

# Engaged Workforce And The Unexplored Link Between The Social Responsibility Score

Durdana Ovais

**Abstract:** The primary objective of this research paper is to establish the relation between two variables namely employee engagement & corporate social responsibility. Literature review established the fact that employee engagement and the perception towards CSR activities are interrelated. The research centers around affective engagement and its relationship between different dimensions of CSR. The empirical study is based on the data collected from the white collar workers of M.P. India. The outcome of the research establishes the fact that, employee engagement is significantly correlated with perception of organizational CSR activities. The results prove that employee engagement significantly and positively impacts CSR. But the research study rejected the hypothesis that Employee Engagement has a higher impact on organizations directly undertaking CSR activities.

**Index Terms:** Corporate Social Responsibility, Employee Engagement, Stakeholders, Employee Perception, Manufacturing organizations, M.P, White Collar workers..

## 1 INTRODUCTION

An interesting trend that is seen in the business environment is the enhanced focus on the corporate social responsibility score. While organizations are investing a lot to gain a positive CSR perception of all its stakeholders. It's the employees who are its internal stakeholders and also one of the most important to influence the other stakeholders. For quite long the HR managers have worked on the concept of employee engagement within their organization. While CSR activities when harnessed do lead to employee engagement, it is also important to test whether engaged employees have a positive and significant relationship with the CSR score. One of the first and most recognizable definitions of engagement is provided by Kahn [1] and it suggests that personal engagement can be defined as: "the harnessing of organization members' selves to their work roles; as such in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance". Maslach [2] in his study has stated that "engagement is characterized by energy, involvement, and efficacy", the direct opposite of the three burnout dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and ineffectiveness. The study conducted by Schaufeli [3] had also presented work engagement as a contrastive concept to burnout, they define work engagement "as a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption". They had also stated in their research that engagement is not a momentary and specific state, but it is "a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior" [3]. Managers agree that modern business demands higher productivity and more efficiency, than in previous times. Companies are trying to increase their performance in order to place their company ahead of the competitors. Sanchez and McCauley in their research had mentioned that at some point, satisfied employees who were contented with their work experience, was a good formula for success, as it was believed that satisfied employee, who wanted to stay with a company will contribute to the workforce stability and productivity [4]. But those times have changed. Nowadays, the business environment is global and competitive and simply satisfied and stable employees are not enough to bring necessary business results. Satisfied employees may just meet the work demands, but this will not lead to higher performance as has been mentioned in the study of Abraham [5]. Bakker and Leiter in their study suggested that in order to

compete effectively, employers need to go beyond satisfaction - employers must do their best to inspire their employees to apply their full potential and capabilities to their work, if they do not, part of the valuable employees' resources remains unavailable for the company [6]. Therefore, modern organizations expect their employees to be full of enthusiasm and show initiative at work, they want them to take responsibility for their own development, strive for high quality and performance, be energetic and dedicated to what they do – in other words companies want their employees be engaged [6]. Other researchers are also of the view that employee engagement is the best tool in the company's efforts to gain competitive advantages and stay competitive [7]. Therefore, the construct of employee engagement has been an area of interest among many researchers and consultancy firms, and received its recognition in the management literature and among practitioners [8].

## 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Studies by a number of researchers prove that employee engagement supports organizational performance and success (Harter et al., 2002; Salanova et al. 2005)[9] [10]. As literature claims that the outcomes of employee engagement are exactly what most organizations are looking for, there is no surprise in corporate executives seeing the development of the engagement of employees as a priority for organization (Ketter, 2008,) [11]. However, in his book "The New Rules of Engagement", Johnson wrote "the ability to engage employees, to make them work with our business, is going to be one of the greatest organizational battles of the coming 10 years" (Sange and Srivasatava, 2012)[12]. CEOs worldwide see employee engagement as one of the top five most important challenges for management. Employee engagement is an important employee performance and organization management topic. The importance of this topic is proven by its positive consequences for the organization and employees - "Work engagement is a positive experience in itself" (Schaufeli et al., 2002)[3]. Almost all major consultancy firms state that there is a connection between employee engagement and profitability increase through higher productivity, increased sales, customer satisfaction and employee retention (Bakker and Leiter, 2010)[13]. In academic circles, positive consequences on work engagement are also associated with customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover (Harter et al., 2002) [9], positive work attitudes, individual health, extra-role behaviors

