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Abstract: This research aimed to investigate relationships between quality of work life, burnout, school alienation, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors. In this context, a model was proposed based on the literature review and the model was tested through structural equation model. The study group of the research consists of 314 volunteer teachers working in the state schools in Kilis in 2016-2017 academic years. The data was collected through work-related quality of life scale, burnout scale, school alienation scale, affective commitment scale and organizational citizenship behaviors scale. The analysis with descriptive, correlation, path and bootstrap methods were used to analyze the data. As a result of the analysis, it was found that teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life have a negative effect on burnout and school alienation, whereas they have a positive effect on affective commitment. Besides, their perceptions for affective commitment have a positive impact on organizational citizenship behaviors. Another important result derived from the research is that teachers’ perceptions for burnout and school alienation play partial mediation roles in the effect of their perceptions for quality of work life on affective commitment. Based on these results, it can be suggested that teachers’ working conditions should be constantly improved.
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Introduction

Nowadays, the success of organizations and the realization of their own objectives depend on using of human resources effectively (Hersey, Blanchard & Johnson, 1998). The effective use of human resources and the ability of employees to reveal good performance are possible through physical, mental and spiritual well-being of employees (Barnett & Brennan, 1998). Employees’ highly well-being and feeling good are important factors to conduct their work well and happily (Easton & Laar, 2012; Ladebo & Oloruntoba, 2005). The research indicates that those employees with a high sense of well-being are more determined and productive compared with those ones with a low sense of well-being (Wright & Bonett, 2007; Diener & Seligman, 2004). Employees’ well-being is also considerably affected by the job specifications and the quality of working conditions (Barnett & Brennan, 1998). Poor working conditions such as overworking, work overload and pressure, high labor demands, lack of control over work and lack of participation in decision making processes, low salary, lack of necessary materials, administrators’ and colleagues’ low support, overcrowded classes, unfair treatments and uncertain management approaches cause employees to experience uneasiness and stress and as a result of these conditions, their health is psychologically and physiologically impaired (Akar, 2017; Michie & Williams, 2003; Erjem, 2005; Ozturk, 2011; Asakura & Fujigaki, 1993; Iacovidas, Fountoulakis, Kaprins & Kaprins, 2003; Shain, 2008), thereby reducing their job performance, organizational commitment, general well-being and effectiveness and increasing absenteeism, interpersonal conflict and work alienation (Gallie 2005; Ozturk, 2011; Siu, 2003; Isikhan, 2004). Therefore, it is seen that today’s organizations embark on a quest to establish a positive work environment to protect their employees’ mental and psychical health, thereby revealing their potencies as active and effective ones. Recently, the approach for quality of work life has been prominent to develop work environment (Akar & Ustuner, 2017; Akar, 2017).
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Quality of work life: Quality of work life approach is an approach which stresses out the subjects such as humanization of work, improvement of working conditions, protection of employees and democratization of work environment (Huzzard, 2003). The fact that quality of work life concept is multi-dimensional and comprehensive generally makes it difficult for most researchers to come up with a common definition for the concept. However, industrialists, those who are interested in organizational psychology and management scientists accept that the concept generally deals with employees’ well-being (Danna & Griffin, 1999). Quality of work life is defined as the establishment of work environment where employees feel secure and happy, do not experience stress and their personal and vocational needs are met, are satisfied with their work and an integration into all life spaces are ensured (War, 2001; Sirgy, Efraty, Siegel & Lee, 2001; Lau, Wong, Chan & Law; 2001). Quality of work life enables employees to create an organizational identity and reveal more job performance, increases their job satisfaction and vocational initiatives and decreases their absenteeism, intention to quit and level of burnout (Donalson, 2000; Waitayangkook, 2003; Kheirandish, 2009; Seligman, 2011), thereby creating an effective and efficient organization. It is seen in the research conducted by Donalson (2000) that the sub-dimension job security, which is an important behavioral component of the approach for quality of work life, has the strongest effect on employees’ organizational commitment. Diener and Seligman (2004) argue that employees will be more inclined to be fruitful, productive and happy ones in the organizations aiming to protect their employees’ well-being and redesigning the work to realize this aim. Masoomzadeh, Faizi and Alipour (2013) indicate the fact that employees positively change their perceptions for quality of work life; will decrease their counterproductive work behaviors.

