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Abstract

Introduction

One or two sentences providing a **basic introduction** to the field, comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline. Sample of 707 employees (Age: M = 43.65, SD = 10.08, Females: 38.47%) recruited from different companies in the Czech Republic was used for purpouses of this study. Neuroticism, extraversion, self-efficacy, spirituality, chronic health diseases and frequency of health risk behavior were measured. Higher UWES total score was reported in professional workers, chief workers and in people with higher vocational school or university. The confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) supported the original three-factor solution: χ2 (24) = 75.373; p < 0.001; CFI = 0.999; TLI = 0.999; RMSEA = 0.058; SRMR = 0.021. Measrement equivalence suggested that on configural, metric, scalar and strict level, the UWES assess work engagement invariantly between males and females. The UWES had an excelent internal consistency (α = 0.96, McDonald’s ω = 0.96) and its convergent validity was supported by positive association with extraversion, self-efficacy and by negative association with neuroticism. Logistic regression revealed that higher score in the UWES was associated with lower chance of developing skin diseases and pain of unclear origin. There was no association of the UWES and health risk behaviours such as smoking, alcohol drinking or illegal drug use. Two or three sentences explaining what the **main result** reveals in direct comparison to what was thought to be the case previously, or how the main result adds to previous knowledge.
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Validation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) in the Czech Republic

# Introduction

Based on theoretical assumptions and previous empirical evidence ([Chan, Ho, Ip, & Wong, 2020](#ref-Chan_Ho_Ip_Wong_2020)) we expected significant positive association between self-efficacy and UWES total score (Hypotheses x).

# Methods

## Participants

From the survey (*n* = 1662), we excluded participants being either without work (*n* = 187), pensioners (*n* = 468) or those who did not answer a question regarding economical status (*n* = 223). This resulted in 784 participants. To increase data quality, we removed subjects finishing the survey in a short period of time i.e. < 15 minutes (*n* = 6). The survey typically lasted > 30 minutes. We also excluded respondents answering discrepantly to quality check items (*n* = 71). These items included information about weight, height and age. Tolerance in these control questions was set on 2 kilograms, 2 centimeters, and 2 years respectively. After removal of these subjects, the final number of participants was 707 (Age: *M* = 43.65, *SD* = 10.08, Females: 38.47%).

## Measures

### Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).

### Daily Spiritual Experience Scale (DSES).

Internal consistency of the DSES was excellent: Cronbach’s = 0.96 95% CI[0.95 - 0.97] and McDonald’s = 0.96 95% CI[0.95 - 0.97].

### General Self Efficacy Scale (GSES).

Internal consistency of the GSES was excellent: Cronbach’s = 0.95 95% CI[0.94 - 0.95] and McDonald’s = 0.95 95% CI[0.94 - 0.95].

### Big Five Inventory - Neuroticism subscale (BFI\_N).

Internal consistency of the BFI\_N was good: Cronbach’s = 0.87 95% CI[0.86 - 0.89] and McDonald’s = 0.87 95% CI[0.86 - 0.89].

### Big Five Inventory - Extraversion subscale (BFI\_E).

Internal consistency of the BFI\_E was good: Cronbach’s = 0.85 95% CI[0.84 - 0.87] and McDonald’s = 0.85 95% CI[0.84 - 0.87].

## Data analysis

Inspection of histograms and results of the Mardia test of multivariate skewness and kurtosis indicated that the normality assumption is violated in the UWES items. Moreover, examination of residual plots and result of the Breusch-Pagan test ( = 7.21, *df* = 1, p = 0.007) suggested heteroscedasticity. Thus, methods not requiring parametric assumptions were used. The Little MCAR test provided an evidence that missing values are missing on random. Thus, as there was not a large number of missing values (*n* = 60), incomplete cases were deleted listwise.

