

Supplementary Material

Factorial Validity of the Measures

Quantitative and Emotional Job Demands

To examine the factorial structure of the measures of quantitative and emotional job demands, we used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Several indices were used to evaluate the goodness of fit of the models: relative χ^2 , the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Goodness-of-Fit Index (GFI), the root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). The established cut-off criteria for each index were as follows: CMIN/df < 5, CFI and TLI > 0.95, RMSEA < 0.06, and SRMR < 0.08 (Hu and Bentler 1999; Marsh and Hocevar 1985). Calculations were performed using AMOS, version 26 (Arbuckle 2019). The model consisting of the two correlated factors of quantitative and emotional job demands fitted the data well (CMIN/df = 2.20; CFI = 1.00; TLI = 0.99; RMSEA = 0.036, 90% CI (0.000; 0.068); SRMR = 0.017).

Spirituality at Work

The factorial structure of the SAWS has been tested in several studies, which yielded inconsistent results: some studies suggested a 3-factor solution, and other studies a 4-factor solution (see Kinjerski 2013). Moreover, in several studies, the elimination of some items was needed to achieve a good model fit to the data (Stevenson 2008; Tevichapong 2012). Thus, to verify the structure of the Polish version of the SAWS, we used two statistical methods: principal component analysis (PCA) with direct oblimin rotation ($\delta = 0$) and CFA. The data from the whole sample ($N = 952$) was randomly split into two equal subsets ($n = 476$) using the option "Random sample of cases" available in IBM SPSS (IBM Corp. 2019).

The values of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (0.924) and Bartlett's indicator of sphericity ($\chi^2 = 6403.49$, $p < 0.001$) justified the performance of PCA. Items with factor loadings greater than 0.4 were considered acceptable (Samuels 2017). Scree-plot analysis indicated that as many as 4 components could be present in the data, with eigenvalues of 8.61, 2.42, 1.27, and 1.02. However, the fourth component was made up of only two items (items 1 and 12), among which the former had the positive loading, whereas the latter had the negative one. These items were removed from further analysis. Moreover, items 11, 16, and 18 did not load on the appropriate components and thus were omitted. For the remaining 13 items, 3 components were identified, explaining 76.03% of the variance of spirituality at work. Component 1 consisted of 7 items – 4 items from the "engaging work" subscale and 3 items from the "mystical experiences" subscale; components 2 and 3 were made up of 3 items each, constituting "spiritual connection" and "sense of community" subscales, respectively.

The results of the CFA, conducted in order to cross-validate the results of PCA, showed that a hierarchical model consisting of a second-order factor (general level of spirituality at work) and 3 first-order factors (i.e., subscales of the SAWS) fitted the data well (CMIN/df = 3.91, CFI = 0.96, TLI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.078, 90% CI (0.068; 0.089); SRMR = 0.043).

Burnout

To examine the factorial structure of the OLBI, we used the CFA. First, we tested an original model consisting of two correlated factors (i.e., "disengagement" and "exhaustion"). This model fitted the data poorly (CMIN/df = 9.44; CFI = 0.84; TLI = 0.81; RMSEA = 0.094, 90% CI (0.089; 0.100); SRMR = 0.065).

To find the optimal solution, in the next step we tested three other models, which can be found in the literature concerning the structural validity of the OLBI: the unidimensional, the hierarchical (comprising a second-order factor and two first-order factors), and the bifactor models. The unidimensional model demonstrated a poor fit (CMIN/df = 9.90, CFI = 0.83, TLI = 0.80, RMSEA = 0.097, 90% CI (0.091;

0.102); SRMR = 0.066). Similarly, neither the second-order model (CMIN/df = 9.44, CFI = 0.84, TLI = 0.81, RMSEA = 0.094, 90% CI (0.089; 0.100); SRMR = 0.065) nor the bifactor model (CMIN/df = 11.78, CFI = 0.82, TLI = 0.76, RMSEA = 0.106, 90% CI (0.101; 0.112); SRMR = 0.102) fitted the data well. These results were not unexpected since many models of the OLBI's structure were tested in previous research, yielding somewhat inconsistent results (see, e.g., Baka and Basińska 2016; Demerouti et al. 2003; Sedlar et al. 2015).

