THE ORGANIZATIONAL IMAGES THAT INFLUENCE EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT WITH MEDIATOR VARIABLES PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL

Dr. Dina Diana Lucia

Psychologist; Academics and Practitioner - Indonesia
Email: diana_luciadiana@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT. *Creating organizational images of employees is relevant to the organization and is an important factor for employees, choosing a job, namely deciding to work for the company and positive images of employees about the company after working (Barber, 1998). Furthermore, the factors that determine the formation of employees' views on organizational images, include; product brand, reputation, corporate identity and corporate social responsibility (Harrison (1995), Walsh, et al (008) and these factors can foster the pride of organizational members. Employees' understanding of organizational images that positively affects psychological conditions and encourages the formation of positive psychological conditions known as Psychological Capital as PsyCap, as an individual positive psychological state characterized by; self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience. Youssef and Avolio (2007). So that PsyCap is driven by external factors that come from the environment and management organizations are capable of driving employee engagement. Employees with strong PsyCap, influenced by pride in the organization, are able to encourage employees to play a role in realizing the vision and mission of the organization, being loyal as a form of emotional, cognitive and physical attachment to employees called employee engagement (Kahn 1990. Employee engagement consists of: say, strive and stay (Hewitt, 2004). In this study, variable organizational images were represented by 17 questions, a validity score of 0.55 and a reliability score of 0.95. Psycap with 15 questions, a validity score of 0.48 and a reliability score of 0.93 and Employee engagement represented by 13 question items with a validity score of 0.42 and a reliability score of 0.90. The results of hypothesis testing with the coefficient ʎ = 0.15 (t hit 5.14 >1.96) illustrate the influence of employee organizational images on employee engagement with the PsyCap mediator variable is positive and significant.*

KEYWORDS: orgaizational images, psychological capital, employee engagement

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to describe how organizational images can influence PsyCap which binds employees to work without coercion in the company voluntarily and in totality. Employees describe and rate the organization through its elements; reputation, main product, corporate social responsibility and corporate identity (Fombrun, 1996). Organizational images are important things that organizations need to pay attention to in order to maintain quality human resources.

Companies that pay attention to and apply these images well have a greater chance of getting job applicants and retaining the best employees. In addition, good and positive perceptions of organizational images will provide a sense of attraction, intention (Collins & Stevens, 2001) and praud in individuals. Reputation, main product, corporate responsibility and corporate identity, among others, are aspects that are a general description of the company as a whole and priorities in the formation of organizational images in individuals.

Employee images of the organization are able to involve emotional and cognitive conditions to react according to stimuli that generate positive responses because of the interest in what is perceived at the time (Hoyer and Macinnis, 2010). Such conditions will drive employee behavior to be able to perform various tasks, target expected and overcome obstacles / problems at work. This is in line with what is described in PsyCap with aspects of self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience (Luthan, Youssef & Avolio, 2007). Thus employees who have positive organizational images significantly influence PsyCap and have an impact on decisions and actions to say, stay and strive in the organization (Hewitt, 2005), which is a characteristic of employee engagement with the company or what is called employee engagement. .

In addition, the impact of employee experiences on the organization makes the process of forming positive employee images for the company. The elements of organizational images include reputation (Harrison, 1995), the company's treatment of employees, corporate identity (Fombrun, 1996), playing service products to customers, product quality and being involved in dealing with social problems (Alifahmi & Hifni 2008). The size of the organizational images owned by employees is predicted to increase the psychological aspects, namely hope and optimism of employees and employee interest in the company (Collins & Stevens, 2001). Based on the existing phenomena and research, it is proven that companies need to pay attention to their organizational images in today's competition to get and maintain the best human resources.

According to Chatman (1991), the better the image of an organization in the eyes of employees, the bigger it will be and will increase the company's chances of getting good human resources, especially young people from universities who want to join the company (Fombrun, 1996). These things become positive values and move PsyCap employees to be and work in the company, the employees are working longer in the company because there is pride in the workplace which is an indicator of employee engagement.

REVIEW LITERATURE

Organizational images are defined as "overall impressions" that exist in the minds of employees as a result of accumulated feelings, ideas, attitudes and experiences with the organization, stored in memory, turned into positive / negative meanings, taken to reconstruct images and memories when the name of the organization is heard. or brought to mind (Dowling, 1988; Fombrun, 1996; Kazoleas, et al., 2001; Hatch, et al., 2003; Bravo, et al., 2009). Thus, organizational images are the result of a communication process in which organizations create and disseminate certain messages which are strategic goals; vision, mission, goals and identity that reflect the core values of the organization to be valued (Leuthesser & Kohli, 1997; Van Riel and Balmer, 1997;

Bravo, et al., 2009). This is consistent with Keller's (1993), that the worldwide vision of the brand images so that organizational images can be considered as a type of product images where the product name refers to the organization as a whole rather than the product / service.

