting work-life balance and employee well-being is essential for organizational attractiveness. Offering flexible work arrangements, promoting wellness initiatives, and providing resources for mental health support demonstrate a commitment to employee satisfaction and overall wellness. By prioritizing these factors, organizations can enhance their attractiveness as employers and cultivate a motivated, engaged, and high-performing workforce.

This study was implemented in a population of all employed Lithuanian residents using convenience sampling. It would be valuable to explore organizational attractiveness within specific sectors to identify and analyze prevailing values. This approach would enable the development of tailored guidelines for organizations that aim to align with employee expectations. A comparative and longitudinal study would also enrich knowledge in the research field, especially considering the high uncertainty and instability in most countries and markets.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Rita Bendaraviciene.
 Data curation: Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Formal analysis: Rita Bendaraviciene, Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Funding acquisition: Rita Bendaraviciene.
 Investigation: Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Methodology: Rita Bendaraviciene, Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Project administration: Rita Bendaraviciene.
 Resources: Rita Bendaraviciene.
 Software: Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Supervision: Rita Bendaraviciene.
 Validation: Rita Bendaraviciene, Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Visualization: Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Writing – original draft: Tomas Vitkauskas.
 Writing – review & editing: Rita Bendaraviciene.

REFERENCES

1. Agnihotri, A., & Bhattacharya, S. (2022). CSR fit and organizational attractiveness for job applicants. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 30(6), 1712-1727. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2020-2514>
2. AL-Abrow, H., Al-Maatoq, M., Alharbi, R.K., Alnoor, A., Abdullah, H.O., Abbas, S., & Khattak, Z.Z. (2021). Understanding employees' responses to the COVID-19 pandemic: The attractiveness of healthcare jobs. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 40(2), 19-33. <https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fjoe.22070>
3. Alshathry, S., Donohue, W., Wickham, M., & Fishwick, S. (2014). National culture as an influence on perceptions of employer attractiveness. *Academy of Taiwan Business Management Review*, 10, 101-111. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263237429_National_Culture_as_an_Influence_on_Perceptions_of_Employer_Attractiveness
4. Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3), 185-206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/bm.1996.42>
5. Bakanauskiene, I., Bendaraviciene, R., & Barkauske, L. (2017). Patrauklaus darbdavio bruožai Lietuvos verslo organizacijose: Darbuotojų požiūris [Features of employer attractiveness in Lithuanian business organizations: Employees' perceptions]. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 1142(77), 7-23. (In Lithuanian). Retrieved from <https://portalcris.vdu.lt/server/api/core/bitstreams/5091cf86-3da7-48d7-a927-83adfc363ef8/content>
6. Belinda, C. D., Westerman, J. W., & Bergman, S. M. (2018). Recruiting with ethics in an online era: Integrating corporate social responsibility with social media to predict organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 109, 101-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.10.001>
7. Bellou, V., Chaniotakis, I., Kehagias, I., & Rigopoulou, I. (2015). Employer brand of choice: An employee perspective. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 16(6), 1201-1215. <https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2013.848227>
8. Bendaravičienė, R. (2014). *Employer brand development measuring organizational attractiveness in higher education*. Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University.
9. Benraïss-Noailles, L., & Viot, C. (2021). Employer brand equity effects on employees well-being and loyalty. *Journal of Business Research*, 126, 605-613. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.002>
10. Berthon, P. R., Ewing, M. T., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2005.11072912>
11. Biswas, M. K., & Suar, D. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employer branding. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2502-3>
12. Black, S., & van Esch, P. (2021). AI-enabled recruiting in the war for talent. *Business Horizons*, 64(4), 513-524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.015>
13. Bohlmann, C., Krumbholz, L., & Zacher, H. (2018). The triple bottom line and organizational attractiveness ratings: The role of pro-environmental attitude. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 25(5), 912-919. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1507>
14. Bortnikas, A. (2017). Žmogiškųjų išteklių valdymo modernizavimas šiuolaikinėje organizacijoje [Human resources management modernization of contemporary organization]. *Viešoji Politika ir Administravimas [Public Policy*