The main concern raised by scholars about the structure of the OLBI relates to the use of both positive and negative items. In some studies on the OLBI's structure, positive and negative items formed separate factors. The same result was also noted in the Polish adaptations of the OLBI (Baka and Basinska 2016; Chirkowska-Smolak 2018; see also Baka 2015). Thus, following the suggestion by Sedlar et al. (2015) and Gruszczynska et al. (2021), we decided to test a model with two correlated factors consisting of only negative items of the OLBI. The values of model fit criteria suggested that the model had an acceptable fit (CMIN/df = 4.96, CFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.064, 90% CI (0.052; 0.078); SRMR = 0.029). In the next step, we inspected the convergent and discriminant validity of the modified version of the OLBI. The value for the composite reliability (C.R.) was 0.729 for the "disengagement" and 0.828 for "exhaustion" factors, which can be deemed acceptable (Hair et al. 2010). The average variance extracted (AVE) was 0.411 for the "disengagement" factor and 0.548 for the "exhaustion" factor. Since the threshold for the AVE is 0.50 (Hair et al. 2010), the "disengagement" factor did not meet this criterion. In addition, the value of the Heterotrait-monotrait Ratio of Correlations (HTMT criterion; Henseler et al. 2015) suggested that two factors of the OLBI were nearly indistinguishable (HTMT = 0.95). Based on these results, we finally tested the unidimensional model consisting of all (i.e., eight) the OLBI's negatively worded items. The model yielded an acceptable fit to the data (CMIN/df = 4.98, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.065, 90% CI (0.053; 0.077); SRMR = 0.030).

Table S1. Mediating effect of burnout on the relationship between quantitative demands (Model 4a) / emotional demands (Model 4b) and turnover intention.

Predictors	Outcome: Burnout				Outcome: Turnover intention			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>t</i>
Model 4a								
Quantitative demands	0.116	0.009	0.41	13.68 ***	0.053	0.018	0.09	2.99 **
Gender	0.031	0.059	0.02	0.53	0.220	0.112	0.05	1.96
Job seniority	-0.003	0.002	-0.04	-1.42	-0.005	0.003	-0.04	-1.38
Burnout					1.035	0.062	0.50	16.76 ***
<i>R</i>	0.407				0.547			
<i>R</i> ²	0.166				0.300			
<i>F</i> statistic	<i>F</i> (3, 948) = 62.81; <i>p</i> < 0.001				<i>F</i> (4, 947) = 101.21; <i>p</i> < 0.001			
Model 4b								
Emotional demands	0.122	0.010	0.38	12.55 ***	0.079	0.020	0.12	4.03 ***
Gender	0.126	0.060	0.06	2.11 *	0.277	0.112	0.07	2.47 *
Job seniority	-0.002	0.002	-0.04	-1.38	-0.005	0.003	-0.04	-1.48
Burnout					1.018	0.061	0.49	16.76 ***
<i>R</i>	0.379				0.552			
<i>R</i> ²	0.144				0.305			
<i>F</i> statistic	<i>F</i> (3, 948) = 52.94; <i>p</i> < 0.001				<i>F</i> (4, 947) = 103.79; <i>p</i> < 0.001			

Note. **p* < 0.05, ***p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001; *b* = unstandardized beta; *SE* = standard error; β = standardized beta; *t* = *t*-test. Gender was dummy-coded (0 = women, 1 = men). *N* = 952.

Table S2. Conditional effects of spirituality on the relationship between burnout and turnover intention (Model 59a).

Spirituality at work (moderator)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	Bootstrap 95% <i>CI</i>	
				Lower	Upper
<i>M</i> – 1 <i>SD</i>	1.121	0.086	13.03 ***	0.952	1.289
<i>M</i>	0.840	0.066	12.75 ***	0.711	0.969
<i>M</i> + 1 <i>SD</i>	0.560	0.087	6.45 ***	0.389	0.730

Note. *M* – 1*SD* = one standard deviation below the mean; *M* = mean; *M* + 1*SD* = one standard deviation above the mean; *b* = unstandardized coefficient; *SE* = standard error; *t* = *t*-test; *CI* = confidence interval; *N* = 952.

Table S3. Bootstrapping results for the conditional indirect effects of quantitative demands on turnover intention through burnout (Model 59a).

Effect's number	Spirituality at work (moderator)	Effect	BootSE	Bootstrap 95% <i>CI</i>	
				Lower	Upper
Effect 1	<i>M</i> – 1 <i>SD</i>	0.119	0.014	0.092	0.147
Effect 2	<i>M</i>	0.085	0.010	0.067	0.105
Effect 3	<i>M</i> + 1 <i>SD</i>	0.054	0.011	0.034	0.077
Pairwise contrasts between conditional indirect effects					
Effect 2 – Effect 1		–0.034	0.009	–0.052	–0.016
Effect 3 – Effect 1		–0.065	0.016	–0.096	–0.034
Effect 3 – Effect 2		–0.031	0.007	–0.044	–0.018

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. *M* – 1*SD* = one standard deviation below the mean; *M* = mean; *M* + 1*SD* = one standard deviation above the mean; BootSE = bootstrapped standard error; *CI* = confidence interval; *N* = 952.

Table S4. Conditional effects of spirituality on the relationships between emotional demands and burnout and between burnout and turnover intention (Model 59b).

