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ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze the moderating role of Resilience (R) in the relationship between Organizational Spirituality (OS) and Burnout Syndrome (BOS) in call center operators. The quantitative methodology of the research type included a sample of 512, and the data were collected and analyzed from the Structural Equation Modeling. The results showed a negative relationship between OS and BOS. It was also shown that the perception of perseverance and self-confidence (dimensions of resilience) significantly moderated the association between the two constructs, reducing their effects. The present study contributes to science by improving the Burnout measurement tool, including the Optimism dimension in the validated scale, and reinforcing the moderating role of resilience.
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RESUMO

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar el papel moderador de la Resiliencia (R) en la relación entre Espiritualidad Organizacional (OS) e Síndrome de Burnout (BOS) en operadores de call center. A metodología cuantitativa del tipo de pesquisa incluiu uma amostra de 512 profissionais e os dados foram coletados e analisados a partir da Modelagem de Equações Estruturais. Os resultados mostraram uma relação negativa entre OS e BOS. Também foi demonstrado que a percepção de perseverança e autoconfiança (dimensões da resiliência) moderou significativamente a associação entre os dois construtos, reduzindo seus efeitos. O presente estudio traz contribuições para a ciência aprimorando a ferramenta de medição de Burnout, incluindo a dimensão Ótimismo na escala validada, além de reforçar o papel moderador da resiliência.
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RESUMEN

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar el papel moderador de la Resiliencia (R) en la relación entre la Espiritualidad Organizacional (OS) y el Síndrome de Burnout (SBO) en operadores de call center. La metodología cuantitativa del tipo investigación abarcó una muestra de 512 profesionales y los datos fueron recolectados y analizados mediante el Modelado de Ecuaciones Estruturales. Los resultados mostraron una relación negativa entre OS y BOS. También se demostró que la percepción de perseverancia y autoconfianza (dimensiones de la resiliencia) moderaron significativamente la asociación entre los dos constructos, reduciendo sus efectos. El presente estudio trae aportes a la ciencia al mejorar la herramienta de medición del Burnout, incluyendo la dimensión Optimismo en la escala validada, además de reforzar el rol moderador de la resiliencia.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Technological advancement significantly contributed to the efficiency of the organization's work processes. On the other hand, it also influenced the increase of physical and mental illnesses which affect the individuals and come from information overload, pressure to reach higher productivity and results, and the threatening sensation of job temporariness (Khalid, Sarfaraz, Ahmed & Malik, 2013). As a consequence, individuals with chronic high levels of stress, pathological anxiety, and psychosomatic diseases, among others, became even more vulnerable to the appearance of several health problems, such as Burnout Syndrome (BOS).

BOS affects professionals worldwide and is usually described in the workplace as a potential motivator for dysfunctional behavioral changes that cause physical symptoms (the sensation of exhaustion and fatigue, gastrointestinal upsets, frequent headaches, shortness of breath, sleep deprivation, and trembling) and behavioral symptoms (hyperactivity, violent emotional breakdown, increase in the use of stimulating substances, escape behavior, and difficulty in social relationships) (Freudenberger, 1974), caused by work-overload and the long-term involvement with demanding events (Kumar, Rauf & Rathnasekara, 2019; Zarei, Khakzad, Reniers & Akbari, 2016).

In this sense, acting professionally in environments that require long working hours may affect people’s lives negatively, maximizing the risk factors that cause BOS (Altinoz, Cop, Cakiroglu & Altinoz, 2016). Such is the case of the professional activity of a call center operator, whose expansion became very popular and had a relevant role, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic (Santiago, Bil, Curam, Torrero & Tus, 2021). The call center is characterized by exceptional work demands that, not rarely, are associated with the clients' hostility, high levels of staff turnover, low payment, meager career opportunities and extensive vigilance over the employees (Souza, Ramos & Dias, 2018), which make them more susceptible to health issues (Kim & Yang, 2022; Cho, Kim, Lee, Lim & Jeong, 2019). As companies in this sector serve thousands of customers and need to guarantee their market share, they feel the need to be continuously connected, which makes it one of the areas that are most subject to psychological problems on the part of their employees (Khalid et al., 2013).

