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Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between burnout and organizational commitment. It tests the relationship using a sample of 700 public officers in Istanbul by using structural equation modeling. The model tested via partial least squares method via SmartPls software. Results have shown that employees’ burnout are negatively related to organizational commitment. Specifically, while emotional exhaustion is negatively related to commitment, personal accomplishment contributes positively to commitment. The experience of depersonalization has no significant relationship with all three dimensions of commitment. Findings discussed and some practical implications offered to practitioners as well as some future directions to researchers.
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Introduction

The concept of burnout, defined as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people-work’ of some kind” by Maslach and Jackson (1981, p.99), has continued to attract the attention of many researchers (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003; Gemlik, Sisman, & Sigri, 2010; Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker 2010; Jung & Kim, 2012; Kalliath, O’driscoll, & Gillespie 1998; King & Sethi, 1997; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Meng et al., 2017; Meydan, Basım, & Çetin, 2011; Tan & Akhtar, 1998; Tekin, Aydin, Özmen, & Yaykaşıl, 2014). Although it is widely accepted that organizational commitment and burnout concepts have subdimensions, the papers that examined the relationship between these subdimensions are limited (Gemlik et al., 2010; Peng et al., 2016; Tekin et al., 2014). While in some studies burnout examined multidimensional, organizational commitment examined only with a short version or only with one dimension as affective commitment (Griffin et al. 2010; Jung & Kim, 2012; Leiter & Maslach, 1988). This weakens understanding the relationship between...
these constructs profoundly. While organizational commitment consists of affective, normative and continuance commitment dimensions, burnout consists of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment dimensions. Treating these dimensions holistically and revealing their interrelationships will help to make the connection between these constructs even clearer. Therefore, this study aims to examine the relationship between three dimensions of both constructs.

In some studies, it was found that employees in Turkish public sector are object to higher levels of burnout (Balaban & Konyalı, 2016; Huri et al., 2017; Taycan, Erdoğan Taycan, & Çelik 2013). This situation threatens both the employees’ work performance and their private life and health. A study on the burnout levels of nurses working in hospitals in Ankara (Burke, Koyuncu, & Fiksenbaum, 2010) noted low job satisfaction, lower levels of vigor, absorption and dedication and greater intention to quit. In general terms, burnout has significant costs for organizations because of resulting higher intention to quit (Han, Bonn, & Cho, 2016; Rahim & Cosby, 2016), absenteeism (Petitta & Vecchione, 2011; Schaufeli, Bakker, & Van Rhenen 2009), lower job performance (Demerouti, Bakker, & Leiter, 2014; Petitta & Vecchione, 2011), lower organizational commitment (Wong & Laschinger, 2015). Showing parallelism with literature, studies conducted in Turkey revealed that burnout diminish employees’ commitment (Gemlik et al., 2010), job performance (Karatepe & Uludag, 2008), job satisfaction (Uskun, Ozturk, Kisioglu, & Kirbiyik, 2005) and increase employees’ turnover intention (Babakus, Yavas, & Karatepe, 2008). These studies make burnout an important concept to understand. In addition to dealing with employees’ burnout, it is vital for business managers to increase employees’ organizational commitment. Having employees with high levels of commitment will result in greater citizenship behaviours (Chun Shin, Choi, & Kim, 2013; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000), voice behaviours (Lapointe & Vandenberge, 2018), attitudinal and behavioral loyalty (Yao, Qiu, & Wei, 2019), lower intentions to quit (Juhi, Pa'wan, F., & Hansaram, 2013; Kang, Gatling, & Kim, 2015), lower absenteeism (Lambert, Griffin, Hogan, & Kelley, 2010; Somers, 1995) and greater work performance (Kim, Shin, Vough, Hewlin, & Vandenberge, 2018; Williams & Anderson, 1991), high knowledge sharing among employees (Curtis & Taylor, 2018). Thus, it is highly important for organizations to increase employees’ levels of commitment. This study aims to examine the relationship between burnout and organizational commitment of public sector employees in Turkey.

