Abstract: This study aimed to investigate the effect of work stress on affective commitment directly and indirectly through the mediation of job satisfaction. Organizations need to develop employee’s affective commitment. This emotional attachment believed to have positive impact on organizational performance. The current study examined 428 participants from various industries in Indonesia. Using path analysis the study revealed that work stress had very small negative effect on job satisfaction. Job satisfaction had significant positive effect on affective commitment, but work stress did not have significant effect on affective commitment. Thus job satisfaction did not mediate the effect of work stress on affective commitment. Findings suggest that organization still need to find other factors which have impact on employee’s affective commitment, while they can still achieve affective commitment by providing a program that enhances job satisfaction. The contribution of this paper is to provide wider analysis regarding stress and job attitude to improve organizational policies in managing human resources.
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enhance employee performance and productivity, which leads to employee satisfaction and an increase in organizational commitment.

Robbins & Judge (2017) described organizational commitment as the degree to which an employee identifies with a particular organization and its goals and wishes to maintain membership in the organization. It is an individual’s psychological attachment to the organization. The organization should find ways to improve how employees feel about their jobs and make them more committed to their organizations. Committed individuals tend to display the continuation of their employment with the organization and greater motivation toward pursuing organizational goals and decisions (Kinicki & Fugate, 2016).

It is not just commitment, but most managers need employees who are effectively committed to their employer because those employees tend to engage in more interpersonal and organizational citizenship behavior (Colquitt et al., 2015). Furthermore, Mercurio (2015) also confirms that affective commitment, or the emotional attachment to the organization, is an important essence of organizational commitment. Most previous studies also indicate that effective commitment is more predictive of major organizational consequences such as turnover intention, absenteeism, and organizational citizenship behavior than other types of organizational commitment. George & Jones (2012) argued that employees with affective commitment could be identified as happy to be members of an organization believe in and feel good about the organization and what it stands for, are attached to the organization, and intend to do what is good for the organization. Other benefits for having employees with higher affective commitment are lower turnover intention (Addae et al., 2006), higher organizational citizenship behavior (Kim, 2013), better job performance (Park & Rainey, 2007), lower absenteeism (Garland et al., 2013), stronger employee engagement (Glarino, 2013), and willingness to share knowledge to other (Jeung et al., 2017).

The current study examines the influence of work stress and job satisfaction on affective commitment in private and public organizations in Indonesia. Research that addresses the relation of these three variables is still rarely done especially by using participants from various organizations. Each organization faced with demands from customers to increase their service and product quality. To answer these demands organization relies on its employees. That is the reason why organization should pay careful attention to manage them. They need to provide better work environment, attractive job, and care so employees more likely to be committed to organization. By focusing on the aspect of work stress, organizations show sympathy for potential employee problems caused by their work. If it is found that stress can interfere with work or the work can cause stress, employee will develop less affective commitment. Work stress has an impact on individual and organizational performance because stress leads to apathy, negative attitude, and decreased job values.

On the other hand, job satisfaction also has a role in developing high affective commitment. If work stress negatively impacts affective commitment, job satisfaction has reverse impact. An employee with high satisfaction level will show high affective commitment. These two factors can support each other to build employee’s affective commitment. The article expected to provide valuable knowledge to academicians and practitioners to study the mediation of job satisfaction in relation to work stress and affective commitment. Business organizations can improve their policies regarding human resources management, while academicians can develop a new perspective on how these three variables interact with each other. Both parties then can help each other to discuss and find positive solutions on how to develop employee’s affective commitment.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Kinicki & Fugate (2016) describe stress as an adaptive response to environmental demands, referred to as stressors that produce adaptive responses that include physical, emotional, and behavioral reactions that are influenced by individual differences. While definition from Robbins & Judge (2017) explain stress as a dynamic condition experienced by employee when face opportunities, de-
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mands, or resources that have relation with their interest but they do not have certainty regarding results. It is clearly that stress is an individual state of mind when they are faced with demands caused by several conflicting choices and do not yet have the certainty of the results or resources. If you develop a sense of being overwhelmed, sense an insurmountable problem, expected to do achieve enormous target, or felt uncertain about how to respond to a situation that is when you face stress.

