



INTERNATIONAL
HELLENIC
UNIVERSITY

School of Economics and Business Administration

MSc in Management 2012-2013

MSc Thesis

**Exploring the Relationships of Work Engagement,
Job Satisfaction and Occupational Stress: A study
of Employees in Greece**

Student Name: Dimitrios Thomas

Student No: 1102120015

Supervisor: Dr S. K. Giannikis

Thessaloniki, November 2013

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine further the relationships among levels of job satisfaction, job stress and work engagement. In the first instance, it was proposed that high levels of overall job satisfaction would have a positive impact on work engagement. Second, it was examined the relationship between a number of specific job satisfaction facets with work engagement. More specifically it was proposed that satisfaction with co-workers, promotion- growth opportunities, job security and supervisors would have a positive effect on work engagement. On the other hand, it was proposed that satisfaction with pay-compensation would not necessarily be positively related to work engagement. Third, it was suggested that occupational stress would have a negative impact to overall job satisfaction. These hypotheses were tested in a study of 186 randomly selected employees. As expected the findings provided strong support for the proposed impact of overall job satisfaction on work engagement. In addition, co-workers and promotion-growth opportunities were found to be strong predictors of work engagement. Moreover, there was adequate evidence to suggest that indeed compensation and pay were not necessarily positively related to work engagement. Contrary to expectations, satisfaction with supervisors and job security did not have a significant main effect on work engagement. There was also some evidence to suggest that occupational stress had a negative impact on job satisfaction.

This thesis is dedicated to my father

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my personal supervisor, Dr Stefanos K. Giannikis whose expertise, helpful comments and constant assistance guided me throughout this report. Without his knowledge, patience and his communicative spirit, this study would never have been completed.

I would like also to thank to my family for the support and encouragement they provided me all these years.

Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
List of Tables	vi
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Research Objectives and Research Questions.....	2
1.3 Thesis Overview.....	3
2 Literature Review.....	4
2.1 Work Engagement.....	4
2.1.1 Work Engagement is Different than Workaholism	6
2.2 Job Satisfaction	6
2.2.1 Job Satisfaction Facets.....	8
2.3 Job Stress.....	9
2.3.1 Importance and Causes of Stress	10
2.4 Relationships between Job Satisfaction, Job Stress and Work Engagement	11
2.5 Development of Research Hypotheses.....	15
3 Methodology.....	17
3.1 Participants and Procedure	17
3.2 Measures Instruments.....	17
3.2.1 Work Engagement	17
3.2.2 Job Satisfaction	19
3.2.3 Job Stress	20
3.3 Control Variables	20
4 Results - Data Analysis.....	22
4.1 Demographics Description.....	22
4.2 Correlation Analysis.....	22

4.3	Hierarchical Regression Analysis	25
4.3.1	Testing the Effects of Employees’ Overall Job Satisfaction on Work Engagement.....	26
4.3.2	Testing the Effects of Job Satisfaction Facets on Work Engagement ...	28
4.3.3	Testing the Effects of Job Stress on Overall Job Satisfaction	31
5	Discussion and Implications	34
5.1	Predicting Work Engagement	34
5.2	Predicting Job Satisfaction.....	36
5.3	Practical Implications.....	37
6	Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research	40
	References.....	42
	Appendix.....	55

List of Tables

Table 1	Factors of Job Satisfaction (Source: 2012 Job Satisfaction Survey by SHRM)	12
Table 2	Satisfaction with Conditions of Employee Engagement (Source: 2012 Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement by SHRM)	13
Table 3	Relationships among Job Satisfaction, Job Stress and Work Engagement	14
Table 4	Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations for Independent Variables	23
Table 5	Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Overall Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement.....	26
Table 6	Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Job Satisfaction Facets and Work Engagement	28
Table 7	Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Excluding Supervisors	30
Table 8	Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Job Stress and Overall Job Satisfaction	31

1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Employees nowadays have highly different views about career issues in comparison with employees in the past (van der Heijden et al., 2008). However, some issues like employees' well-being are diachronic and determine to a great extent employees' motivation and performance (Lu, 1999). This report focuses on three important aspects of employees' wellbeing: job satisfaction, job stress and work engagement.

Engagement at work has arisen as a potentially significant matter concerning not only employee performance but also organizational management. A lot of studies tend to support that there is a connection between employee engagement at work and organizational outcomes including also performance based outcomes (Hayes et al., 2002; Laschinger and Finegan, 2005; Lascinger and Leiter, 2006; Salanova et al., 2005; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). The current interest for employee engagement has led to a number of statements being released, for example:

“Employee engagement is becoming more important for UK firms as the country emerges from recession.” (Stevens, 2009)

“If an organization wants to come out of the recession and attract the best staff, then employee engagement has to be a factor they focus on. It's a strategic imperative.” (Higgnbottom, 2009)

Kahn (1990) theorized work engagement as the “harnessing of organizational members” to their work roles. According to Kahn, the present organizational behavior concepts concentrating on person role relationships underline the general states that organization members are concerned: people are to some extent job involved (Lawler and Hall, 1970), committed to organizations (Mowday et al., 1982), or isolated at work in the form of self-estrangement (Blauner, 1964; Seeman, 1972). The past decade, a lot of scientific studies regarding engagement have resulted in insightful findings. For instance, according to Bakker et al. (2008), engaged employees present higher levels of energy, find their work enthusiastic, and they often tend to be fully absorbed in their job so that time flies.

Job satisfaction is another important concept which this report studies. Job satisfaction is defined as the extent people like or dislike their jobs (Spector, 1997). Both

academics and human resource professionals generally make a distinction between “affective job satisfaction” and “cognitive job satisfaction”. The extent of pleasing emotional feelings which individuals have regarding their work overall determines affective job satisfaction (Thompson and Phua, 2012). On the other hand, cognitive job satisfaction is determined by the extent of individuals’ satisfaction with specific aspects of their jobs. These kinds of facets generally include, satisfaction with compensation, promotion opportunities, job security and satisfaction with the co-workers and supervisors relationships (Moorman, 1993). Job satisfaction has also been correlated some other other kinds of work desirable behavior. Specifically, according to Mangoine and Quinn (1975), increased job satisfaction has been negatively related to interference, stealing, not performing job tasks right on purpose, and disseminating rumors or gossip in order to cause troubling situations.

During the past decade, interest in the literature on job stress concerning both theoretical and empirical perspectives has been growing (Fried, 1993). Stress itself could be defined as the reaction to physical and mental demands or according to Rogers et al. (1987) “An interaction between environmental forces and events called stress precipitators, which appear threatening to the person’s reaction to the threat”. The reason that the experience of stress at work has been considered as a significant area of study is because of its potential influence on the health and performance of the personnel (Yi-Hua and Mei-Ling, 2012). According to Lee and Ashforth (1996), job stress refers to the stressors of “workload, work pressure, role ambiguity, conflict, and stress”. In 2002, Brewer and Clippard determined that job stress contains task-based in addition to role-based factors.

1.2 Research Objectives and Research Questions

This study aims to investigate any potential relationships among overall job satisfaction, a number of specific job satisfaction facets, job stress and work engagement of randomly selected employees in Greece. In order to explore the above-mentioned relationships, the levels of employee satisfaction, job stress and work engagement of the employees are measured using the corresponding measure instruments. After that, statistical analysis takes place in order to determine the kind of relationships. Thus, the research questions this study addresses are:

Q1: Is employees' overall job satisfaction related to employees' work engagement? If yes, how is it related and to what extent job satisfaction predicts work engagement?

Q2: Do specific job satisfaction facets (e.g. satisfaction with payment, job security, co-workers, supervisors and promotion-growth opportunities) affect employees' engagement? If yes, which facet(s) predicts work engagement?

Q3: Is job stress related to job satisfaction? If yes, how does job stress affect job satisfaction?

1.3 Thesis Overview

This study includes six chapters. The introductory chapter (Chapter 1) describes the purpose of the project and outlines the research questions and objectives. In Chapter 2, the theoretical framework is established presenting a detailed literature review related to the study's scientific questions. The third chapter (Chapter 3) describes the research methodology and provides reliability measures of the results. Following Chapter 3, the empirical results of the survey are presented in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 the results are discussed and practical implications are argued. Finally, in the last chapter (Chapter 6) study limitations and future research needs are listed.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Work Engagement

Work engagement as a concept, has been described in two different ways. On the one hand, Maslach and Leiter (1997), state that engagement refers to “energy, involvement, and professional efficacy”. The aforementioned are well-thought-out to be the direct contraries of burnout dimensions such as cynicism, exhaustion and inefficacy.

On the other hand, Schaufeli et al. (2002a, 2002b), defined engagement (probably the most predominant definition) as “a positive, fulfilling, work-related state of mind characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption”. In addition, Schaufeli et al. (2002a, 2002b) have determined that work engagement is expected to stay relatively constant over time. More specifically, they consider that engagement is not a temporary and specific condition, but it is “a more persistent and pervasive affective-cognitive state that is not focused on any particular object, event, individual, or behavior”.

Schaufeli and Bakker (2003) describe the three dimensions of work engagement as follows: “Vigor is characterized by high levels of energy and mental resilience while working, the willingness to invest effort in one’s work, and persistence even in the face of difficulties. Dedication refers to being strongly involved in one’s work and experiencing a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride and challenge. Absorption is characterized by being fully concentrated and happily engrossed in one’s work, whereby time passes quickly and one has difficulties with detaching oneself from work.”

Trying to analyze further the three scopes of work engagement starting from vigor, we could state that vigor refers to the greater levels of energy and mental springiness while working. It also refers to the willingness shown by an employee to make noticeable, considerable efforts in his or her job and perseverance in challenging situations (Schaufeli et al., 2002a, 2002b). In other words, great vigor at work means higher levels of motivation for an employee and consequently is more likely to remain persistent whenever meeting difficulties or barriers at work (Salanova and Schaufeli, 2008). Atkinson (1964) defines motivation as: “Motivation is the contemporary or immediate influence on direction, vigor and persistence of action”. The dimension of

vigor is considered as a motivational concept (Salanova et al., 2005) which is consistent with the prior Atkinson's overall definition. Persistence and vigor are probably the two key characteristics of this dimension of work engagement. However, the concept of intrinsic motivation appears to share a lot of conceptual similarities with vigor dimension (Deci and Ryan, 1985). According to Mauno et al. (2007), intrinsic motivation refers to "an individual's need to perform a certain activity (at work) because this activity gives inherent pleasure and satisfaction, and this intrinsically rewarding activity does not contain any extrinsic goals (e.g., better salary, promotion)".

Absorption, another dimension of work engagement, refers in particular to total concentration on and immersion in work. In general, for an absorbed employee, time is passing quickly and it is difficult for the employee to be detached from his or her work (Schaufeli et al., 2002a, 2002b). Recent studies have determined that flow is a rather similar to the experience of the absorption notion (Gonzalez-Roma et al., 2006; Llorens et al., 2007; Langelaan et al., 2006). Flow has been described as a condition of mind in which people are involved in an activity so keenly that nothing else seems to be able to distract them. People, who live the experience, consider it so pleasant that would do it even at great cost, just for the sake of doing it (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990). Csikszentmihalyi also claims that it is possible flow experiences to often happen outside the work condition (e.g., hobbies) as well in any domain of life. Trying to point out the main difference between flow and absorption is that absorption is considered to be a more persistent condition which occurs specifically in the work environment, whereas flow rather represents a impermanent peak experience which might happen in any area of life (Schaufeli et al., 2002a; Hallberg & Schaufeli, 2006; Schaufeli et al., 2006).

Schaufeli et al. (2002a, 2002b), describe the third dimension of work engagement – dedication - as "a strong psychological involvement in one's work, combined with a sense of significance, enthusiasm, inspiration, pride, and challenge". Dedication as concept, presents some similarities with the more traditional job involvement (or commitment) concepts. Job involvement has been defined as "the degree to which an employee psychologically relates to his or her job and to the work performed therein" (Brown, 1996; Cooper-Hakim and Viswesvaran, 2005). Furthermore, according to Kanungo (1982) and Mauno & Kinnunen (2000), job involvement is also viewed as a

function of how far the job can fulfill an employee's current wants and needs. Both job involvement and dedication are considered as relatively constant phenomena. Any actual differences between these two concepts have not yet clearly set. However, dedication appears to be a wider phenomenon than job involvement. Dedication embraces feelings of inspiration, enthusiasm and pride as well as mental states as challenge, while job involvement emphasizes almost exclusively in the psychological significance of the occupation in an employee's life (Mauno et al., 2007).