and performance (Schaufeli and Salanova, 2007)[13]. Therefore, scholars have recently begun exploring the CSR–engagement relationship, with studies finding a positive and significant relationship between CSR and employee engagement [15] [16] . Yet, as mentioned in the study by Galvas in 2016 little is known about why how, and when employees are engaged by CSR [17] . This view is also supported by [10] [1] and [9]models, as they all agree that for engagement or absorption to occur, employees need the physical, emotional and psychological resources to successfully perform their work; – without this, employees eventually disengage. Evidence from a number of studies supports the relation between employee engagement and organizational outcomes. Studies have shown that employee engagement have a positive influence on the following organizational performance indicators: customer satisfaction [9] [18] [19], productivity [9] [20] [3], profit[9] [20] [3] [21], employee turnover [9] [22] [23] and safety[9]. Through their study, these researchers concluded that increasing employee engagement and building an environment that helps to foster employee engagement, can significantly increase the companies' chances of success in their business. Harter et al.'s in their findings mentioned that employee engagement could be a predictor of organizational success, as it seems to have the potential to affect employee retention, employee loyalty and productivity, with some link to customer satisfaction, which results a company's business outcomes , this has been supported by the studies of other researchers, [10], [13] [24] [23] [9] . But not everyone totally agrees with the idea that employee engagement boosts business results. For example, Balain and Sparrow suggest that the link between employee engagement and organizational performance is not so strong[25]. Alternatively they suggest that there is a reverse connection between organizational performance and employees' attitudes, so when the organizational performance indexes are high it evokes positive attitudes among workers. In her research of six public organizations, Sonnentag [26] found that a high level of engagement helps employees "in taking initiative and pursuing learning goals". Engaged employees develop new knowledge, respond to opportunities, go the extra mile as has been mentioned by other researches [27] [14] moreover engaged employees support the company, and engage themselves in mentoring and volunteering. In addition Schaufeli and Salanova mentioned , engaged employees are more satisfied with their job and are more committed to the organization [14], they have the urge to meet challenging goals, and they have the urge to succeed. Engaged employees do not hold back, they not only have more energy, but they also enthusiastically apply their energy at work.

### 3 RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H1: There is significant level of employee engagement in manufacturing organisations.

H2: Employee Engagement significantly and positively impacts CSR.

H3: Employee Engagement has a higher impact on organisations directly undertaking CSR activities.

### 4 METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The descriptive research centers around the manufacturing organizations. The basis for primary data was the industrial units of Bhopal M.P. A sample of 451 responses was

collected with a response rate of 56 percent from manufacturing organisations. Established scales were used for the study. For listing the perception of CSR activities of the organisation scale developed by Turker 2009 [28] was used and for analysing employee engagement the scale as developed by Schaufeli et al. (2002) [3] was used. The CSR scale was having 20 items and Employee engagement scale was having 5 items. Using a survey research design interrelationship was explored between employee engagement and corporate social responsibility activities of the organisations. The sampling technique involved in the study is non-probability judgment sampling and convenience sampling. Mean score and standard deviation were analysed for the items. The highest mean score recorded was for CSR perception towards employees and Employee Engagement and the lowest mean score was observed for Customers. And the highest Standard Deviation was recorded for Employee Engagement. The data was also checked for Skewness and kurtosis which were found to be within limits the results of which are given in table 1. Reliability analysis was undertaken for corporate social responsibility score and employee engagement score. Cronbach alpha came a 0.832 of 19 items for CSR activities and 0.910 for 5 items of employee engagement score. After factor analysis the total number of item were reduced to 22 and the total reliability score received was 0.903 the results of which are given in table 2. Kaiser, Mayer and Olkin's Test of sampling adequacy was also undertaken to analyse the whether further analysis could be undertaken the results came significant with a statistics of 0.850 as shown in table 3.

