

A. Salman , A.L. Jimoh* , Y.A. Olawale 

University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

*e-mail: Jimoh.al@unilorin.edu.ng

JOB BURNOUT AND EMPLOYEE COMMITMENT

Received: November 7, 2024

1st Revision: November 11, 2024

Accepted: December 18, 2024

Abstract. Over the years, organizations have faced the challenge of employees' lack of commitment due to job burnout, which can often be exacerbated by excessive workload. This study aims to investigate the effects of burnout and employee workload on employee commitment. Using a survey research design, the study focused on a population of 130 employees from the Coca-Cola Bottling Company in Ilorin. A simple random sampling technique was employed, allowing every member of the population an equal chance of being included in the study. The sample size of 120 was determined using the Taro Yamane sample size formula. Data were collected through a questionnaire, and the study utilized inferential statistics, such as regression analysis, to test the hypotheses. Descriptive statistics, including frequency tables, were used to analyze the demographic data of the respondents. The findings indicate that employee commitment is negatively affected by both job burnout and workload. Consequently, the study concludes that addressing burnout alone may not necessarily enhance employee commitment, underscoring the need for a more comprehensive approach to employee well-being and organizational culture.

Key words: employee commitment, employee well-being, employee workload, job burnout, and organizational culture.

Introduction

Job burnout is considered one of the key elements influencing workers' commitment (Teo *et al.*, 2021). A significant issue that every employee has at some point in their working career is job burnout. In addition, burnout at work may also have ties to one's professional, familial, or educational lives, among other things. For parents, job burnout is related to their children's education; for students, it's about achieving high marks; for workers, it's about completing tasks on time and effectively, etc. One important element in ensuring productivity among working people is job burnout (Atouba, 2021). However, excessive burnout at work has a negative impact on one's social life, health, and effectiveness at work. According to Jimoh *et al.* (2018), some employees turn to unhealthy coping mechanisms like smoking, drinking, and taking unnecessary medications in order to deal with job burnout. They become ill and feeble as a result. It is believed that an imbalance between an individual's capabilities and the demands of their environment leads to work-related job burnout (Turek, 2020).

According to Turek (2020), occupational job burnout occurs when a person's abilities are not well matched with the demands and conditions of their job, making it difficult for them to handle the pressures of their line of work. Job burnout, according to Cox *et al.* (2022), is a tense state that people encounter when they are faced with exceptional opportunities, constraints, or demands. It is a physical and mental illness that has an impact on each worker's productivity, effectiveness, well-being, and caliber of work. A high percentage of work absences is typically the result of job burnout. Thus, a physical, mental, or emotional reaction to events that results in tension in the body or mind can be characterized as job burnout. It describes circumstances in which a person's inability to meet the demands of their surroundings negatively impacts their well-being (Dunmade *et al.*, 2023; Palenzuela *et al.*, 2019). Workplace commitment among employees is directly correlated with job burnout.

According to Schaufeli and Desart (2020), employee commitment is the sincerity and devotion with which a worker serves his or her company. Employee commitment will motivate him to work

toward the organization's improvement. Their level of performance can rise and their efficiency can increase with commitment. It strengthens the bond between the employer and the worker. It has been demonstrated that job burnout lowers this level of commitment because the employee grows weary of the excessive stress brought on by their work (Zeshan *et al.*, 2024).

According to Jimoh and Kadiri (2018), work environment experiences have an impact on employees' commitment levels and feelings of well-being. According to early research on burnout, even though workers may feel safe and involved in their work at first, burnout happens when unfavorable circumstances cause workers to become disengaged (Hobfoll *et al.*, 2018). A lack of communication between employers and employees can lead to job dissatisfaction, which in turn can cause burnout. Employees who experience burnout perform poorly and produce work that is of low quality, according to studies by Prusik and Szulawski (2019); Safari *et al.* (2020). According to Alam *et al.* (2019), there is still insufficient research on job burnout. More research on burnout at various organizational responsibility levels was suggested by (Prusik & Szulawski, 2019). In an empirical study, Fastje *et al.* (2023) discovered that role conflict, burnout, and role ambiguity are correlated among manufacturing workers. They concluded that more research is necessary to explore the relationships between these factors within an organization. In light of this, the study aims to ascertain how employee commitment is affected by job burnout at a Coca-Cola bottling facility in Ilorin, Kwara State.

Literature Review

Concept of Job Burnout

Because researchers, clinicians, staff, and administrators cannot agree upon anything regarding burnout, there is no perfect definition of it. Schaufeli (2021) posits that burnout is a mental illness that is prevalent worldwide, not exclusive to the human services sector, and is linked to detrimental outcomes for organizations (such as distress, depression, job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, job turnover, and subpar performance). According to Freudenberg, burnout is "the loss of incentive or motivation, particularly when one's commitment to a cause or relationship doesn't yield the expected outcomes."

In this field, Schaufeli and Desart's (2020) definition is the most practical and widely used definition. It highlights three key aspects of burnout:

emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment or professional efficacy, and cynicism. The job burnout dimension that has been studied the most is exhaustion, which is a sign of stress. It entails extreme emotional and physical tiredness that impairs the worker's capacity for productive work. Mental tension and a sense of frustration could be present along with this tiredness. When the worker believes that they are unable to continue providing the same level of service or fulfilling their obligations to the recipients as they did in the past.

Employee Workload

Employee workload, as defined by Jimoh (2022), is the total amount of work assigned to a worker in a given time frame, taking into account both the volume and complexity of tasks. While an insufficiently low workload may cause boredom and disengagement, an excessively high workload can cause stress, burnout, and decreased job satisfaction. On the other hand, when tasks are in line with an individual's abilities and capabilities, they are more likely to keep them motivated and productive, which can improve employee performance and job satisfaction. It is common for variables like role clarity, autonomy, and readily available support to act as mediators in the relationship between workload and employee well-being (Hafeez *et al.*, 2024; Kadiri *et al.*, 2017). According to Lee and Gong (2022), the Job Demand-Control (JDC) model highlights that employees' stress levels can rise and their health may suffer when they have high demands and little control over how their work is completed. According to Hafeez *et al.* (2024), the Workload Stress Model further posits that extended periods of high workloads lead to psychological and physical exhaustion, which in turn lowers overall job performance and raises absentee levels. Employers who make an investment in efficient workload management techniques will see improvements in both organizational performance and employee satisfaction.

The workplace nowadays can be described as being busier, more time-consuming, and more complex. According to Schaufeli and Desart (2020), one of the most hotly contested causes of burnout is the workload, which is also most strongly linked to the fatigue component of job burnout. Workload represents time and energy required for a task (Lee & Gong, 2022). In the most real-world scenario, the imbalance may result from the many obligations and demands (such as deadlines and goals) carried out with insufficient resources. Workers will become so overworked that they are unable to regain their energy

when this kind of overload is a recurring condition in the workplace. Additionally, an incompatibility between the type of work and the worker's skills may lead to an excessive workload (Zeshan *et al.*, 2024).

Concept of Employee Commitment

Employee commitment refers to the emotional and psychological attachment an employee has to their organization, its goals, and values, which drives their dedication and willingness to contribute to its success (Jimoh, 2023). Employee commitment demonstrates job competencies and autonomy, and it is strongly related to perceptions of service quality and job satisfaction. Employee commitment is one of the predictions for improved service performance. Employee commitment provides opportunities for employees to improve their skills and authorizes them to work in order for them to enjoy their jobs. Employee commitment is a human resource action that enables employees to provide effective services. Effective commitment allows employees to share information in order to evaluate customers, solve problems, and generate new ideas (Jimoh & Kadiri, 2018). When customer demand is met, the customer will assign a higher level of performance to the service. Employees who effectively participate in decision making are more likely to hear feedback in order to improve service performance. When senior management listens to and accepts personnel comments, it satisfies employees' self-actualization needs and provides incentives to work hard in order to meet customer expectations (Safari *et al.*, 2020).

Effective commitment implies that employees have some degree of job autonomy. When employees are empowered to perform independently and make key decisions without the approval of management, they have control over their work, which leads to job satisfaction. Furthermore, effective commitment at work allows employees to interact with others. They will enjoy this sense of compliance when staff offers are passed. This will result in increased job satisfaction (Isiaka *et al.*, 2017). Decision making pervades every aspect of management. The importance of decision making cannot, therefore, be overstated for any manager, regardless of his or her level in an organization. Employee commitment is also required in such managerial decisions. Employees must be able to exert upward control over management decisions, so it can be viewed as a sharing process. The added value of this present study is the fact that it lies in extending the understanding of the relationship between job burnout and employee commitment by focusing on underexplored context and employees.

Effect of Job Burnout on Employee Commitment

There are significant costs associated with job burnout for both the company and the employees. A number of negative organizational outcomes, such as absenteeism, poor work performance, high job turnover, and negative attitudes toward work, as well as a variety of health issues, such as headaches and cardiovascular problems, and mental health issues, such as depression and insomnia, demonstrate the significance of job burnout (Cordes & Dougherty, 2023; Safari *et al.*, 2020).

It is a critical area of study in organizational behavior, as burnout significantly affects an employee's emotional and psychological connection to their organization. Reduced organizational commitment is a result of job burnout, which is characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment (Safari *et al.*, 2020). Emotional exhaustion, a core component of burnout, occurs when employees feel overwhelmed and drained due to excessive job demands. As employees become emotionally fatigued, their commitment to the organization diminishes, which can lead to disengagement and detachment from organizational goals (Isiaka *et al.*, 2017). This detachment weakens their sense of loyalty and connection to the organization, thereby reducing their commitment.

Empirical research supports the negative relationship between job burnout and employee commitment. A study by Jimoh and Kadiri (2018) found that higher levels of burnout, particularly emotional exhaustion, were significantly associated with lower levels of affective commitment, which refers to an employee's emotional attachment to, and identification with, their organization. Additionally, depersonalization, where employees develop a cynical and detached attitude toward their work, further reduces their willingness to contribute meaningfully to organizational objectives (Jimoh *et al.*, 2018). This reduction in commitment not only leads to diminished job performance but also increases turnover intention, as employees no longer feel a sense of belonging or obligation toward the organization (Jimoh *et al.*, 2018).

Furthermore, organizations that fail to tackle job burnout may experience long-term consequences in employee commitment. Research has shown that interventions aimed at reducing burnout, such as providing adequate resources, fostering a supportive work environment, and promoting work-life balance, can enhance employees' commitment to the organization (Isiaka *et al.*, 2017). Such interventions

allow employees to feel more valued, thereby increasing their sense of belonging and attachment to the organization. Therefore, addressing the root causes of burnout is crucial for improving employee commitment and reducing turnover rates, which are key drivers of organizational success.

Effect of workload on employee commitment

It is a well-researched area in organizational behavior, with empirical evidence showing that the nature and intensity of workload significantly influence employee commitment levels. Employee commitment, often categorized into affective, continuance, and normative commitment, can be positively or negatively affected by workload depending on the balance between job demands and available resources (Hafeez *et al.*, 2024). Excessive workloads, characterized by the number of tasks, time pressure, and job complexity, often lead to physical and emotional strain, which can weaken employees' affective commitment, or their emotional attachment to the organization (Kong *et al.* 2021). On the other hand, moderate and well-managed workloads may positively contribute to employees' sense of purpose and accomplishment, thereby reinforcing their commitment to organizational goals (Palenzuela *et al.*, 2019).

When employees experience *excessive workload*, they are more likely to encounter stress and burnout, which undermines their emotional connection to their work and their organization. This phenomenon is explained by the *Job Demand-Control (JDC)* model, which posits that high job demands, such as excessive workload, lead to strain when employees have little control or support (Karasek, 1979). Empirical studies support this, with findings indicating that high workloads lead to job dissatisfaction, increased absenteeism, and a reduction in affective commitment (Schaufeli and Desart, 2020). As employees struggle to cope with excessive tasks and tight deadlines, their commitment declines, making them less likely to invest discretionary effort in their work, and more prone to turnover intention (Kong *et al.* 2021).

Conversely, when *workloads are moderate or appropriately managed*, employees often feel challenged but not overwhelmed, leading to greater job satisfaction and a stronger sense of commitment. Studies by Ilyas *et al.* (2023); Kadiri and Jimoh (2017); Zeshan *et al.* (2024) found that employees who had access to sufficient job resources, despite high workload, reported higher levels of organizational commitment and lower intentions to leave their jobs. This implies that workload, when

combined with adequate resources and support, can lead to positive outcomes for employee commitment. Furthermore, the *continuance commitment*, which refers to an employee's perceived cost of leaving the organization, can also be influenced by workload. Employees facing high workloads might remain committed due to a sense of obligation or fear of losing job-related benefits (Teo *et al.*, 2021). However, this form of commitment is often associated with lower job satisfaction and engagement. For example, a study by Jimoh *et al.* (2018) found that employees with high continuance commitment may feel trapped in their roles, especially when workload is overwhelming, leading to reduced morale and performance. While they may stay with the organization, their emotional and psychological commitment may wane over time.

Finally, *normative commitment*, which is based on a sense of obligation to the organization, can also be shaped by workload. Employees who perceive their organization as fair and supportive, even in the face of high workloads, are likely to feel a stronger moral duty to remain committed (Zeshan *et al.*, 2024). Studies show that when organizations provide the necessary support, such as work-life balance initiatives and stress management programs, employees are more likely to reciprocate with a stronger sense of loyalty and commitment. Therefore, while workload can negatively affect commitment, organizations that actively manage and support their employees' workload can mitigate these effects and foster a more committed workforce.

Underlying theory

Social Exchange Theory (SET)

The 1958 paper «Social Behavior as Exchange» by American sociologist George Homans is where social exchange theory first appeared. According to Haley (2018), Homans put forth a paradigm that combined behaviorism and fundamental economics. In the years that followed, additional research pushed the limits of Homans' central ideas. According to the social exchange theory, a cost-benefit analysis shapes the relationship between two individuals (Chou, 2016). That is to say, it is a measure of the amount of work an individual puts in during a one-on-one conversation.

Social exchanges are “voluntary activities,” according to Blau (1964), and they can be started by a company through employee management in the hopes that the employees will reciprocate later. The foundation of social exchange theory is the fairness principle (Blau, 1964; Gouldner, 1960). According to Coyle-Shapiro and Conway (2005), it is one of

the frequently utilized theoretical paradigms for examining organizational behavior. The theoretical basis for understanding organizational interactions is provided by this theory (Coyle & Conway, 2005). According to the social exchange theory, when employees receive opportunities and rewards, they behave in a committed manner. Employee commitment to work increases when organizations use motivational factors to manage their workforce, which in turn leads to better employee performance (Emam *et al.*, 2018).

According to Aldhuwaih (2013), in SET, employee performance is improved through encouragement activities carried out by the organization and the staff, which in turn leads to organizational commitment. According to the tenets of social exchange theory, people join an organization in the hopes that it will foster a respectable work environment and culture in which they can apply their knowledge and abilities to accomplish their goals. As a result, positive interactions between workers and the company improve worker performance (Ahmed *et al.*, 2018). According to Foa and Foa (2012), the rationality, reciprocity, and specificity of the social exchange theory are the three guiding principles that explain the interactions between an employee and their employer. Employers who can satisfy their basic needs and desires and offer enticing rewards will attract and retain employees, according to the first principle.

The reward provided may be insufficient, however, such exchange, on the other hand, is critical in the formation of trust, and commitment (Yigit, 2016; Molm *et al.*, 2000). According to the second principle, which is reciprocity, there is typically reciprocity in the interpersonal relationship between an employer and employee. The third principle, in conclusion, states that a relationship between an employee and their employer can only last so long as it is reciprocal (Cheung, 2000). For the employees, motivational benefits and increased participation in organizational decision-making activities would be a strategic focus which increases their performance in the organization. Although employee loyalty to the company may be rewarded with organizational commitment, this commitment has a significant effect on the organization's ability to increase profitability (Ahmed *et al.*, 2018; Pinho *et al.*, 2014). As a result, there is a connection between resource exchange and the relationship between workload and employee commitments and performance.

The study on organizational commitment and job burnout among Malaysian employees was

conducted by Marmaria *et al.* (2021). The findings of a prior study were verified and supported by this investigation. They demonstrated the higher stress levels experienced by individuals with higher levels of commitment to their organizations relative to those with lower levels of commitment. It was claimed that the only factor negatively correlated with job burnout is emotional commitment. Furthermore, among Turkish health care workers, Gemlik *et al.* (2022) ascertained the connection between organizational commitment and burnout. The study's findings supported the hypothesis that job burnout and organizational commitment are related. The primary research hypothesis, according to which organizational commitment can be predicted by job burnout, was validated.

Sultan *et al.* (2022) study looked at the connection between secondary school teachers in Mahabad City's organizational commitment and job burnout. The studies' findings demonstrated a significant inverse relationship between job burnout and the variables measuring emotional, continuous, and normative commitment. In order to look into the relationship between organizational culture and job burnout, Zamini *et al.* (2021) conducted a study on the relationship between organizational culture and job burnout. It was found that job burnout has a strong effect on organizational culture.

According to Bakker *et al.* (2020), situational and individual factors are the two main categories into which job burnout is typically divided. According to the findings, there will be less demands on workers' physical, psychological, and social well-being, as well as less job burnout, when an organization has adequate resources to support employee well-being. The second factor that contributes to job burnout is individual factors, which refers to personal challenges that employees may face due to health issues or family conflicts. In a study involving female employees in Nigerian banks, Balogun (2022) found that work-family conflict had a significant impact on all three components of job burnout, suggesting that work-family conflict negatively affects female employees' job burnout. Additionally, Ghorpade's (2022) research on the effect of job burnout on employees' organizational commitment in the public and private sectors revealed that excessive job tasks and demands, as well as perceived performance in both public and private sectors, are the primary causes of burnout and detachment from organizational commitment in private sector employees. This is followed by the intolerant behavior of executives and organizations.

Research Gap

The lack of knowledge regarding the intricate relationship between job burnout and organizational commitment represents a research gap. There is a lack of thorough investigation of how these dynamics differ across various cultural, occupational, and organizational settings, despite the fact that previous studies like Bakker et al. (2020), Marmaria et al. (2021), and Sultan et al. (2022) have established significant relationships between these variables, such as the inverse link between job burnout and emotional, continuous, and normative commitment, as well as the role of organizational culture, work-family conflict, and individual challenges. Furthermore, there is a knowledge gap regarding the wider applicability of these findings across sectors because previous research has primarily focused on particular industries, such as healthcare workers, teachers, and female banking employees. Furthermore, in many contexts, the impact of workload and organizational resources in reducing burnout and improving commitment are still poorly understood. Deeper insights into creating interventions that improve workload and organizational commitment while reducing job burnout are required to fill these gaps.

Research Questions

1. How does job burnout influence employee commitment?
2. To what extent employee workload affect employee commitment?

Methodology

The present study employed survey research method and this is justified because it follows a correlational research strategy and helps in predicting behavior (Bordens & Abbott, 2002). The population of the study was 130 employee of Coca-Cola bottling company Ilorin. Random sampling techniques was adopted, which makes it possible for all the employees to have equal opportunity of being selected as the representative sample. Additionally, given the nature of the study, the sample size was calculated using Taro Yamane formula which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2} \tag{1}$$

Where:

n = Sample size

N= Population size = 130

e = Margin error = 0.05 or 5%

N = Population size = 130

n = 120

$$n = \frac{120}{1+71(0.05)^2} \tag{2}$$

Therefore, the sample for the study stood at 120 employees of Coca-Cola bottling company Ilorin. Furthermore, the study used a questionnaire to elicit information from the respondents. The items for employee commitment, employee workload, and job burnout were adopted (Jimoh, 2023; Hafeez et al., 2024; Cordes & Dougherty, 2023). For the purpose of this study, the questionnaire that was used was structured from the concepts of this study. The questions were formulated based on the objectives of the study and were five (5) a point Likert scale. The study employed both descriptive and inferential statistics to analysis the collected data from the respondents. Descriptive statistics such as frequency table, mean, and standard deviation were used to calculate the demographic information of the respondents, while inferential such as single regression was used to analyze the formulated hypotheses.

Results and Interpretations

Hypothesis one

H01: There is no significant relationship between job burnout and employee commitment.

Table 1 – Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.211 ^a	.365	.360	.519

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey, 2024.
Predictor: (Constant), employee commitment.

A summary of the model is shown in Table 1. It demonstrates that the correlation coefficient R is.211, or r = 0.211, indicating a positive linear relationship between job burnout and employee commitment. The coefficient of determination, or R², is 0.365, or roughly 36%, as the result makes abundantly evident. This suggests that job burnout accounts for 36% of employee commitment, with variables outside the model accounting for the remaining 23%.

Table 2 – ANOVA^a

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	335.710	2	111.903	415.523	.024 ^b
	Residual	77.560	118	.269		
	Total	413.271	120			

a. Dependent Variable: employee commitment
 Predictors: (Constant), job burnout

The analysis of variance is displayed in the table. The F-statistic (415.523) is noteworthy because it exceeds the alpha level of 0.24 significance and the ANOVA significance of .024. Consequently, the null

hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected, indicating that there is no meaningful correlation between employee commitment and job burnout.

Table 3 – Coefficients^a

	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.425	.109		3.881	.024
	employee commitment	.036	.032	-.040	1.121	

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey, 2024
 a. Dependent Variable: job burnout

The result in the table above indicates that job burnout has no significant influence on employee commitment since p-value of 0.024 is derived. The result shows the Beta value of -.040 which implies that job burnout has no significant relationship with employee commitment.

Hypothesis two

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between workload and employee commitment.

Table 4 shows that the correlation coefficient R is .103 (i.e. $r = 0.103$ which indicates that there exists a weak linear relationship between employee workload and employee commitment. It is also crystal clear from the table that the R² which is the coefficient of determination is 0.215 approximately 21%. This implies that 21% of implementing employee workload and job burnout can be explained by employee commitment while the remaining 79% are variables that are not included in the model.

Table 4 – Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.103 ^a	.215	.212	.551

Source: Researcher’s Field Survey, 2024
 Predictor: (Constant), employee workload

Table 5 – ANOVA^a

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	159.302	2	53.101	174.601	.031 ^b
	Residual	87.588	118	.304		
	Total	246.890	120			

a. Dependent Variable: job burnout.
 Predictors: (Constant), employee commitment.

Table 5 presents ANOVA table. The F-statistic as shown from the table below is significant since the ANOVA significance of .031 is greater than the alpha

level of 0.05 significant. As a result of this the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternate hypothesis is rejected.

Table 6 – Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.845	.154	5.502	.031
	employee workload and job burnout	.572	.034	-6.71	

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2024

A. Dependent Variable: employee commitment

According to the results shown in the table, which derive a p-value of 0.000, employee commitment has a considerable impact on employee workload. "There is no significant relationship between organizational strategies, workload management, job burnout, and employee commitment at the Nigeria Bottling Company," is the null hypothesis that is accepted, while the alternative hypothesis is rejected, according to the beta value of -.671.

Discussion of findings

The first hypothesis of the study stated that there is no significant relationship between job burnout and employee commitment. After the analysis of the data the result from the finding revealed that there is no significant relationship between job burnout and employee commitment. This finding has already been established by (Barthauer *et al.*, 2019; Lubbadah 2020; Turek, 2020). This result suggests that burnout does not directly influence how committed employees feel toward their organization. This outcome indicate that other factors, such as organizational culture, leadership style, or individual coping mechanisms, play a more important role in shaping employee commitment than job burnout. Additionally, organizations with robust support systems, like employee assistance programs and flexible working arrangements, buffer the negative effects of burnout, allowing employees to remain committed despite experiencing exhaustion or stress.

Lastly, the second hypothesis formulated aims to test whether there is no significant relationship between workload, and employee commitment. The result equally showed that in the cola-cola bottling company in Ilorin the workload did not translate to employee commitment. The result indicates that

the amount of work assigned to employees does not directly affect their level of dedication or attachment to the organization. This suggests that factors such as the work environment, management support, or personal attitudes toward work play a more significant role in influencing commitment than the sheer volume of tasks. Additionally, employees perceive their workload as manageable or be motivated by non-workload-related factors, such as career growth opportunities, recognition, and organizational values. These as also been proven the study conducted by (Jimoh & Kadiri, 2018; Isiaka *et al.*, 2017; Turek, 2020).

The finding that there is no significant relationship between job burnout, workload, and employee commitment challenges established frameworks, such as the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model and the Job Demand-Control (JDC) model, which traditionally suggest that high job demands, like burnout and workload, directly affect employee attitudes and commitment. These results suggest that employee commitment is influenced by other variables, such as individual resilience, organizational culture, or personal values. This calls for further exploration of mediating or moderating factors that can buffer the effects of burnout and workload on commitment. Researchers might need to expand existing models by incorporating factors like emotional intelligence, job autonomy, or organizational justice to better explain employee behavior and commitment in the face of stressors.

From a practical perspective, the results suggest that organizations should not solely focus on reducing burnout and workload to boost employee commitment. Instead, they should also invest in other areas, such as enhancing job satisfaction, fostering a supportive work environment, and offering career

development opportunities, which may have a stronger impact on commitment. While addressing workload and burnout remains important for overall well-being, employers should recognize that employee commitment might be sustained through strategies like leadership development, recognition programs, and building a positive organizational culture. Therefore, human resource policies should emphasize a holistic approach to employee engagement, balancing workload management with initiatives that enhance intrinsic motivation and organizational loyalty.

Based on the findings from the study. Future studies should consider factors such as organizational culture, leadership style, and or individual coping mechanisms against employee commitment than job burnout since the result of the present study revealed that job burnout has no effect on the employee commitment. Equally, factors such as the work environment, management support, or personal attitudes toward work are seen as influencing factors for employee commitment than the sheer volume of tasks. As a result it is advisable for future researchers to look at the determinant factors of employee commitment as discovered from the study. Lastly, future studies should also look at it from the broader view than limiting their studies to a particular organization.

