Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Intercultural Communication Research

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rjic20

Organizational Commitment and Burnout During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comparative Analysis in the United States and New Zealand

Stephen M. Croucher, Kenneth Rocker, Ranjeeta Singh, Angela Feekery, Douglas Ashwell, Malcolm Green, Niki Murray & Kirsty Anderson

To cite this article: Stephen M. Croucher, Kenneth Rocker, Ranjeeta Singh, Angela Feekery, Douglas Ashwell, Malcolm Green, Niki Murray & Kirsty Anderson (17 Jun 2024): Organizational Commitment and Burnout During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comparative Analysis in the United States and New Zealand, Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, DOI: 10.1080/17475759.2024.2368471

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2024.2368471

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

Published online: 17 Jun 2024.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 11

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rjic20

JOURNAL OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2024.2368471

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Organizational Commitment and Burnout During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Comparative Analysis in the United States and New Zealand

Stephen M. Croucher, Kenneth Rocker, Ranjeeta Singh, Angela Feekery, Douglas Ashwell, Malcolm Green, Niki Murray and Kirsty Anderson

School of Communication, Journalism and Marketing, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

This study examined the link between organizational commitment (OC) and burnout during COVID-19 in New Zealand and the United States. Results revealed OC and burnout differed between the U.S. and New Zealand. In addition, the correlations between OC and the dimensions of burnout differed between the nations, particularly on issues linked with emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. These results point to the influence of lockdowns and other physical limitations on burnout and commitment in organizations. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed, as well as areas for future research.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 10 January 2024
Accepted 11 June 2024

KEYWORDS
Burnout; organizational commitment; cross-cultural; pandemic communication; Fisher's z

During the COVID-19 pandemic, many organizations shifted from face-to-face to online or hybrid operations. As the definition of work and organizational life shifted, so too did members' identification with and commitment to organizations (Mont et al., 2021).

In this period, members' organizational commitment and lower levels of burnout were positively associated with higher levels of organizational support and member satisfaction with organizational decision making (Trinidad, 2021). Nations and industries responded differently to the pandemic, with stricter to more relaxed approaches to crisis management. In addition, the pandemic affected nations and industries differently, with some having more economic, political, and health effects than others. Within the context of a crisis, it is normal for organizations to depend on their employees' commitment for managing and navigating through the troubling environment (Gifford et al., 2022). Thus, this study examines the link between organizational commitment and burnout during the pandemic in two nations whose governments responded to the pandemic differently: the United States and New Zealand. New Zealand took a centralized approach, whereas the U.S. was more decentralized, allowing individual states to adopt their own regulations and policies throughout the pandemic. We intend to observe the relationship between the approaches adopted by these nations and their ensuing impact on the dynamics connecting organizational commitment and burnout within the context of a global pandemic.

CONTACT Stephen M. Croucher s.croucher@massey.ac.nz

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

Burnout

The emergence and expansion of burnout has previously been connected with unfavourable circumstances such as pandemics, natural calamities, and traumatic incidents (Allan & Blustein, 2022; Chemali et al., 2019; Mahar & Day, 2022; D. Sharma et al., 2022). Burnout is a syndrome of psychological and emotional exhaustion involving a loss of connection with one's place of work (Leiter & Maslach, 2016). Individuals who have reached a state of burnout, have lost their dedication to work and have depleted their energetic resources. Maslach et al. (2001) defined burnout as including the three dimensions of exhaustion, cynicism, and feelings of inefficacy. Exhaustion is being physically and emotionally drained and unable to complete tasks/be motivated at work. Exhaustion leads to depersonalization which is negative feelings or significant detachment towards others, or a distant attitude towards the work environment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Cynicism is the detachment from the organization at large and organizational change (Salanova et al., 2005). Lack of professional efficacy is a decline in one's feelings of competence, achievements, or success at work. Burnout is a progressive loss of energy and enthusiasm (González-Romá et al., 2006).

Job demands are highly predictive of burnout as they require physical, emotional, and cognitive efforts (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Understanding the relationship between job demands and burnout in the context of differing nations during the COVID-19 pandemic provides insight on how the pandemic influenced areas beyond health-related concerns. The variability in job demands is reflective in the uniqueness demonstrated by each nation when considering factors such as governmental policies, the scale of virus distribution, and the management of social and medical support systems. Evaluating the association between job demands and burnout across different nations provides an opportunity for researchers to compare how diverse response strategies influenced workers' experiences. Job resources can prevent the development of cynicism and buffer the relationship between job demands and burnout (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007). Self-esteem, locus of control, positive affectivity, resilience, optimism, and self-efficacy are all negatively related to burnout (Trinidad, 2021). Burnout has negative effects on job attitude (Moore, 2000), work performance (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004), articulated dissent (Zeng & Chen, 2020; Zeng et al., 2020), and workplace safety (Ye et al., 2021), while increasing job turnover (Leiter & Maslach, 2016). Sangal et al. (2021) found effective leadership communication was associated with decreased work stress and burnout. Research has also shown heightened levels of burnout are linked with heightened role stress and diminished levels of organizational commitment, showing a disconnect with overall organizational culture and environment (Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Ul Hassan et al., 2023).