**Table 1**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

|                     | Mean         | Std. Deviation | Skewness  | Kurtosis  |
|---------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|
|                     | Statistic    | Statistic      | Statistic | Statistic |
| NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | 12.15        | 1.47           | -.488     | -.301     |
| SOCIETY             | 16.24        | 2.06           | -.512     | -.301     |
| CUSTOMERS           | 8.37         | 1.20           | -.951     | -.301     |
| SHAREHOLDERS        | 11.46        | 1.87           | -.031     | -.301     |
| EMPLOYEES           | <b>20.41</b> | 2.56           | -1.118    | -.301     |
| TOTAL CSR           | 68.62        | 6.79           | -.449     | -.301     |
| EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT | 20.42        | 3.02           | -1.363    | -.301     |

**Table 2**

#### Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .903             | 22         |

Table 3

KMO and Bartlett's Test

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | .850     |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Approx. Chi-Square | 5095.477 |
| Df   | 231      |
| Sig.   | .000     |

Table 4

Rotated Component Matrix<sup>a</sup>

|      | Component |      |      |      |      |
|------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
|      | 1         | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    |
| NE1  |           | .407 |      |      |      |
| NE2  |           | .543 |      |      |      |
| NE3  |           | .593 |      |      |      |
| SO1  |           |      | .723 |      |      |
| SO2  |           |      | .777 |      |      |
| SO3  |           |      | .796 |      |      |
| SO4  |           |      | .514 |      |      |
| CUS1 |           |      |      |      | .835 |
| CUS2 |           |      |      |      | .706 |
| SHA1 |           |      |      | .757 |      |
| SHA2 |           |      |      | .826 |      |
| SHA3 |           |      |      | .825 |      |
| EM2  |           | .576 |      |      |      |
| EM3  |           | .712 |      |      |      |
| EM4  |           | .778 |      |      |      |
| EM5  |           | .740 |      |      |      |
| EM6  |           | .583 |      |      |      |
| EE1  | .831      |      |      |      |      |
| EE2  | .816      |      |      |      |      |
| EE3  | .822      |      |      |      |      |
| EE4  | .808      |      |      |      |      |
| EE5  | .838      |      |      |      |      |

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.  
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.  
 a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Principal component analysis was employed for extracting factors through Varimax Rotation Method with Kaiser Normalization for CSR variable. All factor loadings are greater than 0.40 are considered for further analysis. The table above shows factors along with % of variance and factor loading items. The Five factors together accounted to explain 64.46 % of the variance explained. Total Variance Explained shows all the factors extractable from the analysis along with their Eigen values, the percent of variance attributable to each factor, and the cumulative variance of the factor. Here first factor accounts for 17.72 % of the variance, the second 15.72 % , and third factor accounted for 11.56% of variance, fourth factor accounts for 10.36% and fifth factor accounts for 9.10% of variance. The component matrix table below shows the loadings of the 22 variables on the 5 factors extracted. The loadings in the component matrix help to understand the contribution of a particular factor that is the higher the

absolute value of the loading in the component matrix, the more the factor contributes to the variable. Rotated component matrix shows further reduced number of variables as shown in table number 4. Of the three items removed which were having loadings less than 0.40, one item related to natural environment which was coded as NE4 corresponding to the statement of:-Company supports NGOs working in public welfare areas. The second item related to CSR perception towards customers which was coded as CUS 3 corresponding:- Company voluntarily cooperates with the government to solve the social problem. The last item which received less than 0.04 loading was of CSR perception towards employees which was coded as EM1, corresponding to the statement :- Our company encourages its employees to participate to the voluntarily activities.