2.1.1 Work Engagement is Different than Workaholism

Workaholic people choose to spend a great deal of time in work activities when given the option to do so. Workaholics are extremely hard workers and are unwilling to disengage from work (Douglas and Robyn, 2006). They keep thinking about work even if they are not at work. Therefore, workaholics are considered to be obsessed with their work; they are considered compulsive workers (Schaufeli et al., 2006; Scott et al., 1997). As mentioned in the previous section, engaged employees work hard (vigour), are involved (dedicated), and feel happily engrossed (absorbed) in their work. If we take into consideration only the aforementioned characteristics, then engaged workers seem similar to workaholics. The key difference is that for engaged employees, work is fun and not an addiction as it is for workaholics, thus we could say that engaged employees lack the typical compulsive drive. They work hard because they enjoy it to do so and not because they are driven by a strong heavy duty urge they cannot resist (Bakker et al., 2008). On the other hand, the need to work for workaholics is so excessive that many times their health is endangered. This exaggeration many times reduces their happiness and deteriorates their interpersonal and social behavior (Bakker et al., 2009). Thus, work engagement can completely be segregated from workaholism.

2.2 Job Satisfaction

According to Mueller and McCloskey (1990), job satisfaction can be defined as positive affect towards employment and it is "arguably a fairly stable evaluation of how the job meets the employee's needs, wants, or expectations" (Fisher, 2003). Kallenberg and Berg (1987), state that job satisfaction represents "a person's overall evaluation of his or her present work role". Researchers have long viewed job satisfaction as a way to evaluate employees' affective responses to their professions

across place and time because it denotes a “generic” type of work attitude (Firebaugh and Harley, 1995).

Locke (1969) provided one of the most commonly cited definitions of job satisfaction. He defined it as “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values”. The aforementioned definition is closely related to the definition found most often in management textbooks: “the positive feeling about one’s job resulting from the evaluation of one’s job experience or job characteristics” (Mathis and Jackson, 2008; Robbins and Judge, 2007). The two latter definitions insinuate that job satisfaction is a positive emotion which comes of the assessment of extrinsic job factors.

According to Locke’s (1969) discrepancy theory, job satisfaction concept results when there are discrepancies between what employees want and what they have. According to Locke’s view, job satisfaction comes from the fulfillment of something considered as important or valuable, especially the attainment of wants rather than needs. The reason for that is that people often have stronger desires for the things they want rather than these already have. However, the level of satisfaction gained depends on two factors: (1) the importance of the need or want and (2) the difference between what is expected and what is received (Lavanda, 2013).

Previous researches on job satisfaction indicate an atomistic view of workers which has its roots more strongly in “homo economicus” than “classical sociological understandings of social life” (Simpson, 1989). According to Wharton et al. (2000), “early satisfaction research tended to be explicitly individualistic in orientation, treating satisfaction as strictly a function of personal characteristics, while ignoring aspects of the positions people hold and the social relations surrounding those positions”.

Robbins and Judge (2007) characterize job satisfaction as a major job attitude – “an evaluative statement concerning objects, people, and events”. Attitude entails three components – dimensions: “affective – emotional or feeling segment of attitude; cognitive – the opinion or belief segment of attitude and; behavioral – intention to behave in a certain way toward someone or something. Job satisfaction is a strong indicator of the degree to which employees identify with their jobs (job involvement), organizations and their goals (organizational commitment), believe that

organizations value their contributions and care about their wellbeing (perceived organizational support), and are satisfied with and enthusiastic about work (employee engagement)”).

Kalleberg (1977) theorized affective job satisfaction as “unitary concept”. He also stated that a person is possible to be satisfied with one dimension-aspect of a job and dissatisfied with another. An employee’s level of job satisfaction is a function of the variety of certain satisfactions and dissatisfactions that the employee faces with respect to the several dimensions of employment. Moorman (1993) speaks for job satisfaction as an “overall positive emotional” response to a job as a whole or in general. According to Spector (1997), “job satisfaction can be considered as a global feeling about job”. Thus, affective job satisfaction is what called by researchers “overall and/or global job satisfaction”. Therefore, the measures used to research affective job satisfaction focus on tapping how much people subjectively and emotionally like their job as a whole.

On the other hand, Moorman (1993) supports that cognitive job satisfaction “is based on a more logical and rational evaluation of job ...conditions”. Cognitive job satisfaction “is a judgment that entails relating an existent to a cognitive ... standard” (Locke, 1969) with respect to what can be “a constellation of attitudes about various aspects or facets of a job” (Spector, 1997). Therefore, cognitive job satisfaction is “based on comparisons which do not rely on emotional judgments, but instead on evaluations of conditions, opportunities or outcomes” (Moorman, 1993). Therefore, it is measured with items that assess “remuneration, opportunities, or numerous other discriminable job facets calculable in comparative or other reasonably objective terms” (Locke, 1969).

2.2.1 Job Satisfaction Facets

As already has been stated, job satisfaction is not a unitary concept. It very likely for an employee to be relatively satisfied with one dimension of her or his job and be dissatisfied with one or maybe more aspects. In 1974, Chirchill et al. indicated that the construct of job satisfaction is consisted of seven components – facets which are explained in brief below.

Job itself: Henne and Locke (1985) stated that the majority of employees ask for a significant and interesting job which offers success, growth and progress for them. In addition they want “responsibility, autonomy, role clarity, feedback from managers and lack of role conflict” (Henne and Locke, 1985).

Co-workers: Henne and Locke (1985) also stated that employees sympathize co-workers who share similar values with them and ease work achievement. Furthermore, Robbins (2000) claimed that friendly and supportive colleagues lead to increase of job satisfaction.

Supervision: According to Henne and Locke (1985), employees prefer “considerate, honest, fair and competent supervisors”. Recognition and rewards for good performance is also considered very important for employees who also like to participate in decision making. According to Robbins (2000), a participative decision making procedure leads to increased job satisfaction although there are in some cases a few exceptions (e.g. individual differences). Henne and Locke (1985) stated that “employees want their organization to respect them and their values and to be managed effectively”.

Pay: The overall level of an employee’s job satisfaction or dissatisfaction is affected by pay (Oshagbemi, T., Hickson, C., 2003). Workers and employees want enough and fair payment –salary to meet their needs and expectations (Henne and Locke, 1985). Jackson and Schuler (2000) referred to pay fairness, which relates to “a comparison between what people believe they deserve to be paid and what others deserve to be paid”.

Promotion: A promotion refers to advancement to a higher status work position that generally is recognized as having increased responsibility and/or higher wage (Jackson and Schuler, 2000; Dessler, 2012). Employees seek for fair equitable and unambiguous promotion system. Robbins (2000) stated that when people believe that decisions regarding promotion are made in just and fair way and according to their expectations, they are expected to be more satisfied in their job.

2.3 Job Stress

Research in job stress has developed exponentially in past decades regarding both the quantity of studies and the quality of conclusions (Jex and Yankelevich, 2008).

According to Miller et al. (1990), job stress has been considered an increasingly recognized factor to employee turnover, absence and poor performance. Furthermore, it has been widely recognized as a major managerial and economic issue (Miller et al., 1990). A number of causes are considered responsible for job stress, the most important of which are: “the characteristics of the work, the organizational context/environment and the psychological/behavioral characteristics of the individual” (Zeffane and McLoughlin, 2006). Initiatives that have focused on enhancements to the work and organizational environments seem to have made some success at reducing and preventing stress (see Clarke, 2000; Cox and Flin, 1998). Consequently, social and organizational aspects of the workplace have gained interest as potential explanations for increased stress. In that perspective, Mikkelsen et al. (2000) mentioned, “management attitudes, cultures and styles have been found to have significant impact on levels of stress”. Ernst et al. (2004) and Forster & Still (2002) determined that amongst the most frequently and widely reported determinants of job stress and organizational effectiveness are in exact words “feelings of job satisfaction and perceptions of positive workplace communication including perceptions of cooperation and teamwork”.

Sager (1991) defined job stress as “a psychological state perceived by individuals when faced with demands, constraints, and opportunities that have important but uncertain outcomes”. Chen and Silverthorne (2008) described job stress as an individual reaction which is different from general as it is additionally organizational and job related. Montgomery et al. (1996) determined that job stress “can produce adverse consequences for both the individual and the company since it has the effect of lowering motivation levels and performance, and increases turnover intentions”.

Researchers have studied stress in three dimensions: individual differences, environmental factors, and the interplay of both (Parker and Decotiis, 1983). Parker and Decotiis (1983) analyzed the data obtained from 367 managers of a large restaurant, they judged that the concept of job stress is multidimensional. The two distinct dimensions that were identified were time stress and anxiety.

2.3.1 Importance and Causes of Stress

Stress at work may cause a number of unwanted and adverse outcomes not only for employees but also for organizations (Nigam et al., 2003). High and/or excessive

levels of job stress can hamper an organization since persistent stress may often lead to severe losses in productivity, increased absenteeism as well as higher health care expenditures (Murphy, 1995). Management of job stress has become mandatory because of its impact on significant organizational outcomes. Following this tendency, there has been a dramatic increase in interest in stress reduction (Nigam et al., 2003). Despite the fact that numerous significant attempts have been made trying to sort out the main causes of workplace stress, there are still disagreements on the underlying causes. However, according to Cooper et al. (2001), Giga et al. (2003) and Kenny and Cooper (2003) “the most common contributing factors to stress have been identified as emanating from the nature of the job itself and the work climate within which interpersonal relationships take place”. In 1995, Murphy implied that encouragement of cooperation in workplace maybe a way of reducing and/or averting stress. In addition, Rodwell et al. (1998) presented evidence pointing to important negative correlation between teamwork and stress. Collaboration and mutual support are potential levers for reduced stress while in the same time a significant number of past researches evidence indicates the relevance of job satisfaction (Ho, 1997). That is, the greater the degree of job satisfaction the lesser the likelihood of stress. In addition, Miller et al. (1990) indicated that “perceived communication patterns between individuals within and across departments can play a crucial part in affecting levels of stress”. Furthermore, Fostinatos-Ventouratos and Cooper (2005) referred to the relevance of structure and work climates as critical.

2.4 Relationships between Job Satisfaction, Job Stress and Work Engagement

According to Warr (2002), “the different components of work-related wellbeing could be related, but could also be separate dimensions”. For instance, it is possible to experience low work-related depression (e.g. disengagement), but high levels of work-related anxiety (e.g. job stress) (Rothmann, 2008).

As far as the relation between job stress and work engagement is concerned, past research has shown that even when exposed to high job demands and working long hours, some individuals do not demonstrate symptoms of disengagement. Instead, they may find pleasure in dealing with stressors (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). According to Terry et al. (1993), “high levels of stress are associated with low levels

of job satisfaction”. Moreover, Fairbrother and Warn (2003), confirmed that occupational stress is negatively related to job satisfaction. In addition, job satisfaction appears to have a protective effect on the relation between occupational stress and disengagement (Ramirez et al., 1996; Visser et al., 2003). In addition, Visser et al. (2003) stated that job satisfaction has a protective effect against the negative consequences of job stress. The researchers also suggest that when stress is high and satisfaction is low, the risk of low energy –an essential aspect of low work engagement (see Schaufeli et al., 2002a, 2002b) – increases significantly.

In 2012, Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) published the factors that have the most influence according to the 2012 Employee Job Satisfaction Survey (Table 1).