**Literature Review**

**Employee Burnout**

According to Greenberg (1999), stress is an all-too-common reality of work life today, something few individuals can avoid. He defines stress as “the pattern of emotional states and physiological reactions occurring in response to demands from within or outside organizations (i.e., stressors)” (p. 213). Most jobs involve some degree of stress, but only a few people can manage to cope with stressors. Over time, they seem to be worn down by repeated exposure to stress. Such people are often described as suffering from burnout (Greenberg, 1999: 218). Job burnout is defined as a “psychological process—a series of attitudinal and emotional reactions—that an employee goes through as a result of job-related and personal experiences” (Jackson & Schuler, 1983, p. 59).

The causes of burnout include occupational demands (some jobs, such as police officer, firefighter, airline pilot, etc.), role conflict, role ambiguity, work overload, work underload, responsibility for others, lack of social support, and sexual harassment, emotional load, having a job lacks of prestige
The concept of burnout has three subdimensions. These are emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion means lack of energy and indicates the state of one’s being emotionally depleted. This aspect of burnout is the most encountered, reported and examined. Emotionally exhausted workers feel an overextended fatigue, they consider themselves used up, and they don’t want to go back to work another day (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Hellesoy, Gronhaug, & Kvitastein, 2000; Jackson & Schuler, 1983; Kim, Shin, & Umbreit, 2007; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). The second dimension of burnout is depersonalization, which occurs when individuals have unfavorable, callous and cynical behaviors, feelings toward others and their organizations (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Hellesoy et al., 2000; Jackson & Schuler, 1983; Kim et al., 2007; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach et al., 2001). The last dimension of burnout is reduced personal accomplishment, which affects self-evaluation (Maslach et al., 2001). This aspect of burnout is characterized by a feeling of inefficacy with the clients and the job. Workers tend to evaluate themselves negatively, feeling dissatisfied with their achievements and incapable of overcoming the demands of the job (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Hellesoy et al., 2000; Kim et al., 2007; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Although the exhaustion and depersonalization result from work overload and social conflict, reduced personal accomplishment results from a lack of relevant resources (Maslach et al., 2001).

A high level of employee burnout results in the deterioration of personal care and negative organizational outcomes (Greenberg, 1999; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Cordes and Dougherty (1993) categorized the results of burnout as physical (fatigue, insomnia, headaches); emotional (depression, irritability), interpersonal (tendency to withdraw from friends, reduced socialization); attitudinal (low level of organizational commitment, job dissatisfaction); and behavioral (smoking, drug and alcohol use).

**Organizational Commitment**

From the 1990s until the present moment, organizational commitment has been one of the most studied employee attitudes in management literature (Bouraoui, Bensemmane, Ohana, & Russo, 2019; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). The term refers to employees’ attachment to an organization and identification with its goals (Dalal & Crede, 2013, p. 681). According to Allen and Mayer (1996, p.252) organizational commitment is considered to be a psychological link that reduces individuals’ intentions to leave their organizations voluntarily. It is widely accepted that organizational commitment is multidimensional concept. Its dimensions (Allen & Mayer, 1990) are affective commitment (emotional attachment to the organization), normative commitment (perceived obligation to the organization), and continuance commitment (perceived costs associated with leaving the organization). Among these dimensions, affective commitment has the strongest effect on positive individual and organizational work outcomes (Meyer et al., 2002).
There are a number of studies examining how the relationship between the level of organizational commitment and different employee responses and behaviors affects factors such as turnover, performance, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational trust, absenteeism, employee health, well-being and job satisfaction (Blau & Boal, 1987; Cohen, 1993; Fu & Deshpande, 2014; Meyer et al., 2002; Nouri & Parker, 1998; Somers, 1995; Top, Tarcan, Tekingündüz, & Hikmet, 2013; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Specifically, Fu and Deshpande (2014) investigated the relationships among a caring climate, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and the job performance of employees working at a Chinese insurance company. One of the findings of their study that is related to current study is that organizational commitment had a significant direct effect on job performance. Top et al. (2013) investigated the relationships among employee organizational commitment, organizational trust, job satisfaction and perception of supervisors’ transformational leadership behavior in two public hospitals in Turkey. They found that organizational trust and job satisfaction are important predictors of organizational commitment. For more details about the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment, see the meta-analysis provided by Meyer et al. (2002), Choi, Oh and Colbert (2015) and Spanuth and Wald (2017). Findings of these papers show the importance of employees’ commitment to their organizations.

