The Role of Gender as a Moderator Linking Corporate Social Responsibility Perception to Employees Engagement: A Study in the Services Sector of Thailand

Samanan Rattanasirivilai
Graduate School, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand
E-mail: samanan.ra@ssru.ac.th

Sudawan Somjai
Graduate School, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, Thailand
E-mail: sudawan.so@ssru.ac.th

Direk Deeprasert
Command and General Staff College, Thailand
E-mail: direk23@hotmail.com

Article History
Received: 19 February 2021 **Revised:** 25 February 2021 **Published:** 27 February 2021

Abstract
Although there is an empirical evidence to support that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has significant impact on the behavior of employees, not much empirical research has been done, particularly in Thailand. The aim of this research is therefore to bridge the gap by examining the relationship between employee perceptions of CSR and employee engagement in the Thai context. Furthermore, the current study also considers the important role of gender difference with regards to perceptions of CSR and employee engagement. Employees working in various sectors in Thailand (i.e., banking, telecommunications and healthcare sector) were selected for data collection. The process of data collection was done in 2 phases. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to the participants out of which 379 questionnaires were obtained for final data analysis. For the examination of hypotheses, partial least squares structural equation modelling was used. The findings have shown that perceptions of corporate social responsibility have a positive and significant influence on employee engagement. Additionally, the role of gender as moderator in the relationship between corporate social responsibility and employee engagement was also examined. Findings indicated that the relationship between corporate social responsibility and male is stronger than female. This research examines corporate social responsibility importance in the development of positive attitudinal outcomes for employees and recommends that corporate social responsibility should be incorporated as much as possible into businesses.
Keywords: Employee Engagement, Gender, Corporate Social Responsibility, Services Sector, Thailand

Introduction
Over the years, corporate social responsibility (CSR) has become an area of concern for the organizations. They faced a number of challenges, such as ever changing market dynamics, constantly changing technologies and well-educated customers, who paid more attention not only to their respective stakeholders, but also to economic, social and environmental concerns

(Shao et al., 2018). The organization's employees continually inquire about the importance of their work, and failure to respond to them may make it difficult for the organizations to retain and obtain services of their productive employees (Moorthy et al., 2017). Moreover, corporate social responsibility is acknowledged and considered in different areas, including marketing, management and business ethics studies (Afsar, Cheema, & Javed, 2019; Jamali & Karam, 2018).

Nevertheless, previous studies have focused primarily on performance, strategies, marketing and customer behaviour, ignoring the fundamental principles of human resource management (HRM) and organizations. Regardless of this, the employees buy-in was found to be an important factor while coping with corporate social responsibility (Davies & Crane, 2010). Failure to understand the impact of corporate social responsibility on employees attitudes and behaviours would eventually lead to false assumptions and mislead scholars about CSR effectiveness and usage (Al-bdour, Nasruddin, & Lin, 2010). There is a dearth of both theoretical and empirical studies that explore the formation of those factors that lead to and deviate from employee engagement (EE) (Chaudhary, 2017b; Shao et al., 2018). Only a few models conceptualize the consequences of such factors. The aim of the current study is to better understand the possible factors of EE by emphasizing the important role corporate social responsibility. Gallup (2017) has researched that only 15 percent of employees are highly engaged at their respective jobs throughout the world, 67 percent not engaged and 18 percent highly disengaged.

Similarly, Gallup's study shows statistical findings that Malysia services sector employee engagement rates are small in Southeast Asian countries. In this case, the figure shows that only 15 percent of Thai employees remain engaged and 76 percent actively disengaged (Gallup, 2017). This has become an important organizational issue. Disengagement of employees, and reduced productivity in the United States of America results in an economic loss of approximate 550 billion $ US annually (Glavas, 2016). Likewise, employee's disengagement may even become a social concern because they spend a large part of their day at workplace, and if the results are ineffective, it may have a negative impact on the employees' wellbeing (Shao et al., 2018). For instance, CSR was found to be an effective type of employee engagement in Walmart, an organization that has faced criticism because of its unsafe working environment (Aguinis & Glavas, 2013). The personal sustainability plan was a program designed to provide employees with at least one major modification that they thought could change in their work and lives in order to improve sustainability. Eventually, more than 500,000 employees participated in corporate social responsibility initiatives, offering more than 35,000 advanced solutions to support the organization and the world. Therefore, scholars are starting to investigate the relationship between CSR and EE and previous empirical findings revealed a significant and positive correlation between CRS and employee engagement (Gupta, 2017; Tsourvakas & Yfantidou, 2018).