In research that shows the call center environments’ potential to develop BOS in the work environment (Toker & Güler, 2022, Suroedova & Li, 2019), companies need to adopt strategies in order to reduce the BOS effects on their employees’ lives, since the interventions’ financial, organizational and individual costs that are necessary to deal with BOS are usually high, once it directly affects the individual’s physical and psychological welfare with subsequent reflections on the productivity and the quality of the services they carry out.

Studies have identified that factors such as Organizational Spirituality (OS) and Resilience (R) can reduce the BOS effects in individuals within the organizations (Alkudsi, Kamel, El-Awaisi, Shraim & El Hajj, 2022; Putri, Dachriyanus, Mudijran, Malini, Maisa et al., 2022; Lizano, Godoy & Allen, 2019; Kim & Yeom, 2018; Sousa, Pinto, Leite, Araújo, Silva & Castro, 2018; Kalita, 2015). However, in research conducted in the Web of Science and Scopus databases, no studies related to R were found as a modifying variable between OS and BOS, which highlights the lack of studies on this theme construction, highlighting the theoretical gap.

Based on this, the objective of this study was to analyze the moderating role of Resilience (R) in the relationship between Organizational Spirituality (OS) and Burnout Syndrome (BOS) in call center operators. To achieve this study’s objective, this research adopted the dimensions of R “Perseverance” and “Self-confidence” and the “Sense of Community” of the SO, suggesting that, in addition to the association between constructs, Resilience may change the relationship between OS and BOS. From this point of view, it is believed that individuals will have more resources to deal with pressure and adversity and, thus, with BOS predictors in the role played within the organization.

Under this thought, this study contributes to advancing the understanding of the importance of mental health in organizations since the theme is essential for the performance of the professionals working in call center companies. In addition, the research recognizes its originality, analyzing how the relationship between the OS and the R phenomenon can improve people’s performance at work and reduce the appearance of BOS. The call center environment is an area of growing interest for management and business. On the one hand, there is a search for utility structures in which profit-oriented objectives are sought. Moreover, business management goes through spirituality's subjective and multifaceted nature (Udani & Lorenzo-Molo, 2017).

2 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

2.1 Spirituality and Burnout Syndrome

Seen as a model that can benefit organizational behavior management from the perspective that the changes for the individuals’ growth and development in the organizations must come from the inside (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk & Travis, 2004), OS is characterized by the “sense of individual connection to the work community, and of the possibility they have to perform work that is meaningful to their lives” (Rego, Souto, Pinha & Cunha, 2007, p. 3), which can contribute to organizational performance (Woźniak, 2012; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Benefiel, 2003; Sanders III, Hopkins & Geroy, 2003; Ashmos & Duchon, 2000).
Fry (2003) describes OS as the feelings that involve the interest in meaningful work that allows professionals with constant learning, with the development of a sense of competence, purpose, positive connection and social relationships with co-workers and the capacity to live life to their fullest so that their role at work may be following their essential nature. Once recognized as people who can express their thoughts and emotions in their work environment, these individuals tend to reduce their intentions of leaving the organization (Adams et al., 2003) and increase their trust in their managers and leaders (Rego et al., 2007).

As for BOS, it has been defined as a multidimensional phenomenon that is composed of three dimensions: (a) emotional depletion (lack of energy and a feeling of emotional exhaustion); (b) depersonalization (treating clients, co-workers and the organization as objects); and (c) the decrease of professional realization at work (the employee’s tendency to a negative self-assessment) (Ellrich, 2016; Bellou & Chatzinikou, 2015; Maslach & Golberg, 1998).

Studies on BOS began in the United States in the 1970s, encompassing healthcare, denoting the close relationships between professionals and patients (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). The term is strongly connected to exhaustion at work (Ghanizadeh & Jahedizadeh, 2017). BOS can be considered as extreme stress in the work environment that comes from internal and external factors that affect the individuals’ welfare. It can be expressed in different cultures, environments and working groups (Jugdev, 2018; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998). Furthermore, BOS is seen as a factor that reduces individuals’ productivity. The symptoms that pervade BOS include depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, and stress (Okpozo, Gong, Ennis & Adenuga, 2017).