**The Link Between Burnout and Organizational Commitment**

Many studies investigated the link between employee burnout and organizational commitment (Cropanzano et al., 2003; Çetin, Basim, & Aydoğan, 2011; Derin & Demirel, 2012; Gemlik et al., 2010; Griffin et al., 2010; Hakanen, Schaufeli, & Ahola, 2008; Jung & Kim, 2012; Kalliath et al., 1998; King & Sethi, 1997; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maier et al., 2015; Salehi & Gholtash, 2011; Tan & Akhtar, 1998; Tekin et al., 2014; Wong & Laschinger, 2015). Leiter and Maslach (1988) investigated the link between the three dimensions of burnout and the commitment levels of nurses in a private hospital in the US. They found that all dimensions of burnout correlated with commitment. That is, burnout leads to reduced organizational commitment. The results of multiple regression analyses indicated that emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment made independent contributions to predicted levels of commitment. However, the study conducted by Hakanen et al. (2008), which used a sample of Finnish dentists, indicated that burnout did not predict organizational commitment. Kalliath et al. (1998) studied nurses and laboratory technicians employed in a community hospital in the US; found that low commitment contributes to the experience of burnout. Specifically, commitment had a direct effect on emotional exhaustion and an indirect effect (via exhaustion) on depersonalization. Tan and Akhtar (1998), working from a cultural perspective, examined the relationships between normative and affective aspects of organizational commitment and experienced burnout in Hong Kong. They found normative commitment had a positive effect on experienced burnout, whereas affective commitment had no significant impact. Jung and Kim (2012) investigated the relationships between burnout, organizational commitment and the turnover intention attitudes of newspaper firm employees in Korea. Results showed that employees who suffered from burnout reported diminished commitment to the organization and increased turnover intention. Salehi and Gholtash (2011) researched the relationship between job satisfaction, job burnout and organizational citizenship behavior of faculty members at a university in Iran. Their study’s findings revealed that job burnout had a negative effect on organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction had a negative effect on job burnout. Çiftcioglu (2011) investigated the relationships between burnout, occupational commitment and occupational turnover intention among accountants in Istanbul. She found that emotional exhaustion had a partial mediating effect between affective occupational
commitment and occupational turnover intention. Based on this information, the current study will attempt to test some hypotheses. These are:

- **H_{1abc}:** Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, and (c) normative commitment.
- **H_{2abc}:** Depersonalization is negatively related to (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, and (c) normative commitment.
- **H_{3abc}:** Reduced personal accomplishment is negatively related to (a) affective commitment, (b) continuance commitment, and (c) normative commitment.

**Methods**

**Instrument**

The data was collected through a questionnaire that had three main sections. The questionnaire was in Turkish language. The first part of the questionnaire includes items about burnout, while the second includes items to measure organizational commitment. The third part collected information about the demographic characteristics of the participants. Burnout measured using the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). This measure consists of 22 items, which are divided into three dimensions: emotional exhaustion (9 items), depersonalization (5 items) and reduced personal accomplishment (8 items). This measure is the most well-known, accurate and widely used in organizational behavior research. In this sample, the composite reliability was .92, .84, and .84 for emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment, respectively. Organizational commitment was measured with a scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). This multidimensional measure has three dimensions as emotional commitment (8 items), normative commitment (8 items) and continuance commitment (8 items). It is among the most recognized and used in scientific research. In this sample, the composite reliability was .85, .83, .73 for emotional commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment, respectively.