The literature review shows that there are positive relationships between quality of work life and organizational commitment (Hong, Tan & Bujang, 2010), motivation (Baleghizadeh & Gordani, 2012), job satisfaction (Hong, Tan & Bujang, 2010; Bhatnagar & Soni, 2015), happiness (Toulabi, Raoufi & Allahpouropurshaf, 2013), effectiveness (Abbasi, Samadzadeh & Shahbazzadegan, 2011), performance (Asgari, Nojbaee & Rahnama, 2012), organizational citizenship (Nair, 2013), creativity (Mahmoodi, Mohamadian, Ghasemi & Fallah, 2015) and life satisfaction (Zadeh, 2016) as opposed to the negative relationships between quality of work life and work alienation (Erdem, 2014) and stress (Hong, Tan & Bujang, 2010).

Burnout: Burnout, which is defined as physical and emotional deprivation, occurs as a result of working in stressful environments for a long time (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001). Burnout is a psychological reaction to stress experienced in working life (Maslach & Leiter, 2005). While burnout is mostly observed in face to face jobs, it is accepted as an indication for one's low well-being (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). According to Maslach (1982), burnout causes emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and decreased personal accomplishment. High demands from employees in work environment and lack of materials provided employees in return of these demands play a significant role in enabling professional burnout to take place (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). A number of factors such as administrators’ and colleagues’ social support (Russell, Altmaier & Van Velzen, 1987), poor working conditions (Arabaci & Akar, 2010) and lack of communications with colleagues have a significant influence on employees' burnout. The research indicates that burnout has many negative results at personal and organizational levels. Burnout increases employees' absenteeism, intention to quit and withdrawal behaviors, whereas it decreases their performances, motivations, organizational commitments, efficiency and job satisfaction (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010; Maslach et al., 2001; Ghorpade, Lackritz & Singh, 2007; Piko, 2006).

Work (School) alienation: Work alienation is defined as a reflection of individual feelings stemming from disappointments at work environment (Hoy, Blazovsky & Newland, 1983). Work alienation generally refers to employees’ indifference to work (Hirschfeld, 2002). The fact that employees do not have control over their jobs, do not act independently and are not sufficiently involved in decision-making process, can inhibit to express themselves in work environment and therefore cause them to experience alienation (Kanungo, 1983; Mohseni Tabrizi, Zanjani, Taleghani & Taleghani, 2011). Alienation at work can happen when there are insufficient harmonious relationships between employee and organization and besides, there occurs negative socialization at individual and organizational levels (Mohseni et al, 2011; Aiken & Hage, 2001). Alienation is one of the important factors to significantly influence employees’ physical and psychological health (Aiken & Hage, 2001). Alienation decreases employees' motivation, causes them to be off-task at work psychologically and approach to their work through pragmatic consideration. In this regard, those who are alienated to their works avoid being autonomous, undertaking responsibilities and taking in charge of higher positions and prefers to be busy out of their works. Besides, they are not interested in participating into work processes and focus on extrinsic rewards such as money (Banai, Reisel & Probst, 2004). According to Kanungo (1992), work alienation, which is closely related with job dissatisfaction, work stress, anxiety, depression and other psychosomatic illness, reduces employees’ efficiency and motivation and increases absenteeism and employee turnover. The research indicates that work alienation negatively influences job performance (Clark, Halbesleben, Lester & Heintz, 2010), organizational commitment (Hirschfeld & Field, 2000) and organizational citizenship behaviors (Mohseni et al, 2011).