Stress is an organizational behavior topic that’s quite familiar to the individual. You will experience stress whether you are at work, at school, or social environment. For example you will have to face final exams next week, but you do not feel prepared. At the same time, you have also promised your family to go on a trip. Work stress happened and related to work environment. For example, organizations decide to close several stores due to economic pressure. That will reduce the size of its workforce. Some employees might experience stress because their financial security and family wellbeing are threatened. Or, employees have difficulties in communicating with their co-workers or supervisor.

Stress is part of daily life and cannot be avoided. Some people might be able to deal with all of these demands and some people would feel stressed out.

Schermerhorn et al. (2012) explained two kinds of stress, the positive impact, which called eustress and distress which represent negative impact. The organization needs to develop the work environment which nurturing the kind of stress that motivates employee to perform while avoiding practices that drive strain. They can provide employees with great leaders that suit employee’s needs. Offer attractive and competitive compensation, provide adequate tools & support to finish the job, flexible work arrangement, and provide work-family counselling (Al-Hosam et al., 2016; Gill et al., 2010; Jain et al., 2013; Rehman et al., 2010; Russell et al., 2009; Yun et al., 2012).

Stress is not always bad. Stress even can help an individual to focus and enthusiasm to face new challenges. Stress can cause negative strain when the level had exceeds your capability to response. Then it can damage your physical and psychological condition. Negative work stress interferes you might have problems to keep your performance, your health, and your personal life. Work stress also has impact on job performance and organizational commitment (Colquitt et al., 2015). Sajida & Moeljadi (2018) found the mediation role of work stress on employee’s commitment. Kinicki & Fugate (2016) present four outcomes of occupational stress namely psychological, behavioral, cognitive, and physical. Previous literature confirms these outcomes (Lambert et al., 2015; Charity, 2016; Alipour & Monfared, 2015; Paoline et al., 2015; Kumar & Varma, 2017; Khuong & Yen, 2016; Javed et al., 2014).

Job satisfaction becomes one of the most popular issues in organizational behavior. It is an employee’s feeling or response toward dimensions of their job (salary, supervisor, co-workers, job characteristics, and potential career advancement). Job satisfaction is personal, that means each individual can have different level of job satisfaction even though they work at the same company and the same department. Employee satisfaction toward their job considers important aspect and frequently used to evaluate the effectiveness of organizational health regarding their human capital management. It is argued as one of key goals in human resources practices (Bathena, 2018).

According to Kinicki & Fugate (2016), job satisfaction is an affective or emotional response toward various facets of one’s job. Various facets mean that might be more than one aspect that can be assessed to measure job satisfaction. Another definition from Colquitt et al. (2015) regards job satisfaction as a pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences. It represents what you feel and thinks about the job. Highly satisfied employees will show positive attitude at work, and the unsatisfied feeling will result in undesired outcomes. Employees with high job satisfaction experience positive feelings about their duties and willingly take part in any activities. Low job satisfaction employees will perform less and not interested in their duties or activities.

Many things can affect job satisfaction. Robbins & Judge (2017) mention job conditions, personality,
pay, and corporate social responsibility is factors related to job satisfaction. An interesting job that provides continuous training, variety, independence, social support, and positive interaction with co-workers strongly related to job satisfaction. An individual’s personality plays crucial role in developing satisfaction. People with positive core self-evaluation usually more satisfied with their jobs. They believed that their contribution is important and they have competencies to do the jobs. It is not surprising that salary correlates with job satisfaction. Money still motivates people, but the effect can be smaller once an individual reaches a standard level of comfortable living. Lastly, employees whose personal values fit with the organization’s CSR mission are often more satisfied. This relationship is particularly strong for Millennials. If employees can serve higher purpose while doing their job, they often develop higher job satisfaction. Another explanation regarding determinants of job satisfaction came from George & Jones (2012). Personality, work situation, value, and social influence affect job satisfaction. The ways an individual feels thinks, and will influence their job satisfaction. An individual’s value also plays important role in shaping job satisfaction. An employee with strong intrinsic work values felt their job is interesting and giving personal meaning even though it requires long hours and doesn’t pay well. Work conditions regarding the tasks and duties that an individual should perform. This related to the nature of the job, interaction with customers, subordinates, and supervisors, the environment (noise level, crowdedness, and temperature), and company treatment (security, safety, salary). Previous literature supports both arguments regarding antecedents of job satisfaction (Dirani, 2009; Vidal et al., 2007; Yutes, 2014; Danish et al., 2015; Donald et al., 2016; Malik et al., 2011).