The instrument’s factor structure was investigated via Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to test a comprehensive range of models from the literature. We first tested the original correlated three-factor model (Vigor, Dedication, Absorption) and a competing one-factor model (Schaufeli, Bakker, & Salanova, 2006). However, as many studies report strong intercorrelations among the three dimensions, suggesting they may represent a single higher-order construct (Fong & Ng, 2012), we also specified and tested a hierarchical (second-order) model (Domínguez-Salas et al., 2022). Further analyses included tests of alternative two-factor solutions (e.g., Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2012), a partial bi-factor model (de Bruin & Henn, 2013), and several modified three-factor models incorporating correlated error terms (e.g., Simbula et al., 2013). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were first applied to confirm the data’s suitability for factor analysis. Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure together with Bartlett test of sphericity were applied to assess factorability of the UWES data. Five indices were used to inspect model fit: 1) Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA); 2) Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR); 3) chi-square test; 4) Comparative Fit index (CFI) and 5) Tucker-Lewis index (TLI). In the first two indices, values below 0.08 reflects an acceptable fit and below 0.05 a good fit ([Civelek, 2018](#ref-civelek2018essentials); [Hoe, 2008](#ref-hoe_issues_2008); [Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008](#ref-hooper_structural_2008); [Vandenberg & Lance, 2000](#ref-vandenberg_review_2000)). In the last two indices, values above 0.95 suggest an acceptable fit ([Jackson, Gillaspy Jr, & Purc-Stephenson, 2009](#ref-jackson_reporting_2009)) and above 0.97 a good fit ([Schermelleh Engel, Moosbrugger, & Muller, 2003](#ref-schermelleh_engel_evaluating_2003)). Diagonally Weighted Least Squares estimator (DWLS) on polychoric correlation matrix was used to fit CFA models.

The scale reliability was measured by the McDonald’s and also by the Cronbach’s . Convergent validity was inspected by zero order Spearman rank correlations with self-efficacy, neuroticism and with extroversion. Divergent validity was measured by correlation of the UWES with spirituality.

Due to the non-normal distribution of the data, an association between the chronic health illnesses, health risk behaviour and UWES was calculated using logistic regression. In the logistic models, outcome variable was presence of an individual chronic illness or practise of health risk behaviour. The UWES score was set as a predictor. Education and work position were covariates. Both crude and adjusted effect were estimated. The p-values were corrected by Bonferroni correction.

Comparison between socio-demographic groups in the UWES total and subscale score, was performed by Mann–Whitney U test and by Kruskal–Wallis test. For post-hoc testing, Games-Howell and Dunn test were utilized. In these two tests, effect size was reported in Vargha and Delaney ([Vargha & Delan, 2000](#ref-vargha_critique_2000)). The interpretation of the is as follows: small effect (0.56 - 0.64), medium effect (0.64 - 0.71), large effect (> 0.71). All statistical calculations were conducted in R [Version 4.4.1; R Core Team ([2021](#ref-R-base))]. Primary packages used for analysis included: *lavaan* ([Rosseel, 2012](#ref-R-lavaan)), *papaja* ([Aust & Barth, 2020](#ref-R-papaja)) *psych* ([Revelle, 2021](#ref-R-psych)), *usf* ([Peters, 2021](#ref-R-ufs)).

# Results

## Socio-demographic results

Results of the Kruskal-Wallis test followed by the Games-Howell and the Dunn test revealed that there are significant differences in socio-demographic groups in the UWES total and subscale scores: professional workers had significantly higher score in the UWES total and Vigor, Absorption and Dedication subscales scores as compared with workers. Similarly, chief workers reported higher UWES total score and also Dedication and Vigor subscale scores compared with workers (see Table 1). In terms of education, people with higher vocational school or university had significantly higher total and Absorption subscale score as compared with people with non graduation high school or lower education (Table 1). There were not other significant differences between socio-demographic groups. For means and standard deviations of the UWES total and subscale score see online Supplementary table 1.

Table 1  
*Socio-demographic results of the three samples*

| Variables | value | n(%) | UWES\_T | UWES\_D | UWES\_A | UWES\_V |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Work\_position | Worker | 337 (48%) | Professional worker: x2(536)=3.45\*\*, A=0.42 | Professional worker: x2(532) = 3.51\*\*, A = 0.42 | Professional worker: x2(538)=4.02\*\*\*, A=0.41 | Chief worker: x2(156)=3.6\*\*, A=0.39 |
|  | Worker | 337 (48%) | Chief worker: x2(150)=3.85\*\*\*, A=0.38 | Chief worker: x2(144) = 3.57\*\*, A = 0.39 | Chief worker: x2(140)=3.57\*\*, A=0.38 |  |
|  | Professional worker | 227 (32%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Chief worker | 84 (12%) |  |  |  |  |
| Education | Basic school | 22 (3%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Non graduation high school or lower | 266 (38%) | Higher vocational school or University: x2(434)=2.89\*, A=0.35 |  | Higher vocational school or University: x2(426)=3.74\*\*, A=0.34 |  |
|  | High school | 200 (28%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Higher vocational school or University | 219 (31%) |  |  |  |  |
| Family\_status | Not in relationship | 116 (16%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | In relationship | 140 (20%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Married | 324 (46%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Divorced | 116 (16%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Widow/Widower | 11 (2%) |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | Male | 435 (62%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Female | 272 (38%) |  |  |  |  |
| Religiosity | Yes, I am a member of church | 54 (8%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yes, but I am not a member of a church | 144 (20%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | No | 352 (50%) |  |  |  |  |
|  | No, I am convinced atheist | 127 (18%) |  |  |  |  |