Organizational Commitment

There is considerable research on organizational commitment (OC) (see: Cohen, 2007; Madlock & Horan, 2009). Meyer and Allen (1991) defined OC as having three forms: affective, continuance, and normative. Affective OC is an emotional attachment members have towards an organization. Continuance OC is the intention to stay with an organization due to the balance of costs/benefits members perceive. Normative OC is the

obligation members feel to remain in the organization. This approach to OC has largely influenced OC conceptualizations (Meyer et al., 2002). Those who are committed to an organization are more bonded with it and its members. Researchers have shown higher levels of OC positively associated with job satisfaction (Wang, 2015), employees' well-being, performance, and organizational citizenship behaviours (Fu & Deshpande, 2014). Furthermore, higher levels of OC are associated with a reduction in negative productivity and depressive symptoms among workers who are involved in negative workplace relationships (Manata, 2022).

Researchers have linked OC and burnout in many organizational settings. DeRueda (2024) worked with teachers at a local school to design a self-leadership program to improve well-being after finding a positive relationship between normative and affective OC and burnout. In a university setting, Salehi and Gholtash (2011) found OC and burnout were negatively related. Burns et al. (2021) found lower professional fulfilment among Canadian physicians due to unprofessionalism and workplace culture led to higher burnout and lower OC. Sharma and Cooper (2016) found low levels of OC contributed to higher levels of burnout. Leiter and Maslach (1988) also found higher levels of burnout among nurses is linked with lower levels of OC. Overall, research shows in stressful situations (internal and external of the organization), the strength of the relationship between OC and burnout increases. Kalliath et al. (2000) in three samples of healthcare professionals also found the three factors of burnout were negatively related to OC.

Research Questions

Previous research has shown varying correlations between OC and burnout (Enginyurt et al., 2015; Goering et al., 2017; Lambert et al., 2012). These studies have been done in times in which society is not faced with a life changing event such as a pandemic. Here, we explore the extent to which OC and burnout were related during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a unique opportunity to study these correlations at an unprecedented time of stress, isolation, and uncertainty. National lockdowns for prolonged periods of time with mandated remote working from home have led to increased interpersonal isolation. This has been shown to result in feelings of isolation, increased stress, deteriorating physical and mental health and burnout (Meseguer de Pedro et al., 2021), increased emotional exhaustion (Meseguer de Pedro et al., 2021), inter-role conflict from balancing work-home life during remote working (Sokal et al., 2021), and feelings of increased disconnect due to working from home. This loss of connectedness also contributes to a decrease in OC (Sokal et al., 2021). Increased anxiety levels brought on by prolonged job uncertainty and pandemic conditions has been shown to lead to decreased OC in the intention to leave (Tohumcu & Tanriverdi, 2023).

In addition to remote working conditions brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic in relation to burnout and OC, our research compared these correlations between the U.S., and New Zealand. These nations were selected due to their differing approaches in responding to the pandemic. New Zealand had one, coherent, national response with a consistent media presence in updates, whilst the U.S had federal and state roll outs with a more fragmented approach compared to New Zealand. Political responses to COVID-19 affected individuals and organizations in

each country differently. The U.S. had a splintered response, with states responding independently. The U.S. national response, largely driven by a partisan agenda, disparaged experts in denial of the severity and reality of the pandemic's effect (Mazey & Richardson, 2020) and "promoted public division, scepticism and scorn, confusion, bewilderment and satire" (Hopper, 2020, p. 536). Numerous states imposed varied levels of lockdowns, masks were mandated in many states, and businesses closed their doors and went online for weeks to months (Croucher et al., 2022). During the pandemic, the unemployment rate in the U.S. increased to 13% in May 2020, many workers left the workforce, and due to the stress and uncertainty of lockdowns, many workers reported increased stress and burnout (Beheshti, 2022).

In New Zealand, a national lockdown was imposed in March 2020. The international border did not fully reopen again until July 2022. Most political parties rallied behind the Government to support communal safety measures (Croucher et al., 2022). The New Zealand government used empirical evidence to convey accurate and reliable information (Mazey & Richardson, 2020) in empathetic, unifying, "clear and unambiguous operational policy responses" (Hopper, 2020, p. 536). During the pandemic, unemployment remained low, falling to a record of 3.2% in December 2021 and 3.4% in December 2022 (Stats, 2023). The unemployment rates are partially attributed to government wage subsidies. With these subsidies, employers could apply for funds to pay salaries of employees if the business was adversely affected by the pandemic, particularly by border closures and loss of revenue (Graham, 2021). Even with wage subsidies, low unemployment, and a unified government response, New Zealand workers have reported high levels of turnover and burnout (Cropp, 2022).

