Engagement Survey Technical Report

Eagle I.O

Most recently updated 2021-09-07

Contents

Home **7**

1 Introduction **9**

1.1 Engagement as a Psychological Construct 9

2 Instrument creation **13**

2.1 Intended Structure 13

2.2 Item generation 15

2.3 Content Validation 15

3 Procedure **17**

3.1 Pilot 17

3.1.1 Sampling strategy (pilot) 18

3.1.1.1 Pilot analyses 18

3.2 Demographic Information 19

4 Analyses **21**

4.1 Pilot analyses 21

4.1.1 Classical test theory 22

4.1.1.1 Internal consistency estimates 22

4.1.2 Confirmatory factor analyses 23

4.1.2.1 Multigroup analyses 25

4.1.2.2 Bifactor analyses 25

4.1.2.2.1 Final Scale Definitions 25

4.1.3 Summary 40
4.2 Construct and Criterion-related Validation 40

5 Future plans **41**
5.1 Things to do 42
5.2 Research projects 42

6 Author bios **45**

7 References **47**

A Timeline of events **49**
A.1 Spring 2019 49
A.2 Spring 2020 49
A.2.1 February 4, 2020 49
A.2.2 February 24, 2020 50
A.2.3 Structural considerations 50
A.3 Summer 2020 50

B Pilot conditions **53**

C Pilot demographics **59**
C.1 Response date 59
C.2 Response latencies 60
C.3 Geographic constituency 60

D Correlations **61**
D.1 Inter-Item correlations 61
D.2 Scale-level correlations 105
D.2.1 Substantive scales 105
D.2.2 Attitudinal scales 105
. 105

E Corrected item-total correlations **107**

E.1 "Marginal" level 107

E.1.1 Attitudinal 107

E.1.2 Construct Substantive 107

E.2 "Cell" level 107

F Qualitative item characteristics **113**

F.1 Frequency distributions by dimension 114

F.2 Tables of qualitative indices 116

G CFA Modification Indices **119**

Home

This is a report that documents the technical details regarding the development of the Eagle I.O Engagement survey.

This report was written with `bookdown` [Xie, 2020a] within `rMarkdown` [Allaire et al., 2019] using `R` version 4.0.3 [R Core Team, 2020].

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Engagement as a Psychological Construct

The roots of employee [aka work; e.g., Schaufeli and Bakker, 2010] engagement research likely started with theoretical expansions of forms of employee participation [see, for example, Ferris and Hellier, 1984] and job involvement [e.g., Elloy et al., 1991]. This exploration extended into broader considerations of attitudes and emotions [Staw et al., 1994] and were informed by further exploration of the dimensionality of constructs such as organizational commitment [Meyer and

Allen, 1991]. The 1990's saw focused development and refinement (for example, a dissertation; Leone [1995] or actual semantic reference; Kahn). Staw et al. [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 described engaged employees as being physically involved, cognitively vigilant, and emotionally connected. Although occasionally referred to as residing on the opposing pole to *burnout* [Maslach and Leiter, 2008], these two constructs are currently most commonly conceptualized as being distinct [Timms et al., 2012, Kim et al., 2009, Goering et al., 2017, Schaufeli et al., 2008], although certainly not universally [Cole et al., 2012, Taris et al., 2017]. Goering et al. [2017] explore nomological networks, concluding that these two constructs have a moderate (negative) association, but also distinct nomological networks. Schaufeli et al. [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 efficacy), which is experienced in response to chronic job stressors [e.g., Leiter and Maslach, Maslach and Leiter, 1997]. Alternatively, engagement refers to an individual worker's involvement and satisfaction as well as enthusiasm for work [Harter et al., b]. Schaufeli and Bakker [a] further specify a "positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption" (p. 74). Via their conceptualization, vigor is described as high levels of energy and mental resilience while working. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work [Schaufeli et al.]. This absorption element has been noted as being influenced in conceptual specification by [Csikszentmihalyi, 1990]'s concept of "flow".

Regarding measurement, Gallup is widely acknowledged as an early pioneer in the measurement of the construct [see, for example, Coffman and Harter, 1999]. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) is another self-report questionnaire developed by Schaufeli and Bakker [a] that directly assesses the vigor, dedication, and absorption elements.

> we need to do some market research on the Q12: 1. what's the feedback report look like? (google images show one overall "satsifaction" score and/or one overall "engagement" score), 2. how much does it cost, 3. what are the 200 pulse items Gallup refers to? (6/7/21)

Our conceptualization of work engagement is a mental state wherein employees…

- …feel energized (**Vigor**)
- …are enthusiastic about the content of their work and the things they do (**Dedication**)
- …are so immersed in their work activities that time seems compressed (**Absorption**)

The process of coming to this definitional model of employee engagement is further elaborated upon in Appendix A.

Chapter 2

Instrument creation

2.1 Intended Structure

Within the broader process of conceptual construct specification, we decided to attempt an intentional *a priori* bi-factor structure, whereby each of the substantive dimensions (Dedication, Vigor, and Absorption)[1] could further be de-

[1] We also discovered at this point that some contagious agent has infiltrated the minds of people working on this project, such that the word, "absorption" confounds our spelling abilities, and roughly 50% of the time ends up being spelled (misspelled?), "absorbtion"…

constructed into the attitudinal elements of Cognition, Affect, and Behavior [see, for example, Eagly and Chaiken, Rosenberg, 1960]. This is not standard practice within Psychological measurement and introduces complexity into scale definitions. Appendix A loosely documents the line of thought behind this decision.

Through item-writing and revision, it began to dawn on us that the substantive elements may already reflect the Cognition (Vigor), Affect (Absorption), and Behavioral (Dedication) dimensions. As of August, 2020, however, we could not locate a source article that made this potential confound explicit, so we persisted through crafting items that reflected cognitive, affective, and behavioral indicators of each substantive dimension. [2]

The most germaine acknowledgement of this potential construct overlap seems to be made by Schaufeli et al. (pp. 74-75):

> Rather than a momentary and specific state, engagement refers to a more persistent and pervasive affective cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior. **Vigor** is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one's work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. **Dedication** is characterized by a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. Instead of involvement we prefer to use the term dedication. Although, involvement – like dedication (see above) – is usually defined in terms of psychological identification with one's work or one's job [Kanungo, 1982, Lawler and Hall, 1970] , whereby the latter goes one step beyond, both quantitatively as well as qualitatively. In a qualitative sense, dedication refers to a particularly strong involvement that goes one step further than the usual level of identification. In a qualitative sense, dedication has a wider scope by not only referring to a particular cognitive or belief state but including the affective dimension as well. The final dimension of engagement, **absorption**, is characterized by being fully concentrated and deeply engrossed in one's work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.

The survey is intentionally complex in terms of item and scale associations. There are three substantive engagement dimensions as well as three attitudinal dimensions, and item cross-loadings are intended to fully exhaust the 3 x 3 conditions (e.g., each item loads on one substantive and one attitudinal dimension):

[2] We did, however, find some criticisms of the tripartite model of attitudes as originally specified by Rosenberg [1960], although there has also been a recent attempt to reintroduce and improve upon the original model [Kaiser and Wilson, 2019] as well as repurposing of the framework as a *process* [e.g., thoughts and feelings leading to behavior; Pachankis, 2007].

Substantive	Attitudinal
Dedication	Affective
Absorption	Behavioral
Vigor	Cognitive

The feedback report uses the terms, "feel", "do", and "think" instead of the Psychological literature-based affect, behavior, and cognition.

2.2 Item generation

After content validation but prior to settling on 4 candidate items per 3x3 condition, there was a dearth of items within some of the Affective, Cognitive, or Behavioral item groupings. We generated additional candidates at this point and have these items located here (Montclair State University e-mail needed to access). It was from this larger list of (reduced) candidate items that the 36 pilot candidates were identified (and in some cases modified, edited, or otherwise further crafted)

2.3 Content Validation

7 Eagle I.O consultants were twice instructed to place each of 34 items into one of three categories: Absorption, Dedication, or Vigor, and Cognitive, Affective, or Behavioral. Instructions asked each rater to:

> INSTRUCTIONS: Place an "X" in the column that you feel is the best fit for each item (only one "X" per row please)

The substantive scale definitions provided for ratings were:

- *Absorption*: Being fully immersed in one's work, where time passes quickly and one has difficulty detaching from work tasks
- *Vigor*: Experiencing persistent levels of energy, effort, and enthusiasm while working
- *Dedication*: Experiencing pride and challenge in ones work, as well as strong feelings of support from and loyalty toward the organization

The attitudinal scale definitions were:

- *Cognitive*: Pertaining to thoughts or general mental processes (for example what someone thinks)

- *Affective*: Pertaining to feelings or emotions (for example, how someone feels)
- *Behavioral*: Pertaining to acts or actions (for example, what someone does)

The goal was to identify item(s) that were equally and heavily implicated with one substantive and one attitudinal scale.

Chapter 3

Procedure

3.1 Pilot

The pilot administrations consisted of 36 items that were presented in one of four administration groupings (see Appendix B): 1) within substantive dimension (attitudinally grouped [but randomized within blocks of 4]), 2) within at-

titudinal dimension (substantively grouped [but randomized within blocks of 4]), 3) within substantive dimension (randomly distributed by attitude), and 4) within attitudinal dimension (randomly presented by substance).[1]

The four "experimental" conditions therefore prioritized and reflected the 3x3 groupings *or* one of the organization schemes (cognitive, affective, and behavioral *or* dedication, absorption, and vigor).

We chose to control the order of item administration because of our *a priori* specification of a bi-factor structure, with the expectation that item ordering would serve as a response cue, yielding stronger factor structural support based on the organization scheme.

3.1.1 Sampling strategy (pilot)

The pilot sampling strategy consisted of snowball (aka referral) sampling as well as questionnaire posting within social media platforms (LinkedIn and facebook). The pilot goal was to reduce the final instrument from 36 candidate items (4 per "cell") to 18 retained items (2 per "cell"). We hoped to obtain about 250 total responses viable for analysis.

The launch was informed by research looking at different "days of the week" and their effectiveness regarding response rate. This was both commercial as well as academic [e.g., Anseel et al.].