Kandampully and Hu (2007) stated that organizational images consist of two main components; the first is functional like tangible characteristics that can be measured and evaluated easily, the second is emotional such as the feelings, attitudes and beliefs a person has towards the organization.

Organizational identity is based on the core values of the organization and the actions taken and perceptions held by internal stakeholders. Meanwhile, the reputation and image of the organization are developed by external stakeholders and are based on the actions of the organization. Reputation and organizational images are not static, dynamic and tend to be less changeable than the organizational image. Organizational images are stakeholders' perceptions of what the organization has done (actions) and are less likely to last than the reputation of the organization. According to Stuart (1999), "corporate reputation is the perception of corporate identity that is built over time, so that it is much more stable than organizational images".

Every company without realizing it has images that have been attached to the company, not a few goods or services produced by the company are so strong images of consumers. Nguyen and Leblanc (2001) reveal that organizational images are the overall impression that is formed in the minds of people about companies. Where the image relates to the business name, architecture, product variations, traditions, ideology and impressions on the quality of communication made by every employee who interacts with the organization's clients.

Dowling (2004) states that company images are a set of beliefs and feelings about an organization. Images can be said as individual perceptions of the existence of experiences, beliefs, feelings and knowledge of the community itself towards the company, so that aspects of the facilities owned by the company and services delivered by employees to consumers can affect consumer perceptions of images. Thus images are one of the most important assets of a company or organization that should be continuously built and maintained. A good image is a powerful tool, not only to attract consumers in choosing a product or company, but also to improve customer attitudes and satisfaction towards the company.

Corporate identity describes a set of values and principles employees and managers associate with the company. Company identity describes a common understanding of the characteristics that employees of the company use to characterize what the work is like, the products produced, the consumers and investors that are served. The company's identity comes from the company's experience from the time it was founded until now, the cumulative record of the company's success and failure so far.

Several definitions are found in the literature; Aaker and Keller (1990) define organizational images as the perceived quality associated with the company name. In addition, Keller (1993) defines organizational images as the perception of an organization reflected in the associations held in consumer memory. Nguyen and LeBlanc (1998) define organizational images as subjective knowledge, or attitudes such

as ideology, company name, and reputation and service system quality levels. All of these characteristics contribute to building organizational images.

Organizational Aspects of Images. Baum (in Fombrun, 1996) explained that there are (4) four aspects that can build a company's image and reputation to be strong and good, namely:
a. Reliability (reliability in the eyes of consumers), the more reliable the company looks in the eyes of its constituents, the better the company is.
b. Credibility (credibility in the eyes of investors), the more credible a company is in the eyes of its constituents, the better the company is.
c. Trustwothiness (trustworthy in the eyes of employees), the more trusted a company, the better the company.
d. Responsibility (social responsibility in the eyes of the community), the more responsible a company is in the eyes of its constituents, the better the company is.
    Based on the research conducted by Walsh, et al., (2008), explained that consumers value a company's images through five aspects, namely:
a. Customer orientation, refers to consumer perceptions of the willingness of company employees to satisfy consumer needs.
b. Good employers refer to consumer perceptions of how the company and management treat their employees and pay attention to their needs, and consumer expectations that the company has competent employees.
c. The company is reliable and financially strong (reliable and financially strong company), referring to consumer perceptions of the company in terms of competence, solidity and ability to generate profits (profitability), as well as consumer expectations that the company uses its financial resources. in a wise way so that investing in the company is perceived as having little risk.
d. Product brand, product and service quality refers to consumer perceptions of the quality, innovation, value and reliability of goods and services produced by the company.
e. Social and environmental responsibility refers to consumer belief that companies have a positive role in society and the environment in general.