Affective commitment: In addition to being an important component of organizational commitment, affective commitment is defined as employees' being identified with their organizations, emotionally committed to their
organizations, caring and embracing their organizations' objectives and values. An employee with a higher sense of affective commitment has positive feelings for his/her organization and gets pleasure to be a member of the organization. An employee, who has developed a strong affective commitment, keeps working in organization (Meyer & Allen, 1991). In this respect, affective commitment is regarded as the most important organizational commitment component (Zeidan, 2006). Administrator and colleague support, fair treatment, value given to employee's contributions to both himself/herself and to his/her organization have significant role in creating affective commitment (Staples & Barlett, 2003). Affective commitment increases employees' effort. Affective commitment not only encourages individual to work hard to realize his/her organization's objectives but also enables him/her to reveal behaviors beyond pre-determined limits (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). The research indicate that affective commitment increases an employee's performance, job satisfaction, well-being and organizational citizenship behaviors and decreases absenteeism and employee turnover (Harrison, Newman & Roth, 2006; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2006; Magni & Pennarola, 2008).

Organizational citizenship: Organizational citizenship behavior is defined as behavior which employees voluntarily perform to increase their organization's efficiency, but not explicitly rewarded by their organization (Organ, 1988). In other words, organizational citizenship behavior is a voluntary employee behavior to develop organization's well-being without expecting any fee or reward in return. Organizational citizenship behavior is an extra-role performance for employees in addition to the roles assigned by their organizations. That is, employees have a tendency to constantly make a contribution to developing their organizations besides their usual roles. According to Schultz & Schultz (2006), employees with a high sense of organizational citizenship generally undertake additional duties, are volunteer to help their colleagues, obey organization's rules despite nobody's presence, develop and protect organization, and are tolerant to matters at work environment. In this respect, according to Organ, Podsakoff and MacKenzie (2006) organizational citizenship behavior is one of the most important factors to have an impact on organization's efficiency and success. The research reveals that job satisfaction and organizational commitment are the most significant predictors for employees' organizational citizenship behaviors (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Moorman, Niehoff & Organ, 1993). A number of researchers accept that especially affective commitment is a strong predictor for organizational citizenship behavior (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolnytsky, 2002). Fair and equitable treatments (Messer & White, 2006), home-work life balance (Pradhan, Jena & Kumari, 2016) and positive feelings with regard to work (Spitzmuller, Van Dyne & Illies, 2008) have important place in developing organizational citizenship behaviors. It is seen in the research that organizational citizenship behaviors have significant effects on employees' absenteeism, withdrawal behaviors and well-being, business quality, organizational efficiency, employee turnover and organization performance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000;Bienstock, DeMoranville & Smith,, 2003; Hodson 2001; Khalid & Ali, 2005).

Purpose of present research

Educational organizations are institutions which undertake important duties to develop a nation in terms of social, cultural and economic aspects. Required qualified human resource is trained in educational organizations. In this respect, educational organizations have to function according to their objectives and be successful (Akar & Ustun, 2017). As indicated by Manju (2014) that educational organization realizing their objectives and being successful largely depend on teachers and their efforts. To what extent teachers make effort to carry out objectives are influenced by a number of factors which are concerned with work and out of work life. In the scope of this research, relationships between quality of work life, burnout, school alienation, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors were examined through structural equation model (SEM). The hypotheses of the research are provided below.

H1: Teachers' quality of work life significantly and negatively affects their burnout.

H2: Teachers' quality of work life significantly and negatively affects their school alienation.

H3: Teachers' quality of work life significantly and positively affects their affective commitment.

H4: Teachers' school alienation significantly and negatively affects their affective commitment.

H5: Teachers' burnout significantly and negatively affects their affective commitment.

H6: Teachers' affective commitment significantly and positively affects their organizational citizenship behaviors.

H7: School alienation and burnout play mediation roles in the effect of teachers' quality of work life on their affective commitment.