Eagle I.O members sent a template email asking working adults to take the survey and forward it to family and friends who also qualify as participants. Eagle I.O members were also tasked with reaching out to other students, alumni, friends, and family through the following:

- Facebook post on MSU I/O group page
- LinkedIn profiles of all Eagle I.O members
- Email first and second year students directly
- Email MSU alumni directly
- Email I/O professors
- Mentors reached out to mentees individually
- Survey was posted on the Eagle I.O webpage

3.1.1.1 Pilot analyses

A Confirmatory Bi-Factor Analysis will be performed to determine the best candidate items for the final assessment.

[1] Decision was made on 10/13 to have the order of presentation *randomized* within each of the broader organization blocks (for example, Condition 3: all Affective, Cognitive, and Behavioral Absorption items were randomly administered, then all ABC Dedication items, etc [although DAC was also randomized by block such that not every respondent had the same DAC ordering])

3.2 Demographic Information

These are to be included in future administrations in an attempt to develop marketable norms:

- Employees who work overtime vs. those who do not
- Employees who get paid for overtime vs. those who don't receive compensation for extra hours worked[2]

[2] I was thinking about this because at my job I have been working 12+ hours some days yet I do not get overtime pay. Not sure if this would work for what we are doing and I know my work experiences are not universal (nor should they be) haha!

Chapter 4

Analyses

4.1 Pilot analyses

282 people responded. We may want to further screen these 282 responses for short response durations. According to communications with Qualtrics in early December, this is the number of seconds to complete the entire survey.

Currently, the "number of people who clicked on the assessment link (330)" versus valid n (282) may take care of our very low duration respondents. The shortest response duration in the 330 datafile is 101 whereas the lowest in the 282 datafile is 43. All analyses were performed via `R` version R version 4.0.3 (2020-10-10) [R Core Team, 2020]. Demographic consituency of the pilot sample is located in Appendix C.

4.1.1 Classical test theory

In addition to the below interactive plot [via `plotly` version 4.9.2.1; Sievert et al., 2020], a full inter-item correlation matrix is located in Appendix D.

```
## Some items ( I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work. ) were negatively
## probably should be reversed.
## To do this, run the function again with the 'check.keys=TRUE' option
```

4.1.1.1 Internal consistency estimates

Condition 1 administered items within the substantive dimensions (with successive randomized blocks of Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral items). Condition 2 administered items within the attitudinal dimensions (with successive randomized blocks of Absorption, Vigor, and Dedication items). Condition 3 stressed the substantive dimensions (with items fully randomized regardless of attitudinal association). Condition 4 stressed the attitudinal dimensions (with items fully randomized within attitudinal dimension regardless of substantive scale association, see Chapter 3.1 and Appendix B). All internal consistency estimates were generated via `psych` version 2.0.12 [Revelle, 2020]. Alphas for the candidate 12-item scales were:

Dimension	Undifferentiated	Condition 1	Condition 2	Condition 3	Condition 4
Affective	0.87	0.88	0.84	0.88	0.87
Behavioral	0.79	0.73	0.84	0.76	0.87
Cognitive	0.81	0.79	0.85	0.8	0.87
Absorption	0.74	0.72	0.77	0.72	0.87
Vigor	0.85	0.8	0.88	0.84	0.87
Dedication	0.9	0.9	0.91	0.91	0.87

"Cell" level alphas (4 items each scale, responses collapsed across administrative conditions) were:

Cell	Alpha
Affective - Absorption	0.66
Affective - Vigor	0.71
Affective - Dedication	0.75
Behavioral - Absorption	0.56
Behavioral - Vigor	0.7
Behavioral - Dedication	0.64
Cognitive - Absorption	0.59
Cognitive - Vigor	0.62
Cognitive - Dedication	0.83

Corrected item-total correlations are presented in Appendix E

4.1.2 Confirmatory factor analyses

We used `lavaan` version 0.6.8 [Rosseel et al., 2021] and `semPlot` version 1.1.2 [Epskamp, 2019]

Bhv
Cgn
Aff
0.89
0.88
0.95

Eng
Ddc
Vgr
Abs
1.00
0.80
1.02
0.99

Model	χ^2	*df*	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	AIC
3-factor substantive	2159.21	591	0.11	0.1	0.64	0.62	25481.97
Hierarchical substantive	2159.21	591	0.11	0.1	0.64	0.62	25481.97
3-factor attitudinal	2318.92	591	0.11	0.1	0.6	0.58	25641.68
Hierarchical attitudinal	2318.92	591	0.11	0.1	0.6	0.58	25641.68

4.1.2.1 Multigroup analyses

- using experimental condition as "multiple groups" (measurement invariance)

4.1.2.2 Bifactor analyses

bifactor analysis are most commonly applied in the exploration of common method variance [see, for example, Reise, Rodriguez et al.]. Giordano et al. provide an overview regarding past and potential applications of *exploratory* bifactor analysis and cite Reise as an influential impetus for the resurgence of bifactor models in general. Canivez [2016] has a recent overview.

4.1.2.2.1 Final Scale Definitions Final scale definitions were informed by two sets of indices: 1) corrected item-total correlations, and 2) CFA modification

indices. The CFA modification indices extracted from the initial 36-item scale definitions are located in Appendix G.

```
## lavaan 0.6-8 did NOT end normally after 820 iterations
## ** WARNING ** Estimates below are most likely unreliable
##
##   Estimator                                         ML
##   Optimization method                           NLMINB
##   Number of model parameters                       114
##
##                                                   Used       Total
##   Number of observations                           239         282
##
## Model Test User Model:
##
##   Test statistic                                    NA
##   Degrees of freedom                                NA
##
## Parameter Estimates:
##
##   Standard errors                             Standard
##   Information                                 Expected
##   Information saturated (h1) model          Structured
##
## Latent Variables:
```

```
##                    Estimate   Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Cognitive =~
##     Item_1             1.000
##     Item_2             0.516       NA
##     Item_3             1.090       NA
##     Item_4             0.353       NA
##     Item_13            1.130       NA
##     Item_14            0.838       NA
##     Item_15            0.798       NA
##     Item_16            1.098       NA
##     Item_25            0.988       NA
##     Item_26            0.909       NA
##     Item_27            1.080       NA
##     Item_28            0.999       NA
##   Affective =~
##     Item_5             1.000
##     Item_6             0.656       NA
##     Item_7             0.475       NA
##     Item_8             1.242       NA
##     Item_17            0.933       NA
##     Item_18            1.372       NA
##     Item_19            1.044       NA
##     Item_20            0.536       NA
##     Item_29            0.841       NA
##     Item_30            0.381       NA
##     Item_31            0.724       NA
##     Item_32            1.063       NA
##   Behavioral =~
##     Item_9             1.000
##     Item_10            1.109       NA
##     Item_11            0.572       NA
##     Item_12            1.176       NA
##     Item_21            1.362       NA
##     Item_22            1.573       NA
##     Item_23            0.873       NA
##     Item_24            0.890       NA
##     Item_33            0.707       NA
##     Item_34            0.879       NA
##     Item_35            1.237       NA
##     Item_36            0.369       NA
##   Absorption =~
##     Item_1             1.000
##     Item_2         19131.383       NA
##     Item_3          -390.734       NA
##     Item_4         21074.473       NA
##     Item_5          2937.496       NA
```

```
##     Item_6         -1569.896       NA
##     Item_7           727.592       NA
##     Item_8         -1533.787       NA
##     Item_9          4326.028       NA
##     Item_10         5122.173       NA
##     Item_11        -1534.018       NA
##     Item_12        -1356.265       NA
##   Vigor =~
##     Item_13            1.000
##     Item_14           -3.413       NA
##     Item_15            0.449       NA
##     Item_16           -0.517       NA
##     Item_17           -0.246       NA
##     Item_18           -1.152       NA
##     Item_19            0.766       NA
##     Item_20           -3.510       NA
##     Item_21            0.381       NA
##     Item_22           -0.278       NA
##     Item_23            0.324       NA
##     Item_24            0.093       NA
##   Dedication =~
##     Item_25            1.000
##     Item_26            1.378       NA
##     Item_27            1.009       NA
##     Item_28            0.830       NA
##     Item_29            0.885       NA
##     Item_30            0.650       NA
##     Item_31            0.274       NA
##     Item_32            0.512       NA
##     Item_33            0.010       NA
##     Item_34            0.122       NA
##     Item_35            0.888       NA
##     Item_36            0.783       NA
##
## Covariances:
##                    Estimate   Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Affective          0.549       NA
##     Behavioral         0.363       NA
##   Affective ~~
##     Behavioral         0.372       NA
##   Absorption ~~
##     Vigor              0.000       NA
##     Dedication        -0.000       NA
##   Vigor ~~
##     Dedication        -0.082       NA
```

```
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Absorption         0.000
##     Vigor              0.000
##     Dedication         0.000
##   Affective ~~
##     Absorption         0.000
##     Vigor              0.000
##     Dedication         0.000
##   Behavioral ~~
##     Absorption         0.000
##     Vigor              0.000
##     Dedication         0.000
##
## Variances:
##                    Estimate   Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##    .Item_1             1.343       NA
##    .Item_2             0.350       NA
##    .Item_3             0.786       NA
##    .Item_4             0.124       NA
##    .Item_13            0.809       NA
##    .Item_14            0.659       NA
##    .Item_15            1.471       NA
##    .Item_16            0.760       NA
##    .Item_25            1.350       NA
##    .Item_26            0.629       NA
##    .Item_27            1.282       NA
##    .Item_28            0.763       NA
##    .Item_5             1.324       NA
##    .Item_6             1.195       NA
##    .Item_7             0.845       NA
##    .Item_8             0.688       NA
##    .Item_17            0.484       NA
##    .Item_18            0.559       NA
##    .Item_19            0.771       NA
##    .Item_20            0.780       NA
##    .Item_29            0.479       NA
##    .Item_30            1.514       NA
##    .Item_31            0.538       NA
##    .Item_32            0.667       NA
##    .Item_9             1.293       NA
##    .Item_10            1.961       NA
##    .Item_11            1.288       NA
##    .Item_12            1.342       NA
##    .Item_21            0.894       NA
##    .Item_22            0.510       NA
##    .Item_23            0.338       NA
```

```
##    .Item_24           1.026       NA
##    .Item_33           0.401       NA
##    .Item_34           0.532       NA
##    .Item_35           0.547       NA
##    .Item_36           0.984       NA
##     Cognitive         0.593       NA
##     Affective         0.639       NA
##     Behavioral        0.283       NA
##     Absorption        0.000       NA
##     Vigor             0.072       NA
##     Dedication        0.596       NA
```

Currently pretty messed up prior to item deletion (Vigor especially). Model also technically not converging need Renata to fix.