Fombrun (1996) states that organizations that have good images will gain the trust of employees and job seekers. In working, employees expect the company where they work to be trusted, by building trust with employees to maintain the company's good reputation. Furthermore, Fombrun stated that there are three aspects that can build a company's reputation as a good place to work in the eyes of the workforce, namely:
a. Promote trust. Trust does not just form in the work environment and if it is formed, trust does not   continue to grow and take root because trust is very easy to break and needs to be maintained and cared for. The difficulty in forming trust is because humans naturally always question what the motives and concerns of others are for him. Humans feel afraid of being used, so humans will be very careful to trust others. Likewise with companies, of course job seekers will have doubts about the credibility and capabilities of the company, it will be easier for someone to trust a company that treats us like family or partners for life.
b. Empower employees. When individuals are empowered, committed and involved in making decisions, employees will feel good about their work and the company. Feelings of pleasure motivate workers to work harder and do better. A positive

attitude creates trust, forms a work team and sparks creativity and innovation. These things can help the company to move faster and surpass competitors/ competitors.

c. Generating a feeling of pride. When working for a respectful company, employees will have a high emotional involvement with their work. When work feels insignificant, it is very difficult for employees to commit to their work, to products, and to the companies that provide those products. When a product is of low quality or in other words it does not deliver what consumers expect, it will be very difficult to feel good when selling it.

Explained by Harrison (1995) that there are 4 aspects of organizational images, namely:

a. Personality, the overall characteristics of the company that are understood by the environment outside the company. The first element in this image will provide an overview of the company as a whole, such as a trusted company, or a socially responsible company.

b. Reputation, public belief in the company based on personal experience or other people on the output produced by the company. According to Van Riel (2004), measuring the reputation of an organization can be done by looking at 6 reputation driving variables, namely emotional attractiveness, products and services, vision and leadership, workplace environment, financial performance and social responsibility.

c. Values / Ethics, the values and philosophy adopted by the company, including internal policies and external interactions with external parties related to the company. The values adopted by the company can be classified into 10 parts, namely accountability, balance, commitment, community, diversity, empowerment, innovation, integrity, ownership and safety.

d. Corporate Identity, identity in names, symbols, logos, colors and rituals to bring out the company, brand and corporate interests. Gregory (in Sutojo's book, 2004) states that company identity consists of two main elements, namely the company name and logo.

In the organizational assessment method, one of which is the Harris - Fombrun Reputation Quotient, which includes aspects of elements and attributes of corporate reputation that strengthen the company's image, namely:

a. Emotional Appeal; 1). Good feeling about the company, have a good feeling, are happy or love the company, 2). Admire and respect the company, a feeling of awe and respect for the company, 3). Trust the company, have a feeling of trust in the company.

b. Product and Service; 1). Stands behind products / services, assumes that the products or services produced are in accordance with the core business, in accordance with the company's identity, 2). Offer high quality products / services, assuming that the company offers high quality products or services, 3). Develops innovative products / services, assumes that companies are always innovating to develop products or services produced, 4). Offer products / services that are good value, which is the assumption that the company produces products or services that have a selling value

c. Vision and Leadership; 1). Has excellent leadership, assumes that the company runs under reliable leadership, 2). Has a clear vission for the future, assumes that the company has a clear vision to face the challenges ahead, 3). Recognize / take

advantage of market opportunities, assuming that companies are adept at finding and taking advantage of available opportunities.

d. Workplace Environment; 1). Is well managed, assuming that the company is well managed, 2). Looks like a good company to work, the company looks like a good place to work, 3). Looks like has a good employees, seen as a company that has professional employees.

e. Financial performance; 1). Record of profitability, assumes that the company's financial performance records so far show profitability, 2). Looks like a low risk investment, from the company's financial performance, making the company look like a low risk investment place, 3). Strong prospect for future growth, from the company's financial performance makes the company look as a company that has strong prospects for future developments, 4). Tends to outperforms it's competitors, from the company's financial performance it appears that the firm tends to be superior to its competitors.

f. Social Responsibility; 1). Supported good causes, assuming that companies provide good support for social problems, 2). Environtmentally responsible, assuming that the organization has responsibility for environmental problems, 3). Treats people well, assumes that the company treats the surrounding community well.

In this study, the authors used aspects of organizational images according to Harrison (1995); Walsh, et al., (2008) that these aspects are reputation, brand product, corporate identity and corporate social responsibility because these aspects are in accordance with the research context.

Psycohological Capital (PsyCap). According to (Luthans, Luthans, & Luthans, 2004) PsyCap is a theory that develops the potential of human resources, PsyCap is a construction of understanding individual potential that is important to learn. PsyCap was developed after the existence of human capital and social capital. Human refers to a group of individuals working in an organization, while the word capital refers to the resources invested in an organization. The definition of human capital consists of the knowledge, skills and abilities of workers who are displayed in specific competencies. Meanwhile, social capital consists of trust, relationships with other workers and the ability of individuals to develop social networks.