Methodology

In this study, relational screening model was used to examine the relationships between quality of work life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment and organizational citizenship. A comprehensive literature review was firstly conducted and a model was suggested based on the data derived from the review (Cetinkanat & Kosterelciolu, 2016; Erdem, 2014; Pardakhchti, Ahmadi & Arezoumand, 2009; Permarupan, Al- Mamun & Saufi, 2013; Chiaburu, Thundiyil & Wang, 2014; Tan-Ucanok, 2016; Gmelik, Sisman & Sigri, 2010; Li, 2014; Qin, 2009; Chien & Su, 2009; Ogba,2006;
Benjamin, 2012). Relationships between the variables in the proposed model were tested through structural equation model. The model which was formed based on the literature review is displayed in Figure 1.

![Figure 1. The proposed model concerning quality of work life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors](image)

**Population and Sample**

The population of this research comprises of the teachers working in the state schools which operate under the responsibility of Kilis (a province of Turkey) Provincial Directorate of Education in 2016-2017 academic years. Participation into the research was based on voluntariness. In this context, the data derived from 314 teachers was analyzed. 100–150 participants is considered the minimum sample size for conducting SEM (Tinsley, Tinsley, 1987; Tabachnick, Fidell, 2001). In this regard, the number of 314 participants is sufficient for this research. Participants were 46.8% female teachers and 53.3% male ones. 34.7%, 33.8%, 20.4% and 11.1% of the participants were in 20-30, 31-40, 41-50 and 50 and over age ranges, respectively. 7%, 29.6%, 29.3% and 34.1% of the participants work in preschool, primary education, middle school and high schools.

**Data Collection Instruments**

The data was collected through work-related quality of life scale, burnout scale, school alienation scale, affective commitment scale and organizational citizenship behaviors scale.

**Work-related quality of life scale:** Work-related quality of life scale which was developed by Van Laar, Edwards and Easton (2007) and adapted into Turkish by Akar and Ustuner (2017) was used to measure teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life. The scale consists of 23 items and 6 dimensions. The dimensions of the scales are job and career satisfaction, general well-being, home-work interface, stress at work, control at work and working conditions. Five-point Likert scaling is used in the scale. The values obtained from the validity and reliability analysis conducted by Akar and Ustuner (2017) indicate that the scale is valid and reliable. In this research, the validity and reliability of the scale were re-tested. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was seen that the model has fit index values ($\chi^2/df = 361.571/215= 1.68$; RMSEA = .047; GFI = .91; CFI = .96; TLI = .95; NFI = .92). Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is .93. The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the dimensions are as follows: job and career satisfaction .79; general well-being .80; control at work .90; stress at work .70; working conditions .81; home-work interface .91.

**School alienation scale:** School alienation scale which is a subscale of work alienation scale consisting of 4 subscales developed by Elma (2003) was used. School alienation scale comprises of 7 items and has Five-point Likert scaling. The values derived from the validity and reliability analysis conducted by Elma (2003) indicate that the scale is valid and reliable. In the context with this research, the validity and reliability of the scale were re-tested. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was seen that the construct of the scale is compatible with the research data ($\chi^2/df = 20.697/14= 1.48$; RMSEA = .039; GFI = .98; CFI = .99; TLI = .99; NFI = .98). Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is .89.

**Burnout scale-short version:** The burnout scale-short version which was developed by Malach-Pines (2005) and adapted into Turkish by Capri (2013) was used to measure individuals' perceptions for vocational burnout. The scale involves 7-point scaling with 10 items. The values obtained from the validity and reliability analysis conducted by Capri (2013)
reveal that the scale is valid and reliable. In the current research, the validity and reliability of the scale were re-tested. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis indicate that the construct of the scale is compatible with the research data ($\chi^2$/df = 74.998/33 = 2.27; RMSEA = .064; GFI = .95; CFI = .99; TLI = .98; NFI = .98). Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is .96.

**Affective commitment scale:** Affective commitment scale which is one of the subscales of the organizational commitment scale developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and adapted into Turkish by Kursunoglu, Bakay and Tanriogen (2010) was used. The scale consists of 6 items and has Five-point likert scaling. The results of the validity and reliability analysis for the scale carried out by Kursunoglu, Bakay and Tanriogen (2010) show that it is valid and reliable. In this research, the validity and reliability of the scale were re-tested. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis indicate that has fit index values ($\chi^2$/df = 18.646/33 = 2.07; RMSEA = .059; GFI = .98; CFI = .99; TLI = .98; NFI = .98). Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is .92.

