

UWES

UTRECHT

WORK ENGAGEMENT SCALE

Preliminary Manual

[Version 1, November 2003]

Wilmar Schaufeli

&

Arnold Bakker



© Occupational Health Psychology Unit

Utrecht University

Contents

	Page
1. The concept of work engagement	4
2. Development of the UWES	6
3. Validity of the UWES	8
4. Psychometric quality of the Dutch version	11
4.1. Description of the Dutch language database.....	11
4.2. Distribution characteristics of the items.....	13
4.3. Internal consistency.....	14
4.4. Factor structure and inter-correlations.....	15
4.5. Relationships with burnout.....	17
4.6. Relationships with age and gender.....	18
4.7. Differences between occupational groups.....	19
4.8. Shortened version.....	21
4.9. Student version.....	21
5. Other language versions.....	23
5.1. Description of the international language database.....	24
5.2. Distribution characteristics of the items.....	26
5.3. Reliability.....	26
5.4. Factor structure and inter-correlations.....	28
5.5. Relationships with age and gender.....	30
5.6. Differences between countries.....	31
5.7. Shortened version.....	32
6. Practical use.....	33
6.1. Completion and scoring.....	34
6.2. Dutch norms.....	33
6.3. Other language norms.....	37
7. Conclusion.....	41

References

Appendix: UWES versions

Preface

Contrary to what its name suggests, Occupational Health Psychology has almost exclusively been concerned with *ill-health* and *unwell-being*. For instance, a simple count reveals that about 95% of all articles that have been published so far in the *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* deals with negative aspects of workers' health and well-being, such as cardiovascular disease, Repetitive Strain Injury, and burnout. In contrast, only about 5% of the articles deals with positive aspects such as job satisfaction and motivation. This rather one-sided negative focus is by no means specific for the field of occupational health psychology. According to a recent estimate, the amount of psychological articles on negative states outnumbers the amount of positive articles by 17 to 1¹.

However, it seems that times have changed. Since the beginning of this century, more attention is paid to what has been coined *positive psychology*: the scientific study of human strength and optimal functioning. This approach is considered to supplement the traditional focus of psychology on psychopathology, disease, illness, disturbance, and malfunctioning. The recent trend to concentrate on optimal functional also aroused attention in organizational psychology, as is demonstrated by a recent plea for *positive organizational behavior*; that is '*...the study of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today's workplace*'².

Because of the emergence of positive (organizational) psychology, it is not surprising that positive aspects of health and well-being are increasingly popular in Occupational Health Psychology. One of these positive aspects is work engagement, which is considered to be the antipode of burnout. Whilst burned-out workers feel exhausted and cynical, their engaged counterparts feel vigorous and enthusiastic about their work. In contrast to previous positive approaches – such as the humanistic psychology – who were largely unempirical, the current positive psychology is empirical in nature. This implies the careful operationalization of constructs, including work engagement. Hence, we wrote this test-manual of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES).

This test manual is preliminary, which means that our work on the UWES is still in progress. Nevertheless, we did not want to wait any longer with publishing some important psychometric details since many colleagues, both in The Netherlands as well as abroad, are working with the UWES. Many of them have contributed to this preliminary test-manual by providing us with their data. Without their help this manual could not have been written. Therefore, we would like to thank our colleagues for their gesture of true scientific collaboration³.

Utrecht/València, November 2003

¹ Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Lucas, R.E. & Smith, H.I (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 267-302.

² Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 695-706.

³ Sarah Jane Cotton (AUS), Edgar Bresco (SPA), Maureen Dollard (AUS), Esther Greenglass (CAN), Asbjørn Grimsmo (NOR), Gabriele Haeslich (GER), Jari Hakanen (FIN), Sandrine Hollet (FRA), Aristotelis Kantas (GRE), Alexandra Marques Pinto (POR), Stig Berge Matthiesen (NOR), Susana Llorens (SPA), Astrid Richardsen (NOR), Peter Richter (GER), Ian Rothmann (SAF), Katariina Salmela-Aro (FIN), Marisa Salanova (SPA), Sabine Sonnentag (GER), Peter Vlerick (BEL), Tony Winefield (AUS), Hans de Witte (BEL), Dieter Zapf (GER).

1. The concept of work engagement

Work engagement is the assumed opposite of burnout. Contrary to those who suffer from burnout, engaged employees have a sense of energetic and effective connection with their work activities and they see themselves as able to deal well with the demands of their job. Two schools of thought exist on the relationship between work engagement and burnout. The first approach of Maslach and Leiter (1997) assumes that engagement and burnout constitute the opposite poles of a continuum of work related well-being, with burnout representing the negative pole and engagement the positive pole. Because Maslach and Leiter (1997) define burnout in terms of exhaustion, cynicism and reduced professional efficacy, it follows that engagement is characterized by energy, involvement and efficacy. By definition, these three aspects of engagement constitute the opposites of the three corresponding aspects of burnout. In other words, according to Maslach and Leiter (1997) the opposite scoring pattern on the three aspects of burnout – as measured with the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach, Jackson & Leiter, 1996) – *implies* work engagement. This means that low scores on the exhaustion- and cynicism-scales and a high score on the professional efficacy scale of the MBI is indicative of engagement.

However, the fact that burnout and engagement are assessed by the same questionnaire has at least two important negative consequences. First, it is not plausible to expect that both concepts are perfectly negatively correlated. That is, when an employee is not burned-out, this doesn't necessarily mean that he or she is engaged in his or her work. Reversibly, when an employee is low on engagement, this does not mean that he or she is burned-out. Secondly, the relationship between both constructs cannot be empirically studied when they are measured with the same questionnaire. Thus, for instance, both concepts cannot be included simultaneously in one model in order to study their concurrent validity.

For this reason we define burnout and work engagement are two distinct concepts that should be assessed independently (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001). Although employees will experience work engagement and burnout as being opposite psychological states, whereby the former has a positive quality and the latter a negative quality, both need to be considered as principally independent of each other. This means that, at least theoretically, an employee who is not burned-out may score high or low on engagement, whereas an engaged employee may score high or low on burnout. In practice, however, it is likely that burnout and engagement are substantively negatively correlated. In contrast to Maslach and Leiter's (1997) approach, our approach enables the assessment of the strength of the association between work engagement and burnout since different instruments assess both independently. It is possible to include both constructs simultaneously in one analysis, for instance, to investigate whether burnout or engagement explains additional unique variance in a particular variable after the opposite variable has been controlled for.

Work engagement is defined as follows (see also Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2001):

'Engagement is a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption. 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 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'

Accordingly, vigor and dedication are considered direct opposites of exhaustion and cynicism, respectively. The continuum that is spanned by vigor and exhaustion has been labeled energy or activation, whereas the continuum that is spanned by dedication and cynicism has been labeled identification (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2001). Hence, work engagement is characterized by a high level of energy and strong identification with one's work. Burnout, on the other hand, is characterized by the opposite: a low level of energy combined with poor identification with one's work.

As can be seen from the definition above, the direct opposite of the third aspect of burnout – professional inefficacy – is *not* included in the engagement concept. There are two reasons for this. First, there is accumulating empirical evidence that exhaustion and cynicism constitute the core of burnout, whereas lack of professional efficacy seems to play a less prominent role (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001; Shirom, 2002). Second, it appeared from interviews and discussions with employees and supervisors that rather than by efficacy, engagement is particularly characterized by being immersed and happily engrossed in one's work – a state that we have called *absorption*. Accordingly, absorption is a distinct aspect of work engagement that is not considered to be the opposite of professional inefficacy. Based on the previous definition, a self-report questionnaire – called the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) – has been developed that includes the three constituting aspects of work engagement: vigor, dedication, and absorption.

Vigor is assessed by the following six items that refer to high levels of energy and resilience, the willingness to invest effort, not being easily fatigued, and persistence in the face of difficulties.

1. *At my work, I feel bursting with energy*
2. *At my job, I feel strong and vigorous*
3. *When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work*
4. *I can continue working for very long periods at a time*
5. *At my job, I am very resilient, mentally*
6. *At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well**

Those who score high on vigor usually have much energy, zest and stamina when working, whereas those who score low on vigor have less energy, zest and stamina as far as their work is concerned.

Dedication is assessed by five items that refer to deriving a sense of significance from one's work, feeling enthusiastic and proud about one's job, and feeling inspired and challenged by it.

1. *I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose*
2. *I am enthusiastic about my job*
3. *My job inspires me*

* This item is has been eliminated in the 15-item version of the UWES.

4. *I am proud on the work that I do*
5. *To me, my job is challenging*

Those who score high on dedication strongly identify with their work because it is experienced as meaningful, inspiring, and challenging. Besides, they usually feel enthusiastic and proud about their work. Those who score low do not identify with their work because they do not experience it to be meaningful, inspiring, or challenging; moreover, they feel neither enthusiastic nor proud about their work.

Absorption is measured by six items that refer to being totally and happily immersed in one's work and having difficulties detaching oneself from it so that time passes quickly and one forgets everything else that is around.

1. *Time flies when I'm working*
2. *When I am working, I forget everything else around me*
3. *I feel happy when I am working intensely*
4. *I am immersed in my work*
5. *I get carried away when I'm working*
6. *It is difficult to detach myself from my job**

Those who score high on absorption feel that they usually are happily engrossed in their work, they feel immersed by their work and have difficulties detaching from it because it carries them away. As a consequence, everything else around is forgotten and time seems to fly. Those who score low on absorption do not feel engrossed or immersed in their work, they do neither have difficulties detaching from it, nor do they forget everything around them, including time.

Structured qualitative interviews with a heterogeneous group of Dutch employees who scored high on the UWES showed that engaged employees are active agents, who take initiative at work and generate their own positive feedback (Schaufeli, Taris, Le Blanc, Peeters, Bakker & De Jonge, 2001). Furthermore, their values seem to match well with those of the organization they work for and they also seem to be engaged in other activities outside their work. Although the interviewed engaged workers indicated that they sometimes feel tired, unlike burned-out employees who experience fatigue as being exclusively negative, they described their tiredness as a rather pleasant state because it was associated with positive accomplishments. Some engaged employees who were interviewed indicated that they had been burned-out before, which points to certain resilience as well as to the use of effective coping strategies. Finally, engaged employees are not workaholic because they enjoy other things outside work and because, unlike workaholics, they do not work hard because of a strong and irresistible inner drive, but because for them working is fun.

2. The development of the UWES

Originally, the UWES included 24 items of which the vigor-items (9) and the dedication-items (8) for a large part consisted of positively rephrased MBI-items. For instance, *"When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work"* (vigor) versus *"I feel tired when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job"* (exhaustion) and *"I am enthusiastic about my job"* (dedication) versus *"I have become less enthusiastic about*

my work'' (cynicism). These reformulated MBI-items were supplemented by original vigor and dedication items, as well as with new absorption items to constitute the UWES-24. After psychometric evaluation in two different samples of employees and students, 7 items appeared to be unsound and were therefore eliminated so that 17 items remained: 6 vigor items, 5 dedication items, and 6 absorption items (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá & Bakker, 2002a). The resulting 17-item version of the UWES is included in the Appendix. Subsequent psychometric analyses uncovered two other weak items (AB06 en VI06), so that in some studies also a 15-item version of the UWES has been used (e.g., Demerouti, Bakker, Janssen & Schaufeli, 2001). The databases that are analyzed for this test-manual include the UWES-15 as well as the UWES-17 (see 4.1 and 5.1).

The results from psychometric analyses with the UWES can be summarized as follows:

- Factorial validity. Confirmatory factor analyses show that the hypothesized three-factor structure of the UWES is superior to the one-factor model and fits well to the data of various samples from The Netherlands, Spain and Portugal (Salanova, Schaufeli, Llorens, Pieró & Grau, 2000; Schaufeli et al., 2002a; Schaufeli, Martínez, Marques-Pinto, Salanova & Bakker, 2002b; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003). However, there is one exception, using explorative factor analyses Sonnentag (2003) found did not find a clear three-factor structure and decided to use the total-score on the UWES as a measure for work engagement.
- Inter-correlations. Although, according to confirmatory factor analyses the UWES seems to have a three-dimensional structure, these three dimensions are closely related. Correlations between the three scales usually exceed .65 (e.g., Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2000; Schaufeli et al., 2002a, 2002b), whereas correlations between the latent variables range from about .80 to about .90 (Salanova et al., 2000; Schaufeli et al., 2002a, 2002b).
- Cross-national invariance. The factor structure of the slightly adapted student version of the UWES (see 4.9) is largely invariant across samples from Spain, The Netherlands and Portugal (Schaufeli et al., 2002b). Detailed analyses showed that the loadings of maximum three items differed significantly between the samples of the three countries.
- Internal consistency. The internal consistency of the three scales of the UWES is good. That is, in all cases values of Cronbach's α are equal to or exceed the critical value of .70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1984). Usually values of Cronbach's α for the scales range between .80 and .90 (Salanova et al., 2000; Salanova, Grau, Llorens & Schaufeli, 2001; Demerouti et al., 2001; Montgomery, Peeters, Schaufeli & Den Ouden, 2003; Salanova, Bresó & Schaufeli, 2003a; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003; Salanova, Carrero, Pinazo & Schaufeli, 2003b; Schaufeli & Bakker, in press).
- Stability. Scores on the UWES are relatively stable across time. Two, year stability coefficients for vigor, dedication and absorption are .30, .36, and .46, respectively (Bakker, Euwema, & Van Dierendonk, 2003).

In sum: these psychometric results confirm the factorial validity of the UWES – as expected, the UWES consists of three scales that are highly correlated. Besides, this pattern of relationships is observed among samples from different countries, which confirms the cross-national validity of the three-factor solution. Taken together this means that engagement is a construct that consists of three closely related aspects that are measured by three internally consistent scales.

3. The validity of the UWES

Since its introduction in 1999, a number of validity studies have been carried out with the UWES that uncover its relationship with burnout and workaholism, identify possible causes and consequences of engagement and elucidate the role that engagement plays in more complex processes that are related to worker's health and well-being. Below these validity studies are reviewed.

