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Abstract
This paper examined the interaction between burnout and job performance and, as well as the mediating effect of motivation. For this purpose, the data (N=258) was collected from the employees working in the Turkish banks, operating in Istanbul. Empirical results showed that, motivation has a partial mediating effect on the relationship between bank employees’ job performance and burnout. This effect appears particularly for the dimension of depersonalization. The findings also indicated that depersonalization is influential on employees’ job performance and burnout.
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1. Introduction
One of the popular organizational strategies for establishing the organizational performance is to provide happy employees (Demerouët et al, 2014, 96; Wright and Cropanzano, 2000a, 2000b) by stimulating their motivation. Motivation is accepted as an important mechanism that drives human behavior which has an impact on important well-being outcomes (Rubino et al, 2009). An important predictor of maintaining performance is known as motivation, which stimulates the employees to spend more time and energy in the organization. Motivation is apparently a psychological process (Rasu, 2014) that covers many aspects of job-related factors. On the other hand, work stress apparently affects the organizational culture. Regardless of the sector operating in, work stress has negative consequences on employees’ attitudes and behaviors. Burnout is another influential factor in employees’ attitudes and behaviors which reduces the motivation as a result of reaction to job stress. It appears as one of the most negative outcomes among employees (Keel, 1993). Recent research shows that burnout is critical in explaining a wide range of behaviors and attitudes in high-stress work places (Lee and Ashforth, 1996). In the related literature, a number of antecedents and consequences of job burnout have been investigated (Cordes, 1993; Ting and Ling, 2011). Various evidence support the assumptions of negative outcomes of burnout and its interaction with job performance (Babakuş et al, 2009; Bartoli, 2002; Bakker et al, 2004; Maslach, 2003).
Against this background, researchers draw attention to the determination of potential causes of burnout as well as preventive factors. One of the situations that cause mental tension and stress is an individual’s job and working environment (Ashtari et al, 2009). Therefore, organizations use various strategies to maintain employee’s performance like; task performance or adjustment to change at acceptable levels despite experiencing burnout (Demerouti et al, 2014, 96).

However, as the circumstances vary according to sectors, these strategies may not be always effective on each organization. Financial sector is one of the sectors in which the performance of employees is influenced by various factors (Karabay, 2014, 282). Today, the executives in banks try to ensure that bank employees serve in the healthy, happy and satisfied conditions. Furthermore, as the financial sector is involved with through contact with the client, it is important to maintain the motivation of employees. However, it may be tough for the banking industry, compared to other industries due to its dynamics. Further research needs to be done with regard to the burnout context on a more comprehensive outlook. Since decades, scholars have revealed evidence of negative relationships between burnout and performance (Singh et al, 1994). Despite increased interest among scholars, there is an abundant source of evidence with regard to the mediating effects of the motivation of employees in an organization. This is particularly true for the banking industry.

The study is an attempt to fulfill the gap in the international literature. The main purpose of the study is to examine the interaction between job performance, burnout, and the motivation of bank employees working in Turkish deposit banks. The paper is organized as follows. The first section lays the introduction. The next section includes the literature and the development of research hypotheses. The research method, findings and results are explained in the third section. Finally, the last section presents the conclusion, discussion and the limitations of the study.

2. Literature Review and Development of Hypothesis

In the following sections, the conceptual framework within the review of literature is highlighted to support the background of hypotheses, methodology and the findings of the study.

2.1. Burnout and Job Performance

When the work environment is uncomfortable, employees usually try to cut off relations as they are affected psychologically (Cropanzano et al, 1997, 162). One of the major causes is known as the burnout, stimulated by the stress and other work related factors. Latest researches have demonstrated that job outcomes such as work stress may bring out considerable negative consequences for employees’ behaviors within organizations (Jaramillo et al, 2005).

