



HOW INDIVIDUALS' PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL MEDIATE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BIG FIVE PERSONALITY TRAITS AND BURNOUT*

Ayşe GÖKÇEN KAPUSUZ *
Mustafa Fedai ÇAVUŞ **

Abstract

People who are working together with others at a same workplace generally demonstrate different characteristics and each of them have different personality traits. These dissimilarities such as expectations, roles, work environment, organizational system, social life, and so on positively or negatively affect individuals' behaviors.

This study examined personality traits in relation to burnout under the effects of psychological capital with a sample of 416 randomly selected Turkish workers who are actively working in different public organizations in Turkey.

This research has a significant place in aiming to light the way of future researches. Results can be discussed in terms of different implications for future comparative analyses and researches. There are various studies separately focused on personality, burnout, and psychological capital but non of them have discussed yet this trio relationship in relevant literature.

Keywords: Personality Traits, Burnout, Psychological Capital, Dimensions, Mediating Effects.

1. INTRODUCTION

Work life and environment also are two of the main factors that are important to create and improve personality traits (Pelit, Türkmen, & Yarmacı, 2010, 3). Personality traits are the definitions of individuals among others and according to others (Sarıtaş, 1997, 5).

Burnout is expressed as a lack of energy, lack of motivation, negative attitudes and behaviors, and retreating oneself from others by Maslach and her co-workers in 2001.

The focal point of psychological capital is the positive side of human life, defined as hope, creativity, courage, wisdom, responsibility, and so on. It is hoped that if these mentioned positive human properties are understood well, positive psychology will provide and form a basis for a wonderful world. Walumbwa, Luthans, Avey, and Oke (2011, 5) highlighted that psychological capital provide additive values and emotions to people, leading to a feeling of citizenship in an organization or society.

In this study, the relationship between "personality" which expresses the typical collectivity of physiological and mental traits of people in terms of psychology and "burnout" which is described as a loss of personal energy and power has been examined under the effects of "psychological capital" which is a term focuses on the positive sides of personality in terms of individual and organizational to be able to analyze the mediating effects of psychological capital and to answer the question that psychological capital is an intervening variable between purposed relationship or not.

1.1. The Big Five Contents

Personality refers to the continuous personal features that differentiate people from others and help them to understand different situations and act in an allowable manner. Big Five Model is generally considered the most comprehensive and accepted framework, particularly used for applied research. The five dimensions (Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Neuroticism/Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience) were derived from statistical analysis done for years and considered stable and applicable across situations and cultures (Mayfield, Perdue, & Wooten, 2008).

Extraversion refers the people who are "friendly, energetic, cheerful, and thrill-seeker" (Yelboğa, 2006, p.199), talkative, sociable (Gençöz & Öncül, 2012, 198). Extravert people are optimistic and like talking and being outside with people with full of energy and cheer. On the other hand, introverts tend to lose their

* This paper is produced from a doctoral dissertation.

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Selçuk University, Beyşehir Ali Akkanat Faculty of Tourism, Department of Tourism Management (Corresponding author)

*** Prof. Dr., Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Management and Information Systems



motivation and energy. These people choose to be alone and spend more time with themselves. "Extraverts experience more positive emotions than do introverts" (Robbins & Judge, 2009, 18).

Conscientiousness is related to be organized, determined, success-oriented, ambitious, etc. (Yelboğa, 2006, 6). Conscientious individuals are "habitually careful, reliable, ... well-organized, and purposeful" (Storm & Rothmann, 2003, 38), tidy, cautious, and hard working in general and their behaviours are generally planned rather than spontaneous.

Agreeableness is usually used to determine friendly, helpful, understanding, and sensitive people. As Yelboğa (2006, 5) noted that these individuals are devoted, modest, and warm to others while getting in touch. These trusting and social people also are in a good faith and tolerant as Gençöz, et al., (2012, 197) emphasized.

One of the other traits of Big Five, Openness or Openness to Experience, refers behavioral adjectives such as creative, analytical, open to other experiences and ideas. People who are open to experience are creative, skilful, brave, easygoing, self-confident, and so on (Gençöz, et al., 2012, 200).