Avey, Youssef and Luthans (2006) explain that in PsyCap there are constructive characteristics that influence each other so that this construct is better measured as a single unit. PsyCap measurement becomes inadequate if it only analyzes one or several PsyCap characteristics and their relationship with employee performance.

Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007) explain that there are four aspects of PsyCap, namely, self-efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience:

1. Self-efficacy in this study is an individual's self-confidence regarding his ability to mobilize motivation, sources of cognition and take a number of actions needed to achieve success in carrying out tasks, in certain contexts it explains that individuals who have self-efficacy have characteristics; individuals set high targets for themselves and do difficult tasks, like and develop themselves in the presence of challenges, have high self-motivation, try to achieve targets that have been made and remain persistent despite encountering obstacles. Individuals who have high self-efficacy do not wait to set a goal, even though they are full of challenges.

2. Optimism is a way of interpreting events as self-inflicted, persistent and can occur in various situations; and interpret negative events as something that occurs due to external things, is temporary and occurs only in certain situations. Individuals with high optimism will be able to feel the cognitive and emotional implications of getting success.

3. Hope is a state of positive motivation based on the interaction process between agency (energy to achieve goals) and pathways (planning to achieve goals). Agency or willpower is a cognitive condition or thinking condition in which individuals are able to set realistic but challenging goals and expectations and try to achieve these goals with self-determination, energy and perceptions of internal control. While the pathway or waypower is a condition where individuals are able to find alternative steps to achieve the desired goals when facing obstacles in the initial step application.

4. Resilience is the ability to bounce back or bounce back from difficulties, conflicts, failures, even on positive events, progress and increased responsibility. Defines resilience as a phenomenon characterized by a positive adaptation pattern in the context of difficult and risky situations. Specifically, individuals can identify their cognitive abilities, temperament, positive perceptions of themselves, a positive outlook on life, emotional stability, self-regulation, sense of humor and attractiveness including attractiveness as potential assets so that they can contribute to a higher level of resilience which explains that Resiliency depends on two factors, namely resilience assets and resilience risk. .

Fombrun (1996) and Luthans, et al (2007), stated that external factors that can influence PsyCap in the context of industrial organization include:

a. Organizational images. Employees are an important factor that fosters a sense of pride in organizational members, creating an organizational image is relevant and significant in the eyes of shareholders, not only nationally but also internationally. Efforts are made to increase employee images through product brands or brands of companies or organizations that have credibility. This builds the positive psychological condition of employees towards the organization.

b. Employee expectations and optimism can influence perceptions of the organization. In such a positive perspective, PsyCap can lead individuals to encourage their development of what they do today to be able to make what they will get in the future. Furthermore, Fombrun explained that employee expectations and optimism can influence perceptions of the organization.

c. The company's reputation is able to influence the PsyCap component of employee candidates in making initial decisions about choosing a job and deciding to work for a company, the majority of workers prefer large and multinational companies to work for. The company's reputation will affect the employees' sense of pride in the company. The company's reputation is able to influence the PsyCap component of employees in making initial decisions about choosing jobs and deciding to work for a company.

This study uses PsyCap aspects from the theory of Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007), namely: self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience, because these aspects are in accordance with field conditions.

Employee Engagement. Development Dimensions International (DDI), employee engagement is the extent to which employees enjoy and believe in what they do and feel valued when they do it. The Gallup Organization. Employee engagement is involvement with and enthusiasm for work. Hewitt Associates. Emlpoyee engagement is a condition where there is an emotional and intellectual commitment to an organization or group to produce behavior that will help fulfill the organization's promises to customers so that it will improve business results. Then engaged employees are: say, stay and strive.