Job satisfaction often related to several organizational outcomes. Robbins & Judge (2017) discussed several outcomes such as job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, and counter-productive behavior (absenteeism, turnover). According Colquitt et al. (2015) job satisfaction predicts job performance and organizational commitment while Kinicki & Fugate (2016) divide the outcomes into two categories. Attitudinal outcomes which consist of motivation, job involvement, withdrawal cognitions, and perceived stress. While behavioral outcomes such as job performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Previous literatures found outcomes like engagement (Kumar et al., 2018), motivation (Bonenberger et al., 2014), high affective commitment (Lambert et al., 2015), loyalty (Onsardi et al., 2016), low turnover intention (Rubel & Kee, 2015), and willingness to share knowledge to others (Cheema & Javed, 2017).

Allen & Meyer (1990) developed three-component model of commitment. Commitment to an organization is a psychological state of individual or employees, and the three components that affect how employees feel about the organization that they work for are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Affective commitment refers to personal attachment, continuance refers to the fear of loss of something, and normative is about obligation fulfillment. The current study uses affective commitment because it is believed to be the essence of organizational commitment (Mercurio, 2015).

McShane & von Glinow (2018) defined affective organizational commitment as the employee’s emotional attachment to, involvement in, and identification with an organization. Next, George & Jones (2012) defined it as the commitment that exists when employees are happy to be members of an organization, believe in and feel good about the organization and what it stands for, are attached to the organization, and intend to do what is good for the organization. The tendency of a worker to stay with a company is based on an emotional attachment. Affective commitment related to psychological bonds where employees choose to be dedicated and become more responsible for the organization. The individual is said to have an effective commitment when he/she has strong emotional attachment to their organization. In this case individual will likely identify themselves with the organization’s goals and values. An employee who displays affective commitment often strongly identifies themselves with the company and its objectives. They might turn down offers to move to a new company, even if
they offered more attractive compensation. Affective commitment arises from long positive work experiences, which then turn to emotional bonds between the person and the employing organization. This strong bond based on the social exchange theory develop by Homans in 1958 (Cook & Rice, 2006) holds that positive treatment from one party (organization) results in a positive viewpoint from another party (employee).

Affective commitment often related to potential consequences such as organizational citizenship behavior, absenteeism, and turnover intention (George & Jones, 2012). McShane & von Glinow (2018) expressed that employees with a strong psychological connection with the organization are less likely to quit and be absent from work, have higher work motivation, organizational citizenship, and higher job performance as well. Findings from previous studies also support the relationship between affective commitment and those outcomes (Garland et al., 2013 – absenteeism; Glarino, 2013 & Chugthai, 2013 – engagement; Pradhan & Pradhan, 2015 – job performance; Jeung et al., 2017 – knowledge sharing; Vandenberge & Tremblay, 2008 – turnover intention; Kuvaas, 2006 – motivation; Hodgkinson et al., 2018 – business performance; Bagrain, 2010 – helping behavior).

The positive consequences resulted from high affective commitment make it clear that the organization needs to have employees who have affective commitment. To promote this emotional attachment, it is recommended for organizations to identify what aspects that can affect employees’ attitude to having emotional attachment to the organization. Some of the factors such as role stress, perceived organizational support, leadership style, empowerment, job insecurity and employability, and distribution of leadership are connected to a worker’s sense of affective organizational commitment. Ashikali & Groeneveld (2015) found the role of transformational leadership and inclusive organizational culture to affect affective commitment. Saleem & Qamar (2017), revealed the relation between job involvement and job satisfaction with affective commitment. A study in Romania from Ciceci (2012) found negative effect of work stress on affective commitment. Other factors that strongly affected affective commitment are job satisfaction (Dirani, 2009), perceived organizational support (Wong & Wong, 2017), training and performance appraisal (Hodgkinson et al., 2018), and learning culture (Malik & Garg, 2017). Most business organizations might have thought about why people become emotionally committed to one organization? Is it because they love what they do or because individual’s goals align with such company. The current study will examine work stress and job satisfaction and look at how they affect the affective commitment.