Table 1 Factors of Job Satisfaction (Source: 2012 Job Satisfaction Survey by SHRM)

Rank	Factor
1	Job security (63%)
2	Opportunities to use skills and abilities (62%)
3	Organisation’s financial stability (55%)
3	Relationship with immediate superior (55%)
4	Compensation/pay (54%)
5	Communication between employees and senior management (53%)
5	Benefits (53%)
5	The work itself (53%)
6	Autonomy and independence (52%)
7	Management’s recognition of employee job performance (49%)
8	Feeling safe in the work environment (48%)
9	Overall corporate culture (46%)
10	Flexibility to balance life and work issue (38%)
10	Relationship with co-workers (38%)

* Note: n = 600. Figure represents those who answered “very important.” Percentages are based on a scale where 1 = “very unimportant” and 4 = “very important.”

Regarding the relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement, Maylett and Riboldi (2007) stated in their paper that: “job satisfaction is a component in making an employee feel engaged”. The other two components of employee engagement are motivation and effectiveness. In addition, Garg and Kumar (2012) have described in their research paper job satisfaction as an important driver of work engagement. They measured employee engagement levels based on certain specific parameters as: (1) career paths that offer prospects for advancement, (2) fair payment and benefits, (3) a satisfactory work environment, characterized by a sensible workload, good relations with direct supervisor, effective internal communication and good relationship with coworkers. That is, job satisfaction and compensation-pay are two significant parameters being the key drivers of work engagement in an organisation.

BlessingWhite’s Employee Engagement report in 2011, showed that engagement levels in India vary across organizations, organization size, gender, workplace structure and functions. For instance, older and married employees were more engaged compared to younger employees. Employees in healthcare and chemicals had maximum engagement levels and minimum engagement observed in banking and financial services.

Table 2 Satisfaction with Conditions of Employee Engagement (Source: 2012 Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement by SHRM)

Rank	Satisfaction with Conditions of Engagement
1	Relationship with co-workers (76%)
1	The work itself (76%)
2	Opportunities to use skills/abilities (74%)
3	Relationship with immediate supervisor (73%)
4	Contribution of work to organization's business goals (71%)
5	Meaningfulness of job (69%)
5	Autonomy and independence (69%)
6	Variety of work (68%)
7	Organization's financial stability (63%)
8	Overall corporate culture (60%)
9	Management’s recognition of employee job performance (57%)
10	Job-specific training (55%)

Rank	Satisfaction with Conditions of Engagement
11	Organization's commitment to professional development (54%)
11	Communication between employees and senior management (54%)
12	Organization's commitment to corporate social responsibility (49%)
12	Networking (49%)
13	Career development opportunities (48%)
14	Career advancement opportunities (42%)

* Note: Data are sorted by the “overall satisfaction” column and excludes “not applicable” responses.

Avery et al. (2007) analysed the interaction between satisfaction with older co-workers and work engagement. According to the research results, satisfaction with someone’s colleagues was significantly related to engagement.

In 2002, Harter et al. conducted a meta-analysis of studies previously performed by the Gallup Organization. The study examined employee job satisfaction feelings-emotions and work engagement, with the latter variable referring to individual’s involvement with as well as eagerness for work. The results displayed positive and substantial correlation between worker satisfaction, engagement and business unit outcomes of: productivity, profit, employee turnover, employee accidents and customer satisfaction (Harter et al., 2002).

Table 3 Relationships among Job Satisfaction, Job Stress and Work Engagement

Author	Key Findings
Avery et al. (2007)	Satisfaction with colleagues is significantly related to engagement.
BlessingWhite (2011)	Engagement levels vary across organizations, organization size, gender, workplace structure and functions.
Garg and Kumar (2012)	Job satisfaction and compensation-pay are two significant parameters being important drivers of work engagement.
Fairbrother and Warn (2003)	Occupational stress is negatively related to job satisfaction.
Harter et al. (2002)	Positive and substantial correlation between worker satisfaction, engagement and business unit outcomes of: productivity, profit, employee turnover, employee accidents and customer satisfaction.
Kotze and Roodt (2005)	Strong positive correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction.

Author	Key Findings
Maylett and Riboldi (2007)	Job satisfaction is a component in making an employee feel engaged.
Ramirez et al. (1996), Visser et al. (2003)	Job satisfaction appears to have a protective effect on the relation between occupational stress and disengagement.
Schaufeli et al. (2002a, 2002b)	When stress is high and satisfaction is low, the risk of low energy -an essential aspect of low work engagement- increases significantly.
Schaufeli and Bakker (2004)	Some individuals, when exposed to high job demands and working long hours, do not demonstrate symptoms of disengagement. Instead, they may find pleasure in dealing with stressors
Terry et al. (1993)	High levels of stress are associated with low levels of job satisfaction
Warr (2002)	Different components of work-related wellbeing could be related, but could also be separate dimensions
Visser et al. (2003)	Job satisfaction has a protective effect against the negative consequences of job stress

2.5 Development of Research Hypotheses

In this section we will develop and discuss the research hypotheses. Based on literature findings (Maylett and Riboldi, 2007; Harter et al., 2002; Garg and Kumar, 2012; Ramirez et al., 1996; Visser et al., 2003) we would expect satisfied employees (overall-general job satisfaction) to present higher levels of work engagement. Thus the first hypothesis is:

H1. The higher the level of employees' overall-general job satisfaction, the higher their level of work engagement.

The second research hypothesis concerns a number of job satisfaction facets in relation with work engagement. More specifically, we will try to find out the extend that some specific job satisfaction facets are correlated with work engagement (if correlated). Thus, the second hypothesis is separated to five sub-hypotheses:

H2a. The higher the employees' (job) satisfaction levels with co-workers, the higher their level of work engagement.

H2b. The higher the employees' (job) satisfaction levels with opportunities for promotion – growth opportunities, the higher their level of work engagement.

H2c. Payment – compensation is not necessarily positively related to work engagement.

H2d. Satisfaction with supervisors will have a positive effect on work engagement.

H2e. Satisfaction with job security will have a positive impact on work engagement.

The last research hypothesis investigates the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. Warr (2002) stated that different components of work-related wellbeing could be related but they can also be separate dimensions. Visser et al. (2003) stated that job satisfaction has a protective effect against the negative consequences of job stress while Terry et al. (1993) mention that high levels of stress are associated with low levels of job satisfaction Thus, the third hypothesis is:

H3. High levels of work stress, will have a negative impact on job satisfaction.

3 Methodology

3.1 Participants and Procedure

A questionnaire was delivered to a total of 253 employees working in several sectors and positions. A total of 186 completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher resulting in a response rate of 73.5%. A more detailed analysis about sample findings is given in the next chapter (Section 4.1). The questionnaire was distributed from September 2013 to October 2013.

The questionnaire was formed after evaluating and combining the necessary measurement instruments (see Section 3.2) according to the research questions and the hypotheses that have been made. The questionnaire took its final form after adding several control variables (see Section 3.3).

In addition to the English language, the questionnaire was also available in the Greek language. The translation to the Greek language performed with highest caution in order to avoid linguistic pitfalls (e.g. metaphoric expressions) that could lead to misunderstandings. For this reason, a qualified (English to Greek) language expert¹ was asked to translate the questionnaire items and perform the necessary linguistic checks. The questionnaire was accessible on-line and hand-delivered. Prior to their completion, participants were given a brief description of the purpose of the study and were informed that all information would be kept completely confidential. A similar informative message was also available on-line. The purpose of this preface was to make the participants feel comfortable, with the aim of their expressing their job attitudes more openly and willingly. The final form of the questionnaire can be found in the Appendix in both languages.

3.2 Measures Instruments

3.2.1 Work Engagement

There are a number of tools to measure work engagement such as the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli et al., 2002), Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti and Bakker, 2008) and a three-

The translation of the questionnaire was edited by Theodora Karakosta, BA in English Language and Literature at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, MA in Applied Linguistics (Language Acquisition) at Leiden University¹

dimensional concept of work engagement that is very similar to that of Schaufeli et al. (2002) presented by May et al. (2004).

UWES contains items for the assessment of the three characteristic dimensions of engagement as included in Schaufeli et al.'s (2002) definition: dedication, vigor and absorption. The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale has been validated in many countries including China (Yi-Wen and Yi-Qun, 2005), Finland (Hakanen, 2002), Greece (Xanthopoulou et al., n.d.), South Africa (Storm and Rothmann, 2003), Spain (Schaufeli et al., 2002), and The Netherlands (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2003; Schaufeli et al., 2002). According to Bakker and Demerouti (2002) "the confirmatory factor analyses applied to these studies confirmed that the fit of the hypothesized three-factor structure to the data was superior to that of any other alternative factor structures". Furthermore, the internal consistencies of the three dimensions turned out to be adequate in every study. However, it should be mentioned at this point, that there are some studies which did not succeed in finding the three dimension structure of work engagement (e.g. Sonnentag, 2003). This, for example, may have happened because of translation problems, especially when it comes to items that contain metaphoric expressions (e.g. Time flies when I am working) (Sonnentag, 2003).

An alternate tool for the valuation of work engagement is the Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti and Bakker, 2008). This instrument has initially been settled to evaluate burnout, but contains both positively and negatively phrased items, and hence, it can be used to assess work engagement as well.

Finally, May et al. (2004) presented a three-dimensional concept of work engagement that is very similar to that of Schaufeli et al. (2002). More precisely, May et al. discriminate between a physical component, an emotional component, and a cognitive component, which correspond to vigor, dedication, and absorption as measured by the UWES (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008).

In this report, a short, nine-item version of the UWES (Schaufeli et al., 2006) was used to measure work engagement. In 2006, Schaufeli et al. developed this brief version of UWES (UEWS-9; consisted of 9 items instead of 17) providing evidence for its cross-national validity. They indicated that the three work engagement dimensions are moderately strong related. Each of the items was measured on a seven point Likert scale ranging from 'Never' to 'Always – Every Day'. From the total nine

items of the UWES-9, three items are related to vigor, three items to dedication and three items to absorption. In the current study, the internal consistency estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for overall work engagement (9 items together) was .95. Vigor (3 items), dedication (3 items) and absorption (3 items) was .89, .93, and .85, respectively. According to Cicchetti (1994), scales with internal consistency $\geq .70$ are considered acceptable.

3.2.2 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction research has been performed for more than forty years and several types of instruments have been developed (e.g. global or multidimensional instruments, multi or single-item instruments, instruments designed for jobs in general or for a specific workforce) (van Saane et al., 2003). Some of the instruments for measuring job satisfaction are: Andrew and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (Rentsch and Steel, 1992), Job Descriptive Index – JDI (Smith, Hulin & Kendall, 1969), Job Satisfaction Survey – JSS (Spector, 1985), Job Diagnostic Survey – JDS (Hackman and Oldham, 1975) and many more (van Saane et al., 2003).

The items used to measure the general job satisfaction and the job satisfaction facets in this study have been taken from Hackman's and Oldham's (1975) JDS. In 1976, Hackman and Oldham developed the Job Characteristics Theory. To justify their theory, Hackman and Oldham developed JDS. JDS is able to measure most aspects-facets of the theory, including job characteristics, psychological states, outcomes, internal motivation and satisfaction, and growth need strength as a moderator variable.

The JDS has been used in many studies and research papers (Lawrence, 2001; Giannikis and Mihail, 2011; van Saane et al., 2003 etc). The total items used from JDS were 19: general satisfaction (5 items), satisfaction with pay (2 items), job security (2 items), co-workers behaviour (3 items), supervision (3 items) and promotion opportunities (4 items). Each of the items was measured on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from '*Extremely Dissatisfied*' to '*Extremely Satisfied*'. In this study, the internal consistency estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for general satisfaction (5 items), satisfaction with pay (2 items), job security (2 items), co-workers behaviour (3 items), supervision (3 items) and promotion opportunities (4 items) was .85, .87, .72, .71, .86 and .85, respectively. Van Saane et al. (2003) states that internal consistency

reliabilities of JDS vary from .56 to .88 across the subscales of general satisfaction and facets of satisfaction. All the items used can be found in the Appendix.

3.2.3 Job Stress

Job stress was operationally defined as the degree up to which employees feel an anxiety or tension caused by their jobs. In order to measure job stress for this study, the two items developed by Motowidlo et al. (1986) were selected. These two items are:

- (1) JS1. My job is extremely stressful.
- (2) JS2. I feel a great deal of stress because of my job.