Nevertheless, there is not much evidence about when, why and how employees are engaged by corporate social responsibility (Glavas, 2016), specifically in Asian countries, such as Thailand. Thus, this research aims to examine the association between CSR and employee engagement. Furthermore, a question of interest is does corporate social responsibility acts as antecedent of employee engagement? Turner and Tajfel (2004) argued that there is a need for people to be categorized into social groups, from which they can gain a portion of their status. This idea helps in explaining employee's feelings and behaviors. As a result, CSR will contribute to employee engagement as a shared goal. In addition, when an organization invests to finalize new work relations with its shareholders, they become somewhat effective (Lindgreen & Swaen, 2010) since employees' being a shareholders examine, identify, assess, and respond to corporate social responsibility initiatives.

Furthermore, Turban and Greening (2000) stated that the difference in gender was influential in shaping a person's attitude and values. However, consideration must be given to the gender difference in the association between CSR and employee engagement. The remaining part of this research paper is structured as follows: The following section addresses the literature review of CRS and EE, followed by the development of hypotheses. Further, methodology portion explains the measurement scales and methods employed in this research that falls after the formulation of the hypotheses. Next is the result section, where the outcomes of partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) are shown. Finally, this study discussed the findings and their suggestions.

Literature Review

Corporate Social Responsibility

Many scientific fields have studied corporate social responsibility and there are various ways to define it. CSR is referred to as an organization's evaluation and activities to resolve problems beyond its economic, technological and lawful limits to assist and achieve its financial benefits in the environment and society where it works (Afsar et al., 2019; González-Rodríguez, Martín-Samper, Köseoglu, & Okumus, 2019). "European Commission on Communities" (2001) summarized corporate social responsibility as a way of thinking in which companies actively develop environmental and social problems into their business activities and relations with shareholders. Lee and Kotler (2005) defined CSR as the desire and willingness to improve a community's wellbeing by providing corporate services and business policies. More simply, it can be said that these policies and practices are actively adopted by business firms to bring about positive changes for many shareholders in terms of society and environment. Past literature have explained the external advantages of corporate social responsibility (Farooq, Rupp, & Farooq, 2017; Hawn & Ioannou, 2016). For example, Waheed and Yang (2019) found an indirect positive relationship between corporate social responsibility and the profitability of a firm. For example, Waheed and Yang (2019) found an indirect positive relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability of a firm. In addition, organizations are expected to use a multi-stakeholders approaches in stakeholders theory rather than relying on the conventional idea of a single stakeholder (Wang, Hsieh, & Sarkis, 2018).

In the same way, many important potential benefits of corporate social responsibility for the organization have been proven. CSR can therefore affect the self-esteem, commitment, training, motivation and faithfulness of employees (Chen & Lee, 2018). In line with the current study, Waddock and Graves (1997) argued that supporting and recognizing the efforts made by their employees in terms of engagement and profitability is advantageous for organizations participated in CSR activities. The researcher also mentioned the link between better financial results and increased employee's productivity. Peterson (2004) explained that a positive correlation exists between engagement and employee's perceptions about corporate social responsibility, particularly where personal interests of the employees are consistent with the ethics and values of the organization.

Employee Engagement

The engagement of workers is regarded as an essential aspect of occupational safety

The level of dedication, effort and devotion of employees to their work related activities is known as employee engagement (Chaudhary, 2017a). The important component of work place wellbeing is employee engagement (Jena, Pradhan, & Panigrahy, 2018). A study of the literature on this term have shown that majority of employee engagement concepts are derived from the psychology theories and organizational behaviour. According to Kahn (1990, p. 694) employee engagement is referred to as, "the harnessing of organisation members' selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances".

Similarly, Roberts and David (2017) explained employee engagement as having a psychological existence. In contrast, a consultancy firm, "The Institute of Employment Studies" which emphases on HR problems, claimed to be engagement to the positive attitudes and organizational standards that employees in the organization have adopted. The reciprocal relation between the employer and the employee, as these are the key drivers of EE, should be developed in order to enhance employee engagement of organizations in the context of career development, effective communication, promotion, work life balance, job satisfaction, incentives, team work and working conditions (Robinson, 2010). Since employee engagement is used in combination with job involvement and employee commitment, many people usually confuse employee engagement with these terms because their definitions are identical (Macey & Schneider, 2008).

However, given the optimistic work attitude of these three concepts, there is a significant conceptual distinction between employee engagement, job involvement and employee commitment. Job involvement encompasses the notion that work will meet life needs and desires and explains the cognitive and psychological dimensions of work (Kanungo, 1979). Employee engagement, on the other hand, explores the behavioral and emotional facets of work and emphasizes on the shared beliefs and objectives of the organization and its employees. Nevertheless, in the current research, the definition by Kahn (1990) is adopted since it gives a precise description in general which includes the physical, emotional and cognitive dimensions of employee engagement. Employees who are well-engaged understand the goals and values of the organization, and thus can execute their jobs remarkably while working together with their colleagues for the development of the organization.