The burnout as a phenomenon has appeared in the 1970s in the United States, particularly among people working in the human services (Maslach et al, 2001, 398). The concept is mostly defined as a response to chronic emotional and interpersonal stressors on the job. It has multiple dimensions which are interrelated and that occur as an overwhelming exhaustion, feelings of cynicism, detachment from the job, a sense of ineffectiveness as well as lack of accomplishment (Jackson et al., 1986; Maslach et al, 2001, 399). These dimensions are mostly notified as; emotional exhaustion; depersonalization; and diminished personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1982; Cordes and Dougherty 1993). According to Maslach (2001), although exhaustion reflects the stress dimension of burnout, it fails to capture the critical aspects of the relationship that individuals associate with their work. In this sense, it can be stated that emotional exhaustion is some sort of an initiator of the burnout syndrome. Another aspect of burnout is called depersonalization, which is known as an attempt to put distance between oneself and other members of an organization by actively ignoring the qualities that make them unique. This is often done by engaging people negatively (Maslach and Jackson, 1981, 99; Karatepe and Uludağ, 2008; 112) to their work. The relationship of inefficacy (also known as diminished personal accomplishment), which is another form of burnout, is relatively more complex compared to the other two aspects.

Until the developmental course of burnout over time, the phenomenon has gone through various phases in the 1980s as the studies with regard to burnout shifted to more systematic empirical research (Maslach et al, 2001, 399-401). The scale widely used by researchers has been the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), originally established for use in human service occupations, by Maslach and Jackson (1981). After the concept has been in researchers’ agenda, the scholars began to examine the outcomes of burnout.
Burnout may have significant impacts on individuals’ health such as; loss of job, family relations, psychological disorders and addiction (Wright and Cropanzano, 2000; Özer, 1998). In terms of organizational outcome; job burnout causes important consequences like absenteeism, inefficiency in innovative capabilities, loss of productivity as well as intention to leave (Toppinnen et al, 2005). In the related literature, studies often show evidence of higher levels of burnout in health professionals especially for those working in hospitals (Ashtari et al, 2009; Lazaro et al, 1984; Bogaert et al, 2013). This is particularly true for the financial sector. It is claimed that banking does not appear to be counted among the most stressful industry. However, when its dynamics are considered, financial sector is one of the hardest working places full of stressors. Job stress among employees appears as a major driver in emerging burnout leading to declining performance. Recent crisis has shown that intensive workload and job stress among employees have increased the concern of being unemployed in banking industry.

In this study, job performance of bank employees is the primary organizational outcome. Job performance, so far, is defined as “the level of productivity of an employee’s job-related behaviors and outcome” (Babin and Boles, 1998, 82). It measures the level of achievement of employees’ with regard to business and social objectives from the perspectives of the management (Hersey and Blanchard, 1993). Employees' levels of burnout may be an essential predictor of employees’ job performance in an organization (Kreitner and Kinicki, 1998). In this sense, an employee is exposed to burnout she/he is affected in terms of reduced job performance (Babakuş et al, 2009).

Recent literature provides evidence with regard to the interaction between burnout and performance (Halbesleben et al, 2007; Karatepe et al, 2008; Bakker et al, 2004; Demerouti et al, 2005; Ting and Ling, 2011; Ashtari et al, 2009; Bartoli, 2002). Bakker et al (2004), using structural equation model, stated that job demands (particularly work pressure and emotional demands) are found as the most important antecedents of the emotional exhaustion. Babakuş et al (2009) investigated both the direct relationships between burnout, job performance and turnover intentions among frontline bank employees in New Zealand. Their findings illustrated that burnout mediates the effects of job demands and job resources on job performance and turnover intentions. The literature presents similar evidence that employees experiencing burnout often consider leaving their organization (Halbesleben and Bucklely, 2004; Babakuş et al, 2009). Karatepe and Uludağ (2008), in their study, investigated whether the role stress and burnout affect job performance. They found that role ambiguity causes job performance to decrease while role conflict enhance job performance. The results also indicated that diminished personal accomplishment has a significant negative influence on job performance while other components of burnout don’t. Prior studies have also shown that behavior and outcome performance measures are positively correlated (Ashtari et al, 2009; Cravens et al., 1993; Babakus et al., 1996). According to Ting and Ling (2011), when the employees do not have sufficient right and freedom in their work, they will feel low spirit, which mean they will face job burnout and that will cause lower performance. Based on the literature, we hypothesize that burnout will adversely affect bank employees’ performance:

\[ H_1: \text{Emotional exhaustion is negatively related to job performance.} \]

\[ H_2: \text{Depersonalization is negatively related to job performance.} \]

