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ABSTRACT

This study contributes to the research on job satisfaction as variable of employee wellbeing. The Job demands-resource (JD-R) model was used to examine the relationship of work overload as job demand and autonomy as job resource with job satisfaction, turnover intent and organizational commitment. The hypotheses which were proposed in this study were tested using a cross-sectional quantitative research design. 150 respondents from different industry sectors were included in this research. The results show that there is a negative effect of work overload on job satisfaction and a positive effect of autonomy on job satisfaction. Also, the results display that job satisfaction has a negative effect on turnover intent and a positive effect on organizational commitment. Moreover, the mediation effect of job satisfaction was tested and showed that there exists full mediation of job satisfaction between work overload and organizational commitment, work overload and turnover intentions, and autonomy and turnover intentions. It was also hypothesized that exists full mediation of job satisfaction between autonomy and organizational commitment. However, the results showed that there was no mediation of job satisfaction between autonomy and organizational commitment. Instead, the result showed a full mediation of autonomy between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. According to the results in this study, job demands and job resources play a major role in determining employee’s job satisfaction and their intentions to leave or commit to the organization. Therefore, the employers should consider different strategies in increasing their employees’ job satisfaction, either by decreasing work overload or by increasing autonomy, or a combination of both.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, work overload, autonomy, affective commitment, turnover intentions, job demands-resource (JD-R) model
Introduction:
A potential candidate for EU membership, the Republic of Kosovo is a lower-middle-income country with solid economic growth performance since the end of war in 1999 (The World Bank, 2013). Efforts aimed at strengthening domestic productivity will need to remain the pivotal policy anchor, as Kosovo continues to struggle with high rates of unemployment and poverty. Joblessness in particular – estimated at about 40 percent – remains a central economic-policy challenge (The World Bank, 2013). Widespread unemployment and lack of quality jobs have contributed to poverty and income insecurity (The World Bank, 2013). The lack of jobs has direct consequences on income, as households with unemployed heads have the highest extreme poverty indices (The World Bank, 2013). Many households with adult members with unsteady jobs are below the poverty line, depending on small, informal enterprises offering uncertain employment for the majority of their income (The World Bank, 2013). Kosovo’s difficult labor market conditions have been especially severe for youth and women (The World Bank, 2013). Estimates suggest that unemployment among 15-24 year olds exceeds 55 percent (The World Bank, 2013). The generally poor quality of education system, high level of nepotism, coupled with limited employment opportunities, makes it difficult for young people to access and retain jobs; those who do succeed in finding employment are typically hired into low-skilled, low-productivity positions often in the informal sector such as construction and building sector and service sector (Mehmeti, 2010; The World Bank, 2013). According to labor force survey data, 37.8 percent of employed youth do not have an employment contract and 35.1 percent of 15-24 year olds are neither employed nor in education or training (The World Bank, 2013).

The report done by USAID (2003), states that unemployment was the most prominent problem the people had in their minds with the rate of 85.8% of the respondents. Corruption was second in perceived importance (38.9%) following by poverty (32.9%), and job related issues such as low income, long working hours and work pressure (30.9%). It is also reported that in Kosovo there is a poor level of employment standards, an excessive bureaucracy, and insufficient law enforcement (Spector, Winbourne & Beck, 2003). Moreover, the labor law of Kosovo states that it remains legal obligation of labor inspectorate to monitor Labor Law enforcement, as far as the employer is aware on how to respect the rights of employees which are legal but also moral obligations (Krasniqi, 2013). It is argued that this is not the case in real life, because of the inefficiency of municipal courts to resolve contests from labor relations and as a result of this
often come the hesitation of employees to address the courts in order to require justice in case if their rights are violated (Krasniqi, 2013). Besides that, the most worrying findings are that over 56% of the employees work without working contracts and below the minimum salary which is 220EUR (Krasniqi, 2013). According to these and other findings, the conditions and circumstances in which employees in Kosovo work, are below any human standard.

Employee attitudes toward satisfaction with the job have become of compelling interest to industrial psychologists because of their impact on behavior at work (Robbins, 1993). Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction as: ‘a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences’ (p.1304). Job satisfaction in the broad sense simply refers to a person’s general attitude toward the job or toward specific dimensions of the job (Hodson, 1991). Therefore, the concept of job satisfaction traditionally has been of great interest to social scientists concerned with the problems of work within a society (Kalleberg, 1977).

Furthermore, job satisfaction can be characterized as an attitude concerning the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs (Spector, 1997). Researchers have shown that job satisfaction is one of the main components of employee wellbeing, therefore the employee wellbeing can be explained through the measurement of job satisfaction (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). Thus, this study focuses on job satisfaction as part of employee wellbeing. Researchers have used the JDR model to explain the antecedents and outcomes of wellbeing. The job demands-resource (JD-R) model proposes that working conditions can be categorized into two broad categories, job demands and job resources, that are differentially related to specific outcomes (Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner & Schaufeli, 2001).

Hence, Job demands-resource (JD-R) model incorporates many possible working conditions, and focuses on both negative and positive indicators of employee wellbeing (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). The main assumption of the job demands-resource (JD-R) model is that every occupation may have its own specific factors associated with job stress, these factors can be classified in two general categories (i.e. job demands and job resources), (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). Job demands refer to physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort and are therefore associated with certain physical and psychological costs (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). On the other hand, job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that are either/or; functional in achieving work goals, reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, stimulate personal growth, learning, and
development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006).

Moreover, many studies have shown that job characteristics can have a profound impact on employee wellbeing (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). For instance, research shows that job demands such as work overload, emotional demands and role ambiguity may lead to physical and psychological problems (Doi, 2005; Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004), whereas job resources such as autonomy may instigate a motivational process leading to job-related learning, work engagement, and organizational commitment (Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2005; Taris and Feij, 2004). For example, Bakker et al. (2003a) applied the model to call center employees of the Dutch telecom company, and investigated its predictive validity for self-reported absenteeism and turnover intentions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). This investigation shows that the first energy-driven process whereby job demands such as work overload, were the most important predictors of employee wellbeing and the second motivation-driven process whereby job resources such as autonomy and social support were the only predictors of dedication and organizational commitment, which in turn were related to turnover intentions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). These findings support the JD-R model’s claim that job demands and job resources initiate two different psychological processes, which eventually affect important organizational outcomes (Bakker et al., 2003; Schauffeli & Bakker, 2004).