Factors affecting employee engagement. Many studies have tried to identify the factors that lead to employee engagement and develop models for implications for organizations with the aim of finding out the drivers that will increase strong employee engagement. The factors forming employee engagement are expressed by Mc Bain (2007) and Development Dimensions International (DDI) (in Wellins, et al., 2008), namely: organization, management and leadership, working life, individual personal characteristics, leadership that is different from others and strategies with organizational systems. The factors that influence employee engagement will be different in each type of job and organization. In general, McBain (in Margareth & Saragih, 2008) explains that there are 3 (three) main factors that drive employee engagement, namely:

a. Organization. Organizational matters that can drive employee engagement are organizational culture, vision and values adopted, organizational brand. The organizational culture in question is an organizational culture that has openness and a supportive attitude as well as good communication between colleagues. Fairness and trust as organizational values also have a positive impact on the creation of employee engagement. These things will provide perceptions for employees when they get support from the leadership and the organization.

b. Management and Leadership. Engagement is built through a process, it takes a long time and a high commitment from the leader. In creating employee engagement, organizational leaders are expected to have several skills. Some of them are communication techniques, techniques for providing feedback and performance appraisal techniques. These things become a way for managers to create employee engagement so that these are specifically referred to as drivers of employee engagement.

c. Working life. The comfort of working environment conditions triggers employee engagement. There are several working conditions that are expected to create employees engagement. First, a work environment that has procedural and distributive justice. This happens because employees who have the perception that if they receive procedural and distributive justice will be fair to the organization by building deeper emotional ties to the organization. Second, the work environment that involves employees in decision making. This condition affects employees psychologically, because employees think that the organization needs and respects employees. This makes employees more attached to the organization. Third, organizations that pay attention to the balance of work life and employees' families. In many studies, it is explained that when conflicts between work and family occur, employees will tend to decide to leave work.

Decision Wise Inc (2007) states that there are 3 (three) factors that can affect employee engagement, namely:

a. Motivation This situation is created when employees have autonomy in acting, have clear goals, get   feedback and have clear rules and tasks about what to do.
b. Satisfaction This situation can be created when employees are given opportunities to develop, there is openness, a safe work environment and positive support in building relationships with colleagues.
c. Effectiveness. This situation can be created when employees have a clear direction of communication, work conformity with their competencies, access to the needs needed and the authority to make decisions.

Benefits of Employee Engagement Watson Wyatt Wordwide's (2007) study of the Human Capital Index study shows consistent results from year to year. Companies that made improvements to certain HR practices were successful in achieving business returns of up to (47%). Human resource management practices that can contribute significantly to the performance of the business include: staffing, performance management, development and leadership management. In this study, the aspects of employee engagement that are used as references are: say, stay and strive as stated by Hewitt (2005).

METHODOLOGY

The hypothesis in this study involved exogenous variables, namely organizational images, PsyCap as the mediator variable and the endogenous variable was employee engagement. The operational definition of each variable:

1. Employee engagement is a form of attachment and involvement with the full enthusiasm of employees in their organization, both emotionally, cognitively and physically. Employee engagement is measured by employee engagement scale based on employee engagement aspects from Hewitt (Hewitt Associates 2005), namely: Say, Stay and Strive. The blueprint for employee engagement scale is as in table 1 below:

Table. 1
Blue Print Scala Employee Engagement

	Aspec	Indicator	Item Number		Total
			Favourable	Unfavourable	Item
1.	Say	a. Speak positively	1, 3	2, 4	**4**
		b. Communicative	5, 7	6, 8	**4**
2.	Strive	a. Extra performance	9, 11	10, 12	**4**
		b. Contribution	13, 16	14, 15	**4**
3.	Stay	a. Loyalty	17, 19	18, 20	**4**
		b. Management Support	21, 23	22, 24	**4**
	Total		**12**	**12**	
24					

Respondents are asked to provide an assessment of each item / question according to themselves in the value range of one (1) which is the lowest value that reflects the lowest weight given by the respondent of an item / question until the number five (5) is the highest value that reflects the highest weight that is assigned to it. given

the respondent to an item / question. The data obtained is through measurements with a semantic differential scale model.

2. PsyCap is a psychological condition that optimizes the psychological potential of an individual. PsyCap is measured using the PsyCap Questionare (PCQ) attitude scale developed by Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007) whose aspects are: self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience. The PsyCap instrument in this study was constructed by the author based on PsyCap aspects from Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007). The Psycap scale blueprint is as shown in the table 2. below:

Table. 2
Blue Print Scala PsyCap

| | Aspec | Indicator | Item Number | | Total |
			Favourable	Unfavourable	Item
1	*Self Efficacy*	a. Ability to carry out tasks	1, 3	2, 4	**4**
		b. Task success	5, 7	6, 8	**4**
2	*Optimism*	a. Positive future	9, 11	10, 12	**4**
		b. Appreciation of the present	13, 15	14, 16	**4**
3	*Hope*	a *Pathways*	17, 19	18, 20	**4**
		b. *Agency*	21, 23	22, 24	**4**
4	*Resilence*	a. Awareness for rise up	25, 27	26, 28	**4**
		b. Talents, skills	29, 31	30, 32	**4**
	Total		**16**	**16**	**32**

Respondents are asked to provide an assessment of each item / question according to themselves in the value range of one (1) which is the lowest value that reflects the lowest weight given by the respondent of an item / question until the number five (5) is the highest value that reflects the highest weight that is assigned to it. given the respondent to an item / question. The data obtained is through measurements with a semantic differential scale model.