Development of Hypothesis

Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement: The literature review on the corporate social responsibility have shown various research patterns. The first aspect centered on the effect of the CSR on an organization's financial performance (Hou, 2019). Afterwards, research focused on non-financial performance, like organizational identity (Lamond, Dwyer, Arendt, & Brettel, 2010), consumer loyalty (Pérez & Del Bosque, 2015b), corporate image (Balmer, Powell, Elving, Pomering, & Johnson, 2009) and organizational attraction to new comers (Wang, Tong, Takeuchi, & George, 2016). Nevertheless, research in developing countries like Thailand is limited in terms of HRM at individual level, that includes employee behaviour. While research on corporate social responsibility in the context of HRM are still in its infancy, a number of researches in this field have been conducted over the period of time. Few studies showed that the relationship between CSR and EE is significant and positive (Al Amri, Das, & Ben-Ayed, 2019; Ilkhanizadeh & Karatepe, 2017). Soni and Mehta (2020) found that understanding corporate social responsibility initiatives affects employee engagement level. Likewise, a positive and significant relationship between CSR and employee engagement has also been shown by Caligiuri, Mencin, and Jiang (2013), who also managed to prove that an association between project meaningfulness, social support, access to resources for employee engagement.

Similarly, Glavas (2012) said that there is a positive correlation between CSR and employee engagement because people share common values and beliefs and demonstrate a high degree of significance at work. CSR helps organizations not only to conduct beyond what has been stated in the value statement, but also to turn it into reality. This makes it easier for employees to take on the real values of the organization, as illustrates in previous researches where a positive relationship was established between corporate social responsibility and acceptance of the values of the organization by its potential employees (Jones Christensen, Mackey, & Whetten, 2014). Corporate social responsibility can also serve as a guide to enabling workers to become more important at workplace. For example, Dekas, Rosso, and Wrzesniewski (2010)

proposed that organizations must use corporate social responsibility as a means of inspiring workers to accomplish an important goal.

Furthermore, Mahmood, Aftab-Ud-din, and Fan (2019) suggested that if workers are aware of the greater good that their performance leads to, they feel better about themselves, which in turn enhances their self-concept, and become more aware of the identity of organization. Even though there is a lack of research examining the CSR and EE relationship, the possible correlation between the two can be clarified with other studies with similar hypotheses. In one of these previous studies, a nomological web of employee engagement was developed, in which two concepts related to employee engagement were found to be job satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. In past corporate social responsibility studies, a significant and positive correlation was found between corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction (Valentine & Fleischman, 2008). The relationship between CSR and EE is therefore believed to exist in recent studies. Nevertheless, no research has been done that investigated the factors affecting the CSR-EE link in Thailand. As a result, current research seeks to address the said relationship by exploring the role of gender difference in employee engagement that is based on the perceptions that employees have about CSR. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: Employees perceptions of corporate social responsibility has a positive influence on employee engagement.

Influence of gender difference in the relationship between corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: According to Turban and Greening (2000), gender difference plays an important role in shaping individual attitudes and values. Consequently, consideration of the influence of gender difference in the CSR-EE relationship is important. Gender-socialization approach suggests that gender affects the morals of individuals (Calabrese, Costa, & Rosati, 2016). Conflicting opinions were seen in prevailing research on the influence of gender difference on the perceptions and expectations of CSR. Previous research has revealed that, compared to males, females are more socially responsible and therefore place greater emphasis on activities and issues related to CSR (Yasser, Al Mamun, & Ahmed, 2017). Uduji, Okolo-Obasi, and Asongu (2019) found in their research that females showed a great deal of interest in corporate social responsibility, while males focused on providing training in the organization. This shows that female focus more on unrestricted practice and behaviour, while men place more emphasis on economic and instrumental problems.

As a result, it can be assumed that females are more subtle to workplace ethical and moral standards compared to males. In comparison, past empirical studies revealed that the same CSR and moral behavior exists for both genders (Pérez & del Bosque, 2015a). In addition, cultural difference may affect the behaviour of people and it is therefore also necessary to examine the effect of cultural difference on perceptions of CSR in Thai context. Bases on the above arguments, we proposed the following hypothesis:

H2: Gender as a moderator in the relationship between corporate social responsibility and EE will be higher in males than females.

Research Methodology

The authors used a structured questionnaire to collect data. Responses of the participants were obtained from services sector experts working in banking, telecommunications and healthcare sectors located in different cities of Thailand. The process of data collection was done in 2 phases for avoiding common method bias. Items regarding employee's perceptions of corporate social responsibility were distributed between employees in the first phase; and then, after a period of one month, the remaining items (i.e., employee engagement) of the questionnaire were circulated among employees in the same departments as in the previous period. A total of 500 questionnaires were distributed to the participants out of which 410 questionnaires were returned. 23 questionnaires were discarded due to incomplete information.