It is believed that employees who perceive their workload and responsibilities as too heavy and regard their work as stressful and demanding would have less commitment to the organization. Work stress can cause by several factors like poor leadership, poor relations with co-workers, demanding jobs, and lack of support from company. These factors can easily affect the employee perception towards organization. Refer to the social exchange theory. Too much work stress will reduce the emotional attachment or affective commitment. Stressful employees will have difficulties to appreciate their company. This study investigates 15 articles from various countries and found that researchers reported negative correlations between work stress and affective commitment with various r values. Only three that showed strong correlations at above 0.50 (Alipour & Monfared, 2015; Ciceci, 2012; Lambert et al., 2015). While the rests only show weak correlation (Hunter & Thatcher, 2007; Khatibi et al., 2009; Yousef, 2002; Akpinar et al., 2013; Yang et al., 2017; Ahmad & Roslan, 2016; Sanjeev & Rathore, 2014; Michael et al., 2009; Anton, 2009; Tiwari & Mishara, 2008; Kafashpoor et al., 2014). Based on these findings, first hypothesis is set as follows

$$H_1: \text{Work stress will have a significant negative effect on affective commitment.}$$

The reverse direction also found on the relation of work stress and job satisfaction. Employees who perceive their job as demanding and stressful rarely enjoy their work. If this happens, in the long run, they can experience dissatisfaction. The de-
crease in satisfaction level can affect anything like performance and commitment. Heavy workload, poor working conditions, role ambiguity, and role conflict can reduce employee’s satisfaction. To study the relation between these variables, 18 articles were investigated. There are 8 studies which represent strong correlations (Tziner et al., 2015), Mansoor et al., 2011), Kumar & Varma, 2017), Duraisingam (2009), Lambert & Paoline III, 2008), Paoline et al., 2015) Giauque et al., 2013), and Kim et al., 2014). Seven studies showed weak correlations or below .50 (Yousef, 2002; Masihabadi et al., 2015; Paille, 2011; Lu et al., 2007; Tongchaipraisit & Ariyabuddhiphongs, 2016; Lin et al., 2013; Love et al., 2010). Although most studies show a negative relationship, there is one research from Saeed & Farooq (2014) argued that there is insignificant correlation between work stress and job satisfaction. Overriding one different result, the second hypothesis for this study is

H2 : work stress will have a significant negative effect on employee’s job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and affective commitment are two popular variables that are often discussed in the field of organizational behavior. Affective commitment is different from normative and continuous commitment. Employees who have an effective commitment develop emotional attachment and relationships with the organization. This emotional attachment can drive employee to work more seriously and achieve better results. They assume that working for the company is important and will support their success. Employees will have a higher level of affective commitment if the company is considered to pay attention to their level of satisfaction. Research from various countries using a variety of industries reinforces the view that there is a positive correlation between job satisfaction and affective commitment. Eighteen scientific articles from 2002 to 2017 were study and fourteen showed the strong correlations (Alsiewi & Agil, 2014; Saleem & Qamar, 2017; Lambert et al., 2015; Dirani, 2009; Colakoglu et al., 2010; Imam et al., 2013; Matzler & Renzl, 2007; Park & Rainey, 2007; Xie, 2005; Donald, 2016; Sieger et al., 2011; Mehmood et al., 2016; Yousef, 2002). Only four articles showed weak correlations (Chang et al., 2015; Islam et al., 2014; Gangai & Agrawal, 2014; Kuo, 2015). This finding confirms the strong positive relationships which lead us to set the third hypothesis as followed

H3 : employee job satisfaction will have significant positive effect on affective organizational commitment.

Assuming that those hypotheses will holds, where job satisfaction could mediate work stress effect on affective commitment, the next hypothesis is

H4 : Job satisfaction will mediate the effect of work stress on employees’ affective commitment.

METHOD

Participants

A survey of five different organizations consists of two public services, two private companies, and one government-owned company (BUMN). The questionnaire was distributed to 120 employees in each organization which total of 600 questionnaires. We receive 428 useable responds and represent 71.3% return rate. The questionnaire distributed through human resources department and the participants treated as anonymous. The procedure was adopted because the difficulties in getting permission to handed the questionnaire directly to the intended participants. Of the participants, male employees dominated in terms of gender (65.4%). Age range distributed quite evenly with the range of 40 – 45 years is the most followed by under 25 years old. It looks like each organization already prepares to replace the aging employees. 42.1% held undergraduate degree which is quite normal since most jobs in the organization do not need higher degree of education. Approximately 75% are officers, employees who had no managerial position. And 29.2% have ten years or more experience in their current organization. Employees seem experience good work environment since most of them (74.3%) only work up to 9 hours per day. The detail characteristics of the sample are presented in Table 1.
Data Analysis

The current study uses bootstrapping approach using the PROCESS Macro as a tool to test the significance of mediation. Mediation analysis enables scholars to examine the processes through which certain variable(s) affects another. Preacher et al. (2007) argued that bootstrapping has been considered as an appropriate approach in such cases because it avoids normality assumptions of the sampling distribution through the application of bootstrapping confidence intervals. (Hayes et al., 2017; Preacher et al., 2007). In practical terms, the macro facilitates the implementation of the recommended bootstrapping approach and readily assesses the significance of conditional effects at different values of a moderator (Oh & Oh, 2017). Previous studies that use this analysis technique were Goswami et al. (2016), Karazsia et al. (2014), Wongpakaran et al. (2016), Prasetio et al. (2017), and Kane & Ashbaugh (2017). The steps to measure the relationship between variables and the mediation of job satisfaction began with the installation of macro file called PROCESS inside SPSS (version 21). Then authors followed the procedures explain in Hayes (2013) to get the result. The mediating of job satisfaction will be determined based on the value of the Upper-level and Lower-level Confidence Interval which should be either all positive or negative. If both signs appear, then job satisfaction does not have mediation role in the relation of work stress and affective commitment.

Measurements

The questionnaire used in this study consist of 34 items covering for work stress (8 items), job satisfaction (20 items), and affective commitment (6 items). A 6-point response scale was employed, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The average score yielded a summary score reflecting employee’s perception regarding each variable.

Work stress was measured using items develop from Elci et al. (2012). Two items were added to the initial scale. Examples of the items include ‘I
often feel exhausted after work,’ and ‘I regard my job as very strenuous and demanding.’ Cronbach’s alpha for work stress scale was .869. Job Satisfaction was measured based on the concept explain in Robbins & Judge which uses five dimensions (supervisor, salary, co-worker, career, & job itself). Examples of the items include: ‘The salary is in accordance with the workload,’ and ‘My supervisor respects employee contributions.’ The internal consistency of the scale for this study was .915. Affective organizational commitment scale develops based on the work of Meyer and Allen (1991). We only use the items for affective commitment. Examples of the items included in the affective subscale were ‘I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization,’ and ‘I feel emotionally attached to this organization.’ The internal consistency of Cronbach’s alpha for affective, continuance was .864.

**RESULTS**

Table 2 shows means, standard deviations, and correlations. The value between job satisfaction and affective commitment show strong positive correlation (.625, \( p < .01 \)). The negative correlations of work stress and job satisfaction is negative and weak (-.129, \( p < .01 \)). Surprisingly, work stress did not have a significant correlation with affective commitment. (-.055, \( p > .05 \)). Correlations were calculated to gain an understanding of the relationship between independent, dependent, and mediation variables. In terms of demographic variables (age, tenure, position education, and work hour) have moderate to weak positive correlation with job satisfaction and affective commitment. The association of those demographic variables with work stress was weak (below .20). Even regarding position variables did not correlate with work stress (\( p > .05 \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Stress</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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While for the two other variables, they should be at high level. The result indicates that both can still be enhanced in the future.

Hypothesis H₁ that work stress will have a significant negative effect on affective commitment was not supported (Table 4, coefficient .024, p > .05). Meanwhile H₂ was supported. Work stress has significant negative effect on job satisfaction (Table 4, coefficient -.086, p < .01). That is extremely weak effect. Hypothesis H₃ also supported. Job satisfaction has significant positive effect on affective commitment (Table 4, coefficient .841, p < .01). The relationship between variables is presented in Figure 1.

Bootstrapping was used to examine the indirect effect and mediation of job satisfaction (Hayes, 2013). Using the PROCESS Macro with SPSS, the mediation was tested. Bootstrapping known as an appropriate approach because it avoids normality assumptions (Preacher et al., 2007). This method becomes popular, as evidenced by studies from Goswami et al. (2016), Karazsia et al. (2014), Wongpakaran et al. (2016), and Oh & Oh (2017). The complete results showed in Table 5. The bootstrapping results were confirmed with 95 percent CI around the indirect effect, not containing 0 (“0.142, “0.002). Therefore hypothesis H₄ that job satisfaction will mediate the relation of work stress and affective commitment was not supported. That indicates by the Lower Level Confidence Interval (LLCI) and Upper-Level Confidence Interval (ULCI), which contain 0.

**Table 4  Regression coefficient, Standard error, & Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Stress</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.890</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R Square                  | 0.017 |     | 0.626   |
| F =                      | 7.256 |     | 136.827 |
| p =                      | 0.007 |     | 0.000   |

**Table 5  Indirect effect of Work Stress on Affective Commitment through Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Stress --&gt; Job Satisfaction --&gt; Affective Commitment</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Boot SE</th>
<th>BootLLCI</th>
<th>BootULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The current study examined the effect of work stress on affective commitment and also explored the mediating role of job satisfaction. Refers to social exchange theory, higher stress will lead to lower affective commitment. Social exchange assumed the reciprocity between two parties. Employees who perceive that their job is stressful will also perceive...
that the organization did not provide enough resources for them. They also might develop a negative feeling about the organization. Such condition will impact the development of emotional attachment. The stressful job also hinders employee job satisfaction, which makes employee more reluctant to identify themselves with the organization.

Regarding the hypothesis, \( H_1 \), current study found that work stress was not significantly related to affective commitment. This result is different compared to previous studies which found negative effect resulting from work stress to affective commitment (Lambert et al., 2015; Michael et al., 2009; Akpinar et al., 2013; Alipour & Monfared, 2015). This finding contributes to the new paradigm when discussing both variables. This result could become new phenomenon. An individual can develop certain stress level which did not affect their positive perception toward the organization. Once again since the stress level score is categorized as moderate to low, we should conduct more studies to examine whether the high-stress level will eventually affect affective commitment. In the meantime, study using five organizations provide rare finding regarding the nature of work stress and affective commitment.

Referring to the research question whether work stress affects job satisfaction, this study found that work stress has significant but weak effect on job satisfaction. It means that mostly, employee satisfaction affected by other factors. Our finding (-.086) was in line with previous literature, but the effect is the lowest compared to other studies (Tziner et al., 2015; Kumar & Varma, 2017; Yousef, 2002; Lin et al., 2013). Employees in those organizations did not perceive that stress will affect their satisfaction. They might still experience high satisfaction level even though at the same time also experience certain level of stress at work. That can occur because they need to work to meet their needs. They may also have positive thoughts regarding their current job. At least they have a job. Whether it is satisfying or not, it depends on the person. Especially if they consider the fact that unemployment level was high and also the difficulty of finding new jobs. An employee’s emotional attachment also did not affect work stress. The work stress score, which shows moderate to low level might cause this condition. It is important to study other organizations that had higher score in stress level then compare the result with the low-stress level.

Lastly, our study found a very strong impact of job satisfaction on affective commitment (.841). This result support study from Alsiewi & Agil (2014), Saleem & Qamar (2017), Lambert et al. (2015), and Dirani (2009). Job satisfaction significantly affects affective commitment. If employees felt satisfied with their job they might develop affective commitment. For example, if someone wants flexibility in their work and they get a job as a lecturer which offers flexi-time. He or she should be perceived high satisfaction since their need was met. Then, they have to produce one article in six months and they get funding for the article. They can write an article from university or while at home. That will increase their positive perception of their job and the organization. Facing with this treatment he or she might develop higher affective commitment because organization supports their needs. If this condition occurs in a long time and recurring the emotional bond will become stronger.