Table 2  
*Means and standard deviations of the UWES total and subscale scores*

| Variables | value | UWES\_T: M(SD) | UWES\_A: M(SD) | UWES\_D: M(SD) | UWES\_V: M(SD) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Work\_position | Worker | 37.76 (13.12) | 12.6 (4.54) | 12.7 (4.84) | 12.49 (4.44) |
|  | Professional worker | 41.28 (10.95) | 14.01 (3.76) | 14.0 (4.11) | 13.26 (3.81) |
|  | Chief worker | 43.08 (10.85) | 14.4 (4.04) | 14.6 (4.17) | 14.13 (3.53) |
| Education | Basic school | 33.68 (14.67) | 11.68 (5.23) | 11.1 (5.03) | 10.95 (4.85) |
|  | Non graduation high school or lower | 38.45 (13.16) | 12.77 (4.68) | 13.0 (4.81) | 12.72 (4.42) |
|  | High school | 39.59 (12.32) | 13.2 (4.3) | 13.4 (4.50) | 13 (4.21) |
|  | Higher vocational school or University | 41.73 (10.56) | 14.23 (3.47) | 14.1 (4.21) | 13.43 (3.62) |
| Family\_status | Not in relationship | 36.63 (12.07) | 12.23 (4.34) | 12.4 (4.46) | 12.02 (4.05) |
|  | In relationship | 40.25 (11.79) | 13.8 (4.11) | 13.6 (4.37) | 12.83 (4.1) |
|  | Married | 40.15 (11.98) | 13.54 (4.12) | 13.5 (4.53) | 13.14 (4.03) |
|  | Divorced | 40.29 (13.52) | 13.13 (4.64) | 13.7 (4.95) | 13.47 (4.52) |
|  | Widow/Widower | 45.5 (12.64) | 14.8 (4.87) | 15.2 (4.66) | 15.5 (3.69) |
| Gender | Male | 39.02 (11.83) | 13.11 (4.12) | 13.2 (4.38) | 12.7 (4.07) |
|  | Female | 40.8 (12.94) | 13.7 (4.51) | 13.7 (4.87) | 13.45 (4.25) |
| Religiosity | Yes, I am a member of church | 40.68 (11.1) | 13.56 (3.86) | 13.8 (4.44) | 13.32 (3.64) |
|  | Yes, but I am not a member of a church | 38.59 (12.71) | 13.09 (4.53) | 13.0 (4.65) | 12.52 (4.23) |
|  | No | 40.11 (12.2) | 13.43 (4.23) | 13.5 (4.50) | 13.14 (4.14) |
|  | No, I am convinced atheist | 39.27 (12.51) | 13.21 (4.32) | 13.2 (4.74) | 12.88 (4.29) |

*Note.* SD = standard deviation, M = mean, UWES\_T = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Total score, UWES\_A = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Absorption subscale, UWES\_D = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Dedication subscale, UWES\_V = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Vigor subscale

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis and Construct Validity.

Our investigation into the UWES-9’s factor structure began by confirming the data’s suitability for factor analysis via the Bartlett test ( (36) = 6,322.72, p < .001) and the KMO measure (0.96). With this confirmed, we conducted a series of CFAs to determine the optimal factorial structure for the Czech sample, with results presented in Table 3.

We first discovered that the standard, textbook models—including one-factor, two-factor, hierarchical, and the original correlated three-factor structures—demonstrated poor fit to the data. For instance, the standard three-factor model yielded an RMSEA of 0.12, substantially higher than its dynamically-generated Level-0 cutoff of 0.03, indicating a significant degree of misfit.

This initial finding prompted a more focused investigation into modified three-factor models that could account for local dependencies, such as item wording overlap. Based on the validation literature, we identified two primary candidates for a final, decisive comparison. The first, based on **Domínguez-Salas et al. (2022)**, included correlated errors between items 1 and 2 (Vigor) and items 8 and 9 (Absorption). The second, a more complex model following **Zecca et al. (2015)**, included these same two correlations plus a third between items 3 and 4 (Dedication).