The practice of spirituality in the work environment may help reduce the BOS effect (Fan, Cao, Zhou, Duan & Xing, 2023; Putri et al., 2022; Lizano, Godoy & Allen, 2019; Kim & Yeom, 2018; Garg, 2017; Kalita, 2015). One of the main dimensions comprehended as one of the predictors of attitudes and behaviors at work (Millman, Czaplewski & Ferguson, 2003) is the Meaning of Community, or Sense of Community, which brings upon the individuals the feeling that there is a mutual purpose among the team members (Pawar, 2017; Rego et al., 2007). This element will lead the individuals to a higher stress resistance and a lack of realization at work, which are BOS predictors (Luthans, 2002a; 2002b). In this sense, the following hypotheses were developed:

H1: The sense of community positively contributes to BOS reduction.
H1a: The sense of community acts to reduce the overload effects.
H1b: The sense of community acts to reduce the effects of work cut-off.

In general, individuals who have a strong relationship with others in the work environment can generate positive results regarding their mental health (Soha, Osman, Salahuddin, Abdullah & Ramlee, 2016). Thus, people with a high sense of community are psychologically more strengthened, perseverant, and aware of their meaning in life (Sanders III et al., 2003) and more optimistic about bearing with BOS and its predictors (Ra & Ganesh, 2006). This way, organizational environments that allow the employees to perform work that is meaningful to life and that carries the sense of belonging to the working community can lead to higher levels of individual and organizational performance (Duffy & Sperry, 2012; García-Zamor, 2003), since these environments nurture or foster the employees’ self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism (Rego et al., 2007). In the wake of this reasoning, and according to Gustafsson and Skoog (2012), Crosno, Rinaldo, Black and Kelley (2009) and Hayes and Weathington (2007), it stands out that optimism is a personality disposition that reflects the expectation that good things will happen. According to the authors, optimistic people can proactively anticipate and respond to the stressors caused by BOS, resulting in less stress, higher levels of performance and job satisfaction. According to Carver, Scheier and Segerstrom (2010) and Chang, Rand and Strunk (2000), optimistic people see the world differently from pessimists, which has implications for people’s psychological well-being and general health.

Therefore, optimism is associated with a sense of control, self-confidence and belonging, making optimists more likely to adopt BOS active and proactive coping (Aspinwall & Taylor, 1997). Based on this argument, there is the following complementary hypothesis:

H1c: The sense of community is positively associated with optimism at work.

2.2 Perseverance’s Moderating Effect

Professionals with highly stressful positions are more likely to develop problems such as anxiety, depression and BOS. However, some are less affected due to their resilience (Davies, Stoerner & Froese, 2019; Rees, Breen, Cusack & Hegney, 2015). Resilience involves the individual’s capacity to deal with reality shocks and prolonged sources of stress (Manyena & Gordon, 2015). Within an environment of adverse work, these professionals who call themselves resilient tend to note they have enough confrontation strategies to deal with work difficulties and pressures when compared to those who do not believe they have the resilience capacity (Kimura, Bande & Fernández-Ferrin, 2018).

Within this context, it is important to understand how resilience and its relationship with BOS can affect an individual’s organizational performance. Empiric evidence shows that resilience may be associated with a lower BOS prevalence, and it reduces its levels and effects on individuals (García-Rivera, Mendoza-Martínez, García-Alcaraz, Olguín-Tiznado & Wilson et al., 2022; Nimako,
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No empirical evidence exists about the R’s moderating effect in the relationships between OS and BOS. However, research conducted in different areas showed that R was an important factor in moderating the relationships between work overload and harassment (Kimura et al., 2018), stress and the consequences related to alcohol in the members of the United States National Guard (Morgan, Brown & Bray, 2018), physical abuse and suicidal thoughts in Chinese university students (Low, Kwok, Tam, Yeung & Lo, 2017), and ostracism and depression in Chinese teenagers (Niu, Sun, Tian, Fan & Zhou, 2016).

Therefore, based on the evidence found in research which showed the negative relationship between R and BOS, it is expected that resilience, more specifically in its dimension “Perseverance”, may influence the association impact between the sense of community and BOS, reducing the BOS negative effects more significantly and increasing the individuals’ level of optimism as they face challenges. Thus, since it involves capability, there is the understanding that perseverance can moderate the BOS effects, which leads to the following hypotheses:

H2: There is a moderating effect of perseverance in the relationship between the sense of community and BOS.
H2a: Perseverance moderates the relationship between the sense of community and overload.
H2b: Perseverance moderates the relationship between the sense of community and work cut-off.
H2c: Perseverance moderates the relationship between the sense of community and optimism at work.