JD-R model also shows two different underlying psychological processes which play a role in the development of job strain and motivation (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). In the first designed job demands such as work overload, exhaust employees ‘mental and physical resources and may therefore lead to the depletion of energy (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). The second process proposed by the JD-R model is motivational in nature, whereby it is assumed that job resources have motivational potential and lead to better performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006).

Work overload is defined as having too many demands and too little time to fulfill them (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1976). This study focuses in this type of job demand because it is believed that a lot of people are faced with obligations which require them to do more than they are able to do in the time available (Sales, 1970). Stamps and Piedmonte (1986) define autonomy as the amount of job-related independence, initiative, and freedom either permitted or required in daily activities at work. Autonomy as a component of job resources was included in this study because it is ranked as one of the most important factors contributing to employees’ job satisfaction (Stamps, 1998). This is supported by the job characteristic model developed by
Hackman and Oldham (1976) which argues that enrichment of specified job characteristics is the core factor in making employees satisfied with their jobs. Organizational commitment refer to the extent to which employees identify and involve themselves with a particular organization (Porter et al. 1974). Researchers argue that organizational commitment represent a related linkage between employee and the organization that includes job satisfaction among its specific components (Porter et al. 1974). It is also argued that turnover intent – the process of thinking of quitting or planning to leave the organization, has been of interest for both managers and researchers across a wide array of disciplines (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001). Therefore, the interest in turnover intentions has intensified as the pressure for the financial performance among organizations around the world has increased (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001). In this study job satisfaction as a specific job attitude was considered as mediator which involves both sides; job demands and resources and the consequences of them.

Therefore, JD-R model proposes that job demands and job resources are important for the prediction of job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). Thus, in this study the focus will be how job demands and job resources affect the variables such as turnover intent and organizational commitment, whereby the job satisfaction will be as mediator of these variables.

Therefore, the research question is as follows; how do work overload and autonomy affect the job satisfaction in Kosovo and how does job satisfaction mediates the link between role overload and autonomy on the one hand, and organizational commitment and turnover intentions on the other hand?

**Relevance:**

The last decade has witnesses a renewed interest among economists and other social scientists in studying the socio-economic determinants of job satisfaction (Llorente & Macias, 2005). One purpose of this study is to enhance our knowledge of the determinants of job satisfaction. Therefore, the first contribution of this paper is that it studies the factors which influence job satisfaction. Research shows that workload and autonomy are considered as structural determinants and are related to job satisfaction (Kim, Price, Mueller & Watson, 1996). Thus, the purpose of this paper is to examine the empirical relationship between these variables and causes of job satisfaction.

The second contribution is that this paper studies commitment and turnover intent as the
outcomes of job satisfaction. There is evidence that job satisfaction is an intervening variable in the organizational commitment and turnover intent, therefore job satisfaction is viewed as an essential component in determining the two variables such as organizational commitment and turnover intent (Gaertner, 2000).

The third contribution of this paper is that it explores job satisfaction and therefore wellbeing of employees in Kosovo. Thus, it will contribute to the few studies on job satisfaction with regards to the determinants of job satisfaction in a developing country such as Kosovo where poor rule of law, corruption and employee rights violation are in high levels.

This paper is expected to give a clear overview about the job satisfaction determinants within a category of people whom their rights are violated in daily basis and do not have any protection from the government. Moreover, this study will show new facts and figures of the current situation of these people which do not have much choice but to work hard even when their basic rights as employees are hugely violated (Spector, Winbourne & Beck, 2003). Therefore, this paper will also serve as awareness among people of Kosovo. Thus, the people in charge for the improvement of employee job satisfaction will be better equipped and informed about the employee’s situation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this paper as theoretical framework, the job demand – resource (JDR) model will be used to argue the different working conditions such as work overload and autonomy that affects the job satisfaction. Further, it will be argued that the consequences of job satisfaction can be either organizational commitment or turnover which it will be explained below.

Work overload and job satisfaction

The literature examining potentially negative consequences of work stressors such as work overload on job satisfaction is very extensive, from early studies on organizationally-related stress (Kahn et al., 1964). Work overload is the extent to which demands of the job are excessive (Agho, Mueller, Price, 1993). It describes situations in which employees feel that there are too many responsibilities or activities expected of them in light of the time available, their abilities, and other constraints (Rizzo, House, & Litzman, 1970). It is argued by Remsburg et al., (1999) that heavy work overload is a major reason for job dissatisfaction, also Schaefer & Moos (1996) found that long term care employees who reported more workload were less satisfied with their
job. This is supported by one of the dual processes of JD-R model which states that poorly
designed jobs, or chronic job demands (e.g. work overload) exhaust employees’ mental and
physical resources and may therefore lead to the depletion of energy (i.e. a state of exhaustion),
health problems and to lower job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2006). Hence, the
following hypothesis was established:

_Hypothesis 1a: Work overload is negatively related to job satisfaction._

**Autonomy and job satisfaction**
Autonomy plays a central role in many organizational stress theories (Frese, 1989; Ganster,
1989). Hackman and Oldham (1975) define autonomy as the degree to which the job provides
substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and
in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out. It is argued that autonomy or job
control may lead to a healthier coping style in workplace (De Croon, Sluiter, Blonk, Broersen &
Frings-Dresen, 2004). Research shows that autonomy may be crucial for job satisfaction because
greater autonomy is associated with more opportunities to cope with stressful situations (Karasek,
1998). This argument is also supported by one of the dual processes of JD-R model which is
motivational in nature, whereby it is assumed that job resources such as autonomy have
motivational potential and lead to satisfaction (Bekker & Demerouti, 2006). A positive
relationship between autonomy and job satisfaction has been documented for number of years
(Argyris, 1957; Davis & Werling, 1960; Vroom, 1964). The typical worker is thought to be more
job satisfied when his or her relationship to the work process is characterized by greater self-
regulation (Weaver, 1977). Aiken and Hage (1966) reported that organizations that conform more
to the formal bureaucratic arrangements are likely to have more work alienation and alienation
from expressive relation. Moreover, there was greater dissatisfaction with the work in those
organizations in which there was no autonomy and jobs were fractionized and rigidly structured
(Argyris, 1973). Also, Carpenter (1971) found that the greater the teacher autonomy and
opportunity to use professional authority, the higher the job satisfaction. The research shows that,
the job satisfaction of a person is determined to a large extent by what has been termed the
autonomy of the position she or he occupies, therefore the greater autonomy produces higher job
satisfaction (Trow, 1956). Therefore, it was hypothesized that:
**Hypothesis 1b: Autonomy is positively related to job satisfaction.**