Neuroticism or Emotional (in)Stability is used to describe the degree of emotional instability, moodiness, anxiety, irritability, and sadness (McCrae & Costa, 1987, 89; Madnawat & Mehta, 2010, 325). Those individuals who are emotionally stable are confident, poised, patient, tolerant to the stress (Yelboğa, 2006, 2). But neurotic people are usually defined as angry, impatient, quick-tempered, worried, resentful, and nervous (Gençöz, et al., 2012, 204) but they are not shy (McCrae, 2000, 22).

1.2. Burnout and Burnout Dimensions

Freudenberger expressed the term "burnout" as an emotional depletion, loss of motivation and enthusiasm not only in a work place, but also in social life (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2008, 208). Burnout can be defined as a process of progressing stress and a source of losing idealism, energy, and goals (Iacovides, Fountoulakis, Kaprinis, & Kaprinis, 2003, 211). Maslach and Jackson described, represented, and concentrated on three dimensions of burnout in 1981.

Emotional exhaustion is defined as a first finding of burnout and refers to the sensual weariness from the work (Kutanis & Tunç, 2010, 62). This subscale represents the feelings of being "emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, 101). In other respects, Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter, (2001, 402) emphasize that emotional exhaustion may cause to the second step of burnout named as "depersonalization".

Depersonalization is a second dimension of burnout and generally used to determine being distanced, cynic, cold, unemotional behaviors. According to Maslach, et al. (2001, 398), the step of depersonalization or being distanced is an attempt to protect individual against burnout and frustration. Because, burnout is an ongoing and ever-growing process.

As Kutanis, et al., (2010, 61) emphasized that low personal accomplishment results from high personal expectations about career, work, workplace, and also society. But years later, people see that all expectations will not be able to come true and hopelessness begins.

1.3. Psychological Capital

Psychological capital can be defined as a complement of personal and organizational features which can be developed and directed (Luthans, 2002, 58). According to Page and Donohue (2004, 23), positive experiences advance one's personal capacity to act effectively, achieve high performance levels, and realize their full potential.

Developable psychological capital involves management of the positive psychology constructs of self-efficacy/confidence (Bandura, 1997, 2; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998, 587; Luthans & Youssef, 2004, 147), hope (Snyder, Irving, & Anderson, 1991, 358; Luthans, et al., 2004, 157), optimism (Luthans, et al., 2004, 157), and resiliency (Masten & Reed, 2002, 78; Luthans, et al., 2004, 157). These four components exhibit a "motivational propensity" (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010, 48) to successfully complete the goals.

People who are self-confident know how to improve their motivation. They choose challenging tasks to extend their performance and motivate themselves against the obstacles faced while working toward accomplishing goals. Self-efficacy is related to the personal beliefs about abilities (Polatçı, 2014, 121).

Rick Snyder's large scaled concept-building study and research in 2000 identified the three fundamental concepts and dimensions of hope such as agency, pathways, and goals. Goals are the main desires to be attained. In light of this information, optimism as distinct from hope is defined as an "explanatory style" (Luthans, et al., 2004, 153) to expect good and positive results.



Optimists enjoy bringing good things out of adversity while pessimists more readily give up or get depressed in the face of adverse circumstances (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001, 203; Carver & Scheier, 2003, 3). Carver and Scheier (2002, 231) emphasized that optimists are able to vary their approach to “problems and challenges”; and differ in “manner and success” to deal with adversity.

Research from Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, and Combs (2006, 388) supports that psychological resiliency is a coping skill used in cases of uncertainty, negative situations, and obstacles; and according to Çetin and Basım (2011, 82) it contains in itself the other three components (hope, self-efficacy, and optimism).

2. METHOD AND MATERIALS

The purpose of this research focuses on measuring the effects of psychological capital upon the relationship between personality traits and burnout.

2.1. Instruments - Participants and Procedures

Based on the purpose of this research, three different Turkish translation scales have been used together into one single questionnaire form with Likert-type response scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Personality has been measured by the Big Five Personality Traits Inventory generated by Lewis Goldberg in 1981 with the 50-item questionnaire that includes 10 items for each traits.