2.2. Motivation

Fostered by the competition, executives began to expect from their employees to exert more effort, be more motivated and take initiatives towards sustaining the organization’s goals (Cropanzano et al, 1997, 162). Motivation is often called as the feeling of challenge or competence resulting from performing the job (Keaveney, 1992). It is the process where the employees energizes and directs behavior towards the successful attainment of goals (Salami, 2008, 156; Eymur and Geban, 2011). However, motivation is not the only explanation of behavior. It interacts with and acts in conjunction with other cognitive processes (Rasu, 2014, 255). Employees demonstrate relatively high levels of intrinsic motivation if they are adequately motivated to serve for the organizational goals (Anderson and Oliver, 1987; Cravens et al., 1993). Motivated individuals, in this sense, are better able to cope with work situations, interpreting conflicting or ambiguous demands as well as challenging and stimulating aspects of their job responsibilities (Keaveney and Nelson, 1993). Considering the multiple tasks that workers have to perform, it may be tough to identify with precision the motivational processes underlying each given task (Karimi and Ali, 2014, 48) since employees may be working under difficult circumstances. Because of this fact, there is a growing interest in examining the relationship between motivation and burnout (Low et al, 2000).
When studying burnout, researchers have typically focused on both organizational factors such as: job demands or individual factors like self-efficacy, or self-esteem (Fernet et al, 2010). Nevertheless, special attention is required to examine the role of motivation. The literature sets back with various studies that investigated the interaction between motivation and burnout in volunteerism (Chacon, 2000; Fuertes and Jimenez, 1999); self-compassion, motivation, and burnout (Çetin et al, 2008); motivation and burnout (Aypay and Eryılmaz, 2011) motivation and job performance (Alonso et al, 2001; Halbesleben et al, 2007; Leisink and Steijn, 2009; Erez et al, 2001; Miao et al, 2007; Springer, 2011). Another study belongs to Low et al (2000) whom investigated the relationships among burnout, attitudes, and behavior using survey results from salespeople in Australia. Using path analysis, their results showed that intrinsic motivation, role ambiguity, and role conflict are all significant antecedents of burnout. They also found that job satisfaction and performance are direct outcomes of burnout, and also mediate the indirect impact of burnout on organizational commitment and intention to quit.

Despite various studies, the literature presents limited number of evidence with regard to the mediating effect of motivation as a predictor of job performance. Rubino (2009) examined the role of motivation by linking intrinsic motivation as a mediator between well-established job stressors and burnout. He found that intrinsic motivation was a full mediator for the effect of perceived fit on the inefficacy dimension of burnout. Fernet et al (2010) examined the interplay between the quality of relationships with coworkers and job motivation in predicting burnout of employees. In their study, self-determined motivation at work was used as a potential moderator, since they investigated whether relationships with coworkers are equally important to all employees in preventing burnout. Using structural equation modeling, they indicated that there are negative effects for self-determined motivation on burnout. Furthermore, the results have shown that intrinsically motivated individuals are likely to experience only limited role conflict in their jobs because their level of motivation empowers their defenses against this role stressor (Keaveney and Nelson, 1993). Based on the statements above, we propose that;

\[ H_3: \text{Motivation is a mediator between burnout and job performance of employees.} \]

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Goal

The purpose of this study is to identify the relationship between the job burnout and job performance among bank employees. It is also aimed to examine the whether the motivation mediates burnout and performance. We propose that burnout negatively influences job performance. In order to analyze the proposition, a survey using questionnaires was conducted.

3.2. Instruments

The research adopts an exploratory model and an online data collection was preferred in order to facilitate recycling. Current scale was adopted from various original scales in the related literature. The scale involves 31 variables apart from demographic variables.

**Job Performance.** We used 2-item scale adapted from based on Goris et al (2003). The measure incorporates items which tap into respondents’ self-assessment with their performance in general as well as their attitudes with regard to their managers’ perceptions. Job performance had a reliability coefficient of 0.59.

**Burnout.** We used 14 items-scale of “Maslach Burnout Inventory” (Maslach and Jackson, 1986) to assess professional burnout in banking professions. Original scale consists of three areas: 1) Emotional exhaustion, 2) Depersonalization and 3) Personal accomplishment. The items ask respondents to judge the likelihood that they are burnout in terms of emotionally (9 items) and depersonalization (5 items). The reliability coefficient for emotional exhaustion was 0.937, while the reliability coefficient for depersonalization was 0.889.

**Job Motivation.** The items were adapted from “Work Motivation Behavior Scale” of the Akinboye's (2001) executive behavior battery to measure motivation level of the employees motivation which contains 15-item using a Likert scale ranging from strongly agrees to strongly disagree. The reliability coefficient for motivation was 0.948.