Table 5

Correlation Analysis between CSR sub constructs and Employee Engagement

|                     | Natural Environment | Society | Customers | Shareholders | Employees | Employee Engagement |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------|-----------|--------------|-----------|---------------------|
| Natural Environment | 1                   |         |           |              |           |                     |
| Society             | .548**              | 1       |           |              |           |                     |
| Customers           | .373**              | .500**  | 1         |              |           |                     |
| Shareholders        | .379**              | .392**  | .458**    | 1            |           |                     |
| Employees           | .597**              | .529**  | .449**    | .398**       | 1         |                     |
| Employee Engagement | .259**              | .414**  | .521**    | .361**       | .366**    | 1                   |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation analysis shows a strong and positive relationship between employee engagement and CSR dimensions of Natural environment, Society, Customers, Shareholders and Employees. Among these the highest correlation was found amongst employee engagement and perception of CSR activities towards customers, followed by Employee engagement and CSR perception towards Society. The least positive correlation was found amongst employee engagement and natural environment.

H1: There is significant level of employee engagement manufacturing organisations.

**Table 6**

Test Statistics

|             | EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT  |
|-------------|----------------------|
| Chi-Square  | 545.585 <sup>a</sup> |
| df          | 11                   |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000                 |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 37.6.

To analyse hypothesis one that there is significant level of employee engagement in manufacturing organisations chi-square test was undertaken the result of which came as significant with chi-square statistics as 545.585 and degree of freedom as 11.

H2: Employee Engagement significantly and positively impacts CSR.

**Table 7**

Test Statistics

|             | CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY | EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT  |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Chi-Square  | 307.387 <sup>a</sup>            | 545.585 <sup>b</sup> |
| Df          | 32                              | 11                   |
| Asymp. Sig. | .000                            | .000                 |

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 13.6.

b. 0 cells (.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 37.6.

To analyse hypothesis two that there is significant level of employee engagement in manufacturing organisations chi-square test was undertaken the result of which came as significant with chi-square statistics as 545.585 and degree of freedom as 11.

**Table 8**

| Variables | R                 | Adjusted R Square | F       | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| CSR       | .499 <sup>a</sup> | .248              | 148.892 | 1.327                       | .499                      | 12.202 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT  
b. Dependent Variable: CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The above table shows the result when CSR is regressed on employee engagement. The perception regarding CSR activities of the organisations are the dependent variable and perception regarding employee engagement is the independent variable. Regression analysis confirms that there

exists positive relationship between them. The value of R<sup>2</sup> is 0.249. That is 24.9% of the outlook towards CSR activities is determined by employee engagement. The table indicates that the model is significant as the p value is 0.000. The F value and significance confirm that the relationship is significant at 0.05 level and not just accidental.

H3: Employee Engagement has a higher impact on organisations directly undertaking CSR activities.

**Table 9**

| Variables | R                 | Adjusted R Square | F       | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| CSR       | .437 <sup>a</sup> | .189              | 67.922  | .205                        | .437                      | 8.241  | .000 |
| NON-CSR   | .674 <sup>b</sup> | .451              | 132.656 | .247                        | .674                      | 11.518 | .000 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT  
b. Dependent Variable: CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The above table shows the result when CSR is regressed on employee engagement of those organizations who are directly undertaking CSR activities like CSR projects and those organizations who are not directly undertaking CSR activities but giving the money to the PM National relief fund. The perception regarding CSR activities of the organisations are the dependent variable and perception regarding employee engagement is the independent variable. Regression analysis confirms that there exists positive relationship between them. The value of R<sup>2</sup> is 0.189 for those organizations which are directly undertaking CSR activities and .451 for those organization who are undertaking CSR activities indirectly. That is 18.9% of the outlook towards CSR activities is determined by employee engagement in organization directly undertaking CSR activities whereas 45.1% of the outlook towards CSR activities is determined by employee engagement in organization indirectly undertaking CSR activities. The table indicates that the model is significant as the p value is 0.000. The F value and significance confirm that the relationship is significant at 0.05 level and not just accidental.