**Organizational citizenship scale:** Organizational citizenship scale which was developed by Rodskoff and MacKenzie (1989) and adapted into Turkish by Polat (2007) was used. The scale comprises of 20 items and 4 sub-dimensions and has Five-point likert scaling. The scale is valid and reliable based on the analysis for validity and reliability conducted by Polat (2007). In this research, the validity and reliability of the scale were re-tested ($\chi^2$/df = 293.099/166 = 2.07; RMSEA = .049; GFI = .91; CFI = .97; TLI = .98; NFI = .94). Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the scale is .95.

**Analyzing of Data**

Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations were used to identify teachers’ perceptions for the variables in the research and correlation analyses were used to identify the presence and direction of the relations among the variables. Confirmatory factor analysis was employed to test the fit index values of the scales and construct validity. Besides, path analysis was conducted to test the proposed model. Lastly, bootstrap analysis method was carried out to identify the significance level of the mediating effect in the proposed model. The data was analyzed through SPSS and AMOS statistic package programs. The significance level for the research was .05.

**Findings / Results**

Arithmetic mean and standard deviations for teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors and correlation coefficient values which showing the directions of the relations between the variables are displayed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work life</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School alienation</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational citizenship</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, it was seen that there are moderately negative relationships between teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life and school alienation ($r = -.50$) and burnout ($r = -.54$), and moderately positive relationships between teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life and affective commitment ($r = .48$) and organizational citizenship ($r = .37$) ($p < .05$). It was found that there are moderately positive relationships between teachers’ perceptions for school alienation and burnout ($r = .62$) and moderately negative relationships between teachers’ perceptions for school alienation and affective commitment ($r = -.61$) and organizational citizenship ($r = .48$) ($p < .05$). It was revealed that there are moderately negative relationships between teachers’ perceptions for burnout and affective commitment ($r = -.68$) and organizational citizenship ($r = .52$) ($p < .05$). Besides, it was found that there is a moderately positive relationship between their perceptions for affective commitment and organizational citizenship ($r = .67$) ($p < .05$). Based on Table 1, the highest relationship among the variables is between affective commitment and burnout, whereas the lowest relationship is between quality of work life and organizational citizenship. When arithmetic means of the variables are taken into account, the mean for teachers' quality of work life, burnout, school alienation, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors on all the variables are at moderate level.

The path analysis results and standardized estimated values for the proposed model created based on the literature review is displayed in Figure 2.
According to the path diagram in Figure 2, all paths between the variables (work of quality life-school alienation, burnout and affective commitment; school alienation and burnout-affective commitment; affective commitment-organizational citizenship) are seen to be significant ($p < .05$). When the fit index values are examined, it is seen that they are at excellent level ($\chi^2/df = 4.947/3 = 1.65$; RMSEA = .049; GFI = .99; CFI = .99; TLI = .99; NFI = .99). Based on this finding, it can be stated that the proposed model is excellently compatible with the research data. When the path diagram with the standardized estimated values in Figure 2 is considered, teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life has directly negative significant effects on school alienation ($\beta = -.50$) and burnout ($\beta = -.54$), and has a directly positive significant effect on affective commitment ($\beta = .11$) ($p < .05$). While teachers’ perceptions for school alienation has a directly significant negative effect on affective commitment ($\beta = -.28$), their perceptions for burnout has a directly negative significant effect on affective commitment ($\beta = -.45$) ($p < .05$). Besides, it was found that teachers’ perceptions for affective commitment has a directly significant positive effect on organizational citizenship ($\beta = .68$) ($p < .05$). These findings indicate that $H_1$, $H_2$, $H_3$, $H_4$, and $H_5$ hypotheses were accepted.

According to the path diagram in Figure 2, teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life account for 25% of school alienation variance and 29% of burnout variance. In addition to these findings, their perceptions for quality of work life, school alienation and burnout together account for 53% of affective commitment variance. Lastly, it was revealed that teachers’ perceptions for affective commitment account for 47% organizational citizenship variance.