To adjudicate between these two competing models, we performed a scaled chi-square difference test. The test revealed that the additional complexity of the Zecca et al. model offered no significant improvement in fit (*χ²*diff(NA and 1) = NA0.04, *p* = NA0.84). Consequently, based on the principle of parsimony, we selected the simpler model from **Domínguez-Salas et al. (2022)** as the final and best-fitting representation of the data.

An evaluation of this final model revealed an excellent CFI (0.994) and a low SRMR (0.017). However, its RMSEA (0.102) remained higher than its dynamically generated cutoff of 0.036, suggesting that while this structure is superior to all alternatives, it is not a perfect representation of work engagement in this sample.

### Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

Our investigation into the UWES-9’s factor structure began by confirming the data’s suitability for factor analysis via the Bartlett test ( (36) = 6,322.72, p < .001) and the KMO measure (0.96). With this confirmed, we conducted a series of CFAs to determine the optimal factorial structure for the Czech sample, with results presented in Table 3.

We first discovered that the standard, textbook models—including one-factor, two-factor, hierarchical, and the original correlated three-factor structures—demonstrated poor fit to the data. For instance, the standard three-factor model yielded an RMSEA of 0.12, substantially higher than its dynamically-generated Level-0 cutoff of 0.03, indicating a significant degree of misfit.

This initial finding prompted a more focused investigation into modified three-factor models that could account for local dependencies, such as item wording overlap. Based on the validation literature, we identified two primary candidates for a final, decisive comparison. The first, based on **Domínguez-Salas et al. (2022)**, included correlated errors between items 1 and 2 (Vigor) and items 8 and 9 (Absorption). The second, a more complex model following **Zecca et al. (2015)**, included these same two correlations plus a third between items 3 and 4 (Dedication).

To adjudicate between these two competing models, we performed a scaled chi-square difference test. The test revealed that the additional complexity of the Zecca et al. model offered no significant improvement in fit (*χ²*diff(NA and 1) = NA0.04, *p* = NA0.84). Consequently, based on the principle of parsimony, we selected the simpler model from **Domínguez-Salas et al. (2022)** as the final and best-fitting representation of the data.

The fit of this final model produced an excellent CFI (0.994) and a low SRMR (0.017). However, its RMSEA (0.102) remained higher than its dynamically generated cutoff of 0.036, suggesting that while this structure is superior to all alternatives, it is not a perfect representation of work engagement in this sample.

### Item Statistics and Reliability.

Internal consistency for the UWES total score was excellent (Cronbach’s α = 0.96; McDonald’s ωt = 0.96). To assess the reliability of the subscales from the final CFA model, we examined both traditional and model-based indices. Cronbach’s α values were high for Dedication (0.93), Vigor (0.90), and Absorption (0.88). Further supporting this, model-based Composite Reliability (CR) values—which assess the internal consistency of the factor items—were also excellent for Vigor (0.85), Dedication (0.91), and Absorption (0.84), all well above the 0.70 threshold for good reliability.

### Construct Validity Evaluation.

With the best-fitting model established and its reliability confirmed, we next conducted a comprehensive evaluation of its construct validity, starting with its internal properties. We first assessed convergent validity by calculating the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) for each factor. The results for Vigor (0.72), Dedication (0.82), and Absorption (0.69) all comfortably exceeded the 0.50 benchmark, indicating that for each factor, a majority of the variance in its items was captured by the construct itself rather than by measurement error.

Given the high inter-factor correlations (see Figure 1), a stringent test of discriminant validity was necessary to determine if the factors were empirically distinct. We employed the Heterotrait-Monotrait Ratio of Correlations (HTMT) for this purpose, which is a modern and stringent test of the distinctiveness of latent factors. The analysis yielded values of 0.95 (Vigor-Dedication), 0.96 (Vigor-Absorption), and 0.94 (Dedication-Absorption). As all values substantially exceeded the 0.90 threshold, this provided definitive evidence that the factors, while structurally sound, are not internally distinct from one another.

This finding led to our final validity test, where we examined the scale’s relationships with external criteria to see if the subscales behaved differently despite their internal overlap. As shown in Table ??, the UWES scores behaved as expected: the total score and all subscales were positively associated with extroversion and self-efficacy, and negatively associated with neuroticism. For divergent validity, no significant correlation was found with spirituality, with the exception of the Dedication subscale.