Regarding the mediation of job satisfaction, this study found different results compare to three previous studies from Pakistan, United Arab Emirates, and Taiwan. Malik et al. (2010) studied branch managers in Pakistan banking and revealed that job satisfaction partially mediated the effects of role overload and role conflict on affective commitment. Yousef (2002) found the mediating role of job satisfaction in the influences of role overload on various facets of organizational commitment using mostly supervisors as participants. Job stressors also consistently show a positive and significant relationship with affective commitment through job satisfaction in Taiwan police officers (Kuo, 2015). The current study differs from previous studies. That can be interesting since there are country and industry differences. Thus the results of studies that discuss the interaction of these three variables can produce different results. It is interesting to analyze them further using different objects. If we compare the participants from Yousef (2002) and Malik et al.
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(2010) both used managerial level, while current studies mostly used officers. But Kuo (2015) also used police officers and found the mediation role of job satisfaction. Future study can consider this condition and use diverse participants.

The implication of this study for a practitioner in organizational is that employee job satisfaction and effective commitment was not always related to work stress. To enhance effective commitment, organization can look for other variables. For instance, they can improve the leadership practice, provide more development opportunities, implement work-life balance policies, and also provide resources support for employees. The organization should also understand that they cannot eliminate work stress. They need to manage such stress and directed them to drive employees to increase their performance.

Nevertheless, organizations need to create employee who poses emotional or affective commitment. While this study failed to prove the role of work stress to achieve that goal, management can consider other factors. Perceived organizational support, organizational culture, and leadership style are some of important factors that affect affective commitment. The human resources department needs to do the preliminary survey to identify what are the most important factors in their organization. There are uncertainties when dealing with human being especially if it is related to work attitude.

This study has some potential limitations. First, the study only investigated the overall stress and did not use dimensions like role overload and role conflict. Analysis with dimension can provide a more detail investigation. Second, the study excluded two dimensions of organizational commitment (normative and continuance). Some scholars regard this as incomplete. Future study can cover all three components of organizational commitment and then examine the most important component. Third, for the reason of speed and large participants, the study relied on the use of questionnaire to collect the required data. Future studies can combine the use of questionnaire with the in-depth interview to get more accurate results. Fourth, using cross-sectional data will prevent thorough investigation regarding employee attitude in the long run. Longitudinal data can be used to obtain deeper insights for the causal relationships since human behavior will change over time.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The current study has four hypotheses. Hypothesis \( H_1 \) that it is significant and negative

The effect of work stress on affective commitment was not supported. In this study, work stress did not affect employee's affective commitment.

Meanwhile, our second hypothesis \( H_2 \) that conveys work stress has significant and negative effect on job satisfaction was supported. But this is only very small effect which considers as weak.

The third hypothesis \( H_3 \) that employee job satisfaction will have significant positive effect on affective organizational commitment was also supported. How about the mediation role of job satisfaction? We already knew that work stress did not have direct effect on affective commitment.

In some cases, some variables can perform mediation even though the independent variable did not have direct effect on dependent variable. But this study found that job satisfaction did not have mediation role in the relation between work stress and affective commitment. These results give overall views that for this particular organization our research model did not apply.

Recommendations

Therefore, organizations need to find other factors if they want to increase employee affective commitment. They can conduct the study to assess how the employee perceives their leader style and examine whether it affects their perception regarding organization. The leadership style that matches with subordinate preference can create a sense of compatibility. Some employees even develop emotional attachment to their leader if they felt the person provides enough support. That is important aspect that should be considered when highlighting organizational support. Employee perception regarding support from organization also plays crucial role in developing emotional attachment. An organiza-
tion that helps employee to do their job by providing adequate support will reap positive consequences. People are enjoyed their job because they face fewer problems or if they have problems, they can rely on the organization to help them. That does not apply only in the scope of work but also in the personal life of the employees. Concern about personal matters is common in Indonesia. Providing flexibility for taking care personal matters can have great positive impression. Of course this has to be done properly. But, this small favour can improve employee’s perception. The culture inside the organization can be the key to understand and enhance affective commitment. Culture believed can shape emotion. The organizational culture that suit employee’s need like for example supportive culture can build emotional commitment. The organization needs to develop program to cultivate the company culture into the employee’s mind. In the long run this will help to transform employee’s thoughts, so they felt that the organization’s culture is in accordance with their culture and develop emotional attachment to the organization.
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