Bootstrap analysis was conducted to examine the mediating effects in the proposed model (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The model was re-analyzed in 95% confidence interval through protected error and corrected bootstrap method by determining the sampling size as 1000, which is indeed 314. As a result of bootstrap analysis, it was seen that teachers’ perceptions for burnout and school alienation play partial mediation roles in the effect of their perceptions for quality of work life on affective commitment. That is, their perceptions for quality of work life directly influence affective commitment, besides their perceptions for quality of work life indirectly influence affective commitment through school alienation and burnout. It is seen that the indirect effect is statistically significant (Indirect effect = .38 [.31 -.45]). This result indicates that a significant part of the total effect of quality of work life on affective commitment indirectly takes place from burnout and school alienation.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

This research aimed to investigate relationships between quality of work life, burnout, school alienation, affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors. In this context, a model was proposed based on the extensive literature review. According to this model, teachers’ quality of work life directly and indirectly affects affective commitment through school alienation and burnout. Besides, affective commitment influences organizational citizenship behaviors. The proposed model was tested through structural equation model. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that the model is acceptable in its current presence.

In the current research, it was found that teachers’ quality of work life has significantly negative effects on school alienation and burnout levels and a significantly positive effect on affective commitment. This result overlaps with the
previous research (Cetinkanat & Kosterelioglu, 2016; Erdem, 2014; Pardakhtchi, Ahmad & Arezoumand, 2009; Permarupan, Al-Mamun & Sauff, 2013). According to this result, the teachers with a low sense of quality of work life can experience burnout and school alienation and face an inhibition to develop affective commitments for the schools where they work. It is known that the primary objective of quality of work life is to improve working conditions and increase organizational efficiency. Poor working conditions can cause a number of negative results at personal and organizational levels. Based on the conducted research, many negative working conditions such as lack of materials at work environment, work overload, poor administration applications, overcrowded classes, low salary and statuses, students' behavior and motivation problems, administrators and colleagues' low support, insecure work environment, insufficient recognition and rewards and unfair treatments negatively affect teachers, reduce their motivations and job satisfactions and cause them to experience intensive stress at work environment (Gillespie, Walsh, Winefield, Dua & Stough, 2001; Ozturk, 2011). Being exposed to stress at work environment for a long time can cause burnout. It was revealed in the study conducted with the academic members by Rothmann, Barkhuizen and Tytherleigh (2008) that high demands for jobs and lack of materials at work environment cause the academic members to experience burnout and deteriorate their physical and psychological health states. Career development, organizational structure and climate, vocational development tendencies, interpersonal relationships and matters encountered with regard to jobs are enumerated as primary reasons for burnout in the study conducted by Niyazi, Hosseini and Fazel (2009). All these reasons are related with the quality of work life. It can be stated that teachers can feel lower burnout at work environment where their personal needs are met, their vocational developments are supported, and democratic and positive interpersonal relationships are available. In another study it is emphasized that most of the teachers are not pleased with their school administrations, physical conditions, overcrowded classes and work overload and therefore all these decrease their organizational commitment (Erjem, 2005). It is known that quality of work life has a significant effect on especially affective commitment which is a sub-dimension of organizational commitment (Tasdemir Afsar, 2014). Based on this result, it seems impossible for employees to be identified with their organizations, affectively commit to their organizations and be enthusiastic to work for a long time at poor work environment. It was found in the study conducted on teachers by Cetinkanat and Kosterelioglu (2016) that quality of work life is a significant factor for teachers to experience work alienation. According to Dworkin, Saha and Hill (2003), bureaucratic organization structure restricting communication between teachers and school administrators is a decisive factor for teachers to be exposed to alienation. It is known that communication is hierarchical based in over-centralized bureaucratic educational systems where all powers are centralized; curriculum, decisions and reforms for education are prepared and taken in centralized body. In such a centralized body (Educational system in Turkey is centralized) it can be expressed that it is inevitable for teachers to feel alienated to their work and schools due to the working conditions such as having low autonomy, insufficient involvement in decision-making processes. All these negative cases can be overcome with an educational system where local regions keep providing educational systems according to their own conditions; administrative principles based on schools are taken into account; and all stakeholders are involved in decision-making processes with regard to delivery of educational services.