- Work engagement and burnout. As expected, the three aspects of burnout – as measured with the MBI – are negatively related with the three aspects of work engagement (Salanova, Schaufeli, Llorens, Pieró & Grau, 2000; Demerouti et al., 2001; Schaufeli et al., 2002a; Schaufeli, Martínez, Marques-Pinto, Salanova & Bakker, 2002b; Montgomery et al., 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, in press). However, the pattern of relationships slightly differs from what was expected. Namely, vigor and exhaustion are much less strongly inter-related than could be expected on theoretical grounds, whereas (lack of) professional efficacy was most strongly related to all three aspects of engagement. As a consequence, a second-order factor analytic model in which the three sub-scales load together with lack of professional efficacy on one factor and exhaustion and cynicism on the other factor fits well to the data (Salanova et al., 2000; Schaufeli et al., 2002a; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, in press). A similar result was obtained by Demerouti et al. (1999) using discriminant analyses. In this study, the three engagement scales plus lack of professional efficacy loaded on one discriminant function, whereas both other burnout scales loaded on the second remaining function. A possible explanation for these findings may be that lack of professional efficacy is measured with items that are *positively* formulated and that are subsequently reversed to constitute a "negative" score that is supposed to be indicative for *lack* of professional efficacy. Recently, Bouman, Ten Brake en Hoogstraten (2000) showed that the notoriously low *negative* correlations between lack of professional efficacy and both other burnout dimensions change dramatically in much higher *positive* correlations when instead of reversing positively formulated items, negative items are used to tap lack of efficacy. Still unpublished Belgian, Dutch (Waegenmakers, 2003) and Spanish studies replicate this remarkable result. In other words, that professional efficacy is stronger related to engagement than to burnout is probably partly due to the fact that the efficacy items of the MBI have been positively phrased instead of negatively. However, it is also conceivable that work engagement leads to feelings of professional efficacy.
- Work engagement and workaholism. A recent study on the construct validity of work engagement, burnout and workaholism showed that engagement and workaholism are hardly related to each other

with the exception of absorption that correlates moderately positive with the workaholism aspect 'working excessively' (Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003). Moreover, it is remarkable that vigor and dedication are negatively – albeit weakly – correlated with the second defining characteristic of workaholism, namely 'strong inner drive'. Obviously, the irresistible inner drive of the workaholic to work is different from the vigor and dedication characteristic of the engaged employee. This study also showed that work engagement and workaholism are related to different variables: both types of employees work hard and are loyal to the organization they work for, but in case of workaholism this goes at the expense of the employee's mental health and social contacts outside work, whereas engaged workers feel quite good, both mentally as well as socially.

- Possible causes of work engagement. It should be emphasized that we are dealing with possible causes (and consequences) of engagement, since only very few causal inferences can be made because the majority of studies is cross-sectional in nature. Work engagement is positively associated with job characteristics that might be labeled as resources, motivators or energizers, such as social support from co-workers and one's superior, performance feedback, coaching, job autonomy, task variety, and training facilities (Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2001, 2003; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003; Schaufeli & Bakker, in press). Sonnentag (2003) showed that the level of experienced work engagement is positively associated with the extent to which employees recovered from their previous working day. Moreover, work engagement is positively related with self-efficacy (Salanova et al., 2001), whereby it seems that self-efficacy may precede engagement as well as follow engagement. (Salanova, Bresó & Schaufeli, 2003). This means that an upward spiral may exist: self-efficacy breeds engagement, which in its turn, increases self-efficacy beliefs, and so on. In a similar vein, a recent unpublished study among students showed that previous academic performance (i.e., the student's GPA as taken from the university's computerized student information system) correlated positively with engagement (Waegenmakers, 2003). An earlier study across three countries had already revealed that engagement is positively related to *self*-reported academic performance (Schaufeli et al., 2002b). Furthermore, it appears that employee's who take the positive feelings from their work home or who – vice versa – take the positive experiences at home to their work exhibit higher levels of engagement compared to those where there is no positive cross-over between the two different domains (Montgomery et al., 2003). Finally, in a study among working couples it was shown that wives' levels of vigor and dedication uniquely contribute to husbands' levels of vigor and dedication, respectively, even when controlled for several work and home demands (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2003). The same applies to husband's levels of engagement that are likewise influenced by their wives' levels of engagement. This means that engagement crosses over from one partner to the other, and vice versa. So far, two longitudinal studies have been performed on the possible causes of burnout. The study of Bakker et al (2003) among employees from a pension fund company showed that job resources such as social support from one's colleagues and job autonomy are positively related to levels of engagement that are measured two years later. Also, it appeared in this study that engaged employees are successful in mobilizing their job resources. Bakker, Salanova, Schaufeli and Llorens (2003) found similar results among Spanish teachers.

- Possible consequences of work engagement. The possible consequences of work engagement pertain to positive *attitudes* towards work and towards the organization, such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and low turnover intention (Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2000; Schaufeli & Bakker, in press; Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003), but also to positive organizational behavior such as, personal initiative and learning motivation (Sonnentag, 2003), extra-role behavior (Salanova, Agut & Peiró, 2003), and proactive behavior (Salanova et al., 2003). Furthermore, there are some indications that engagement is positively related to health, that is, to low levels of depression and distress (Schaufeli, Taris & Van Rhenen, 2003) and psychosomatic complaints (Demerouti et al., 2001). Finally, it seems that work engagement is positively related to job performance. For instance, a study among about one-hundred Spanish hotels and restaurants showed that employees' levels of work engagement had a positive impact on the service climate of these hotels and restaurants, which, in its turn, predicted employees' extra-role behavior as well as customer satisfaction (Salanova, Agut, & Peiró, 2003). It is important to note that, in this study, work performance was measured independently from the employees, namely by interviewing customers about their satisfaction with the service received.
- Work engagement as a mediator in the motivation process. The previous findings about possible causes and consequences suggest that work engagement may play a mediating role between job resources on the one hand and positive work attitudes and work behaviors at the other hand. In a recent study, Schaufeli and Bakker (in press) tested such a model among four samples from different types of service organizations. Their structural equation model also included job stressors, burnout, and health complaints. They found some evidence for the existence of two types of processes: (1) a process of health impairment or *erosion* in which job stressors and lacking job resources are associated with burnout, which, in its turn is related to health complaints and negative work attitudes; (2) a *motivational* process in which available job resources are associated with work engagement, which, in its turn, is associated with positive work attitudes. Also other studies confirmed the mediating role of work engagement. Essentially, the results of Schaufeli and Bakker (in press) have been replicated by Hakanen, Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) in a study among a large sample of Finnish teachers. Furthermore, the results of the study by Salanova, Agut and Peiró (2003) corroborate the model of Schaufeli and Bakker (in press): work engagement plays a mediating role between job resources (e.g., technical equipment, participation in decision making) and service climate and job performance (i.e., extra-role behavior and customer satisfaction) Moreover, in another study among over 500 ICT-workers, Salanova et al. (2003) observed that work engagement mediated the relationship between available resources (performance feedback, task variety, and job control) and proactive organizational behavior.
- Work engagement as a collective phenomenon. Work engagement is not only an individual phenomenon, but it also occurs in groups; that is, it seems that employees in some teams or parts of the organization are more engaged than in other teams or parts (Salanova, Agut en Peiró, 2003; Taris, Bakker, Schaufeli & Schreurs, 2003). Obviously, engagement is not restricted to the individual employee, but groups of employees may differ in levels of engagement as well. Bakker and Schaufeli

(2001) observed in a study that included 130 teams from different organizations that the collective level of engagement of the team is associated with the individual level of engagement of the team members: the more engaged the team, the more engaged its members. Moreover, it appeared that the 'engaged' teams were able to acquire more job resources compared to the teams that were less 'engaged', which in its turn had a positive impact on the level of engagement of the individual team members. This so-called collective engagement has also been studied in the laboratory by Salanova, Llorens, Cifre, Martínez and Schaufeli (2003). They found that groups of students who had to carry out a particular task under time pressure reported higher levels of collective engagement, only when the group also felt competent to solve the task. When the group felt that they lacked the competence to do so, levels of collective engagement were low. Unfortunately, the effect of engagement on task performance was not investigated in this study. Finally, the previously discussed results from the study of Bakker et al. (2003) on working couples showed that engagement is 'contagious'; that is, it may cross over from one partner to the other and vice versa. This process of transference or crossover by which one person "catches" the high level of engagement of the other may be responsible for the emergence of collective forms of engagement.

In sum: validity studies that have been carried out with the UWES show that work engagement is indeed negatively associated with burnout, albeit that the relationship between vigor and exhaustion and between dedication and cynicism is somewhat less strong than was expected. Furthermore, engagement can be discriminated from workaholism. Particularly job resources that act as motivators seem to cause work engagement, whereas engaged employees exhibit positive job attitudes, experience good mental health, and seem to perform better than those who are less engaged. Finally, engagement is not restricted to the individual, it may crossover to others thus leading to what has been labeled collective engagement.

4. The psychometric quality of the UWES

Below, results on the psychometric quality of the UWES are reported using a Dutch language database, consisting of Dutch and Flemish studies among different occupational groups, as well as an international database that includes data from various countries. First, the psychometric analyses of the Dutch language database are presented, followed by that of the international database. A similar structure is used in both cases: first the composition of the database is discussed and next the results are presented of analyses regarding the distribution characteristics of the items, the internal consistencies of the subscales, the factor structure of the UWES, the relationships with burnout, age, and gender, and the differences between professional groups (in the Dutch database) and between countries (in the international database). Finally, a short version of the UWES is presented, as well as a slightly adapted version for students.

4.1. Description of the Dutch language database

For the purpose of carrying out psychometric evaluations of the UWES, a database has been compiled that includes 25 studies that have been conducted between 1999 and 2003 in The Netherlands and in Flanders. These

studies took either place in a single organization, sometimes including multiple sites, or included specific professional groups such as farmers or physicians (see Table 1).

In 11 of the 25 studies from the database, the UWES-17 ($N = 2,313$) has been used, whereas in the remaining 14 studies ($N = 7,366$) the UWES-15 has been used. Unless mentioned otherwise, the UWES-15 is used for the psychometrical analyses because in that case all 9,679 respondents could be included. However, the analyses were run simultaneously with the UWES-17 and the shortened UWES-9 (see 4.7). In case the results of these analyses substantively differed from those obtained with the UWES-15, this is mentioned in the text.

Table 1: Composition of the database of the Dutch language version of the UWES

	Study	N	%
1	Employees of an insurance company*	86	.9
2	Consultants of a computer firm*	80	.8
3	Ground staff of an airline company*	82	.8
4	Employees of a call-center of a telecom company*	477	4.9
5	Teaching staff and administrating staff of a professional college*	1003	10.4
6	Employees of a law firm*	57	.6
7	Military police officers*	3042	31.4
8	Employees of a pension fund*	507	5.2
9	Employees of an insurance company*	381	3.9
10	Employees of a local radio/TV station*	84	.9
11	Physicians who completed a career counseling instrument	655	6.8
12	Police officers	99	1.0
13	Medical and nursing staff of surgical units of a university hospital	104	1.1
14	Hospice staff*	84	.9
15	White collar civil servants	74	.8
16	Hospice staff	204	2.1
17	Volunteers who responded to a newspaper ad	124	1.3
18	Managers of a telecom company	587	6.1
19	Blue collar workers from the food processing industry	111	1.0
20	Participants of a workshop on the improvement of personal effectiveness at work	121	1.3
21	Farmers and horticulturists from a network of the Dutch Economic Agricultural Institute*	382	3.9
22	Flemish farmers*	496	5.1
23	Flemish white collar workers from various organizations*	590	6.1
24	Flemish blue collar workers from the automotive industry	64	.7
25	Flemish nurses	199	2.1
	Total	9,679	100

Note: * The UWES-15 has been completed

The database includes 42,8% men and 57,2% women and age ranges from 15 to 81 years ($M = 38.2$ years; $SD = 10.51$). Most employees are Dutch (86%), with the remaining employees originating from Belgium (Flanders). In both countries, a similar Dutch language version of the UWES has been used. Table 2 presents the occupational groups that have been included in the database.

Table 2: Occupational groups in the database of the Dutch language version of the UWES

Occupational group	N	%
Farmers and horticulturists	844	9.1
Blue collar workers	301	3.1
Hospital staff	264	2.7
White collar workers (profit sector)	1,645	16.9
Hospice workers	288	2.9
Physicians	655	6.8
Nurses	201	2.1
Civil servants	229	2.4
College staff	1,003	10.4
(Military) police officers	3,145	32.5
Managers	638	6.6
White collar workers (not-for-profit sector)	363	3.8
Miscellaneous	63	0.6
Information missing	48	0.4
Total	9,679	100.0

The studies that are included in the database are at best representative for a particular organization or for a particular occupational group, such as military police officers, or Dutch farmers and horticulturists. As a consequence, the database is not representative for the Dutch and/or Flemish working population. However, the database is rather heterogeneous as far as professional groups is concerned, ranging from unskilled blue collar and white collar workers to executives, and from hospice staff to university hospital surgeons. Also, the database includes employees who work predominantly with people (in health care and education), things or live stock (e.g., production line workers, farmers), or information (office clerks, managers); a distinction that can be made as far as the object of employee's work is concerned (Fine & Cronshaw, 1999). Hence, albeit that the database as such is not representative, it is heterogeneous enough to carry out psychometric analyses.

4.2. Distribution characteristics of the items

It was examined to what extent the frequency distributions of the UWES items deviate from normality as far as their skewness and kurtosis is concerned. It appeared that, generally speaking, items are normally distributed across the samples. As far as skewness is concerned, relatively minor deviations from the critical value of 1.96 were found for items DE01 (in one single sample: 2.5) and AB01 (in three samples: < 2.6). The deviations in

terms of kurtosis were somewhat more frequent but likewise not very serious: item DE01 (in two samples: < 6,2), item AB01 (in five samples: < 8.8), item V I01 (in two samples: < 4.1), item DE02 (in one sample: 4.2) and item VI02 (in two samples: < 34). Perhaps, except for item AB01 deviations from normality are rather unproblematic.

4.3. Internal consistency

Table 3 shows the internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) of the scales of the various versions of the UWES (for the short UWES-9, see 4.7). The α -values have been computed for the total database as well as for the individual studies. Table 3 displays the range of α as well as its median (Md). The latter is based on 15 studies (N = 9.679) as far as the UWES-9 and UWES-15 is concerned, whereas the median is based on the remaining 11 studies (N = 2.313) as far as the UWES-17 is concerned. As can be seen from Table 3, the internal consistencies are quite good for the short version as well as for both longer versions. Moreover, internal consistencies are well above the criterion of .60 that is recommended for newly developed measurement instruments (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 3: Cronbach's α of the UWES-scales

	UWES-9 (N = 9,679)			UWES-15 (N = 9,679)			UWES-17 (N =2,313)		
	Total	Md	Range	Total	Md	Range	Total	Md	Range
Vigor	.84	.84	.75 – .91	.86	.86	.81 – .90	.83	.86	.81 –.90
Dedication*	.89	.89	.83 – .93	.92	.91	.88 – .95	.92	.92	.88 –.95
Absorption	.79	.79	.70 – .84	.82	.81	.75 – .87	.82	.80	.70 –.88

Note. * The dedication scales of the UWES-15 and the UWES-17 are identical.