Pre-existing levels of OC among individuals would have been affected by the multivariable approaches in government responses and support in each nation. This combined with increased mental strain from working at home in isolation may have resulted in increased psychological burdens leading to burnout in some individuals. Moreover, the two countries' governments differed in how they supported businesses, organizations, and individuals during the pandemic. Thus, the first research question explores possible differences in OC and burnout in the U.S. and New Zealand:

RQ1: To what extent do United States and New Zealand participants differ on organizational commitment and burnout?

The second research question explores the correlations between organizational commitment and burnout. Specifically, this research question answers calls in cross-cultural communication to statistically explore correlational relationships across national samples (Croucher & Kelly, 2019; Croucher et al., 2024; Ones et al., 2012) to better understand theoretical constructs. Specifically, researchers are increasingly calling for cross-cultural studies to avoid the assumption that constructs will statistically perform the same in all national contexts (Croucher & Kelly, 2019; Ones et al., 2012). Thus:

RQ2: To what extent is the relationship between organizational commitment and burnout different for United States and New Zealand participants?

Method

Participants and Procedures

In total, 849 people participated in this study ($n = 375$, U.S.; $n = 474$, New Zealand). Participants were asked their working status (full or part-time), number of years working with their current employer, size of their employer/organization, and if they worked at home during a COVID-19 lockdown (yes/no). See Table 1 for a breakdown of demographics by nation. Surveys were collected by Qualtrics between July-September 2022. Qualtrics provided a small financial incentive for participants to participate in the study. Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were conducted on both measures in each nation. Criteria set by Hu and Bentler (1999) were followed. If re-specification of a measure was required, item(s) removed in one nation were removed in the other nation to ensure equality of the measure between nations.

Instruments

Organizational commitment was measured using Porter and Smith's (1970) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). The OCQ contains 15 items, rated from 1 *strongly disagree* to 7 *strongly agree*. Sample items include: "I really care about the fate of this company" and "I feel very little loyalty to this organization." CFA with re-specification confirmed a valid uni-dimensional construct in the U.S.[1] and New Zealand.[2] Descriptive statistics, correlations, means and standard deviations for all measures are in Table 2.

Burnout was assessed using Maslach and Jackson's (1981) Burnout Inventory. The inventory includes three factors with 22 items. The items are rated from 0 *never* to 6 *everyday*. The three factors of burnout are: Emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization. Emotional exhaustion describes an individual's feelings of being exhausted by their work or feeling emotionally over-extended. Personal accomplishment describes an individual's feelings of successful achievements at work and feelings of competence. Depersonalization describes feelings of impersonal connection towards others in the organization and apathy towards the organization. The depersonalization factor (rather than cynicism) focused on the impact of social isolation imposed by lockdowns creating potential withdrawal from the emotions of work rather than withdrawal from the work itself (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). CFA with re-specification confirmed a valid factor structure in the U.S.[3] and New Zealand.[4]

Results

RQ1 asked the extent to which OC and burnout differed in the U.S. and New Zealand. To answer this question, a series of independent samples *t*-tests were conducted. For OC, U.S. participants ($M = 4.87$; $SD = 1.20$) scored higher on OC than New Zealand participants ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 1.14$), $t(847) = 3.00$, $p < .001$. For emotional exhaustion, there was no significant difference between U.S. ($M = 2.55$, $SD = 1.57$) and New Zealand participants ($M = 2.48$, $SD = 1.36$), $t(742.90) = .76$, $p = .22$. For personal accomplishment, U.S. participants ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.05$) scored higher on personal accomplishment than New Zealand participants ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .90$), $t(738.22) = 2.43$, $p < .001$. For

Table 1. Participant demographics by nation.

Variable	*n*	*M*	*SD*
New Zealand			
Sex			
Male	212 (44.7%)		
Female	262 (55.3%)		
Working Status			
Full-Time	341 (71.9%)		
Part-Time	133 (28.1%)		
Industry			
Primary	7 (1.5%)		
Secondary	70 (14.8%)		
Tertiary	361 (76.2%)		
Quaternary	34 (7.2%)		
Quinary	2 (.4%)		
Race			
White/Pakeha	311 (65.6%)		
Māori	82 (17.3%)		
Pacific Islander	36 (7.6%)		
Asian	30 (6.3%)		
Indian/Pakistani	15 (3.2%)		
Political Affiliation			
National	196 (41.4%)		
Labour	188 (39.7%)		
Green	41 (8.6%)		
Māori	27 (5.7%)		
Other Party	22 (4.6%)		
Age		43.21	14.38
Years with Current Employer		7.04	7.35
Organizational Size (# of Employees)		535.96	1072.80
Work went into Lockdown			
Yes	363 (76.6%)		
No	111 (23.4%)		
United States			
Sex			
Male	185 (49.3%)		
Female	190 (50.7%)		
Working Status			
Full-Time	271 (72.3%)		
Part-Time	104 (27.7%)		
[5]Industry			
Primary	2 (.5%)		
Secondary	43 (11.5%)		
Tertiary	296 (78.9%)		
Quaternary	21 (5.6%)		
Quinary	12 (3.2%)		
Race			
White	277 (73.9%)		
African-American	43 (11.5%)		
Mixed	31 (8.3%)		
Asian-American	13 (3.5%)		
Other and Hispanic	11 (2.9%)		
Political Affiliation			
Democrat	142 (37.9%)		
Republican	122 (32.5%)		
Independent	111 (29.6%)		
Age		45.13	17.06
Years with Current Employer		10.06	10.26
Organizational Size (# of Employees)		1637.64	5517.94
Work went into Lockdown			
Yes	254 (67.7%)		
No	121 (32.3%)		

Table 2. Measurement descriptive statistics.

Variable	Range	*M*	*SD*	Skew	Kurtosis	α	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	*z*
Combined Sample											
(1) Organizational Commitment	1–7	4.73	1.17	−.57	.08		-				
(2) Emotional Exhaustion	0–6	2.51	1.46	.15	−.74		−.31**	-			
(3) Depersonalization	0–6	4.16	1.18	−.65	.39		.66**	−.32**	-		
(4) Pers. Accomplishment	0–6	3.99	.97	−.21	−.14		.40**	−.30**	.43**	-	
New Zealand											
(1) Organizational Commitment	1.11–6.89	4.62	1.14	−.54	−.01	.90	-				
(2) Emotional Exhaustion	0–6	2.48	1.36	.15	−.66	.77	−.41**	-			
(3) Depersonalization	0–6	4.17	1.12	−.70	.59	.85	.68**	−.41**	-		
(4) Pers. Accomplishment	1.5–6	3.92	.90	−.14	−.22	.70	.32**	−.37**	.33**	-	
United States											
(1) Organizational Commitment	1–7	4.87	1.20	−.65	.24	.89	-				
(2) Emotional Exhaustion	0–6	2.55	1.57	.13	−.87	.85	−.22**	-			
(3) Depersonalization	0–6	4.14	1.26	−.59	.16	.89	.65**	−.22**	-		
(4) Pers. Accomplishment	0–6	3.99	.97	−.21	−.14	.70	.47**	−.25**	.53**	-	

Variables	New Zealand	United States	*z*
Fisher's *z* Difference Test			
Organizational Commitment and Emotional Exhaustion	.4356	.2237	6.16**
Organizational Commitment and Depersonalization	.8291	.7753	1.56
Organizational Commitment and Pers. Accomplishment	.3316	.5101	5.19**
Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization	.4356	.2237	6.16**
Emotional Exhaustion and Pers. Accomplishment	.3884	.2554	3.87**
Depersonalization and Pers. Accomplishment	.3428	.5901	7.19**

**$p < .01$.
**$p < .01$.

depersonalization, there was no significant difference between U.S. ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.26$) and New Zealand participants ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.12$), $t(742.90) = -.39$, $p = .35$.

Post-hoc analyses were also conducted exploring the effects on burnout and organizational commitment of race, political affiliation, and if a participant went into lockdown. Race, political affiliation, and if a participant went into lockdown or not did not have a significant effect on burnout or organizational commitment. RQ2 asked the extent to which the relationship between OC and burnout differed between U.S. and New Zealand participants. Table 2 presents the correlations between burnout and OC, as well as Fisher's difference test between correlations (z). Five of the Fisher's z comparisons were significant. U.S. and New Zealand participants differed on all relationships except for the link between OC and depersonalization.

Discussion

Previous studies have shown the dimensions of OC and burnout do not all correlate inversely (Enginyurt et al., 2015), with emotional exhaustion, one of the dimensions of burnout (Enginyurt et al., 2015), showing the greatest contribution towards burnout and

its relation to OC. Previous studies have been carried out during non-crisis times. This study examined the relationship between OC and burnout during lockdown, at a time of significant deviation from "normal" work conditions, high general chronic uncertainty, high levels of anxiety and feelings of isolation from mandatory remote working, and a lack of engagement from workplace relationships (Tohumcu & Tanriverdi, 2023). This unique climate allowed us to conduct research comparing two national approaches during the COVID-19 pandemic, to compare not only the correlation between OC and burnout at an unprecedented time globally, but also allowing for cultural comparisons. The results for both nations indicated OC is inversely related to the burnout dimension of emotional exhaustion but positively related to the burnout dimensions of depersonalization and personal accomplishment. In both nations, our samples dealt with a similar mix of males and females, where the average was White, tertiary in industry (white-collar), and aged around the middle 40s. The number of employees in organizations reported in the U.S. on average was over three times greater in size than reported in the New Zealand sample. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development [CIPD] (2022) reported larger organizations may have higher burnout rates nevertheless, results in our study show only slight differences in burnout factors between both samples.

The correlations between OC and the subdimensions of burnout differed between the nations, particularly on issues linked with emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. The approach taken by New Zealand gained global acknowledgement for its efficacy in communication transparency and quantity, and urgent and comprehensive control mechanisms. However, this achievement came with the trade-off of being considered one of the most stringent nations in terms of its response (Hale et al., 2021). Haar and O'Kane (2022) reported health-related concerns and changing and challenging work practices for workers in New Zealand during the pandemic caused higher levels of burnout. Cho et al. (2019) found information overload in communication caused increased emotional burnout through increased emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. The psychological impact caused from extensive information, extended lockdowns, awareness of rising global mortality rates, economic impacts, and uncertainty on restriction lifting in New Zealand could be a likely basis for the difference in emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment between the two observed nations. In the U.S. these psychological impact factors might have been muted somewhat by apparent attempts to minimize the seriousness of the virus and the potential severity of its impact.

The higher scores from the New Zealand sample compared to the U.S. for all other correlations that included the emotional exhaustion variable may be due to the single, coherent, and coordinated approach with daily open communications in New Zealand leading to higher uncertainty and emotional distress, cumulatively contributing to higher rates of burnout compared to the diverse and fragmented approach across the varying states in the U.S. It may have been the transparency provided by the New Zealand government instilling a different level of fear in New Zealanders in contrast to the U.S. sample who likely had mixed emotions about the lockdown parameters. The mix of emotions in the U.S. sample could stem from various inconsistences including ambiguity in work from home orders, fragmented dissemination of information pertaining to the virus from various levels of government, and the influence of partisan agendas, all of which affected every state differently. Whereas the physical barriers of enforced

remote and hybrid working, lack of consistency in working protocols, and fragmented contact with work colleagues, among other factors, may have contributed to the higher levels of emotional exhaustion and diminishing OC found in New Zealand as the data illustrates. The removal of physical barriers earlier in the U.S., as workers were allowed back to their place of work, would likely result in resumed levels of OC like prior to the lockdowns. However, the prolonged and multifactorial contributors to emotional exhaustion with the lengthiest lockdown, and working in isolation, imposed on New Zealand would take significantly longer to recover from than in the U.S. These findings are in line with existing literature showing emotional exhaustion contributed the most towards the explanatory capacity of the burnout subdimensions of OC (Enginyurt et al., 2015). A consequence of workplace burnout is diminished commitment to the organization and increased intention towards turnover (Jung & Kim, 2012).

During the pandemic, many workers were forced to work from home resulting in a disruption to their day-to-day interpersonal communication with their colleagues. As Rani et al. (2009) note, the loss of interpersonal support networks can lead to burnout and job dissatisfaction. While some may have enjoyed working at home other workers, despite having high levels of OC, may have found the experience socially isolating thereby leading to depersonalization. Furthermore, interpersonal communication in the workplace often gives individuals the opportunity to share and celebrate their achievements and generates a sense of community. It also gives opportunities for workers to receive work-related feedback (Rani et al., 2009). Working from home may have severely limited these opportunities and this may be the reason for the unexpected positive relationship between OC and feelings of lack of self-efficacy.

The findings of this study enhance our understanding of the effect on burnout of the COVID-19 pandemic and national responses to it. The pandemic created a shared encounter with challenges to organizational commitment experienced differently according to political and governmental responses to the crisis. Participants' experiences of four explanatory factors of burnout in a crisis under two different national responses give insights into possible reasons for differences and similarities to inform future organizational strategies under governmental responses to widespread international and national crises. Particularly interesting is the strong relationship between OC and the factors of depersonalization, personal accomplishment, and emotional exhaustion, and a similarly strong relationship between emotional exhaustion and the factors of depersonalization and personal accomplishment. These results indicate the importance of proactive organizational strategies to enhance organizational commitment and ameliorate emotional exhaustion in response to governmental crisis response measures to reduce the potential effect of burnout.

Given extraversion has been linked to people high on this trait seeking interaction with others (Kroencke et al., 2023), future research may examine how extraversion and introversion interact with OC. Furthermore, from a practical point of view, in times of crisis where employees are obliged to work from home, a pandemic or natural disaster, employers may wish to create ways for employees to maintain their sense of interpersonal contact between themselves, their fellow workers, and immediate supervisors. Moreover, as many organizations in 2024 are working to bring workers back to the office, re-create workplace communities cut-off during the pandemic, and exploring more flexible working arrangements (Yvas, 2022), future work should explore the links between extraversion, interaction, workplace communication, burnout, and OC.

Limitations and Conclusion

There are several limitations in the study. First, the sample for this study is not a purely random sample. Qualtrics, like other data collection firms has been shown to be a reliable data collection method (Croucher et al., 2020). However, the data does rely on pools of participants Qualtrics can reach. Second, respondents were only asked if they had been subject to a lockdown or not, Therefore, the possible effects of lockdown length were not considered. However, subsequent analyses illustrated whether a person was in lockdown had no significant effect on organizational commitment or burnout. Third, differences in organizational size between New Zealand and the U.S. may have been a factor in the different rates of burnout between the two nations and this is an area for future research. Fourth, another possible limitation is the use of the Social Sciences version of Maslach Burnout Inventory which measures depersonalization and emotional burnout rather than cynicism, as measured by the General Use Maslach Burnout Inventory. Examination of cynicism is therefore an area for future research. Fifth, the data were collected after the peak of the pandemic at one point in time. Furthermore, data for the levels of burnout and organizational commitment existing in New Zealand and the U.S. existing before this point in time are unavailable for comparison. The final limitation to this study is a potential violation of homogeneity. The New Zealand response to COVID-19 was unified, while the U.S. response was highly variable across states. Thus, comparing a highly unified response of one country against a country with 50 diverse responses could have created a high amount of variance within the data. However, following on the work of previous cross-cultural researchers (Croucher & Kelly, 2019; Ones et al., 2012), we sought to compare the national responses of two nations. Future research could compare two nations more comparable in population size to reduce this risk.

Despite these limitations, this study contributes to our understanding of the links between OC and burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic. It gives insights into the impact on same phenomena (organizational commitment and burnout) of different, externally imposed catalysts (diverse pandemic control methods) in politically and culturally diverse contexts (US and New Zealand). This research is significant in that it helps us better understand how individuals within workplaces responded to the pandemic and suggests foci for organizational strategies to reduce potential burnout in an international or national crisis.

Notes

1. United States - $\chi2(27) = 82.52$, $p < .0001$; SRMR = .09, GFI = .96, CFI = .97, RMSEA = .07; deleted items = 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, and 15.
2. New Zealand - $\chi2(27) = 74.25$, $p < .0001$; SRMR = .06, GFI = .97, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .06; deleted items = 1, 3, 9, 11, 12, and 15.
3. United States - $\chi2(51) = 97.33$, $p < .0001$; SRMR = .10, GFI = .96, CFI = .98, RMSEA = .05; deleted items = 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.
4. New Zealand - $\chi2(51) = 201.37$, $p < .0001$; SRMR = .10, GFI = .93, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .08; deleted items = 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.
5. Primary industries – Agriculture, horticulture, forestry.
   Secondary industries – manufacturing
   Tertiary industries – Retail sector and service industry
   Quaternary industries- Research and Development, education, and knowledge production
   Quinary industries – Public healthcare, government services

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The work was supported by the Massey Business School.

References

Allan, B. A., & Blustein, D. L. (2022). Precarious work and workplace dignity during COVID-19: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *136*, 103739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103739

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Beheshti, N. (2022, January 22). *New Gallup workplace report says employee stress is at an all-time high*. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/nazbeheshti/2022/06/22/new-gallup-workplace-report-says-employee-stress-is-at-an-all-time-high/?sh=254f010b2335

Burns, K. E. A., Pattani, R., Lorens, E., Straus, S. E., Hawker, G. A., & Hutchinson, G. (2021). The impact of organizational culture on professional fulfillment and burnout in an academic department of medicine. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(6), e0252778. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252778

Chemali, Z., Ezzeddine, F. L., Gelaye, B., Dossett, M. L., Salameh, J., Bizri, M., Dubale, B., & Fricchione, G. (2019). Burnout among healthcare providers in the complex environment of the Middle East: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, *19*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7713-1

Cho, J., Lee, H. E., & Kim, H. (2019). Effects of communication-oriented overload in mobile instant messaging on role stressors, burnout, and turnover intention in the workplace. *International Journal of Communication*, *13*, 1743–1763. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/9290/2623

Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (2022). *Health and wellbeing at work 2022*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. https://www.cipd.org/globalassets/media/comms/news/ahealth-wellbeing-work-report-2022_tcm18-108440.pdf

Cohen, A. (2007). Commitment before and after: An evaluation and reconceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, *17*(3), 336–354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2007.05.001

Cropp, A. (2022, April 3). *Worker burnout has tripled during COVID-19 pandemic, and key staff might be hard to replace*. Stuff. https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/128191663/worker-burnout-has-tripled-during-covid19-pandemic-and-key-staff-might-be-hard-to-replace

Croucher, S. M., & Kelly, S. (2019). Measurement in intercultural and cross-cultural communication. In E. E. Graham & J. P. Mazer (Eds.), *Communication research measures III: A sourcebook* (pp. 141–159). Routledge.

Croucher, S. M., Murray, N., Ashwell, D., Cullinane, J., & Nguyen, T. (2022). Predicting vaccine confidence: Patient self-advocacy and fear of COVID-19 in the United States. *Southern Communication Journal*, *87*(4), 348–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2022.2099569

Croucher, S. M., Nguyen, T., & Rahmani, D. (2020). Prejudice toward Asian-Americans in the Covid-19 pandemic: The effects of social media use in the United States. *Frontiers in Health Communication*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2020.00039

Croucher, S. M., Yotes, T., Ashwell, D., & Condon, S. M. (2024). A comparison of the relationship between extraversion and argumentativeness in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New

Zealand. *Communication Research Reports*, *41*(2), 82–93. https://doi.org/10.10180/08824096.2024.2327548

DeRueda, M. (2024). Organizational commitment and teacher burnout assessment: Inputs to self-leadership enhancement program development. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *19*(4), 506–523. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11094393

Enginyurt, O., Cankaya, S., Aksay, K., Tunc, T., Koc, B., Bas, O., & Ozer, E. (2015). Relationship between organisational commitment and burnout syndrome: A canonical correlation approach. *Australian Health Review*, *40*(2), 181–187. https://doi.org/10.1071/AH14177

Fu, W., & Deshpande, S. P. (2014). The impact of caring climate, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment on job performance of employees in a Chinese insurance company. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *124*(2), 339–349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1876-y

Gifford, R. E., van de Baan, F. C., Westra, D., Ruwaard, D., Zijlstra, F. R., Poesen, L. T., & Fleuren, B. P. (2022). There and back again. Examining the development of employee commitment during a prolonged crisis. *SSM-Qualitative Research in Health*, *2*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmqr.2022.100053

Goering, D. D., Shimazu, A., Zhou, F., Wada, T., & Sakai, R. (2017). Not if, but how they differ: A meta-analytic test of the nomological networks of burnout and engagement. *Burnout Research*, *4*, 21–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2017.05.003

González-Romá, V., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: Independent factors or opposite poles? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *68*(1), 165–174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2005.01.003

Graham, J. (2021, September 23). *Wage subsidy was essential to save jobs during lockdowns*. Stuff. https://www.stuff.co.nz/opinion/126386197/wage-subsidy-was-essential-to-save-jobs-during-lockdowns

Haar, J., & O'Kane, C. (2022). A post-lockdown study of burnout risk amongst New Zealand essential workers. *Social Science & Medicine*, *306*, 115157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.115157

Halbesleben, J. R., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Burnout in organizational life. *Journal of Management*, *30*(6), 859–879. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.004

Hale, T., Angrist, N., Goldszmidt, R., Kira, B., Petherick, A., Phillips, T., Webster, S., Cameron-Blake, E., Hallas, L., Majumdar, S., & Tatlow, H. (2021). A global panel database of pandemic policies (oxford COVID-19 government response tracker). *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(4), 529–538. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01079-8

Hopper, T. (2020). Swimming in a sea of uncertainty – business, governance and the coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. *Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change*, *16*(4), 533–539. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-07-2020-0091

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Jung, J., & Kim, Y. (2012). Causes of newspaper firm employee burnout in Korea and its impact on organizational commitment and turnover intention. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *23*(17), 3636–3651. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.654806

Kalliath, T. J., O'Driscoll, M. P., Gillespie, D. F., & Blueborn, A. C. (2000). A test of the maslach burnout inventory in three samples of health care professionals. *Work & Stress*, *14*(1), 35–50. https://doi.org/10.1080/026783700417212

Kroencke, L., Humberg, S., Breil, S., Geukes, K., Zoppolat, G., Balzarini, R. N., Alonso-Ferres, M., Slatcher, R. B., & Back, M. D. (2023). Extraversion, social interactions, and well-being during the COVID-19 pandemic: Did extraverts really suffer more than introverts? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *125*(3), 649–679. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000468

Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2012). Hanging on too long: The relationship between different forms of organizational commitment and emotional burnout among correctional staff. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(1), 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9159-1

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *9*(4), 297–308. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030090402

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2016). Latent burnout profiles: A new approach to understanding the burnout experience. *Burnout Research*, *3*(4), 89–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.burn.2016.09.001

Madlock, P. E., & Horan, S. M. (2009). Predicted outcome value of organizational commitment. *Communication Research Reports*, *26*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824090802637023

Mahar, C., & Day, A. (2022). 3 Job burnout: The epidemic within a pandemic. In M. P. Leiter & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Burnout while working: Lessons from pandemic and beyond* (pp. 38–67). Routledge.

