

The Effect of Organizational Commitment and Burnout on Organizational Cynicism: A Field Study in the Healthcare Industry

A. Beduk, K. Eryesil, O. Esmen

II. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. Organizational Cynicism

Historical background of cynicism goes back to 4th century A.D. to the cynic school. Cynicism that found its roots as a life style and school of thought in Ancient Greek is based on Diogenes from Sinope who inspired Great Alexander by his thoughts. When asked why he was wandering around with a flaming lantern in the day, Diogenes answered that he was looking for an honest person. This saying ironically describes cynicism term that represents the belief of people's not being honest in fact [2].

Cynicism, basics of which can be carried up to the ancient Greece, was firstly investigated by philosophy then medical science and psychology (Diogenes Syndrome), as stated above. In organizational sense, cynicism began to be investigated as a subject of management science, especially with the general acceptance of the studies of [3]-[6]. While psychology and medical science examined cynicism and cynical behavior within the framework of personal characteristics and effects before, in the studies conducted in the field of management discipline examining the organizational sense, discovering the activities that have an impact on individuals in organizational sense and the determining which activities to be carried out in organizational context take the precedence.

Organizational cynicism was firstly characterized as attitude by [4]. These are:

- The attribution of self-interested behavior to management
- The assumption that organizational processes operate under these apparent self-interests
- The belief that these conditions are unlikely to change.

Dean et al. [5], defines organizational cynicism as "A negative attitude toward one's employing organization, comprising three dimensions:

- Belief that the organization lacks integrity,
- Negative affect toward the organization and
- Tendencies to disparaging and critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with these beliefs and affect".

To briefly describe these dimensions we can say, according to the employees working in the cognitive dimension, there is a belief that lack of justice, honesty and sincerity within the organization and the belief that personal interests are in the forefront of the decisions taken. In emotional dimension,

Abstract—The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between organizational commitment which is defined as a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values, and burnout syndrome and organizational cynicism. Accordingly, a field research based on survey method was conducted on the employees of a health institution operating in the province of Konya. The findings of the research show that there is a positive statistically significant relationship between organizational cynicism and burnout while there is a negative statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and burnout. Furthermore, it has been also realized that there is a negative and statistically significant relationship between organizational commitment and organizational cynicism.

Keywords—Burnout, organizational commitment, organizational cynicism, healthcare management.

I. INTRODUCTION

ORGANIZATIONAL cynicism is employees' belief that organizations lack ethical integrity and principles such as justice, honesty and sincerity are sacrificed for organizational benefits. Over the years, researchers have become more interested on issues relating to organizational cynicism. The concept of cynicism has become the subject of various disciplines in social sciences like philosophy, religion, political science, sociology, management, and psychology [1]. In addition, burnout and commitment continue to be a significant topic of interest for researchers of organizational behavior and human resource management. Therefore, this research would like to investigate the relationships between organizational cynicism, burnout, and organizational commitment. Revealing the relation about mentioned variables will contribute both to the theory since there is no similar study in the field. Within this frame, hypotheses were formed first in this study by drawing organizational framework about variables contained by the study, then the application made for testing the hypotheses took place.

A. Beduk and K. Eryesil are with the Selçuk University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Konya, 42075 Turkey (phone: +90-332-223-4351, +90-332-223-3091; fax: +90-332-241-0046; e-mail: abeduk@hotmail.com, kemalettineriesil@hotmail.com).

O.Esmen is with the Selçuk University, Kulu Vocational School, Program of Foreign Trade, Konya, 42075 Turkey (phone: +90-332-223-3091; fax: +90-332-241-0046; e-mail: osmanesmen@yahoo.com).

employees can have anger, hatred, anxiety and embarrassment. In behavioral dimension, for the organization, there is a tendency to make critics in a strongly disparaging, derogatory way [7].