2.3 Self-confidence’s Moderating Effect

The relationship impact between OS and BOS can be affected by “Self-confidence”, another R dimension. Resilience appears from several processes and interactions that overcome individual limits and involve interpersonal relationships and social support (Masten & Wright, 2010). Self-confidence, therefore, consists of malleable positive beliefs that protect the individual against psychological challenges and work overload. As resilience produces the capacity to tolerate heavy workloads in the individual (Duchek, 2018), professionals who have self-confidence, who believe in themselves and their capacities and abilities (Deep et al., 2012), and who feel they are connected to others in their interpersonal relationships and social support (Masten & Wright, 2010; Rego et al., 2007) will have higher probabilities to see they have enough resources to deal with BOS, for example, through optimism at work, partially corroborating Hofstde’s studies (1980). In this context, the following hypotheses were raised:

H3: There is a moderating effect of self-confidence over the relationship between the sense of community and BOS.
H3a: Self-confidence moderates the relationship between the sense of community and overload.
H3b: Self-confidence moderates the relationship between the sense of community and work cut-off.
H3c: Self-confidence moderates the relationship between the sense of community and optimism at work.

Figure 1 represents the theoretical model that encompasses the structure of the three research hypotheses.

3 METHODOLOGY

This is a quantitative approach study that uses the survey-type descriptive research (Mathers, Fox & Hunn, 2009) developed through the Structural Equation Modeling (CB-SEM) based on precepts by Hair, Black, Bardin & Anderson (2010) and Kline (2011). SEM is a multivariate statistical analysis technique that enables evaluating a
series of simultaneous relationships that combine elements related to the multiple regressions with factor analysis to estimate a series of simultaneous dependence relationships (Hair et al., 2010). One of the most common modeling strategies is model development, which suggests that a model be improved through continuous modifications in the structural and measuring models (Hair et al., 2010; 2014). In this sense, the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is recommended as an SEM predecessor (Severo, Guimarães & Dorion, 2018).

EFA is a variable reduction procedure combining a set of items of joint variation in the same factor (Costa, 2011). In this sense, EFA regroups the observable variables, and upon considering their inter-relationships, the newly formed factors explain the covariation between the variables more perfectly (Hair et al., 2010). Therefore, EFA must be used before the SEM method, for it tests the factors’ statistical formation without considering the pre-existing theoretical models and allows the visualization of the formation of the constructs which were not predicted by literature (Guimarães, Severo & Vasconcelos, 2017; Severo et al., 2018).

The research instruments were adapted based on the empirical reality and the scales of Organizational Spirituality (Rego, Pinha & Cunha, 2007); Resilience (Wagnild & Young, 1993), which was translated and adapted by Pesce (2005) and validated by Bacchi and Pinheiro (2011) in Brazil; and Burnout Syndrome (Schuster & Dias, 2018). The data collection for the investigation of the constructs researched, according to Table 1, happened by convenience for a non-probabilistic sample. It took place between June and July 2018 through the application of questionnaires validated in person and through an electronic form sent via GoogleForms™. The scales used were of the Likert type of 5 points, ranging from 1 – fully disagree – to 5 – fully agree. There was also a survey on social-demographic data.

### Table 1
Constructs and dimensions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Spirituality</td>
<td>Sense of Community: makes the individuals feel there is a mutual goal among the team members.</td>
<td>Rego Souto and Cunha (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resilience</td>
<td>Perseverance: will not give up when facing difficulties.</td>
<td>Pesce et al. (2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-confidence: professionals who believe in themselves and their capabilities and skills.</td>
<td>Pesce et al. (2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout Syndrome</td>
<td>Overload: results from intense physical and emotional pressure before the excess of tasks assigned to the individuals.</td>
<td>Schuster and Dias (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Cut-Off: the feeling of losing identification with work and the desire to stay in the same profession.</td>
<td>Schuster and Dias (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism: the tendency to analyze situations from positive views, searching for good solutions.</td>
<td>Schuster and Dias (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

The survey was conducted in Northeastern Brazil and applied to a sample of 540 call center operators. When it comes to the answers collected, Hair et al. (2010) state that, for the SEM completion, a minimum of 10 respondents is necessary for each observable variable. During the data cleansing, 28 cases were discarded due to missing information or presenting outliers. The data were processed and analyzed with the help of the SPSS® software, version 20 for Windows, and the AMOS software, version 18, attached to SPSS®.