After treating missing values and detection of outliers 379 questionnaires were obtained for final data analysis with a response rate of 75.8 percent.

Measurement Scales

Employee engagement scale with three dimensions "physical, emotional and cognitive" with a total of 18-items were adopted from Rich, Lepine, and Crawford (2010) and a single measure of global item was used to check the convergent validity (redundancy analysis) of the reflective-formative construct (i.e., employee engagement) as suggested Hair Jr, Hult, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2017). Employee engagement is a higher order reflective-formative construct with three dimensions (i.e., physical, emotional and cognitive) (Khosa, Ishaq, & Kamil, 2020a, 2020b; Lianto, Eliyana, & Fauzan, 2018), Each dimension contains six (6) items . The items were rated on a 5-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 to 5 (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The total score average has presented the overall picture of employee engagement definition of Kahn 1990, where higher score indicates higher engagement. The sample items of physical engagement are "I work with intensity on my job" and "I exert my full effort to my job". Similarly, sample items of emotional engagement are "am enthusiastic in my job" and "I feel energetic at my job". Likewise, sample items of cognitive engagement are "At work, my mind is focused on my job" and "At work, I pay a lot of attention to my job" For the measurement of employee perceptions of corporate social responsibility, a 6 items scale was adopted from Yfantidou and Tsourvakas (2018) The six items assess the perceptions of employees about the efforts made by their organization towards corporate social responsibility by analyzing if they are contented and support the corporate social responsibility programs of the organization (Yfantidou & Tsourvakas, 2018). A sample item of CSR is "I believe that my company is trying to reduce its environmental impact."

Research Findings

For the analysis of the research model, the most widespread statistical software, Smart PLS 3.0 was used by conducting partial least squares structural equation modelling (PLS-SEM) (Ringle, Becker, & Wende, 2015). In management and marketing research, PLS-SEM is widely utilized (Farrukh, Sajid, Zreen, & Khalid, 2019; Ramesh, Saha, Goswami, & Dahiya, 2019). In addition, when the theoretical basis for a subject is limited, the PLS-SEM technique is appropriate. PLS-SEM is a suitable approach for the exploratory research (Hair, Henseler, Dijkstra, & Sarstedt, 2014). We employed disjoint two stage approach by Becker, Klein, and Wetzels (2012). In Becker's two stage approach, higher order construct needs two additional steps: measurement model stage one for lower order components and measurement model stage two for higher order construct which shows the association between higher order construct and lower order components.

Measurement Model

In stage one, we connected exogenous latent construct (i.e., corporate social responsibility) with the lower order components of endogenous latent construct EE (i.e., physical, cognitive and emotional). In measurement model, the first stage which is reflective is assessment through item reliability, convergent validity (CV), construct reliability (CR), convergent validity and discriminant validity as suggested by Hair Jr et al. (2017).

Every item's reliability is measured by examination of factors loadings that has a threshold value of 0.708. In the present analysis, all the items of the reflective constructs ranges between 0.711 to 0.905 and have achieved the threshold value (Table 1) as suggested by (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Composite reliability was then used for measuring construct reliability. The composite reliability should be 0.7 or greater (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) to be considered sufficient. In this analysis, the CR values of all the latent variables were between 0.885 to 0.912 which met the threshold criterion (0.70), hence, CR is confirmed. Construct validity was measured using average variance extracted (AVE). All the constructs have exceeded the AVE threshold

value 0.50 as proposed by Hair Jr et al. (2017) indicating that the variables have satisfactory levels of convergent validity. Hair Jr, Sarstedt, Cheah, Becker, and Ringle (2019) notes that researchers have overlooked the lower order components variance inflation factor (VIF) values in the reflective-formative types of latent variables. The present study reported VIF values of the lower order components as suggested by Hair Jr et al. (2019). In addition, the analysis also provided the values of VIF of lower order components between 1.552 and 3.884 that were less the threshold value of 5 (Hair Jr et al., 2017) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Measurement Model Loadings, CR, AVE and VIF