Many studies have been done to measure its impact on working life, together with the theoretical studies on organizational cynicism. Together with many studies the relationship between organizational cynicism and; organizational commitment [8]-[12] trust [13], [14], inspiration [15], organizational change [16]-[18], mobbing [19], organizational citizenship behavior [20], (in)justice [21], [12], job satisfaction [22], have been examined before. While in the studies to determine the relationship between cynicism and commitment, trust, inspiration, job satisfaction, justice and organizational citizenship, the relationship had been generally found to be negative; in the studies to determine the relationship between cynicism and mobbing and injustice the relationship had been found to be positive. As one can notice through the dates, the studies in this area intensify in the last decade. On the other hand, although positive or negative relationships have been determined in the studies, there is not a common idea of overall studies, such as many areas of social sciences.

B. Burnout Syndrome

Burnout is a concept first considered in the clinical studies by [23]. Freudenberger [23] defines the burnout “as a state of being exhausted in the internal resources of individual as a result of being unsuccessful, wearing out, losing energy and power, and unsatisfied desires” [24]. With that Maslach considered the burnout syndrome as a social problem [24], since it reflected the real experiences of people in business life, it became a concept that is begun to be examined in the organizational literature. From this point of view, burnout syndrome is defined as a long termed reaction against the chronic, emotional, and interpersonal stress resources in business environment [25]. The exhaustion behavior in the business environment emerges in three forms as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment [26], [25]. Emotional exhaustion is defined as exhaustion of individual’s emotions and feelings toward the other people [27]-[29]. Depersonalization is defined as that the individual feels lack of emotion toward the people [28]; his/her negative and inflexible attitudes toward the people he/she serves; that he/she becomes unreactive to the job [24]; and that he/she behaves to the people like an object, says insolent words to the people, exhibits an indifferent and mocker attitude [29]. Reduced personal accomplishment represents the dimension of evaluating the own achievement of person and it means the decrease at the level of the sufficiency and efficiency in the business of individual [25].

C. Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment as a, the strength of the bond that employee feel about the organization that arise as a result of organization-employee relationship. In other words,

organizational commitment which represent the psychological approach to the organization, is a psychological condition that reflects the relationship between the employee and the organization, and that led to the decision to continue membership in the organization [30], [31].

According to Eisenberg and others, the concept of organizational commitment involves three elements. These elements are [32]:

- Adoption of the Organization's goals and values and feeling a strong belief in these values,
- Spend more effort than expected, to maintain the organization's benefit,
- Feeling a strong desire to continue membership in the organization.

The common feature of definitions related to the concept of organizational commitment is the expectation for the individuals connected to the organization to behave in the direction of doing their best for providing the success of the organization. However, the idea about strong committed employees to have higher performance levels than the ones without commitment is the most important factor used as a base in defining the organizational commitment concept [33]. Allen and Meyer have examined organizational commitment, in three dimensions as; affective commitment, continuance and normative commitment [34]. Emotional commitment is defined as the desire of individuals working in the enterprise to remain in the enterprise with their own preferences. Continuance commitment is the employees’ taking into account cost of leaving their work and continuing in the enterprise as an obligation. Normative commitment is the feeling of the employees connected to the organization as a moral sense of duty and because they believe, they should not leave the enterprise [30]. The common feature of these three types of commitment (affective, continuance and normative) are that they reflect a psychological condition, which connect the employees to an organization, which effect the decisions about whether the slidatary with the organization will continue or not [35], [36].

III. METHOD

A. Data Collection Method Used in the Research

In this study, in order to identify the levels of organizational cynicism of the employees of health institutes “Scale of Organizational Cynicism” developed by [3] used their studies; in order to identify the levels of organizational commitment developed by [34] and in order to identify the levels of burnout developed by [26] were used.

This study aims to determine relationships between organizational cynicism, organizational commitment, and burnout on the employees of a health institution operating in the province of Konya. In direction of this aim the hypotheses developed in the scope of study are put order as follow:

- H₁: Organizational cynicism is negatively related to organizational commitment.
- H₂: Organizational cynicism is positively related to

burnout.

- H₃: Organizational commitment is negatively related to burnout.