To proceed with the Structural Equation Modeling, the adjustment indexes were used (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), which are: (a) Composite Reliability, with values greater than 0.7, showing the scale adequacy; (b) Average Extracted Variation (AVE) equal to or higher than 0.7; the Convergent Validity (CV) (>0.7) and the Discriminant Validity (DV) should both have values lower than CV; (c) Structural Equation Modeling with hypothesis tests, standardized (SE) and Unstandardized estimates (EU), and; (d) the moderating effect hypothesis, the multi-group hypothesis test analysis and the variance analysis (ANOVA).

Besides, to analyze the model, the Chi-square was divided by the level of liberty, as well as the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Normed Fit Index (NFI), the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), the Adjusted Goodness of Fit (AGFI), the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Root Mean square Residual (RMR), according to guidelines by Hair et al. (2010; 2014).

### 4 RESULTS

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests assessed the normality of data for all constructs. The evidence did not present normally distributed data (Kolmogorov-Smirnov = 0.10, p <0.001; Shapiro-Wilk = 0.95, p <0.001).

The final sample resulted in 512 valid cases (22.2%). On the respondents’ profile, in terms of majority, 59% were females; 60.5% had finished High School; the age group was between 21 and 25 years (52%); 50.6% have been working as a call center operator in the company between 1 and 3 years; 64.1% are single, and 71.9% have no children.
The constructs’ structure was designed using the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with Varimax rotation. Then, the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was achieved through the parameters described in Table 2.

Table 2
Observable variables’ factor loads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observable variables</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.874; Cronbach’s alpha=0.830; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=54.22%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to have achieved things in my life.</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>39.668</td>
<td>123.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am friends with myself.</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>38.164</td>
<td>122.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a determined person.</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>37.539</td>
<td>123.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually find a reason to laugh.</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>37.695</td>
<td>129.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My self-confidence helps me go through difficult moments.</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>36.660</td>
<td>123.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an emergency, I am someone others can count on.</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>39.199</td>
<td>120.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perseverance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.870; Cronbach’s alpha=0.851; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=52.98%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I make plans, I stick to them until the end.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>35.820</td>
<td>119.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually reach my goals one way or another.</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>34.727</td>
<td>113.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping myself focused on what interests me is really important to me.</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>39.961</td>
<td>115.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am self-disciplined.</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>35.215</td>
<td>122.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep my interest in things.</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>36.328</td>
<td>120.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on myself more than any other person.</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>36.523</td>
<td>120.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough energy to do what must be done.</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>35.684</td>
<td>122.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.843; Cronbach’s alpha=0.852; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=62.87%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often I feel sick of my tasks.</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>34.023</td>
<td>133.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are days I feel tired even before getting to work.</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>35.098</td>
<td>136.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After work, I need more time to feel better now than I used to.</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>34.043</td>
<td>136.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During work, I feel emotionally drained.</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>34.102</td>
<td>130.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After work, I feel tired and without energy.</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>34.121</td>
<td>134.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work cut-off</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.697; Cronbach’s alpha=0.776; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=69.13%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I speak negatively about my job more frequently.</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>28.398</td>
<td>136.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lately, I have done my work almost mechanically.</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>33.965</td>
<td>133.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over time, I have lost interest in my work.</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>32.715</td>
<td>140.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.791; Cronbach’s alpha=0.758; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=50.93%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do new and interesting things at my work frequently.</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>29.102</td>
<td>133.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see my work as a positive challenge.</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>32.813</td>
<td>129.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am more and more committed to my work.</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>30.781</td>
<td>134.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can deal well with my work pressures.</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>33.555</td>
<td>123.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After professional tasks, I have energy for my leisure activities.</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>31.777</td>
<td>132.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO=0.815; Cronbach’s alpha=0.843; Bartlett’s sphericity=0.000; Explained variance=61.48%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work is related to what I consider important in my life.</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>28.965</td>
<td>134.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see a connection between my work and the benefits for the community as a whole.</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>30.664</td>
<td>125.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I work, I feel I am useful to the community.</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>34.063</td>
<td>123.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel joy at my work.</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>31.484</td>
<td>131.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most days, I feel happy to come to work.</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.609</td>
<td>29.609</td>
<td>134.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

The questionnaire’s mean response was 3.43, with a standard deviation variability of 1.27, which leads to the conclusion that there is a strong agreement among the respondents.