Burnout has been measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) which was created and developed by Maslach and Jackson in 1981 to measure hypothesized cases related to burnout, and consists of 22 items (9 for emotional exhaustion, 5 for depersonalization, and 8 for low/reduced personal accomplishment).

24-item Psychological Capital scale created by Luthans and his coworkers has also been used in this research and each dimension of psychological capital has the same number (6) of statements.

Besides, five control variables as demographic information (gender, age, marital status, monthly income, educational background, and working area) have been asked in questionnaire form as well. 420 of 500 returned questionnaire data have been reviewed and 416 of them were added to the analyses which include 42% females, 58% males, and 72% married (n=301) participants.

2.2. Limits of The Research

People who share the same culture look like each other in respect to similar personality traits and perceptions. This can cause to participate in survey with similar thoughts and feelings.

Besides culture and cultural values, people working in the same public organizations are a part of these limits of the research. They might have influenced each other while filling in the questionnaire at the same offices.

In addition to these, some individuals showed the lack of participation and did not want to complete survey because of the length of questionnaire form.

This study was also limited to another constraint such as individual consideration-oriented scales. It is thought that people choose the way to demonstrate themselves better than life in an individual consideration and this affects the analysis results.

Despite all limitations, remarkable findings have been generated and suggestions for the future researches have been made.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Reliability Analysis

Regarding to the used scales, overall reliability coefficient has been found as 0.933 and cronbach's alpha for personality traits scale has been found as 0.926, it has been calculated for burnout scale as 0.876, and 0.969 for psychological capital scale. All these values are suitable in terms of the reliabilities.

3.2. Correlation Analysis

Based on the correlation analysis of this research, Pearson correlation values showed that personality dimensions are positively related to psychological capital dimensions in general while negatively related to burnout dimensions. Negative and high-level relation (-0.740 at the $p < 0.01$ level) between agreeableness and depersonalization represents that agreeable individuals do not easily depersonalize themselves from others around them.

Negative poor relations at the $p < 0.01$ level are demonstrated between neuroticism and all four dimensions of psychological capital (-0,399; -0,376; -0,288; -0,397) as well. That means that if neuroticism



increases among individuals, their positive attitudes and thoughts will decrease. This can cause to stress and depression and people cannot also develop healthy relations with each other.

Highest-level positive relationship (0.864 at the $p < 0.01$ level) is found between conscientiousness and self-efficacy and this can be interpreted as conscientious individuals believe in their own power and abilities to complete different tasks and reach their desired goals.

Positive and high-level/strong relationship between openness to experience and self-efficacy, hope, resiliency (0,832; 0,809; 0,788 at the $p < 0.01$ significance level); between conscientiousness and self-efficacy, hope, optimism, resiliency (0,864; 0,861; 0,753; 0,861 at the $p < 0.01$ significance level); between agreeableness and all four dimensions of psychological capital (0,805; 0,806; 0,736; and 0,797 again at the $p < 0.01$ level) indicate linear increases among variables.

On the other hand, there are high-level and positive associations between openness to experience and conscientiousness (0.810, $p < 0.01$) and agreeableness (0.749, $p < 0.01$). Thereto, conscientiousness is in a positive and high-level relationship with agreeableness (0.827) at a 0.01 significance level as well.

3.3. Regression Analysis

In this research, regression analyses with different dependent variables/dimensions have been used to be able to answer the research question of "How does psychological capital affect/mediate the relationship between personality traits and burnout?".

3.3.1. Personality Traits - Burnout

Consistent with earlier researches, five personality traits has been tested with each dimensions of burnout. The F value is 56.044 and sign. 0.000 and reflects the significant regression model. Adjusted R^2 is 0.399 which means that 39.9% of the changes in emotional exhaustion (dependent variable) are explained by personality traits (independent variable). Standardized coefficients (beta) show that neuroticism has the highest and positive and significant influence on emotional exhaustion with 0.387 ($p < 0.000$). Right after, openness to experience follows with 0.318 (31%) positive and significant influence at the 0.000 significance level. Other dimensions of personality traits such as conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness negatively and significantly affect emotional exhaustion and these values (-0.202, -0.141, and -0.370) represent the inverse relationship among variables.