3. Organizational images are employees' beliefs and feelings of pride about the organization. Organizational images are measured by the scale of organization images based on aspects of organizational images from Hoyet, (2008); Cable and Graham (2004); Fombrum (1996), namely; corporate reputation, brand products, corporate social responsibility and corporate identity. The organizational images scale in this study was constructed by the writer based on the organizational images aspects of Harrison (1995); Walsh et al. (2008). Blue print on Organizational scale as in the table 3 below :

Table 3.
Blue Print Scala Organizational Images

	Aspect	Indicator	Item Number		Total Item
			Favourable	*Unfavourable*	
1.	*Reputation*	a. Public Trust	1, 3	2, 4	**4**
		b. appreciation	5, 7	6, 8	**4**
2.	*Brand Product*	a. Quality products	9, 11	10, 12	**4**
		b. Product innovation	13, 15	14, 16	**4**
3.	CSR	a. Support issues social	17, 19	18, 20	**4**
		b. To be responsible on the environment	21, 23	22, 24	**4**
4.	*Corporate Identity*	a. Vision / Mission of the Organization and Leadershi	25, 27	26, 28	**4**
		b. Standardization management / value	29, 31	30, 32	**4**
	Total		**16**	**16**	**32**

Respondents are asked to provide an assessment of each item / question according to themselves in the value range of one (1) which is the lowest value that reflects the lowest weight given by the respondent of an item / question until the number five (5) is the highest value that reflects the highest weight that is assigned to it. given the respondent to an item / question. The data obtained is through measurements with a semantic differential scale model.

In testing the validity and reliability of the research instrument using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to determine the validity of the construct (construct validity) and construct reliability (construct reliability). The main purpose of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is used to determine the strength of each item in measuring what it wants to measure (Kerlinger, 1986). If the observed variable indicators measuring the same construct show good convergent validity, if the level of intercorrelation between these indicators is indicated to be strong or moderate. The construct is said to be valid if the factor loading value is ≥ 0.50, and the construct reliability is seen from the construct reliability value, if the value is ≥ 0.70, then the construct is declared reliable. Whereas discriminant validity means that a construct is able to calculate more variance from a number of indicators related to measurement compared to measurement error.

FINDINGS

The research data collection was carried out on operational employees in the Jakarta area, the research data consisted of primary data obtained using instruments from researchers. The research data were analyzed using the Structural Equation Model (SEM) (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2008). Two-step confirmatory factor data analysis (2nd CFA) was carried out for estimation based on the statistical goodness of fit (GoF) resulting from the analysis of the variables studied (Wijanto, 2008). The 2nd Order CFA analysis shown, namely items that have a factor loading value above 0.50 and items that have a factor loading value below 0.50 are aborted. (Sharma, 1996; Ferdinand, 2000). The final recapitulation of the 2nd Order CFA analysis of the research variables:

1. Organizational Images. The test of the 2nd Order CFA analysis for the organizational images scale in the final results displays indicators with a loading factor value above 0.50. The reputation indicator is represented by 4 items, while the brand product indicator is represented by 4 items, the corporate social responsibility indicator has 4 items and the corporate identity indicator is represented by 5 items with a loading factor above 0.50.

Table. 4

Reliability Test Scala Organizational Images

Indicator	Standar Loading λ	λ^2	Measurament Error (1- λ^2)	CR	VE
O1	0.73	0.53	0.47		
O3	0.73	0.53	0.47		
O5	0.62	0.38	0.62		
O7	0.60	0.36	0.64		
O9	0.72	0.52	0.48		
O11	0.75	0.56	0.44		
O13	0.71	0.50	0.50		
O15	0.70	0.49	0.51	0.95	0.55
O17	0.63	0.40	0.60		
O19	0.82	0.67	0.33		
O21	0.73	0.53	0.47		
O23	0.69	0.48	0.23		
O25	0.77	0.59	0.35		
O26	0.52	0.27	0.07		
O27	0.66	0.44	0.19		
O29	0.67	0.45	0.20		
O31	0.52	0.27	0.07		
λ	11.57	7.98	6.63		

The suitability of the variables in the results of the 2nd Order CFA test can be seen the value of goodness of fit (GoF). Based on the test with the 2nd Order CFA, it is known that the standard loading factor is ≥ 0.50, so the validity is good. In the reliability measurement with the calculation results, the Construct Reliability value is 0.95, with the standard set CR ≥ 0.70 and Variance Extract 0.55, with the VE standard ≤ 0.50, thus it is concluded that the reliability of the organizational images construct has been fulfilled and can be accepted. The results of the organizational images scale reliability test can be seen in the table 4.