- and Administration], 16(2), 335-346. (In Lithuanian). <https://doi.org/10.13165/VPA-17-16-2-12>
15. Cable, D. M., & Graham, M. E. (2000). The determinants of job seekers' reputation perceptions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(8), 929-947. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200012\)21:8<929::AID-JOB63>3.0.CO;2-O](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200012)21:8<929::AID-JOB63>3.0.CO;2-O)
 16. Dabirian, A., Kietzmann, J., & Diba, H. (2017). A great place to work!? Understanding crowd-sourced employer branding. *Business Horizons*, 60(2), 197-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2016.11.005>
 17. Dassler, A., Khapova, S. N., Lysova, E., & Korotov, K. (2022). Employer attractiveness from employee perspective: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.858217>
 18. De Waal, A. (2022). Measuring organizational attractiveness. *International Journal of Management and Applied Research*, 9(1), 1-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18646/2056.91.22-001>
 19. Frandsen, S. (2017). Organizational image. In *The International Encyclopedia of Organizational Communication* (pp. 1795-1804). John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc103>
 20. Guillot-Soulez, C., Saint-Onge, S., & Soulez, S. (2022). Green certification and organizational attractiveness: The moderating role of firm ownership. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 29(1), 189-199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/csr.2194>
 21. Gustainienė, L., Prancėvičienė, A., & Bukšnytė-Marmienė, L., & Genevičiūtė-Janonienė, G. (2014). Darbuotojo gerovė ir pozityvi darbo aplinka: Integruotas teorinis modelis [Employee well-being and positive work environment: An integrated theoretical model]. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 69(69), 37-53. (In Lithuanian). <https://doi.org/10.7220/MOSR.1392.1142.2014.69.3>
 22. Hadi, N., & Ahmed, S. (2018). Role of employer branding dimensions on employee retention: Evidence from educational sector. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(3), Article 44. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci8030044>
 23. Held, K., & Bader, B. (2018). The influence of images on organizational attractiveness: Comparing Chinese, Russian and US companies in Germany. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(3), 510-548. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1173085>
 24. Highhouse, S., Lievens, F., & Sinar, E. F. (2003). Measuring attraction to organizations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63(6), 986-1001. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403258403>
 25. Kardelis, K. (2017). *Mokslinių tyrimų metodologija ir metodai [Research methodology and methods]*. Vilnius: Mokslo ir Enciklopedijų Leidybos Centras [Science and Encyclopedias Publishing Center]. (In Lithuanian).
 26. Krekel, C., Ward, G., & De Neve, J.-E. (2019). *Employee wellbeing, productivity, and firm performance* (Saïd Business School WP 2019-04). Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3356581
 27. Kroll, C., Nuesch, S., & Foege, J. N. (2021). Flexible work practices and organizational attractiveness in Germany: The mediating role of anticipated organizational support. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 32(3), 543-572. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1479876>
 28. Kumar, P. (2023). The pulse of Gen Y in India: An exploratory study on dimensions of employer attractiveness. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58(4). Retrieved from <https://vlex.in/vid/the-pulse-of-gen-939416712>
 29. Lambert, J. R., Basuil, D. A., Bell, M. P., & Marquardt, D. J. (2019). Coming to America: Work visas, international diversity, and organizational attractiveness among highly skilled Asian immigrants. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(15), 2293-2319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1322116>
 30. Liu, L., & Nemoto, N. (2021). Environmental, social and governance (ESG) evaluation and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Accounting & Finance*, 21(4), 14-29. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jaf.v21i4.4522>
 31. Maier, L., Baccarella, C. V., Wagner, T. F., Meinel, M., Eismann, T., & Voigt, K. I. (2022). Saw the office, want the job: The effect of creative workspace design on organizational attractiveness. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 80(2), Article 101773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2022.101773>
 32. Mazurkiewicz, A. (2017). Career shaping of a talented employee. *Proceedings of the 16th Conference in Tomaszowice, Poland*. Retrieved from <http://repozytorium.wsb-nlu.edu.pl/xmlui/handle/11199/10503>
 33. Minh Ha, N., Anh, P. T., Yue, X.-G., Phi Nam, N. H., & Ntim, C. G. (rev. ed.). (2021). The impact of tax avoidance on the value of listed firms in Vietnam. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8, Article 1930870. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1930870>
 34. Parker, D. F., & DeCotiis, T. A. (1983). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 160-177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(83\)90145-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(83)90145-9)
 35. Pisarska, A., & Iwko, J. (2021). The aspects of corporate social responsibility in the job candidates' recruitment and selection processes in a teal organization. *Sustainability*, 13(23), Article 13175. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132313175>
 36. Reis, G. G., & Braga, B. M. (2016). Employer attractiveness from a generation perspective: Implications for employer branding. *Revista de Administração*, 51(1), 103-116. <https://doi.org/10.5700/rausp1226>
 37. Saaranen, T., Tossavainen, K., Turunen, H., Kiviniemi, V., & Vertio, H. (2007). Occupational