**Organizational commitment and job satisfaction**

A lot of attention has been given recently to the study of commitment to the organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Organizational commitment is defined as the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization (Mowday, Steer, & Porters, 1979). Hence, organizational commitment refers to the relationship of the employees with the organization in which they work (Bakker, Demerouti, De Boer, & Schaufeli, 2003). It can be characterized by at least three related factors; a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of membership in the organization and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday, Steer, & Porters, 1979). Organizational commitment is the bond between the worker and the organization (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Employees with high commitment are loyal to the organization, share its values, and identify with the goals of the organization (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). There is a strong argument that committed employees are seen as having a sense of belonging and identification that increases their involvement in the organization’s goals (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Thus, the second hypothesis was formulated:

**Hypothesis 2a: Job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment.**

**Turnover Intent and job satisfaction**

According to Hellman (1997), increasing dissatisfaction in employees results in higher chance of considering other employment opportunities. There are two general types of turnover, involuntary and voluntary (Price & Mueller, 1986). Involuntary turnover is when a person is removed from his or her job by the employer (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Voluntary turnover is when the employee chooses to leave the job (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). It is argued that, voluntary turnover tends to be more harmful to the organization and occurs more frequently than involuntary turnover (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Rather than measuring actual turnover, in this study it will be measured turnover intent. Turnover intent is the cognitive process of thinking of quitting, planning on leaving the job, and the desire to leave the job (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979). Studying turnover intentions rather than actual turnover has several advantages (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Turnover intent is often used as the final outcome variable in studies.
because it is easier to measure and tend to be more accurate (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). It is argued that it is difficult to gain access to people who have already left to determine why they really quit (Firth, Mellor, Moore, & Loquet, 2004). Additionally, administrative records are sometimes closed to outside researchers or may be incomplete or inaccurate (Mitchell et al., 2000). It is also argued that, those employees who are thinking of quitting may still be swayed by changes in the work environment (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Therefore, it is too late to change the work environment for those who have already left employment (Lambert & Hogan, 2008). Moreover, turnover intention is consequently considered as an outcome of affective variables, such as job satisfaction, rather than actual turnover (Hellman, 1997).

According to Hellman (1997), increasing dissatisfaction in employees result in a higher chance of considering other employment opportunities. The meta-analysis studies show that the relationship between job satisfaction and intent to leave was found to be significantly different from zero and consistently negative (Coomber & Barriball, 2007). Reviews of the literature on the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover have reported a consistent negative relationship (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Locke, 1975; Porter & Steers, 1973; Vroom, 1964). Porter and Steers (1973) suggested that expressed “intention to leave” may represent the next logical step after dissatisfaction in the withdrawal decision process. Mobley, Horner, and Hollingsworth (1978) proposed a linear process model in which an individual’s low job satisfaction causes thoughts of quitting an organization, leading to intention to search for other employment, which causes the formation of an intention to leave or stay, and, finally, quitting. Therefore, job satisfaction has been cited as a major contributory factor to intent to stay with or leave an organization (Strachota et al., 2003). Also, it is argued that job satisfaction as an important predictor of intent to stay has the secondary effect of decreasing turnover, with many authors concluding that a decrease in turnover intent occurs when a workforce is satisfied (Saleh et al., 1965; Blegen, 1993; Irvine & Evans, 1995; Hellman, 1997). Thus, the following hypothesis was established:

_Hypothesis 2b: Job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intention._
Mediation of job satisfaction between work overload and organizational commitment

Research on job satisfaction have resulted in a sound understanding of how job demands and job resources affect employees’ level of job satisfaction and how job satisfaction, in turn, influences a variety of important workplace behaviors (e.g. organizational commitment and turnover intentions), (Crede et al., 2007). Job satisfaction as mediator has been presented in both theoretical reviews and empirically oriented work (Hulin & Judge, 2003). Research shows that reliable relations between job satisfaction and job behavior such as organizational commitment or intentions to quit, may reflect the unavoidability of feelings about jobs and the salience of jobs to most employees. Work overload has been found to have mixed effects on organizational commitment (Jones et al., 2007). The research done by Singh et al., (1994) involving customer service representatives notes a negative relationship between work overload and organizational commitment. Thus, the hypothesis 3a was established:

Hypothesis 3a: The relationship between work overload and organizational commitment is negatively mediated by job satisfaction.

Mediation of job satisfaction between work overload and turnover intent

An outcome of work overload could be turnover intent (Sager & Wilson, 1995). Employees retaliate against dissatisfying working conditions such as high job demands (high work overload) by engaging in harmful behavior (e.g. deciding to quit or preparing to quit the organization), (Crede et al., 2007). The direct path between work overload and turnover intent is not often hypothesized and rarely passes through a mediating job outcome such as job satisfaction (Jones et al., 2007). Whereby, this path was studied in this study conceptual model and the following hypothesis was established.

Hypothesis 3b: The relationship between work overload and turnover intent is positively mediated by job satisfaction.
Mediation of job satisfaction between autonomy and organizational commitment

Pfeffer & Lawler (1980) linked organizational commitment to the type of control an organization exercises over its members. Research shows that employees of utilitarian organizations are less satisfied and less committed than are employees of organizations which give them more autonomy at workplace (Etzioni, 1975). This is in line with another study in which it was found that employees belonging to coercive organizations are the least satisfied and committed (Mintzer, 1968). It is argued that employees respond to perceived favorable working conditions such as job resources (autonomy) by behaving in ways that benefit organization and/or other employees (e.g. organizational commitment), (Crede et al., 2007). Thus, the following hypothesis was established:

Hypothesis 4a: The relationship between autonomy and organizational commitment is positively mediated by job satisfaction.

