1 Development of an Intentional BiFactor Engagement Measure

2 Morgan Russell[1], Casey Osorio-Duffoo[2], Renata Garcia Prieto Palacios Roji[1], & John Kulas[1]

3 [1] Montclair State University

4 [2] Harver

5 Author Note

6 Add complete departmental affiliations for each author here. Each new line herein

7 must be indented, like this line.

8 Enter author note here.

9 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Morgan Russell, Postal

10 address. E-mail: my@email.com

Abstract

Employee engagement has, in recent years, enjoyed a surge in popularity as a positive employee outcome. Despite this burgeoning interest, disagreement still remains regarding its factor structure and nomological relationship with similar concepts, such as burnout.

One or two sentences providing a **basic introduction** to the field, comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

Two to three sentences of **more detailed background**, comprehensible to scientists in related disciplines.

One sentence clearly stating the **general problem** being addressed by this particular study.

One sentence summarizing the main result (with the words "**here we show**" or their equivalent).

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.

One or two sentences to put the results into a more **general context**.

Two or three sentences to provide a **broader perspective**, readily comprehensible to a scientist in any discipline.

Keywords: Engagement, engagement

Word count: X

Development of an Intentional BiFactor Engagement Measure

The roots of employee (aka work; e.g., W. Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010) engagement research likely started with theoretical expansions of forms of employee participation (see, for example, Ferris & Hellier, 1984) and job involvement (e.g., Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). This exploration extended into broader considerations of attitudes and emotions (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994) and were informed by further exploration of the dimensionality of constructs such as organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The 1990's saw focused development and refinement (for example, a dissertation; Leone (1995) or actual semantic reference; Kahn (1990)). Staw, Sutton, and Pelled (1994) investigated the relationships between *positive emotions* and favorable work outcomes, and although they do not use the word, "engagement," their distinction between felt and expressed emotion likely held influence upon the burgeoning interest in the engagement construct.

Kahn (1990) described engaged employees as being physically involved, cognitively vigilant, and emotionally connected. Although occasionally referred to as residing on the opposing pole to *burnout* (Christina Maslach & Leiter, 2008), these two constructs are currently most commonly conceptualized as being distinct (Goering, Shimazu, Zhou, Wada, & Sakai, 2017; Kim, Shin, & Swanger, 2009; Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Taris, & Van Rhenen, 2008; Timms, Brough, & Graham, 2012), although certainly not universally (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O'Boyle, 2012; Taris, Ybema, & Beek, 2017). Comparing the two, Goering, Shimazu, Zhou, Wada, and Sakai (2017) concluded that they have a moderate (negative) association, but also distinct nomological networks. Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Taris, and Van Rhenen (2008) investigated both internal and external association indicators, concluding that engagement and burnout (as well as *workaholism*) should be considered three distinct constructs.

Burnout can be defined as a psychological syndrome characterized by exhaustion (low energy), cynicism (low involvement), and inefficacy (low self-efficacy), which is experienced

57 in response to chronic job stressors (e.g., Leiter & Maslach, 2004; C. Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

58 Alternatively, engagement refers to an individual worker's involvement and satisfaction as

59 well as enthusiasm for work (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002). W. B. Schaufeli and Bakker

60 (2003) further specify a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized

61 by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 74). Via their conceptualization, vigor is described

62 as high levels of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication refers to being

63 strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm,

64 inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated

65 and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties

66 with detaching oneself from work (Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker,

67 2002). The dimension of absorption has been noted as being influenced in conceptual

68 specification by (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990)'s concept of "flow."

69 Regarding measurement, Gallup is widely acknowledged as an early pioneer in the

70 measurement of the construct (see, for example, Coffman & Harter, 1999). The Utrecht Work

71 Engagement Scale (UWES) is another self-report questionnaire developed by W. B. Schaufeli

72 and Bakker (2003) that directly assesses the vigor, dedication, and absorption elements.

73 we need to do some market research on the Q12: 1. what's the feedback report

74 look like? (google images show one overall "satsifaction" score and/or one overall

75 "engagement" score), 2. how much does it cost, 3. what are the 200 pulse items

76 Gallup refers to? (6/7/21)

77 Our conceptualization of work engagement is a mental state wherein employees. . .

78 • . . . feel energized (**Vigor**)

79 • . . . are enthusiastic about the content of their work and the things they do

80 (**Dedication**)

81 • . . . are so immersed in their work activities that time seems compressed (**Absorption**)

⁸² <center>**Methods**</center>

⁸³ Choice of focus on BIC versus AIC discussed in Dziak, Coffman, Lanza, Li, and

⁸⁴ Jermiin (2020).

⁸⁵ **Participants**

⁸⁶ 330 individuals provided ratings across 36 candidate items. These participants were

⁸⁷ gathered via snowball sampling, with an initial population of undergraduate and graduate

⁸⁸ students, as well as professional acquaintances of faculty members.