**Sampling**

While public employees in Turkey have been taken as the subject of this research, the scope of the study is limited to public employees working in Istanbul. According to official statistics, there were about 3.34 million public employees in Turkey as of 2016. Approximately 340,000 of them are employed in Istanbul. Because it was impossible to reach all of them, snowball sampling method applied. In order to reach the number of participants required, support was obtained from public employees who ran master's degree programs in universities. Students were asked to administer the questionnaire to colleagues at public institutions. Each student gave the questionnaire to 10 pupils and provided it to their colleagues. The data collected in March-May 2016 periods. The number of questionnaires collected was 786. Seventy-seven of them could not be analyzed because they lacked many required information or only offered single-level answers. The remaining 709 surveys were used to conduct the analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The partial least squares method (PLS-SEM) was used to test the hypotheses developed for the purpose of the study, since it is a more appropriate analytical technique for testing models where the PLS sample number is relatively small (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). Furthermore, PLS is
a repetitive method that does not impose distributional assumptions on data in estimating the structural equation model (Fornell, Johnson, Anderson, Cha & Bryant, 1996). For this reason, PLS-SEM was preferred in the present investigation. This analysis was conducted using the SmartPLS package program (Ringle, Wende & Becker, 2015).

Findings

Demographic Findings

Of the participants 45.8% were female, and 57% had no children. The majority of participants (73.8%) were in the middle-income level in Turkey, earning approximately $1,000 per month. It was also noted that approximately 45% of the participants were in the 41–50 age group. Approximately 79% of the participants were found to have undergraduate and postgraduate educations. Twenty six percent of participants had 20 years of experience or more in the same business, while 57% had been employed in the same industry for 16 years or more. Only 16% had been working in the same business for less than one year.

Table 1. Measurement Model Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Factor Loadings</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>36.325</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>37.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>54.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with people all day is a strain for me</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>35.094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with people directly puts too much stress on me</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>100.358</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>67.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>21.316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>28.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>I feel I treat some recipients as if they were impersonal 'objects'</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>16.948</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I've become more callous toward people since I took this job</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.862</td>
<td>53.179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>38.142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't really care what happens to some recipients</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>19.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel recipients blame me for some of their problems</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>11.166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal accomplishment</td>
<td>I feel very energetic</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>31.874</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my recipients</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>39.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel exhilarated after working closely with my recipients</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>39.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>22.564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>I am very happy to work in this institution in the rest of my career.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>63.932</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I enjoy talking to people outside the company about my workplace.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>23.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel like I have problems with institutional problems.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>33.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This institution means something very special to me.</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>35.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not have a strong sense of belonging to this institution.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>19.245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>One of the main reasons for continuing to work in this institution is that I do not believe that loyalty is important and therefore it is not a moral imperative to stay in the institution.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>38.782</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Even if I get a better job offer from another institution, I do not believe it would be right to leave.</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>26.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I grew up believing that man could only depend on an institution.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>23.635</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>I wanted to leave this institution at the moment, but many things in my life would have been half.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>8.494</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are very few options to leave this institution.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.912</td>
<td>32.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structural Model

The LS-SEM model consists of two structures: a measurement and a structural model (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2014). For this reason, first the measurement model and then the structural model were examined. The validity and reliability of constructs was tested within the scope of the measurement model. In the analysis of the first measurement model, the results of the analysis
were repeated one by one excluding one item from emotional exhaustion, four items from personal accomplishment, three items from affective commitment, six items from continuance commitment and five items from normative commitment which have factor loadings less than .50. The result of the final measurement model analysis is shown in Table 1.