65.9% of those participating in the study is male, and 34.1% female. The mean age of participants is about 35 and the youngest participator is 24 years old and the oldest participator is 58 years old. The academic titles of participants are 42.1% Asst Dr., 9.5% specialist doctor, 20.6% Asst. Prof. Dr., 17.5% Assoc .Prof. Dr. and 10.3% Prof. Dr. 48.3% of participants are working on internal medicine, 44.2% on surgical medicine, and 7.5% on basic medicine.

TABLE I
INTERNAL CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS RESULTS OF THE SCALES

Scales	Number of Item	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Organizational Cynicism	13	0,897
Organizational Commitment	16	0,984
Burnout	21	0,846

It was precipitated that the scale of organizational cynicism (0,897), scale organizational commitment (0,984), and scale of burnout (0,846) were confident at high degree ($0,60 > \alpha > 0,80$).

In the study, in order to examine the structural validity of the data belonging to the scale of organizational cynicism, this scale was subjected to descriptive factor analysis. As a result of analysis carried out to test the compliance of data for factor analysis, it was identified that the result of, Barlett normal distribution test was significant ($p < 0.05$), while KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) value was 0.763. Furthermore, when the results of factor analysis were evaluated, it was seen that the items of scale, whose eigenvalues are more than 1, were collected under a three factor. And also, in order to examine the structural validity of the data belonging to the scale of organizational commitment, this scale were subjected to descriptive factor analysis. As a result of analysis carried out to test the compliance of data for factor analysis, it was identified that the result of Barlett normal distribution test was significant ($p < 0.05$), while KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) value was 0.893. Moreover, when the results of factor analysis were evaluated, it was seen that the items of scale, whose eigenvalues are more than 1, were collected under a three factor. In order to examine the structural validity of the data belonging to the scale of burnout, it was identified that the result of Barlett normal distribution test was significant ($p < 0.05$), while KMO (Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin) value was 0.781. In addition, when the results of factor analysis were evaluated, it was seen that the items of scale, whose eigenvalues are more than 1.

According to the results of correlation analysis, it was identified that there was a negative directional and statistically significant relationship ($r = -0,203$, $p < 0,01$) between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment. In addition, it was identified that there was a positive directional and statistically significant relationship ($r = -0,405$, $p < 0,01$) between organizational cynicism and burnout. Furthermore there was a negative directional and statistically significant

relationship ($r = -0,436$, $p < 0,01$) between burnout and organizational cynicism.

TABLE II
CORRELATION ANALYSIS AMONG ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM,
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND BURNOUT

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Organizational Cynicism	1		
Organizational Commitment	(-0,235)**	1	
Burnout	(0,405)**	(-0,436)**	1

Note: ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.01$.

When correlation coefficients were examined, although it was identified that there was positive and negative directional relationships between the independent variables, determining that the coefficients were small than 0.7 and there was no multiple relations, in order to examine the relationships between the variables, regression analysis was conducted.

TABLE III
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AND
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Dependent Variable	R ²	Independent Variable	B	Std. E.	t	F	p
		Constant		0,370	8,042		
Organizational Cynicism	-0,235	Organizational Commitment	-0,235	0,095	2,780	17,728**	<0,05

Note: ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.01$.

When the results of regression analysis, it was reached the conclusion that organizational commitment has an effect on organizational cynicism and the levels of organizational commitment accounted for the variance on organizational cynicism in the rate of 23.5%. In addition it was concluded that the model put forward was statistically significant ($p < 0,05$) and that organizational commitment negatively affected the variable organizational cynicism ($R^2 = -0,235$). In this direction, H1 hypothesis developed in the form of "Organizational cynicism is negatively related to organizational commitment" was accepted.

TABLE IV
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL CYNICISM AND BURNOUT

Dependent Variable	R ²	Independent Variable	B	Std. Error	t	F	p
		Constant		0,176	16,331	30,896**	<0,05
Organizational Cynicism	0,405	Burnout	0,405	0,047	5,558		5

Note: ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.01$.