Deese guys also do bifactor stuff: Mansolf and Reise [2017]

#####Final Scale Definition (18 items Casey's item reduction method)

```
##                npar               fmin              chisq                 df
##              39.000              1.055            538.098            132.000
##              pvalue      baseline.chisq       baseline.df     baseline.pvalue
##               0.000           2262.874           153.000               0.000
##                 cfi                tli               nnfi                rfi
##               0.808              0.777              0.777              0.724
##                 nfi               pnfi                ifi                rni
```

```
##               0.762              0.658              0.809              0.808
##                logl   unrestricted.logl                aic                bic
##           -6456.018          -6186.969          12990.036          13128.145
##              ntotal               bic2              rmsea     rmsea.ci.lower
##             255.000          13004.506              0.110              0.100
##      rmsea.ci.upper       rmsea.pvalue                rmr         rmr_nomean
##               0.120              0.000              0.124              0.124
##                srmr       srmr_bentler srmr_bentler_nomean               crmr
##               0.080              0.080              0.080              0.084
##         crmr_nomean         srmr_mplus   srmr_mplus_nomean               cn_05
##               0.084              0.080              0.080             76.734
##               cn_01                gfi               agfi               pgfi
##              82.846              0.782              0.718              0.604
##                 mfi               ecvi
##               0.451              2.416

## lavaan 0.6-8 ended normally after 49 iterations
##
##   Estimator                                         ML
##   Optimization method                           NLMINB
##   Number of model parameters                        39
##
##                                                   Used       Total
##   Number of observations                           255         282
##
## Model Test User Model:
##
##   Test statistic                               538.098
##   Degrees of freedom                               132
##   P-value (Chi-square)                           0.000
##
## Model Test Baseline Model:
##
##   Test statistic                              2262.874
##   Degrees of freedom                               153
##   P-value                                        0.000
##
## User Model versus Baseline Model:
##
##   Comparative Fit Index (CFI)                    0.808
##   Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)                       0.777
##
## Loglikelihood and Information Criteria:
##
##   Loglikelihood user model (H0)              -6456.018
##   Loglikelihood unrestricted model (H1)      -6186.969
```

```
##
##   Akaike (AIC)                                12990.036
##   Bayesian (BIC)                              13128.145
##   Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (BIC)         13004.506
##
## Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:
##
##   RMSEA                                           0.110
##   90 Percent confidence interval - lower          0.100
##   90 Percent confidence interval - upper          0.120
##   P-value RMSEA <= 0.05                           0.000
##
## Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:
##
##   SRMR                                            0.080
##
## Parameter Estimates:
##
##   Standard errors                             Standard
##   Information                                 Expected
##   Information saturated (h1) model          Structured
##
## Latent Variables:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Absorption =~
##     Item_1            1.000
##     Item_3            1.233    0.187    6.590    0.000
##     Item_5            1.296    0.209    6.190    0.000
##     Item_8            1.701    0.236    7.212    0.000
##     Item_9            0.688    0.154    4.460    0.000
##     Item_10           0.826    0.189    4.377    0.000
##   Vigor =~
##     Item_13           1.000
##     Item_16           1.087    0.140    7.767    0.000
##     Item_17           1.020    0.123    8.293    0.000
##     Item_18           1.679    0.182    9.214    0.000
##     Item_22           1.070    0.131    8.149    0.000
##     Item_23           0.526    0.081    6.459    0.000
##   Dedication =~
##     Item_26           1.000
##     Item_28           0.866    0.070   12.421    0.000
##     Item_29           0.810    0.063   12.793    0.000
##     Item_32           0.849    0.066   12.769    0.000
##     Item_33           0.286    0.040    7.164    0.000
##     Item_34           0.362    0.047    7.746    0.000
##
```

```
## Covariances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Absorption ~~
##     Vigor             0.445    0.082    5.411    0.000
##     Dedication        0.605    0.106    5.720    0.000
##   Vigor ~~
##     Dedication        0.692    0.106    6.559    0.000
##
## Variances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##    .Item_1            1.520    0.137   11.096    0.000
##    .Item_3            0.862    0.081   10.646    0.000
##    .Item_5            1.420    0.130   10.902    0.000
##    .Item_8            0.638    0.071    8.938    0.000
##    .Item_9            1.442    0.129   11.201    0.000
##    .Item_10           2.194    0.196   11.206    0.000
##    .Item_13           1.129    0.104   10.903    0.000
##    .Item_16           0.897    0.084   10.705    0.000
##    .Item_17           0.546    0.052   10.424    0.000
##    .Item_18           0.581    0.066    8.797    0.000
##    .Item_22           0.669    0.064   10.518    0.000
##    .Item_23           0.445    0.040   11.021    0.000
##    .Item_26           0.999    0.107    9.349    0.000
##    .Item_28           0.730    0.079    9.298    0.000
##    .Item_29           0.558    0.062    9.003    0.000
##    .Item_32           0.618    0.068    9.024    0.000
##    .Item_33           0.424    0.039   10.922    0.000
##    .Item_34           0.560    0.052   10.843    0.000
##     Absorption        0.378    0.104    3.640    0.000
##     Vigor             0.484    0.106    4.588    0.000
##     Dedication        1.410    0.203    6.940    0.000
```

```
##                npar                fmin               chisq                  df
##              39.000               1.052             536.537             132.000
##              pvalue      baseline.chisq         baseline.df     baseline.pvalue
##               0.000            2262.874             153.000               0.000
##                 cfi                 tli                nnfi                 rfi
##               0.808               0.778               0.778               0.725
##                 nfi                pnfi                 ifi                 rni
##               0.763               0.658               0.810               0.808
##               logl   unrestricted.logl                 aic                 bic
##          -6455.237           -6186.969           12988.474           13126.583
##              ntotal                bic2               rmsea      rmsea.ci.lower
##             255.000           13002.944               0.110               0.100
##      rmsea.ci.upper        rmsea.pvalue                 rmr          rmr_nomean
##               0.119               0.000               0.131               0.131
##                srmr        srmr_bentler srmr_bentler_nomean                crmr
##               0.076               0.076               0.076               0.080
##         crmr_nomean          srmr_mplus   srmr_mplus_nomean               cn_05
##               0.080               0.076               0.076              76.955
##               cn_01                 gfi                agfi                pgfi
##              83.084               0.790               0.728               0.610
##                 mfi                ecvi
##               0.452               2.410
```

```
## lavaan 0.6-8 ended normally after 53 iterations
```

```
##
##   Estimator                                         ML
##   Optimization method                           NLMINB
##   Number of model parameters                        39
##
##                                                   Used       Total
##   Number of observations                           255         282
##
## Model Test User Model:
##
##   Test statistic                               536.537
##   Degrees of freedom                               132
##   P-value (Chi-square)                           0.000
##
## Model Test Baseline Model:
##
##   Test statistic                              2262.874
##   Degrees of freedom                               153
##   P-value                                        0.000
##
## User Model versus Baseline Model:
##
##   Comparative Fit Index (CFI)                    0.808
##   Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)                       0.778
##
## Loglikelihood and Information Criteria:
##
##   Loglikelihood user model (H0)              -6455.237
##   Loglikelihood unrestricted model (H1)      -6186.969
##
##   Akaike (AIC)                               12988.474
##   Bayesian (BIC)                             13126.583
##   Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (BIC)        13002.944
##
## Root Mean Square Error of Approximation:
##
##   RMSEA                                          0.110
##   90 Percent confidence interval - lower         0.100
##   90 Percent confidence interval - upper         0.119
##   P-value RMSEA <= 0.05                          0.000
##
## Standardized Root Mean Square Residual:
##
##   SRMR                                           0.076
##
## Parameter Estimates:
```

```
##
##   Standard errors                              Standard
##   Information                                  Expected
##   Information saturated (h1) model           Structured
##
## Latent Variables:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Cognitive =~
##     Item_1            1.000
##     Item_3            1.157    0.154    7.520    0.000
##     Item_13           1.049    0.153    6.878    0.000
##     Item_16           1.144    0.154    7.425    0.000
##     Item_26           1.371    0.192    7.158    0.000
##     Item_28           1.367    0.177    7.742    0.000
##   Affective =~
##     Item_5            1.000
##     Item_8            1.295    0.129   10.051    0.000
##     Item_17           0.843    0.094    8.943    0.000
##     Item_18           1.424    0.139   10.261    0.000
##     Item_29           0.972    0.111    8.753    0.000
##     Item_32           1.078    0.119    9.099    0.000
##   Behavioral =~
##     Item_9            1.000
##     Item_10           1.251    0.278    4.507    0.000
##     Item_22           1.734    0.293    5.918    0.000
##     Item_23           0.915    0.167    5.473    0.000
##     Item_33           0.781    0.150    5.208    0.000
##     Item_34           0.989    0.184    5.374    0.000
##
## Covariances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Affective         0.518    0.090    5.754    0.000
##     Behavioral        0.287    0.064    4.514    0.000
##   Affective ~~
##     Behavioral        0.328    0.070    4.713    0.000
##
## Variances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##    .Item_1            1.390    0.130   10.689    0.000
##    .Item_3            0.756    0.077    9.784    0.000
##    .Item_13           1.055    0.101   10.413    0.000
##    .Item_16           0.806    0.081    9.914    0.000
##    .Item_26           1.454    0.143   10.200    0.000
##    .Item_28           0.839    0.089    9.381    0.000
##    .Item_5            1.330    0.124   10.713    0.000
```

```
##    .Item_8           0.517    0.059    8.739    0.000
##    .Item_17          0.536    0.052   10.265    0.000
##    .Item_18          0.480    0.060    7.971    0.000
##    .Item_29          0.799    0.077   10.379    0.000
##    .Item_32          0.793    0.078   10.155    0.000
##    .Item_9           1.363    0.125   10.870    0.000
##    .Item_10          2.048    0.189   10.853    0.000
##    .Item_22          0.448    0.062    7.278    0.000
##    .Item_23          0.363    0.037    9.947    0.000
##    .Item_33          0.382    0.037   10.368    0.000
##    .Item_34          0.492    0.049   10.136    0.000
##     Cognitive        0.508    0.122    4.166    0.000
##     Affective        0.724    0.144    5.025    0.000
##     Behavioral       0.258    0.085    3.042    0.002
```

```
## lavaan 0.6-8 ended normally after 103 iterations
##
##   Estimator                                         ML
##   Optimization method                           NLMINB
##   Number of model parameters                        60
##
##                                                   Used       Total
##   Number of observations                           255         282
##
```

```
## Model Test User Model:
##
##   Test statistic                               214.910
##   Degrees of freedom                               111
##   P-value (Chi-square)                           0.000
##
## Parameter Estimates:
##
##   Standard errors                             Standard
##   Information                                 Expected
##   Information saturated (h1) model          Structured
##
## Latent Variables:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Cognitive =~
##     Item_1            1.000
##     Item_3            0.534    0.101    5.285    0.000
##     Item_13           1.231    0.176    7.007    0.000
##     Item_16           0.668    0.110    6.097    0.000
##     Item_26          -0.329    0.112   -2.924    0.003
##     Item_28           0.121    0.091    1.321    0.186
##   Affective =~
##     Item_5            1.000
##     Item_8            3.178    1.177    2.700    0.007
##     Item_17           0.644    0.294    2.191    0.028
##     Item_18           2.326    0.809    2.875    0.004
##     Item_29          -0.253    0.258   -0.982    0.326
##     Item_32          -0.113    0.255   -0.442    0.658
##   Behavioral =~
##     Item_9            1.000
##     Item_10           1.253    0.286    4.380    0.000
##     Item_22           0.532    0.138    3.863    0.000
##     Item_23           0.519    0.121    4.291    0.000
##     Item_33           0.297    0.101    2.951    0.003
##     Item_34           0.404    0.120    3.352    0.001
##   Absorption =~
##     Item_1            1.000
##     Item_3            1.488    0.270    5.519    0.000
##     Item_5            1.623    0.340    4.769    0.000
##     Item_8            1.927    0.364    5.286    0.000
##     Item_9            0.696    0.197    3.537    0.000
##     Item_10           0.803    0.238    3.377    0.001
##   Vigor =~
##     Item_13           1.000
##     Item_16           1.264    0.185    6.823    0.000
##     Item_17           1.327    0.230    5.758    0.000
```

```
##     Item_18           2.100    0.340    6.176    0.000
##     Item_22           1.537    0.247    6.211    0.000
##     Item_23           0.715    0.127    5.614    0.000
##   Dedication =~
##     Item_26           1.000
##     Item_28           0.840    0.067   12.499    0.000
##     Item_29           0.804    0.060   13.401    0.000
##     Item_32           0.827    0.063   13.082    0.000
##     Item_33           0.268    0.039    6.813    0.000
##     Item_34           0.342    0.046    7.413    0.000
##
## Covariances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##   Affective ~~
##     Absorption        0.000
##   Behavioral ~~
##     Absorption        0.000
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Absorption        0.000
##   Affective ~~
##     Vigor             0.000
##   Behavioral ~~
##     Vigor             0.000
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Vigor             0.000
##   Affective ~~
##     Dedication        0.000
##   Behavioral ~~
##     Dedication        0.000
##   Cognitive ~~
##     Dedication        0.000
##     Affective         0.043    0.029    1.494    0.135
##     Behavioral        0.257    0.070    3.671    0.000
##   Affective ~~
##     Behavioral       -0.014    0.019   -0.737    0.461
##   Absorption ~~
##     Vigor             0.237    0.075    3.144    0.002
##     Dedication        0.549    0.113    4.862    0.000
##   Vigor ~~
##     Dedication        0.560    0.103    5.450    0.000
##
## Variances:
##                    Estimate  Std.Err  z-value  P(>|z|)
##    .Item_1            1.053    0.117    8.984    0.000
##    .Item_3            0.745    0.075    9.890    0.000
##    .Item_13           0.418    0.105    3.962    0.000
```

```
##    .Item_16          0.767    0.078    9.879    0.000
##    .Item_26          0.868    0.104    8.376    0.000
##    .Item_28          0.737    0.077    9.588    0.000
##    .Item_5           1.363    0.127   10.769    0.000
##    .Item_8           0.096    0.141    0.682    0.496
##    .Item_17          0.549    0.054   10.125    0.000
##    .Item_18          0.363    0.082    4.425    0.000
##    .Item_29          0.523    0.061    8.588    0.000
##    .Item_32          0.624    0.069    9.059    0.000
##    .Item_9           1.141    0.127    8.967    0.000
##    .Item_10          1.726    0.195    8.866    0.000
##    .Item_22          0.482    0.056    8.643    0.000
##    .Item_23          0.340    0.037    9.241    0.000
##    .Item_33          0.402    0.038   10.553    0.000
##    .Item_34          0.513    0.050   10.251    0.000
##     Cognitive        0.610    0.143    4.277    0.000
##     Affective        0.076    0.055    1.378    0.168
##     Behavioral       0.366    0.120    3.049    0.002
##     Absorption       0.233    0.089    2.611    0.009
##     Vigor            0.267    0.088    3.017    0.003
##     Dedication       1.475    0.206    7.156    0.000
```