Manata, B. (2022 online first). Relational balance in the workplace: Exploring the moderating role of organizational commitment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences Elsevier BV*, *37*(3), 572–598. https://doi.org/10.1177/08933189221137579

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *2*(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry: Official Journal of the World Psychiatric Association*, *15*(2), 103–111. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20311

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Reviews of Psychology*, *52*(1), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Mazey, S., & Richardson, J. (2020). Lesson-drawing from New Zealand and covid-19: The need for anticipatory policy making. *The Political Quarterly*, *91*(3), 561–570. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12893

Meseguer de Pedro, M., Fernández-Valera, M. M., García-Izquierdo, M., & Soler Sánchez, M. I. (2021). Burnout, psychological capital and health during COVID-19 social isolation: A longitudinal analysis. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(3), 1064. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031064

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). *Commitment in the workplace*. Sage.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(1), 20–52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Mont, O., Curtis, S. K., & Palgan, Y. V. (2021). Organisational response strategies to COVID-19 in the sharing economy. *Sustainable Production and Consumption*, *28*(1), 52–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2021.03.025

Moore, J. E. (2000). Why is this happening? A causal attribution approach to work exhaustion consequences. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*(2), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.2307/259017

Ones, D. S., Dilchert, S., Deller, J., Albrecht, A.-G., Duehr, E. E., & Paulus, F. M. (2012). Cross-cultural generalization: Using meta-analysis to test hypotheses about cultural variability. In A. M. Ryan, F. T. L. Leong, & F. L. Oswald (Eds.), *Conducting multinational research: Applying organizational psychology in the workplace* (pp. 91–122). American Psychological Association.

Porter, L. W., & Smith, F. J. (1970). *The etiology of organizational commitment* [Unpublished manuscript]. University of California Irvine.

Rani, P. T., Bentley, T., & Gian, C. (2009). The effects of burn-out and supervisory social support on the relationship between work-family conflict and intention to leave: A study of Australian cancer workers. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, *23*(1), 53–69. https://doi.org/10.1108/14777260910942551

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Garcia-Renedo, M., Burriel, R., Breso, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2005). Towards a four-dimensional model of burnout: A multigroup factor-analytic study including depersonalization and cynicism. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *65*(5), 807–819. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405275662

Salehi, M., & Gholtash, A. (2011). The relationship between job satisfaction, job burnout and organizational commitment with the organizational citizenship behavior among members of

faculty in the Islamic Azad University –first district branches, in order to provide the appropriate model. *Procedia - Social & Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 306–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.091

Sangal, R. B., Bray, A., Reid, E., Ulrich, A., Liebhardt, B., Venkatesh, A. K., & King, M. (2021). Leadership communication, stress, and burnout among frontline emergency department staff amid the COVID-19 pandemic: A mixed methods approach. *Healthcare*, *9*(4), 100577. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hjdsi.2021.100577

Sharma, D., Ghosh, K., Mishra, M., & Anand, S. (2022). You stay home, but we can't: Invisible 'dirty' work as calling amid COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *132*, 103667. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2021.103667

Sharma, R. R., & Cooper, S. C. (2016). Contribution of individual and organizational factors in burnout. In R. Sharma & S. Cooper (Eds.), *Executive burnout – eastern and western concepts, models, and approaches for mitigation* (pp. 17–62). Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.

Sokal, L., Trudel, L. E., & Babb, J. (2021). I've had it! Factors associated with burnout and low organizational commitment in Canadian teachers during the second wave of the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, *2*, 100023. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100023

Stats, N. Z. (2023, February 1). *Labour market statistics: December 2022 quarter*. https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/labour-market-statistics-december-2022-quarter/

Tohumcu, K., & Tanriverdi, D. (2023). The predictive effect of anxiety and burnout levels related to the COVID-19 pandemic and organizational commitment on their intention to leave the organization of the healthcare professionals. *European Journal of Therapeutics*, *29*(2), 208–220. https://doi.org/10.58600/eurjther.20232902-1597.y

Trinidad, J. E. (2021). Teacher satisfaction and burnout during COVID-19: What organizational factors help? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.2006795

Ul Hassan, F. S., Karim, W., Shah, H. A., & Khan, N. U. (2023). Role stress and organizational commitment in the service industry: A moderated mediation model of job burnout and transformational leadership. *Journal of Management Development*, *42*(3), 165–182. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-10-2021-0292

Wang, Y. (2015). Examining organizational citizenship behavior of Japanese employees: A multidimensional analysis of the relationship to organizational commitment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *26*(4), 425–555. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.560882

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands-resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *14*(2), 121–141. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121

Ye, L., Liu, S., Chu, F., Zhang, Q., & Guo, M. (2021). Effects of personality on job burnout and safety performance of high speed rail drivers in China: The mediator of organizational identification. *Journal of Transportation Safety & Security*, *13*(7), 695–713. https://doi.org/10.1080/19439962.2019.1667931

Yvas, L. (2022). "New normal" at work in a post-COVID world: Work-life balance and labor markets. *Policy and Society*, *41*(1), 155–167. https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puab011

Zeng, C., & Chen, H. (2020). An exploration of the relationships between organizational dissent, employee burnout, and work-family balance: A cross-cultural comparison between China and Finland. *Communication Studies*, *71*(4), 633–648. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2020.1749864

Zeng, C., Permyakova, T. M., Smolianina, E. A., & Morozova, I. S. (2020). Exploring the relationship between employee burnout, organizational dissent and work-family culture in Russian organizations. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *49*(2), 119–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2020.1719430