

Validation on Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and Multi Sectors Analysis

Iwan Sidharta

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Pasundan, Bandung
E-mail : iw.sidh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Research on work engagement has proven by previous studies that showed constructive, positive behaviors related to work. Several studies used the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument, but evidence of instrument construct validity is only available in some countries. This study investigates the validity of UWES constructs using a multisample in several sectors in the Greater Bandung Region, Indonesia. The approach to testing validity uses confirmatory factor analysis with the Lisrel 8.8 program tool. The results of the study showed that version 17 of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument was valid and realistic in a multisample in several industrial sectors in the Greater Bandung Region, Indonesia. The research implications can recommend the use of version 17 of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument to measure Work Engagement at the individual level in the organization.

Keywords: work engagement, validity, confirmatory factor analysis.

INTRODUCTION

In an organization of individual behavior is one of the essential focuses that are considered by policymakers (Hersona & Sidharta, 2017), this is related to what behavior desired to achieve organizational goals. (Silva, Hutcheson & Wahl, 2010) The role of individuals in an organization is an intangible asset when viewed from the Knowledge Base View approach (Machmud & Sidharta, 2016) and needs to be improved. (Vogl, (2015) Individual behavior is undoubtedly a positive behavior so that the target by the organization can carry out well. Positive behavior can contribute to the achievement of organizational performance; in this case, is the company. (Riketta, 2002). One of the goals of

the company is to achieve superior performance compared to similar companies (Saridakis, Lai & Cooper, 2017) so that they can have an edge in business competition. (Delery & Roumpi, 2017)

One of the behaviors desired by the company so that the organization's goals achieved is work engagement. (Shuck, Reio Jr & Rocco, 2011) Evidence of research shows that work engagement can contribute to organizational effectiveness such as increasing employee satisfaction (Christian et al., 2011), organization behavior (Newman, Joseph & Hulin, 2010) meaningful work (Duffy at al., 2012), Callings (Hirschi, 2012) as well as self efficacy (Hirschi, 2011) and occupational identity (Luyckx, Duriez, Klimstra & De Witte, 2010), job

involvement (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011) positive behavior related to outcome organizational and organizational success (Xanthopoulou, Bekker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2009).

Individual behavior within an organization when referring to the job attitudes approach (Albrecht, 2010) consists of outcomes individual behavior in an asset organization using work evaluation based on cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Shuck et al, 2013; Zigarmi et al., 2011; Zigarmi et al., 2012). The work engagement construct is an evaluation of the work of individuals from a practical aspect (Breif & Weiss, 2002; Rich, Lepine & Crawford, 2010) which is an emotional aspect of their work experience. While referring to Schaufeli et al., (2002); Schaufeli and Bakker (2003); Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova (2006) who developed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) stated that work engagement is a positive behavior concerning vigor, dedication, and absorption in well being at work. Several studies have shown that work engagement is a predictor and antecedents such as job demands, burnout, (Crawford, LePine & Rich, 2010) effectiveness of work (Knight, Patterson & Dawson, 2017) job involvement, organizational commitment (Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006) employee satisfaction and business outcomes (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002).

However, several studies have shown that there is an overlap between the constructs of work engagement and job satisfaction, such as the research shown by Nimon, Shuck & Zigarmi (2016) by comparing the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) construct (Schaufeli et al., 2002), Job Engineering Scale (Rich , Lepine & Crawford, 2010), Harmonious Passion Scale (Vallerrand et al., 2003) and Job Satisfaction Scale (Hackman & Oldham, 1980; Luthans et al., 2006) with a semantic analysis approach. However, several studies show that work engagement with job satisfaction shows contract differences as evidenced by Mackay, Allen & Landis (2017) that there is a difference

between job attitude constructs consisting of job satisfaction, job involvement and organizational commitment with work engagement with sample 49 results published research representing 22,090 individuals. Apart from differences above the empirical evidence in measuring work engagement, many use the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument (Farndale et al., 2014). There are several variations of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument, namely version 17 items, version 9 items, and ultra-short versions.

The research conducted by Shimazu et al. (2008) validates in Japan with 2,334 samples, study conducted by Fong & Ng (2012) validates using Chinese version, research conducted by Balducci, Fraccaroli & Schaufeli (2010) validates Italian version, research conducted by Naude & Rothmann (2004) confirmed in the Gauteng Province of South Africa with a sample of 318 people, a study conducted by Vazquez et al. (2015) validated the Brazilian version, a study conducted by Zecca et al. , (2015) confirm the French version, and research conducted by Sulaiman & Zahoni (2016) proves the Malaysian version.