It is remarkable that the 6-item vigor scale is not more internally consistent than the scale with 5 items, whereas the 5-item absorption scale even seems to be somewhat *more* internally consistent than the scale with 6 items. The latter appears particularly from a comparison of α -values across studies. Because, in principle, Cronbach's α increases with test-length, α 's for the UWES-9 scales, that only include three items, are somewhat lower than the corresponding values of the UWES-15 or UWES-17. However, the internal consistency of the shortened scales largely exceeds the generally accepted criterion for existing scales of $\alpha \geq .70$ (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

In conclusion: all scales of the UWES are highly internally consistent. Furthermore, adding another item to the vigor and absorption scales does not increase the scale's internal consistence; quite to the contrary, it even seems that is slightly decreases. In other words, as far as the internal consistency is concerned, both extra items (VIT06 and ABS06) might just as well be eliminated. This is yet another reason to focus on the psychometric qualities of the UWES-15.

Table 4, shows the internal consistencies of the total scale of the UWES. In the next paragraph, it will be argued that in some instances using the total score is to be preferred above using the scores on the three subscales. As can be seen from the table, the total scales of the three UWES versions are highly internally consistent.

Table 4: Cronbach's α of the total UWES scale

	N	Total	Median	Range
UWES-9	9,679	.93	.93	.89 – .97
UWES-15	9,679	.92	.94	.90 – .96
UWES-17	2,313	.93	.94	.91 – .96

4.4. Factor structure and inter-correlations

In order to investigate the factor structure of the UWES, a number of confirmatory factor analyses have been carried out. The analyses have first been carried out using the total database, followed by the analyses of all individual studies separately, using the so-called Multiple Group Method. In order to increase the statistical power only those studies with more than 200 employees have been included in the analyses. This means that for the UWES-9 and the UWES-15 ten samples were analyzed (N = 8,120) and for the UWES-17 only two (N = 1,242).

Using this two-step approach it is possible to assess the fit of a particular factor solution to the data of the entire group in the database, as well as to assess the extent to which the factor solution is invariant across the separate studies. The fit of the one-factor solution that assumes that all three aspects of work engagement load on one underlying dimension is assessed, as well as the fit of the three factor solution that assumes that the three aspects of work engagement (vigor, dedication and absorption) are independent, yet correlated factors (Table 5). In other words, it is investigated if work engagement is a one-dimensional or three dimensional construct.

Table 5: The fit of the one-factor and three-factor solutions of the UWES

Model	N	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
<i>UWES-9</i>									
1-factor	9,679	4394.38	27	.90	.83	.13	.92	.90	.92
1-factor MG	8,120	3838.04	270	.90	.83	.04	.92	.90	.92
3-factor	9,679	2296.23	24	.95	.91	.10	.96	.94	.96
3-factor MG	8,120	2197.85	240	.95	.90	.03	.95	.94	.96
<i>UWES-15</i>									
1-factor	9,679	10937.76	90	.85	.80	.11	.89	.87	.89
1-factor MG	8,120	1026.80	900	.83	.77	.04	.87	.86	.88
3-factor	9,679	7798.57	87	.89	.85	.10	.92	.90	.92
3-factor MG	8,120	8273.85	870	.87	.81	.03	.90	.89	.91

Table 5: Continued

Model	N	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
UWES-17									
1-factor	2,313	3554.65	119	.83	.78	.11	.87	.85	.87
1-factor MG	1,242	2333.28	238	.78	.72	.08	.82	.81	.84
3-factor	2,313	2637.97	116	.87	.83	.10	.90	.89	.91
3-factor MG	1,242	1859.93	232	.82	.77	.08	.86	.85	.87

Note: MG = Multiple-Group method; GFI = *Goodness-of-Fit Index*; AGFI = *Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index*; RMSEA = *Root Mean Square Error of Approximation*; NFI = *Normed Fit Index*; NNFI = *Non-Normed Fit Index*; CFI = *Comparative Fit Index*.

Table 5 shows that the fit of the three-factor solution is superior to that of the one-factor solution. However, as far as the UWES-9 is concerned, the fit of the one-factor model is also acceptable; that is the relative fit indices (NFI, NNFI en CFI) exceed the critical value of .90 (Byrne, 2001)⁴. Moreover, the one-factor as well as the three-factor solution of the UWES-9 is relatively invariant across the 10 Dutch language studies that were included in the analyses. It can be inferred from the result that the fit of both models in the total group does not deviate substantially from the fit that is obtained using the MG-method (this indicates that the factor loadings and covariations between the factors are invariant across occupational groups). Also, the three-factor solution of UWES-15 is invariant across the 10 studies involved, albeit to a somewhat lesser extent. As far as the UWES-17 is concerned, there is a large difference between the fit in both samples that have been included, which points to a relatively poor invariance.

Although the fit of the three-factor solution appears to be somewhat better than that of the one-factor solution, the correlations between the three scales of the UWES are rather strong. This applies both to the correlations between the latent factors, as well as from the correlations between the manifest or observed scale scores (Table 6). Because latent variables represent "true scores" that are free of measurement error, correlations between latent scores are by definition higher than correlations between observed scores that include this measurement error.

Table 6: Correlations between latent and manifest UWES-factors

	Total group		Median		Range	
	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest
<i>UWES-9 (N = 9,679)</i>						
Vigor - Dedication	.87	.70	.88	.70	.85 – .95	.55 – .80
Dedication - Absorption	.91	.77	.92	.76	.86 – .98	.66 – .85
Vigor - Absorption	.84	.71	.86	.72	.77 – .92	.59 – .81

⁴ In principle, RMSEA should be smaller than .08, or at least .10 (Byrne, 2001), but in very large samples a somewhat higher value of RMSEA is usually observed.

<i>Table 6: Continued</i>						
	Total group		Median		Range	
	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest
<i>UWES-15 (N = 9,679)</i>						
Vigor - Dedication	.87	.77	.87	.79	.84 – .97	.59 – .86
Dedication - Absorption	.93	.80	.92	.79	.84 – .98	.65 – .87
Vigor - Absorption	.90	.76	.93	.76	.84 – .98	.60 – .87
<i>UWES-17 (N = 2,313)</i>						
Vigor - Dedication	.89	.78	.85	.80	.83 – .87	.61 – .84
Dedication - Absorption	.90	.77	.89	.76	.88 – .90	.62 – .84
Vigor - Absorption	.90	.75	.89	.75	.85 – .92	.55 – .84

The very high correlations between the (latent) factors of the UWES suggest that although psychometrically speaking we deal with an instrument that is composed of three dimensions, for practical purposes the three factors be collapsed into one factor. This applies particularly to the shortened version, because the one-factor model of the UWES-9 fitted well to the data (see Table 5).

In conclusion: Work engagement, as assessed by the UWES may be considered a one-dimensional as well as a three-dimensional construct. The high correlations between the three dimensions (see Table 6) and the high values for Cronbach's α for the total scale support a one-dimensional model, whereas the superior fit of the three dimensional model supports the existence of three subscales (at least for the UWES-15 and UWES-17) (see Table 5).

In case one is interested in the different dimensions of work engagement, it's obvious that the three-dimensional instrument should be used. This may be the case when work engagement is included in a linear structural model where the latent engagement factor may be represented by the three manifest factors. However, when one is interested in the concept of engagement as such, rather than in its constituting parts, the total score (of the shortened version) may be used. Since the three scales of the UWES are so strongly correlated, they should not be entered simultaneously in multivariate regression analyses in order to avoid problems with multicollinearity. In that case, the use of the total score is preferred.

4.5. Relationship with burnout

In 15 studies from the database (N = 6,726) the Utrechtse Burnout Scale (UBOS; Schaufeli & Van Dierendonck, 2000) – the Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory - General Survey (MBI-GS; Maslach, Leiter & Jackson, 1986) – has been included as well. This allows an examination of the correlations between the three dimensions of burnout – exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy – and work engagement. It is expected that burnout and engagement are negatively correlated, especially as far as vigor and exhaustion, and dedication and cynicism are concerned (see 1). Table 7 presents to correlations that are obtained in the total

group of 6,767 employees as well as the median and the range of correlations that are found across the 15 studies separately.

Table 7: Correlations between burnout (UBOS) and work engagement (UWES) (N = 6,726)

		Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	UWES
Exhaustion	Correlation in total group	-.38	-.26	-.15	-.28
	Median	-.40	-.33	-.19	-.36
	Range	-.29 – -.71	-.21 – -.51	-.10 – -.43	-.22 – -.58
Cynicism	Correlation in total group	-.50	-.66	-.46	-.60
	Median	-.53	-.65	-.44	-.61
	Range	-.40 – -.65	-.55 – -.73	-.34 – -.55	-.50 – -.70
Reduced	Correlation in total group	-.66	-.67	-.55	-.68
Professional	Median	-.65	-.70	-.56	-.70
Efficacy	Range	-.58 – -.74	-.63 – -.78	-.44 – -.69	-.60 – -.75

Note: UBOS = Utrecht Burnout Scale.

All correlations in the 15 studies between the burnout and engagement scales are negative and with virtually no exception also significant. The three engagement scales are most strongly correlated with (reduced) professional efficacy, which might be caused by the fact that the items of the efficacy scale are positively worded and have been reversed in order to assess *inefficacy* (see 3). As expected, dedication is strongly negatively correlated with cynicism, but contrary to expectations, the correlation between vigor and exhaustion is relatively low. In other words, engaged employees are not cynical and feel competent in their jobs, and – to a somewhat lesser degree – do not feel very fatigued.

4.6. Relationships with age and gender

The three scales of the UWES correlate weakly and positive with age: vigor $r = .05$, dedication $r = .14$, and absorption $r = .17$. The correlation of age with the total UWES score is $.14$. Hence, older employees feel more engaged. However, the percentage of shared variance is rather small – i.e., less than 2%.

Men (N = 5,450) score significantly higher than women on dedication and absorption (N = 4,066), whereas no gender differences in levels of vigor seem to exist. In addition, men have higher total-scores on the UWES-15 compared to women. Although these differences are statistically significant, they lack practical significance because their size is very small. The mean score for men on dedication and absorption is 4.02 and 3.65, respectively, whilst the corresponding mean values for women are 3.90 and 3.48. Hence, the gender differences regarding dedication and absorption are $.12$ and $.17$, respectively; which is far less than one standard deviation. The total-score on the UWES-15 for men is 3.89 against 3.77 for women; a minor difference of only $.12$; which is again far less than the standard deviation. Since mean levels of engagement do not differ much between men and women, it was decided not to compute gender-specific norm scores.

4.7. Differences between occupational groups

Generally speaking, differences in mean levels of engagement between various occupational groups are significant, but relatively small and they almost never exceed the size of one standard deviation. Nevertheless, a particular pattern is observed whereby farmers and managers exhibit the highest scores on all dimensions and blue-collar workers and physicians show the lowest scores. The fact that levels of engagement are so low among physicians is perhaps somewhat surprising but might be explained by the particular composition of the sample. The physicians who are included in the database filled out a computerized questionnaire through the internet – including the UWES – that was part of a so-called "career monitor" (Bakker, Schaufeli, Bulters, Van Rooijen & Ten Broek, 2002). The target group of the career monitor project was physicians who experienced any kind of career problem. Hence it is plausible that this specific group of physicians might show low engagement with their jobs. As a matter of fact this could have been the very reason to participate in the career counseling's project. Furthermore, each of the three engagement dimensions also shows a somewhat particular pattern as far as high or low scoring occupational groups is concerned. For instance, home care workers are not very vigorous but feel quite dedicated, whereas military police officers feel moderately vigorous, but feel neither dedicated nor absorbed by their job.

Tables 8 to 11 show the means and standard deviations of the three occupational groups with the highest and the lowest scores on each of the dimensions of the UWES, as well as on the total questionnaire. Only for vigor and absorption do the differences between the highest scoring group and the lowest scoring group exceed one standard deviation, which indicates a practically relevant difference. Because the mean values of the various occupational groups do not differ systematically, no occupation-specific norms have been computed.

Table 8: Levels of vigor for various occupational groups (UWES-15)

Occupational Group	N	Mean	Standard deviation
<i>Highest scores</i>			
Managers	632	4.29	1.03
Farmers	875	4.22	1.06
White collars workers (profit)	1,826	4.15	1.11
<i>Lowest scores</i>			
Home care staff	84	3.71	1.03
Blue-collar workers	376	3.67	1.23
Physicians	655	3.04	0.92
<i>Total group</i>	9,679	3.99	1.10

Table 9: Levels of dedication for various occupational groups (UWES-15)

Occupational Group	N	Mean	Standard deviation
<i>Highest scores</i>			
Farmers	875	4.27	1.03
Managers	632	4.26	1.06
Home care staff	84	4.25	1.11
<i>Lowest scores</i>			
Blue-collar workers	376	3.78	1.03
Military police officers	3,193	3.66	1.23
Physicians	655	3.29	0.92
<i>Total group</i>	9,679	3.91	1.10

Table 10: Levels of absorption for various occupational groups (UWES-15)

Occupational Group	N	Mean	Standard deviation
<i>Highest scores</i>			
Farmers	875	4.10	1.10
Managers	632	3.98	1.08
Nurses	201	3.92	1.04
<i>Lowest scores</i>			
Military police officers	3,193	3.35	1.17
Blue-collar workers	376	3.34	1.27
Physicians	655	2.96	1.92
<i>Total group</i>	9,679	3.58	1.18

Table 11: Total-score for occupational group (UWES-15)

Occupational Group	N	Mean	Standard deviation
<i>Highest scores</i>			
Farmers	875	4.24	1.04
Managers	632	4.22	1.00
White collar workers (profit)	1,826	3.97	1.12
<i>Lowest scores</i>			
Military police officers	3,193	3.69	1.12
Blue collar workers	376	3.63	1.24
Physicians	655	3.10	0.87
<i>Total group</i>	9,679	3,82	1.10

4.8. Short version

In order to shorten the scales of the UWES to three items maximum, an iterative process has been carried out, whereby each sample was analyzed separately. First, of each scale the most characteristic item was selected on face value. Next, this item was regressed on the remaining items of the particular scale. The item with the highest β -value in most samples was then added to the initial item. In the next step, the sum of these two items was regressed on the remaining items of the scale, and again the item with the highest β -value in most samples was added to both items that were previously selected. These three items constitute the final shortened version of that scale.

As most characteristic item for vigor was selected: *"At my work, I feel bursting with energy"* (VI01). This item was supplemented in the next two steps by *'At my job, I feel strong and vigorous'* (VI02), and *'When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work'* (VI03), respectively. The values of Cronbach's α vary from .75 to .91 (median: .84) across the 25 studies. Correlations with the longer 5-item and 6-item versions vary between .95 and .97 (median: .96), and .93 and .96 (median: .96), respectively.