Higher order constructs	**Lower order constructs (Reflective)**	**Indicators**	**Loadings**	**CR**	**AVE**	**VIF**
	Corporate social responsibility	CSR1	0.766	0.885	0.562	1.976
		CSR2	0.711			1.669
		CSR3	0.723			1.552
		CSR4	0.727			1.593
		CSR5	0.746			1.778
		CSR6	0.819			2.156
Employee Engagement (Formative)						
	Physical engagement	PE1	0.780	0.938	0.716	2.151
		PE2	0.859			3.129
		PE3	0.905			3.884
		PE4	0.896			3.724
		PE5	0.850			3.497
		PE6	0.777			2.354
	Emotional engagement	EE1	0.741	0.912	0.635	1.828
		EE2	0.763			1.999
		EE3	0.863			2.520
		EE4	0.831			2.335
		EE5	0.797			2.172
		EE6	0.790			2.287
	Cognitive engagement	CE1	0.808	0.917	0.649	2.387
		CE2	0.873			3.957
		CE3	0.859			3.564
		CE4	0.722			1.899
		CE5	0.794			2.453
		CE6	0.769			2.165

Discriminant validity is the extent of the difference between items of different constructs. The discriminant validity can also be assessed by checking the values of Heterotrait-Monotrait ratio (HTMT) correlation In this research, the HTMT criterion by Henseler, Ringle, and Sarstedt (2015) was used for the assessment of discriminant validity. The discriminant validity by using a value less than 0.85 is to test the associations of constructs that quantify different phenomena (Kline, 2015). The results of the study have successfully met the threshold value of 0.85 as suggested by (Kline, 2015).

Table 2: Discriminant Validity (HTMT Criterion)

Constructs	CSR	EC	EE	EP
CSR				
EC	0.334			
EE	0.344	0.587		
EP	0.357	0.613	0.540	

Measurement Model Second Stage

After the establishment of measures, according to Chin (2010), the next stage involved testing higher-order constructs as indicated in the structural model. Higher-order constructs commonly incorporate two layers of components (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2013). Accordingly, the present study hypothesized to evaluate employee engagement as higher order reflective-formative construct, since employee engagement comprised of three dimensions (physical, emotional and cognitive). The findings clearly confirm the validity of the reflective/formative measurement model. Three steps are involved in assessing reflective formative measures: (1) test for convergent validity (redundancy analysis) (2) testing collinearity (VIF) and (3) assessing of weights and t values (Ramayah, Cheah, Chuah, Ting, & Memon, 2018).

The redundancy analysis is achieved through an established scale or a global single item (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Here the path coefficient value should be above the threshold value of 0.70 to support the convergent validity of the construct (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Next, high relationship between formative construct is known as collinearity (Hair Jr, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2014). In PLS-SEM, collinearity is assessed through (VIF) variance inflation factor (Ramayah et al., 2018). The collinearity expected threshold value is less than 5. The last stage assessed the weights and t values of formative construct (i.e., employee engagement). If the t values result more than 1.645 retain the construct indicator, even if the outer weights are none significant keep the indicator in the construct (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Table 3 has presented results of measurement (outer) model stage two of formative measure (i.e., employee engagement).

Table 3 Measurement model of second stage (formative)

Construct	Items	Convergent Validity	Weights	VIF	t-Values	P-values
Employee Engagement	EP		0.420	1.566	7.737	0.000
	EE	0.709	0.400	1.507	5.784	0.000
	EC		0.390	1.658	6.986	0.000

Structural Model

We evaluated the path coefficient significance using the structural model in the second phase of the measuring model. For the assessment of proposed hypotheses, Smart PLS was used. A bootstrapping technique with 5000 resamples was used to test the significance of path coefficient (Hair Jr et al., 2017). The result of the structural path coefficient (beta value = 0.379, t value = 6.501), thus supported the hypothesis H1. As displayed in figure 2 and Table 4, the t-value was above the threshold value of 1.645; therefore, supported the hypothesis H1.

Table 4 Direct Hypotheses

Path Relationships	B values	SD	T values	Results
CSR -> Employee engagement	0.379	0.058	6.501	Supported

For testing the influence of gender as a moderator in the relationship between CSR and EE, an approach called "multigroup analysis" (MGA) was used (Hair Jr et al., 2017). In addition, measurement invariance needs to be evaluated before performing MGA. As per the recommendations of Henseler, Hubona, and Ray (2016), composite model process three steps measurement invariance was run that comprises of the calculation of "compositional invariance, configural invariance, and scale invariance". There was no significance in the difference of factor loadings between both the groups, hence establishing configural invariance. Likewise, even compositional and scalar invariances have been confirmed. A significant difference in perceptions of CSR and employee engagement between men and women have been shown in results of both PLS-MGA and permutation test. Hence, H2 is confirmed. Findings of MGA are displayed in Table 5. The outcomes of the current research enable an advanced comprehension of gender roles in employee perception of CSR and engagement.