3.3. Research Sample

The research sample (N=258) represents the bank employees working in private and public banks operating in Istanbul, Turkey.
3.4. Data Analysis Method and Findings

The correlation analysis was used to analyze the relationships between the variables as illustrated in Table 1.

<p>| Table 1: Results of Correlations (Pearson Correlation) Among Variables |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>M8</th>
<th>M9</th>
<th>M10</th>
<th>M11</th>
<th>M12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td><strong>65.92</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td><strong>58.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.21</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td><strong>56.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.23</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td><strong>45.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.79</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td><strong>51.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.81</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td><strong>50.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.81</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.81</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td><strong>45.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.57</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).**

M: Motivation; EA: Emotional Exhaustion; DP: Depersonalization; JP: Job Performance
To evaluate the dimensional relationships between variables the correlation analysis is conducted. When the findings are considered, job performance statistically has 2 dimensions, motivation has 15 dimensions and burnout has 14 dimensions.

Yet, burnout is distinguished into two sub-dimensions (9 dimensions as one and 5 as other sub-dimension) powerfully distributed. As illustrated in Table 2, when 31 variables are rotated through varimax method, they are gathered in 4 dimensions. This outcome shows consistency within the given literature.

Table 2: Factor Analysis of Motivation, Burnout and Job Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M9</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M10</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M11</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M12</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M13</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M14</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M15</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 2, two sub-dimensions that explain job performance are gathered in a single dimension. In the remaining of the study, the variable will be named as job performance in which the 2 sub-dimensions explain 66.86% of job performance. Furthermore, the reliability of the dimensions is tested in the medium level (Cronbachalph: 0.594).
With regard to motivation, 15 sub-dimensions that explain motivation is collected in a single factor since variable henceforward will be named as motivation. The dimensions explain %58.99 of motivation. The Cronbach alpha is tested as 0.948. When burnout is considered, 14 sub-dimensions that explain burnout are gathered in two dimensions, different from the variables above. Those 2 variables from now on will be named as “emotional exhaustion (EA)” and “depersonalization (DEP)”. The sub-dimensions explain %66, 89 of EA with a Cronbach alpha value of 0.937, while the sub-dimensions explain %69, 6 of DEP with an alpha value of 0.889. Table 2 indicates that these 4 factors are correlated to each other statistically (p< 0, 01). Both the factor analysis and the correlation results support the conceptual significance. To measure the relation within variables, the Baron and Kenny (1986) mediation technique is used. This technique is an efficient technique that allows the researchers to explain how and why the resulting impact on job performance has occurred. Therefore, the motivation variable (the mediator) is tested whether mediates between performance and burnout (emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales). According to this assumption, the model is indicated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Research Model

In this study, for the motivation variable to be named as mediator, the changes in burnout needs to be statistically explained by the changes in motivation (Path a). Additionally, the changes in motivation should explain the changes in job performance (Path b). In addition to these two conditions, when the effects of motivation are controlled, significant relationship that exists between burnout and performance is expected to be reduced or statistically insignificant (Path c'). Figure 1 demonstrates the modelled relationships between variables (a, b, c ve c') which are tested by hierarchical regression (Demir, 2008)

In this study, the dependent variable is specified as job performance (Y_p) and the independent variables as burnout (X_d). Motivation variable is tested as a mediator variable (Y_m, X_m). As a result of factor analysis, due to the fact that burnout is divided into two sub-dimensions, burnout is considered to be analyzed within 2 independent variables in the regression analysis. Nevertheless, as a result of the regression analysis, emotional exhaustion was not determined to be statistically significant as an independent variable. Therefore, depersonalization of burnout scale was investigated. Regression models and the results relating to the study are illustrated as follows.