Model	χ^2	*df*	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	AIC
3-factor substantive	538.1	132	0.11	0.08	0.81	0.78	12990.04
3-factor attitudinal	536.54	132	0.11	0.08	0.81	0.78	12988.47
Bi-factor model	214.91	111	0.06	0.04	0.95	0.93	12708.85

4.1.3 Summary

Recommendation for final instrument based on consideration of all of the above pieces of evidence

4.2 Construct and Criterion-related Validation

Use Gallup for construct validation [Thackray, Harter et al., a]. Also the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale [UWES; Schaufeli et al., Schaufeli and Bakker, b]

Chapter 5

Future plans

Most effort is currently dedicated to the technical report. We also need feedback reports and a user manual. The feedback report(s) are the most secondarily important.

The development of the feedback report will occur in stages:

1. static .pdf
2. "static" .html (standard template but potentially interactive elements)
3. "static" `xaringan` [Xie, 2020b]
4. dynamic `xaringan`

- user-generated presenter notes

- user-selected visuals (taken from .html report)

5. Dynamic dashboard

The intent is to lean on the `xaringan` presentation as the central marketable piece. Initial templates should be able to do client colors and fonts via chunk specification, but evolved templates should be client-driven, such that figures can be selected and annotated from the .html, generating a user-selected and annotated `xaringan` presentation that can be hosted by Eagle but accessed via password protection by the client.

Eventually Eagle could optimize interpretation via contributions of cognitive psychologists, graphic designers, etc.

5.1 Things to do

- Finalize items (SIOP papers should take care of this)
- ~~Get survey into Qualtrics for pilot testing~~
- Work on feedback report
- Generate User Manual

5.2 Research projects

Figure 5.1: SIOP 2022

Three projects are being targetted for SIOP 2022:

1. Engagement instrument development

- document the *a priori* bi-factor pursuit
- pilot study with 36 items culled to 18 final
- "ignore" pilot conditions (e.g., not the focus of write-up)
- four levels of feedback:
  - overall (engagement)
  - marginal (substantive)
  - marginal (attitudinal)
  - cell (substantive x attitudinal)
- Morgan taking the lead (6/3/21)

2. Different paths toward scale definitions

- modification indices vs. corrected item-total correlations
- final arbiter = ???
- Casey taking the lead (6/3/21)

3. Measurement invariance across the 4 pilot administration conditions

- focus on 4 pilot conditions
- look into item ordering literature (probably from 1970's)
- relative strength of association (item-trait) based on item ordering
- if we do this only with final scale definitions won't the conditions be watered-down?
- currently leaderless

4. Engagement instrument validation (data collection summer 2021)

- Need to first finalize scale definitions

Chapter 6

Author bios

[Renata Garcia Prieto Palacios Roji](mailto:garciaprier1@mail.montclair.edu) is pursuing her Ph.D. in Industrial a

Chapter 7

References

Appendix A

Timeline of events

A.1 Spring 2019

This is believed to be Eagle I.O's initial definition of engagement:

> A state of personal immersion in work characterized by enthusiasm, dedication, and personal investment, expressed cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally in the proactive pursuit of advancing organizational goals.

This definition was created by Eagle I.O Spring 2019, and modified by Kulas and Renata the following Fall semester of 2019 to include the *four* dimensions of Fulfillment, Absorbtion, Dedication, and Vigor.

A.2 Spring 2020

We considered removing fulfillment.

Fulfillment: finding meaning in one's work, while having a sense of autonomy, growth, usefulness, achievement, and feeling appreciated by org. [Satisfaction(?)]

It was decided to operationalize fullfillment as an *outcome* of engagement rather than a definitional element

A.2.1 February 4, 2020

We lost the document where we had saved the citations for the creation of our engagement dimensions. we found it today (02/04/2020).

Three out of the four dimensions (Dedication, Vigor, and Absorbtion) came from Schaufeli et al., and we are trying to find where Fulfillment came from. We are also trying to improve the definition of each domain by looking at the current items and conducting a Modified Q sort (not correct name) to create piles of items that have commonalities within each domain.

A.2.2 February 24, 2020

Definitional amendment notes and considerations:

Absorption: being fully concentrated and happily immersed in ones work [time passes quickly and has difficulty detaching from ones work; Schaufeli et al.]

Dedication/Commitment: being strongly involved in one's work and experiencing a sense of enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge. [Schaufeli et al.] Identifying as an organizational member/ambassador

This includes conceptual elements of identification with the organization, a sense of "oneness", seeking continuous learning and improvement. We got rid of "challenge" altogether and moved the "inspiration" and "pride" elements to other categories.