To formally test whether the magnitude of these correlations differed across subscales, we used Hittner et al.’s (2003) z-test. The analysis revealed specific differences in the subscales’ external relationships. For example, the correlation between Vigor and extraversion was significantly stronger than that of Absorption and extraversion (*p* = p < .001). In contrast, the difference in their correlations with neuroticism was not always statistically significant (e.g., Vigor vs. Dedication, *p* = p = 0.132; Vigor vs. Absorption, *p* = p < .001).

This provides a complete psychometric picture: The UWES-9 factors are so highly inter-correlated that they fail modern tests of internal discriminant validity (HTMT). However, they retain enough unique variance to exhibit some statistically distinct relationships with key external criteria. For subsequent analyses within this paper where the primary goal is to understand the relationship between *overall* work engagement and other outcomes, a total score remains the most stable and parsimonious measure. We therefore use the total score for our primary analyses, while acknowledging that the subscales may offer nuanced, albeit highly overlapping, perspectives.



*Figure* 1. SEM plot of the modified three-factor model (Domínguez-Salas et al., 2022) with factor loadings and item residuals.

Table 3  
*Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Indices for Alternative Model Specifications*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1  One Factor Model |  |  |  |  | 2  Hierarchical Model |  |  |  |  | 3  Three Factor Model  Standard |  |  |  |
| Misspecification | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |
| Level-0 | 0.012 | 0.026 | 0.999 |  |  | 0.012 | 0.039 | 0.996 | NONE |  | 0.011 | 0.032 | 0.997 | NONE |
| Level-1 | 0.013 | 0.036 | 0.999 |  |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.177 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.177 |
| Level-2 | 0.017 | 0.059 | 0.997 |  |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.143 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.143 |
| Level-3 | 0.022 | 0.09 | 0.994 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fitted Model | **0.026** | **0.139** | **0.986** |  |  | **0.021** | **0.092** | **0.978** |  |  | **0.021** | **0.092** | **0.978** |  |
|  | 4a  Two Factor  Vigor Dedication |  |  |  |  | 4b  Two Factor  Vigor Absorption |  |  |  |  | 4c  Two Factor  Dedication Absorption |  |  |  |
| Misspecification | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |
| Level-0 | 0.012 | 0.033 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.012 | 0.034 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.012 | 0.035 | 0.996 | NONE |
| Level-1 | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.174 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.187 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.19 |
| Fitted Model | **0.024** | **0.106** | **0.968** |  |  | **0.022** | **0.094** | **0.974** |  |  | **0.024** | **0.107** | **0.967** |  |
|  | 5a  Modified 3F  Balducci et al \ |  |  |  |  | 5b  Modified 3F  Chaudhary et al \ |  |  |  |  | 5c  Modified 3F  Dom nguez Salas et al \ |  |  |  |
| Misspecification | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |
| Level-0 | 0.011 | 0.038 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.011 | 0.033 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.011 | 0.036 | 0.997 | NONE |
| Level-1 | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.122 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.178 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.15 |
| Level-2 |  |  |  |  |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.144 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.121 |
| Fitted Model | **0.017** | **0.077** | **0.987** |  |  | **0.021** | **0.093** | **0.978** |  |  | **0.017** | **0.076** | **0.986** |  |
|  | 5d  Modified 3F  Littman Ovadia   Balducci |  |  |  |  | 5e  Modified 3F  Sepp l  et al \ |  |  |  |  | 5g  Modified 3F  Zecca et al \ |  |  |  |
| Misspecification | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |  | SRMR | RMSEA | CFI | Magnitude |
| Level-0 | 0.011 | 0.035 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.011 | 0.034 | 0.997 | NONE |  | 0.011 | 0.037 | 0.997 | NONE |
| Level-1 | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.178 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.15 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.15 |
| Level-2 | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.121 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.143 |  | NONE | NONE | NONE | 0.121 |
| Fitted Model | **0.018** | **0.077** | **0.985** |  |  | **0.02** | **0.091** | **0.979** |  |  | **0.017** | **0.078** | **0.986** |  |

*Note.* SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; CFI = Comparative Fit Index. Bold values indicate the fitted model results. NONE indicates parameter was not estimated for that specification level.