Mediation of job satisfaction between autonomy and turnover intent

Many researchers have theorized that job satisfaction is a key antecedent of turnover intent (Mobley et al., 1979). The effect of job satisfaction on turnover intent is only one part of equation because, according to Lambert et al., (2001), it is equally important to explore the key antecedents of job satisfaction. The belief is that autonomy decreases turnover by its positive impact on job satisfaction (Price, 2001). Spector’s (1986) meta-analytic study found that autonomy was related to higher job satisfaction, and lower turnover intentions.

Hypothesis 4b: The relationship between autonomy and turnover intentions is negatively mediated by job satisfaction.
Method:

Design
In this study, the data was collected through one general questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed by hard copy. This was because many people in Kosovo did not use email or other information technology services. Together with the survey the respondents were given also a letter which explained the purpose of the survey.

Procedure
The questionnaires were given to 150 employees within the country of Kosovo. The employees that were given the questionnaires worked mostly in private sectors only 5 of 150 employees who responded to the survey were employed in public organizations. The respondents work in more than 10 different jobs, and these jobs included waiters, hairdressers, cashiers, salesmen, chefs, truck drivers, bakers, building and construction workforce and so on. Also, jobs were examined in both rural areas as well as in urban areas. Data were collected from all 150 employees, therefore all of them responded. From 150 responders, 70 of them were females while the rest were male.

The data was collected through a random sampling which means that respondents were chosen based on their immediate availability and easy access (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). It was suggested that is best to approach the organizations in which the survey could be conducted. Taking into consideration the faulty and false data which Kosovar employers could force their employees to fill in the questionnaires, it was more appropriate and the answers given by respondents could be

Fig. 1. Conceptual Model
much more truthful, if the employees in diverse working sectors could be approached directly. As long as few people in Kosovo worked during night shifts, the respondents were chosen only those who work during day time. To reach as many respondents as possible, the snowball effect was used meaning that respondents were asked to invite others to join this study (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). The respondents were given two weeks to fill the questionnaires. However, most of the respondents filled and returned questionnaires within a week. The aim was to approach 150 respondents in total.

**Measures**

A number of rules have been suggested to help researchers write material that can be translated into another language (Brislin, Lonner & Thorndike, 1973). The decentering method, first suggested by Werner and Cambell (1970), is based on the back-translation procedure which is commonly used in cross-cultural research. In back-translation, a researcher prepares material in one language and asks a bilingual to translate it into another (target) language (Brislin, 1976). A second bilingual blindly translates the material back into the original language (Brislin, 1976). The researcher then has two original language forms to examine and can easily make judgment about the quality of the translation (Brislin, 1976).

Some of the measures are based on scales from the validated extended version of the Questionnaire on the Experience and Evaluation of Work (VBBA; Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994), and some of the measures are based on the 8 item scale for job demands in our study work overload (Cousins et al., 2004).

**Autonomy** – Autonomy was measured with the Questionnaire on the Experience and Evaluation of Work (VBBA; Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994), the VBBA was modeled after internationally well-known instruments like the Job Content Questionnaire (JCQ; Karasek, 1985), and similarly has core and extended versions. Previous research has found evidence for the validity of the VBBA scales (e.g., Van Veldhoven, De Jonge, Broersen, Kompier, & Meijman, 2002; Van Veldhoven, Taris, De Jonge, & Broersen, 2005).

The autonomy scale contains 11 items about a range of task aspects that can or cannot be controlled by the individual employee (Van Veldhoven, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2010). All items have a four point of answering scale (1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=always). One example item from this scale is: “Can you organize your work yourself?”
**Work overload** – the scale contains 8 items which measure work overload (Cousins et al., 2004). All items have a five point of answering scale (1=never, 2=seldom, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=always). One example item of this scale is: “I am pressured to work long hours”

**Job Satisfaction** – according to the meta-analysis on the measurement of job satisfaction made by Wanous, Reichers & Hudy (1997), one single item can be used for measuring the overall job satisfaction. Thus, the job satisfaction will be measured with one single item derived from a larger questionnaire by Dolbier, Webster, McCalister, Mallon and Steinhardt (2005). The item is “Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?” The item is answered on seven point scale (1=extremely dissatisfied; 7=extremely satisfied). Therefore, this item was recoded and reverse stated.

**Organizational Commitment** – the organizational commitment will be measured with the eight item scale based on Allen and Meyer (1990) and ask respondents to make evaluations about their ties with the organization (Van Veldhoven, Bakker, & Xanthopoulou, 2010). All items have a four point of answering scale (1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=always). One item example is: “I feel very much at home working for this organization.”

**Turnover intent** – Turnover intent is measured by following single item: “Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job (with another employer) within next year?” This item has two answering scales (1=very likely, 2=not likely at all), (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001). This item was recoded as well. Moreover, a complete overview of all items used can be found in appendix A.

**Control Variables**

In this study the following variables will be included: gender, age, and educational level. It is important that gender will be controlled in this study, because several researches have argued that men and women may differ in the appraisal of job demands (Cavenaugh et al., 2000; Geller & Hobfoll, 1994). Gender will be measured with one item scale (0=male, 1=female). Age is also one of the important control variables. There are three views which explain the important relationship of job satisfaction and age. The first view is that the relationship is best represented by a U-shaped function (Herzberg, Mausner, Peterson, & Capwell, 1957). The second view is that job satisfaction increases in a positive linear fashion with respect to age (Hulin & Smith, 1965). The third function is positive and linear until a terminal period in which there is a
significant decline in job satisfaction (Carrell & Elbert, 1974; Saleh & Otis, 1964). Age will be asked by one open ended question and it will be asked to be answered in years. Lastly, the education level will be asked with one item. A study by Glenn, Taylor, and Weaver (1977) shows that there is of importance of using education as control variable when studying job satisfaction due to the strong association between education and extrinsic rewards. The item can be answered on two item scale (0= primary school, 1=university).