- wellbeing of school staff members: A structural equation model. *Health Education Research*, 22(2), 248-260. <https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cyl073>
38. Sekiguchi, T., Mitate, Y., & Yang, Y. (2023). Internship experience and organizational attractiveness: A realistic job fit perspective. *Journal of Career Development*, 50(2), 353-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08948453221094311>
 39. Shaikh, E., Brahmi, M., Thang, P. Ch., Watto, W. A., Trang, T. T. N., & Loan, N. T. (2022). Should I stay or should I go? Explaining the turnover intentions with corporate social responsibility (CSR), Organizational identification and organizational commitment. *Organizational Identification and Organizational Commitment*, 14(10), Article 6030. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106030>
 40. Slåtten, T., Lien, G., & Svenkerud, P.J. (2019). The role of organizational attractiveness in an internal market-oriented culture (IMOC): A study of hospital frontline employees. *BMC Health Services Research*, 19(1), Article 307. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4144-8>
 41. Soeling, P. D., Ajeng Arsanti, S. D., & Indriati, F. (2022). Organizational reputation: Does it mediate the effect of employer brand attractiveness on intention to apply in Indonesia? *Heliyon*, 8(4), Article E09208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09208>
 42. Šorytė, D., & Pajarskienė, B. (2014). Darbuotojų gerovė ir ją skatinantys psichosocialinės darbo aplinkos veiksniai [Employees' well-being and positive impact of psychosocial workplace factors]. *Visuomenės Sveikata [Public Health]*, 2(65), 9-19 (In Lithuanian). Retrieved from [https://www.hi.lt/uploads/pdf/visuomenes%20sveikata/2014.2\(65\)/VS%202014%202\(65\)%20LIT%20%20Darbuotoju%20gerove.pdf](https://www.hi.lt/uploads/pdf/visuomenes%20sveikata/2014.2(65)/VS%202014%202(65)%20LIT%20%20Darbuotoju%20gerove.pdf)
 43. Sthapit, A., & Shrestha, B. (2020). Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding for employee retention in Nepalese hospitality industry. *Nepalese Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 1(1), 13-27. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3617466
 44. Suen, H. Y., Hung, K. E., & Tseng, F. H. (2020). Employer ratings through crowdsourcing on social media: An examination of US Fortune 500 companies. *Sustainability*, 12(16), Article 6308. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12166308>
 45. Verčič, T. A., & Ćorić, S. D. (2018). The relationship between reputation, employer branding and corporate social responsibility. *Public Relations Review*, 44(4), 444-452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2018.06.005>
 46. Turker, B., & Ece, E. (2020). Organizational attractiveness dimensions and workplace authenticity relationship. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 3(3), 1021-1031. <https://doi.org/10.31014/aior.1992.03.03.258>
 47. Uma, S. N., Shruthi, V. K., & Smita, M. G. (2013). Employer branding – The competitive edge for corporate success. *IJEMR*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://ijemr.in/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Employer-Branding-The-Competitive-Edge-For-Corporate-Success.pdf>
 48. Umrani, W., Channa, N., Ahmed, U., Syed, J., Pahi, M., & Ramayah, T. (2022). The laws of attraction: Role of green human resources, culture and environmental performance in the hospitality sector. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 103, Article 103222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2022.103222>
 49. Vitkauskas, T. (2022). *Links between organizational attractiveness and employee well-being* (Master's thesis). Vytautas Magnus University.
 50. Whysall, Z., Owtram, M., & Brittain, S. (2019). The new talent management challenges of Industry 4.0. *Journal of Management Development*, 38(2), 118-129. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-06-2018-0181>
 51. Zhang, Q., Cao, M., Zhang, F., Liu, J., & Li, X. (2020). Effects of corporate social responsibility on customer satisfaction and organizational attractiveness: A signaling perspective. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 29(1), 20-34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12243>

APPENDIX A

Table A1. Organizational attractiveness scale

Subscales (dimensions)	Statements
Social value	<p>I get along well with my colleagues. I work in an organization with a good image and reputation in society. Our organization has created a safe working environment. There is no high turnover of employees in our organization. The organization adheres to the principles of sustainable development and social responsibility.</p>
Value of benefits	<p>My workplace is properly equipped. My job is interesting. My work tasks are non-routine. At work, I can implement new ideas and realize my potential. The organization has opportunities to change the direction of activity.</p>
Development value	<p>I have enough training to do my job well. My organization uses new technologies. My work environment is creative. There are opportunities for growth and development in the organization. The organization carries out innovative (advanced, modern) projects.</p>
Engagement value	<p>My work corresponds to my competencies. I can make decisions independently in my work. I can realize myself at work. I can do significant work for the organization. In the implementation of goals, employee cooperation is encouraged. I can participate in making important decisions for the organization.</p>
Economic value	<p>The organization encourages achieving the highest/best results. In my organization, good employees are recognized. At work, there is an opportunity to receive salary supplements and bonuses. I am adequately compensated for the work I do. There are opportunities to be promoted at work. There is an effective employee incentive system and fringe benefits system (e.g., mobile phone, car, etc.) at work.</p>
Management/ Leadership value	<p>I can get advice from my supervisor. The leader of my organization is trustworthy. I feel supported by my supervisor. My supervisor gives me feedback on my work. The management of my organization cares about the employees. There is smooth internal communication in my organization.</p>
Work/ Life balance value	<p>I have enough time to do my work. Work can be combined with personal life needs. I have enough freedom and flexibility at work. I can work from home.</p>