Dedication: seeking continous imporvement and demonstrating initiative

Vigor: investing consistent effort, persistence, energy, and mental resilience while working [Schaufeli et al.] maybe add enthusiasm here as well

Vigor: Experiencing persistent levels of energy and enthusiasm while working

A.2.3 Structural considerations

It was considered to potentially change from a focus on affective, cognitive, and behavioral to whether their engagement stems from content/satisfaction with the organization or the people they work with. This idea was however abandoned Spring 2020.

After completing individual Q-sorts (Kulas and Renata) we decided to revisit the originally specified substantive definitions and build them up a little to make the difference between them more noticeable (and we also retained the affect, behavior, cognition focus).

A.3 Summer 2020

Definitions as of 5/19/2020:

Absorption: Being fully immersed in one's work, where time passes quickly and one has difficulty detaching from work tasks

Vigor: Experiencing persistent levels of energy, effort, and enthusiasm while working

Dedication: Experiencing pride and challenge in ones work, as well as strong feelings of support from and loyalty toward the organization

The development team "content validation" as well as the broader content validation to inform the pilot administration (see Chapter 2.3) retained these definitions we ordered all the items according to the ones we individually selected for each category and created an item bank with the remaining items. Together we placed the items in the bank into the agreed upon categories.

Appendix B

Pilot conditions

Our four orderings of items were randomized within dimension (Affective, Behavioral, Cognitive or Dedication, Absorption, Vigor), "block" (Qualtrics designation for groupings of items), and item. The elements that were randomized are identified in the following tables by randomized element (A, B, C, or D):

Table B.1: Pilot administration ordering Condition 1

Condition1	Substantiv
I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Absorptio
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Absorptio
Time passes quickly while I'm working	Absorptio
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Absorptio
I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Absorptio
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Absorptio
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Absorptio
I love starting my workday.	Absorptio
I devote more time than is expected of me.	Absorptio
I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Absorptio
I never miss a work deadline.	Absorptio
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Absorptio
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor
Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor
I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor
This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor
I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor
I plan my future with this company.	Dedication
I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedication
I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedication
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedication
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedication
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedication
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedication
My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedication
I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedication
I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedication
I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedication
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedication

Table B.2: Pilot administration ordering Condition 2

Condition2	Substantive	Attitudi
I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Absorption	Cognitiv
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Absorption	Cognitiv
Time passes quickly while I'm working	Absorption	Cognitiv
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Absorption	Cognitiv
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor	Cognitiv
Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor	Cognitiv
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor	Cognitiv
I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor	Cognitiv
I plan my future with this company.	Dedication	Cognitiv
I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedication	Cognitiv
I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedication	Cognitiv
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedication	Cognitiv
I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Absorption	Affective
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Absorption	Affective
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Absorption	Affective
I love starting my workday.	Absorption	Affective
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor	Affective
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor	Affective
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor	Affective
This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor	Affective
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedication	Affective
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedication	Affective
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedication	Affective
My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedication	Affective
I devote more time than is expected of me.	Absorption	Behavior
I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Absorption	Behavior
I never miss a work deadline.	Absorption	Behavior
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Absorption	Behavior
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor	Behavior
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor	Behavior
I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor	Behavior
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor	Behavior
I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedication	Behavior
I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedication	Behavior
I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedication	Behavior
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedication	Behavior

Table B.3: Pilot administration ordering Condition 3

Condition3	Substantiv
I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Absorption
I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Absorption
I devote more time than is expected of me.	Absorption
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Absorption
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Absorption
I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Absorption
Time passes quickly while I'm working	Absorption
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Absorption
I never miss a work deadline.	Absorption
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Absorption
I love starting my workday.	Absorption
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Absorption
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor
Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor
I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor
I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor
This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor
I plan my future with this company.	Dedication
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedication
I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedication
I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedication
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedication
I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedication
I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedication
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedication
I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedication
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedication
My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedication
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedication

Table B.4: Pilot administration ordering Condition 4

Condition4	Substantive	Attitudi
I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Absorption	Cognitiv
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor	Cognitiv
I plan my future with this company.	Dedication	Cognitiv
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Absorption	Cognitiv
Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor	Cognitiv
I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedication	Cognitiv
Time passes quickly while I'm working	Absorption	Cognitiv
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor	Cognitiv
I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedication	Cognitiv
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Absorption	Cognitiv
I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor	Cognitiv
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedication	Cognitiv
I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Absorption	Affective
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor	Affective
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedication	Affective
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Absorption	Affective
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor	Affective
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedication	Affective
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Absorption	Affective
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor	Affective
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedication	Affective
I love starting my workday.	Absorption	Affective
This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor	Affective
My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedication	Affective
I devote more time than is expected of me.	Absorption	Behavior
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor	Behavior
I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedication	Behavior
I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Absorption	Behavior
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor	Behavior
I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedication	Behavior
I never miss a work deadline.	Absorption	Behavior
I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor	Behavior
I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedication	Behavior
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Absorption	Behavior
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor	Behavior
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedication	Behavior

Appendix C

Pilot demographics

C.1 Response date

As reported by Qualtrics' `Recorded Date` estimates:

Figure C.1: Qualtrics recorded date of pilot survey response

C.2 Response latencies

As reported by Qualtrics' `Duration (in seconds)` variable:

```
## `stat_bin()` using `bins = 30`. Pick better value with `binwidth`.
```

Figure C.2: Qualtrics recorded response latencies (truncated for over 7000 seconds)

C.3 Geographic constituency

As reported by Qualtrics' `Location Latitude` and `Location Longitude` estimates, rounded to one decimal place in consideration of pilot respondents' privacy:

Geographic location of pilot sample respondents

Appendix D

Correlations

D.1 Inter-Item correlations

I enjoy thinking about work even when Iâ€™m not at work.

Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete.

I am happiest when I am immersed in a project.

I love starting my workday.

I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.

Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.

I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me.

This job drains my energy.

I am proud to be a member of this organization.

I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task.

I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization.

My job makes me feel like Iâ€™m part of something meaningful.

I devote more time than is expected of me.

I have to be reminded to take breaks while Iâ€™m at work.

I never miss a work deadline.

I never allow distractions to interfere with my work.

When work is slow I find ways to be productive.

I express enthusiasm for my job while at work.

I try my best to perform well at work.

If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.

I make valued contributions to the organization.

I embrace challenging situations at work.

I speak positively about this organization to others.

This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job.

I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day.

Thinking about work saps my energy.

I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task.

Iâ€™m able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday.

I plan my future with this company.

I believe this company cares about my career goals.

I often think about finding another job.

This organization challenges me to work at my full potential.

Iâ€™m able to concentrate on my work without distractions.

I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work.

Time passes quickly while Iâ€™m working.

I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work.

I enjoy thinking about work even when Iâ€™m not at work.

1.00

0.42

0.27

0.49

0.40

0.51

0.33

0.25

0.36

0.21

0.30

0.43

0.18

0.17

-0.03

0.10

0.24

0.38

0.25

0.10

0.28

0.28

0.35

0.00

0.15

0.40

0.24

0.29

0.38

0.33

0.37

0.36

0.16

0.26

0.34

0.25

Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete.

0.42

1.00

0.19

0.36

0.35

0.47

0.23

0.36

0.25

0.07

0.20

0.28

0.10

-0.05

-0.13

-0.02

0.15

0.24

0.18

0.08

0.15

0.13

0.17

-0.01

0.10

0.50

0.18

0.21

0.37

0.27

0.39

0.20

0.06

0.03

0.30

0.00

I am happiest when I am immersed in a project.

0.27

0.19

1.00

0.21

0.35

0.27

0.43

0.09

0.14

0.16

0.18

0.20

0.21

0.17

0.05

0.13

0.20

0.25

0.18

0.12

0.20

0.28

0.10

-0.02

0.22

0.12

0.30

0.10

0.19

0.13

0.13

0.06

0.13

0.12

0.22

0.12

I love starting my workday.

0.49

0.36

0.21

1.00

0.59

0.82

0.35

0.43

0.50

0.20

0.46

0.50

0.19

0.14

0.11

0.25

0.34

0.46

0.31

0.23

0.33

0.28

0.46

0.26

0.35

0.51

0.33

0.49

0.46

0.50

0.52

0.53

0.29

0.12

0.49

0.06

I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.

0.40

0.35

0.35

0.59

1.00

0.59

0.52

0.28

0.47

0.19

0.47

0.58

0.21

0.24

0.06

0.23

0.36

0.52

0.35

0.20

0.32

0.39

0.42

0.24

0.36

0.40

0.39

0.35

0.40

0.46

0.41

0.39

0.30

0.09

0.44

0.04

Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.

0.51

0.47

0.27

0.82

0.59

1.00

0.43

0.43

0.53

0.24

0.48

0.54

0.20

0.19

0.11

0.24

0.34

0.55

0.35

0.23

0.36

0.31

0.49

0.20

0.37

0.54

0.38

0.51

0.47

0.50

0.55

0.50

0.25

0.17

0.47

0.12

I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me.

0.33

0.23

0.43

0.35

0.52

0.43

1.00

0.17

0.41

0.32

0.52

0.53

0.40

0.40

0.10

0.23

0.46

0.57

0.43

0.26

0.41

0.54

0.37

0.14

0.39

0.21

0.32

0.36

0.39

0.40

0.36

0.40

0.20

0.31

0.42

0.27

This job drains my energy.

0.25

0.36

0.09

0.43

0.28

0.43

0.17

1.00

0.36

0.27

0.21

0.34

-0.05

-0.05

-0.02

0.04

0.11

0.28

0.06

0.02

0.12

0.15

0.35

0.31

0.09

0.61

0.09

0.30

0.35

0.42

0.51

0.31

0.10

-0.14

0.22

-0.19

I am proud to be a member of this organization.

0.36

0.25

0.14

0.50

0.47

0.53

0.41

0.36

1.00

0.29

0.52

0.63

0.17

0.19

0.14

0.28

0.37

0.54

0.39

0.21

0.27

0.36

0.75

0.40

0.26

0.36

0.24

0.34

0.57

0.68

0.59

0.59

0.26

0.15

0.44

0.11

I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task.

0.21

0.07

0.16

0.20

0.19

0.24

0.32

0.27

0.29

1.00

0.27

0.35

0.04

0.02

-0.04

0.03

0.05

0.22

0.19

0.02

0.25

0.33

0.28

0.34

0.02

0.17

0.03

0.18

0.20

0.44

0.27

0.36

0.02

0.00

0.20

-0.01

I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization.