When the results of regression analysis assessed, it was reached the conclusion that burnout has an effect on organizational cynicism and the levels of burnout accounted for the variance on organizational cynicism in the rate of 40.5%. Moreover, it was concluded that the model put forward was statistically significant ($p < 0,05$) and that burnout positively affected the variable organizational cynicism ($R^2 = 0,405$). In this direction, H2 hypothesis developed in the form of "Organizational cynicism is positively related to burnout" was accepted.

TABLE V
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND BURNOUT

Dependent Variable	R ²	Independent Variable	B	Std. Error	t	F	p
Organizational Commitment	-0,436	Constant			0,176	16,331	
		Burnout	-0,436	0,047	5,558	30,896**	<0,05

Note: **p<.05, *p<.01

When the results of regression analysis, it was reached the conclusion that burnout has an effect on organizational commitment and the levels of burnout accounted for the variance on organizational commitment in the rate of 43,6%. In addition it was concluded that the model put forward was statistically significant (p<0,05) and that burnout negatively affected the variable organizational commitment (R²=-0,436). In this direction, H3 hypothesis developed in the form of "Organizational cynicism is negatively related to organizational commitment" was accepted.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, the relationships between organizational cynicism, burnout and organizational commitment in Konya has been examined. Considering the results of the study, a positive and significant relationship has been determined between organizational cynicism and burnout, and a negative and significant relationship has been determined between organizational commitment and burnout. In addition, a negative and significant relationship has been determined between organizational cynicism and organizational commitment. It has been concluded that, organizational cynicism have importance in explaining organizational commitment and burnout. Just because the sample of this study is composed of a specific sector in Konya, generalization power of the results of this study is weak. In this respect, larger samples can be re-worked in the future research. It should be taken into account that the data of the study have been evaluated only for a certain period of time. Due to the fact that this research was made only in Konya, it can be beneficial to study similar samples in different cities or different sectors in Konya. Additionally, owing to the certain time constraint, when the questions to answer and hypotheses put forward are considered, it can be suggested that realizing a periodic study can be a more suitable approach as data collection.

REFERENCES

[1] Ince, M., and Turan, S., Organizational Cynicism as A Factor that Affects the Organizational Change in the Process of Globalization and An Application in Karaman's Public Institutions, *Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, Issue 37, 104-121, 2011.
[2] Karacaoğlu, K., and İnce, F., Brandes, Dharwadkar ve Dean'in (1999) Örgütsel Sinizm Ölçeği Türkçe Formunun Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması: Kayseri Organize Sanayi Bölgesi Örneği, *Business and Economics Research Journal*, 3(3) 2012, pp. 77 – 92.
[3] Brandes-Duncan, P. An Exploration of Organizational Cynicism. Working Paper, University of Cincinnati, 1995.
[4] Andersson, L., M., Employee Cynicism: An Examination Using a Contract Violation Framework, *Human Relations*; 49(11); 1395-1418, 1996.
[5] Dean, W., J., et al., Note Organizational Cynicism, *Academy of Management Review*; 23(2): 341-352, 1998.