Results:
IBM SPPS statistics 20.0 was used for the analysis of the data. First, the Cronbach’s Alpha analysis was conducted for each scale with multiple items in order to determine how much the items on a scale are measuring the same underlying dimension (Bland & Altman, 1997). What constitutes a good level of internal consistency differs depending on what source someone refers to, although all recommended values are 0.7 or higher (DeVillis, 2003; Kline, 2005). The autonomy scale consisted of eleven items and the result showed that it has high level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.804. The work overload scale also showed a good level of internal consistency with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.746. Finally, a reliability analysis was carried to measure internal consistency for organizational commitment scale, and the results showed a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.798. Moreover, a principal components analysis was run on 29-question that measured five different scales such as work overload, autonomy, job satisfaction, turnover intent, and organization commitment. Inspection of the correlation matrix showed that all variables had at least one correlation coefficient greater than 0.3. However, four questions were excluded from analysis because they did not have any correlation greater than 0.3. The KMO measure was 0.865 or “meritorious” on Kaiser’s (1974) classification of measure values, and it shows that it is appropriate to run a principal component analysis for our data. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was statistically significant (p < 0.001), indicating that the data was likely factorable. Principal component analysis revealed five components that had eigenvalues greater than one and which explained 30.8%, 10.4%, 6.4%, 4.9%, and 4.6% of the total variance. The five component solution explained 57.1% of the total variance. Component loadings and communalities of the rotated solution are presented in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Rotated Component Coefficients</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q2</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q1</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q8</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q5</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q3</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q6</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment_Q4</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q5</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q6</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.260</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q4</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.195</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q2</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q1</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q7</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q4</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q3</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JobSatisfaction_Q1</td>
<td>reverse coded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>-.526</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q2</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q9</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.206</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q10</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q11</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy_Q8</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>-.332</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q6</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q1</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workoverload_Q8</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Table 2 presents the correlations (Pearson’s r) of the main variables used in this study. As it can be seen, the correlations between job satisfaction and turnover intent (-0.385, p < 0.001); autonomy (0.474, p < 0.001); work overload (-0.608, p < 0.001), and organizational commitment (0.342, p < 0.01) are all significant. Therefore, these results show that the use of regression analysis to test the causality between these variables is appropriate. Also, this correlations matrix confirms the hypothesized negative relationship between job satisfaction, work overload and turnover intent, and it shows the positive link between job satisfaction and other two variables autonomy and organizational commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>12.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>-.317***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Work overload</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-.608***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Autonomy</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>.474***</td>
<td>-.416***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Turnover intent</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>-0.200*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-.385***</td>
<td>.275***</td>
<td>-.306***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>.342***</td>
<td>-.225***</td>
<td>.664***</td>
<td>-.194**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Correlations matrix. Note: a. *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001
The relationship of work overload and autonomy with job satisfaction

Multiple regression analysis was carried out to examine the proposed hypotheses. In order to test the hypotheses 1a and 1b, the control variables were entered in block 1, work overload and autonomy were entered in block 2, and job satisfaction was the dependent variable. In order to test hypothesis 2a, the control variables were entered in block 1, job satisfaction in block 2, and organizational commitment was the dependent variable. In order to test hypothesis 2b, the control variables were entered in block 1, job satisfaction in block 2, and turnover intent was the dependent variable. In order to test the mediation hypotheses (3a, 3b, 4a and 4b) the rules of Baron and Kenny (1986) were applied.

Firstly, hypothesis 1a and 1b were tested. The assumptions of linearity, independence of errors, homoscedasticity, unusual points and normality of residuals were met. The model summary table, explains 43.3% of the variance in the scores and this percentage (R²) represents the proportion of variance in job satisfaction that can be explained by the work overload and autonomy. Furthermore, model two which includes age, gender, education, autonomy and work overload explains more variance then model one where only the control variables were included. In the model two, the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable (job satisfaction), F (5, 144) = 21.957, p < .001. None of the control variables explains a significance amount of the variance in this multiple regression analysis. However, the two independent variables such as autonomy (β = .270*** and work overload (β = -.493*** showed a very strong significance, therefore these findings confirm that autonomy is positively related to job satisfaction and work overload is negatively related to job satisfaction. Regression coefficients, F change and standard errors can be found in table 3.
Table 3. Multiple regression analysis - hypothesis 1a and 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (Job satisfaction)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Job satisfaction)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>s.e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>-1.083</td>
<td>0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>21.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3 - 146</td>
<td>5 - 144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between job satisfaction and organization commitment

Multiple regression analysis was carried out in order to test the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The assumptions for linearity, independence of errors, unusual points, homoscedasticity, and normality of residuals were met. In model 2 all variables predicted statistically significantly the dependent variable (organizational commitment), F (4, 145) = 5.302, Adj. R² = .104. Whereas, the control variables in model one did not predict statistically significantly the dependent variable, F (3, 146) = 0.656, Adj. R² = -.007. All three control variables did not add any significance explanatory in this regression equation. However, the independent variable job satisfaction significantly predicted organizational commitment (β = 0.341***), therefore this findings confirms that job satisfaction is positively related to organizational commitment. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple regression analysis - hypothesis 2a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (Organization commitment)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Organization commitment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>s.e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>5.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3 - 146</td>
<td>4 - 145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. *p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001
Logistic regression analysis – the relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intent

Binary logistic regression can be used to analyze data in studies where the outcome variable is binary or dichotomous (Warner, 2008). In our study, a typical binary outcome of interest is whether the intention to leave the organization is highly likely or not likely at all. A logistic regression analysis was performed to ascertain the effects of job satisfaction and three control variables (age, gender, education) on the turnover intent as a dependent variable. The reason that we used logistic regression analysis in testing this hypothesis was because the outcome variable (turnover intent) was binary or dichotomous. The outcome variable was reverse coded 1 – not likely at all and 2 – very likely. The logistic regression model was statistically significant, Chi-square (1) = 26.922, p < .001. The model explained 26.9% (Nagelkerke R square) of variance in turnover intentions and correctly classified 82% of cases. Of the four predictor variables only two were statistically significant: age and job satisfaction (-.640*** as shown in Table 5).