Dubinsky et al. (1995) used these two items in his study: “Transformational leadership: an initial investigation in sales context”. Motowidlo et al. (1986) reported a coefficient alpha of .83 for this scale while Bradley (2004) reported a coefficient alpha of .89 for this scale.

The participants in this study were requested to rate each item on a seven-point scale ranging from ‘*Strongly Disagree*’ to ‘*Strongly Agree*’. The higher the score, the higher the indication that employees feel more stressful. In this report, the internal consistency estimate (Cronbach’s alpha) for job stress (2 items) is .91.

3.3 Control Variables

Maynard et al. (2006) stated that the demographic variables of gender, age, level of education and tenure in the profession have an effect on the job attitudes. Thus, these demographic variables are treated as control variables in this study. The demographic variables as well as their given value are presented below:

Gender: 0 = female, 1 = male

Age: 0 = 18–25 years old, 1 = 26 – 35 years old, 2 = 36 – 45 years old, 3 = 46 – 55 years old, 4 = 56 – 72 years old

Educational Level: 0 = Gymnasium, 1 = Professional/Vocational Lyceum (EPAL – TEE), 2 = General Lyceum (High School), 3 = Public or Private Vocational Training Institute (IEK - IIEK), 4 = Technological Educational Institute (TEI), 5 = Higher Educational Institute (AEI – Bachelor’s Degree), 6 = Master Degree or Higher

Marital Status: 0 = Single, 1 = Married, 2 = Living common law (living together but not married), 3 = Divorced - Separated, 4 = Widowed

Tenure: Measured in months.

Sector: 0 = Public, 1 = Private, 2 = Other

It is worth mentioning at this point, that the sector 'Other' includes among others Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and European Commission institutes.

Working Hours: 0 = Full-time, 1 = Part-time

Job Position: 0 = Managerial position, 1 = Non – Managerial position

4 Results - Data Analysis

4.1 Demographics Description

A total of 186 completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher (109 were submitted online and 77 were hand-delivered questionnaires). Most of the participants were women (52.4%) but the difference with men's percentage was small (47.6%). Most participants were aged between 26 and 35 years old (61%) followed by the 36-45 years old group (15.5%). A total 72.8% of the participants held at least a Bachelor's degree while 43.9 % stated that hold an MSc or higher degree. The average work tenure for participants was 58.73 months while the maximum tenure was 420 months and the minimum 1 month. Most people participating in the survey were single (57.8%) or married (31%). The highest percentage of the participants worked in the private sector (63.1%), a total 23% in the public sector and the rest 13.9% in some other sector. Far the majority of the participants were full-time employees (87.7%) while 77.5% declared that held non-managerial positions.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Before testing the research hypotheses and the conceptual models the correlation between the variables was examined in order to identify possible indications of collinearity (or multicollinearity). Multicollinearity is the undesirable situation where the correlations among the independent variables are strong (Hair et al., 1998). Multicollinearity may lead to paradoxical multiple regression results. For example, the model may fit the data satisfactorily (high F-Test), even though none of the X variables has a statistically significant impact on explaining Y. This happens because multicollinearity misleadingly inflates the standard errors. Thus, it makes some variables statistically insignificant while they should be otherwise significant (Hair et al., 1998). Table 4 illustrates the correlation coefficients of independent and control variables of the study.

Table 4 Means, Standard Deviations (SD), and Correlations for Independent Variables

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Demographics									
1. Gender	.48	.50							
2. Age	1.34	.92	.076						
3. Educational level	4.73	1.6	-.021	-.160*					
4. Marital status	.57	.80	-.106	.475**	-.096				
5. Tenure (in months)	58.73	82.26	.009	.718**	-.204**	.267**			
6. Sector	.91	.60	.019	-.215**	-.090	-.014	-.237**		
7. Working hours	.12	.33	.002	-.104	-.108	-.085	-.114	-.052	
8. Job position	.78	.42	-.026	-.176*	-.104	-.080	-.142	-.081	.124
Overall job satisfaction and facets (seven point scale)									
9. Overall job satisfaction	5.04	1.26	-.085	.162*	-.019	.178*	.175*	.047	-.201**
10. Security	4.50	1.51	.112	.155*	-.055	.039	.166*	.080	-.287**
11. Pay	4.24	1.69	.079	.046	-.107	.099	.090	.231**	-.107
12. Co-workers	5.36	1.04	-.040	.072	.000	.045	.121	.070	-.052
13. Supervisors	5.04	1.37	.009	-.003	.000	-.001	.055	.144*	-.163*
14. Promotion opportunities	4.94	1.28	.023	.074	.078	.019	.116	.089	-.220**
Job stress and work engagement (seven point scale)									
15. Job stress	4.53	1.68	-.044	.128	-.017	.104	.137	.008	-.098
16. Work engagement	4.19	1.31	-.014	.156*	-.020	.074	.173*	.020	-.063

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Demographics									
1. Gender									
2. Age									
3. Educational level									
4. Marital status									
5. Tenure (in months)									
6. Sector									
7. Working hours									
8. Job position									
Overall job satisfaction and facets (seven point scale)									
9. Overall job satisfaction	-.101								
10. Security	-.042	.571**							
11. Pay	-.029	.546**	.532**						
12. Co-workers	-.067	.552**	.407**	.299**					
13. Supervisors	-.030	.703**	.549**	.530**	.600**				
14. Promotion opportunities	-.143	.726**	.586**	.466**	.702**	.766**			
Job stress and work engagement (seven point scale)									
15. Job stress	-.205**	-.106	-.031	-.003	-.059	-.175*	.032		
16. Work engagement	-.103	.541**	.358**	.233**	.627**	.515**	.707**	.004	

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A correlation is a measure of the linear relationship between variables. Thus, a correlation analysis can provide evidence to researchers regarding the existence of any kind of relationship between variables. Therefore we can **partially** provide an answer to the research questions as these presented in Section 1.2.

Thus, analysis provided statistically significant evidence that employees' overall job satisfaction is related to employees' work engagement. Between the two variables, a correlation value of .54 (significant at the 0.05 level) has been calculated indicating a strong positive relationship between these two variables.

All five job satisfaction facets are positively related with work engagement. The highest correlation is observed between promotion and work engagement ($r = .707$, $p \leq 0.01$) while the lowest between pay and work engagement ($r = .233$, $p \leq 0.01$). The rest correlation values between job security, co-workers, supervisors and work engagement are .358, .627 and .515 respectively ($p \leq 0.01$ for all variables).

In Table 4 we can see that a negative correlation ($r = -.106$) exists between job stress and overall job satisfaction which indicates the existence of a relationship between the two variables.

Correlation is important however does not tell us much about the direction of the relationships between variables. We can take this process further and look at predicting one variable from another using regression analysis.

4.3 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to test the hypotheses. Some researchers suggest that multicollinearity could be an issue if the Pearson's r of several independent variables is over .70 (De Vaus, 2002). Others argue that correlation among the independents over .80 indicate signals of multicollinearity (Kutner et al., 2004) while a third opinion supports that bivariate correlation above .90 is suggestive for multicollinearity (Hair et al., 1998; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). In the current study statistically significant ($p \leq .05$) and high positive correlation ($>.70$) with more than one independent variable were found. Thus, additional tests for multicollinearity were executed. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and the tolerance coefficient values were calculated. Researchers contend that multicollinearity is suspected when the VIF is greater than 10 and/or the tolerance limit is less than .1 (Mendenhall and Sincich, 1996; Montgomery and Peck, 1982). In the present study, the VIF did not surpass

3.66 and the tolerance lowest value was 0.27, providing evidence that multicollinearity is not an issue.

4.3.1 Testing the Effects of Employees’ Overall Job Satisfaction on Work Engagement

Hierarchical regression analysis was conducted in which work engagement was regressed on three steps (three blocks of predictors). The first block of predictors (n=4) consisted of personal demographic characteristics (gender, age, marital status and level of education). The second block of predictors (n=4) consisted of work profile characteristics (job tenure, sector, working hours and organizational level). The final block comprised the measure of overall job satisfaction. The first two blocks of predictors served as control variables before considering the relationship of the measure of employees’ overall job satisfaction on work engagement measure. Thus, step 3 evaluated the amount of variance in work engagement explained by general job satisfaction. The size of the sample in all hierarchical regression analyses was 186. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Overall Job Satisfaction and Work Engagement

	Work engagement
	Standardized beta coefficients
Step 1: Demographic characteristics	
Gender	-.026
Age	.161
Educational level	.005
Marital status	-.005
R ²	.025
Adjusted R ²	.004
F	1.164
Step 2: Demographic characteristics and work profile characteristics	
Gender	-.022
Age	.062
Educational level	.013
Marital status	.001
Tenure	.133
Sector	.060
Working hours	-.029
Job position	-.064
R ²	.042

	Work engagement
	Standardized beta coefficients
Adjusted R ²	-.001
ΔR ²	.017
F change	.81
F	.985
Step 3: Demographic characteristics, work profile characteristics and overall job satisfaction	
Gender	.020
Age	.056
Educational level	.011
Marital status	-.060
Tenure	.063
Sector	.021
Working hours	.061
Job position	-.038
Overall job satisfaction	.541***
R ²	.308
Adjusted R ²	.273
ΔR ²	.266
F change	68.003***
F	8.76***

*** $p \leq .001$

When a block of predictors contributed to a significant amount on increase in explained variance on a given outcome variable ($p \leq .05$), all measures within the corresponding blocks having significant and independent relationships with this outcome ($p \leq .05$) were identified. As shown in Table 5, neither the demographic nor the work profile characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variance on work engagement measure. Although it is interesting to observe the changes taking place after adding steps to our analysis, we are mainly interested in the final model. The final model includes the demographics and the work profile characteristics plus overall job satisfaction predictor. Results shown in Table 5 indicate that the final model is statistically significant, $F(9, 177) = 8.76, p \leq .001$, and accounted for approximately 31% of the variance of work engagement ($R^2 = .308, \text{Adjusted } R^2 = .273$). Overall job satisfaction received the strongest weight in the model ($b = .541, p \leq .001$). Thus Table 5 provides strong empirical support for H1 as stated in Section 2.5. At this point, we are able to provide a circumstantial answer to the first research question. Work engagement is positively related to job satisfaction. The amount of variance of work engagement explained by job satisfaction reached 31%.

4.3.2 Testing the Effects of Job Satisfaction Facets on Work Engagement

To test further H2, hierarchical regression was employed. In Table 6, the results of the regression analysis are illustrated. Results of steps 1 and 2 are identical to these of Table 5 and thus are skipped.

Table 6 Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Job Satisfaction Facets and Work Engagement

	Work engagement
	Standardized beta coefficients
Step 3: Demographic characteristics, work profile characteristics and job satisfaction facets	
Gender	-.011
Age	.072
Educational level	-.059
Marital status	.021
Tenure	.027
Sector	-.001
Working hours	.070
Job position	.005
Job security	-.045
Pay	-.105
Co-workers	.229**
Supervisors	-.042
Promotion – growth opportunities	.666***
R ²	.566
Adjusted R ²	.534
ΔR ²	.524
F change	41.832***
F	17.390***

** p ≤ .01

*** p ≤ .001

In line with the regression analysis in Section 4.3.1, the current analysis is consisted of three successive steps. The first two steps include the demographic and work profile characteristics, while the third step evaluated the amount of variance in work engagement explained by employees' job satisfaction facets. Yet again, neither the demographic nor the work profile characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variance on work engagement measure. Results suggest that the final model is statistically significant, $F(13, 173) = 17.39, p \leq .001$, and

accounted for approximately 56% of the variance of work engagement ($R^2 = .566$, Adjusted $R^2 = .534$). It is obvious that the addition of the job satisfaction facets (step 3) to the model lead to a notable increase of the model's predicted value ($\Delta R = .524$). We found that employees are more likely to report greater work engagement when their job provides opportunities for promotion and growth ($b = .666$, $p \leq .001$) and when the behavioral relationships with their co-workers ($b = .229$, $p \leq .01$) are considered satisfactory. Thus we conclude that opportunities for promotion – growth and co-workers are significantly positively related ($p \leq .001$, $p \leq .01$ respectively) to work engagement. Consequently, there is strong empirical support for H2 α and H2 β while the rest job satisfaction facets were not significantly related ($p \geq .05$) to work engagement.