As a second regression model personality traits and other dimension of burnout named as depersonalization have been used. Accordingly, F value has been found as 122.303 and significant. Adjusted R^2 is 0.594. Agreeableness and neuroticism have significant influences on depersonalization. The value of 0.234 (sign. 0.000) represents a positive and significant relationship between neuroticism and depersonalization and -0.668 shows an inverse and high-level effect of agreeableness on depersonalization. On the other hand, openness to experience also has a positive effect on depersonalization but it statistically is insignificant.

According to the third regression analysis results table of personality traits and low personal accomplishment below, F is 0.620 (sig. 0.685) and this model is not significant ($p > 0.05$). So, significant relationship between five personality traits and reduced personal accomplishment could not be found.

3.3.2. Personality Traits - Psychological Capital

F value between self-efficacy and five personality traits has been found as 392.152 and model is significant (sign.000; $p < 0.01$). Personality traits are able to clarify 82.5% of self-efficacy. All five dimensions of personality traits have significant influences on self-efficacy. First four traits except neuroticism represent positive and significant influences on self-efficacy and -0.111 shows an inverse effect of neuroticism on self-efficacy. This means that the higher scores on neuroticism, the less is self-efficacy. Positively, conscientiousness is the most effective personality trait on self-efficacy with 0.413 ($p < 0.01$), while extraversion is the less effective one with 0.092 ($p < 0.05$).

Second regression analysis has been done between hope and five personality traits and F value is 343.441 and model is significant (sign.000; $p < 0.01$). Adjusted R^2 is 0.805. All dimensions of personality traits except neuroticism are positively and significantly effective on self-efficacy. Neuroticism also has a significant influence on hope but it is an inverse/negative effect (-0.094; sign. 0.000; $p < 0.01$). Again, conscientiousness is the most effective and significant variable on hope with 0.439 ($p < 0.01$), while extraversion is the less effective and (liminal) significant one with 0.088 ($p = 0.05$).

On the other hand, F value between personality traits and optimism is 135.866 and the regression model is significant ($p < 0.01$), and 61.9% of dependent variable (optimism) is clarified by independent variables. Conscientiousness has the highest and positive and significant influence on optimism with 0.365 ($p < 0.01$). Right after, agreeableness follows with 0.300 (30%) positive and significant influence at the 0.000



significance level. Neuroticism has an inverse effect on optimism but it is insignificant (-0.039; sign. 0.233; $p > 0.05$). On the other hand, there is a positive relationship (0.064) between openness to experience and optimism but this also is an insignificant relationship at the 0.261 significance level ($p > 0.05$).

As examined the relationship between personality traits and resiliency, 321,524 (sign.0.000) represents the F value and significant model. 79.4% of resiliency is explained by personality traits. 0.504 is the indicator of positive, significant, and highest relationship between conscientiousness and resiliency ($p < 0.01$). Extraversion is insignificantly ($p > 0.05$) related to resiliency and neuroticism has an inverse (-0.135) and significant (sign.0.000; $p < 0.01$) relationship with resiliency.

3.3.3. Psychological Capital - Burnout

First of all, emotional burnout has been used as a dependent variable to be able to test the relationship with psychological capital dimensions. Significant model is seen with 43.539 F value and adjusted R^2 is 0.291. Most of the relationships are negative and self-efficacy is the unique one which has a positive but insignificant relationship with emotional burnout.

Secondly, if depersonalization is taken as a dependent variable, $F=95.943$, sign. 0.000, and adjusted $R^2=0.478$ have been found. There are negative/inverse relationships between all four dimensions of psychological capital and depersonalization and two components of psychological capital (hope and resiliency) demonstrate insignificant relationship with depersonalization.

Another significant regression model (sign.0.026) is seen between four psychological capital dimensions and low/reduced personal accomplishment as well. Self-efficacy and resiliency are in negative relations with low personal accomplishment and hope and optimism are in positive relations. But, insignificant relationships with low personal accomplishment are coming from self-efficacy, optimism, and resiliency.