Another result derived from the current research is that teachers' burnout and school alienation levels have significantly negative effects on their affective commitment. This result overlaps with the previous research (Chiauru, Thundiyil & Wang, 2014; Tan-Ucanok, 2016; Gmelik, Sisman & Sigri, 2010; Li, 2014; Qin, 2009). This result indicates that it cannot be possible for teachers who feel alienated to their schools and experience burnout, to affectively be committed to their work. It is revealed in the study conducted by Tan-Ucanok (2016) that employees' affective commitment is negatively affected by their work alienation which causes them to find their jobs and results meaningless and think that they do not have a decisive power at their organizations due to not being involved in decision-making processes. This is an expected result when affective commitment is considered to focus on "being identified with organization, being affectively committed to organization, internalizing organization's objectives and values and being enthusiastic to keep working at organizations". It is impossible for a teacher who is alienated to his/her job and find his/her job meaningless and think not to have a power to change anything at school, to make an effective commitment with his/her school. Those teachers who experience burnout are not expected to make an affective commitment with their schools, either. It is emphasized in previous research that employees who are exposed to emotional exhaustion and burnout types such as decreased personal accomplishment, are impossible to affectively be committed to their jobs (Qin, 2009; Li, 2014). It is accepted that emotional exhaustion is the most important component of burnout and it reflects stressful dimension of burnout. The research indicates that emotional exhaustion triggers behaviors which cause individuals to affectively and cognitively withdraw from their jobs (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). In this respect, it is an inevitable result for teachers who experience burnout, to be alienated to their schools and to not make an affective commitment with their schools.

One of the results obtained from the analysis of the research model is that teachers' affective commitment levels significantly positive effect on their organizational citizenship behaviors. This result is supported with the previous research findings (Chien & Su, 2009; Ogba, 2006; Benjamin, 2012). This result implies that teachers with a higher sense of affective commitment are more likely to act organizational citizenship behaviors. The results of previous research reveal that employees with a higher sense of organizational commitment have also higher performances (Khan, Ziauddin & Ramay 2010; Suliman & Iles 2000). It is an expected result that teachers with a higher sense of affective
commitment, who are identified with their schools, embrace their schools’ objectives and values, are enthusiastic to undertake extra roles apart from their usual ones to constantly develop their schools. Affective commitment with school enables teachers to exhibit more performance than expected. In this context, it can be suggested that school administrators who want to increase their teachers’ effort, should develop their affective commitment.

One of the most important results derived from the research is that teachers’ perceptions for burnout and school alienation play partial mediation roles in the effect of their perceptions for quality of work life on their affective commitment. According to this result, teachers’ perceptions for quality of work life directly influence their affective commitments towards schools and also indirectly influence their affective commitments through the mediation roles of burnout and school alienation. As mentioned above, poor working conditions can cause teachers to experience work alienation and burnout, thereby decreasing their affective commitments with their schools. Quality of work life has a low direct effect on affective commitment. However, it has a significant effect on burnout and school alienation, and therefore affects affective commitment more.

Lastly, it was found that teachers’ quality of work life accounts for 29% of burnout variance and 25% of school alienation variance; quality of work life, burnout and school alienation together account for 53% of affective commitment variance; affective commitment accounts for 47% of organizational citizenship behavior. In this context, it can be suggested that working conditions should be constantly improved to increase teachers’ affective commitment and organizational citizenship behaviors and decrease their burnout and school alienation levels at schools where they work for.

This research has several limitations. First of all, it is impossible to make causal inferences as this study is a cross-sectional study. Secondly, as the data were obtained from self-rating scales, this study is limited how the participants understood the items in the scales and whether they were honest while responding the items.
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