**Model 1:**  
\[ Y_m = \beta_0 + a X_d + e_1 \]  
\[ Y_m = 4.259 - 0.211 X_d \]  
Sig: 0.0000, 0.001  F_{sig} : 0.000

**Model 2:**  
\[ Y_p = \beta_0 + b X_m + e_2 \]  
\[ Y_p = -2.764 + 0.385 X_m \]  
Sig: 0.000 0.000 0.000  F_{sig} : 0.000

**Model 3:**  
\[ Y_p = \beta_0 + c X_d + e_3 \]  
\[ Y_p = -0.247 X_d \]  
Sig: 0.000 0.000  F_{sig} : 0.000

**Model 4:**  
\[ Y_p = \beta_0 + b X_m + c\' X_d + e_4 \]  
\[ Y_p = -2.501 + 0.348 X_m - 0.173 X_d \]  
Sig: 0.000 0.000 0.003  F_{sig} : 0.000
To argue whether there is an effect of mediation, the comparison of \(c\)' and \(c\) values are necessary. It is essential that the evaluation (in case of same signals) within this comparison should be made within absolute values (Demir, 2008). The results of regression are summarized below in terms of mediation testing.

\[ |c| < |c|; | -0.173 | < | -0.247 | \]

points out that motivation has a partial mediating effect.

\[ a \cdot b + c\); (-0.211) (0.385) \] - 0.173 = -0.245 points out the total effect of depersonalization on job performance (Sum of Direct and Indirect Effect)

\[ c\); -0.173 indicates the direct effect of depersonalization when the mediating effect of motivation is considered.

\[ a \cdot b; (-0.211) (0.385) = -0.173 \]

points out the effect of motivation on job performance.

**Figure 2: Results Adopted Research Model**

For the mediation effect to be expressed precisely, it is critical to explain the reduction or the disappearance of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, statistically. Therefore, providing the conditions recommended by Baron and Kenny (1996), it is necessary to examine the significance of the calculated values of “z value” using “Sobel test” (Sobel, 1982). When the effect of mediation is tested through Sobel z, the results (Z = 3.067, p = .022) confirm the significant mediating effect of motivation in the study. Therefore, based on the empirical findings; we reject H1, while we partially accept the hypothesis H2 and accept H3.

**Conclusion**

It is acknowledged that work stress apparently causes employees to experience burnout in their workplace which can lead to negative consequences. Emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are the negative outcomes of stress that the employees cope with during performing their tasks. This study aims to reveal the interaction between job performance burnout, and the mediating effect of motivation of bank employees. Burnout is the focus of our research for several reasons. First, the negative effects of burnout on employees may involve substantial costs due to turnover, absenteeism, and reduced productivity. Second, an understanding of the role of burnout in the selling environment may help to guide management in reducing its harmful effects. Third, burnout has been found to be related to attitudes and behaviors that are also important in the selling environment. It is apparent that burnout has a significant negative impact on job performance. Similar to earlier researches that suggest unfavorable effects of burnout on performance, our empirical results indicated that motivation has a partial mediating effect on the relationship between bank employees’ job performance and burnout. We found that only depersonalization was negatively related to job performance within burnout dimensions.

The findings also showed that depersonalization is influential on job performance and burnout. The results of this study lead to a number of important managerial implications, since many of the variables are controllable by management. To encourage enhanced performance and other job outcomes managers must identify the ways to offset the effects of negative influences of burnout which will in the long term help to increase the motivation of employees. In this respect, efforts to measure employees’ burnout and other negative antecedents of stressors would be a valuable management tool that would diagnose this negative influence.
Limitations and Further Research

The study makes several contributions to the field of organizational behavior and the sector implications. First of all, empirical evidence regarding the relationships of the three components of burnout with employees’ job performance in the extant literature is limited. The study provides evidence in this regard. Second, empirical evidence pertaining to the relationships of mediators with burnout dimensions in the banking literature is considerably limited.

The findings of this study may prove useful to bank managers for business practices. When the burnout is considered, it can be observed that most of the relevant data have come from either cross-sectional studies or studies utilizing statistical causal models. This study, in this sense, aims to fulfill the gap in the given literature.

Despite the rationale of the study, it has some limitations. First limitation is that the study involves the mediating effect of general motivation. Nevertheless, the theory proposes that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can be internalized, as the acquisition and acceptance of new values or goals may lead people to become autonomously motivated to engage in behavior. In this respect, future research could involve also other burnout dimensions engaged with other job-related variables such as; organizational silence, whistleblowing and other constructs where burnout is also likely to be an important explanatory variable. Future studies should try to replicate the findings in more representative samples. Secondly, our participants were randomly selected from the sector, which in advance require the sample to be expanded. Therefore, more research is needed on job burnout in a range of settings among bank employees in order to establish the external validity of findings in this area. This would offer an additional insight into the role of burnout and further extend the generalizability of these findings to financial industry.
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