Table 5 Moderation Test

Path	Male	Female	β difference	Henseler's MGA analysis (p value)	Permutation analysis (p value)	Decision
CSR -> Engagement	0.472	0.249	0.223	0.016	0.025	Supported

Conclusion and Discussion

Findings revealed that a positive association between employees' perceptions of corporate social responsibility and employee engagement. This is consistent with the results of past research (Yfantidou & Tsourvakas, 2018). Findings of this research suggest that employees in Thailand are ready to work beyond their limits if they feel that their effect on the society is positive. Since employee engagement is generally described as dedication and loyalty applied to an individual's employment (Peterson, 2004) and is closely correlated with the feelings of self-importance, it is reasonable to believe that workers are proud to be known as part of organizations having a good image. In addition, gender played the role of a moderator in the relation between CSR and EE. Empirical evidence suggests that the relationship between CSR and male is stronger than females. This is contradictory to the findings of a number of previous studies where it was found that positive concerns toward CSR were displayed more in women than in men (Brammer, Millington, & Rayton, 2007; Peterson, 2004). On the other hand, the findings of this study contradict those researches where there was no evidence of a gender difference in attitudes and behaviours at work (Calabrese et al., 2016). Such variations in the finding may be due to various cultural backgrounds and the level of financial growth of the country where the research was carried out.

According to the results of the study, it is suggested to managers of those companies where there are many female employees to put more emphasis on CSR. CSR can therefore be used as a method to maintain skilled workers, women in particular (Brammer et al., 2007). Given the theoretical contributions, incorporating CSR to the full potential in business strategies is essential. In most cases, CSR initiatives are run by a company department which emphasizes the extra-role of CSR behaviors such as volunteering, recycling, etc. in contrast to this approach, two methods must be used for incorporating CSR into the job of an employee. In order for CSR to be closely linked to its policies, goods and services, it should first incorporate the organization as a whole (Aguinis & Glavas, 2013). It is fairly unusual to see, but most of the organizations have been able to incorporate CSR in some way.

The second is the bottom-up method, where workers are motivated to integrate CSR principles into their personal employment via job crafting concepts. The findings indicate that, according to personal opinion, the CSR needs be adjusted. Generally, there is a blanket strategy for

executing CSR in an organization. Given the results of the research, CSR is a feature that can have a very profound influence on people. CSR has the ability to affect a person's true values. The company could also take advantage of the newly energized labor force. Gallup (2017) study reveals that employees from 142 countries, only 15 percent of the workers were engaged in their job activities. In fact, the researchers recommend that companies that have the potential to engage their workers might pursue an additional benefit. In short it can be assumed that the employee is the one who gains the most. If CSR can be viewed as a way to improve the wellbeing of other workers, then encouraging employees to gain wellbeing through work, which tends to take a significant amount of time, is a CSR accomplishment.

Limitations

There are a few limitations in the current research. Firstly, we accept that there is no significant "cause and effect" relation between the constructs used in this cross-sectional study. So, longitudinal methodology for the collection of data is advised for future research. Secondly, this research used gender difference as a tool to elucidate the relationship between corporate social responsibility and employee engagement; however, it is possible that the perception of CSR differs from one employee to other. Thus, for understanding the link between CSR and EE, it is essential to include dispositional characteristics and personality traits. Finally, in order to improve the generalizability of the results, future research on various cultural backgrounds should be performed.

References

Afsar, B., Cheema, S., & Javed, F. (2019). Employees' corporate social responsibility perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors for the environment: The mediating roles of organizational identification and environmental orientation fit. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 27*(1), 9-21.

Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2013). Embedded versus peripheral corporate social responsibility: Psychological foundations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 6*(4), 314-332.

Al-bdour, A., Nasruddin, E., & Lin, S. (2010). The relationship between internal corporate social responsibility and organizational commitment within the banking sector in Jordan. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 5*(14), 932-951.

Al Amri, F., Das, A., & Ben-Ayed, O. (2019). The impact of perceived corporate social responsibility on employee engagement: The case of Qatar. *Business Strategy & Development, 2*(3), 180-191.

Balmer, J., Powell, S., Elving, W., Pomering, A., & Johnson, L. (2009). Advertising corporate social responsibility initiatives to communicate corporate image. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 14*(4), 420-439.

Becker, J.-M., Klein, K., & Wetzels, M. (2012). Hierarchical latent variable models in PLS-SEM: guidelines for using reflective-formative type models. *Long Range Planning, 45*(5-6), 359-394.

Brammer, S., Millington, A., & Rayton, B. (2007). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to organizational commitment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18*(10), 1701-1719.

Calabrese, A., Costa, R., & Rosati, F. (2016). Gender differences in customer expectations and perceptions of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 116*(1), 135-149.

Caligiuri, P., Mencin, A., & Jiang, K. (2013). Win-win-win: The influence of company-sponsored volunteerism programs on employees, NGOs, and business units. *Personnel Psychology, 66*(4), 825-860.