Therefore, these findings confirm hypothesis 2b which states that job satisfaction is negatively related to turnover intentions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>95% C.I. for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>4.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.640</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>17.226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.526</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>23.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>251.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linear regression and multiple regression analysis for mediating hypothesis

The hypothesis 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b stated that job satisfaction mediates the links between autonomy/work overload and organizational commitment/turnover intention. Baron and Kenny (1986) proposed a four step approach for mediating hypothesis in which several regression analyses are conducted and significance of the coefficients is examined at each step. In order to test hypothesis 3a, firstly, in our study it was conducted a simple regression analysis with work over load predicting directly organizational commitment. Secondly, a simple regression analysis was conducted with work overload predicting job satisfaction alone. Thirdly, a simple regression analysis was conducted with job satisfaction predicting organizational commitment. Finally, a multiple regression analysis was conducted with work overload and job satisfaction predicting organizational commitment. In this study the same procedure was followed for the rest of mediation hypothesis 3b, 4b, and 4a.

In the first step, a linear regression established that work overload could not statistically significantly predict organizational commitment, $F (4, 145) = 2.236, p = .068$. In the second step, the linear regression analysis showed that work overload could statistically significantly predict job satisfaction alone, $F (4, 145) = 21.608, p < .001$. Also, in the third step, when testing hypothesis 2a the linear regression analysis showed that job satisfaction could statistically significantly predict organizational commitment, $F (4, 145) = 5.302, p < .001$. The multiple regression analysis was conducted to predict organizational commitment from work overload and job satisfaction. These two variables statistically significantly predicted organizational commitment, $F (5, 144) = 4.216, p < .001$, Adj. $R^2 = .099$. The mediating variable (job satisfaction) added statistically significantly to the prediction, $p < .001$ while the variable X (work overload) in step four did not add statistically significantly to the prediction ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, this showed that the finding supports full mediation. Therefore, the steps 1 to 3 show that a predicted direction exists among the variables (Baron & Kenny, 1986). If one or more of these relationships are no significant, researchers usually conclude that mediation is not possible or likely (MacKinnon, Fairchild & Fritz, 2007). Thus, according the first three steps results, it was proceed with the step four. The rule for mediation in step four is that some form of mediation is supported if the effect of independent variable (work overload) is no longer significant after controlling for the mediator (job satisfaction) (Baron & Kenny, 1986). In other words, if variable X (work overload) is no longer significant when mediating variable is included
in the regression, then the findings supports full mediation but if variable X (work overload) is still significant but the strength of the effect is reduced (i.e., both work overload and job satisfaction significantly predict variable Y in our case organization commitment), then the findings supports partial mediation (Baron & Kenny, 1986). These findings confirmed that the relationship between work overload and organization commitment is negatively mediated by job satisfaction. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found in Table 6.

### Table 6. Summary of Linear and multiple regression analysis for testing mediation hypothesis 3a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and statistic</th>
<th>(Organization commitment)</th>
<th>(Organization commitment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1 (β)</td>
<td>Step 4 (β)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.333***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>-.216**</td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.236</td>
<td>4.216***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (Adj. R²)</td>
<td>.058(.032)</td>
<td>.128(.097)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

The mediation effect of job satisfaction between work overload, autonomy, and turnover intent

The four step procedure of Baron and Kenny (1986) was carried out to test the mediating effect of job satisfaction between work overload, autonomy, and turnover intent. Even though, in Baron and Kenny’s (1986) four steps for mediation effect is not allowed to use other techniques except multiple regression analysis, this was the only provisional way in testing the hypothesis 3b and 4b. As it is argued there are better methods and techniques to test the hypotheses of this kind (Breen, Karlson & Holm, 2013). Firstly, the path between work overload and autonomy and variable Y (turnover intent) was tested. Secondly, the path between work overload and autonomy and variable M (job satisfaction) was skipped because it was already done when hypotheses 3a,
1a and 1b were tested. The third step involved a logistic regression analysis testing the path between variable M (job satisfaction) and dependent variable (turnover intent). And finally, the fourth step was conducted by performing a logistic regression analysis including the control variables and independent variables X (work overload, autonomy) and M (job satisfaction) while variable Y (turnover intent) was dependent variable.

In the first step, the logistic regression established that work overload could not statistically significantly predict turnover intent, \( p > .001 \), whereas autonomy statistically significantly predicted turnover intent, \( p < 0.05 \). Also, in the third step the logistic regression was carried out and it established that job satisfaction could statistically significantly predict turnover intent, \( p < .001 \). Lastly, a logistic regression analysis was carried out to predict turnover intent from work overload, autonomy, and job satisfaction.

The mediating variable added statistically significantly to the prediction, \( p < .05 \) while the variable X (work overload) in the multiple regression analysis showed to be not very significant (.701) and also autonomy was not significant either (.064), therefore we can conclude that there is full positive mediation by job satisfaction. These findings support our hypotheses that the relationship between work overload and turnover intent is positively mediated by job satisfaction. And the relationship between autonomy and turnover intent is negatively mediated by job satisfaction. Regression coefficients and standard errors can be found below in Table 7.

Table 7. Summary of logistic regression analysis for testing mediation - hypothesis 3b and 4b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and statistic</th>
<th>(Turnover Intent)</th>
<th>(Turnover Intent)</th>
<th>(Turnover Intent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Step 1 (B)</td>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Step 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.640***</td>
<td>-.549**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-1.203**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work overload</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td></td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Snell R²</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R²</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *\( p < 0.05 \), **\( p < 0.01 \), ***\( p < 0.001 \)
The mediation effect of job satisfaction between autonomy and organization commitment

Hypothesis 4a suggested mediating effect of job satisfaction on the relationship between autonomy and organizational commitment. The same four step procedure was followed running linear regression in order to predict the direct path between autonomy and organizational commitment, the path between autonomy and job satisfaction, the link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment and finally a multiple regression analysis was performed to predict organizational commitment from autonomy and job satisfaction.

The linear regression showed that autonomy could statistically significantly predict organizational commitment, $F(4, 145) = 30.738, p < .001$. In the second step of Baron and Kenny (1986) for testing the mediation effect, the linear regression analysis established that autonomy could statistically significantly predict job satisfaction, $F(4, 145) = 11.589, p < .001$. Testing the path between job satisfaction and organizational commitment was skipped here because it was carried out earlier while testing hypothesis 3a. Finally, a multiple regression analysis was run to predict organizational commitment from autonomy and job satisfaction. These variables statistically significantly predicted organizational commitment, $F(5, 144) = 24.459, p < .001$. Adj. $R^2 = .431$. Autonomy added statistically significantly to the prediction, $p < .001$ while job satisfaction as mediating variable did not contribute statistically significantly to the prediction showing a significance of $p > .05$.

