Electronic Supplementary Material for
Falco, A., Girardi, D., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., & Di Sipio, A. (2020). Does workload moderate the association between perfectionism and workaholism? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000253

Psychometric properties of the instruments administered in the study

Method

Data Analysis

First, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out to evaluate the psychometric properties of the instruments administered in T1 (MT1). Then the longitudinal measurement invariance of the DUWAS was analysed using confirmatory factor analysis (Vandenberg & Lance, 2000; see also Brown, 2015). Longitudinal measurement invariance is an important empirical question when the analysis involves more than one time point (Little, 2013). Briefly, several increasingly constrained models were tested in a sequential way (i.e., stepwise) to assess different levels of measurement invariance, that is, configural invariance (M1INV), metric invariance (M2INV), and invariance of factor variances and covariances (M3INV).

Results

MT1 showed an acceptable fit to data, $\chi^2(84) = 274.72$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .073, CFI = .925, NNFI = .906, SRMR = .056. All items loaded substantially on the respective factor (median standardized factor loading of .73), and correlations between latent factors ranged from .14 to .48, suggesting that the scale items reflect different constructs.

With respect to the longitudinal invariance of the DUWAS across measurement occasions, M1INV showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(154) = 367.06$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .057, CFI = .956, NNFI = .946, SRMR = .055, and configural invariance was supported. Next, M2INV showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(162) = 380.78$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .056, CFI = .955, NNFI = .947, SRMR = .056. Moreover, the fit of M2INV was not worse than the fit of M1INV, $\Delta\chi^2(8) = 13.64$, $p = .09$, and metric invariance was supported. Finally, M3INV, in which the variances of WE and WC (as well as their covariance) were constrained to be equal across time frames, showed a good fit to data, $\chi^2(165) = 382.88$, $p < .001$; RMSEA = .055, CFI = .955, NNFI = .948, SRMR = .058. Also, the fit of M3INV was not worse than the fit of M2INV, $\Delta\chi^2(3) = 1.99$, $p = .57$. Therefore, factor loading, variances of WE and WC, as well as their covariances, were invariant across time frames.

References

Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Little, T. D. (2013). *Longitudinal structural equation modeling*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*(1), 4–70. doi:10.1177/109442810031002