## 5 DISCUSSIONS

Preliminary analysis was conducted for the variables under study. This included the required test to check conditions necessary to conducted regression analysis. The data did not show any violation of the conditions required. Descriptive analysis checked for the skewness and kurtosis which were found to be with the set parameters. Though established scales were used still reliability analysis were conducted to reaffirm their applicability in the given research area. The result was .903 of reliability was observed for the 22 items. Sampling adequacy test assured of the sample size The KMO measure of sampling adequacy showed 0.850. Factor analysis was conducted. The research results established that employee engagement is significantly correlated with perception of organizational CSR activities. The outcome also proves that employee engagement significantly and positively impacts CSR perception and Employee Engagement has a higher impact on organizations directly undertaking CSR activities. Correlation analysis was undertaken to check the relationship between different dimensions of CSR perception and affective employee engagement. It was found that the highest correlation was found amongst Employee

engagement and CSR perception towards Customers. Indicating that serving the customers better is the key for the organizations. This may also indicate that the basis objection of the organization comes first for the employees through the satisfaction of customers. The least score were received by the correlation between employee engagement and the perception towards natural environment. If we analyze the correlation table the highest correlation is found amongst employee engagement and Customers, then Society, then between employee engagement and Employees, Shareholders and then Natural environment. This could be taken as an important indication of the preferences of the employees and the CSR projects can be undertaken likewise by the organizations. For Hypothesis one chi square test was undertaken to check the level of employee engagement in the selected organizations. In order to test the second Hypothesis regression analysis was undertaken where CSR perception was the dependent variable and Employee Engagement was the independent variable. The value of R<sup>2</sup> was observed as 0.249 that is the perception of CSR activities explained 24.9% of variance in the level of employee engagement which is significant as indicated by the F- value of 148.892 in the model summary table 7. For Hypothesis three two dependent variables entered the regression model and explained for 18.9% of variance in the outlook towards CSR by employee engagement in organization directly undertaking CSR activities whereas 45.1% of the outlook towards CSR activities is determined by employee engagement in organization indirectly undertaking CSR activities. as such Hypothesis 1 and hypothesis was held accepted by hypothesis 3 was rejected based on the findings. The results showed that greater variance is found in outlook towards CSR perception of organizations who are not directly undertaking CSR activities. which leads to another crucial question that is doing business the right way the most important thing to have a better CSR score. If the internal and most crucial stakeholders view this who are in turn a part of the society, will it be the voice of the society.

## REFERENCES

- [1] by Kahn (1990) [1]
- [2] Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B. and Leiter, M.P. (2001), "Job burnout", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 52, pp. 397-422.
- [3] Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A.B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout and: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- [4] Sanchez, P. & McCauley, D. (2006). Measuring and managing engagement in a cross cultural workforce: New insights for global companies. *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 26(1), pp. 41-50.
- [5] Abraham, S., 2012. Development of Employee Engagement Programme on the basis of Employee Satisfaction Survey. *Journal of Economic Development, Management, IT, Finance and Marketing*, 4(1), pp. 27-37
- [12] Sange. R. & Srivasatava. R.K. (2012) "Employee Engagement and Mentoring: An Empirical Study of Sales Professionals", *Synergy*, 10(1), 37-50. Kahn, W.A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- [6] Bakker, A.B. and Leiter M.P., (2010). *Work engagement: a handbook of essential theory and research*. New York, NY: Psychology Press
- [7] Rashid, H.A., Asad, A. and Ashraf, M.M., (2011). Factors Persuading Employee Engagement and Linkage of EE to Personal & Organizational Performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(5), pp. 98-108.
- [8] Ologbo, C.A. and Saudah, S., (2011). Engaging People who Drive Execution and Organizational Performance. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 3(3), pp. 569-575.
- [9] Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 268-279.
- [10] Salanova, M., Agut, S. & Peiro, J.M. (2003). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227.
- [11] Ketter, P. (2008). What's the big deal about employee engagement? *T+D*, 62(2), 44-49.
- [13] Bakker, A.B. and Demerouti, E. (2007), "The job demands resources model: state-of-the-art", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 309-28
- Bakker, A.B. and Leiter M.P., (2010). *Work engagement: a handbook of essential theory and research*. New York, NY: Psychology Press
- [14] Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2007). Work engagement: an emerging psychological and its implications for organizations. In S. W. Gilliland, D. D. Steiner, & D. P. Skarlicki (Eds.), *Research in Social Issues in Management (Volume 5): Managing Social and Ethical Issues in Organizations*. (pp. 135-177). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.
- [15] Glavas A., Piderit S. K. (2009). How does doing good matter? Effects of corporate citizenship on employees. *J. Corporate Citizenship*
- [16] Caligiuri P., Mencia A., Jiang K. (2013). Win-win-win: the influence of company-sponsored volunteerism programs on employees, NGOs, and business units. *Pers. Psychol.* 66 825-860. 10.1111/peps.12019
- [17] Glavas A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and organizational psychology: an integrative review. *Front. Psychol.* 7:144 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00144
- [18] Towers Perrin (2003), *Working Today: Understanding What Drives Employee Engagement*, Towers Perrin HR Services
- [19] Heintzman R, Marson B (2006), People, service and trust: links in the public sector service value chain, Canadian Government Executive, [www.hrmagr.gc.ca/veo-be/publications/atricle\\_e.asp](http://www.hrmagr.gc.ca/veo-be/publications/atricle_e.asp)
- [20] Salanova, M., Agut, S., and Peiro, J. M. 2003. Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: The mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1217-1227.
- [21] Markos, S and Sridevi, M.S (2010) "Employee Engagement: The Key to Improving Performance", *International Journal of Business and Management* Vol. 5, No.12, pp.89-97