Based on Table 2, it is possible to note that Cronbach’s alpha for all the factors was higher than 0.7. Bartlett’s sphericity test came up with p<0.0001, KMO (>0.5), and factor load (>0.5). In contrast, most commonalities were >0.5, except for some variables that presented lower values. However, they were seen as indispensable for the construct’s theoretical analysis. This way, such results show the constructs’ normality and reliability with an adequate execution of EFA, CFA and Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) for the completion of this study.

Table 3 describes the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), in which the calculations are used to evaluate whether the Convergent Validity was above or very close to the recommended value (>0.5), which shows a strong integration between the observable variables in each construct (Hair et al., 2010; 2014). The Discriminant Validity, which represents the correlation among the phenomena, mostly presented values lower than CV, which shows the variables have a higher consistency within their constructs.
Convergent validity and discriminant validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Sense of Community</th>
<th>Overload</th>
<th>Work Cut-Off</th>
<th>Optimism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Community</td>
<td>0.650ª</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload</td>
<td>-0.255ª</td>
<td>0.667ª</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Cut-Off</td>
<td>-0.245ª</td>
<td>0.778b</td>
<td>0.669ª</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>0.809ª</td>
<td>-0.219b</td>
<td>-0.179b</td>
<td>0.506ª</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

The constructs’ Composite Reliability presented a result that was higher than expected (>0.5), both in the set of all the observable variables (0.967) and the constructs’ Sense of Community (0.903), overload (0.909), Work Cut-off (0.858), and optimism (0.835), which is considered appropriate and consistent with the SEM execution (Fornell & Larcker, 1981; Hair et al., 2010). According to Figure 2, the relationships among the constructs were analyzed from the Final Integrated Model.

Table 4 presents the results of the Initial Integrated Model’s Covariance and Correlation, performs the multi-group analysis and considers the group that supports the values corresponding to “self-confidence” and “perseverance”. It must be noted that the results show meaningful relationships (p<0.0001) for the Standardized Estimate (SE) and Unstandardized Estimate (UE), thus confirming the relationship among the constructs, which sustains the hypotheses H1, H2 and H3.

According to the analysis from the table above, the research findings showed that the sense of community minimizes the overload effects (-0.320) and the Work Cut-off effects (-0.321). In contrast, it maximizes optimism (0.794) in the individuals investigated.
To evaluate the model’s structure, an analysis of the adjustment measure values was performed based on production reports from the AMOS software, which tried to identify the degree through which the model predicts the covariance matrix, as shown in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Final integrated model’s adjustment indexes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model’s quality indexes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integrated model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>1492.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of liberty</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square divided by the level of liberty</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Probability</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI – Comparative Fit Index</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI – Normed Fit Index</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI – Goodness of Fit Index</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI – Adjusted Goodness of Fit</td>
<td>0.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA – Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMR – Root Mean square Residual</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECVI – Expected Cross-Validation Index</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMO – Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Variance Extracted – AVE</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Reliability</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

Some Final Integrated Model indexes differ from the recommended values, such as CFI>0.9, NFI>0.9, GFI between 0.9 and 1.0, AGFI>0.9, and AVE>0.7. However, under review, it is possible to see that the values are estimated. Thus, the framework was supported based on Hair et al. (2010; 2014) premises. Nevertheless, there may be an adequacy of the indexes that compare the model (Table 4), which involves other correlations and the connection between the observable variables and the delimited constructs.

To test the hypotheses which have the moderating effect of resilience in the relationship between OS and BOS (H2 and H3), a variance analysis was performed (ANOVA) to compare the mean of the answers to check if there are meaningful differences among those investigated.