2. PsyCap. The test of the 2nd Order CFA analysis for the psychological capital scale in the final results displays indicators with a loading factor value above 0.50. The self-efficacy indicator is represented by 4 items with a loading value variation above 0.50, while the optimism indicator is represented by 5 items, the hope indicator has 4 items and the resilence indicator is represented by 2 items with a loading factor above 0.50. The suitability of variables in the results of the 2nd Order CFA test can be seen the value of Goodness of fit (GoF). Reliability measurement to determine the reliability of the items on each indicator and the variance of the extract, the results of the Psychological Capital scale reliability test can be seen in table 5 below :

Table. 5
Reliability Test Scala Psycohological Capital

| Idicator | Standar Loading | | Measurament Error (1- | CR | VE |
	Ʌ	Ʌ²	Ʌ²)		
PC1	0.68	0.46	0.54		
PC3	0.64	0.41	0.59		
PC5	0.75	0.56	0.44		
PC7	0.64	0.41	0.59		
PC9	0.66	0.44	0.56		
PC10	0.57	0.32	0.68		
PC11	0.67	0.45	0.55		
PC13	0.66	0.44	0.56	0.93	0.48
PC15	0.71	0.50	0.50		
PC17	0.63	0.40	0.60		
PC21	0.62	0.38	0.62		
PC23	0.64	0.41	0.17		
PC24	0.58	0.34	0.11		
PC26	0.55	0.30	0.09		
PC27	0.65	0.42	0.18		
Ʌ	9.65	6.25	6.78		

The calculation results obtained that the Construct Reliability value was 0.93, with the standard set by CR is ≥ 0.70 and the result of Variance Extract is 0.48, with the VE standard being ≥ 0.50, thus it can be concluded that the reliability of the psychological capital construct has been met even though the Variance Extract value is < 0.50. Hatcher in Longino (2007) explains that the variance extracted test is conservative, so that the VE value < 0.50 can be accepted.

3. Employee engagement. The test of the 2nd Order CFA analysis for employee engagement scale in the final results displays indicators with a loading factor value above 0.50, namely; the say indicator is represented by 4 items with a loading value variation above 0.50, while the stay indicator is represented by 4 items and the strive indicator has 5 items with a loading factor above 0.50. The goodness of fit structural model of employee engagement has met the standard GoF value is ≥ 90 which means good (fit) (Santoso, 2016).). The next step is measuring the reliability to determine the reliability of the items of each indicator and the variance of the extract. The results of the calculation showed that the construct reliability value was 0.90, with the standard set by CR is ≥ 0.70 and Variance Extract 0.42, with the VE standard being ≥ 0.50 (Kusnendi, 2008), thus it can be concluded that the reliability of the employee engagement construct has been met, even though the Variance value Extract < 0.50. Hatcher (in Longino, 2007) explains that the variance extracted test is conservative, so that the VE value > 0.50 can be accepted. Employee engagement scale reliability test results can be seen in the table 6 :

Table. 6
Reliability Test Scala Employee Engagement

Indicator	Standar Loading Λ	Λ²	Measurament Error (1-Λ²)	CR	VE
E1	0.64	0.41	0.59		
E2	0.58	0.34	0.66		
E3	0.56	0.31	0.69		
E7	0.51	0.26	0.74		
E9	0.52	0.27	0.73		
E11	0.69	0.48	0.52		
E13	0.75	0.56	0.44	0.90	0.42
E16	0.63	0.40	0.60		
E17	0.51	0.26	0.74		
E18	0.62	0.38	0.62		
E20	0.8	0.64	0.36		
E22	0.63	0.40	0.16		
E23	0.51	0.26	0.07		
Λ	7.95	4.97	6.92		

CONCLUSION

From the results of research and testing of empiric data between variables, namely the influence of organizational images on employee engagement with PsyCap as a positive and significant mediator variable, with a coefficient $Λ = 0.15$ (t count $5.14 > 1.96$). The results of this study provide a perspective that psychological capital has a significant and positive effect on employee engagement. Psychological capital as the psychological condition of employees referred to in this study is influenced by various individual social environmental situations, including employee perceptions of the organization or called organizational images, and influences the employees' PsyCap to be emotionally, physically and cognitively tied to the organization called engagement.