- [22] Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293315.
- [23] Hallberg and Schaufeli (2006), Hallberg, U. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, 11, 119127.
- [24] Hakanen et al. (2006) Hakanen, J., Bakker, A.B. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43, 495513.
- [25] Balain S, Sparrow P (2009), *Engaged to Perform: A new perspective on employee engagement: Executive Summary*, Lancaster University Management School
- [26] Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: A new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
- [27] Lockwood, T. (2007). Design Value: A Framework for Measurement. Volume 18, Issue 4 Pages 90–97
- [28] Turker 2009 ,Measuring corporate social responsibility: A scale development study, *Journal of Business Research*, 85 (2009), pp. 411-427

Model Summary

| Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .499 <sup>a</sup> | .249     | .248              | 6.98148                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

| Model |            | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1     | Regression | 7257.143       | 1   | 7257.143    | 148.892 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|       | Residual   | 21835.988      | 448 | 48.741      |         |                   |
|       | Total      | 29093.131      | 449 |             |         |                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

b. Dependent Variable: CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model |                     | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       |                     | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant)          | 53.731                      | 2.245      |                           | 23.937 | .000 |
|       | EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT | 1.327                       | .109       | .499                      | 12.202 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Table 1  
Model Summary

| CSR     | Model | R                 | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---------|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| CSR     | 1     | .437 <sup>a</sup> | .191     | .189              | 6.53739                    |
| NON-CSR | 1     | .674 <sup>a</sup> | .455     | .451              | 4.34400                    |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

ANOVA<sup>b</sup>

| CSR     | Model |            | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F       | Sig.              |
|---------|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| CSR     | 1     | Regression | 2902.805       | 1   | 2902.805    | 67.922  | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|         |       | Residual   | 12265.658      | 287 | 42.737      |         |                   |
|         |       | Total      | 15168.464      | 288 |             |         |                   |
| NON-CSR | 1     | Regression | 2503.263       | 1   | 2503.263    | 132.656 | .000 <sup>a</sup> |
|         |       | Residual   | 3000.377       | 159 | 18.870      |         |                   |
|         |       | Total      | 5503.640       | 160 |             |         |                   |

a. Predictors: (Constant), EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

b. Dependent Variable: CORPORATERESPONSIBILITY

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| CSR     | Model |                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|---------|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|         |       |                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |        |      |
| CSR     | 1     | (Constant)               | 6.045                       | 1.725      |                           | 3.504  | .001 |
|         |       | CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY | .205                        | .025       | .437                      | 8.241  | .000 |
| NON-CSR | 1     | (Constant)               | 4.021                       | 1.466      |                           | 2.744  | .007 |
|         |       | CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY | .247                        | .021       | .674                      | 11.518 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT