Supplementary Material

# Supplementary Data

## *Preliminary Analyses.*

### *Analysis 1 (Germany and Indonesia).*

# The configural invariance model for thriving was a good fit to the data (χ2 = 0.000; df = 0; *p* ≤ .001; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.000); SRMR = .000). The fit of the metric invariance model was also good (χ2 = 5.357; df = 2; *p* =.069; CFI = .994; RMSEA = .062 (90% CI = .000 /.129); SRMR = .047), and imposing constraints on the factor loadings did not diminish model fit (Δχ2 = 5.357; df = 2; *p* =.069). Thus, metric invariance was supported. After adding constraints on item intercepts across countries, model fit was still good (χ2 = 6.172; df = 4; *p* =.187; CFI = .996; RMSEA = .035 (90% CI = .000 /.087); SRMR = .052), and showed no reduction in model fit compared to the metric one (Δχ2 = 0.815; df = 2; *p* = .665). Thus, partial scalar invariance was supported.

# For organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), the fits of the configural invariance model (χ2 = 0.000;

# df = 0; *p* ≤ .001; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.000); SRMR = .000) and of the

# metric invariance model (χ2 = 0.688; df = 2; *p* = .709; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI =

# .000/.069); SRMR = .015) were good. The metric invariance model showed no significant reduction

# compared to the configural one (Δχ2 = 0.688; df = 2; *p* = .709), supporting metric invariance. After

# adding constraints on item intercepts across countries, model fit was still good (χ2 = 3.475; df = 4; *p*

# = .482; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.068); SRMR = .012), and showed no reduction

# in model fit compared to the metric one (Δχ2 = 3.00; df = 2; *p* = .223), thereby supporting scalar

# invariance.

### *Analysis 2 (Germany and UAE).*

# The configural invariance model for thriving was a good fit to the data (χ2 = 0.000; df = 0; *p* ≤ .001; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.000); SRMR = .000). The fit of the metric invariance model was also good (χ2 = 1.067; df = 2; *p* = .587; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000 /.114); SRMR = .023), and imposing constraints on the factor loadings did not diminish model fit (Δχ2 = 1.067; df = 2; *p* = .587). Thus, metric invariance was supported. After adding constraints on the intercepts of item 1 and 4, model fit was still good (χ2 = 3.998; df = 4; *p* = .406; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000 /.105); SRMR = .044), and showed no reduction in model fit compared to the metric one (Δχ2 = 3.115; df = 2; *p* = .211). Thus, partial scalar invariance was supported.

# For organization-based self-esteem (OBSE), the fits of the configural invariance model (χ2 = 0.000; df = 0; *p* ≤ .001; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.000); SRMR = .000) and of the metric invariance model (χ2 = 0.104; df = 2; *p* = .949; CFI = 1.000; RMSEA = .000 (90% CI = .000/.008); SRMR = .008) were good. The metric invariance model showed no significant reduction compared to the configural one (Δχ2 = 0.104; df = 2; *p* = .949), supporting metric invariance. After adding constraints on item intercepts across countries, model fit was still good (χ2 = 5.006; df = 4; *p* = .287; CFI = .996; RMSEA = .035 (90% CI = .000/.114); SRMR = .027), and showed no reduction in model fit compared to the metric one (Δχ2 = 5.169; df = 2; *p* = .075). Thus, and because we assumed measurement invariance when models did not differ by more than .010 in CFI, supplemented by .015 in RMSEA or .030 in SRMR, based on the criteria by Chen (2007), scalar invariance was supported.

# Supplementary Tables

*2.1. Additional analyses.*

Table 1

*Sociodemographic characteristics of participants separated by country*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristic | Germany | Indonesia | UAE |
|   | *n* | *%* | *n* | *%* | *n* | *%* |
| Gender |   |   |   |
|  Female | 132 | 51% | 508 | 60.6% | 152 | 66.1% |
|  Male | 46 | 17.8% | 126 | 15% | 74 | 32.2% |
| Degree |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  Bachelor | 90 | 34.8% | 564 | 67.2% | 219 | 95.2% |
|  Master | 96 | 37.1% | 68 | 8.1% | 3 | 1.3% |
| Teacher training |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|  Yes | 120 | 46.3% | 595 | 70.9% | 28 | 12.2% |
|  No | 64 | 24.7% | 36 | 4.3% | 190 | 82.6% |

*Note.* Germany: *n* = 259; Indonesia: *n* = 839; UAE = 230. Participants in Germany were on average 24.49 (*SD* = 4.69), in Indonesia 21.15 (*SD* = 4.01), and in the UAE 19.77 (*SD* = 1.78) years old. In Germany 81 (31.2%), in Indonesia 205 (24.4%), and in the UAE 4 (1.7%) of the students did not indicate their gender. In Germany, 73 (28.1%), in Indonesia 207 (24.7%), and in the UAE 8 (3.5%) of the students did not indicate their degree. In Germany, 75 (29%), in Indonesia 208 (24.8%), and in the UAE 12 (5.2%) of the students did not indicate if they were studying as part of a teacher training program.
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