Based on the results (p <0.001), hypotheses H2 and H3 were confirmed, for there is a meaningful difference among the groups, which shows the possibility that higher perseverance and higher self-confidence have more intensive impacts on the relationships between OS and BOS. Table 6 exemplifies the hypothesis test based on the moderating effects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Moderating effects’ hypothesis’ test.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final integrated model</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a - Moderate high Perseverance Sense of Community → Overload</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b - Moderate high Perseverance Sense of Community → Work Cut-off</td>
<td>-0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c - Moderate high Perseverance Sense of Community → Optimism</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a - Moderate high self-confidence Sense of Community → Overload</td>
<td>-0.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b - Moderate high self-confidence Sense of Community → Work Cut-off</td>
<td>-0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c - Moderate high self-confidence Sense of Community → Optimism</td>
<td>0.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data.

The table above shows that the constructs are meaningful and, based on the results, it is possible to see that the relationship tends to increase when the resilience constructs (perseverance and self-confidence) act as moderators in the influence relationships between OS and BOS (H2a = -0.434, H2b = -0.390, H3a = 0.428, H3b = -0.366), thus reducing the negative effects and increasing optimism (H2c = 0.816, H3c = 0.818), which minimizes the BOS tendency agent.

5 DISCUSSION

The relationship between OS and BOS and the moderating variables in this relationship was examined. Initially, the hypothesis showed that there is a negative association between OS and BOS, which makes OS positively contribute to reducing the negative effects of BOS and, consequently, increase the optimism of individuals (dimension belonging to OS) so that they commit to the work that supports previous research (Fan et al., 2023; Putri et al., 2022; Lizano, Godoy & Allen, 2019; Kim & Yeom, 2018; Kalita, 2015; García-Zamor, 2003).

The results confirmed the first hypothesis (H1), supporting the notion that OS is associated with a lower BOS prevalence, which reduces its levels and effects on the individuals (García-Rivera, Mendoza-Martínez, García-Alcaraz, Olguín-Tiznado, Wilson et al., 2022; Nimako, 2021; Abram & Jacobowitz, 2020; Callahan et al., 2018; Arrogante Silva, Souza, Castro, Silva & Guimarães - Resilience as a moderator of the relationship between organization spirituality and burnout…
Resilience as a moderator of the relationship between organization spirituality and burnout

It means that, as call center operators realize that the organization gives them a sense of belonging to the work community, they tend to be more resistant to BOS predictors (Luthans, 2002a; 2002b) and their symptoms (Okpozo et al., 2017), reducing the effects of overload more significantly (H1a) and the work eliminated intentions (H1b).

In this sense, the companies have the opportunity to adopt OS actions and, therefore, improve their employees' physical and psychological welfare with consequent reflections on productivity, quality and organizational performance (Woźniak, 2012; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Benefiel, 2003; Sanders III, Hopkins & Geroy, 2003). As for optimism, the H1c hypothesis test pointed out a slight increase, which strengthens the OS role as the BOS-reducing factor in the individuals' strengthening due to the development of BOS.

Then, the study presented hypotheses that pointed out that perseverant and self-confident professionals, who know they belong to a work community, would have more mechanisms to deal with the BOS risks and become more optimistic, even when facing the syndrome's effects. Both hypotheses, H2 and H3, were confirmed. The results were coherent with previous research, which demonstrated the resilience's moderating effect on the relationships among the constructs (Kimura et al., 2018; Morgan et al., 2018; Low et al., 2017; Niu et al., 2016).

The evidence concerning R as a moderator is notable, for they show the different reactions to the BOS development. A spiritualized organization will have professionals who are more protected against the syndrome's negative impacts. These results will intensify as the managers encourage opportunities for the call center employees to increase their interaction process with others, keep a strong relationship with them and build informal networks (Duffy & Sperry, 2012).

According to this thought, organizations must encourage strengthening their professionals' psychological resources, such as practices that involve lectures, courses, psychological follow-up and other measures that stimulate emotional intelligence maximization, resilience and confrontation capability upon problems in the work environment. With this understanding, it is possible to allow their professionals to perform work that brings them life meaning with a narrow link to the sense of belonging to the work community, thus increasing their individual and organizational levels of performance (Garcia-Zamor, 2003).

Moreover, if well nourished by the organizations, protection factors included in the interpersonal relationships, in the individual capabilities, religions, culture, communities, and problem-solving skills, among other aspects, can better prepare the individuals to overcome adversities in the work environment (Masten & Wright, 2010).