⁸⁹ Participant job title, hours worked per week, and organizational tenure were recorded.

⁹⁰ Mean hours worked per week was NA

⁹¹ Mean organizational tenure was INSERT HERE, with a standard deviation of INSERT

⁹² HERE. YOU NEED TO RECODE TENURE TO ACCOUNT FOR MONTHS/YEARS.

⁹³ Participants who did not exactly specify their tenure (e.g. "A bit over a year") were not

⁹⁴ included in this average.

⁹⁵ **Material**

⁹⁶ Our survey was administered on Qualtrics

⁹⁷ **Item generation.**   We generated a set of 36 items for our engagement measure, with

⁹⁸ the ultimate goal of reducing them to a final set of 18. These items were generated according

⁹⁹ to a review of extant tripartite engagement measures, as well as *WHAT RESEARCH DID*

¹⁰⁰ *WE USE FOR ATTITUDINAL WORDING? WAS IT LITERALLY JUST "I THINK," "I*

¹⁰¹ *FEEL," "I DO?"* Each item was worded to reflect both a substantive dimension as well as

¹⁰² an attitudinal dimension, for example *EXAMPLE ITEM HERE*

¹⁰³ Our 3x3 bifactor model produced nine pairs of dimensions (e.g., Vigor-Cognitive,

¹⁰⁴ Vigor-Affective, Vigor-Behavioral, etc.). With 36 initial items, this left four items per pair of

¹⁰⁵ substantive and attitudinal dimensions. *DON'T KNOW HOW IN RMARKDOWN BUT*

CAN WE INSERT A 3x3 TABLE TO VISUALIZE HOW THERE ARE 4 ITEMS FOR

EACH PAIRING OF THE SUB/ATT DIMENSIONS. ALSO, THIS WORDING SUCKS,

MAKE IT BETTER

See table *X* for a full list of items and their respective dimensions.

Procedure

Looking into the specification of polychoric covariances (Jöreskog, 1994). This seems to be not very commonly leveraged (only package that seems to estimate these is `semPlot`). We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study. We took two different approaches to determining final scale definitions: 1) focus on corrected item-total correlations, and 2) focus on CFA modificiation indices.

CFA Modification Indices.   Looking at the substantive and attitudinal models independently, we requested modification indices from each, with the intent of retaining indicators whose shared residual covariances were implicated as being "freed." The path with the highest modification index across both CFA's was between item2 and item4, which are both indicators of "Absorption" and "Cognition." One of these items was therefore a candidate for deletion, and semantic preference was given to item4, "I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work" over item2, "I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work." After item2 was excluded from both scale definitions (substantive and attitudinal), the CFAs were re-run and modification indices re-checked for bi-factor structure optimizing modifications.[1]

We prioritized item deletions such that an item was implicated for deletion if: 1) modification index was high (relative to others) and 2) error residual was within same "cell."

---

[1] Probably put a table in here highlighting certain modification indices (with a key to intended factor-item association).

129 The choice of itme to delete was based on author preference for wording/semantics as well as

130 construct element coverage (considering the possible consequences for construct deficiency).

131 Item variance was also consulted (retention more likely with greater item variance).

132   Actually it doesn't matter that much with only 1 item deletion -

133   probably go ahead and do a few before recheck modification indices

134 **Single factor versus bifactor approaches.**

135 **Data analysis**

136   We used R [Version 4.0.5; R Core Team (2021)] and the R-packages *dplyr* [Version

137 1.0.6; Wickham, François, Henry, and Müller (2021)], *DT* [Version 0.18; Xie, Cheng, and Tan

138 (2021)], *forcats* [Version 0.5.1; Wickham (2021a)], *ggplot2* [Version 3.3.3; Wickham (2016)],

139 *kableExtra* [Version 1.3.4; Zhu (2021)], *lavaan* [Version 0.6.8; Rosseel (2012)], *magrittr*

140 [Version 2.0.1; Bache and Wickham (2020)], *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth

141 (2020)], *purrr* [Version 0.3.4; Henry and Wickham (2020)], *readr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham

142 and Hester (2020)], *sem* [Version 3.1.11; Fox, Nie, and Byrnes (2020); Epskamp (2019)],

143 *semPlot* [Version 1.1.2; Epskamp (2019)], *stringr* [Version 1.4.0; Wickham (2019)], *tibble*

144 [Version 3.1.2; Müller and Wickham (2021)], *tidyr* [Version 1.1.3; Wickham (2021b)], and

145 *tidyverse* [Version 1.3.1; Wickham et al. (2019)] for all our analyses.