As most characteristic item for dedication was selected: *'I am enthusiastic about my job'* (DE02). This item was supplemented by *'I am proud on the work that I do'* (DE04), and *'My job inspires me'* (DE03), respectively. The values of Cronbach's α vary from .83 to .93 (median: .89) across all studies. Correlations with the longer, 5-item version vary from .92 to .96 (median: .94).

As most characteristic item for absorption was selected: *'I am immersed in my work'* (AB04). This item was supplemented by *'I get carried away when I'm working'* (AB05), and *'I feel happy when I am working intensely'* (AB03), respectively. The values of Cronbach's α vary from .75 to .94 (median: .79). Correlations with the longer, 5-item and 6-item versions vary between .92 and .96 (median: .95), and .88 and .94 (median: .92), respectively.

Cronbach's α of the instrument including all 9 items varies from .89 to .97 (median: .93).

4.9. Student version

In addition to a version for employees, a student version of the UWES has also been developed: the UWES-S (see Appendix). Compared with the employee version, some items have been rephrased, for instance, *'When I'm doing my work as a student, I feel bursting with energy'* instead of *"At my work, I feel bursting with energy"*.

Two independent datasets are available, both of students from the Social Faculty of Utrecht University, who in 2000 (N = 292) and 2003 (N = 235) completed the 17-item UWES-S. The complete dataset (N = 527) is used for the psychometric analyses that are reported below. The majority of the total sample is woman (88%), the remaining 12% is men; age varies between 18 and 49 years, with a mean of 22.8 years (SD = 3.08).

All items of the UWES-S are about normally distributed. Neither the skewness nor the kurtosis of any item exceeds the critical value of 1.96. Cronbach's α for the original vigor (6 items), dedication (5 items) and absorption (6 items) scales is .63, .81 and .72, respectively. The internal consistency of the vigor scale satisfies the criterion of .60 for a newly developed measurement instrument, whereas both other scales exceed the criterion of $\geq .70$ for established scales (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

A similar procedure was followed as outlined in 4.7 in order to develop a shortened version of the UWES-S, which resulted in three identical items for vigor (*'I feel strong and vigorous when I'm studying or going to class'*; *'I feel fit and vigorous when I'm studying or I'm in class'*; *'When I get up in the morning I feel like going to class'*), but three different items for dedication (*'I find my studies full of meaning and purpose'*; *'My study inspires me'*; *'I am proud of my studies'*), and absorption (*'Time flies when I am studying'*; *'When I am studying, I forget everything else around me'*; *'I get carried away when I am studying'*). Cronbach's α for the three shortened scales are .73, .76, and .70, respectively, and .84 for the total 9-item scale. Hence, all shortened scales have good internal consistencies, satisfying the criterion of .70.

Table 12 shows the results of confirmatory factor analyses for assessing the fit of the one-factor and three-factor solutions of the UWES-S.

Table 12: The of the one-factor and three-factor solutions of the UWES-S (N = 572)

Model	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
<i>UWES-S-17</i>								
1-factor	1929.52	238	.80	.74	.08	.81	.80	.83
3-factor	59.00	116	.89	.86	.08	.82	.83	.85
<i>UWES-S-9</i>								
1-factor	173.78	27	.93	.88	.10	.88	.86	.89
3-factor	92.75	24	.96	.93	.07	.93	.92	.95

Note: GFI = Goodness-of-Fit Index; AGFI = Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index; RMSEA = Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; NFI = Normed Fit Index; NNFI = Non-Normed Fit Index; CFI = Comparative Fit Index.

In all cases, the fit of the three-factor model to the data is superior to that of the one-factor model. Furthermore, the hypothesized three-factor model of the UWES-17 does not fit very well to the data. This is for the most part caused by the low factor loadings of some vigor items; these items have been eliminated in the short version, so that the fit to the data is better.

Table 13 displays the correlations between the latent factors, resulting from the confirmatory factor analyses as well as between the manifest or observed scale scores. As noted before, the former are by definition higher than the latter. Compared to Table 6 the correlations between the scales are lower for the student version than for the employee version.

Table 13: Correlations between the scales of the UWES-S (N = 572)

	UWES-S-17 (manifest)	UWES-S-9 (manifest)	UWES-S-9 (latent)
Vigor – Dedication	.53	.54	.76
Dedication - Absorption	.51	.48	.70
Vigor – Absorption	.67	.58	.81

Based on the internal consistency as well as the fit of the three-factor model, the shortened version of the UWES-S is to be preferred above the original 17-item version. Like in case of the employee version, the total score as well as the three sub-scale scores of the (shortened) student version can be used as indicators of engagement.

Engagement among students (UWES-S-9) is weakly correlated with the age: vigor $r = .23$, dedication $r = .13$ and absorption $r = .15$. The older the students, the more engaged they feel. Levels of engagement (UWES-S-9) do not differ significantly between male and female students.

In addition to the UWES-S, all students also completed the student version of the UBOS – the Dutch version of the MBI-GS (Schaufeli et al., 2002b). Table 14 displays the correlations between burnout and engagement among students.

Table 14: Correlation between the UWES-S-9 and the UBOS-S (N = 572)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption
Exhaustion	-.16	-.07	-.00
Cynicism	-.35	-.60	-.26
Reduced efficacy	-.56	-.53	-.46

Against expectations, but in accordance with the results among employees, vigor and exhaustion are only weakly negatively related. However, as expected, the correlation between dedication and cynicism is rather strong. Like among employees, correlations with reduced efficacy are highest (see Table 7).

5. Other language versions

Below, the psychometric quality of the UWES is investigated using an international database, including studies among different occupational groups in various countries. First the composition of the database is discussed and next the results are presented of various psychometric analyses. Finally, a short version of the UWES is presented, as well as a slightly adapted version for students.

5.1. Description of the international language database

For the purpose of carrying out psychometric evaluations of the UWES, a database has been compiled that includes 23 studies that have been conducted between 1999 and 2003 in 9 countries. These studies took either place in a single organization, sometimes including multiple sites, or included specific professional groups such as teachers or police officers (see Table 15).

Table 15: Countries included in the international database of the UWES

	Country	N	%
1	Australia	473	3.7
2	Canada	267	2.1
3	Finland	3,651	28.9
4	France	221	1.7
5	Germany	821	6.5
6	Greece*	470	3.7
7	Norway	2,349	18.6
8	South Africa	2,547	20.2
9	Spain	1,832	14.5
	Total	12,631	100

Note: * The UWES-15 has been completed

In almost all cases the UWES-17 was used, except in two Greek studies (total N = 470) that used the UWES-15. All analyses were run simultaneously with the UWES-15, the UWES-17 and the shortened UWES-9 (see 5.8). In Canada, Australia and South Africa, the English version of the UWES was used, whereas in the remaining countries local language versions were employed (see Appendix).

The database includes 46.9% men and 53.1% women, and age ranged from 15 to 80 years (M = 40.2 years; SD = 12.9). Table 16 presents the occupational groups that are included in the database.

Table 16: Occupational groups included the international database of the UWES

Occupational group	N	%
Salvation Army officers	470	3.7
Blue collar workers	1,210	9.6
Hospital staff	78	.6
White collar workers (profit sector)	1,912	15.1
Civil servants	147	1.2
<i>Table 16:</i> Continued		

Occupational group	N	%
Physicians	50	.4
Nurses	385	3.4
University staff	428	2.4
Paramedics	681	5.4
Police officers	2,547	20.2
Teachers	2,601	20.6
Managers	226	1.8
White collar workers (not-for-profit sector)	1,488	11.8
Social workers/psychologists	147	1.2
Information missing	258	2.0
Total	12.631	100.0

The studies that are included in the database are neither representative for a specific country, nor for a specific occupational group. Samples from three countries include only one occupational group: Australian Salvation Army officers, South African police officers, and French salespersons. However, the database is rather heterogeneous, not only as far as its international composition is concerned, but also regarding occupational groups that are represented that range from blue-collar workers to university staff. Like the Dutch language database, the international database also includes employees who work predominantly with people (in health care and education), things (e.g. blue collar workers), or information (office clerks, managers); a distinction that can be made as far as the object of employee's jobs is concerned (Fine & Cronshaw, 1999). Hence, albeit that the database as such is not representative, it is heterogeneous enough to carry out psychometric analyses.

5.2. Distribution characteristics of the items

It was checked in samples of all 9 countries separately to what extent the frequency distributions of the UWES items deviate from normality as far as their skewness and kurtosis is concerned. It appeared that, generally speaking, items are normally distributed. Only in the French and German samples deviations from the critical value of 1.96 were found. As far as skewness is concerned these were items the DE01 (Germany), and AB02 and VI01 (France). For kurtosis these were the items DE01 and AB01 (Germany), and VI01, VI02, VI03, VI06, DE01, DE02, DE05, AB02, and AB06 (France). Except for the kurtosis of DE01 (Germany), and VI01 and AB02 (France) all deviations from normality were rather small (i.e. < 3.0). Thus, it can be concluded that with only a very few exceptions in samples from two countries the work engagement items are normally distributed.

5.3. Reliability

Two aspects of reliability are considered: internal consistency and test-retest reliability, also called stability.

Internal consistency

Table 17 shows the internal consistencies (Cronbach's α) of the scales of the various versions of the UWES (for the short UWES-9, see 5.8). The α -values have been computed for the total database as well as for the individual

studies. Table 17 displays the range of α as well as its median (Md). The latter is based on the samples from all 9 countries.

Table 17: Cronbach's α of the UWES-scales

	UWES-9 (N = 12,631)			UWES-15 (N = 12,631)			UWES-17 (N = 12,161)		
	Total	Md	Range	Total	Md	Range	Total	Md	Range
Vigor	.72	.76	.60 – .87	.80	.80	.56 – .88	.82	.82	.66 – .87
Dedication*	.84	.87	.74 – .90	.89	.89	.83 – .92	.89	.89	.83 – .92
Absorption	.77	.79	.66 – .85	.81	.82	.73 – .88	.83	.83	.79 – .88
Total score	.90	.91	.85 – .94	.92	.94	.88 – .96	.93	.93	.88 – .95

Note. * The dedication scales of the UWES-15 and UWES-17 are identical.

As can be seen from Table 17, the internal consistencies are quite good for the short version as well as for both longer versions. Because Cronbach's α increases with test-length, α 's for the UWES-9 scales, that only include three items per subscale, are somewhat lower than the corresponding values of the longer subscales of the UWES-15 and the UWES-17 (see also 5.8). However, with one exception (French sales persons) the internal consistencies of the shortened scales largely exceed the generally accepted criterion for existing scales of $\alpha \geq .70$ (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Basically, the 6-item versions of the vigor and absorption scales that are included in the UWES-17 are slightly more internally consistent than the 5-item versions from the UWES-15. Only in one specific sample, namely French salespersons, there is large discrepancy observed; Cronbach's α for the 5-item vigor scale of this sample is only .56, against .66 for the 6-item version.

Test-retest reliability

There are two longitudinal studies included in the international database which allow to assess the stability of the UWES across time. The UWES was administered twice with an interval of one year among 293 Australian Salvation Army officers and among 563 Norwegian paramedics. The stability coefficients (r_t) are shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Test-retest reliability (r_t) of the UWES scales

Scale	Salvation Army (AUS) (N = 293)	Paramedics (NOR) (N = 563)
Vigor-6	.64	.71
Vigor-5	.64	.70
Vigor-3	.61	.71

<i>Table 18: Continued</i>		
Scale	Salvation Army (AUS) (N = 293)	Paramedics (NOR) (N = 563)
Dedication-5	.58	.69
Dedication-3	.56	.66
Absorption-6	.58	.69
Absorption-5	.58	.68
Absorption3	.57	.63
UWES-17	.63	.72
UWES-15	.62	.72
UWES-9	.64	.73

The stability coefficients are slightly higher in the Norwegian sample, but in about the same range as in the Australian sample. No large differences in stability exist between the three dimensions of the UWES, perhaps with the exception of vigor that seems to be slightly more stable across time. Also, the length of the (sub)scales does not seem to influence the level of stability. The one-year stability of the UWES is in about the same range as that for the Maslach Burnout Inventory (see Schaufeli & Van Dierendonck, 2000).

In conclusion: all scales of the UWES are highly internally consistent. Furthermore, adding another item to the vigor and absorption scales hardly increases the scales' internal consistency. In other words, as far as the internal consistency is concerned, both extra items (VIT06 and ABS06) might just as well be eliminated. Although – as expected – the internal consistencies of the shortened version are somewhat lower, they are still within the acceptable range. Finally, the stability of engagement across a one-year time lag is similar to that of burnout and does differ much between the three dimensions, although the stability coefficient of vigor seems to be somewhat higher. The stability of the shortened version is similar to that of both longer versions.

5.4. Factor structure and inter-correlations

In order to investigate the factor structure of the UWES, a number of confirmatory factor analyses have been carried out. The analyses have been carried out using the total database and using the data of each country simultaneously, using the so-called Multiple Group method. (see also 4.4) The fit of the one-factor solution that assumes that all three aspects of work engagement load on one underlying dimension is assessed, as well as the fit of the three factor solution that assumes that the three aspects of work engagement (vigor, dedication and absorption) are independent, yet correlated factors (Table 19). In other words, it is investigated if work engagement is a one-dimensional or three-dimensional construct.

Table 19: The fit of the one-factor and three-factor solutions of the UWES in 9 different countries

Model	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
<i>UWES-9 (N = 12,631)</i>								
1-factor	3605.09	27	.93	.89	.10	.93	.91	.93
1-factor MG	6317.45	243	.89	.81	.04	.90	.87	.90
3-factor	1666.02	24	.97	.95	.07	.97	.95	.97
3-factor MG	3522.35	216	.94	.89	.03	.94	.92	.95
1-factor	8735.72	90	.90	.87	.09	.91	.89	.91
1-factor MG	15041.83	810	.84	.78	.04	.86	.85	.87
3-factor	5483.06	87	.94	.92	.07	.94	.93	.94
3-factor MG	10081.09	783	.89	.84	.03	.90	.89	.91
<i>UWES-17 (N = 12,161)</i>								
1-factor	11136.17	119	.89	.86	.09	.90	.88	.90
1-factor MG	18341.74	952	.82	.77	.04	.85	.83	.85
3-factor	7439.64	116	.93	.90	.07	.93	.92	.93
3-factor MG	14239.45	928	.86	.82	.03	.88	.87	.89

Note: MG = Multiple-Group method; GFI = *Goodness-of-Fit Index*; AGFI = *Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index*; RMSEA = *Root Mean Square Error of Approximation*; NFI = *Normed Fit Index*; NNFI = *Non-Normed Fit Index*; CFI = *Comparative Fit Index*.