## Item statistic and reliability

Internal consistency of the UWES total score was excellent: Cronbach’s = 0.96 95% CI[0.96 - 0.96] and McDonald’s = 0.96 95% CI[0.96 - 0.96]. When assessing the internal consistency of the UWES subcales, the highest values yielded Dedication subscale: Cronbach’s = 0.93 95% CI[0.92 - 0.94] and McDonald’s = 0.93 95% CI[0.92 - 0.94] followed by the Vigor subscale: Cronbach’s = 0.90 95% CI[0.89 - 0.91] and McDonald’s = 0.90 95% CI[0.89 - 0.91]. The lowest internal consistency was observed in the Absorption factor: Cronbach’s = 0.88 95% CI[0.86 - 0.89] and McDonald’s = 0.88 95% CI[0.86 - 0.89]. The Table 4 illustrates statistics of UWES items. In general, correlations between these items and item-total correlations were high. The lowest item-total correlation had item 9.

Table 4  
*Item statistic and Polychoric correlations between the UWES items*

| Items | UWES\_1 | UWES\_2 | UWES\_3 | UWES\_4 | UWES\_5 | UWES\_6 | UWES\_7 | UWES\_8 | UWES\_9 | ITC | Skewness | kurtosis | M(SD) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UWES\_1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.84 | -0.35 | -0.28 | 4.31 (1.48) |
| UWES\_2 | 0.79\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.81 | -0.43 | -0.34 | 4.56 (1.49) |
| UWES\_3 | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.89 | -0.3 | -0.56 | 4.43 (1.59) |
| UWES\_4 | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.84\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.85 | -0.28 | -0.87 | 4.23 (1.71) |
| UWES\_5 | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.71\*\*\* | 0.82\*\*\* | 0.76\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.84 | -0.22 | -0.75 | 4.11 (1.65) |
| UWES\_6 | 0.75\*\*\* | 0.72\*\*\* | 0.74\*\*\* | 0.7\*\*\* | 0.71\*\*\* | 1 |  |  |  | 0.81 | -0.6 | -0.22 | 4.76 (1.54) |
| UWES\_7 | 0.7\*\*\* | 0.69\*\*\* | 0.82\*\*\* | 0.78\*\*\* | 0.77\*\*\* | 0.7\*\*\* | 1 |  |  | 0.83 | -0.43 | -0.6 | 4.72 (1.66) |
| UWES\_8 | 0.71\*\*\* | 0.71\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.72\*\*\* | 0.68\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.69\*\*\* | 1 |  | 0.82 | -0.55 | -0.44 | 4.6 (1.63) |
| UWES\_9 | 0.66\*\*\* | 0.65\*\*\* | 0.72\*\*\* | 0.73\*\*\* | 0.68\*\*\* | 0.67\*\*\* | 0.7\*\*\* | 0.72\*\*\* | 1 | 0.78 | -0.14 | -0.82 | 3.96 (1.66) |

*Note.* \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, ITC = Item-total correlation corrected for scale reliability and item overlap

Correlation analysis indicated that there is significant positive association between all UWES subscale and total score and extroversion. The highest correlation was found in the Vigor subscale. In addition, there was significant negative correlation between all UWES subscales and total score with neuroticism. The highest association was also found in the Vigor subscale. Moreover, the UWES total and its all subscales were associated with self-efficacy. The strongest association was observed in the Vigor subscale. Finally, there was no correlation between the UWES composite and subcale score with spirituality with exception of Dedication subscale (see Table 5).

Table 5  
*Correaltion matrix of the UWES, personality characteristics and socio-demographic indicators*

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | M(SD) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. UWES | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.69 (12.27) |
| 2. UWES\_V | .94\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.98 (4.15) |
| 3. UWES\_D | .95\*\*\* | .85\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.38 (4.57) |
| 4. UWES\_A | .93\*\*\* | .82\*\*\* | .83\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  | 13.33 (4.28) |
| 5. BFI\_E | .19\*\*\* | .23\*\*\* | .18\*\*\* | .13\*\*\* | - |  |  |  |  | 24.20 (5.21) |
| 6. BFI\_N | -.19\*\*\* | -.23\*\*\* | -.18\*\*\* | -.12\*\* | -.27\*\*\* | - |  |  |  | 23.02 (5.70) |
| 7. Age | .03 | .06 | .01 | .02 | -.01 | -.10\*\* | - |  |  | 43.65 (10.08) |
| 8. Gender | .07 | .08 | .05 | .07 | .06 | .20\*\*\* | .08\* | - |  | 1.38 (0.49) |
| 9. DSES | .13 | .09 | .17\* | .11 | .09 | -.06 | -.02 | .10 | - | 2.39 (1.10) |
| 10. GSES | .28\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | .25\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -.44\*\*\* | .08\* | -.09\* | .13 | 28.43 (4.95) |