A key limitation of this study is its narrow focus on the relationship between job burnout and employee commitment, which revealed no significant effect of job burnout on commitment. This restricted scope may overlook other critical factors that influence employee commitment, such as organizational culture,

leadership style, work environment, management support, and individual coping mechanisms. Furthermore, the study was limited to a single organizational context, which restricts the generalizability of the findings to other industries or settings. Additionally, the study did not consider broader contextual or demographic variables, which could provide deeper insights into the dynamics of employee commitment. These limitations highlight the need for future research to explore a wider range of determinants and adopt a broader, more inclusive approach to enhance the applicability and relevance of findings.

Conclusions

The study's findings revealed that there is no significant relationship between job burnout and employee commitment, as demonstrated by previous studies. This suggests that while burnout can have negative effects on employee well-being, it does not directly impact their level of commitment to the organization. Instead, other factors such as organizational culture, leadership style, and personal coping strategies may play more influential roles in shaping commitment. The presence of strong support systems within the organization, such as employee assistance programs and flexible working conditions, can mitigate the negative impact of burnout, allowing employees to maintain their commitment even in challenging circumstances. Therefore, tackling burnout may not necessarily lead to improved commitment, highlighting the need for a more comprehensive approach to employee well-being and organizational culture.

References

- Atouba, Y. (2021). How does participation impact IT workers' organizational commitment? Examining the mediating roles of internal communication adequacy, burnout and job satisfaction, *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 42(4), pp. 580-592. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2020-0422>.
- Barthauer, L., Kaucher, P., Spurk, D., & Kau, S. (2019). Burnout and career (un) sustainability : Looking into the Blackbox of burnout triggered career turnover intentions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, July. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2019.103334>
- Baysal, C., Yangil, F. M., & Sevim, Ş. (2020). Analysis of the relationship between organizational commitment and counterproductive work behaviour on academicians. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 15(1), 143–157. <https://doi.org/10.5937/SJM15-18502>
- Demerouti, E., Veldhuis, W., Coombes, C., & Hunter, R. (2019). Burnout among pilots: psychosocial factors related to happiness and performance at simulator training. *Ergonomics*, 62(2), 233–245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2018.1464667>.
- Dunmade, E.O., Ajayi, M.A., & Jimoh, A.L. (2023). Globalization and Its Impact on Human Resource Management Practices in Pz Cussons Nigeria Plc., Lagos. *The Journal of Business Studies*. 7(1). https://www.fcm.esn.ac.lk/jbs/vol_07-1.html#.
- Hafeez, S., Memon, M.A., Mirza, M.Z., Raziq, M.M., Sarwar, N. and Ting, H. (2024). The dual impact of job variety on employee happiness and stress: the mediating role of employee engagement and burnout, *Journal of Management Development*, 43(2), pp. 170-186. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-03-2023-0084>.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of Resources in the Organizational Context : The Reality of Resources and Their Consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103–130. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104640>.

Jimoh, A.L. (2023). Moderating role of employee participation in organizational commitment and employee performance relationship in the Nigerian telecommunication company. *Bahria University Journal of Management and Technology (BJMT)*, 6(1) <https://www.bjmt.bahria.edu.pk/index.php/ojs/article/view/54>.

Jimoh, A.L. (2022). The influence of perceived organizational support on talent management and job performance. *Jurnal Aplikasi Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 8(3). Permalink/DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.8.3.738>.

Jimoh, A.L. and Kee, D.M.H. (2022). Talent management: the way out of poor task performance, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 54(4), pp. 623-636. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-03-2022-0016>.

Jimoh, A. L. & I. B. Kadiri (2018). Impact of staff welfare on job commitment in tuyil pharmaceutical company, Ilorin, Kwara State. *LASU Journal of Human Resource Management and Employment Relations*, 1(1). <https://lasuerhrmjournals.com.ng/volume-1-issue-1/>.

Ilyas, S., Abid, G. and Ashfaq, F. (2023). The impact of perceived organizational support on professional commitment: a moderation of burnout and mediation of well-being, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 43(7/8), pp. 710-726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-06-2022-0170>.

Isiaka S.B., Kadiri, I.B. & Jimoh, A.L. (2017). Effect of reward on organizational commitment: a case study of lagos state internal revenue service, Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 19(3). <http://www.jsd-africa.com>.

