

Engagement Measurment of Invariance

Casey Osorio-Duffoo<sup>1</sup>, Morgan Russell<sup>2</sup>, Renata Garcia Prieto Palacios Roji<sup>2</sup>, & John Kulas<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Harver

<sup>2</sup> Montclair State University

Author Note

Add complete departmental affiliations for each author here. Each new line herein must be indented, like this line.

Enter author note here.

The authors made the following contributions. Casey Osorio-Duffoo: Conceptualization, Writing - Original Draft Preparation, Writing - Review & Editing; Morgan Russell: Writing - Review & Editing.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Casey Osorio-Duffoo, Postal address. E-mail: caseyosorio@gmail.com

## Abstract

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

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

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

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

Two or three sentences explaining what the **main result** reveals in direct comparison to what was thought to be the case previously, or how the main result adds to previous knowledge.

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

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

*Keywords:* keywords

Word count: X

## Engagement Measurement of Invariance

**Definitions of Engagement**

The roots of employee (aka work; e.g., W. Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010) engagement research likely started with theoretical expansions of forms of employee participation (see, for example, Ferris & Hellier, 1984) and job involvement (e.g., Elloy, Everett, & Flynn, 1991). This exploration extended into broader considerations of attitudes and emotions (Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994) and were informed by further exploration of the dimensionality of constructs such as organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The 1990's saw focused development and refinement (for example, a dissertation; Leone (1995) or actual semantic reference; Kahn (1990)). Staw, Sutton, and Pelled (1994) investigated the relationships between *positive emotions* and favourable work outcomes, and although they do not use the word, “engagement,” their distinction between felt and expressed emotion was likely a stimulating influence upon the burgeoning interest in the engagement construct. Gallup is also widely acknowledged as an early pioneer in the measurement of the construct (see, for example, Coffman & Harter, 1999).

Kahn (1990) described engaged employees as being physically involved, cognitively vigilant, and emotionally connected. Although occasionally referred to as residing on the opposing pole to *burnout* (Christina Maslach & Leiter, 2008), these two constructs are currently most commonly conceptualized as being distinct (Timms, Brough, & Graham, 2012), although not universally (Cole, Walter, Bedeian, & O'Boyle, 2012; Taris, Ybema, & Beek, 2017).

- Engagement/Burnout: Burnout is defined as a psychological syndrome characterized by exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy, which is experienced in response to chronic job stressors. Engagement is understood to be the direct opposite of burnout and exist on a continuum—with engagement on one end and burnout on the other. Exhaustion (low energy), cynicism (low involvement), and inefficacy (low efficacy) are characteristic of

burnout; whereas, high energy, high involvement, and high efficacy are characteristic of engagement C. Maslach and Leiter (1997) (Maslach and Leiter, 1997) (Leiter & Maslach, 2004).

- Work engagement: Work engagement refers to a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Vigor is characterized by 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 (Wilmar B. Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2002) - The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), a self-report questionnaire first developed by Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) (W. B. Schaufeli & Bakker, 2003) includes the three aspects of work engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption. - we have to make note of how we are different from this!
- Employee engagement: Employee engagement refers to the “individual's involvement and satisfaction as well as enthusiasm for work” (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002)
- Work engagement is the mental state where employees...
- ... feel full with physical energy (**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 to fly (**Absorption**)

The tripartite substantive model of employee engagement is also partially informed by the definitions provided with the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (schaufeli\_\_utrecht\_\_2003?).

## Methods

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions (if any), all manipulations, and all measures in the study.

### Participants

### Material

### Procedure

### Data analysis

We used R [Version 4.0.5; R Core Team (2021)] and the R-package *papaja* [Version 0.1.0.9997; Aust and Barth (2020)] for all our analyses.

## Results

## Discussion

## References

Aust, F., & Barth, M. (2020). *papaja: Create APA manuscripts with R Markdown*.

Retrieved from <https://github.com/crsh/papaja>

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

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

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

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

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F., & Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.2.268>

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

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

- 115 Leone, D. R. (1995). *The relation of work climate, higher order need satisfaction,*  
116 *need salience, and causality orientations to work engagement, psychological*  
117 *adjustment, and job satisfaction* (PhD thesis). ProQuest Information & Learning.
- 118 Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. (1997). What causes burnout. *Maslach C, Leiter MP. The*  
119 *Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What to Do*  
120 *about It. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass Publishers, 38–60.*
- 121 Maslach, Christina, & Leiter, M. P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and  
122 engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(3), 498–512.
- 123 Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of  
124 organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61–89.
- 125 R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.*  
126 Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from  
127 <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 128 Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). UWES–utrecht work engagement scale:  
129 Test manual. *Unpublished Manuscript: Department of Psychology, Utrecht*  
130 *University, 8.*
- 131 Schaufeli, Wilmar B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002).  
132 The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor  
133 analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71–92.
- 134 Schaufeli, W., & Bakker, A. (2010). The conceptualization and measurement of work  
135 engagement. In W. Schaufeli, A. Bakker, & M. Leiter (Eds.), *Work engagement:*  
136 *A handbook of essential theory and research* (pp. 10–24). New York: Psychology  
137 Press.

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

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

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