All these results based on the regression analyses can be seen below:

Table 1. Regression analyses results

Models	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Beta	Sig.
1	Pers_OpToExp	Burn_EmoExha	,318	,000
	Pers_Cons		-,202	,011
	Pers_Extravers		-,141	,010
	Pers_Agree		-,370	,000
	Pers_Neuro		,387	,000
2	Pers_OpToExp	Burn_Depers	,087	,139
	Pers_Cons		-,086	,186
	Pers_Extravers		-,009	,848
	Pers_Agree		-,668	,000
	Pers_Neuro		,234	,000
3	Pers_OpToExp	PsyCap_SelfEffic	,260	,000
	Pers_Cons		,413	,000
	Pers_Extravers		,092	,002
	Pers_Agree		,183	,000
	Pers_Neuro		-,111	,000
4	Pers_OpToExp	PsyCap_Hope	,204	,000
	Pers_Cons		,439	,000
	Pers_Extravers		,088	,005
	Pers_Agree		,212	,000
	Pers_Neuro		-,094	,000
5	Pers_OpToExp	PsyCap_Optim	,064	,261
	Pers_Cons		,365	,000
	Pers_Extravers		,122	,005
	Pers_Agree		,300	,000
	Pers_Neuro		-,039	,233
6	Pers_OpToExp	PsyCap_Resili	,159	,000
	Pers_Cons		,504	,000
	Pers_Extravers		,028	,384
	Pers_Agree		,209	,000
	Pers_Neuro		-,135	,000
7	PsyCap_SelfEffic	Burn_EmoExha	,013	,925
	PsyCap_Hope		-,241	,076
	PsyCap_Optim		-,156	,048
	PsyCap_Resili		-,186	,191
8	PsyCap_SelfEffic	Burn_Depers	-,375	,002



	PsyCap_Hope		-,127	,274
	PsyCap_Optim		-,175	,010
	PsyCap_Resili		-,051	,677
9	PsyCap_SelfEffic	Burn_PersAccomp	-,201	,219
	PsyCap_Hope		,485	,002
	PsyCap_Optim		,024	,798
	PsyCap_Resili		-,244	,144

3.4. The Mediation Test

The Mediation Test was also used in this study to test the mediator role of psychological capital upon the relationship between personality traits and burnout. As seen on the table below, the relationship between emotional exhaustion as a dependent variable and personality traits dimensions in conjunction with psychological capital dimensions were analyzed. When examined the table below, $F=36.171$ and model is significant. 43.3% of the changes of dependent variable (emotional exhaustion) are examined by independent variables.

On the other hand, two dimensions of personality traits (conscientiousness and extraversion) and two dimensions of psychological capital (self-efficacy and resiliency) have no significant effects on emotional exhaustion. Openness to experience has the strongest, positive, and significant effect (0.391) on emotional burnout. Other independent variable which also has a positive and significant influence on emotional burnout is neuroticism with 0.348.

When previous regression analyses tables examined again, the effects of agreeableness and neuroticism on emotional exhaustion reduced from -0.370 to -0.257 for agreeableness and from 0.387 to 0.348 for neuroticism and can be seen on the following table below.

On the other hand, significant (0.011) relationship between conscientiousness and emotional exhaustion has been insignificant (0.990). Likewise, the relationship between extraversion and emotional exhaustion has also been insignificant from 0.010 to 0.074.

Based on this, it can be said that psychological capital is not an intervening variable in relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion, and emotional exhaustion. Relationships have just been insignificant instead of reducing or disappearing.

Interpretation about the mediator effect between openness to experience and emotional exhaustion could not be mentioned. Because the effect of openness to experience on emotional exhaustion increased from 0.318 to 0.391 when previous results compared. As mentioned before, there should be a reduced or removed effect to be able to test the mediator effect. By the way, partial mediator effect of psychological capital can be mentioned between agreeableness, neuroticism, and emotional exhaustion based on the reduced values.