Table 6 provides minimal empirical support for H2 γ . Although payment is indeed not positively related to work engagement, the value is not statistically significant related ($p \geq .05$). At this point, we will make again a short reference to multicollinearity. It has already been stated that in the present study, the VIF did not surpass 3.66 and the tolerance lowest value was 0.27 at any time for all independent variables being compliant with the limits of $VIF < 10$ and $tolerance > .1$ suggested by many researchers. Though, some researchers (i.e. Montgomery and Peck, 1982) suggest that stricter limits of the VIF (i.e. $VIF \leq 3$) lead to safer results regarding multicollinearity.

In Table 4, we can see that the promotion – growth variable is highly correlated with the supervisors' variable ($r = .766$, $p \leq .01$). It is worth mentioning here that this is the highest correlation between all variables. The high correlation between these two variables is not surprising. Supervisory behavior is one important determinant in the making of an employee's organizational and professional career (Vicino and Bass, 1978; Thompson and Dalton, 1976; Farris, 1972). Katz and Tushman (1983) stated that “supervisory behavior directly affects early work experiences which, in turn, dramatically affect career outcomes”. The aforementioned findings explain to a great extent the close relationship between promotion opportunities and supervision. Trying to reach lower VIF levels ($VIF \leq 3$) in order to achieve less multicollinearity and taking into consideration the high correlation and the given relationship between promotion opportunities and supervision, the latter variable is removed from our model. As a result, the VIF for all independent variables falls below 3 (highest value of $VIF = 2.8$, lowest value of tolerance = .372). The results, presented in Table 7, are very interesting.

Table 7 Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Excluding Supervisors

	Work engagement
	Standardized beta coefficients
Step 3: Demographic characteristics, work profile characteristics and job satisfaction facets excluding supervisors	
Gender	-.010
Age	.074
Educational level	-.058
Marital status	.022
Tenure	.027
Sector	-.002
Working hours	.070
Job position	.002
Job security	-.049
Pay	-.119*
Co-workers	.224**
Promotion – growth opportunities	.643***
R ²	.566
Adjusted R ²	.536
ΔR ²	.524
F change	52.456***
F	18.901***

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

By removing the supervisors variable, pay – another job satisfaction facet which prior to the supervision variable removal was not statistically significant – becomes significant now. The new model is statistically significant, $F(12, 174) = 18.901, p \leq .001$ and did not result in any change in explaining the variance of work engagement ($R^2 = .566$). Nevertheless we are able to spot a minor increase in Adjusted R^2 (Adjusted $R^2 = .536$) in comparison with the previous model (Adjusted $R^2 = .534$) which is justified because of the decrease of the total number of predictors. Opportunities for promotion and growth ($b = .643, p \leq .001$) and co-workers ($b = .224, p \leq .01$) remain the strongest predictors of work engagement although they are slightly decreased in comparison with the previous model. This reduction is justified as after removing the supervisors' variable, the pay variable contributes more to the final model. Consequently, pay's beta coefficient changed from $b = -.105, p \geq .05$ (old model) to $b = -.119, p \leq .05$ (new model) becoming statistically significant. Thus, Table 7 now provides empirical support for

H2c. At this point we are able to provide a fully justified answer to the second research question. Empirical results showed that some specific job satisfaction facets indeed affect employees' engagement levels. Opportunities for promotion – growth and co-workers were the strongest predictors affecting positively work engagement. After modifying our model, we showed that payment is not positively related to work engagement. Job security and supervisors were not significant predictors of work engagement.

Hypotheses 2d and 2e were not supported by the results. Both job security and supervisors variables showed a weak negative relationship ($b = -.045$ and $b = -.042$ respectively) with work engagement. The aforementioned results were not statistically significant.

4.3.3 Testing the Effects of Job Stress on Overall Job Satisfaction

Hierarchical regression analysis was performed in order to test H3 in which overall job satisfaction was regressed on three steps. The first two steps included the control variables in line with the regression models presented earlier. The final block comprised the measure of job stress. Thus, step 3 evaluated the amount of variance in overall job satisfaction explained by job stress. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis are presented in Table 8.

Table 8 Results of Hierarchical Regression Analysis Regarding Job Stress and Overall Job Satisfaction

	Overall job satisfaction
	Standardized beta coefficients
Step 1: Demographic characteristics	
Gender	-.082
Age	.115
Educational level	.009
Marital status	.115
R ²	.046
Adjusted R ²	.025
F	2.183
Step 2: Demographic characteristics and work profile characteristics	
Gender	-.078
Age	.011
Educational level	.002
Marital status	.113
Tenure	.129
Sector	.071
Working hours	-.166*
Job position	-.047

	Overall job satisfaction
	Standardized beta coefficients
R ²	.092
Adjusted R ²	.052
ΔR ²	.047
F change	2.287
F	2.266*
Step 3: Demographic characteristics, work profile characteristics and overall job satisfaction	
Gender	-.085
Age	.013
Educational level	-.001
Marital status	.122
Tenure	.144
Sector	.073
Working hours	-.177*
Job position	-.079
Job stress	-.178*
R ²	.122
Adjusted R ²	.077
ΔR ²	.030
F change	5.974*
F	2.734**

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

As shown in Table 5, the demographic characteristics entry (step 1) was not significant. On the other hand, the work profile variables block (step 2) was significant at the level of $p \leq .05$ ($F = 2.266$). However, the variance of overall job satisfaction that could be explained by this group of work profile variables was relatively low ($R^2 = .092$, Adjusted $R^2 = .052$). From all the work profile variables, only the working hours variable was statistically significant ($p \leq .05$). Specifically, employees are more likely to express higher job satisfaction when they are full-time employed ($b = -.166$, $p \leq .05$). Step 3 evaluated the amount of variance in overall job satisfaction explained by job stress. The entry of employees' job stress (step 3) was again significant ($F(9, 177) = 2.34$, $p \leq .01$). The final model is able to explain approximately 12% of the variance of overall job satisfaction ($R^2 = .122$, Adjusted $R^2 = .077$). Job stress and working hours were the strongest predictors in the model. We found that both job stress ($b = -.178$, $p \leq .05$) and working hours ($b = -.177$, $p \leq .05$) were negatively related to general job satisfaction.

Thus, Table 8 provides adequate empirical support for H3. Results indicated that higher levels of job stress, may lead to lower level of job satisfaction. The aforementioned conclusion is able to provide a circumstantial answer to the third research question proving the negative relationship between job stress and overall job satisfaction.

5 Discussion and Implications

5.1 Predicting Work Engagement

According to the research's empirical results, the mean work engagement is 4.19 indicating a moderate engagement of the employees to their workplace. The aforementioned findings are in accordance with Shimazu et al.'s findings (2008) which place Greece in the 13th place among 15 countries on the work engagement scale (being ahead only from Spain and Japan). The relatively low work engagement could be due to several reasons. Conceptualization of work engagement itself is not easy since according to Macey and Schneider (2008) "comprises a complex nomological network encompassing trait, state, and behavioral constructs, as well as the work and organizational conditions that might facilitate state and behavioral engagement". A possible explanation could be the management attitude and behaviour. In their report to British Government, MacLeod and Clarke (2009) suggest that management attitude can cause lack of awareness, uncertainty about starting, organizational culture and the underestimation of engagement. Another explanation suggests that organizations often fail to attach "meaning for people" and underestimate the fact that people desperately need meaning in their lives and that they are eager to sacrifice a great deal to institutions that will provide this meaning for them (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006). Providing to employees simply a job or employability perhaps leads in increasing employees' mistrust and lower levels of engagement. In addition, Maylett and Riboldi (2007) pointed out a direct relationship between a manager's individual behavior, the overall engagement of that manager's team, and its general success.

The results presented in the current study indicated that personal demographic characteristics were generally unrelated to levels of work engagement being in accordance with past researches (Adeyemo, 2007; Koyuncu et al., 2006). Work situation characteristics were also not significantly related to work engagement in this study although some past researchers have connected work-related characteristics with employee engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2006).

On the other hand job satisfaction and some job satisfaction facets were found to be strong predictors of work engagement. For work engagement, our results largely supported the three initial hypotheses (H1, H2a and H2b) and subsequently H2c. Specifically, our first hypothesis (H1) suggested that the higher the level of employees' overall-general job satisfaction, the higher their level of work engagement. This prediction was fully supported. The result is also consistent with previous studies which have pointed out the positive relationship between job satisfaction and work engagement (Saks, 2006; Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004; Sonnentag, 2003;

Kotze and Roodt, 2005). More specifically, Schaufeli and Bakker (2004) describe the experience of engagement as a fulfilling, positive work-related experience and state of mind while Sonnentag (2003) relates engagement to good health and positive work affect. Kotze and Roodt (2005) showed that there is a strong positive correlation between employee engagement and job satisfaction after a research conducted to 104 employees of two commercial banks of South Africa in 2003. In addition, Harter et al. (2002) specifically equated engagement with both satisfaction and involvement.

Moreover, apart from identifying the level of work engagement predicted from overall job satisfaction, this study explored the relationship between a number of job satisfaction facets and work engagement. More specifically, hypothesis 2a which assumed that co-workers satisfaction is positively related to employee engagement was fully supported. The results are in accordance with previous studies (Avery et al., 2007; May et al., 2004) verifying the kind of the relationship. It is obvious that harmonious relations with coworkers lead employees to feel more certain and secure in exposing their true selves to others in performing their jobs and, therefore, to be more engaged. On the contrary, poor relations with coworkers should increase defensiveness, resulting in greater detachment in the work scenery. In addition, perceiving one's coworkers as supportive has been understood as an important job resource that simplifies the achievement of work objectives and correlates significantly with employee engagement (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). As far as hypothesis 2b is concerned, results confirmed the positive relationship between satisfaction in promotion – growth opportunities and work engagement. The findings are generally consistent with previous research. Schaufeli, Bakker, and Van Rhenen (2008) found that increases in social support, autonomy, opportunities to learn and to develop, and performance feedback were positive predictors of work engagement. Moreover, it is plausible to assume that engaged employees are more likely to be committed to those organizations that provide opportunities for learning, growth, and development (Houkes et al., 2001).

Findings of the current research provide also adequate support for hypothesis 2c albeit, as indicated earlier, a highly intercorrelated with pay-compensation variable (supervisors) had to be removed. Results revealed a negative relationship between pay-compensation and work engagement refuting this way a common folk perception that money is the most important driver within the employee-organization relationship. Many researchers consider compensation as a very important driver to job satisfaction and consequently to work engagement (Saks, 2006; Garg and Kumar, 2012). However, according to Lockwood (2007), beyond

compensation and benefits, key retention factors contain “the mission and values of the company, treatment of people, learning and development opportunities, work-life balance policies and practices, and rewards to employees for their efforts”. The negative relationship between compensation and work engagement that results indicated, could maybe explained to an extent by the current economic circumstances in Greece. The continuous reduction in salaries and wages has created a ‘status quo’ leading employees to seek different kinds of incentives offered by organizations in order to be satisfied and subsequently engaged. Of course a person that may be satisfied with his job does not necessarily do a meaningful work but a more satisfied employee is certainly a more engaged one (see H1).

Hypotheses 2d and 2e were not supported by the data. Results indicated a weak negative relationship between job security and supervisors with work engagement but statistically insignificant. In general, supervisors play a critical role in worker well-being and engagement (Gallup Management Journal, 2006). In addition, Wayne and Green (1993) suggest that when supervisors engage in behaviors showing positive esteem for employees, employees feel obliged to reciprocate so that the exchange becomes mutually beneficial. As far as job insecurity is concerned, most existing research has focused on its negative effects on individuals as on organizations. Job insecurity is often reported to result in reduced psychological well-being, characterized by such phenomena as anxiety, depression, irritation or strain-related psychosomatic complaints (Catalano et al., 1986; Dekker and Schaufeli, 1995). However, the adverse economic conditions in Greece and the high unemployment rate (27.1% in the second semester of 2013, EL.STAT.) have enormously decreased the likelihood of job changes for employees even if they do not feel secure within their current position.