Table 19 shows that the fit of the three-factor solution is superior to that of the one-factor solution. However, as far as the UWES-9 is concerned, the fit of the one-factor model is also acceptable; that is, all relative fit indices (NFI, NNFI en CFI) exceed the critical value of .90 (Byrne, 2001)⁵. Moreover, the one-factor as well as the three-factor solution of the UWES-9 is relatively invariant across the 9 countries that were included in the analyses. This can be inferred from the result that the fit of both models in the total group does not deviate substantially from the fit that is obtained using the MG-method. Also, the three-factor solution of UWES-15 is invariant across the 9 countries involved, albeit to a somewhat lesser extent. In contrast, the invariance of the three-factor structure of the UWES-17 is somewhat poor.

Table 20: The fit of the 3-factor UWES-15 model in the national samples

Country	N	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
Australia	473	552.63	87	.86	.80	.11	.89	.89	.90
Canada	267	285.66	87	.87	.82	.09	.89	.91	.92
Finland	3,651	2350.19	87	.91	.88	.08	.90	.89	.91
France	221	189.84	87	.90	.86	.07	.89	.90	.91
Germany	821	1173.59	87	.82	.75	.12	.83	.81	.84

⁵ In principle, RMSEA should be smaller than .08, or at least .10 (Byrne, 2001), but in very large samples a somewhat larger value of RMSEA is usually observed.

Table 20: Continued

Country	N	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
Greece	470	644.29	87	.84	.77	.12	.89	.88	.90
Norway	2,349	2483.58	87	.86	.81	.10	.91	.89	.91
South Africa	2,547	1668.94	87	.92	.88	.08	.92	.91	.93
Spain	1,832	1531.06	87	.89	.85	.10	.88	.86	.89

Table 21: The fit of the 3-factor UWES-9 model in the national samples

Country	N	χ^2	df	GFI	AGFI	RMSEA	NFI	NNFI	CFI
Australia	473	150.14	24	.94	.88	.11	.95	.94	.96
Canada	267	271.22	24	.93	.86	.11	.93	.91	.94
Finland	3,651	522.21	24	.97	.94	.08	.96	.95	.96
France	221	230.26	24	.90	.80	.14	.93	.90	.94
Germany	821	1176.54	24	.89	.80	.14	.93	.90	.93
Greece	470	494.55	24	.96	.93	.09	.96	.95	.96
Norway	2,349	657.76	24	.94	.89	.09	.91	.91	.94
South Africa	2,547	475.95	24	.94	.89	.10	.93	.90	.93
Spain	1,832	135.20	24	.89	.80	.13	.92	.89	.93

As can be seen from Tables 20 and 21 the hypothesized three-factor model of the UWES-15 and the UWES-9 fits reasonably well in most countries, with relative fit-indices NFI, NNFI, and CFI either satisfying or approaching the criterion of .90. Only in the Spanish and German samples, the fit of the UWES-15 is relatively weak. However, the UWES-9 does fit well to the data of these both countries.

Although the fit of the three-factor solution appears to be better than that of the one-factor solution, the correlations between the three scales of the UWES are rather strong. This applies both to the correlations of the latent factors from the confirmatory factor analysis, as well as from the correlations between the manifest or observed scale scores (Table 22). Please note that the correlations between latent the scores are by definition higher than correlations between observed scores because they are free of measurement error.

Table 22: Correlations between latent and manifest UWES-factors

	Total group		Median		Range	
	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest	Latent	Manifest
<i>UWES-9 (N = 12,631)</i>						
Vigor - Dedication	.96	.75	.95	.78	.87 – .99	.69 – .83
Dedication - Absorption	.84	.67	.89	.77	.65 – .96	.52 – .84
Vigor - Absorption	.79	.59	.83	.70	.72 – .99	.42 – .81

Table 22: Continued						
UWES-15 (N = 12,631)						
Vigor - Dedication	.94	.76	.94	.82	.86 – .99	.60 – .84
Dedication - Absorption	.84	.69	.92	.80	.67 – .97	.52 – .85
Vigor - Absorption	.85	.67	.94	.79	.70 – .99	.52 – .83
UWES-17 (N = 12,161)						
Vigor - Dedication	.93	.78	.94	.80	.82 – .99	.60 – .84
Dedication - Absorption	.85	.72	.91	.78	.75 – .94	.66 – .85
Vigor - Absorption	.86	.70	.90	.76	.73 – .99	.58 – .86

The very high correlations between the (latent) factors of the UWES suggest that although psychometrically speaking we deal with an instrument that is composed of three dimensions, for practical purposes the three factors might be collapsed into one score. This applies particularly to the shortened version, because the one-factor model of the UWES-9 fits well to the data (see Tables 19 and 21)

In conclusion: Work engagement, as assessed by the UWES may be considered a one-dimensional as well as a three-dimensional construct. The high correlations between the three dimensions (see Table 22) and the high values for Cronbach's α for the total scale (see Table 17) support a one-dimensional model, whereas the superior fit of the three dimensional model supports the three-dimensional model (at least for the UWES-15 and UWES-17) (see Tables 19-21).

In case that one is interested in the different dimensions of work engagement, evidently the three-dimensional scale should be used. This might also be the case when work engagement is included in a linear structural model where the latent engagement factor may be represented by the three manifest factors vigor, dedication and absorption. However, when one is interested in the concept of engagement *as such*, rather than in its constituting parts, the total score may be used. In that case one may prefer to use the shortened 9-item version. Since the three scales of the UWES are so strongly correlated, they should not be entered simultaneously in multivariate regression analyses in order to avoid problems with multicollinearity. Also in that case, the use of the total score is preferred.

5.5. Relationship with burnout

In all except two Norwegian studies (total N = 2,114), the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, Leiter & Jackson, 1986) has been administered as well. This allows us to examine the correlations between the three dimensions of burnout – exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy – and work engagement. It is expected that burnout and engagement are negatively correlated, especially as far as vigor and exhaustion, and dedication and cynicism are concerned (see 1). Tables 23 and 34 present the correlations that are obtained in the total group of 10,427 employees as well as the median and the range of correlations that are found across the 9 countries separately for the UWES-15 and the UWES-9, respectively.

Table 23: Correlations between burnout (MBI-GS) and work engagement (UWES-15) (N = 6,726)

		Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	UWES-15
Exhaustion	Correlation in total group	-.33	-.31	-.09	-.27
	Median	-.32	-.31	-.24	-.25
	Range	-.07 – -.49	-.01 – -.45	-.03 – -.28	-.02 – -.44
Cynicism	Correlation in total group	-.37	-.44	-.21	-.38
	Median	-.36	-.49	-.28	-.40
	Range	-.03 – -.63	-.29 – -.65	-.06 – -.53	-.17 – -.64
Reduced professional efficacy	Correlation in total group	-.50	-.51	-.39	-.52
	Median	-.59	-.57	-.45	-.63
	Range	-.28 – -.70	-.28 – -.72	-.23 – -.59	-.29 – -.74

Table 24: Correlations between burnout (MBI) and work engagement (UWES-9) (N = 6,726)

		Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	UWES-15
Exhaustion	Correlation in total group	-.38	-.34	-.10	-.31
	Median	-.37	-.34	-.13	-.31
	Range	-.05 – -.51	-.03 – -.41	-.05 – -.37	-.00 – -.45
Cynicism	Correlation in total group	-.39	-.45	-.23	-.40
	Median	-.42	-.51	-.28	-.46
	Range	-.16 – -.62	-.32 – -.65	-.06 – -.51	-.27 – -.64
Reduced efficacy	Correlation in total group	-.44	-.50	-.36	-.49
	Median	-.56	-.56	-.46	-.57
	Range	-.26 – -.61	-.39 – -.71	-.31 – -.56	-.27 – -.68

Almost all correlations between the burnout and work engagement scales in the samples from the various countries are significant and negative. Of the total of 120 correlations involving the UWES-15, only 8 were non-significant, for the UWES-9, seven non-significant correlations were observed. Almost all non-significant correlations were obtained in either the Greek or the French samples. The three engagement scales – but particularly vigor and dedication – are most strongly correlated with reduced efficacy, which may have been caused by the fact that the items of the efficacy scale are positively worded and have been reversed in order to assess *inefficacy* (see 3). As expected, dedication is relatively strongly negatively correlated with cynicism, but contrary to expectations, the correlation between vigor and exhaustion is relatively low. Absorption is least correlated with the burnout scales. The total score on engagement is most strongly correlated with reduced efficacy, followed by cynicism and exhaustion, respectively. In other words, engaged employees are not cynical and feel competent in their jobs, and – to a somewhat lesser degree – do not feel very fatigued.

5.6. Relationships with age and gender

In the total sample, virtually no relationship is observed between work engagement and age; except for a correlation of .05 with vigor that lacks any practical relevance. Correlations with age in the separate samples from the 9 countries are significantly positive. The older the employees, the more engaged they feel. Generally speaking the size of the correlations is rather small ($< .20$), with the exception of the Canadian sample ($.30 < r < .35$). This is, in most cases, the percentage of shared variance is rather small – i.e., less than 4%. Since no strong and systematic relationship is with age observed, it was decided not to compute age-specific norm scores.

In the total database, men ($N = 6,469$) score significantly higher than women ($N = 5,722$), on all three aspects of engagement: means for men on vigor, dedication and absorption are 4.28, 3.83, and 4.36, respectively, against 4.11, 3.77, and 4.26 for women. Although these differences are statistically significant, they lack practical significance because their size is very small; i.e. much less than one standard deviation. The total-score on the UWES-15 for males is 4.10 against 4.05 for women; a minor difference of only .05, which is again far less than the standard deviation. With a few exceptions, the picture emerges from the analyses of the separate samples: generally speaking, compared to women, men show slightly higher values on the three aspects of engagement, but in none of the cases this difference is of practical importance; i.e. more than one standard deviation. Since mean levels of engagement do not differ much between men and woman, it was decided not to compute gender-specific norm scores.

5.6 Differences between countries

Although differences in levels of engagement have been computed between countries, these are difficult to interpret since the composition of the samples from the various countries differs to a large extent. For instance, the Finnish sample includes schoolteachers and academic teaching staff, whereas the South African sample only includes police officers. Hence, the country samples are contaminated with occupational group. This being said, fairly large differences were observed between countries. For instance the highest scores for vigor, dedication and absorption were observed for the Finnish ($M = 4.57$), the French ($M = 4.80$) and again the French ($M = 4.56$) samples, respectively. The lowest scores for all three aspects of engagement were observed for the Canadian sample: $M = 3.35$, $M = 3.41$, and $M = 3.72$, respectively. The French sample includes sales persons, whereas the Canadian sample includes white and blue-collar workers. Hence the different scores of the countries might just as well reflect differences between occupational groups. In any case, the scales of the UWES are sensitive to differences in scoring between countries and/or occupational groups. Because it is not clear how the observed differences have to be interpreted, neither country specific nor occupational specific norms have been computed.

5.7 Shortened version

In order to shorten the scales of the UWES to three items maximum, a similar iterative process was carried out as described in 4.8. As most characteristic item for vigor was selected: *"At my work, I feel bursting with energy"*. This item was supplemented in the next two steps by *'At my job, I feel strong and vigorous'*, and *'When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work'*, respectively. The former item showed the highest β -value in all national samples, whereas the latter showed the highest β -value in all but two samples (Finland and Spain). The values of Cronbach's α vary from .60 to .87 (median: .76) across the 9 national samples. Except for Finland and France, all α -values exceed .70. Correlations with the longer, 5-item and 6-item versions vary between .80 and .96 (median: .91), and .82 and .96 (median: .90), respectively.

As most characteristic item for dedication was selected: *'I am enthusiastic about my job'*. This item was supplemented by *'My job inspires me'* and *'I am proud on the work that I do'*, respectively. The former item showed the highest β -value in all national samples except France, whereas the latter showed the highest β -value in all but two samples (Germany and Greece). The values of Cronbach's α vary from .74 to .90 (median: .87) across countries. Correlations with the longer, 5-item version vary from .93 to .98 (median: .96).

As most characteristic item for absorption was selected: *'I am immersed in my work'*. This item was supplemented by *'I get carried away when I'm working'*, and *'I feel happy when I am working intensely'*, respectively. The former item showed the highest β -value in all national samples except South Africa, France and Canada and Finland, whereas the latter showed the highest β -value in all but two samples (Canada and Greece). The values of Cronbach's α vary from .66 to .85 (median: .79). Except for Spain all α -values exceed .70. Only correlations with the longer, 5-item and 6-item versions vary between .90 and .96 (median: .94), and .88 and .96 (median: .92), respectively.

Cronbach's α of all 9 items varies from .85 to .94 (median: .91) across the 9 national samples. The α -value for the total database is .90.

6. Practical use

In this final chapter of the test-manual, the completion and the scoring of the UWES is discussed. Furthermore, norms of the various (language) versions of UWES are presented that are based on statistical cut-offs points.

6.1. Completion and scoring

It takes about 5-10 minutes to complete the UWES, which can be done individually as well as group wise. The UWES may be used for individual assessment as well as for group assessment, for instance as part of an employee satisfaction survey, or a psychosocial risk evaluation. The instruction at the top of the UWES test-form is self-evident (see Appendix). If necessary, it can be checked if the subject(s) have understood the instruction..

In order to avoid answering bias that might result from specific connotations related to 'work engagement' this term is not used in the title of the questionnaire. Instead, the more neutral term '*Work & Well-being Survey*' is chosen with UWES between parentheses.

The mean scale score of the three UWES subscales is computed by adding the scores on the particular scale and dividing the sum by the number of items of the subscale involved. A similar procedure is followed for the total score. Hence, the UWES, yields three subscale scores and/or a total score that range between 0 and 6.

For the content of the items and the meaning of the scale scores the reader is referred to Chapter 2.

6.2. Dutch norms

Group norms

In order to interpret the scores of a particular group of employees on (a dimension of) the UWES, the mean score from the database can be used (Tables 25 and 26). A simple t-test can be used in order to test the significance of the difference between the specific group at hand and the database score. As has been mentioned before, the use of either the UWES-15 or the UWES-9 is recommended. However, in the tables below the values of the UWES-17 are included as well, which do not basically differ from those of the UWES-15.

Tables 25 and 26 show the means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the three engagement dimensions of the various versions of the UWES, and of the total-scores of the UWES, respectively.