Table 2. The mediator effect of psychological capital in relationship between personality traits and emotional exhaustion Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2,992	,268		11,149	,000
PsyCap_SelfEffic	-,005	,110	-,006	-,046	,964
PsyCap_Hope	-,241	,117	-,256	-2,064	,040
PsyCap_Optim	-,154	,073	-,151	-2,098	,037
PsyCap_Resili	-,056	,119	-,061	-,466	,641
Pers_OpToExp	,396	,074	,391	5,322	,000
Pers_Cons	,000	,071	-,001	-,012	,990
Pers_Extravers	-,129	,072	-,097	-1,789	,074
Pers_Agree	-,224	,063	-,257	-3,556	,000
Pers_Neuro	,414	,050	,348	8,294	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Burn_EmoExha

As a second mediation test, the relationship between depersonalization as a dependent variable and personality traits dimensions in conjunction with psychological capital dimensions were analyzed. F value is 71.070 and regression model is significant. And 60.3% of dependent variable is examined by independent



variables. Two dimensions of personality traits (conscientiousness and extraversion) and three dimensions of psychological capital (hope, optimism, and resiliency) have no significant effects on depersonalization. Neuroticism has the strongest, positive, and significant effect (0.213) on depersonalization. Openness to experience follows neuroticism with a positive and significant effect on depersonalization (0.147; sign. 0.018). In addition, agreeableness has a negative and significant influence on depersonalization.

On the other hand, beta coefficient of openness to experience on depersonalization increased from 0.087 to 0.147 and became significant when psychological capital dimensions attached to personality traits.

Again, interpretation about the mediator effect between openness to experience and depersonalization could not be mentioned because of the increasing values. The effects of agreeableness and neuroticism reduced when tables are compared. Beta coefficient between agreeableness and depersonalization reduced from -0.668 to -0.607 and the value between neuroticism and depersonalization also reduced from 0.234 to 0.213.

As a result, partial mediator effect of psychological capital can be mentioned in a relationship between agreeableness, neuroticism, and depersonalization. Psychological capital is not an intervening variable in a relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion, and depersonalization. Because the relationship between these variables demonstrated insignificant increase.

Table 3. The mediator effect of psychological capital in relationship between personality traits and depersonalization Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	4,082	,251		16,238	,000
PsyCap_SelfEffic	-,217	,103	-,236	-2,103	,036
PsyCap_Hope	-,021	,109	-,020	-,196	,845
PsyCap_Optim	-,118	,069	-,104	-1,717	,087
PsyCap_Resili	,080	,112	,079	,720	,472
Pers_OpToExp	,166	,070	,147	2,382	,018
Pers_Cons	,017	,066	,019	,252	,802
Pers_Extravers	,037	,067	,025	,555	,580
Pers_Agree	-,594	,059	-,607	-10,046	,000
Pers_Neuro	,283	,047	,213	6,058	,000

a. Dependent Variable: Burn_Depers

There is not a significant relationship between the dimensions of personality traits and reduced personal accomplishment. Because, the model is insignificant (sign. 0.087). The previous effects of openness to experience and agreeableness are insignificantly reduced from 0.04 to -0.029 and from 0.092 to 0.049. In this case, it is not possible to mention about the mediator effect of psychological capital in a relationship between personality traits and low personal accomplishment because of the insignificant model.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Mutual interactions of work life and personality of member of organizations play a big and significant role to shape the organizational behavior (Pelit, et al., 2010, 5). Pennings, Kyungmook, and Witteloostuijin (1998) noted that the features of human capital mostly influence organizational behavior and performance; by the way, it is important to pull customers in an organization and create customer loyalty.

According to Maslach and Zimbardo (1982, 3), burned-out people face a chronic tiredness, feel strange from the work and feel that he or she is incapable with his/her job. As Ashforth, Saks, and Lee (1997, 5) emphasized that the slope of this decrease is determined by people, jobs, organizations, and also national culture. In addition to these, the sense of leadership of managers can be thought as an effective variable on burnout.