*Note.* \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001; SD = standard deviation, M = mean, UWES = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, BFI\_N = Big Five Inventory - Neuroticism subscale, BFI\_E = Big Five Inventory - Extraversion subscale, UWES\_A = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Absorption subscale, UWES\_D = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Dedication subscale, UWES\_V = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale - Vigor subscale. DSES = Daily Spiritual Experience Scale, GSES = General Self Efficacy Scale

## Invariance testing and factor loadings

The results of the measurement invariance testing are summarized in Table 6). In this analysis, we report the scaled fit indices, as the robust versions could not be computed for the scalar and strict invariance models. <–This can occure when highly constrained models are tested with the WLSMV estimator–>. The change in the scaled Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was less than 0.01 across all model comparisons. This finding strongly supports full measurement invariance and indicates that the UWES assesses work engagement equivalently in males and females.

Table 6  
*Measurement eqivalence of the UWES between genders*

| Model | x2 | df | p-value | CFI | TLI | RMSEA | SRMR |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Baseline | 235.312 | 24 | p < .001 | 0.991 | 0.987 | 0.117 90% CI (0.103-0.131) | 0.021 |
| Configural | 292.872 | 48 | p < .001 | 0.99 | 0.985 | 0.126 90% CI (0.112-0.14) | 0.024 |
| Metric | 233.511 | 54 | p < .001 | 0.993 | 0.99 | 0.102 90% CI (0.088-0.115) | 0.026 |
| Scalar | 244.871 | 96 | p < .001 | 0.994 | 0.995 | 0.069 90% CI (0.059-0.08) | 0.024 |
| Strict | 244.871 | 96 | p < .001 | 0.994 | 0.995 | 0.069 90% CI (0.059-0.08) | 0.024 |

*Note.* x2 = chi-square, df = degrees of freedom, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, TLI = Tucker-Lewis index, RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation, SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual, CI = confidence interval

## Association of the UWES with chronic health ilnesses

Results of the regression analysis revealed that work engagement is significantly related with chronic diseases. Specifically, higher work engagement was significantly related with lower probability of developing skin diseases or eczema (in crude effect) pain of unclear origin (both crude and adjusted effect see 7).

Table 7  
*Logistic regression table depicting associations (in odds ratios) between the UWES and chronic diseases*

|  | Skin diseases eczema | Pain of unclear origin | Hypertension | Diabetes | Arthritis |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Crude effect | 0.98\* (0.95, 1.00) | 0.93\*\* (0.89, 0.97) | 1.01 (0.99, 1.03) | 1.00 (0.98, 1.03) | 0.97 (0.95, 1.01) |
| Adjusted effect | 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) | 0.94\*\* (0.90, 0.98) | 1.01 (0.99, 1.03) | 1.01 (0.98, 1.03) | 0.98 (0.95, 1.01) |
|  | Depression/Anxiety | Migraine | Cancer | Thyroid disease | Astma |
| Crude effect | 0.99 (0.96, 1.02) | 1.00 (0.97, 1.03) | 1.00 (0.95, 1.07) | 1.01 (0.99, 1.04) | 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) |
| Adjusted effect | 1.00 (0.97, 1.02) | 1.00 (0.97, 1.04) | 1.00 (0.94, 1.07) | 1.02 (1.00, 1.05) | 0.98 (0.96, 1.01) |
|  | Gastric or duodenal ulcers | Chronic lung disease | Skin diseases eczema | Allergy | Pain in the small pelvis |
| Crude effect | 1.01 (0.95, 1.10) | 0.97 (0.92, 1.02) | 0.98\* (0.95, 1.00) | 0.99 (0.97, 1.01) | 1.00 (0.96, 1.05) |
| Adjusted effect | 1.01 (0.94, 1.10) | 0.97 (0.93, 1.02) | 0.98 (0.96, 1.00) | 0.99 (0.97, 1.01) | 1.01 (0.97, 1.05) |
|  | Ischemic heart disease | Obesity | Stroke | Back pain |  |
| Crude effect | 1.00 (0.93, 1.08) | 0.99 (0.97, 1.01) | 0.95 (0.87, 1.04) | 0.99 (0.97, 1.00) |  |
| Adjusted effect | 0.99 (0.92, 1.07) | 0.99 (0.97, 1.01) | 0.95 (0.86, 1.04) | 0.99 (0.98, 1.01) |  |

*Note.* \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001, results are reported in odds ratios; Education and Work position were covariates in adjusted effect; values in brackets refers to 95% confidence interval for odds ratios

# Association of the UWES with health risk behaviour

Results of logistic regression suggested that there is no relationship between work engagement and the smoking, alcohol drinking, drug abuse, coffee drinking or using computer or television for recreation in both crude and adjusted effect (Table 8). Variable smoking was the most closer to the significance threshold.