0.30

0.20

0.18

0.46

0.47

0.48

0.52

0.21

0.52

0.27

1.00

0.56

0.26

0.16

0.09

0.22

0.28

0.52

0.37

0.18

0.55

0.54

0.49

0.29

0.24

0.21

0.20

0.31

0.38

0.43

0.38

0.46

0.22

0.21

0.35

0.16

My job makes me feel like Iâ€™m part of something meaningful.

0.43

0.28

0.20

0.50

0.58

0.54

0.53

0.34

0.63

0.35

0.56

1.00

0.21

0.22

0.02

0.27

0.35

0.56

0.38

0.16

0.46

0.43

0.53

0.27

0.34

0.40

0.26

0.40

0.53

0.58

0.56

0.55

0.33

0.15

0.47

0.10

I devote more time than is expected of me.

0.18

0.10

0.21

0.19

0.21

0.20

0.40

-0.05

0.17

0.04

0.26

0.21

1.00

0.38

-0.01

0.24

0.33

0.24

0.32

0.15

0.22

0.20

0.13

-0.01

0.34

0.03

0.13

0.20

0.24

0.13

0.22

0.25

0.17

0.31

0.32

0.29

I have to be reminded to take breaks while Iâ€™m at work.

0.17

-0.05

0.17

0.14

0.24

0.19

0.40

-0.05

0.19

0.02

0.16

0.22

0.38

1.00

0.12

0.21

0.20

0.33

0.29

0.14

0.16

0.14

0.14

-0.02

0.37

-0.03

0.19

0.14

0.17

0.11

0.13

0.23

0.11

0.27

0.15

0.28

I never miss a work deadline.

-0.03

-0.13

0.05

0.11

0.06

0.11

0.10

-0.02

0.14

-0.04

0.09

0.02

-0.01

0.12

1.00

0.35

0.18

0.16

0.19

0.08

0.11

0.11

0.17

0.10

0.32

-0.03

0.10

0.26

0.01

0.01

0.00

0.06

0.33

-0.01

0.08

-0.06

I never allow distractions to interfere with my work.

0.10

-0.02

0.13

0.25

0.23

0.24

0.23

0.04

0.28

0.03

0.22

0.27

0.24

0.21

0.35

1.00

0.29

0.29

0.21

0.19

0.26

0.21

0.30

0.11

0.54

0.09

0.21

0.39

0.12

0.14

0.20

0.22

0.54

0.04

0.31

0.01

When work is slow I find ways to be productive.

0.24

0.15

0.20

0.34

0.36

0.34

0.46

0.11

0.37

0.05

0.28

0.35

0.33

0.20

0.18

0.29

1.00

0.42

0.45

0.31

0.23

0.29

0.31

0.09

0.46

0.23

0.24

0.40

0.34

0.25

0.34

0.41

0.31

0.17

0.40

0.13

I express enthusiasm for my job while at work.

0.38

0.24

0.25
0.46
0.52
0.55
0.57
0.28
0.54
0.22
0.52
0.56
0.24
0.33
0.16
0.29
0.42
1.00
0.50
0.31
0.40
0.46
0.54
0.15
0.40
0.32
0.35
0.41
0.38
0.44
0.41
0.43
0.28

0.19

0.42

0.14

I try my best to perform well at work.

0.25

0.18

0.18

0.31

0.35

0.35

0.43

0.06

0.39

0.19

0.37

0.38

0.32

0.29

0.19

0.21

0.45

0.50

1.00

0.30

0.26

0.37

0.38

0.16

0.41

0.19

0.23

0.36

0.29

0.32

0.26

0.36

0.24

0.24

0.32

0.19

If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.

0.10

0.08

0.12

0.23

0.20

0.23

0.26

0.02

0.21

0.02

0.18

0.16

0.15

0.14

0.08

0.19

0.31

0.31

0.30

1.00

0.25

0.22

0.24

0.11

0.32

0.18

0.08

0.37

0.17

0.21

0.14

0.31

0.27

-0.06

0.24

-0.07

I make valued contributions to the organization.

0.28

0.15

0.20

0.33

0.32

0.36

0.41

0.12

0.27

0.25

0.55

0.46

0.22

0.16

0.11

0.26

0.23

0.40

0.26

0.25

1.00

0.46

0.20

0.12

0.31

0.20

0.18

0.27

0.26

0.25

0.29

0.29

0.24

0.09

0.26

0.00

I embrace challenging situations at work.

0.28

0.13

0.28

0.28

0.39

0.31

0.54

0.15

0.36

0.33

0.54

0.43

0.20

0.14

0.11

0.21

0.29

0.46

0.37

0.22

0.46

1.00

0.34

0.22

0.27

0.16

0.14

0.28

0.24

0.33

0.22

0.36

0.19

0.19

0.30

0.14

I speak positively about this organization to others.

0.35

0.17

0.10

0.46
0.42
0.49
0.37
0.35
0.75
0.28
0.49
0.53
0.13
0.14
0.17
0.30
0.31
0.54
0.38
0.24
0.20
0.34
1.00
0.43
0.30
0.32
0.20
0.35
0.54
0.62
0.56
0.55
0.28
0.13

0.40

0.08

This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job.

0.00

-0.01

-0.02

0.26

0.24

0.20

0.14

0.31

0.40

0.34

0.29

0.27

-0.01

-0.02

0.10

0.11

0.09

0.15

0.16

0.11

0.12

0.22

0.43

1.00

0.06

0.26

-0.03

0.20

0.25

0.45

0.36

0.37

0.18

-0.13

0.11

-0.16

I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day.

0.15

0.10

0.22

0.35

0.36

0.37

0.39

0.09

0.26

0.02

0.24

0.34

0.34

0.37

0.32

0.54

0.46

0.40

0.41

0.32

0.31

0.27

0.30

0.06

1.00

0.17

0.30

0.53

0.25

0.15

0.24

0.32

0.57

0.13

0.48

0.06

Thinking about work saps my energy.

0.40

0.50

0.12

0.51

0.40

0.54

0.21

0.61

0.36

0.17

0.21

0.40

0.03

-0.03

-0.03

0.09

0.23

0.32

0.19

0.18

0.20

0.16

0.32

0.26

0.17

1.00

0.17

0.45

0.28

0.41

0.51

0.30

0.21

-0.12

0.32

-0.18

I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task.

0.24

0.18

0.30

0.33

0.39

0.38

0.32

0.09

0.24

0.03

0.20

0.26

0.13

0.19

0.10

0.21

0.24

0.35

0.23

0.08

0.18

0.14

0.20

-0.03

0.30

0.17

1.00

0.29

0.12

0.16

0.18

0.14

0.26

0.18

0.26

0.13

Iâ€™m able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday.

0.29

0.21

0.10

0.49

0.35

0.51

0.36

0.30

0.34

0.18

0.31

0.40

0.20

0.14

0.26

0.39

0.40

0.41

0.36

0.37

0.27

0.28

0.35

0.20

0.53

0.45

0.29

1.00

0.24

0.33

0.32

0.43

0.50

0.12

0.50

0.08

I plan my future with this company.

0.38

0.37

0.19

0.46

0.40

0.47

0.39

0.35

0.57

0.20

0.38

0.53

0.24

0.17

0.01

0.12

0.34

0.38

0.29

0.17

0.26

0.24

0.54

0.25

0.25

0.28

0.12

0.24

1.00

0.60

0.63

0.51

0.18

0.16

0.38

0.10

I believe this company cares about my career goals.

0.33

0.27

0.13

0.50

0.46

0.50

0.40

0.42

0.68

0.44

0.43

0.58

0.13

0.11

0.01

0.14

0.25

0.44

0.32

0.21

0.25

0.33

0.62

0.45

0.15

0.41

0.16

0.33

0.60

1.00

0.57

0.69

0.19

0.19

0.33

0.12

I often think about finding another job.

0.37

0.39

0.13

0.52

0.41

0.55

0.36

0.51

0.59

0.27

0.38

0.56

0.22

0.13

0.00

0.20

0.34

0.41

0.26

0.14

0.29

0.22

0.56

0.36

0.24

0.51

0.18

0.32

0.63

0.57

1.00

0.48

0.26

0.03

0.38

-0.02

This organization challenges me to work at my full potential.

0.36

0.20

0.06

0.53

0.39

0.50

0.40

0.31

0.59

0.36

0.46

0.55

0.25

0.23

0.06

0.22

0.41

0.43

0.36

0.31

0.29

0.36

0.55

0.37

0.32

0.30

0.14

0.43

0.51

0.69

0.48

1.00

0.29

0.27

0.45

0.20

Iâ€™m able to concentrate on my work without distractions.

0.16

0.06

0.13

0.29

0.30
0.25
0.20
0.10
0.26
0.02
0.22
0.33
0.17
0.11
0.33
0.54
0.31
0.28
0.24
0.27
0.24
0.19
0.28
0.18
0.57
0.21
0.26
0.50
0.18
0.19
0.26
0.29
1.00
0.01
0.44

-0.04

I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work.

0.26

0.03

0.12

0.12

0.09

0.17

0.31

-0.14

0.15

0.00

0.21

0.15

0.31

0.27

-0.01

0.04

0.17

0.19

0.24

-0.06

0.09

0.19

0.13

-0.13

0.13

-0.12

0.18

0.12

0.16

0.19

0.03

0.27

0.01

1.00

0.15

0.90

Time passes quickly while Iâ€™m working.

0.34

0.30

0.22

0.49

0.44

0.47

0.42

0.22

0.44

0.20

0.35

0.47

0.32

0.15

0.08

0.31

0.40

0.42

0.32

0.24

0.26

0.30

0.40

0.11

0.48

0.32

0.26

0.50

0.38

0.33

0.38

0.45

0.44

0.15

1.00

0.09

I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work.

