Szabó and Eszter Kontra, Health Promotion Perspectives 2026;16(3): 422-S1
doi:10.34172/hpp.46031
https://hpp.tbzmed.ac.ir

Supplementary File

Worklife resources and engagement across national and organizational contexts: a pilot cross-sectional study of two sites of a multinational company in Hungary and Sweden

Analyses were based on item-level survey data. Negatively worded AWS items were reverse-scored so that higher scores consistently indicate greater worklife congruence; higher workload scores therefore indicate a more manageable workload. The pooled regression models in the main manuscript estimate average associations across the two sites and do not test equality of country-specific slopes. Country-stratified estimates should not be interpreted as pure cultural contrasts because country and organizational function were completely confounded in the study design.

Analytic clarification. The sensitivity calculations reported in the main manuscript refer to the minimum overall fixed-model R^2 (R^2 deviation from zero) detectable with 80% power at $\alpha = .05$ for the specified number of predictors. Observed post hoc power was not reported because it is determined by the observed test statistic and adds little information beyond the obtained result; sensitivity analysis instead quantifies what effect sizes the available design could reliably detect. These values are not ΔR^2 calculations for a second regression block. Calculation parameters are reported in Table S3; the intercept was not counted as a predictor.

Table S1. Internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of UWES-9 and AWS scales

Scale	Total sample α (N = 121)	Sweden α (n = 80)	Hungary α (n = 41)
Vigor	.756	.739	.784
Dedication	.821	.851	.753
Absorption	.629	.688	.648
UWES-9 total	.872	.871	.885
Workload	.803	.822	.754
Control	.715	.733	.675
Reward	.833	.845	.812
Community	.752	.740	.770
Fairness	.802	.816	.796
Values	.734	.722	.761

Note. Alpha estimates assess internal consistency in the present sample and do not establish cross-language measurement equivalence. Scalar measurement invariance was not established; between-country mean comparisons should therefore be regarded as provisional.

Table S2. Regression diagnostic summary

Outcome	Durbin-Watson	Shapiro-Wilk p	Breusch-Pagan p	Max VIF
Vigor	1.73	.046	.015	2.36
Dedication	2.07	.039	.072	2.36
Absorption	1.96	.003	.443	2.36

Note. Departures from normality were observed across the regression models, while evidence of heteroskedasticity was detected for the vigor model. HC3 heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors, confidence intervals and p values were therefore used for coefficient inference in the main regression table. The negative adjusted fairness coefficient for absorption is interpreted as a possible suppression pattern rather than a substantive negative effect because the bivariate fairness-absorption association was near zero and the sign emerged only after simultaneous adjustment for correlated AWS domains. The lower internal consistency of the three-item absorption subscale ($\alpha = .629$) provides an additional reason for caution in interpreting this result.

Table S3. Sensitivity-analysis parameters for minimum detectable overall regression effects

Scenario	N	k	df1	df2	α	Power	Min. f^2	Overall R^2
Pooled AWS-only	121	6	6	114	.05	.80	.119	.106
Pooled country/site indicator + AWS	121	7	7	113	.05	.80	.126	.112
Sweden AWS-only	80	6	6	73	.05	.80	.185	.156
Hungary AWS-only	41	6	6	34	.05	.80	.398	.285

Note. Noncentral-F sensitivity calculations tested overall fixed-model R^2 deviation from zero, with numerator df equal to k, the number of predictors, and denominator df = N - k - 1. The noncentrality parameter was $\lambda = f^2 \times N$. The intercept was not counted as a predictor. Values are minimum detectable overall model effects at $\alpha = .05$ and 80% power; they are not ΔR^2 effects for a second block.

Table S4. Pearson correlations between AWS domains and engagement dimensions in the total sample (N = 121)

Engagement	Workload	Control	Reward	Community	Fairness	Values
Vigor	.239 (.008)	.455 (< .001)	.327 (< .001)	.415 (< .001)	.202 (.026)	.441 (< .001)
Dedication	.111 (.224)	.414 (< .001)	.452 (< .001)	.420 (< .001)	.263 (.004)	.494 (< .001)
Absorption	-.025 (.783)	.246 (.007)	.249 (.006)	.328 (< .001)	.038 (.678)	.243 (.007)

Note. Cells report r (two-tailed p). Higher workload scores indicate a more manageable workload. Country-specific coefficients are reported in Supplementary Tables S5-S6 and are exploratory.

Table S5. Pearson correlations in the Swedish sample (n = 80)

Engagement	Workload	Control	Reward	Community	Fairness	Values
Vigor	.222 (.048)	.609 (< .001)	.403 (< .001)	.499 (< .001)	.211 (.061)	.558 (< .001)
Dedication	.077 (.497)	.501 (< .001)	.518 (< .001)	.481 (< .001)	.292 (.009)	.539 (< .001)
Absorption	-.073 (.521)	.318 (.004)	.385 (< .001)	.399 (< .001)	.037 (.742)	.297 (.007)

Note. Cells report r (two-tailed p). Higher workload scores indicate a more manageable workload. These country-specific coefficients are exploratory and hypothesis-generating; significance in one country and non-significance in the other do not establish a statistically significant between-country difference.

Table S6. Pearson correlations in the Hungarian sample (n = 41)

Engagement	Workload	Control	Reward	Community	Fairness	Values
Vigor	.237 (.136)	.133 (.405)	.147 (.360)	.212 (.184)	.248 (.118)	.181 (.258)
Dedication	.129 (.423)	.232 (.145)	.304 (.053)	.266 (.092)	.287 (.069)	.369 (.018)
Absorption	.086 (.592)	.083 (.604)	-.037 (.816)	.174 (.277)	.055 (.733)	.125 (.435)

Note. Cells report r (two-tailed p). Higher workload scores indicate a more manageable workload. These country-specific coefficients are exploratory and hypothesis-generating; significance in one country and non-significance in the other do not establish a statistically significant between-country difference.