Although, the first three steps showed a high significance, the fourth step showed that job satisfaction, which was hypothesized as a mediating variable, drops from significance, which suggests that autonomy mediates the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This information confirms that job satisfaction has an indirect effect on organizational commitment and autonomy acts as mediator between them. This is consistent with the fact that some studies have given support to this theoretical framework with the fact that employees with higher levels of autonomy were more likely to be satisfied with their jobs, and also were more likely to stay loyal and commit themselves to the organization (Thomson & Prottas, 2005). However, the hypothesis which stated that the relationship between autonomy and organizational commitment was not supported according to the results.
Table 7. Summary of Linear and multiple regression analysis for testing mediation - hypothesis 4a.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and statistic</th>
<th>(Affective commitment) Step 1</th>
<th>(Job satisfaction) Step 2</th>
<th>(Affective commitment) Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>- .131*</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.130*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.669***</td>
<td>.478***</td>
<td>.658***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30.738***</td>
<td>11.589***</td>
<td>24.459***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² (Adj. R²)</td>
<td>.459(.444)</td>
<td>.242(.221)</td>
<td>.459(.440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001

Fig. 2. The relationship of work overload and autonomy, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intent, and mediation effect of job satisfaction.
Discussions
In this paper the JD-R model (Demerouti et al., 2000, 2001) was used to investigate how the job demand (work overload) and the job resource (autonomy) are related to job satisfaction, turnover intent and affective commitment. Therefore, a sample of 150 respondents in private sector from Kosovo was used to investigate the hypotheses. This study contributed in several ways toward employee wellbeing in Kosovo. The JD-R model predicts that high job demands are negatively related to job satisfaction (Bakker, Demmerouti, 2007). The results from this study confirmed this part of JD-R model when the link between work overload and job satisfaction was tested. The findings show that there is a direct effect of work overload on job satisfaction. The second part of JD-R model states that job resources contribute positively to job satisfaction (Bakker, Demmerouti, 2007). Thus, the findings confirm that autonomy as job resource affects directly the job satisfaction. Therefore, in this study two working conditions were identified to be as some of the main causes of job satisfaction among employees in Kosovo. Moreover, such findings are consistent with other research about job demands and job resources. For instance, Janssen, Bakker, & de Jong (2001) argued that work overload is negatively related to job satisfaction. Also, Landsbergis (1988) argues that job dissatisfaction is significantly higher in jobs that combine high work overload demands with low autonomy.
Moreover, this study provided a strong evidence for the role which the job satisfaction has on organizational commitment and turnover intentions. The findings show that job satisfaction has a direct effect on organizational commitment and it has also strong effect on turnover intentions. However, according to Mobley (1977), there are several factors which normally occur between one’s satisfaction for the job and his or her intentions to leave. The results explain that employees in Kosovo tend to leave their organization more when their job satisfaction is lower. This finding is consistent with the reports about nurses in private hospitals whom after their job satisfaction decreased, most of them intent to leave their jobs (Mehmeti, 2010). The results are supported by Tett & Meyer (1993) that job satisfaction contribute in very unique way to turnover intentions. On the other hand, organizational commitment tend to have a moderate and slow increase or decrease when job satisfaction is higher or lower. Perhaps this occurs because, as the previous research shows, it takes more time for an employee to establish affective commitment (Porter, Steers, Mowday & Boulian, 1974).
In this study it was argued that job satisfaction serves as mediator between work overload and
organizational commitment. The findings display a full mediation of job satisfaction between work overload and organizational commitment. Thus, the employees perceived work overload as one of the determinants of organizational commitment and their job satisfaction to link these two variables. These findings confirms previous research that main determinants of organizational commitment are job satisfaction (Hrebinia, & Alutto, 1972), and work overload (Morris & Koch, 1979; Morris & Sherman, 1981). Another contribution of this study to the previous research is that the mediation of job satisfaction between work overload and turnover intent was tested. Moreover, several potential consequences of job satisfaction has been identified and one of such is turnover intent (Dittrich & Carrell, 1979). However, this relationship was extended by integrating JD-R model and predicting that job demand such as work overload is an important variable in causing turnover intentions and job satisfaction acts only as a mediator between those two. The results confirmed this assumption by showing that job satisfaction fully mediates the work overload and turnover intentions. Therefore, employees in Kosovo tend to be quite sensitive towards their work overload, and as their work overload increases, the intent to leave the organization increases as well. Moreover, according to the findings, when work overload is present among employees in Kosovo, job satisfaction decreases, therefore they begin to consider in leaving that organization. Several research supports these finding by arguing that turnover intent is preceded by job satisfaction, which is preceded by job characteristics such as work overload (Mobley, Horner, & Hollingsworth, 1978; Miller, Katerberg, & Hulin, 1979).

Finally, according to the findings in this research, there is strong evidence that autonomy is very important element for employees in Kosovo and it serves as a mean in increasing or decreasing one’s job satisfaction. Therefore, research supports the arguments that autonomy has positive effects on work-related attitudes such as job satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, one of the main streams of this study was to test the mediation effect of job satisfaction between autonomy and organizational commitment. The results showed that job satisfaction has an indirect effect on organizational commitment, whereas, autonomy fully mediated the link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Such findings display that employees in Kosovo produce organizational commitment toward the organization only when they are satisfied with their jobs and this satisfaction is followed by the autonomy in their workplace. Even though, this might be a rare case, still the findings show that the primary condition for employees in Kosovo is to be satisfied with basic working conditions and then to look for some
sort of autonomy which serves them to be committed to their organization. This explains that the job resource such as autonomy is preferred by the employees in Kosovo only when job satisfaction is increased. In this study the mediation effect of job satisfaction between autonomy and turnover intent was tested. The results confirmed the previous research which stated that autonomy is an important determinant of job satisfaction (Dwayer, Schwartz, & Fox, 1992; McCloskey, 1990; Roedel & Nystrom, 1988; Seybolt, 1986), which directly affects the intentions to quit the organizations (Mobley et al., 1979). The results showed that employees in Kosovo experience a low autonomy and job satisfaction, therefore the tendencies to leave the organization are quite high.