0.25

0.00

0.12

0.06

0.04

0.12

0.27

-0.19

0.11

-0.01

0.16

0.10

0.29

0.28

-0.06

0.01

0.13

0.14

0.19

-0.07

0.00

0.14

0.08

-0.16

0.06

-0.18

0.13

0.08

0.10

0.12

-0.02

0.20

-0.04

0.90

0.09

1.00

D.2 Scale-level correlations

Because of the large inter-construct covariance estimates, we constructed standard unit-weighted scale aggregates (interactive plot of unit-weighted aggregates located below)

D.2.1 Substantive scales

D.2.2 Attitudinal scales

Correlation matrix of 3 unit-weighted substantive and 3 unit-weighted attitudinal scales:

Absorption
Vigor
Dedication
Cognitive
Affective
Behavioral
0.65
0.78
0.78
0.89
0.80
0.72
0.80
0.79
0.77
0.81
0.87
0.86
0.75
0.66
0.79

Appendix E

Corrected item-total correlations

E.1 "Marginal" level

E.1.1 Attitudinal

E.1.2 Construct Substantive

E.2 "Cell" level

Table E.1: Affective Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I enjoy thinking about work even when Iâ€™m not at work.	270	0.56	3.1	1.5
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete.	269	0.40	2.6	1.2
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project.	267	0.35	4.6	1.0
I love starting my workday.	270	0.70	3.6	1.3
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	270	0.65	4.5	1.0
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	269	0.77	3.8	1.4
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me.	269	0.58	4.6	1.2
This job drains my energy.	269	0.43	3.2	1.4
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	268	0.64	4.7	1.2
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task.	263	0.35	4.5	1.4
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization.	268	0.60	5.0	1.0
My job makes me feel like Iâ€™m part of something meaningful.	267	0.70	4.6	1.3

Table E.2: Behavioral Items

	n	r.dr
I devote more time than is expected of me.	271	0.
I have to be reminded to take breaks while Iâ€™m at work.	269	0.
I never miss a work deadline.	269	0.
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work.	271	0.
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	270	0.
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work.	271	0.
I try my best to perform well at work.	272	0.
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	271	0.
I make valued contributions to the organization.	267	0.
I embrace challenging situations at work.	269	0.
I speak positively about this organization to others.	269	0.
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job.	270	0.

Table E.3: Cognitive Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day.	271	0.46	4.1	1.3
Thinking about work saps my energy.	270	0.35	3.6	1.4
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task.	269	0.35	3.4	1.4
Iâ€™m able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday.	271	0.56	4.1	1.2
I plan my future with this company.	265	0.55	3.9	1.6
I believe this company cares about my career goals.	268	0.58	3.9	1.5
I often think about finding another job.	267	0.56	3.5	1.6
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential.	268	0.67	4.3	1.3
Iâ€™m able to concentrate on my work without distractions.	270	0.39	3.7	1.4
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work.	272	0.31	3.7	1.5
Time passes quickly while Iâ€™m working.	272	0.60	4.6	1.2
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work.	273	0.22	3.7	1.6

Table E.4: Absorption Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I enjoy thinking about work even when Iâ€™m not at work.	270	0.46	3.1	1.5
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete.	269	0.16	2.6	1.2
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project.	267	0.32	4.6	1.0
I love starting my workday.	270	0.50	3.6	1.3
I devote more time than is expected of me.	271	0.46	4.5	1.3
I have to be reminded to take breaks while Iâ€™m at work.	269	0.37	3.7	1.6
I never miss a work deadline.	269	0.16	4.5	1.2
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work.	271	0.39	3.2	1.4
Iâ€™m able to concentrate on my work without distractions.	270	0.36	3.7	1.4
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work.	272	0.42	3.7	1.5
Time passes quickly while Iâ€™m working.	272	0.51	4.6	1.2
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work.	273	0.37	3.7	1.6

Table E.5: Vigor Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day.	271	0.50	4.1	1.28
Thinking about work saps my energy.	270	0.49	3.6	1.38
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task.	269	0.39	3.4	1.37
Iâ€™m able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday.	271	0.63	4.1	1.22
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	270	0.62	4.5	1.03
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	269	0.70	3.8	1.40
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me.	269	0.59	4.6	1.20
This job drains my energy.	269	0.34	3.2	1.37
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	270	0.53	4.5	1.18
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work.	271	0.68	4.8	1.11
I try my best to perform well at work.	272	0.50	5.4	0.76
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	271	0.36	4.2	1.14

Table E.6: Dedication Items

	n	r.dr
I plan my future with this company.	265	0.
I believe this company cares about my career goals.	268	0.
I often think about finding another job.	267	0.
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential.	268	0.
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	268	0.
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task.	263	0.
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization.	268	0.
My job makes me feel like Iâ€™m part of something meaningful.	267	0.
I make valued contributions to the organization.	267	0.
I embrace challenging situations at work.	269	0.
I speak positively about this organization to others.	269	0.
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job.	270	0.

Table E.7: Affective - Absorption Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I enjoy thinking about work even when Iâ€™m not at work.	270	0.57	3.1	1.5
Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete.	269	0.37	2.6	1.2
I am happiest when I am immersed in a project.	267	0.31	4.6	1.0
I love starting my workday.	270	0.51	3.6	1.3

Table E.8: Affective - Vigor Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	270	0.58	4.5	1.0
Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	269	0.63	3.8	1.4
I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me.	269	0.47	4.6	1.2
This job drains my energy.	269	0.34	3.2	1.4

Table E.9: Affective - Dedication Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I am proud to be a member of this organization.	268	0.61	4.7	1.2
I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task.	263	0.38	4.5	1.4
I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization.	268	0.59	5.0	1.0
My job makes me feel like Iâ€™m part of something meaningful.	267	0.66	4.6	1.3

Table E.10: Cognitive - Absorption Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
Iâ€™m able to concentrate on my work without distractions.	270	0.14	3.7	1.4
I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work.	272	0.58	3.7	1.5
Time passes quickly while Iâ€™m working.	272	0.29	4.6	1.2
I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work.	273	0.52	3.7	1.6

Table E.11: Cognitive - Vigor Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day.	271	0.40	4.1	1.3
Thinking about work saps my energy.	270	0.32	3.6	1.4
I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task.	269	0.32	3.4	1.4
Iâ€™m able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday.	271	0.60	4.1	1.2

Table E.12: Cognitive - Dedication Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I plan my future with this company.	265	0.67	3.9	1.6
I believe this company cares about my career goals.	268	0.70	3.9	1.5
I often think about finding another job.	267	0.65	3.5	1.6
This organization challenges me to work at my full potential.	268	0.65	4.3	1.3

Table E.13: Behavioral - Absorption Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
I devote more time than is expected of me.	271	0.36	4.5	1.3
I have to be reminded to take breaks while Iâ€™m at work.	269	0.37	3.7	1.6
I never miss a work deadline.	269	0.22	4.5	1.2
I never allow distractions to interfere with my work.	271	0.42	3.2	1.4

Table E.14: Behavioral - Vigor Items

	n	r.drop	mean	sd
When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	270	0.51	4.5	1.18
I express enthusiasm for my job while at work.	271	0.54	4.8	1.11
I try my best to perform well at work.	272	0.54	5.4	0.76
If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	271	0.40	4.2	1.14

Table E.15: Behavioral - Dedication Items

	n	r.dr
I make valued contributions to the organization.	267	0.
I embrace challenging situations at work.	269	0.
I speak positively about this organization to others.	269	0.
This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job.	270	0.

Appendix F

Qualitative item characteristics

Item reading level information was performed via the packages `quanteda` version 2.1.2 [Benoit et al., 2020] and `quanteda.textstats` version 0.94.1 [Benoit et al., 2021] in R version 4.0.3 (2020-10-10) [R Core Team, 2020]. Two indices were investigated: "Flesch-Kincaid" is the same grade level index that's currently used by Microsoft Word [Kincaid et al.] whereas "Dale.Chall" reflects N_{wd} ["difficulty" of words; Chall and Dale]. These indices are primarily influenced by two qualitative characteristics: N_{wf}, which is the number of words matching the Dale-Chall List of 3000 "familiar words", and N_{wd}, which is the number of "difficult" words not matching the Dale-Chall list of "familiar" words.

The average Flesch-Kincaied (e.g., reading grade) for our 36 candidate pilot items was 6.2 (sd = 3.04). The average Dale-Chall index was 38.61 (sd = 11.11).

F.1 Frequency distributions by dimension

Infrequent word incidence across attitudinal dimensions
density
0.04
0.03
0.02
0.01
0.00
10
20
30
40
50
60
Dale Chall Index
Attitudinal Dimension
Affective
Behavioral
Cognitive

Item reading level estimates across substantive/attitudinal dimension comb
density
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
5
10
Flesch−Kincaid Index
Att/Engage Interaction
Absorption Affective
Absorption Behavioral
Absorption Cognitive
Dedication Affective
Dedication Behavioral
Dedication Cognitive
Vigor Affective
Vigor Behavioral
Vigor Cognitive

F.2 Tables of qualitative indices

Table F.1: Organized by Flesch-Kincaid aka Reading Level

	document	Substantive	Att
36	This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedication	Bel
35	I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedication	Bel
33	I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedication	Bel
34	I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedication	Bel
31	I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedication	Aff
28	This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedication	Cog
24	If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor	Bel
16	I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor	Cog
1	I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Absorption	Cog
4	I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Absorption	Cog
12	I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Absorption	Bel
18	Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor	Aff
15	I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor	Cog
27	I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedication	Cog
22	I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor	Bel
26	I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedication	Cog
29	I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedication	Aff
30	I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedication	Aff
14	Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor	Cog
17	I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor	Aff
6	Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Absorption	Aff
2	I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Absorption	Cog
7	I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Absorption	Aff
13	I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor	Cog
5	I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Absorption	Aff
19	I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor	Aff
3	Time passes quickly while I'm working	Absorption	Cog
25	I plan my future with this company.	Dedication	Cog
32	My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedication	Aff
9	I devote more time than is expected of me.	Absorption	Bel
8	I love starting my workday.	Absorption	Aff
10	I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Absorption	Bel
11	I never miss a work deadline.	Absorption	Bel
20	This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor	Aff
21	When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor	Bel
23	I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor	Bel