5.2 Predicting Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3, which stated that the job stress and overall job satisfaction scales are negatively related, was adequately supported. The current statistically significant findings concur with existing literature (Fairbrother and Warn, 2003; Terry et al., 1993; Visser et al., 2003) confirming that job stress is a negative predictor of job satisfaction. Findings showed a minimal relation between personal characteristics and levels of job satisfaction satisfaction. Demographic characteristics were generally unrelated to levels of job satisfaction. The same picture was observed with the work profile characteristics excluding only the working hours (full-time – part-time) variable. Thus, it was found that work status provides significant evidence regarding the variation in job satisfaction. More specifically, employees are more

likely to express higher job satisfaction when they are full-time employed rather than when being part-time. The current result agrees with some previous researchers (Miller and Terborg, 1979) who reported a lower level of satisfaction for part-time employees but differs from some others (Eberhardt and Shani, 1984). Eberhardt and Shani (1984) reported that the part-time employees presented a higher level of overall job satisfaction than did the full-time employees but he specified that in his research, the part-timers received benefits comparable to those of the full-time employees. Other researchers found no significant differences in level of job satisfaction between full-time and part-time employees (Logan et al., 1973). A possible explanation for the full-time employees' higher job satisfaction could be the higher levels of job security and compensation they receive although in most cases the full-time job positions are accompanied with higher levels of responsibilities.

When stress is high and satisfaction low, the risk for emotional exhaustion – the central aspect of burnout increases prominently (Visser et al., 2003). However, not all individuals, when exposed to high job demands and working long hours, demonstrate symptoms of disengagement. On the other hand, they may find pleasure in dealing with stressors (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004).

5.3 Practical Implications

Since high engagement predicts low turnover (Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, C. L. M., 2003), the findings of the current study have also practical implications for organizations. It is very important for Greek companies and organizations to set a policy direction in which the attainment and enhancement of employees' engagement will be a primary objective. In a global survey of 50,000 employees in 27 countries, organizations that have a highly engaged workforce were found to have almost 10 times as many committed, high-effort workers as those with a low-engaged workforce (Lockwood, 2007). The level of engagement determines whether people are productive and stay with the organization or move to the competition. As results of the present study suggest, organizations could boost employees' engagement by targeting to increase job satisfaction. A number of factors are known to contribute to employees' job satisfaction. Factors that affect the level of job satisfaction include job security, benefits such as health care, opportunities to use skills and abilities, work itself, compensation/pay, and feeling safe at work (SHRM, 2012). The depressed current economic climate in Greece does not allow to the majority of organizations to insist much on extrinsic motivations in order to enhance job satisfaction, thus they could turn to other solutions that will

not increase the per-employee company expenditure. Career advancement opportunities along with personal development and promotion-growth opportunities could be a strong alternative. As this aspect continues to trend up in importance, organizations need to pay attention to employees' satisfaction level with career advancement opportunities. When employees feel that they've become proficient at the responsibilities of their current positions and are ready to move to next level, they should allowed claiming for more challenging positions within their organizations. The aforementioned aspect may also be related to employees' uncertainty about the economy. It may be more likely for them to desire advancement within their organization rather than taking the risk of moving to a new employer.

Organizations should also pay attention to work environment and the relationships with co-workers. Results indicated that satisfaction with co-workers is a strong predictor for work engagement. However, companies are not able to guarantee that all employees will have harmonic relationships among each other, but they can set a number of rules and regulations in an effort to make the employees feel fairly treated.

The relationship an employee has with his or her supervisor is a central element to the employee's attachment to the organization (Vicino and Bass, 1978; Thompson and Dalton, 1976) and consequently to his engagement. One of the components of a good relationship is effective communication. The relationship employees have with their supervisors is directly connected to their success and growth at work (Katz and Tushman, 1983). Therefore, supervisors and higher-in-hierarchy managers within organizations have to develop a positive relationship with employees – a relationship in which employees feel safe and supported. Another important issue regarding management is about management's recognition. Management's recognition of employee job performance is one of the ways that organizations use to keep employees satisfied and engaged (SHRM, 2012).

Job stress is described as one of the most important workplace health hazards for employees (Danna and Griffin, 1999). Taking into consideration the (frequently reported) negative relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction, organizations need to invest more on anxiolytic means for their employees. Pleasant and effective workplaces could be a solution to lower the anxiety levels within the organization's environment. Employees in effective workplaces report lower general stress levels and fewer health problems, signs of depression and sleep problems than employees in less effective workplaces (SHRM, 2012). Google is an

example of a truly pioneer in this field. Google emphasizes on workplace culture that encourages innovation and offers to its employees multiple (within the company) facilities.

6 Conclusions, Limitations and Future Research

The main purpose of the present study was to examine the relationships among overall job satisfaction, a number of job satisfaction facets and work engagement of randomly selected employees ($n = 186$) working in Greece. In addition, we studied the relationship between job stress and general job satisfaction. Three hypotheses were tested of which the second one included five sub-hypotheses. Results are summarized as follows: Hypotheses 1, 2a and 2b were strongly supported by the data. Hypothesis 3 was adequately supported by the data while hypothesis 2c fitted to the data, albeit after removing the supervisors' predictor (a predictor highly correlated with the opportunities for promotion – growth predictor). Contrary to expectations, satisfaction with supervisors (H2d) and job security (H2e) did not have a significant main effect on work engagement. Thus, overall job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with co-workers, promotion-growth opportunities and satisfaction with payment – compensation were found to significantly affect the levels of work engagement. Additional regressions analyses revealed the negative relationship between occupational stress and employees' levels of job satisfaction. The employees' work status also contributed significantly to the explanation of job satisfaction variation.

As is the case with any study, this report is subject to a number of limitations. Perhaps most noteworthy is that all collected data were self-reported, meaning that same-source bias could have effect in our results (Podsakoff et al., 2003). This borders the conclusions one can derive about causality and in addition raises concerns regarding common method bias. Findings come from a study of cross-sectional design and data were collected at a certain point of time, without regard to differences in time. The abovementioned limitation becomes more important if we take into consideration the tough current economic conditions in Greece. Thus, it is recommended that the research is repeated in a longitudinal basis in the near future in order to collect data that can be compared to the current study's findings. From a research point of view, it would be particularly interesting to find out whether and how the transitions and changes of Greek economy affect employees' engagement and satisfaction.

Another limitation is that, although the overall sample is considered adequate, it is not large. Therefore, conclusions must be drawn with caution and always in combination with existing literature. A related concern is that the geographical coverage of the sample is relatively small. Consequently, some caution is required in generalizing the results to the larger population. Further research in larger nation-wide samples is needed in order to return more reliable results.

Moreover, the present study did not focus on any specific professional sector. The randomly selected participants worked in several occupational fields, thus no conclusion for a particular professional field maybe derived. Future research could focus on certain professional sectors in order to derive more representative conclusions.

References

- Adeyemo, D. A. (2007). Emotional intelligence and the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employee in public parastatals in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 324-330.
- Atkinson, J. W. (1964). Introduction to motivation. Princeton: NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Avery, D.R., McKay, P.F. & Wilson, D.C. (2007). Engaging the aging workforce: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with co-workers, and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1542-1556.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. (2008). Towards a model of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 13(3), 209-223.
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W.B., Leiter, M.P., & Taris, T.W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress*, 22, 187-200.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., & Burke, R. (2009). Workaholism and relationship quality: A spillover-crossover perspective. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 23-33.
- Blauner, R. (1964). Alienation and freedom. Chikago: University of Chikago Press.
- BlessingWhite. (2011). *Employee Engagement Report. Beyond the numbers: A practical approach for individuals, managers and executives*. Princeton: BlessingWhite Research.
- Bradley, G. (2004). *Job Strain and Healthy Work in Teachers: a Test of the Demands-Control-Support Model*. PhD Thesis, Griffith University, Faculty of Commerce and Management, School of Applied Psychology.
- Brown, S. P. (1996). A meta-analysis and review of organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 235-255.
- Cartwright, S., Holmes, N. (2006). The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 199-208.

- Catalano, R., Rook, K., & Dooley, D. (1986). Labor markets and help-seeking: a test of the employment security hypothesis. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27, 277-287.
- Chen, J., Silverthorne, C. (2008). The Impact of Locus of Control on Job Stress, Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(7), 572-582.
- Chirchill, G. A., Ford, N. M. & Walker, O. C. (1976). Organizational Climate and Job Satisfaction in the Salesforce. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13(4).
- Cicchetti, D. V. (1994). Guidelines, criteria, and rules of thumb for evaluating normed and standardized assessment instruments in psychology. *Psychological Assessment*, 6, 284-290.
- Clarke, S. (2000). Safety culture: under-specified and overrated? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2(1), 65-90.
- Cooper, C., Dewe, P. and O'Driscoll, M. (2001). *Organizational Stress: A Review and Critique of Theory, Research, and Applications*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 241-259.
- Cox, S., Flin, R. (1998). Safety culture: philosopher's stone or man of straw? *Work and Stress*, 12, 189-201.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Danna, K., Griffin, R.W. (1999). Health and Well-Being in the Workplace: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Journal of Management*, 25(3), 357-384.
- De Vaus, D. A. (2002). *Surveys in social research* (5th ed. ed.). London: Routledge.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dekker, S. W., Schaufeli, W. B. (1995). The effects of job insecurity on psychological health and withdrawal: a longitudinal study. *Australian Psychologist*, 30, 57-63.

- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A.B. (2008). The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory: A good alternative to measure burnout (and engagement). *Handbook of Stress and Burnout in Health Care*. New York: Nova Science.
- Dessler, G. (2012). *Human Resource Management* (13th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Douglas, E. J., Robyn J. M. (2006). Workaholic, or just hard worker? *Career Development International*, 11(5), 394-417.
- Dubinsky, A.J., Yammarino, F.J., Jolson, M.A. & Spangler, W.D. (1995). Transformational leadership: an initial investigation in sales context. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 15(2), 15-31.
- Eberhardt, B.J., Shani, A. B. (1984). The Effects of Full-Time Versus Part-Time Employment Status on Attitudes Toward Specific Organizational Characteristics and Overall Job Satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(4), 893-900.
- EL.STAT. (2013, June 13). *Hellenic Statistical Authority*. Retrieved from http://www.statistics.gr/portal/page/portal/ESYE/BUCKET/A0101/PressReleases/A0101_SJO02_DT_MM_03_2013_01_F_GR.pdf
- Ernst, M.E., Franco, M., Messmer, P.R. and Gonzalez, J.L. (2004). Nurses' job satisfaction, stress and recognition in a pediatric setting. *Pediatric Nursing*, 30(3), 219-228.
- Fairbrother, K. & Warn, J. (2003). Workplace dimensions, stress and job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(1), 8-21.
- Farris, G. (1972). The effect of individual roles on performance in innovative groups. *R&D Management*, 3, 23-28.
- Firebaugh, G., Harley, B. (1995). Trends in job satisfaction in the United States by race, gender, and type of occupation. *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 5, 87-104.
- Fisher, C. D. (2003). Why Do Lay People Believe That Satisfaction and Performance Are Correlated? Possible Sources of a Commonsense Theory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24(6), 753-777.