For measurement model, convergent and discriminant validity examined (Hair et al., 2014). Since AVE (average variance explained) and standardized factor loadings values exceed the recommended value of .50, convergent validity is provided (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). For discriminant validity, the square root of every AVE value belonging to each latent should be larger than any correlation among any pair of latent constructs. Table 2 shows that discriminant validity is also provided (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). Given the values obtained in the measurement model, it can be stated that convergent and discriminant validity and reliability of constructs are provided. After measurement model, structural model examined.

Table 2. Discriminant Validity of Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discriminant Validity</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional commitment</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional exhaustion</td>
<td>-.355</td>
<td>-.550</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.384</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal accomplishment</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>-.410</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>-.320</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold values represent square root of AVE values of each constructs.

The bootstrap resampling method was used to determine the $t$ values for the path coefficients in the structural model, and the sub-sample value was set to 5000, as suggested by previous researchers (Hair et al., 2014; Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovics, 2009). The results obtained are shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Structural model results.](image-url)
As shown in Figure 2, emotional exhaustion has negative significant impact on affective ($\beta = -0.420$, $t = 11.609$, $p = .001$), continuance ($\beta = -0.278$, $t = 5.771$, $p = .001$), normative ($\beta = 0.155$, $t = 3.188$, $p = .001$) commitment. Personal accomplishment has positive significant impact on affective ($\beta = 0.216$, $t = 5.942$, $p = .000$), continuance ($\beta = 0.155$, $t = 3.188$, $p = .001$) and normative ($\beta = 0.215$, $t = 5.273$, $p = .000$) commitment. Depersonalization have no impact on all dimensions of organizational commitment. Accordingly, it can be said that as the emotional exhaustion of the employees decreases, the degree of commitment increases, and as the perceptions of personal accomplishment increase, the degree of commitment increases. In this context, it can be stated that in order to increase the levels of affective, continuance and normative commitment, it is necessary to increase the levels of perception of personal accomplishments and decrease levels of emotional exhaustion. The affective commitment of employees varies by 35%, and the continuance and normative commitment by 14%.

According to $f^2$ values (Cohen, 1988), the emotional exhaustion levels of employees had a medium effect on affective commitment. On the other hand, Stone-Geisser's $Q^2$ value has been taken into account in estimating the predictive relevance. Hair et al. (2011) recommended cross-validated redundancy to examine $Q^2$. The blindfolding method has been applied for $Q^2$ value (Tenenhaus, Vinzi, Chatelin & Lauro, 2005). As the $Q^2$ values of the affective ($SSO = 3545$, $SSE = 2920,799$, $Q^2 = 0.176$), continued ($SSO = 1418$, $SSE = 1306,628$, $Q^2 = 0.079$) and normative ($SSO = 2127; SSE = 1961,199; Q^2 = 0.078$) are larger than zero. Therefore, it can be stated that the model carries the predictive explanatory property for commitment (Henseler et al., 2009).

Conclusions

This paper aims to examine the relationship between burnout and organizational commitment of public sector employees in Turkey. The data collected through questionnaire. The proposed model tested with partial least squares method via SmartPls software. The findings revealed that employees’ burnout is negatively related to organizational commitment. Specifically, while emotional exhaustion is negatively related to commitment, personal accomplishment contributes positively to commitment. The experience of depersonalization has no significant relationship with all three dimensions of commitment.

Theoretical Implications

Although the relationship between burnout and organizational commitment is often addressed in the literature, the number of studies that deal with both these concepts in a multidimensional manner is rather limited. Burnout in relation to commitment has been variously treated as an independent (Çetin et al., 2011; Gemlik et al., 2010; Griffin et al., 2010; Jung & Kim, 2012; Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Tan & Akhtar, 1998), dependent (Kalliah et al., 1998; Tan & Akhtar, 1998; Tekin et al., 2014), mediating (Croppanzano et al., 2003) or moderating (King & Sethi, 1997) variable in the previous studies. This supports a close relationship between the two concepts. Apart from that, researchers have not established a complete mutual relation between the two concepts.