**Limitations of data collection approach**

Like many other studies, this paper has its own limitations as well. The measurement of the model variables is based on self-reports, which increases the possibility that the relationships between variables might be due to common method variance (Bakker, Demerouti & Schaufeli, 2010). Data was collected totally based on self-reports rather than in personnel records of different variables. For instance, extra hours or different workload situations were measured only what employees reported. In addition, as Kosovo employment system is considered very unstable, employers do not keep records adequately. Another limitation of data collection is that it was held only in one country. Thus, it does not give us a detailed explanation of how our model variables occur in other regional countries. Yet another limitation was that the survey was conducted only in private sector, basically employees with minimum wage from wide range of occupations who work under very bad working conditions. This is another shortcoming of this study which do not represent other groups of employees within Kosovo labor market such as public sector. Therefore, these findings do not show the public sector employee wellbeing, however, each of the relationships in this study’s model has been found in studies among employees in a wide range of occupations (Bekker, Demerouti, de Boder & Schaufeli, 2001).

**Future research directions**

Considering this study limitations, it would be necessary for future researchers to include a more wide national representative sample which would give much more confident findings. Moreover, as the research was done only in one country, future researchers might want to compare two
countries with one another, thus it will produce better assumptions and predictions regarding the level of employee wellbeing in Kosovo. As the conceptual model was introduced, it is clear that it does not imply any formal model or theory, thus future researchers might develop a more detailed model with additional variables which would enable them to make more measures and come up with better results. Even though the literature in employee wellbeing is very rich, still it would be of high importance and necessary to develop a framework which could explain the variables included in this study in much detailed way. Although, this is always the case in organizational behavior research, it is instructive to consider what such additional variables might be affecting relationships observed in such studies (Thomson & Prottas, 2005).

Implications for practitioners
The employers in Kosovo, should be more aware of the importance of autonomy by taking action about this issue. Employers in Kosovo should try to retain their employees by giving them more autonomy in the work place which would enable them to feel more important for the organization and their satisfaction about their jobs would increase. This could be done by letting the employees organize their daily tasks by themselves. Therefore, employers should not persist to get involved in every detail of one’s job and in every move that an employee makes. Moreover, this study shows that employees in this country view work overload as negative part of their life which affects their satisfaction at workplace. The main concern in Kosovo private sector remains the unpaid extra working hours, which makes employees feel tired, unmotivated and looking for better organizations which possibly offer better working conditions (Mehmeti, 2010). Therefore, employers in Kosovo should act within their legal framework and have good intentions when they hire an employee. Thus, by both reducing work overload or by keeping it but paying for it, employees would be more satisfied and they would be more committed to that organization.

The results showed that job satisfaction remains as core mediator between JD-R model and plays an important role for employees in Kosovo when they decide to remain or leave the organization. According to Lambert and Hogan (2009), if employees like their jobs, there is less of a reason to quit as compared to when the employees dislikes their jobs. Therefore, employers in Kosovo should take this into account and improve working conditions by establishing contracts for employees and respect the employment laws especially regarding the extra working hours.
However in order to increase the affective commitment employers in Kosovo should focus in reducing the negative job demands which lowers job satisfaction of employees. This can be done by hiring additional employees, therefore the work volume will be distributed to larger number of employees which in turn could reduce the work overload of the current employees. Another important suggestion is that employers in Kosovo should manage the time more efficiently, thus it enable them to get the job done within the scheduled working time.
Appendix A:

Task Autonomy – (VBBA; Van Veldhoven & Meijman, 1994)
Item Scale: 11

*Scored on a 4-point LIKERT scale ‘never’, ‘sometimes’, ‘often’, ‘always’:

1. Do you have freedom in carrying out your work activities?
2. Do you have influence in the planning of your work activities?
3. Do you have an influence on the pace of work?
4. Can you decide how your work is executed on your own?
5. Can you interrupt your work for a short time if you find it necessary to do so?
6. Can you decide the order in which you carry out your work on your own?
7. Can you participate in the decision about when something must be completed?
8. Can you personally decide how much time you need for a specific activity?
9. Do you resolve problems arising in your work yourself?
10. Can you organize your work yourself?
11. Can you decide on the content of your work activities yourself?

Work Overload – (Cousins et al., 2004)
Item Scale: 8

*Scored on a 5-point LIKERT scale ‘never’, ‘seldom’, ‘sometimes’, ‘often’, ‘always’:

1. I am pressured to work long hours
2. I have unachievable deadlines
3. I have to work very fast
4. I have to work very intensively
5. I have to neglect some tasks because I have too much to do
6. Different groups at work demand things from me that are hard to combine
7. I am unable to take sufficient breaks
8. I have unrealistic time pressures

Job Satisfaction – (Dolbier, Webster, McCalister, Mallon and Steinhardt, 2005)
Item Scale: 1

*Scored on a 7-point LIKERT scale: 1-extremely satisfied, 7-extremely dissatisfied:

1. Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?

Turnover intent: (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2001).
Item Scale: 1

*Scored on a 2-point LIKERT scale: 1-very likely, 2-not likely at all

1. Taking everything into consideration, how likely is it that you will make a genuine effort to find a new job (with another employer) within next year?
Organizational Commitment – (Allen & Meyer, 1990)
Item Scale: 8

Scored on a 4-point LIKERT scale ‘never’, ‘sometimes’, ‘often’, ‘always’:

1. I find that my own views correspond closely to those of the organization.
2. It is important to me that I can make a contribution to the organization’s goals.
3. I really feel very closely involved with this organization.
4. I feel very at home working for this organization.
5. I have put so much of myself into this organization that I would find it extremely hard to leave.
6. With respect to this organization, I really feel obliged to stay on several more years.
7. It would take very little negative change to make me leave.
8. Working for this organization is very appealing in comparison with most other jobs that I could get.

Control Variables

Items:
1. What is your age?
2. Are you male or female?
3. What is your educational level?
   Primary school, University
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