Table F.2: Organized by Dale Chall aka includes Difficult Words

	document	Subst
36	This organization provides the resources necessary for me to successfully perform my job	Dedic
34	I embrace challenging situations at work.	Dedic
16	I'm able to maintain good levels of energy throughout the workday	Vigor
4	I find it difficult to mentally disconnect from work	Abso
31	I feel proud of my accomplishments within this organization	Dedic
20	This job drains my energy (r)	Vigor
24	If I notice my energy level is low, I take corrective steps to re-energize.	Vigor
28	This organization challenges me to work at my full potential	Dedic
14	Thinking about work saps my energy (r)	Vigor
33	I make valued contributions to the organization	Dedic
6	Most days, I feel happiest when the workday is soon to be complete (r)	Abso
35	I speak positively about this organization to others.	Dedic
1	I'm able to concentrate on my work without distractions	Abso
12	I never allow distractions to interfere with my work	Abso
22	I express enthusiasm for my job while at work	Vigor
2	I have a hard time detaching mentally from my work	Abso
7	I am happiest when I am immersed in a project	Abso
19	I feel motivated to go beyond what is asked of me	Vigor
13	I devote my full attention to my work tasks throughout the day	Vigor
30	I feel supported by my supervisor when I fail at a task	Dedic
15	I would rather direct my focus toward a work task than a personal task	Vigor
8	I love starting my workday.	Abso
11	I never miss a work deadline.	Abso
25	I plan my future with this company.	Dedic
17	I enjoy spending time completing my job tasks.	Vigor
27	I often think about finding another job (r)	Dedic
9	I devote more time than is expected of me.	Abso
23	I try my best to perform well at work	Vigor
26	I believe this company cares about my career goals	Dedic
18	Most days I feel enthusiastic about starting my work day.	Vigor
21	When work is slow I find ways to be productive.	Vigor
29	I am proud to be a member of this organization.	Dedic
32	My job makes me feel like I'm part of something meaningful	Dedic
10	I have to be reminded to take breaks while I'm at work	Abso
5	I enjoy thinking about work even when I'm not at work	Abso
3	Time passes quickly while I'm working	Abso

Appendix G

CFA Modification Indices

Initial CFA modification indices (top 700 reported; 36-item specification):

Bibliography

JJ Allaire, Jeffrey Horner, Yihui Xie, Vicent Marti, and Natacha Porte. *markdown: Render Markdown with the C Library Sundown*, 2019. URL https://github.com/rstudio/markdown. R package version 1.1.

Frederik Anseel, Filip Lievens, Eveline Schollaert, and Beata Choragwicka. Response rates in organizational science, 1995–2008: A meta-analytic review and guidelines for survey researchers. 25(3):335–349. ISSN 1573-353X(Electronic),0889-3268(Print). doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9157-6. Place: Germany Publisher: Springer.

Kenneth Benoit, Kohei Watanabe, Haiyan Wang, Paul Nulty, Adam Obeng, Stefan Müller, Akitaka Matsuo, Jiong Wei Lua, Jouni Kuha, and William Lowe. *quanteda: Quantitative Analysis of Textual Data*, 2020. URL https://quanteda.io. R package version 2.1.2.

Kenneth Benoit, Kohei Watanabe, Haiyan Wang, Jiong Wei Lua, and Jouni Kuha. *quanteda.textstats: Textual Statistics for the Quantitative Analysis of Textual Data*, 2021. URL https://quanteda.io. R package version 0.94.1.

Gary L Canivez. *Principles and methods of test construction: Standards and recent advancements*, chapter Bifactor modeling in construct validation of multifactored tests: Implications for understanding multidimensional constructs and test interpretation. Hogrefe Publishers, Gottingen, Germany, 2016.

Jeanne Sternlicht Chall and Edgar Dale. *Readability revisited: The new Dale-Chall readability formula*. Brookline Books.

Curt Coffman and Jim Harter. A hard look at soft numbers. *Position paper, Gallup Organization*, 1999.

Michael S Cole, Frank Walter, Arthur G Bedeian, and Ernest H O'Boyle. Job burnout and employee engagement: A meta-analytic examination of construct proliferation. *Journal of management*, 38(5):1550–1581, 2012.

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*, volume 1990. Harper & Row New York, 1990.

Alice H. Eagly and Shelly Chaiken. *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

David F. Elloy, James E. Everett, and W. Randolph Flynn. An examination of the correlates of job involvement. *Group & Organization Studies*, 16(2):160–177, June 1991. doi: 10.1177/105960119101600204. URL http://ezproxy.montclair.edu:2048/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=1991-29008-001&site=eds-live&scope=site. Publisher: Sage Publications.

Sacha Epskamp. *semPlot: Path Diagrams and Visual Analysis of Various SEM Packages' Output*, 2019. URL https://github.com/SachaEpskamp/semPlot. R package version 1.1.2.

Robert Ferris and Phillip Hellier. Added value productivity schemes and employee participation. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 22(4):35–44, November 1984. ISSN 1038-4111. doi: 10.1177/103841118402200406. URL http://ezproxy.montclair.edu:2048/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2013-23190-006&site=eds-live&scope=site. Publisher: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Casey Giordano, Deniz S. Ones, Niels G. Waller, and Kevin C. Stanek. Exploratory bifactor measurement models in vocational behavior research. 120: 103430. ISSN 0001-8791. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103430. URL http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001879120300555.

Daniel D Goering, Akihito Shimazu, Feigu Zhou, Tyki Wada, and Ryutaro Sakai. Not if, but how they differ: A meta-analytic test of the nomological networks of burnout and engagement. *Burnout Research*, 5:21–34, 2017.

J. K. Harter, F. L. Schmidt, S. Agrawal, and S. K. Plowman. The relationship between engagement at work and organizational outcomes 2012 q12 meta-analysis lincoln. a.

James K. Harter, F. Schmidt, and T. Hayes. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. b. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268.

William A. Kahn. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. 33(4):692–724. Publisher: Academy of Management Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510.

Florian G. Kaiser and Mark Wilson. The Campbell Paradigm as a Behavior-Predictive Reinterpretation of the Classical Tripartite Model of Attitudes. *European Psychologist*, 24(4):359–374, 2019. ISSN 1016-9040. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040/a000364. URL https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7039345/.

Rabindra N Kanungo. Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of applied psychology*, 67(3):341–349, 1982. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.67.3.341.

Hyun Jeong Kim, Kang Hyun Shin, and Nancy Swanger. Burnout and engagement: A comparative analysis using the Big Five personality dimensions. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(1):96–104, March 2009. ISSN 0278-4319. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2008.06.001. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0278431908000431.

J. Peter Kincaid, Robert P. Fishburne Jr, Richard L. Rogers, and Brad S. Chissom. Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count and flesch reading ease formula) for navy enlisted personnel.

Edward E Lawler and Douglas T Hall. Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 54(4):305–312, 1970. doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029692.

Michael Leiter and Christina Maslach. Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. In *Research in Occupational Stress and Well-being*, volume 3, pages 91–134. ISBN 978-0-7623-1057-9. doi: 10.1016/S1479-3555(03)03003-8. Journal Abbreviation: Research in Occupational Stress and Well-being.

Dean Roger Leone. *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, November 1995. Issue: 5-B Journal Abbreviation: Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering Pages: 2917 Publication Title: Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering Volume: 56.

Maxwell Mansolf and Steven P. Reise. When and why the second-order and bifactor models are distinguishable. *Intelligence*, 61:120–129, 2017. Publisher: Elsevier.

C Maslach and MP Leiter. 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*, pages 38–60, 1997.

Christina Maslach and Michael P. Leiter. Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(3):498–512, 2008. Publisher: American Psychological Association.

John P. Meyer and Natalie J. Allen. A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human resource management review*, 1(1):61–89, 1991. Publisher: Elsevier.

John Pachankis. The Psychological Implications of Concealing a Stigma: A Cognitive–Affective–Behavioral Model. *Psychological bulletin*, 133:328–45, April 2007. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.133.2.328.

R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2020. URL https://www.R-project.org/.

Steven P. Reise. The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. 47(5): 667–696. ISSN 0027-3171, 1532-7906. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2012.715555. URL http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00273171.2012.715555.

William Revelle. *psych: Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*, 2020. URL https://personality-project.org/r/psych/https://personality-project.org/r/psych-manual.pdf. R package version 2.0.12.

Anthony Rodriguez, Steven P. Reise, and Mark G. Haviland. Evaluating bifactor models: Calculating and interpreting statistical indices. 21(2):137–150. ISSN 1939-1463, 1082-989X. doi: 10.1037/met0000045. URL http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/met0000045.

Milton J. Rosenberg. *Cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of attitudes*. 1960. Publisher: Yale University Press.

Yves Rosseel, Terrence D. Jorgensen, and Nicholas Rockwood. *lavaan: Latent Variable Analysis*, 2021. URL https://lavaan.ugent.be. R package version 0.6-8.

W. B. Schaufeli and A. B. Bakker. UWES–utrecht work engagement scale: test manual. 8, a.

Wilmar Schaufeli and Ab Bakker. The conceptualization and measurement of work engagement. In Wilmar Schaufeli, AB Bakker, and MP Leiter, editors, *Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research*, pages 10–24. Psychology Press, New York, January 2010. Publisher: Psychology Press.

Wilmar B. Schaufeli and Arnold B. Bakker. Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. 12:10–24, b.

Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Marisa Salanova, Vicente González-Romá, and Arnold B. Bakker. The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. 3(1):71–92.

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

Carson Sievert, Chris Parmer, Toby Hocking, Scott Chamberlain, Karthik Ram, Marianne Corvellec, and Pedro Despouy. *plotly: Create Interactive Web Graphics via plotly.js*, 2020. URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=plotly. R package version 4.9.2.1.

Barry M. Staw, Robert I. Sutton, and Lisa H. Pelled. Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5(1):51–71, 1994. Publisher: INFORMS.

Toon W Taris, Jan Fekke Ybema, and Ilona van Beek. Burnout and engagement: Identical twins or just close relatives? *Burnout research*, 5:3–11, 2017.

John Thackray. *The Gallup Q12*. Gallup Management Journal.

Carolyn Timms, Paula Brough, and Deborah Graham. Burnt-out but engaged: the co-existence of psychological burnout and engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(3):327–345, 2012.

Yihui Xie. *bookdown: Authoring Books and Technical Documents with R Markdown*, 2020a. URL https://github.com/rstudio/bookdown. R package version 0.21.

Yihui Xie. *xaringan: Presentation Ninja*, 2020b. URL https://github.com/yihui/xaringan. R package version 0.18.