Chaudhary, R. (2017a). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: can CSR help in redressing the engagement gap? *Social Responsibility Journal, 13*(2), 323-338.

Chaudhary, R. (2017b). Demographic factors, personality and entrepreneurial inclination. *Education+ Training, 59*(2), 171-187.

Chen, L., & Lee, L. (2018). Boosting employee retention through CSR: A configurational analysis. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 25*(5), 948-960.

Chin, W. (2010). How to write up and report PLS analyses. In *Handbook of partial least squares* (pp. 655-690). Berlin: Springer.

Davies, I., & Crane, A. (2010). Corporate social responsibility in small-and medium-size enterprises: investigating employee engagement in fair trade companies. *Business Ethics: A European Review, 19*(2), 126-139.

Dekas, K., Rosso, B., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 30*(1), 91-127.

Farooq, O., Rupp, D., & Farooq, M. (2017). The multiple pathways through which internal and external corporate social responsibility influence organizational identification and multifoci outcomes: The moderating role of cultural and social orientations. *Academy of Management Journal, 60*(3), 954-985.

Farrukh, M., Sajid, M., Zreen, A., & Khalid, R. (2019). Knowledge sharing in higher education institutes. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education, 12*(2), 311-329.

Gallup. (2017). *State of Global Workplace Report*. New York: Gallup.

Glavas, A. (2012). Employee engagement and sustainability: A model for implementing meaningfulness at and in work. *Journal of Corporate Citizenship,* (46), 13-29.

Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*(1), 1-10.

González-Rodríguez, M., Martín-Samper, R., Köseoglu, M., & Okumus, F. (2019). Hotels' corporate social responsibility practices, organizational culture, firm reputation, and performance. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27*(3), 398-419.

Gupta, M. (2017). Corporate social responsibility, employee-company identification, and organizational commitment: Mediation by employee engagement. *Current Psychology, 36*(1), 101-109.

Hair, J., Henseler, J., Dijkstra, T., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). Common beliefs and reality about partial least squares: comments on Rönkkö and Evermann. *Organizational Research Methods, 17*(2), 182-209.

Hair, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning, 46*(2), 1-12.

Hair Jr, J., Hult, G., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. London: Sage Publications.

Hair Jr, J., Hult, G., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Los Angeles: Sage publications.

Hair Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Cheah, J.-H., Becker, J.-M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). How to specify, estimate, and validate higher-order constructs in PLS-SEM. *Australasian Marketing Journal, 27*(3), 197-211.

Hawn, O., & Ioannou, I. (2016). Mind the gap: The interplay between external and internal actions in the case of corporate social responsibility. *Strategic Management Journal, 37*(13), 2569-2588.

Henseler, J., Hubona, G., & Ray, P. (2016). Using PLS path modeling in new technology research: updated guidelines. *Industrial Management & Data Systems, 116*(1), 2-20.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115-135.

Hou, T. (2019). The relationship between corporate social responsibility and sustainable financial performance: Firm-level evidence from Taiwan. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(1), 19-28.

Ilkhanizadeh, S., & Karatepe, O. (2017). An examination of the consequences of corporate social responsibility in the airline industry: Work engagement, career satisfaction, and voice behavior. *Journal of Air Transport Management, 59*(1), 8-17.

Jamali, D., & Karam, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility in developing countries as an emerging field of study. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 20*(1), 32-61.

Jena, L., Pradhan, S., & Panigrahy, N. (2018). Pursuit of organisational trust: Role of employee engagement, psychological well-being and transformational leadership. *Asia Pacific Management Review, 23*(3), 227-234.

Jones Christensen, L., Mackey, A., & Whetten, D. (2014). Taking responsibility for corporate social responsibility: The role of leaders in creating, implementing, sustaining, or avoiding socially responsible firm behaviors. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 28*(2), 164-178.

Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(4), 692-724.

Kanungo, R. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(1), 119-138.

Khosa, M., Ishaq, S., & Kamil, B. (2020a). Antecedents of employee engagement with the mediating effect of occupational stress in the banking sector of pakistan. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research, 2*(1), 63-75.

Khosa, M., Ishaq, S., & Kamil, B. (2020b). Antecedents of employee engagement with the mediation of occupational stress and moderation of co-worker's support in the banking sector of pakistan. *International Journal of Management Studies and Social Science Research 2*(1), 45-58.

Kline, R. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*: Guilford Press.

Lamond, D., Dwyer, R., Arendt, S., & Brettel, M. (2010). Understanding the influence of corporate social responsibility on corporate identity, image, and firm performance. *Management Decision, 48*(10), 1469-1492.