Therefore, call center-type organizations must be aware of the risks BOS can cause for individuals and their operations. Since it is about a context favorable to the development of the syndrome (Altinoz et al., 2016), managers need to search for confrontation strategies under the risks of reducing their professionals' productivity and increasing staff turnover (Okpozo et al., 2017). Based on this study’s results, investing in the individuals’ spirituality and resilience in the work environment is a factor to be taken into consideration by organizations.

6 CONCLUSIONS

The study focuses on two main discoveries. The first one is identifying the dimensions of Perseverance and Self-confidence in Resilience as moderating factors that can influence the relationship between OS and BOS. The second one is the improvement of the BOS measuring tool from the identification of variables with a positive sense that led the investigators to include the dimension Optimism into the validated model, thus demonstrating, both theoretically and empirically, that the individuals who suffer with the BOS effects can psychologically nourish from means to fight off the overload and the work cut-off.

The research has important managerial implications since the call center environment is susceptible to high staff turnover due to health problems. Their managers need to be sensitive to the consequences that BOS may bring upon the work environment, thus creating a proactive view to fight off its effects by recognizing that their professionals have an inner life that needs constant nourishment with feelings of professional realization, of belonging to the work community, and that they have a purpose to be useful to the organization and to the community which they serve.

The main contributions of this study to science focus on elaborating a framework, that is, releasing a measurement model to other researchers, as well as a structural model that evaluates the relationships between the BOS and the OS phenomena, with resilience as a moderating element.

In this context, the managerial contribution of the research is located in the possibility of influencing personnel managers in the construction of policies that consider Organizational Spirituality and Resilience, respectively, as factors that positively influence and moderate the coping with Burnout Syndrome at work. By doing so, personnel managers will be able to improve physical and psychological well-being (self-confidence, perseverance and people protected from the effects of Burnout Syndrome) and the interaction between people at work (formal and informal relationships), and these results will influence the increase of people’s productivity, in the quality of the work done by them and in the organizational performance.

Based on this study’s results, we understand that investing in the spirituality and resilience of individuals in the work environment is an important attitude to be taken by organizations in order to minimize the impacts of burnout on employees, as well as enable them to deal with other challenges and problems at the organizational level. Organizations can use different strategies and actions to promote spirituality in the workplace, including:
Promotion of lectures, courses and workshops that seek to clarify the distinction between religion and spirituality for employees at different organizational levels, as well as a better understanding of the dimensions of organizational spirituality and its importance for the quality of life (Honiball, Geldenhuys & Mayer, 2014).

Promotion of periodic dynamics capable of promoting engagement and teamwork among employees to generate greater rapport and a sense of community (Flores-Bulls, Caballer-Miedes & Mateu-Pérez, 2022).

Offer psychological support so employees can deal with difficulties related to the different dimensions of organizational spirituality (García-Zamor, 2003).

Enable periodical moments for the teams to reflect on the different dimensions of organizational spirituality (Shava & Chinyamurindi, 2021; Honiball, Geldenhuys & Mayer, 2014).

Establishment of collective goals, the achievement of which is linked to bonuses for work team members, to foster a culture of collaboration, and consequently expanding the sense of community (Pouragha, Sheikhbardsiri, Asgharnezhad, Abdolahi, Sahebi et al., 2022).

Create and maintain an organizational climate based on collaboration, not employee competition. Therefore, individual goals should emphasize personal improvement, not employee competition (Pouragha, Sheikhbardsiri, Asgharnezhad, Abdolahi, Sahebi et al., 2022).

The limitations of this research may focus on the fact that it is a cross-sectional survey applied to a sample for convenience, which implies that its results may not be generalized.

Further studies should be carried out to investigate the relationship between burnout syndrome and organizational spirituality in the context of call centers. As this study focused on the dimensions of R “Perseverance” and “Self-confidence” and the “Sense of Community” of the SO, we recommend using other factors present in these phenomena in order to observe how much they can or cannot influence the reduction of burnout in telemarketers. Other studies could also analyze the relationship between resilience and burnout, using spirituality as a moderating or mediating factor in this relationship. In addition, new constructs, such as nomophobia, perceived professional overqualification, job satisfaction, customer pressure, market competition, organizational entrenchment, and affective commitment, among others, are also encouraged to incorporate these studies.
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