The results of the meta-analysis prove that the stable validity of the across time is the 17 version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) with the Confirmatory Factor Analysis approach. (Seppälä et al., 2008). Research conducted by Klassen et al. (2012) using multinational samples, namely Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Indonesia, and Oman with a sample of 853 teachers using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) version 9 shows that samples from Indonesia have a low internal consistency compared to other countries, the Multidimensional model has good fit indices as well as the one factor model has a good indice fit model. The results showed that the multidimensional model was the best result compared to the one factor model, but when referring to the results of the meta-analysis analysis by Seppälä et al., (2008) showed that the best model was the Utrecht Work

Engagement Scale (UWES) version 17 compared to version 9, it is necessary to do validation by using multisample from several sectors to prove this with samples in Indonesia with different sectors.

This research was to investigate and validate version 17 of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) in Bandung Raya, Indonesia. The results of the study are expected to contribute to the work engagement study using the version 17 Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument.

METHOD

This study aims to validate the version 17 Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument with the Confirmatory Factor Analysis approach. Confirmatory Factor Analysis refers to the validity and reliability of constructs that make up the factors studied, in this case, there are three factors that dimension of work engagement, namely vigor, dedication, and absorption. This approach included in the quantitative approach where verification is done by calculating statistically data samples used in answering the proposed hypothesis. The analytical tool used is LISREL 8.8 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 2006), where the program by the data is one of the good and comprehensive analysis tools in conducting confirmatory factor analysis tests.

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument version 17 is a questionnaire distributed to respondents. Respondents in this study were employees in 3 different sectors, namely the creative industry sector, the construction service sector and the tour and travel service sector in the Bandung Raya region which consisted of Bandung City, Cimahi City, Bandung Regency, and West Bandung Regency. Respondents in the creative industry sector consisted of 300 respondents, respondents in the construction services sector with the classification of M2 as many as 241 respondents and respondents in the tour and

travel services sector as many as 350 respondents. Respondents were asked to fill out the version 17 Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) questionnaire, which was first translated into Indonesian by professional translators. Respondents were asked to fill in a five-point Likert scale. The original version and Indonesian version can see in the appendix. The dimensions of the Vigor instrument used are as follows: At work, I feel that I am bursting with energy (VI1), I feel strong and vigorous (VI2), When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (VI3), I can continue working for very long periods (VI4), at my job, I am very resilient, mentally (VI5) and at work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (VI6). The Dedication Dimension consists of 5 instruments namely I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (DE1), I am enthusiastic about my job (DE2), My job inspires me (DE3), I am proud of the work that I do (DE4) and To me, my job is challenging (DE5). The absorption dimension consists of 6 statements as follows: Time flies when I'm working (AB1), When I am working, I forget everything else around me (AB2), I feel happy when I am working intensely (AB3), I am immersed in my work (AB4), I get carried away when I'm working (AB5), and it's difficult to see myself from my job (AB6).

Psychometric analysis of Work Engagement Scale (UWES) version 17 refers to the contract of validity and reliability which refers to the value of Variance Extracted (VE) and construct reliability (CR), constraints on construct validity loading factor > 0.5 and $CR > 0.7$ (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The observed parameters were 17 indicators with three factors that formed Work Engagement so that the degree of freedom (df) > 0 because the number of estimated parameters is positive and can be said to be an over-identified built model (Boomsma, 2000).

After that, further analysis was carried out using the confirmatory factor analysis approach to prove the validity of version 17 of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) as a multidimensional factor.

RESULT and DICUSSION

The multidimensional Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) version 17 model consisting of dimensions of vigor, dedication, and absorption described figure 1 as shown below:

Figure 1. Multidimensional Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) Model 17




Figure 1.
 Multidimensional Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) Model 17

The results of the psychometric analysis indicate that loading factor > 0.5 and CR > 0.7, as shown in table 1, see at appendix.

The results of the psychometric analysis are following the recommendations proposed by Fornell and Larcker (1981). Furthermore, the results of confirmatory factor analysis refer to fit indices (Iacobucci, 2010) based on different chi-square test criteria (Satorra & Bentler, 2001), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (Browne & Cudeck, 1993), CFI and NFI (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The calculation results of the fit indices can see in table 2.