For example, Griffin et al. (2010) did not find any significant relationship between organizational commitment and burnout. In their study, the concept of organizational commitment is examined unidimensional, while burnout multidimensional. The findings of Hakanen, Bakker, & Schaufeli, (2006) revealed that employees’ burnout symptoms were negatively related to organizational commitment. However, the researchers measured organizational commitment in one dimension, rather than including all three dimensions of the construct. In addition, they measured burnout
symptoms only with emotional exhaustion. In another study, Hakanen et al. (2008) found employees’ burnout had no significant impact on their organizational commitment attitudes. The researchers measured burnout with two scales from Maslach Burnout Inventory, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and measured organizational commitment with two items. The findings of Leiter and Maslach (1988) indicated that two dimensions of burnout, emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment made independent contributions to the prediction of commitment. Although they used all three dimensions of burnout to measure that construct, one of the shortcomings of their study is that they used a basic version of organizational commitment construct.

The limitations of previous investigations are clear from relative importance accorded to each concept and the lack of fully realized relationships between the two. There is still critical work to be done. In the current study, burnout was defined as the independent variable, and organizational commitment as the dependent variable. Emotional exhaustion, reduced personal accomplishment, and depersonalization subscales were used to define the concept of burnout, while the concept of organizational commitment was examined with all the subdimensions as affective, normative, and continuance commitment. As a result of the analyses made, it was determined that emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment have significant effects on all three types of commitment. However, it has been determined that depersonalization has no effect on all three dimensions of commitment. This means that employees with high levels of emotional exhaustion and reduced personal success have less of an affective, continuance, and normative commitment to their organizations. Findings obtained by Kervancı (2013) are significantly compatible with our findings. She found that emotional exhaustion had negative effect on affective and normative commitment. Moreover, it was found that reduced personal accomplishment had negative effect only on affective commitment. Once more, it can be said that the great majority of the findings we have obtained overlap with the findings of Tekin and his colleagues (2014) and Derin and Demirel (2012). However, they contradict with the findings of Hakanen et al. (2008). A possible reason of this contradiction is that Hakenen et al. (2008) measured affective commitment only with two items.

Practical Implications

The emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment that are dimensions of burnout have significant effect on all aspects of organizational commitment. It is thought that these findings will help the managers of institutions to develop some precautions and policies. Firstly, it is highly important to determine factors that cause emotional exhaustion. At this point, the extent to which the factors in which Cordes and Dougherty (1993) categorize the causes of burnout should be investigated. Managers should develop a set of solutions to address the identified factors. Otherwise, the affective, normative, and continuance commitment of employees will diminish. This could result not only having lack of employees whose commitment to the organization high that will result in high performance, productivity, citizenship behaviors for organization but also physical (fatigue, insomnia), emotional (depression, irritability), and interpersonal (reduced socialization) negative effects for employees. These negative effects diminish their quality life. A possible way for managers to deal with employee burnout is creating a good communication lines with employees (Miller Ellis, Zook, & Lyles, 1990; Kim & Lee, 2009). According to Miller et al. (1990) participation in decision making process and social support are effective ways of dealing with burnout in terms of communication for managers. In particular, employee participation in decision-making process is crucial in reducing stress and increasing personal accomplishment. Beyond these, through an effective supervisory communication employee could get a chance to
inform the supervisors about their working experiences that cause employee burnout as workload and role conflict. Thereby administrators can revise management process of organization (Kim & Lee, 2009).

**Limitations and Future Research**

The finding of this paper is limited to public officers in Istanbul. Thus, they cannot be generalized whole public officers in Turkey. Paper also presents a number of recommendations to future researchers. In particular, taken together, the structural model of burnout as a predictor and the results of testing on staff working in different public organizations in Turkey will be of benefit to those managing employee-employer relations in the relevant institutions. There may also be some factors that have differentiating effects in relation to burnout and organizational commitment, for example, gender and duration of work. Taking these factors into account will provide clearer and more accurate results for management.
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