Magennis and Smith (2005, 8) noted that self-efficacy and optimism are the important factors to protect people against burnout. This means that these two psychological capital dimensions should be in a negative relationship with burnout. Our research findings distinctly discovered the positive relationship between optimism and low personal accomplishment in addition to the positive relationship between self-efficacy and emotional exhaustion.



Especially, based on the analyses and results, it is seen that most of the burnout dimensions were negatively influenced by personality traits and the same burnout variables also were negatively and mostly effected by four Psychological capital components as well and most of these four components are positively influenced by five dimensions of personality traits.

According to the previous work about the relationship between psychological capital and burnout, Salanova (2004, 1049) noted that positive perceptions of self-efficacy decreases job burnout. Results presented that self-efficacy is in a positive relationship with emotional exhaustion while in a negative relationship with other two dimensions of burnout.

Maslach, et al., (2001, 403) said that emotional burnout is positively related to neuroticism and our results verified this hypothesis. On the other hand, Madnawat, et al., (2010, 325) noted that neuroticism and emotional exhaustion are in a positive relationship and our findings verified this statement as well. Burke, Matthiesen, and Pallasen (2006, 468) emphasized the negative relationship between extraversion and burnout. Based on our expectations, it has been found that extraversion is negatively related to all dimensions of burnout. Zellars, Perrewe, and Hochwarter (2000, 1582) also emphasized the positive association between openness to experiences and reduced personal accomplishment and this statement has also been verified by our research results.

Besides all, Therasa and Vijayabanu (2014, 148) mentioned about the positive relationship between extraversion and psychological capital. Based on our research results, extraversion is positively associated with all dimensions of psychological capital.

All in all, individuals should know and be aware of their personality traits to be able to make a right choice and right decision, improve personal relationships, and be in harmony with the environment around themselves. As Çavuş (2006, 25) noted that personal evaluations and perceptions are generally depending on workers' personalities and managers should take into consideration the personality traits of employees under the light of psychological capital factors.

The implications of this present study might be possible to use for different researches in the future. Future research is recommended to test the theory regarding the Organizational Citizenship Behavior besides Personality Traits by including other mediator factors such as culture, leadership and so on. The relationship between personality traits and mobbing can be analyzed under the effects of culture. Because, some different personal and psychological qualities and structures can be learned from different cultures and personality traits of these cultures.

Moreover, different researches with the same variables can be done with employees in the private sectors as well. In addition to all, the effects of recruitment methods upon the relationship between burnout and perceptions of blue-collar workers can be considered as another important topic which deserves mention in the future researches.

REFERENCES

- Ashforth, B. E., Saks, A. M., & Lee, R. T. (1997). On The Dimensionality Of Jones' (1986) Measures of Organizational Socialization Tactics. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 5(4), 200-214. DOI: 10.1111/1468-2389.00061.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *New York: Freeman*.
- Burke, R. J., Matthiesen, S. B. & Pallasen, S. (2006). Workaholism, Organizational Life and Well-Being of Norwegian Nursing Staff. *Career Development International*, 11(5), 463-477.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. S. (2002). *Optimism*. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, (pp. 231-243).
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. (2003). *Optimism*. In S. J. Lopez, & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive Psychological Assessment. A Handbook of Models and Measures*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Çavuş, M. F. (2006). *İşletmelerde Personel Güçlendirme Uygulamalarının Örgütsel Yaratıcılık ve Yenilikçiliğe Etkileri Üzerine İmalat Sanayiinde Bir Uygulama*. Doctoral dissertation. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Anabilim Dalı, Konya.
- Çetin, F., & Basım, N. (2011). Psikolojik Dayanıklılığın İş Tatmini ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Tutumlarındaki Rolü. *"İş, Güç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 13(3), 79-94.
- Gençöz, T., & Öncül, O. (2012). Examination of Personality Characteristics in a Turkish Sample via Five Factor Model of Personality: Development of Basic Personality Traits Inventory. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 139(3), 194-216.
- Iacovides, A., Fountoulakis, K. N., Kaprinis, St., & Kaprinis, G. (2003). The Relationship Between Job Stress, Burnout, and Clinical Depression. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 75, 209-221.
- Kutunis, R. O., Tunç, T. (2010). Kişilik ve Örgütsel Yaşam: Tükenmişlik Sendromu Yönünden Bir Değerlendirme. *"İş Güç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 12(2), 59-74.
- Luthans, F. (2002). Positive Organizational Behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 57-72.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M. (2004). Human, Social, And Now Positive Psychological Capital Management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(2), 143-160.
- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Norman, S. M., & Combs, G. M. (2006). Psychological Capital Development: Toward a micro-intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 27, 387-393.



- Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., & Peterson, S. J. (2010). The Development and Resulting Performance Impact of Positive Psychological Capital. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21(1).
- Madnawat, A. V. S., Mehta, P. (2010). Personality as a Predictor of Burnout Among Managers of Manufacturing Industries. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 38(2), 321-328.
- Magennis, R., Smith, D. B. (2005). All Used Up: Factors associated with burnout among Missouri Social Service workers. *Missouri Electronic Journal of Sociology*.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E. (1981). The Measurement of Experienced Burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., Zimbardo, P. G. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.
- Masten, A., Reed, M. J. (2002). Resilience in Development. (R. Snyder & S. Lopez, Eds.). *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 72-82.
- Mayfield, C., Perdue, G. & Wooten, K. (2008). Investment Management and Personality Type. *Financial Services Review*, 17, 219-236.
- McCrae R. R., Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality Across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.
- McCrae, R. R. (2000). Trait Psychology and the Revival of Personality and Culture Studies. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 44(1), 10-31.
- Page, L. F., Donohue, R. (2004). Positive Psychological Capital: A preliminary exploration of the construct. *Monash University Business and Economics, Department of Management Working Paper Series*, 51(4).
- Pelit, E., Türkmen, F., & Yarmacı, N. (2010). Turizm Sektöründeki İşgörenlerin Kişilik Özelliklerini Değerlendirmeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(1), ISSN: 1309-8012.
- Pennings, J. M., Kyungmook, L., & Witteloostuijn, A. (1998). Human Capital, Social Capital, and Firm Dissolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(4).
- Polatçı, S. (2014). Psikolojik Sermayenin Görev ve Bağlamsal Performans Üzerindeki Etkileri: Polis Teşkilatında Bir Araştırma. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 14(1), 115-124.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A. (2009). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. 10th Edition, Pearson: Prentice Hall.
- Salanova, M. P. (2004). Engagement and Burnout: Analyzing their associated patterns. *Psychological Reports*, 94(3), 1048-1050.
- Sarıtaş, M. (1997). Yönetimde Kişilik Faktörü. *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 3(4), 527-548.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2008). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, 14(3), 204-220.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (2001). *Optimism, Pessimism, and Psychological Wellbeing*. In E. C. Chang (Ed.). *Optimism & Pessimism: Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice*, American Psychological Association. Washington D. C. 198-216.
- Snyder, C. R., Irwing, L., & Anderson J. R. (1991). *Hope and Health: Measuring the will and the ways*. In C. R. Snyder & D. R. Forsyth (Eds.). *Handbook of Social and Clinical Psychology*. New York: Pergamon. 355-361.
- Stajkovic, A., Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and Work-related Performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychology Bulletin*, 44, 580-590.
- Storm, K., Rothmann, S. (2003). The Relationship Between Burnout, Personality Traits and Coping Strategies in a Corporate Pharmaceutical Group. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(4), 35-42.
- Therasa, C., Vijayabanu, C. (2014). The Impact of Big Five Personality Traits and Positive Psychological Strengths Towards Job Satisfaction: A review. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 23(2), 142-150. DOI: 10.3311/PPso.7620.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., Avey, J. B., & Oke, A. (2011). Authentically Leading Groups: The mediating role of positivity and trust. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 4-24.
- Yelboğa, A. (2006). Kişilik Özellikleri ile İş Performansı Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. "İş-Güç" Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 8(2).
- Zellars, K., Perrewe, P., & Hochwarter, W. (2000). Burnout in Healthcare: The role of the five factors of personality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30, 1570-1598.