Table 25: Mean (M), standard error (SE), and standard deviation (SD) of the UWES dimensions

Dimension	UWES-9 (N = 9,679)			UWES-15 (N = 9,679)			UWES-17 (N = 2,313)		
	M	SE	SD	M	SE	SD	M	SE	SD
Vigor	4.01	.01	1.14	3.99	.01	1.11	3.99	.01	1.08
Dedication	3.88	.01	1.38	3.91	.01	1.31	3.91	.01	1.31
Absorption	3.35	.01	1.32	3.59	.01	1.18	3.56	.01	1.18

Table 26: Mean (M), standard error (SE), and standard deviation (SD) of the total UWES scores

Version	N	Mean	Standard error	Standard deviation
UWES-9	9,679	3.74	.01	1.17
UWES-15	9,679	3.82	.01	1.10
UWES-17	2,313	3.82	.01	1.09

In addition to means, also scoring percentages may be compared. In order to make this possible, the scores on the (dimensions of the) UWES have been recoded as follows:

-
- 0 to .99 → 1 (once a year or less)
 - 1 to 1.99 → 2 (at least once a year)
 - 2 to 2.99 → 3 (at least once a month)
 - 3 to 3.99 → 4 (at least a couple of times a month)
 - 4 to 4.99 → 5 (at least once a week)
 - 5 to 6 → 6 (a couple of times per week or daily)
-

The three tables below show distributions of the scoring categories 1 to 6 of the UWES-9, UWES-15, and UWES-17, respectively.

Table 27: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-9 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	0.5	1.9	2.7	1.1
2	2.8	6.2	10.1	5.8
3	13.0	15.2	23.0	19.1
4	25.0	21.7	27.6	28.3
5	31.4	25.8	21.5	28.7
6	27.2	29.3	15.1	17.0

Table 28: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-15 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	0.6	1.7	1.2	0.8
2	3.0	6.0	6.9	4.5
3	13.7	14.9	20.6	17.5
4	27.1	23.5	29.9	29.5
5	32.4	27.4	27.0	31.2
6	23.4	26.5	14.4	16.5

Table 29: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-17 (N = 2,313)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	0.5	1.7	1.3	0.8
2	2.8	6.0	7.0	4.4
3	13.3	14.9	21.4	17.7
4	28.0	23.5	30.5	30.1
5	33.0	27.4	26.2	31.1
6	22.4	26.5	13.8	15,9

Tables 27 to 29 show that over half of the employees have a mean score of either 5 or 6 on the vigor as well as the dedication scales, whereas this is true for 40% and 45% as far as absorption and the total-score are concerned. This means that relatively many employees score high on job engagement; against about 2% who report feelings of engagement to occur once per year or less, 20% report that they experience such feelings at least once a week, or even daily.

Individual norms

For the establishment of statistical norms for the UWES it was decided to use five categories: ‘very low’, ‘low’, ‘average’, ‘high’, and ‘very high’. Table 30 shows the definition of these five categories. This choice was, amongst others, motivated by the distribution of the items and by considerations concerning the standard measurement error. The categories are defined as follows.

Table 30: Scoring categories for the UWES

Qualification	Lower limit	Upper limit
‘Very high’	95 ^e percentile	≤ score
‘High’	75 ^e percentile	≤ score < 95 ^e percentile
‘Average’	25 ^e percentile	≤ score < 75 ^e percentile
‘Low’	5 ^e percentile	≤ score < 25 ^e percentile
‘Very low’		score < 5 ^e percentile

Tables 31 to 33 display the norm scores for the UWES-9, UWES-15 and UWES-17, respectively.

Table 31: Norm scores for de UWES-9 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.00	≤ 1.33	≤ 1.17	≤ 1.77
Low	2.01 – 3.25	1.34 – 2.90	1.18 – 2.33	1.78 – 2.88
Average	3.26 – 4.80	2.91 – 4.70	2.34 – 4.20	2.89 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.65	4.71 – 5.69	4.21 – 5.33	4.67 – 5.50
Very high	≥ 5.66	≥ 5.70	≥ 5.34	≥ 5.51
M	4.01	3.88	3.35	3.74
SD	1.13	1.38	1.32	1.17
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

Table 32: Norm scores for the UWES-15 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.00	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.93
Low	2.01 – 3.20	1.61 – 3.00	1.61 – 2.75	1.94 – 3.06
Average	3.21 – 4.80	3.01 – 4.90	2.76 – 4.40	3.07 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.65	4.91 – 5.79	4.41 – 5.40	4.67 – 5.53
Very high	≥ 5.66	≥ 5.80	≥ 5.41	≥ 5.54
M	3.99	3.81	3.59	3.82
SD	1.11	1.31	1.18	1.10
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

Table 33: Norm scores for the UWES-17 (N = 2,313)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.17	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.93
Low	2.18 – 3.20	1.61 – 3.00	1.61 – 2.75	1.94 – 3.06
Average	3.21 – 4.80	3.01 – 4.90	2.76 – 4.40	3.07 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.60	4.91 – 5.79	4.41 – 5.35	4.67 – 5.53
Very high	≥ 5.61	≥ 5.80	≥ 5.36	≥ 5.54
M	3.99	3.81	3.56	3.82
SD	1.08	1.31	1.10	1.10
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

6.3. Other language norms

Group norms

In order to interpret the scores of a particular group of employees on (a dimension of) the UWES, the mean score from the database can be used. A simple t-test can be used in order to test the significance of the difference between the specific group at hand and the database score. Table 34 shows the means, standard errors, and standard deviations of the three engagement dimensions of the various versions of the UWES, and of the total-scores of the UWES.

Table 34: Mean (M), standard error (SE), and standard deviation (SD) of the UWES dimensions

Dimension	UWES-9 (N = 12,631)			UWES-15 (N = 12,631)			UWES-17 (N = 12,161)		
	M	SE	SD	M	SE	SD	M	SE	SD
Vigor	4.18	.01	1.24	4.22	.01	1.37	4.24	.01	1.09
Dedication	4.28	.01	1.36	4.33	.01	1.30	4.33	.01	1.36
Absorption	3.68	.01	1.43	3.82	.01	1.31	3.77	.01	1.28
Total score	4.05	.01	1.19	4.12	.01	1.12	4.10	.01	1.11

In addition to means, also scoring percentages may be compared. In order to make this possible, the scores on the (dimensions of the) UWES have been recoded as follows:

-
- 0 to .99 → 1 (once a year or less)
 - 1 to 1.99 → 2 (at least once a year)
 - 2 to 2.99 → 3 (at least once a month)
 - 3 to 3.99 → 4 (at least a couple of times a month)
 - 4 to 4.99 → 5 (at least once a week)
 - 5 to 6 → 6 (a couple of times per week or daily)
-

The three tables below show distributions of the scoring categories 1 to 6 of the UWES-9, UWES-15, and UWES-17, respectively.

Table 35: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-9 (N = 12,631)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	1.0	1.5	3.0	1.1
2	3.5	4.1	7.4	4.3
3	10.1	9.5	15.1	12.6
4	20.7	18.0	22.5	24.4
5	29.5	25.6	23.3	32.6
6	35.3	41.3	23.4	25.1

Table 36: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-15 (N = 12,631)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	0.7	1.3	2.1	0.8
2	2.8	3.9	6.6	3.5
3	9.5	9.7	15.3	11.6
4	22.6	18.0	24.7	24.1
5	32.7	26.8	28.5	34.5
6	31.7	40.3	22.9	25.5

Table 37: Scoring distribution in percentages of the UWES-17 (N = 12,161)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total-score
1	0.6	1.3	2.0	0.7
2	2.5	3.9	6.6	3.5
3	9.4	9.7	16.3	11.8
4	22.1	18.0	25.2	24.9
5	34.4	26.8	28.9	34.8
6	31.1	40.3	21.0	24.3

Tables 35 to 37 show that over half of the employees have a mean score of either 5 or 6 on the three engagement scales, whereas less than 10% scores a 1 or a 2. This means that relatively many employees score high on job engagement; against about 2% who report feelings of engagement to occur once per year or less, 25% report that they experience such feelings at least a couple of times per week, or even daily.

Individual norms

For the establishment of statistical norms for the UWES it was decided to use five categories: ‘very low’, ‘low’, ‘average’, ‘high’, and ‘very high’. Table 30 shows the definition of these five categories. This choice was, amongst others, motivated by the distribution of the items and by considerations concerning the standard measurement error. The categories are defined as follows.

Table 38: Scoring categories for the UWES

Qualification	Lower limit	Upper limit
‘Very high’	95 ^e percentile	score
‘High’	75 ^e percentile	score < 95 ^e percentile
‘Average’	25 ^e percentile	score < 75 ^e percentile
‘Low’	5 ^e percentile	score < 25 ^e percentile
‘Very low’		score < 5 ^e percentile

Tables 39 to 41 display the norm scores for the UWES-9, UWES-15 and UWES-17, respectively.

Table 39: Norm scores for de UWES-9 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.00	≤ 1.33	≤ 1.17	≤ 1.77
Low	2.01 – 3.25	1.34 – 2.90	1.18 – 2.33	1.78 – 2.88
Average	3.26 – 4.80	2.91 – 4.70	2.34 – 4.20	2.89 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.65	4.71 – 5.69	4.21 – 5.33	4.67 – 5.50
Very high	≥ 5.66	≥ 5.70	≥ 5.34	≥ 5.51
M	4.01	3.88	3.35	3.74
SD	1.13	1.38	1.32	1.17
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

Table 40: Norm scores for the UWES-15 (N = 9,679)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.00	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.93
Low	2.01 – 3.20	1.61 – 3.00	1.61 – 2.75	1.94 – 3.06
Average	3.21 – 4.80	3.01 – 4.90	2.76 – 4.40	3.07 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.65	4.91 – 5.79	4.41 – 5.40	4.67 – 5.53
Very high	≥ 5.66	≥ 5.80	≥ 5.41	≥ 5.54
M	3.99	3.81	3.59	3.82
SD	1.11	1.31	1.18	1.10
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

Table 41: Norm scores for the UWES-17 (N = 2,313)

	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Total score
Very low	≤ 2.17	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.60	≤ 1.93
Low	2.18 – 3.20	1.61 – 3.00	1.61 – 2.75	1.94 – 3.06
Average	3.21 – 4.80	3.01 – 4.90	2.76 – 4.40	3.07 – 4.66
High	4.81 – 5.60	4.91 – 5.79	4.41 – 5.35	4.67 – 5.53
Very high	≥ 5.61	≥ 5.80	≥ 5.36	≥ 5.54
M	3.99	3.81	3.56	3.82
SD	1.08	1.31	1.10	1.10
SE	.01	.01	.01	.01
Range	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00	.00 – 6.00

7. Conclusion

Work engagement has recently emerged as the antipode of burnout. After investigating burnout for more than 25 years, research expanded to include its assumed opposite. The UWES operationalizes this new concept of work engagement by using three scales: vigor, dedication, and absorption. This preliminary test-manual summarizes the psychometric analyses that have been carried out using two large databases: a Dutch language database that includes almost 10,000 respondents from The Netherlands and Belgium, and an international database that includes almost 12,000 respondents from nine different countries.

It appears that the UWES has quite satisfactory psychometric properties:

1. The three subscales are internally consistent and stable across time;
2. The three-factor structure is confirmed, and seems to be invariant across samples from different countries;
3. Engagement as measured with the UWES is negatively related to burnout, albeit that instead of loading on burnout, professional efficacy loads on engagement;
4. Engagement is very weakly positively related to age;
5. Men show slightly higher engagement scores than women; although statistically significant, these differences are practically speaking irrelevant;
6. Small differences in levels of engagement between occupational groups exist, but these also lack practical significance.

In addition to the version for employees, also a student version is available (only in Dutch and Spanish). Moreover, a short 9-item version has been developed that shows similar positive psychometric characteristics as the longer 15-item version.

Taken together, it seems that with the UWES, we have a valid and reliable indicator of work engagement that can be used for future research on work engagement.

References

- Bakker, A.B. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). *Socially induced burnout*. Paper presented at the 5th EAWOP Congress, Prague, May 16-19.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). The socially induced burnout model. In S.P. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in Psychology Research* (Vol. 25; pp. 13-30). New York: Nova Science Publishers
- Bakker, A.B. Demerouti, E. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). *Crossover of burnout and engagement among working couples*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Bakker, Euwema & van Dierendonck (2003). *Job resources foster engagement and motivation to change*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Bakker, A.B., Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W.B., & Llorens, S. (2003). *Job resources and engagement: A longitudinal study*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Bakker, A.B., Schaufeli, W.B., Bulters, A.J. Van Rooijen, A. & Ten Broek, E. (2002). Carrière-counseling voor artsen via internet [Career counseling for physicians via the internet]. *Medisch Contact*, 57, 454-456.
- Bouman, A.M., Te Brake, H. & Hoogstraten, J. (2002). Significant effects due to rephrasing the Maslach Burnout Inventory's personal accomplishment items. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 825-826.
- Byrne, B.M. (2001). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B., Janssen, P.P.M. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Burnout and engagement at work as a function of demands and control. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 27, 279-286.
- Fine, S.A. & Cronshaw, S.F. (1999). *Functional job analysis: A foundation for human resources management*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hakanen, J., Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B.(2003). *Job demands, job resources and their relationships with burnout and engagement among Finnish teachers*. Manuscript in preparation..
- Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). *The truth about burnout: How organizations cause personal stress and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. (1996). *Maslach Burnout Inventory. Manual (3rd ed.)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Montgomery, A., Peeters, M.C.W., Schaufeli, W.B. & Den Ouden, M. (2003). Work-home interference among newspaper managers: Its relationship with Burnout and engagement. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 16, 195-211.
- Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H.(1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Salanova, M. Grau, R., Llorens, S., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2001). Exposición a las tecnologías de la información, burnout y engagement: el rol modulador de la autoeficacia profesional [Exposure to information technology, burnout and engagement: about the role of professional self-efficacy]. *Psicología Social Aplicada*, 11, 69-89.
- Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W.B., Llorens, S., Pieró, J.M., & Grau, R. (2001). Desde el 'burnout' al 'engagement': una nueva perspectiva [From burnout to engagement: A new perspective]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 16, 117-134.
- Salanova, M., Brescó, E. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). *Hacia un modelo espiral de la autoeficacia en el estudio del burnout y engagement* [Towards a spiral model of self-efficacy in the study of burnout and engagement]. Submitted for publication.
- Salanova, M., Carrero, V., Pinanzo, D., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). *Job characteristics and proactive behaviour: The mediating role of job engagement*. Submitted for publication.
- Salanova, M, Llorens, S., Cifre, E., Martinez, I., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). Perceived collective efficacy, subjective well-being and task performance among electronic work groups: An experimental study. *Small Groups Research*, 34, 43-73.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., & Pieró, J.M. (2003). *Linking organizational facilitators and work engagement to extra-role performance and customer loyalty : The mediating role of service climate*. Submitted for publication.
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Peiró, J.M., & Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). *How emotions predict self-efficacy: The mediating role of job engagement*. Submitted for publication.
- Schaufeli, W.B., & Bakker, A.B. (2001). Werk en welbevinden: Naar een positieve benadering in de Arbeids- en Gezondheidspsychologie [Work and well-being: Toward a positive approach in Occupational Health.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T., Le Blanc, P., Peeters, M., Bakker, A. & De Jonge, J. (2001). Maakt arbeid gezond? Op zoek naar de bevlogen werknemer [Does work make happy. In search of the engaged worker]. *De Psycholoog*, 36, 422-428.