Spirituality at work (moderator)	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	Bootstrap 95% <i>CI</i>	
				Lower	Upper
Relationship between emotional demands and burnout					
<i>M</i> – 1 <i>SD</i>	0.130	0.011	11.36 ***	0.107	0.152
<i>M</i>	0.114	0.009	13.06 ***	0.096	0.131
<i>M</i> + 1 <i>SD</i>	0.097	0.012	8.44 ***	0.075	0.120
Relationship between burnout and turnover intention					
<i>M</i> – 1 <i>SD</i>	1.066	0.089	12.04 ***	0.893	1.240
<i>M</i>	0.816	0.066	12.38 ***	0.686	0.945
<i>M</i> + 1 <i>SD</i>	0.565	0.084	6.76 ***	0.401	0.729

Note. *M* – 1*SD* = one standard deviation below the mean; *M* = mean; *M* + 1*SD* = one standard deviation above the mean; *b* = unstandardized coefficient; *SE* = standard error; *t* = *t*-test; *CI* = confidence interval; *N* = 952.

Table S5. Bootstrapping results for the conditional indirect effect of emotional demands on turnover intention through burnout (Model 59b).

Effect's number	Spirituality at work (moderator)	Effect	BootSE	Bootstrap 95% CI	
				Lower	Upper
Effect 1	$M - 1SD$	0.138	0.016	0.108	0.170
Effect 2	M	0.093	0.011	0.072	0.115
Effect 3	$M + 1SD$	0.055	0.012	0.034	0.079
Pairwise contrasts between conditional indirect effects					
Effect 2 – Effect 1		–0.045	0.010	–0.066	–0.026
Effect 3 – Effect 1		–0.083	0.017	–0.117	–0.049
Effect 3 – Effect 2		–0.038	0.007	–0.051	–0.023

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. $M - 1SD$ = one standard deviation below the mean; M = mean; $M + 1SD$ = one standard deviation above the mean; BootSE = bootstrapped standard error; CI = confidence interval; $N = 952$.

References

- Arbuckle, James L. 2019. *Amos, Version 26.0*. Chicago: IBM SPSS.
- Baka, Łukasz, and Beata A. Basinska. 2016. Psychometric Properties of the Polish Version of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). *Medycyna Pracy* 67: 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.13075/mp.5893.00353>
- Baka, Łukasz. 2015. Does Job Burnout Mediate Negative Effects of Job Demands on Mental and Physical Health in a Group of Teachers? Testing the Energetic Process of Job Demands-Resources Model. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health* 28: 335–46. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.00246>
- Chirkowska-Smolak, Teresa. 2018. Polska adaptacja kwestionariusza do pomiaru wypalenia zawodowego OLBI (The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory). *Studia Oeconomica Posnaniensia* 6: 27–47. <https://doi.org/10.18559/SOEP.2018.3.2>
- Demerouti, Evangelia, Arnold B. Bakker, Ioanna Vardakou, and Aristotelis Kantas. 2003. The Convergent Validity of Two Burnout Instruments: A Multitrait-Multimethod Analysis. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 19: 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.19.1.12>
- Gruszczynska, Ewa, Beata A. Basinska, and Wilmar B. Schaufeli. 2021. Within- and Between-Person Factor Structure of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: Analysis of a Diary Study Using Multilevel Confirmatory Factor Analysis. *PloS One* 16: e0251257. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251257>
- Hair, Joseph F., William C. Black, Barry J. Babin, and Rolph E. Anderson. 2010. *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 7th ed. New York: Pearson.
- Henseler, Jörg, Christian M. Ringle, and Marko Sarstedt. 2015. A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-Based Structural Equation Modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 43: 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8>
- Hu, Li-tze, and Peter M. Bentler. 1999. Cutoff Criteria for Fit Indexes in Covariance Structure Analysis: Conventional Criteria versus New Alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 6: 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- IBM Corp. 2019. *IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 26.0*. Armonk: IBM Corp.
- Kinjerski, Val M. 2013. The Spirit at Work Scale: Developing and Validating a Measure of Individual Spirituality at Work. In *Handbook of Faith and Spirituality in the Workplace: Emerging Research and Practice*. Edited by Judi Neal. New York: Springer, pp. 383–402. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5233-1_23
- Marsh, Herbert W., and Dennis Hocevar. 1985. Application of Confirmatory Factor Analysis to the Study of Self-Concept: First- and Higher Order Factor Models and Their Invariance Across Groups. *Psychological Bulletin* 97: 562–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.97.3.562>
- Samuels, Peter. 2017. *Advice on Exploratory Factor Analysis*. Centre for Academic Success. Birmingham: Birmingham City University. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.5013.9766>
- Sedlar, Nataša, Lilijana Šprah, Sara Tement, and Gregor Sočan. 2015. Internal Structure of an Alternative Measure of Burnout: Study on the Slovenian Adaptation of the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI). *Burnout Research* 2: 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2015.02.001>
- Stevison, James M. 2008. Toward a Greater Understanding of Spirit at Work: A Model of Spirit at Work and Outcomes. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tui University, Cypress, CA.
- Tevichapong, Passagorn. 2012. Individual Spirit at Work and Its Relationship with Employee Work Attitudes and Organisational Outcomes. An Empirical Examination in Corporate Thailand. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Aston University, Birmingham, UK.