Table 8  
*Logistic regression table depicting associations (in odds ratios) between the UWES and health risk behaviours*

|  | Smoked | Drunk alcohol | Used illegal drugs | Drunk coffee | Used television or computer for recreation |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Crude effect | 1.00 (0.99, 1.02) | 1.00 (0.98, 1.01) | 0.97 (0.92, 1.02) | 1.01 (1.0, 1.02) | 1.01 (0.99, 1.03) |  |
| Adjusted effect | 1.01 (1.00, 1.03) | 1.00 (0.98, 1.01) | 0.98 (0.93, 1.04) | 1.01 (1.00, 1.03) | 1.01 (0.99, 1.03) |  |

*Note.* \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001, results are reported in odds ratios; Education and Work position were covariates in adjusted effect; values in brackets refers to 95% confidence interval for odds ratios

# Discussion

# References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*. Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>

Chan, E. S. S., Ho, S. K., Ip, F. F. L., & Wong, M. W. Y. (2020). Self-efficacy, work engagement, and job satisfaction among teaching assistants in hong kong’s inclusive education. *SAGE Open*, *10*(3), 2158244020941008. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020941008>

Civelek, E. C. (2018). *Essentials of structural equation modeling* (1 edition). Zea Books.

Hoe, S. L. (2008). Issues and procedures in adopting structural equation modelling technique. *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, *3*(1), 76–83.

Hooper, D., Coughlan, J., & Mullen, M. R. (2008). Structural Equation Modelling: Guidelines for Determining Model Fit. [Journal Article]. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, *6*(1), 53–59. <https://doi.org/10.21427/D7CF7R>

Jackson, D. L., Gillaspy Jr, J. A., & Purc-Stephenson, R. (2009). Reporting practices in confirmatory factor analysis: An overview and some recommendations [Journal Article]. *Psychological Methods*, *14*(1), 6–23. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014694>

Peters, G.-J. (2021). *Ufs: Quantitative analysis made accessible*. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=ufs>

R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from <https://www.R-project.org/>

Revelle, W. (2021). *Psych: Procedures for psychological, psychometric, and personality research*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University. Retrieved from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>

Rosseel, Y. (2012). lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *48*(2), 1–36. Retrieved from <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v48/i02/>

Schermelleh Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Muller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures [Journal article]. *Methods of Psychological Research*, *8*(2), 23–74.

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *3*(1), 4–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>

Vargha, A., & Delan, H. D. (2000). A critique and improvement of the CL common language effect size statistics of McGraw and Wong [Journal article]. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *25*(2), 101–132. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1165329>

# Appendix

Table 9  
*Lower-triangular correlations between residuals*

|  | UWES\_1 | UWES\_2 | UWES\_5 | UWES\_3 | UWES\_4 | UWES\_7 | UWES\_6 | UWES\_8 | UWES\_9 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UWES\_2 | 8.56164746876331e-08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UWES\_5 | 0.00920276431306999 | -0.0116459621257381 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UWES\_3 | -0.0147697386719264 | -0.019342618059396 | 0.0297246371488522 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UWES\_4 | -0.0122486517156107 | 0.0102957104820212 | -0.00690270580209562 | -0.00063571776403748 |  |  |  |  |  |
| UWES\_7 | -0.0238435607749439 | -0.0118121756374657 | 0.0191594707117608 | 0.00490858277981565 | -0.00527095977526038 |  |  |  |  |
| UWES\_6 | 0.0408411118435587 | 0.0289480593181149 | -0.025072386892129 | -0.0170759525111859 | -0.0222827809925696 | -0.00851161981361159 |  |  |  |
| UWES\_8 | 0.0136806291198889 | 0.0217478962314934 | -0.0469538445218126 | -0.0109136862684587 | 0.00823281367751949 | -0.00601839534511828 | 0.0138899286384286 |  |  |
| UWES\_9 | -0.0147032719940451 | -0.0177562582923751 | -0.0208368068746484 | 0.000204314965730812 | 0.0326559789431375 | 0.0232359289076537 | -0.0195914505203864 | -1.92989854763681e-07 |  |

*Note.* UWES = Utrecht Work Engagement Scale