- Schaufeli, W.B. & Bakker, A.B. (in press). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Van Dierendonck, D. (2000). *UBOS -- Utrechtse Burnout Schaal. Handleiding* [UBOS Test Manual]. Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets Test Services.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V. & Bakker, A.B. (2002a). The measurement of engagement and burnout and: A confirmative analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Martinez, I., Marques Pinto, A. Salanova, M. & Bakker, A.B. (2002b). Burnout and engagement in university students: Across national study. *Journal of Cross- Cultural Psychology*, 33, 464-481.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W., & Van Rhenen, W. (2003). *Workaholism, burnout and engagement: Three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being?* Submitted for publication.
- Shirom, A. (2002). Job related burnout: A review. In J.C. Quick & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.). *Handbook of Occupational Health Psychology* (pp. 245-264). American Psychological Association: Washington DC.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior (2003): A new Look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
- Waegenmakers, K. (2003). *Burnout, bevlogenheid en studieprestaties bij studenten* [Burnout, engagement and academic performance in students]. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Psychology Department, Utrecht University, The Netherlands.

Appendix

UWES versions

- 1a. Dutch version
 - b. Dutch student version
2. English version
3. German version
4. French version
5. Norwegian version
6. Swedish version
7. Finnish version
- 8a. Spanish version
 - b. Spanish student version
9. Greek version
10. Russian version
11. Portuguese student version

Dutch version

Werkbelevingslijst (UBES) ©

De volgende uitspraken hebben betrekking op hoe u uw werk beleeft en hoe u zich daarbij voelt. Wilt u aangeven hoe vaak iedere uitspraak op u van toepassing is door steeds het **best passende** cijfer (van 0 tot 6) in te vullen?

	Sporadisch	Af en toe	Regelmatig	Dikwijls	Zeer dikwijls	Altijd
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nooit	Een paar keer per jaar of minder	Eens per maand of minder	Een paar keer per maand	Eens per week	Een paar keer per week	Dagelijks

1. _____ Op mijn werk bruis ik van energie. (VI01)*
2. _____ Ik vind het werk dat ik doe nuttig en zinvol. (DE01)
3. _____ Als ik aan het werk ben, dan vliegt de tijd voorbij. (AB01)
4. _____ Als ik werk voel ik me fit en sterk. (VI02)*
5. _____ Ik ben enthousiast over mijn baan. (DE02)*
6. _____ Als ik werk vergeet ik alle andere dingen om me heen. (AB02)
7. _____ Mijn werk inspireert mij. (DE03)*
8. _____ Als ik 's morgens opsta heb ik zin om aan het werk te gaan (VI03)*
9. _____ Wanneer ik heel intensief aan het werk ben, voel ik mij gelukkig. (AB03)*
10. _____ Ik ben trots op het werk dat ik doe. (DE04)*
11. _____ Ik ga helemaal op in mijn werk. (AB04)*
12. _____ Als ik aan het werk ben, dan kan ik heel lang doorgaan. (VI04)
13. _____ Mijn werk is voor mij een uitdaging. (DE05)
14. _____ Mijn werk brengt mij in vervoering. (AB05)*
15. _____ Op mijn werk beschik ik over een grote mentale (geestelijke) veerkracht. (VI05)
16. _____ Ik kan me moeilijk van mijn werk losmaken. (AB06)
17. _____ Op mijn werk zet ik altijd door, ook als het tegenzit. (VI06)

* Verkorte versie (UBES-9); VI = vitaliteit; DE = toewijding; AB = absorptie.

Dutch student version

Studiebelevingslijst (UBES-S) ©

De volgende uitspraken hebben betrekking op hoe je je studie beleeft en hoe je je daarbij voelt. Geef s.v.p. aan hoe vaak iedere uitspraak op jou van toepassing is door steeds het **best passende** cijfer (van 0 tot 6) in te vullen.

	Sporadisch	Af en toe	Regelmatig	Dikwijls	Zeer dikwijls	Altijd
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nooit	Een paar keer per jaar of minder	Eens per maand of minder	Een paar keer per maand	Eens per week	Een paar keer per week	Dagelijks

1. _____ Als ik studeer bruis ik van de energie. (VI01)*
2. _____ Ik vind mijn studie nuttig en zinvol. (DE01)*
3. _____ Wanneer ik studeer vliegt de tijd voorbij. (AB01)*
4. _____ Ik voel mij sterk en fit wanneer ik studeer en colleges volg. (VI02)*
5. _____ Ik ben enthousiast over de inhoud van mijn studie. (DE02)
6. _____ Ik vergeet alles om mij heen als ik verdiept ben in mijn studie. (AB02)*
7. _____ Mijn studie inspireert mij. (DE03)*
8. _____ Als ik 's morgens opsta heb ik zin om naar college te gaan of te gaan studeren (VI03)*
9. _____ Wanneer ik heel intensief aan het studeren ben, voel ik me gelukkig. (AB03)
10. _____ Ik ben er trots op dat ik deze studie doe. (DE04)*
11. _____ Ik ga helemaal op in mijn studie. (AB04)*
12. _____ Als ik aan het studeren ben kan ik heel lang doorgaan. (VI04)
13. _____ Ik vind mijn studie uitdagend. (DE05)
14. _____ Ik laat me meeslepen door de stof wanneer ik studeer. (AB05)
15. _____ Ik beschik over een grote mentale veerkracht voor zover het mijn studie betreft. (VI05)
16. _____ Het is voor mij moeilijk afstand te nemen van mijn studie. (AB06)
17. _____ Ik ga door met studeren, zelfs als het tegenzit. (VI06)

* Verkorte versie (UBES-S-9); VI = vitaliteit; DE = toewijding; AB = absorptie.

English version

Work & Well-being Survey (UWES) ©

The following 17 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the '0' (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

	Almost never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very often	Always
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Never	A few times a year or less	Once a month or less	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day

1. _____ At my work, I feel bursting with energy* (VI1)
2. _____ I find the work that I do full of meaning and purpose (DE1)
3. _____ Time flies when I'm working (AB1)
4. _____ At my job, I feel strong and vigorous (VI2)*
5. _____ I am enthusiastic about my job (DE2)*
6. _____ When I am working, I forget everything else around me (AB2)
7. _____ My job inspires me (DE3)*
8. _____ When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work (VI3)*
9. _____ I feel happy when I am working intensely (AB3)*
10. _____ I am proud on the work that I do (DE4)*
11. _____ I am immersed in my work (AB4)*
12. _____ I can continue working for very long periods at a time (VI4)
13. _____ To me, my job is challenging (DE5)
14. _____ I get carried away when I'm working (AB5)*
15. _____ At my job, I am very resilient, mentally (VI5)
16. _____ It is difficult to detach myself from my job (AB6)
17. _____ At my work I always persevere, even when things do not go well (VI6)

* Shortened version (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption

German version

Arbeitsengagement ©

In der folgenden Liste finden Sie Aussagen dazu, wie man die Arbeit erleben kann. Kreuzen Sie bitte das für Sie Zutreffende an. Bitte beachten Sie, dass Sie hier sieben Antwortmöglichkeiten haben.

	fast nie	ab und zu	regelmäßig	häufig	sehr häufig	Immer
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nie	ein paar Mal im Jahr oder weniger	einmal im Monat oder weniger	ein paar Mal im Monat	einmal in der Woche	ein paar Mal in der Woche	jeden Tag

1. _____ Bei meiner Arbeit bin ich voll überschäumender Energie (VII)*
2. _____ Meine Arbeit ist nützlich und sinnvoll (HI1)
3. _____ Während ich arbeite, vergeht die Zeit wie im Fluge (VA1)
4. _____ Beim Arbeiten fühle ich mich fit und tatkräftig (VI2)*
5. _____ Ich bin von meiner Arbeit begeistert (HI2)*
6. _____ Während ich arbeite, vergesse ich alles um mich herum. (VA2)
7. _____ Meine Arbeit inspiriert mich (HI3)*
8. _____ Wenn ich morgens aufstehe, freue ich mich auf meine Arbeit (VI3)*
9. _____ Ich fühle mich glücklich, wenn ich intensiv arbeite (VA3)*
10. _____ Ich bin stolz auf meine Arbeit (HI4)*
11. _____ Ich gehe völlig in meiner Arbeit auf (VA4)*
12. _____ Wenn ich arbeite, kann ich für sehr lange Zeit dran bleiben (VI4)
13. _____ Meine Arbeit ist eine Herausforderung für mich (HI5)
14. _____ Meine Arbeit reißt mich mit (VA5)*
15. _____ Bei meiner Arbeit bin ich geistig sehr widerstandsfähig (VI5)
16. _____ Ich kann mich nur schwer von meiner Arbeit lösen (VA6)
17. _____ Bei meiner Arbeit halte ich immer durch, auch wenn es mal nicht so gut läuft (VI6)

* Kurzversion (UWES-9); VI= Vitalität; HI = Hingabe; AB = Absorbiertheit

French version

Echelle d'engagement au travail (UWES) ©

Lisez chaque sentiment que vous éprouvez à l'égard de votre travail et dites si vous éprouvez ce sentiment. Si vous n'avez jamais éprouvé ce sentiment, entourez le chiffre '0' (zero). Si vous éprouvez ce sentiment, indiquez quelle en est la fréquence en entourant le chiffre entre '1' et '6' qui vous correspond le mieux.

	Presque jamais	Rarement	Quelquefois	Souvent	Très souvent	Toujours
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Jamais	Quelques fois par an ou moins	Une fois par mois ou moins	Quelques fois par mois	Une fois par semaine	Quelques fois par semaine	Tous les jours

1. _____ Je déborde d'énergie pour mon travail (VII)*
2. _____ Je trouve que mon travail a un sens et une utilité (DE1)
3. _____ Le temps passe à allure folle lorsque je travaille (AB1)
4. _____ Je me sens fort(e) et vigoureux(se) pour faire ce métier (VI2)*
5. _____ Je suis passionné(e) par mon travail (DE2)*
6. _____ Lorsque je travaille, j'oublie tout autour de moi (AB2)
7. _____ Faire ce métier est stimulant (DE3)*
8. _____ Lorsque je me lève le matin, j'ai envie d'aller travailler (VI3)*
9. _____ Je suis content(e) lorsque je suis captivé(e) par mon activité (AB3)*
10. _____ Je suis fier(e) du travail que je fais (DE4)*
11. _____ Je suis complètement absorbé(e) par mon travail (AB4)*
12. _____ J'arrive à travailler longtemps sans m'arrêter (VI4)
13. _____ Selon moi, mon travail est un véritable challenge (DE5)
14. _____ Je suis littéralement plongé(e) dans mon travail (AB5)*
15. _____ Je ne me laisse pas abattre dans mon travail (VI5)
16. _____ Il m'est très difficile de me détacher de mon travail (AB6)
17. _____ Je persévère toujours dans mon travail, même quand les choses ne vont pas bien (VI6)

* Version raccourcie (UWES-9); VI = vigueur; DE = dévouement; AB = absorption

Norwegian version

Skjema på jobb og velvære (UWES) ©

I det følgende presenteres 17 utsagn om følelser du kan ha i forhold til jobben din. For hvert utsagn skal du ta stilling til hvor ofte du føler det på denne måten. Sett ring rundt det nummeret i følge skalaen fra 0 til 6 nedenfor som best beskriver dine følelser.

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Aldri i det siste året	Noen ganger det siste året	Månedlig	Noen ganger i måneden	Ukentlig	Noen ganger i uken	Daglig

1. _____ Jeg er full av energi i arbeidet mitt* (VII)
2. _____ Jeg synes at arbeidet mitt har både mål og mening (DE1)
3. _____ Tiden bare flyr når jeg arbeider (AB1)
4. _____ Jeg føler meg sterk og energisk på jobben (VI2)*
5. _____ Jeg er entusiastisk i jobben min (DE2)*
6. _____ Når jeg arbeider glemmer jeg alt annet rundt meg (AB2)
7. _____ Jeg blir inspirert av jobben min (DE3)*
8. _____ Når jeg står opp om morgenen ser jeg frem til å gå på jobben (VI3)*
9. _____ Jeg føler meg glad når jeg er fordypet i arbeidet mitt (AB3)*
10. _____ Jeg er stolt av det arbeidet jeg gjør (DE4)*
11. _____ Jeg er oppslukt av arbeidet mitt (AB4)*
12. _____ På jobben kan jeg holde på med å arbeide i lange perioder av gangen (VI4)
13. _____ For meg er jobben en utfordring (DE5)
14. _____ Jeg blir fullstendig revet med av arbeidet mitt (AB5)*
15. _____ Jeg føler meg psykisk sterk på jobben (VI5)
16. _____ Det er vanskelig for meg å løsrive meg fra jobben (AB6)
17. _____ Jeg er alltid utholdende på jobb, selv når ting ikke går bra (VI6)

* Forkorte versjon (UBES-9); VI= vitalitet; DE = entusiasme ; AB = fordypning.

Swedish version

Engagemang (UWES) ©

Följande 17 påståenden handlar om hur du brukar känna dig på arbetet. Läs varje påstående noga och tänk efter om du någon gång haft den känslan när du jobbar. Om du aldrig känt dig på det viset, kryssa i '0' (noll) i rutan efter frågan. Om du har upplevt känslan som beskrivs, tala om hur ofta genom att kryssa i den siffra mellan 1 och 6 som bäst stämmer överens med hur vanligt, eller ovanligt, det är att du känner på det här viset när du jobbar.