Lee, N., & Kotler, P. (2005). Best of breed: When it comes to gaining a market edge while supporting a social cause,"corporate social marketing" leads the pack. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 11*(3-4), 91-103.

Lianto, L., Eliyana, A., & Fauzan, R. (2018). Enhancing the employee engagement: The mediating role of exchange ideology. *Jurnal Pengurusan, 53*(1), 61 - 71.

Lindgreen, A., & Swaen, V. (2010). Corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 12*(1), 1-7.

Macey, W., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 1*(1), 3-30.

Mahmood, M., Aftab-Ud-din, M., & Fan, L. (2019). Why individual employee engagement matters for team performance? *Team Performance Management: An International Journal, 25*(1/2), 47-68.

Moorthy, K., Na, S., Yee, C., Xian, C., Jin, O., Mun, T., & Shan, W. (2017). Influence of corporate social responsibility in job pursuit intention among prospective employees in Malaysia. *International Journal of Law and Management, 59*(6), 1159-1180.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. (1994). The theory of measurement error. *Psychometric Theory, 3*(1), 209-247.

Pérez, A., & del Bosque, I. (2015a). How customers construct corporate social responsibility images: Testing the moderating role of demographic characteristics. *Business Research Quarterly, 18*(2), 127-141.

Pérez, A., & Del Bosque, I. (2015b). An integrative framework to understand how CSR affects customer loyalty through identification, emotions and satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics, 129*(3), 571-584.

Peterson, D. (2004). The relationship between perceptions of corporate citizenship and organizational commitment. *Business & Society, 43*(3), 296-319.

Ramayah, T., Cheah, J., Chuah, F., Ting, H., & Memon, M. (2018). *Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) using SmartPLS 3.0: An updated and practical guide to statistical analysis.* Singapore: Pearson.

Ramesh, K., Saha, R., Goswami, S., & Dahiya, R. (2019). Consumer's response to CSR activities: Mediating role of brand image and brand attitude. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(2), 377-387.

Rich, B., Lepine, J., & Crawford, E. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(3), 617-635.

Ringle, C., Becker, J., & Wende, S. (2015). SmartPLS 3. Retrieved from https://www.smartpls.com/

Roberts, J., & David, M. (2017). Put down your phone and listen to me: How boss phubbing undermines the psychological conditions necessary for employee engagement. *Computers in Human Behavior, 75*(1), 206-217.

Robinson, P. (2010). Responsible retailing: The practice of CSR in banana plantations in Costa Rica. *Journal of Business Ethics, 91*(2), 279-289.

Shao, R., Rupp, D., Skarlicki, D., Paddock, E., Kim, T., & Nadisic, T. (2018). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: The moderating role of CSR-specific relative autonomy and individualism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(5), 559-579.

Soni, D., & Mehta, P. (2020). Manifestation of Internal CSR on Employee Engagement: Mediating Role of Organizational Trust. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 55*(3), 441-459.

Tsourvakas, G., & Yfantidou, I. (2018). Corporate social responsibility influences employee engagement. *Social Responsibility Journal, 14*(1), 123-137.

Turban, D., & Greening, D. (2000). Corporate social performance as a competitive advantage in attracting a quality workforce. *Business & Society, 39*(3), 254-280.

Turner, J., & Tajfel, H. (2004). The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In J. T. Jost & J. Sidanius (Eds.), *Key readings in social psychology: Political psychology: Key readings* (pp. 276-293). New York: Psychology Press.

Uduji, J. I., Okolo-Obasi, E. N., & Asongu, S. A. (2019). Sustaining cultural tourism through higher female participation in Nigeria: The role of corporate social responsibility in oil host communities. *International Journal of Tourism Research, 22*(1), 120-143.

Valentine, S., & Fleischman, G. (2008). Ethics programs, perceived corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics, 77*(2), 159-172.

Waddock, S., & Graves, S. (1997). The corporate social performance-financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(4), 303-319.

Waheed, A., & Yang, J. (2019). Effect of corporate social responsibility disclosure on firms' sales performance: A perspective of stakeholder engagement and theory. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26*(3), 559-566.

Wang, H., Tong, L., Takeuchi, R., & George, G. (2016). Corporate social responsibility: An overview and new research directions: Thematic issue on corporate social responsibility. In (Vol. 59). New York: Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor.

Wang, Z., Hsieh, T., & Sarkis, J. (2018). CSR performance and the readability of CSR reports: too good to be true? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 25*(1), 66-79.

Yasser, Q., Al Mamun, A., & Ahmed, I. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and gender diversity: insights from Asia Pacific. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 24*(3), 210-221.

Yfantidou, I., & Tsourvakas, G. (2018). Corporate social responsibility influences employee engagement. *Social Responsibility Journal, 14*(1), 123-137.