The calculation results showed that version 17 of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument had psychometric analysis and good fit indices. One sample with RSMEA was 0.091, and CFI was 0.96, NFI was 0.95, and χ^2 / df was 2,948. The second sample with RSMEA was 0.102, and CFI was 0.93, NFI was 0.92 and χ^2 / df as big as 2.997. The third sample with RSMEA was 0.98, and CFI was 0.96, NFI was 0.95, and χ^2 / df was 2,939. Based on the reference established by Fit Indices (Iacobucci, 2010), it can say that the CFA model is good so that it can be recommended for measurement Work Engagement in the creative industry sector, construction service sector, tour

Table 2. The fit indices of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) 17

	RSMEA	CFI	NFI	χ^2 / df
Sample 1	0.091	0.96	0.95	2.948
Sample 2	0.102	0.93	0.92	2.997
Sample 3	0.098	0.96	0.95	2.939

and travel service sector as well as for teachers (Klassen et al., 2012). The results of this study complement previous studies in several countries as conducted by Shimazu et al., (2008); Fong & Ng (2012); Balducci, Fraccaroli & Schaufeli (2010); Naude & Rothmann (2004); Vazquez et al. (2015); Zecca et al., (2015) and Sulaiman & Zahoni (2016).

CONCLUSION

Work Engagement is currently one of the many constructs recognized in various countries. Research on Work Engagement refers to Schaufeli et al. (2002); Schaufeli and Bakker (2003); Schaufeli, Bakker & Salanova (2006) who developed the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) stated that work engagement is a positive behavior in relation to vigor, dedication, and absorption in well being at work. Vigor refers to the energy and endurance of an individual when working has a durable fighting power. Dedication refers to the feeling of enthusiasm for inspiration and pride and willingness to face challenges in work. While absorptions refer to individuals, who focus on carrying out their work and can overcome all difficulties in the work that occurs and positive behavior is one of the management focus in shaping its employees so that it can produce positive outcomes for the organization. The results of this study fill the gap validation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) instrument version 17 as a multidimensional construct. However, there are still some weaknesses regarding this research, where only a few sectors of respondents need further investigation using a wider industry so that the results of the study can be generalized.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. (2010). *Handbook of employee engagement*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2010). Psychometric properties of the Italian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 26(2):143–149
- Boomsma, A. (2000). Reporting analyses of covariance structures. *Structural equation modeling*, 7(3), 461-483.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 3, 297–307.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136–162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage, cop.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel psychology*, 64(1), 89-136.
- Crawford, E. R., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2010). Linking job demands and resources to employee engagement and burnout: a

- theoretical extension and meta-analytic test. *Journal of applied psychology*, 95(5), 834.
- Delery, J. E., & Roumpi, D. (2017). Strategic human resource management, human capital and competitive advantage: is the field going in circles?. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27(1), 1-21.
- Dobrow, S. R., & Tosti-Kharas, J. (2011). Calling: The development of a scale measure. *Personnel psychology*, 64(4), 1001-1049.
- Duffy, R. D., Bott, E. M., Allan, B. A., Torrey, C. L., & Dik, B. J. (2012). Perceiving a calling, living a calling, and job satisfaction: Testing a moderated, multiple mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(1), 50-59.
- Farndale, E., E. Beijer, S., JPM Van Veldhoven, M., Kelliher, C., & Hope-Hailey, V. (2014). Work and organisation engagement: aligning research and practice. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1(2), 157-176.
- Fong, T. C. T., & Ng, S. M. (2012). Measuring engagement at work: Validation of the Chinese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 19(3), 391-397.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). "Same same" but different? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment?. *European psychologist*, 11(2), 119-127.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(2), 268.
- Hersona, S., & Sidharta, I. (2017). Influence of leadership function, motivation and work discipline on employees' performance. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen*, 15(3), 528-537.
- Hirschi, A. (2011). Callings in career: A typological approach to essential and optional components. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 79(1), 60-73.
- Hirschi, A. (2012). Callings and work engagement: Moderated mediation model of work meaningfulness, occupational identity, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 59(3), 479-489.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- Joreskog, K., & Sorbom, D. (2006). LISREL 8.8. *Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software Inc.*
- Klassen, R. M., Aldhafri, S., Mansfield, C. F., Purwanto, E., Siu, A. F., Wong, M. W., & Woods-McConney, A. (2012). Teachers' engagement at work: An international validation study. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 80(4), 317-337.
- Knight, C., Patterson, M., & Dawson, J. (2017). Building work engagement: A systematic review and meta-analysis investigating the