	Nästan aldrig	Sällan	Ibland	Ofta	Mycket ofta	Alltid
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Aldrig	Några gånger om året eller mindre	En gång i månaden eller mindre	Några gånger i månaden	En gång i veckan	Några gånger i veckan	Varje dag

1. _____ Jag spritter av energi på jobbet * (VII)
2. _____ Jag tycker att mitt jobb har både mening och mål (DE1)
3. _____ Tiden flyger iväg när jag arbetar (AB1)
4. _____ På jobbet känner jag mig stark och energisk (VI2)*
5. _____ Jag känner mig entusiastisk inför mitt jobb (DE2)*
6. _____ När jag arbetar glömmmer jag allt annat runt omkring mig (AB2)
7. _____ Mitt arbete inspirerar mig (DE3)*
8. _____ När jag stiger upp på morgonen så känner jag för att gå till jobbet (VI3)*
9. _____ Jag känner mig lycklig när jag går upp i mitt arbete (AB3)*
10. _____ Jag är stolt över det arbete jag utför (DE4)*
11. _____ Jag rycks med när jag arbetar (AB4)*
12. _____ Jag kan arbeta i väldigt långa perioder åt gången (VI4)
13. _____ För mig är jobbet en utmaning (DE5)
14. _____ Jag är uppslukad av mitt arbete (AB5)*
15. _____ Jag kommer alltid igen efter motgångar på jobbet (VI5)
16. _____ Jag har svårt att släppa tankarna på mitt jobb (AB6)
17. _____ Även om saker på jobbet inte går så bra så ger jag aldrig upp (VI6)

*Kortversion (UWES-9); VI=Vitalitet; DE =Entusiasm; AB = Försjunkhet (i arbetet)

Finnish version

Työn imu (UWES) ©

Kuinka usein sinulla on seuraavien väittämien kaltaisia tuntemuksia tai ajatuksia? Lue jokainen väittämä huolellisesti ja päätä, miten usein koet työssäsi väittämässä kuvattua tuntemusta tai ajatusta. Jos sinulla ei koskaan ole ollut kysyttyä kokemusta, rastita '0' (nolla). Jos sinulla on ollut väittämän mukaisia kokemuksia, rastita se vaihtoehto (yhdestä kuuteen), joka parhaiten kuvaa, kuinka usein olet kokenut kuvatulla tavalla.

	hyvin harvoin	harvoin	joskus	melko usein	hyvin usein	aina
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
en/ei koskaan	muutaman kerran vuodessa	kerran kuussa	muutaman kerran kuussa	kerran viikossa	muutaman kerran viikossa	päivittäin

1. _____ Tunnen olevani täynnä energiaa, kun teen työtäni (VI)
2. _____ Työni on mielestäni merkityksellistä ja sillä on selvä tarkoitus (DE1)
3. _____ Työskennellessäni unohdan ajan kulun (A12)
4. _____ Tunnen itseni vahvaksi ja tarmokkaaksi työssäni (VI2)*
5. _____ Olen innostunut työstäni (DE2)*
6. _____ Kun työskentelen, unohdan kaiken muun ympärilläni (AB2)
7. _____ Työni inspiroi minua (DE3)*
8. _____ Aamulla herättyäni minusta tuntuu hyvältä lähteä töihin (VI3)*
9. _____ Tunnen tyydytystä, kun olen syventynyt työhöni (AB3)*
10. _____ Olen ylpeä työstäni (DE4)*
11. _____ Olen täysin uppoutunut työhöni (AB4)*
12. _____ Jaksan työskennellä hyvinkin pitkiä aikoja kerrallaan (VI4)
13. _____ Minulle työni on haastavaa (DE5)
14. _____ Kun työskentelen, työ vie minut mukanaan (AB5)*
15. _____ Olen hyvin sinnikäs työssäni (VI5)
16. _____ Minun on vaikea irrottautua työstäni, kun olen siihen uppoutunut (AB6)
17. _____ Jatkan hellittämättä työssäni silloinkin, kun asiat eivät suju niin hyvin (VI6)

Shortened version (UWES-9); VI = tarmokkuus; DE = omistautuminen; AB = uppoutuminen

Spanish Version

Encuesta de Bienestar y Trabajo (UWES) ©

Las siguientes preguntas se refieren a los sentimientos de las personas en el trabajo. Por favor, lea cuidadosamente cada pregunta y decida si se ha sentido de esta forma. Si nunca se ha sentido así conteste '0' (cero), y en caso contrario indique cuántas veces se ha sentido así teniendo en cuenta el número que aparece en la siguiente escala de respuesta (de 1 a 6).

Nunca	Casi nunca	Algunas veces	Regularmente	Bastante veces	Casi siempre	Siempre
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ninguna vez	Pocas veces al año	Una vez al mes o menos	Pocas veces al mes	Una vez por semana	Pocas veces por semana	Todos los días

1. _____ En mi trabajo me siento lleno de energía (VII)*
2. _____ Mi trabajo está lleno de significado y propósito (DE1)
3. _____ El tiempo vuela cuando estoy trabajando (AB1)
4. _____ Soy fuerte y vigoroso en mi trabajo (VI2)*
5. _____ Estoy entusiasmado con mi trabajo (DE2)*
6. _____ Cuando estoy trabajando olvido todo lo que pasa alrededor de mí (AB2)
7. _____ Mi trabajo me inspira (DE3)*
8. _____ Cuando me levanto por las mañanas tengo ganas de ir a trabajar (VI3)*
9. _____ Soy feliz cuando estoy absorto en mi trabajo (AB3)*
10. _____ Estoy orgulloso del trabajo que hago (DE4)*
11. _____ Estoy inmerso en mi trabajo (AB4)*
12. _____ Puedo continuar trabajando durante largos períodos de tiempo (VI4)
13. _____ Mi trabajo es retador (DE5)
14. _____ Me "dejo llevar" por mi trabajo (AB5)*
15. _____ Soy muy persistente en mi trabajo (VI5)
16. _____ Me es difícil 'desconectarme' de mi trabajo (AB6)
17. _____ Incluso cuando las cosas no van bien, continuo trabajando (VI6)

* Versión abreviar (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedicación; AB = absorción

Spanish student version

Encuesta de Bienestar y in Contexto Académico (UWES-S) ©

Las siguientes preguntas se refieren a los sentimientos de las personas en el trabajo. Por favor, lea cuidadosamente cada pregunta y decida si se ha sentido de esta forma. Si nunca se ha sentido así conteste '0' (cero), y en caso contrario indique cuántas veces se ha sentido así teniendo en cuenta el número que aparece en la siguiente escala de respuesta (de 1 a 6).

Nunca	Casi nunca	Algunas veces	Regularmente	Bastante veces	Casi siempre	Siempre
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ninguna vez	Pocas veces al año	Una vez al mes o menos	Pocas veces al mes	Una vez por semana	Pocas veces por semana	Todos los días

1. _____ Mis tareas como estudiante me hacen sentir lleno de energía (VII)*
2. _____ Creo que mi carrera tiene significado (DE1)
3. _____ El tiempo "pasa volando" cuando realizo mis tareas como estudiante (AB1)
4. _____ Me siento fuerte y vigoroso cuando estoy estudiando o voy a las clases (VI2)*
5. _____ Estoy entusiasmado con mi carrera (DE2)*
6. _____ Olvido todo lo que pasa alrededor de mí cuando estoy abstraído con mis estudios (AB2)
7. _____ Mis estudios me inspiran cosas nuevas (DE3)*
8. _____ Cuando me levanto por la mañana me apetece ir a clase o estudiar (VI3)*
9. _____ Soy feliz cuando estoy haciendo tareas relacionadas con mis estudios (AB3)*
10. _____ Estoy orgulloso de hacer esta carrera (DE4)*
11. _____ Estoy inmerso en mis estudios (AB4)*
12. _____ Puedo seguir estudiando durante largos períodos de tiempo (VI4)
13. _____ Mi carrera es retardadora para mí (DE5)
14. _____ Me "dejo llevar" cuando realizo mis tareas como estudiante (AB5)*
15. _____ Soy muy "resistente" para afrontar mis tareas como estudiante (VI5)
16. _____ Es difícil para mí separarme de mis estudios (AB6)
17. _____ En mis tareas como estudiante no paro incluso si no me encuentro bien (VI6)

* Versión acortada (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedicación; AB = absorción

© Schaufeli & Bakker (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale is free for use for non-commercial scientific research. Commercial and/or non-scientific use is prohibited, unless previous written permission is granted by the authors.

Greek Version

Εργασία και Ευημερία (UWES) ©

Σημειώστε με ένα κύκλο πόσο συχνά ισχύει για σας το περιεχόμενο της κάθε δήλωσης ακολουθώντας την εξής διαβάθμιση :

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Μερικές φορές	Τακτικά	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντα
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μια φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μια φορά τη βδομάδα	Μερικές φορές τη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

1. _____ Στη δουλειά μου αισθάνομαι να πλημμυρίζω από ενεργητικότητα. (VI1)*
2. _____ Η εργασία που κάνω είναι χρήσιμη και γεμάτη νόημα. (DE1)
3. _____ Ο χρόνος κυλάει γρήγορα όταν εργάζομαι. (AB1)
4. _____ Νιώθω γεμάτος/η ζωντάνια και δύναμη όταν εργάζομαι. (VI2)*
5. _____ Είμαι ενθουσιασμένος/η με τη δουλειά μου. (DE2)
6. _____ Όταν εργάζομαι ξεχνώ τα πάντα γύρω μου. (AB2)
7. _____ Η εργασία μου με εμπνέει. (DE3)*
8. _____ Όταν σηκώνομαι το πρωί έχω διάθεση να πάω στη δουλειά μου. (VI3)*
9. _____ Νιώθω ευτυχισμένος/η όταν εργάζομαι με εντατικούς ρυθμούς. (AB3)*
10. _____ Νιώθω υπερήφανος/η για τη δουλειά που κάνω. (DE4)*
11. _____ Είμαι τελείως απορροφημένος/η από την εργασία μου. (AB4)*
12. _____ Όταν εργάζομαι είμαι ικανός να συνεχίσω τη δουλειά μου για πολλή ώρα. (VI4)
13. _____ Η δουλειά μου αποτελεί πρόκληση για μένα. (DE5)
14. _____ Η δουλειά μου με συναρπάζει. (AB5)*
15. _____ Στην δουλειά μου έχω μεγάλη πνευματική αντοχή. (VI5)
16. _____ Μου είναι δύσκολο να αποσπάσω τον εαυτό μου από τη δουλειά μου (AB6)
17. _____ Δείχνω πάντοτε επιμονή στη δουλειά μου, ακόμα κι όταν τα πράγματα δεν πάνε καλά. (VI6)

* Shortened version (UWES-9); VI=Σφρίγγος, DE= Αφοσίωση, AB=Απορρόφηση

Russian version

Опросник (UWES) ©

Вопросы, приведенные ниже, относятся к переживаниям, которые человек испытывает в связи со своей работой. Пожалуйста, прочтите внимательно каждое из утверждений и определите, чувствовали ли Вы когда-либо нечто подобное по отношению к основной работе. Если у Вас никогда не было такого переживания, обведите 0 на бланке ответов, если то или иное переживание у Вас было, отметьте на бланке, как часто оно возникает, в соответствии со шкалой, приведенной ниже (баллы от 1 до 6).

Никогда 0 Ни разу	Почти никогда 1 Несколько раз в год	Достаточно редко 2 Раз в месяц или реже	Иногда 3 Несколько раз в месяц	Достаточно часто 4 Раз в неделю	Почти всегда 5 Несколько раз в неделю	Постоянно 6 Каждый день
-------------------------	---	---	---	--	---	----------------------------------

1. _____ Во время работы меня переполняет энергия*
2. _____ Моя работа целенаправленна и осмысленна
3. _____ Когда я работаю, время пролетает незаметно
4. _____ Во время работы я испытываю прилив сил и энергии*
5. _____ Я полон энтузиазма в отношении своей работы*
6. _____ Во время работы я забываю обо всем окружающем
7. _____ Моя работа вдохновляет меня*
8. _____ Проснувшись утром, я радуюсь тому, что пойду на работу*
9. _____ Я счастлив, когда интенсивно работаю*
10. _____ Я горжусь своей работой*
11. _____ Я ухожу в работу с головой*
12. _____ Могу работать в течение длительного времени без перерывов
13. _____ Работа ставит передо мной сложные и интересные задачи
14. _____ Я позволяю работе «уносить» меня*
15. _____ В работе я очень настойчив и не отвлекаюсь на постороннее
17. _____ Мне трудно отложить работу в сторону
17. _____ Я продолжаю работать даже тогда, когда дела идут плохо

* короткий версия (UWES-9)

Portuguese student version

Questionário do bem estar e no contexto academic (UWES-S) ©

Enquanto aluno (você) faz determinadas tarefas, como por exemplo assistir às aulas (tanto teóricas como práticas), ir à biblioteca, fazer trabalhos de grupo, estudar, etc. Os itens que se seguem referem-se a sentimentos, crenças e comportamentos relacionados com a sua experiência como aluno do ensino superior. Por favor responda a cada um dos itens de acordo com a escala de respostas que se segue, cujos valores variam entre 0 (se nunca teve esse sentimento ou crença) e 6 (se o tem sempre).

Nunca	Quase nunca	Algumas vezes	Regularmente	Bastantes vezes	Quase sempre	Sempre
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Nenhuma vez	Algumas vezes por ano	Uma vez ou menos por mês	Algumas vezes por mês	Uma vez por semana	Algumas vezes por semana	Todos os dias

1. _____ As minhas tarefas como aluno fazem-me sentir cheio(a) de energia (VII)*
2. _____ Creio que o meu curso tem significado (DE1)
3. _____ O tempo passa a voar quando estou a realizar as minhas tarefas como aluno (AB1)
4. _____ Sinto-me com força e energia quando estou a estudar ou vou às aulas (VI2)*
5. _____ Estou entusiasmado(a) com o meu curso (DE2)*
6. _____ Esqueço tudo o que se passa à minha roda quando estou concentrado(a) nos meus estudos (AB2)
7. _____ Os meus estudos inspiram-me coisas novas (DE3)*
8. _____ Quando me levanto de manhã apetece-me ir para as aulas ou estudar (VI3)*
9. _____ Sinto-me feliz quando estou a fazer tarefas relacionadas com os meus estudos (AB3)*
10. _____ Estou orgulhoso(a) de fazer este curso (DE4)*
11. _____ Estou imerso nos meus estudos (AB4)*
12. _____ As minhas tarefas como aluno não me cansam (VI4)
13. _____ O meu curso é desafiante para mim (DE5)
14. _____ "Deixo-me ir" quando realizo as minhas tarefas como aluno (AB5)*
15. _____ Sou uma pessoa com força para enfrentar as minhas tarefas como aluno (VI5)
16. _____ Sinto-me envolvido(a) no meu curso (AB6)
17. _____ Em minhas tarefas como o páro da pupila não, exatamente isso não me sente bem (VI6)

* Versa encurtada (UWES-9); VI= vigor; DE = dedication; AB = absorption