[6] Abraham, R., Organizational Cynicism: Bases and Consequences, *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 126(3), 269-292, 2000.
[7] Tokgöz, N., Örgütsel Sinizm, Örgütsel Destek Örgütsel Adalet İlişkisi: Elektrik Dağıtım İşletmesi Çalışanları Örneği, *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, İİBF Dergisi*, 6(2), 363-387, 2011.
[8] Findik, M., Eryeşil, K., Örgütsel Sinizmin Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerindeki Etkisini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *International Iron & Steel Symposium*, 02-04 April, Karabük, Türkiye, 1250-12, 2012.
[9] Barton, C., L., Ambrosini, V., The Moderating Effect of Organizational Change Cynicism on Middle Manager Strategy Commitment, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24:4, 721-746, 2012.
[10] Altınöz, M., vd., Algılanan Örgütsel Bağlılık ve Örgütsel Sinizm İlişkisi: Ankara'daki Dört ve Beş Yıldızlı Konaklama İşletmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *S.Ü. İİBF Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, Sayı: 21, 285-315, 2011.
[11] Bernerth, B. J. et al., Justice, Cynicism, and Commitment A Study of Important Organizational Change Variables, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(3), 303-326, 2007.
[12] Fitzgerald, M., R., Organizational Cynicism: Its Relationship to Perceived Organizational Injustice and Explanatory Style, *University of Cincinnati, Doctoral Thesis*, 2002.
[13] Özler, vd., Örgütlerde Sinizm Güvensizlikle Mi Bulaşır?, *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2), 47-57, 2010.
[14] Helm, A., Cynics and Sceptics: Consumer Dispositional Trust Advances in Consumer Research, 31, 345-351, 2004.
[15] Urbany, J., E., Inspiration and Cynicism in Values Statements, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Springer, 62: 169-182, 2005.
[16] Stanley, D., J., et al., Employee Cynicism and Resistance to Organizational Change, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 19(4), 429-439, 2005.
[17] Brown, M., Cregan, C., Cynicism: The Role of Employee Involvement, *Human Resource Management*, 47(4), 667-696, 2009.
[18] Watt, J., Piotrowski, C., Organizational Change Cynicism: A Review of the Literature and Intervention Strategies, *Organization Development Journal*, 26, 23-31, 2008.
[19] Gül, H., Ağıröz, A., Mobbing ve Örgütsel Sinizm Arasındaki İlişkiler: Hemşireler Üzerine Bir Uygulama, *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İİBF Dergisi*, XIII(1), 2011.
[20] Yetin, S., A., Örgütsel Sinizm ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkiyi Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(1), 382-696, 2011.
[21] Tokgöz, N., Yılmaz, H., Örgütsel Sinizm: Eskişehir ve Alanya'daki Otel İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama, *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(2), 283-305, 2008.
[22] Leung, K., et al., Social Cynicism and Job Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Analysis, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 59 (2). 318-338, 2010.
[23] Freudenberger, H. J., Staff Burn-Out, *Journal of Social Issues*, 30(1), 159-165, 1974.
[24] Budak, G., Sürgevil, O., Tükenmişlik ve Tükenmişliği Etkileyen Örgütsel Faktörlerin Analizine İlişkin Akademik Personel Üzerinde Bir Uygulama, *D.E.Ü.İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 20(2), 95-108, 2005.
[25] Maslach, C., Goldberg, J., Prevention of Burnout: New Perspectives, *Applied & Preventive Psychology*, 7, 63-74, 1998.
[26] Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., The Measurement of Experienced Burnout, *Journal Of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113, 1981.
[27] Leiter, M.P., Maslach, C., The Impact of Interpersonal Environment on Burnout and Organizational Commitment, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 297-308, 1988
[28] Bruce, S.P., Recognizing Stress and Avoiding Burnout, *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 1, 57–64, 2009.

- [29] Yıldırım, M. H., İçerli, L., Tükenmişlik Sendromu: Maslach ve Kopenhag Tükenmişlik Ölçeklerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi, *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2, 123-131, 2010.
- [30] Meyer, John P. and Natalie J. Allen, *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*, Sage Publications, 1997.
- [31] Vural Z. Beril Akıncı ve Çoşkun Gül, *Örgüt Kültürü*, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, Ankara, 2007.
- [32] Eisenberg, E.M., Monge, P.R. and Miller, K.I., Involvement in Communication Networks as a Predictor of Organizational Commitment, *Human Communication Research*, 10(2),179-201, 1987.
- [33] Özler, D.E., *Örgütsel Davranışta Güncel Konular*, Ekin Kitabevi Yayınları, Bursa, 2010.
- [34] Meyer, J.P. and Natalie J. Allen, A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment, *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89, 1991.
- [35] Meyer J.P., Allen N.J., Smith C.A., "Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551, 1993.
- [36] Obeng, K. & Ugboro, I., "Organizational commitment among public transit employees: an assessment study", *Journal of the Transportation Research Forum*, 57(2), 83-98, 2003.