- effectiveness of work engagement interventions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38(6), 792-812.
- Iacobucci, D. (2010). Structural equations modeling: Fit indices, sample size, and advanced topics. *Journal of consumer psychology*, 20(1), 90-98.
- Luyckx, K., Duriez, B., Klimstra, T. A., & De Witte, H. (2010). Identity statuses in young adult employees: Prospective relations with work engagement and burnout. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(3), 339-349.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Machmud, S., & Sidharta, I. (2016). Entrepreneurial Motivation and Business Performance of SMEs in the SUCI Clothing Center, Bandung, Indonesia. *DLSU Business & Economics Review*, 25(2), 63-78.
- Mackay, M. M., Allen, J. A., & Landis, R. S. (2017). Investigating the incremental validity of employee engagement in the prediction of employee effectiveness: A meta-analytic path analysis. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 108-120.
- Naude, J. L., & Rothmann, S. (2004). The validation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale for emergency medical technicians in Gauteng. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 7(3), 459-468.
- Newman, D. A., Joseph, D. L., & Hulin, C. L. (2010). Job attitudes and employee engagement: Considering the attitude "A-factor.". *The handbook of employee engagement: Perspectives, issues, research, and practice*, 43-61.
- Nimon, K., Shuck, B., & Zigarmi, D. (2016). Construct overlap between employee engagement and job satisfaction: A function of semantic equivalence?. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17(3), 1149-1171.
- Rich, B. L., Lepine, J. A., & Crawford, E. R. (2010). Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Academy of management journal*, 53(3), 617-635.
- Riketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(3), 257-266.
- Saridakis, G., Lai, Y., & Cooper, C. L. (2017). Exploring the relationship between HRM and firm performance: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(1), 87-96.
- Satorra, A., & Bentler, P. M. (2001). A scaled difference chi-square test statistic for moment structure analysis. *Psychometrika*, 66, 507-514. doi: 10.1007/BF02296192.
- Seppälä, P., Mauno, S., Feldt, T., Hakanen, J., Kinnunen, U., Tolvanen, A., & Schaufeli, W. (2009). The construct validity of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale: Multisample and longitudinal evidence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(4), 459-481.
- Schaufeli, W. B. Bakker, A. (2003). Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. Preliminary Manual. *Occupational Health Psychology Unit, Utrecht University*.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and*

- Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701–716.
doi: 10.1177/0013164405282471
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71–92.
doi: 10.1023/A:1015630930326
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kosugi, S., Suzuki, A., Nashiwa, H., Kato, A., ... & Goto, R. (2008). Work engagement in Japan: validation of the Japanese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 510-523.
- Silva, N. D., Hutcheson, J., & Wahl, G. D. (2010). Organizational strategy and employee outcomes: A person–organization fit perspective. *The Journal of psychology*, 144(2), 145-161.
- Shuck, B., Reio Jr, T. G., & Rocco, T. S. (2011). Employee engagement: An examination of antecedent and outcome variables. *Human resource development international*, 14(4), 427-445.
- Shuck, B., Ghosh, R., Zigarmi, D., & Nimon, K. (2013). The jingle jangle of employee engagement: Further exploration of the emerging construct and implications for workplace learning and performance. *Human Resource Development Review*, 12(1), 11-35.
- Sulaiman, W. S. W., & Zahoni, N. A. (2016). Validation of the Utrecht work engagement scale (UWES) in the Malaysian context. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 6(9), 672-676.
- Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C., Mageau, G. A., Loestner, R., Leonard, C. R., Leonard, M., et al. (2003). Les Passions de l’Ame: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86, 757-767.
- Vazquez, A. C. S., Magnan, E. D. S., Pacico, J. C., Hutz, C. S., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2015). Adaptation and validation of the Brazilian version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Psico-USF*, 20(2), 207-217.
- Vogl, T. S. (2015). Differential fertility, human capital, and development. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 83(1), 365-401.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Work engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 82(1), 183-200.
- Zecca, G., Györkös, C., Becker, J., Massoudi, K., de Bruin, G. P., & Rossier, J. (2015). Validation of the French Utrecht Work Engagement Scale and its relationship with personality traits and impulsivity. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology*, 65(1), 19-28.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2011). A preliminary field test of an employee work passion model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 195-221.
- Zigarmi, D., Nimon, K., Houson, D., Witt, D., & Diehl, J. (2012). The work intention inventory: Initial evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Business Administration Research*, 1(1), 24-42.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Psychometric Analysis of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) 17