- Forster, N. and Still, L. (2002). All Work and No Play? The Effects of Occupational Stress on Managers and Professionals in Western Australia. Perth: The Centre for Women and Business.
- Fostinatos-Ventouratos, R. and Cooper, C. (2005). The role of gender and social class in work stress. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(1), 14-23.
- Fried, Y. (1993). Integrating domains of work stress and industrial relations: introduction and overview. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(5), 397-399.
- Garg, A., Kuma, V. (2012). A study of employee engagement in pharmaceutical sector. *International Journal of Research in IT and Management*, 2(5), 85-98.
- Giannikis, S.K., Mihail, D.M. (2011). Modelling job satisfaction in low-level jobs: Differences between full-time and part-time employees in the Greek retail sector. *European Management Journal*, 29, 129-143.
- Giga, S., Cooper, C. and Faragher, B. (2003). The development of a framework for a comprehensive approach to stress management interventions at work. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(4), 280-296.
- González-Roma, V., Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Lloret, S. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: independent factors or opposite poles? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 68, 165-174.
- Hackman, J.R., Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hakanen, J. (2002). From burnout to job engagement – validation of the Finnish version of an instrument for measuring job engagement (UWES) in an educational organization. *Työ ja Ihminen*, 16, 42-58.
- Hallberg, U. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). “Same Same” but diVerent? Can work engagement be discriminated from job involvement and organizational commitment? *European Psychologist*, 11, 119-127.

- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup Studies. In C. L. Keyes, *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived*. (pp. 205-224). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L, Hayes, T.L. (2003). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 268-279.
- Henne, D., Locke, E. A. (1985). Job Dissatisfaction: What Are Consequences? *International Journal of Psychology, 20*, 221-240.
- Higgnbottom, K. (2009, June 22). *Employers want practical help from engagement review*. Retrieved September 20, 2013, from www.cipd.co.uk: <http://www.cipd.co.uk/pm/peoplemanagement/b/weblog/archive/2013/01/29/employers-want-practical-help-from-engagement-review-2009-06.aspx>
- Ho, J. (1997). Corporate wellness programmes in Singapore: effect on stress, satisfaction and absenteeism. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 12*(3), 177-189.
- Houkes, I., Janssen, P. P. M., Jonge, J. d., & Nijhuis, F. J. N. (2001). Specific relationships between work characteristics and intrinsic work motivation, burnout and turnover intention: A multi-sample analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*, 1-23.
- Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S. (2000). *Managing Human Resources* (7th ed.). New York: Sauth-Western Collage Publishing.
- Jex, S., Yankelevich, M. (2008). Work stress. In J. Barling, & C. Cooper (Eds.). *The handbook of organizational behavior*, 498-518.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*((4)), 692-724.
- Kalleberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards—Theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 124-143.
- Kalleberg, A. L., Berg I. (1987). *Work and Industry*. New York: Plenum.

- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 341-349.
- Katz, R., Tushman, M. L. (1983). A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Boundary Spanning Supervision on Turnover and Promotion in Research and Development. *Academy of Management, 26*(3), 437-456.
- Kenny, D. and Cooper, C. (2003). Introduction: occupational stress and its management. *International Journal of Stress Management, 10*(4), 275-279.
- Kotze, K., Roodt, G. (2005). Factors that affect the retention of managerial and specialist staff: An exploratory study of an employee commitment model. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 3*(2), 48-55.
- Koyuncu, M., Burke, R.J., and Fiksenbaum, L. (2006). Work engagement among women managers and professionals in a Turkish bank: Potential antecedents and consequences. *Equal Opportunities International, 25*(4), 299-310.
- Kutner, M. H., Nachtsheim, C. J., Neter, J., & Li, W. (2004). *Applied linear statistical models* (5th ed. ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Langelan, S., Bakker, A. B., van Doornen, L. J. P., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement: do individual differences make a difference? *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 521-532.
- Laschinger, H.K.S., Finegan, J. (2005). Empowering nurses for engagement and health in hospital settings. *Journal of Nursing Administration, 35*(10), 439-449.
- Laschinger, H.K.S., Leiter, M.P. (2006). The impact of nursing work environments on patient safety outcomes: the mediating role of burnout/engagement. *The Journal of Nursing Administration, 36*(5), 259-267.
- Lavanda, C. (2013). Personality as a Predictor of Job Satisfaction: Study of the Relationship between Personality and Job Satisfaction amongst Workers in the Bahamas. *Journal of Management Research, 5*(3), 200-229. doi:10.5296/jmr.v5i3.3936
- Lawler, E. E., Hall, D.T. (1970). Relationships of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction, and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 54*, 305-312.

- Lawrence, R. M. (2001). *The Application of Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristic Model to Perceptions Community Music School Faculty Have Towards their Job*. PhD Thesis, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS, Texas.
- Lee, R.T., Ashforth, B.E. (1996). A meta-analytic examination of the correlates of the three dimensions of job burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *81*(2), 123-133.
- Llorens, S., Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A., & Salanova, M. (2007). Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? *Computers in Human Behaviour*, *23*, 825-841.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is Job Satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *4*(4), 309-336.
- Lockwood, N. (2007). *Leveraging Employee Engagement for Competitive Advantage: HR's Strategic Role*. Alexandria, USA: Society For Human Resource Management.
- Logan, N., O'Reilly, C.A., & Roberts, K.H. (1973). Job satisfaction among part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *3*, 33-41.
- Lu, L. (1999). Work Motivation, Job Stress and Employees' Well-being. *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, *8*(1), 61-72.
- MacLeod, D., Clarke, N. (2009). *Engaging for success: enhancing performance through employee engagement*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- Mangoire, T.W., Quinn, R.P. (1975). Job satisfaction, counter productive behaviour and drug use at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*, 114-116.
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The truth about burnout*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2008). *Human Resource Management*. 12. Mason: OH: Cengage Learning.
- Mauno, S., & Kinnunen, U. (2000). The stability of job and family involvement: applying the multi-wave, multimultivariable. *Work and Stress*, *14*, 51-64.
- Mauno, S., Kinnunen, U., Ruokolainen, M. (2007). Job demands and resources as antecedents of work engagement: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *70*, 149-171.

- May, D.R., Gilson, R.L. and Harter, L.M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 77, 11-37.
- Maylett, T., & Riboldi, J. (2007). Using 360° Feedback to Predict Performance. *T+D*, 61(9), 48-52.
- Maynard, D., Thorsteinson, T. J., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2006). Reasons for working part-time. Subgroup differences in job attitudes and turnover intentions. *Career Development International*, 11(2), 145-162.
- Mendenhall, W., Sincich, T. . (1996). *A Second Course in Statistics: Regression Analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mikkelsen, A., Saksvik, P.O.& Landsbergis, P. (2000). The impact of a participatory organizational intervention on job stress in community health care institutions. *Work and Stress*, 14(2), 156-171.
- Miller, H.E., Terborg, J.R. (1979). Job attitudes of part-time and full-time employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 380-386.
- Miller, K.I., Ellis, B.H., Zook, E.G.& Lyles, J.S. (1990). An integrated model of communication, stress, and burnout in the workplace. *Communication Research*, 17(3), 300-326.
- Montgomery, D., Peck, E. (1982). *Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Moorman, R. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations*, 6, 759-776.
- Motowidlo, S.J., Packard, J.S. & Manning, M.R. (1986). Occupational stress: its causes and consequences for job performance. *Journal of Psychology*, 71(4), 618-629.
- Mowday, R.T., Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover. *New York: Academic Press*.

- Mueller, Charles W., & McCloskey, Joanne C. (1990). Nurses' Job Satisfaction: A Proposed Measure. *Nursing Research*, 19(5), 360-367.
- Murphy, L. (1995). Managing job stress: an employee assistance human resource management partnership. *Personnel Review*, 24(1), 41-50.
- Nigam, J., Murphy, L. and Swanson, N. (2003). Are stress management programs indicators of good places to work? Results of a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(4), 345-360.
- Oshagbemi, T., Hickson, C. (2003). Some Aspects of Overall Job Satisfaction: a Binomial Logit Model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(4), 357-367.
- Parker, D. F., Decotiis, T. A. (1983). Organizational determinants of job stress. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(2), 160-177.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
- Ramirez, A.J., Graham, J., Richards, M.A., Cull, A. & Gregory, W.M. (1996). Mental health of hospital consultants: The effects of stress and satisfaction at work. *Lancet*, 347, 724-728.
- Rentsch J.R., Steel R.P. (1992). Construct and concurrent validation of the Andrews and Withey Job Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Educ Psychol Measure*, 52, 357-367.
- Robbins, S. P. (2000). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior* (Sixth Edition ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2007, April 30). *Organizational Behavior*. 12. Upper Saddle River: NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Rodwell, J., Kienzle, R. and Shadur, M. (1998). The relationships among work-related perceptions, employee attitudes, and employee perceptions and employee performance: the integral role of communication. *Human Resource Management*, 37(3-4), 277-293.

- Rogers, R. E., Li, E. Y., & Shani, A.B. (1987). Perceptions of Organizational Stress among U.S. Military Officers in Germany: An Exploratory Study. *Group Organization Management, 12*(2), 189-207.
- Rothmann, S. (2008). Job satisfaction, occupational stress, burnout and work engagement as components of work-related wellbeing. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 34*(3), 11-16.
- Sager, J. (1991). Type a Behavior Pattern (TABP) among Salespeople and Its Relationship to Job Stress. *The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 11*(2), 1-14.
- Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*(7), 600-619.
- Salanova, M., Agut, S., Peiro, J.M. (2005). Linking organizational resources and work engagement to employee performance and customer loyalty: the mediation of service climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1217-1227.
- Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W.B. (2008). A cross-national study of work engagement as a mediator between job resources and proactive behaviour. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*(1), 116-131.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Martinez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002a). Burnout and engagement in university students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 464-481.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002b). The measurement of engagement and burnout: a two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*, 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire. A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 66*, 701-716.
- Schaufeli, W.B, Bakker, A.B. (2003). The Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES): Test Manual. Department of Social and Organizational Psychology.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B. (2004). Job demands, job resources and their relationship with burnout and engagement: a multisample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25*, 293-315.

- Schaufeli, W.B., Bakker, A.B., & Van Rhenen, W. (2009). How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(7), 893-917.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Taris, T.W. & Bakker, A.B. (2006). Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: On the differences between work engagement and workaholism. *Research companion to working time and work addiction*, 193-217.
- Scott, K.S., Moore, K.S. & Miceli, M.P. (1997). An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism. *Human Relations*, 50, 287-314.
- Seeman, M. (1972). Alienation and engagement. *The human meaning of social change*, 467-527.
- Shimazu, A., Schaufeli, W. B., Kosugi, S., Suzuki, A., Nashiwa, H., Kato, A. (2008). Work engagement in Japan: Validation of the Japanese version of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. *Applied Psychology International Review*, 57, 510-523.
- SHRM. (2012). *Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement*. Alexandria, USA: Society for Human Resource Management.
- Simpson, I. H. (1989). The sociology of work: Where have all the workers gone? *Social Forces*, 67, 563-581.
- Smith, P. C., Hulin, C. L., & Kendall, L. M. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: a Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*. Rand McNally & Company.
- Sonnentag, S. (2003). Recovery, work engagement, and proactive behavior: a new look at the interface between non-work and work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 518-528.
- Spector, P. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. SAGE.
- Spector, P.E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: development of the Job Satisfaction Survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.
- Stevens, M. (2009). Staff engagement moves up the agenda of top firms. *People Management Magazine*, pp. 7.

- Storm, K., Rothmann, I. (2003). A psychometric analysis of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale in the South African police service. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology, 29*, 62-70.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed. ed.). Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon.
- Terry, D.J., Nielsen, M., & Perchard, L. (1993). Effects of work stress on psychological well-being and job satisfaction: The stress-buffering role of social support. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 45*(3), 168-175.
- Thompson, E.R., Phua, F.T.T. (2012). A Brief Index of Affective Job Satisfaction. *Group & Organization Management, 37*, 275-307.
- Thompson, P. H., Dalton, G. W. (1976). Are R&D organizations obsolete? *Harvard Business Review, 54*, 105-116.
- van der Heijden, B., Schalk, R., & van Veldhoven, M. (2008). Ageing and careers: European research on long-term career development and early retirement. *Career Development International, 13*(2), 85-94.
- van Saane, N., Sluiter J. K., Verbeek J.H. A.M., & Frings-Dresen M. H.W. (2003). Reliability and validity of instruments measuring job satisfaction—a systematic review. *Occupational Medicine, 53*, 191-200.
- Vicino, F. L., Bass, B. M. (1978). Lifespace variables and managerial success. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63*, 81-88.
- Visser, M.R.M., Smets, E.M.A., Oort, F.J. & deHaes, C.J.M. (2003). Stress, satisfaction and burnout among Dutch medical specialists. *Canadian Medical Association Journal, 168*, 271-276.
- Warr, P. (2002). The study of well-being, behaviour and attitudes. *Psychology at work, 1-25*.
- Wayne, S. J. & Green, S. A. (1993). The effects of employee citizenship on employee citizenship and impression management behavior. *Human Relations, 46*, 1431-1440.
- Wharton, A. S., Rotolo, T., Bird, S. R. (2000). Social Context at Work: A Multilevel Analysis of Job Satisfaction. *Sociological Forum, 15*(1), 65-90.

- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E. & Kantas, A. (in press). The measurement of burnout and engagement: a cross-cultural study comparing Greece and The Netherlands. *New Review of Social Psychology*.
- Yi-Hua, H., Mei-Ling, W. (2012). The Moderating Role of Personality in HRM - from the Influence of Job Stress on Job Burnout Perspective. *International Management Review*, 8(2), 5-18.
- Yi-Wen, Z., Yi-Qun, C. (2005). The Chinese version of the Utrecht work engagement scale: an examination of reliability and validity. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 13, 268-270.
- Zeffane, R., McLoughlin, D. (2006). Cooperation and stress. Exploring the differential impact of job satisfaction, communication and culture. *Management Research News*, 29(10), 618-631. doi:10.1108/01409170610712326

Appendix

Questionnaire (English version)

Demographics

1. Gender

Male	
Female	

2. Age

18-25 years	
26-35 years	
36-45 years	
46-55 years	
56-72 years	

3. Educational Level

Gymnasium	
Professional/Vocational Lyceum (EPAL – TEE)	
General Lyceum (High School)	
Public or Private Vocational Training Institute (IEK - IIEK)	
Technological Educational Institute (TEI)	
Higher Educational Institute (AEI – Bachelor's Degree)	
Master Degree or Higher	

4. Marital Status

Single	
Married	
Living common law (living together but not married)	
Divorced - Separated	
Widowed	

5. Tenure (in months) – Insert number of months working in the organization

6. Sector

Public	
Private	
Other* (Please define)	

* For example Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)

7. Working Hours

Full - time	
Part - time	

8. Organizational level

Managerial position	
Non – Managerial position	

General Job Satisfaction

1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. I frequently think of quitting this job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. Most people doing this job are very satisfied with the job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. *People doing this job often think of quitting.*

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How satisfied are you with these aspects of your job?

1. *The amount of job security I have*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. *The amount of pay and fringe benefits I receive*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. *The amount of personal growth and development I get in doing my job*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. *The people I talk to and work with on my job*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. *The degree of respect and fair treatment I receive from my boss*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. *The feeling of worthwhile accomplishment I get from doing my job*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. *The chance to get to know other people while on the job*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. *The amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. *The degree to which I am fairly paid for what I contribute to this organization*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. *The amount of independent thought and action I can exercise in my job*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. *How secure things look for me in the future in this organization*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. *The chance to help other people while at work*

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. The amount of challenge in my job

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. The overall quality of the supervision I receive in my work

Extremely Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Slightly Dissatisfied	Neutral	Slightly Satisfied	Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Job Stress

1. My job is extremely stressful.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I feel a great deal of stress because of my job.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Work engagement

The following 9 statements are about how you feel at work. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, cross the “0” (zero) in the space after the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you felt it by crossing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

1. *At my work, I feel bursting with energy.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

2. *At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

3. *I am enthusiastic about my job.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

4. *My job inspires me.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

5. *When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

6. *I feel happy when I am working intensely.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

7. *I am proud of the work that I do.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

8. *I am immersed in my job.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

9. *I get carried away when I am working.*

Never 0 Never	Almost never 1 A few times a year or less	Rarely 2 Once a month or less	Sometimes 3 A few times a month	Often 4 Once a week	Very often 5 A few times a week	Always 6 Every day

Questionnaire (Greek version)

Δημογραφικά

1. Φύλο

Ανδρας	
Γυναίκα	

2. Ηλικία

18-25	
26-35	
36-45	
46-55	
56-72	

3. Μορφωτικό Επίπεδο

Γυμνάσιο	
Επαγγελματικό Λύκειο (ΕΠΑΛ – ΤΕΕ)	
Γενικό Λύκειο	
Ινστιτούτο Επαγγελματικής Κατάρτισης (ΙΕΚ - ΠΕΚ)	
Τεχνολογικό Εκπαιδευτικό Ίδρυμα (ΤΕΙ)	
Ανώτατο Εκπαιδευτικό Ίδρυμα (ΑΕΙ)	
Μεταπτυχιακός Τίτλος ή Ανώτερο	

4. Οικογενειακή Κατάσταση

Ανύπαντρος/-η	
Παντρεμένος/-η	
Κοινή συμβίωση (Όχι παντρεμένοι)	
Διαζευγμένος/-η	
Χήρος/-α	

5. Διάρκεια (σε μήνες) – Εισάγετε τον αριθμό των μηνών που δουλεύετε στην επιχείρηση ή στον οργανισμό

6. Τομέας

Δημόσιος	
Ιδιωτικός	

Άλλο*	
-------	--

* Για παράδειγμα Μη Κυβερνητική Οργάνωση (ΜΚΟ)

9. Ωράριο Εργασίας

Πλήρης Απασχόληση	
Μερική Απασχόληση (Part time)	

10. Θέση στην Επιχείρηση

Διευθυντική (Managerial)	
Μη Διευθυντική (Non – Managerial)	

Ικανοποίηση στην Εργασία

1. Γενικά θα έλεγα ότι είμαι ιδιαίτερα ικανοποιημένος/η με την παρούσα δουλειά μου.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Γενικά είμαι ευχαριστημένος/η με το περιεχόμενο της εργασίας στην δουλειά μου.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. Συχνά σκέφτομαι να παραιτηθώ από την δουλειά μου.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. Η πλειονότητα των εργαζομένων σε αυτήν την επιχείρηση είναι πολύ ικανοποιημένοι με την δουλειά τους.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Οι εργαζόμενοι σε αυτήν την επιχείρηση συχνά σκέφτονται να παραιτηθούν.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Πόσο ικανοποιημένος/-η είσαι με τις παρακάτω όψεις της εργασίας σου;

15. Με το βαθμό εξασφάλισης της απασχόλησης.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστ ημένος/-η	Δυσανε στημένο ς/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστη -μένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένο ς/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/ -η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποι ημένος/-η	Ικανοπο τημένος/ -η	Απόλυτ α Ικανοπο τημένος /-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. Με τις αμοιβές και τα επιδόματα που λαμβάνεις

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστ ημένος/-η	Δυσανε στημένο ς/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστη -μένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένο ς/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/ -η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποι ημένος/-η	Ικανοπο τημένος/ -η	Απόλυτ α Ικανοπο τημένος /-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. Με το βαθμό προσωπικής ανάπτυξης και εξέλιξης που αποκτάς μέσω της άσκησης της εργασίας σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστ ημένος/-η	Δυσανε στημένο ς/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστη -μένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένο ς/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/ -η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποι ημένος/-η	Ικανοπο τημένος/ -η	Απόλυτ α Ικανοπο τημένος /-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. Με τα άτομα που συναναστρέφεσαι και εργάζεσαι μαζί τους στην δουλειά σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. Με το βαθμό σεβασμού και ίσης αντιμετώπισης που απολαμβάνεις από τον εργοδότη σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. Με το αίσθημα της σημαντικής επίτευξης που αποκτάς μέσω της εκτέλεσης της εργασίας σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. Με τη δυνατότητα που σου προσφέρεται να γνωρίσεις άλλα άτομα καθώς ασκείς την εργασία σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

22. Με το βαθμό υποστήριξης και καθοδήγησης που λαμβάνεις από τον προϊστάμενο σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

23. Με το βαθμό στον οποίο δίκαια αμείβεσαι σε σχέση με το τι προσφέρεις σε αυτήν την επιχείρηση.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. Με το βαθμό ανεξάρτητης σκέψης και δράσης που μπορείς να ασκήσεις στην εργασία σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

25. Με το πόσο εξασφαλισμένα εμφανίζονται μελλοντικά, τα πράγματα για εσένα σε αυτήν την επιχείρηση.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

26. Με τη δυνατότητα που σου δίνεται να βοηθήσεις άλλα άτομα καθώς ασκείς την εργασία σου

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. Με το βαθμό πρόκλησης στην εργασία σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. Με τη συνολική ποιότητα της επίβλεψης που απολαμβάνεις στην εργασία σου.

Απόλυτα Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Δυσανεστημένος/-η	Ούτε Δυσανεστημένος/-η ούτε Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ελαφρώς Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Ικανοποιημένος/-η	Απόλυτα Ικανοποιημένος/-η
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Στρες στην Εργασία

1. Η εργασία μου είναι εξαιρετικά αγχωτική.

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

2. *Αισθάνομαι πολύ στρες εξαιτίας της εργασίας μου.*

Διαφωνώ απόλυτα	Διαφωνώ	Διαφωνώ ελαφρώς	Ούτε διαφωνώ ούτε	Συμφωνώ ελαφρώς	Συμφωνώ	Συμφωνώ απόλυτα
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Προσήλωση στην εργασία

Οι ακόλουθες 9 δηλώσεις αφορούν το πως αισθάνεστε στην εργασία σας. Παρακαλώ διαβάστε προσεκτικά την κάθε δήλωση και υποδείξτε αν ποτέ αισθάνεστε με αυτόν τον τρόπο στην εργασία σας. Αν ποτέ δεν έχετε αισθανθεί αυτό το συναίσθημα, μαρκάρετε το 0. Αν έχετε αισθανθεί αυτό το συναίσθημα, υποδείξτε πόσο συχνά το έχετε αισθανθεί σημειώνοντας έναν αριθμό από το 1 έως το 6 αναλόγως με το πόσο συχνά το έχετε αισθανθεί.

1. *Στη δουλειά μου, σφύζω από ενέργεια.*

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Σπάνια	Μερικές φορές	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντοτε
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

2. *Στην εργασία μου αισθάνομαι δυνατός και δραστήριος.*

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Σπάνια	Μερικές φορές	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντοτε
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

3. *Είμαι ενθουσιασμένος με την δουλειά μου.*

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Σπάνια	Μερικές φορές	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντοτε
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4. Η δουλειά μου με εμπνέει.

Ποτέ 0	Σχεδόν ποτέ 1	Σπάνια 2	Μερικές φορές 3	Συχνά 4	Πολύ συχνά 5	Πάντοτε 6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

5. Όταν σηκώνομαι το πρωί, αισθάνομαι ότι θέλω να πάω στη δουλειά μου.

Ποτέ 0	Σχεδόν ποτέ 1	Σπάνια 2	Μερικές φορές 3	Συχνά 4	Πολύ συχνά 5	Πάντοτε 6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

6. Νιώθω χαρούμενος όταν εργάζομαι εντατικά.

Ποτέ 0	Σχεδόν ποτέ 1	Σπάνια 2	Μερικές φορές 3	Συχνά 4	Πολύ συχνά 5	Πάντοτε 6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

7. Είμαι υπερήφανος για τη δουλειά μου.

Ποτέ 0	Σχεδόν ποτέ 1	Σπάνια 2	Μερικές φορές 3	Συχνά 4	Πολύ συχνά 5	Πάντοτε 6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

8. Στην εργασία μου, είμαι απορροφημένος.

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Σπάνια	Μερικές φορές	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντοτε
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα

11. Όταν εργάζομαι, η δουλειά μου με παρασέρνει.

Ποτέ	Σχεδόν ποτέ	Σπάνια	Μερικές φορές	Συχνά	Πολύ συχνά	Πάντοτε
0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ποτέ	Μερικές φορές το χρόνο ή λιγότερο	Μία φορά το μήνα ή λιγότερο	Μερικές φορές το μήνα	Μία φορά τη βδομάδα	Λίγες φορές μες στη βδομάδα	Κάθε μέρα