Kadiri, I.B., & Jimoh, A.L. (2017). Talent Management and Employee Engagement: A Study of Guaranty Trust Bank in Ilorin Metropolis. *Journal of Governance and Management Review*, 2(2). https://pu.edu.pk/home/journal/37/v2_2_17.html.

Kadiri, I.B., Isiaka S.B. & Jimoh, A.L. (2017). Relationship between Talent Management and Labour Turnover in Nigeria banking sector. *Journal of Humanities*, 2(2). *Kampala International University*. <https://www.ijhumas.com/ojs/index.php/kiuhums/issue/view/8>.

Lebrón, M., Tabak, F., Shkoler, O., & Rabenu, E. (2018). Counterproductive Work Behaviors toward Organization and Leader-Member Exchange: The Mediating Roles of Emotional Exhaustion and Work Engagement. *Organization Management Journal*, 15(4), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2018.1528857>

Lubbadeh, T. (2020). Job Burnout : A General Literature Review. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 10(3), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.32479/irmm.9398>.

Palenzuela, P., Delgado, N., & Rodríguez, J. A. (2019). Exploring the Relationship between Contextual Performance and Burnout in Healthcare Professionals. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(2), 115–121. <https://doi.org/10.5093/jwop2019a13>.

Prusik, M., & Szulawski, M. (2019). The Relationship Between the Dark Triad Personality Traits, Motivation at Work, and Burnout Among HR Recruitment Workers. *Front. Psychol*, 10(1290), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01290>.

Safari, A., Adelpannah, A., Soleimani, R., Heidari Aqagoli, P., Eidizadeh, R. and Salehzadeh, R. (2020). The effect of psychological empowerment on job burnout and competitive advantage: The mediating role of organizational commitment and creativity”, *Management Research*, 18(1), pp. 47-71. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRJIAM-06-2019-0935>.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Desart, S. (2020). Manual Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) – Version 2.0. (Issue July). 232. Schaufeli, W. B., Desart, S., & De Witte, H. (2020). Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)–Development, Validity, and Reliability. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 17(24), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17249495>.

Teo, S.T.T., Nguyen, D., Shafaei, A. and Bentley, T. (2021). High commitment HRM and burnout of frontline food service employees: a moderated mediation model, *Employee Relations*, 43(6), pp. 1342-1361. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-06-2020-0300>.

Turek, D. (2021). When does job burnout not hurt employee behaviours?, *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 8(1), pp. 59-79. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-04-2020-0055>.

Zeshan, M., Khatti, S.T., Afridi, F. and de La Villarmois, O. (2024). Control yourself or someone else will control you. Effect of job demands on employee burnout: a perspective from self-regulation theory, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 32(2), pp. 236-254. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-12-2022-3534>.

Information about Authors:

Salman Abdulrasaq – PhD, Associate professor, Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin (Ilorin, Nigeria, e-mail: Salman.az@unilorin.edu.ng)

Jimoh Adams Lukman (corresponding author) – PhD, Department of Industrial Relations and Personnel Management, University of Ilorin (Ilorin, Nigeria, e-mail: Jimoh.al@unilorin.edu.ng)

Olawale Yunusa Alabi – PhD, Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin (Ilorin, Nigeria, e-mail: olayinus4sure@yahoo.com)

Appendix

Section A: Demographics

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other (Specify: _____)

2. What is your age group?

- 18–25
- 26–35
- 36–45
- 46–55
- 56 and above

3. What is your employment level?
 - Entry-level
 - Mid-level
 - Senior-level
 - Executive-level
4. How long have you been with your current organization?
 - Less than 1 year
 - 1–3 years
 - 4–6 years
 - 7 years or more
5. What sector do you work in?
 - Public
 - Private
 - Non-profit

Section B: Burnout	SA	A	N	D	SD
I often feel emotionally drained from my work					
The behaviour of my immediate supervisor contributes to my stress?					
I frequently experience the following symptoms of burnout due to work-related stress?					
I feel supported by my organization in addressing work-related burnout					

Section C: Workload	SA	A	N	D	SD
The overall workload is fair					
I feel the workload is fairly distributed among our team					
My workload prevent me from achieving work-life balance					
My manager’s delegation style affect my workload					
I am often given an unrealistic deadlines					

Section D: Employee Commitment	SA	A	N	D	SD
I believe my immediate supervisor inspires my commitment to the organization					
I think about leaving my current organization					
My supervisor actions enhance my commitment to the organization					