Sample 1, n =300						
	Indicators	Loading Factor	R ²	Error variance	VE	CR
Vigor	V1	0.65	0.42	0.23	0.6	0.7
	V2	0.65	0.42	0.23		
	V3	0.66	0.44	0.23		
	V4	0.63	0.40	0.33		
	V5	0.65	0.42	0.23		
	V6	0.65	0.42	0.23		
Dedication	D1	0.71	0.50	0.03	0.8	0.8
	D2	0.65	0.42	0.33		
	D3	0.65	0.42	0.32		
	D4	0.72	0.52	0.03		
	D5	0.72	0.52	0.03		
Absorption	A1	0.65	0.42	0.33	0.6	0.7
	A2	0.76	0.58	0.23		
	A3	0.66	0.44	0.39		
	A4	0.61	0.37	0.35		
	A5	0.61	0.37	0.35		
	A6	0.60	0.36	0.41		
Sample 2, n =241						
Vigor	V1	0.68	0.46	0.38	0.6	0.7
	V2	0.81	0.66	0.26		
	V3	0.84	0.71	0.34		
	V4	0.72	0.52	0.36		
	V5	0.64	0.41	0.42		
	V6	0.62	0.38	0.41		
Dedication	D1	0.49	0.24	0.31	0.6	0.7
	D2	0.69	0.48	0.26		
	D3	0.73	0.53	0.28		
	D4	0.71	0.50	0.38		
	D5	0.58	0.34	0.46		
Absorption	A1	0.52	0.27	0.33	0.6	0.7
	A2	0.77	0.59	0.26		
	A3	0.51	0.26	0.48		
	A4	0.77	0.59	0.26		
	A5	0.77	0.59	0.26		
	A6	0.78	0.61	0.26		

Sample 3, n =350						
Vigor	V1	0.58	0.34	0.41	0.8	0.8
	V2	0.51	0.26	0.28		
	V3	0.70	0.49	0.01		
	V4	0.81	0.66	0.07		
	V5	0.75	0.56	0.01		
	V6	0.69	0.48	0.03		
Dedication	D1	0.62	0.38	0.03	0.8	0.8
	D2	0.67	0.45	0.33		
	D3	0.75	0.56	0.32		
	D4	0.70	0.49	0.03		
	D5	0.73	0.53	0.00		
Absorption	A1	0.73	0.53	0.33	0.6	0.7
	A2	0.67	0.45	0.23		
	A3	0.79	0.62	0.39		
	A4	0.61	0.37	0.35		
	A5	0.74	0.55	0.41		
	A6	0.76	0.58	0.47		

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) 17

Original Version	Indonesian Version
Vigor	Semangat
At my work, I feel that I am bursting with energy	Di tempat kerja saya, saya merasa bersemangat
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous	Di pekerjaan saya, saya merasa kuat dan bertenaga
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work	Ketika saya bangun di pagi hari, saya merasa ingin bekerja
I can continue working for very long periods at a time	Saya dapat terus bekerja untuk waktu yang sangat lama
At my job, I am very resilient, mentally	Dalam bekerja, saya sangat ulet
At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well	Di pekerjaan saya, saya selalu bertahan, bahkan ketika segala sesuatunya tidak berjalan dengan baik
Dedication	Dedikasi
I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose	Saya menemukan pekerjaan yang saya lakukan penuh makna dan tujuan
I am enthusiastic about my job	Saya antusias dengan pekerjaan saya
My job inspires me	Pekerjaan saya menginspirasi saya
I am proud of the work that I do	Saya bangga dengan pekerjaan yang saya lakukan
To me, my job is challenging	Bagi saya, pekerjaan saya menantang (DE5).
Absorption	Penyerapan
Time flies when I'm working	Ketika saya sedang bekerja, waktu tidak terasa berlalu
When I am working, I forget everything else around me	Ketika saya sedang bekerja, saya lupa semua yang ada di sekitar saya
I feel happy when I am working intensely	Saya merasa senang ketika saya bekerja dengan intens
I am immersed in my work	Saya asyik dengan pekerjaan saya
I get carried away when I'm working	Saya merasa tertarik ketika saya bekerja
It is difficult to detach myself from my job	Sulit untuk melepaskan diri dari pekerjaan saya