DISCUSSION

Organizational images are an inseparable part of how employees perceive and describe organizational forms and are able to change the way individuals think to have a sense of pride in the organization. In this study, it was proven that there is a significant influence related to employee images that affect their psychological condition and this can be a psychological construction of employees to interpret them in the form of behavior. The psychological impact that the organization's images have on employees is able to change the psychological condition of employees which is known as individual psychological capital, to do various things related to activities and activities in the context of industrial organizations.

Maintaining positive organizational images of the organization in the minds of employees, able to generate employee understanding that the organization is a good place to work, arouse feelings of pride in employees, proud of their work, proud of the

company's products and proud of how the organization runs its business. Good Organizational Images are a powerful tool, to foster employee emotional attachment, to engage with the organization in the form of thoughts, emotions and behavior. Thus the image of the organization is one of the most important assets of an organization that should be continuously built and maintained from time to time (Moorman, et al., 1998)

REFERENCES

Alifahmi & Hifni. (2008). Marketing communication orchestra: harmonization of advertising, promotion and marketing public relations. Bandung: Examedia Publishing

Avey, J. B., Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M., (2006) The additive value of positive psychological capital in predicting work attitudes and behaviors. Leadership Institute Faculty Publications. Paper 6.

Bravo, R, Montaner, T., & Pina, JM, (2009), "The role of bank image for customers versus Brown, SP, (1995)," The moderating effects of in-supplier / out-supplier status an organizational buyer attitudes ", Journal of JAMS, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 170-181.

Dowling, G. (1988), "Measuring corporate images: a review of alternative approaches", Journal of Business Research, Vol. 17, pp. 27-34.

Fombrun, C. (1996), Reputation (organizational); Realizing value from the corporate image, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Harrison, S. (1995). Public relations an introduction. Routledge.

Hatch, M.J., Schultz, M., & Williamson, J. (2003), "Bringing the corporation into corporate branding", European Journal of Marketing, Vol. 37 No. 7/8, pp. 1041-64.

Hewitt Associates (2004). Employee engagement at double-digit growth companies, Research Brief.

Joreskog, M. J., & Sorbom, D. (2008). LISREL 8.72: Users reference guide. Scientific Software International Inc.

Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2004). Positive psychological capital: beyond human and social capital. Business Horizons 47/1, 45- 50.

Luthans F, Avolio B, Walumbwa F, & Li W. (2005). The psychological capital of Chinese workers: Exploring the relationship with performance. Management and Organization Review, 1, 247–269. (253).

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological capital: The human competitive edge. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

McBain, R. (2007). The practice of engagement research into current employee engagement practice. Journal of HR Strategic Review, Vol. 6, No. 6.

Moorman, R. H., Blakely, G. R., & Niehoff, B. P. (1998). Does perceived organizational support mediate the relationship between procedural justice and organizational citizenship behavior? The Academy of Management Journal, 41 (3), 351-357.

Nguyen, N., & LeBlanc, G. (1998), "The mediating role of corporate image on customers' retention decisions: an investigation in financial services", International Journal of Bank Marketing, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 52-65.

Kerlinger, R.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Keller, K.L. (1993), "Conceptualizing, measuring and managing customer-based brand equity", Journal of Marketing, Vol. 57, January, pp. 1-22.

Van Riel, C.B.M., & Balmer, J.M.T. (1997), "Corporate identity: the concept, its measurement and management", European journal of marketing, Vol. 31 Nos 5/6, pp. 340-55.

alsh, Vincent-Wayne, Mitchell, Paul, R., Jackson, Sharon, E., & Betty. (2008). Examining the antecedents and consequences of corporate reputation: a customer perspective. British Journal of Management. Vol *: 1-17.

Wellins, R. S., Bernthal., & Phelps, M. (2008). Employee engagement: The key to realizing competitive advantange. Development Dimensions International (DDI) Inc.

Watson Wyatt Worldwide. (2007). Employee engagement and talent management. [Online] Available: www.watsonwyatt.com. (March 23, 2015)