146   **Results**

147   CFA drafts below

148   **Discussion**

References

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

Bache, S. M., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Magrittr: A forward-pipe operator for r.*
Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=magrittr

Coffman, C., & Harter, J. (1999). A hard look at soft numbers. *Position Paper,
Gallup Organization.*

Cole, M. S., Walter, F., Bedeian, A. G., & O'Boyle, E. H. (2012). Job burnout and
employee engagement: A meta-analytic examination of construct proliferation.
Journal of Management, 38(5), 1550–1581.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience* (Vol. 1990).
Harper & Row New York.

Dziak, J. J., Coffman, D. L., Lanza, S. T., Li, R., & Jermiin, L. S. (2020). Sensitivity
and specificity of information criteria. *Briefings in Bioinformatics, 21*(2), 553–565.

Elloy, D. F., Everett, J. E., & Flynn, W. R. (1991). An examination of the correlates
of job involvement. *Group & Organization Studies, 16*(2), 160–177.
https://doi.org/10.1177/105960119101600204

Epskamp, S. (2019). *semPlot: Path diagrams and visual analysis of various SEM
packages' output.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semPlot

Ferris, R., & Hellier, P. (1984). Added value productivity schemes and employee
participation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 22*(4), 35–44.
https://doi.org/10.1177/103841118402200406

Fox, J., Nie, Z., & Byrnes, J. (2020). *Sem: Structural equation models.* Retrieved
        from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=sem

Goering, D. D., Shimazu, A., Zhou, F., Wada, T., & Sakai, R. (2017). Not if, but
        how they differ: A meta-analytic test of the nomological networks of burnout and
        engagement. *Burnout Research*, *5*, 21–34.

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*(2), 268.

Henry, L., & Wickham, H. (2020). *Purrr: Functional programming tools.* Retrieved
        from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=purrr

Jöreskog, K. G. (1994). On the estimation of polychoric correlations and their
        asymptotic covariance matrix. *Psychometrika*, *59*(3), 381–389.

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

Kim, H. J., Shin, K. H., & Swanger, N. (2009). Burnout and engagement: A
        comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *International
        Journal of Hospitality Management*, *28*(1), 96–104.
        https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.001

Leiter, M., & Maslach, C. (2004). Areas of worklife: A structured approach to
        organizational predictors of job burnout. In *Research in occupational stress and
        well-being* (Vol. 3, pp. 91–134). https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(03)03003-8

Leone, D. R. (1995). *The relation of work climate, higher order need satisfaction,
        need salience, and causality orientations to work engagement, psychological*

adjustment, and job satisfaction (PhD thesis). ProQuest Information & Learning.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (1997). What causes burnout. *Maslach C, Leiter MP. The Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do about It. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers*, 38–60.

Maslach, Christina, & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(3), 498–512.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *1*(1), 61–89.

Müller, K., & Wickham, H. (2021). *Tibble: Simple data frames.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tibble

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/

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/

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). UWES–utrecht work engagement scale: Test manual. *Unpublished Manuscript: Department of Psychology, Utrecht University, 8.*

Schaufeli, Wilmar B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*(1), 71–92.

Schaufeli, Wilmar B., Taris, T. W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2008). Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Applied Psychology*, *57*(2), 173–203.

Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2010). The conceptualization and measurement of work engagement. In W. Schaufeli, A. Bakker, & M. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10–24). New York: Psychology Press.

Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, *5*(1), 51–71.

Taris, T. W., Ybema, J. F., & Beek, I. van. (2017). Burnout and engagement: Identical twins or just close relatives? *Burnout Research*, *5*, 3–11.

Timms, C., Brough, P., & Graham, D. (2012). Burnt-out but engaged: The co-existence of psychological burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *50*(3), 327–345.

Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

Wickham, H. (2019). *Stringr: Simple, consistent wrappers for common string operations*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stringr

Wickham, H. (2021a). *Forcats: Tools for working with categorical variables (factors)*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=forcats

Wickham, H. (2021b). *Tidyr: Tidy messy data*. Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr

238   Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L. D., François, R., . . .

239   Yutani, H. (2019). Welcome to the tidyverse. *Journal of Open Source Software*,

240   *4*(43), 1686. https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686

241   Wickham, H., François, R., Henry, L., & Müller, K. (2021). *Dplyr: A grammar of*

242   *data manipulation.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr

243   Wickham, H., & Hester, J. (2020). *Readr: Read rectangular text data.* Retrieved from

244   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr

245   Xie, Y., Cheng, J., & Tan, X. (2021). *DT: A wrapper of the JavaScript library*

246   *'DataTables'.* Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=DT

247   Zhu, H. (2021). *kableExtra: Construct complex table with 'kable' and pipe syntax.*

248   Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra

*Figure 1*. (#fig:CFA.sub)Substantive factor structure CFA

Figure 2. (#fig:CFA.att)Attitudinal factor structure CFA