The relationship between organizational changes and job satisfaction through the mediating role of job stress in the Jordanian telecommunication sector
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ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this research is to investigate the mediating role of job stress in the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction in telecommunication companies in Jordan. The research population is employees working at three communication companies in Jordan; as a convenience sample of 422 was chosen randomly. Descriptive analysis was used to provide general information on the employees of telecommunication companies. Furthermore, validity and reliability tests were used, and regression analysis was applied for the possibility of hypotheses rejection. The findings indicate a significant positive relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction, as well as a significant positive relationship between organizational change and job stress. Additionally, the results indicate a significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The findings also revealed a partial mediating effect of job stress on the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction. According to the findings of this research, to increase employees’ job satisfaction, their level of job stress during organization change operations in telecommunication companies must be decreased. For future research, the present study recommends the investigation of the impact of organizational change on job satisfaction, along with the mediating role of job stress, using different dimensions and sectors.

Keywords: Organizational Change, Job Stress, Job Satisfaction

1. Introduction

Recently, in the dynamic business cycle and competitive environment, organizations have begun searching for new opportunities to achieve a competitive advantage in order to maintain sustainability in the worldwide market (Al-Bilbiese & Al-Nomimi, 2017; Al Shurideh et al., 2019). Job satisfaction has become a key component of successful organizations (Tumen & Zeydanli, 2016; Alshraideh et al., 2017). Job satisfaction has been studied widely in previous literature (Eslami & Gharakhani, 2012), and several specialists, managers, and researchers believe that it plays a vital role in employee productivity and retention rate (Alshurideh, 2014; Al Kurdi et al., 2020a; Kurdi et al., 2020). Job satisfaction can be affected by many factors, such as promotion, wages, benefits, working conditions, leadership, social relationships, and the work itself (Parvin & Kabir, 2011; Alzoubi et al., 2020). Additionally, according to Akhtar and Rong (2015), organizational changes have a significant impact on job satisfaction.
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Today, organizations must change constantly because development and growth occur through changes (Petrou, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2018; Alshurideh, 2019; Alshurideh et al., 2020). Moreover, it is important to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations (Boni, 2017; Aburaya et al., 2020). Organizational change has been classified into three levels: individual, group, and system level changes (Caves, 2018). Nevertheless, successful organizational change requires employee engagement and involvement (Van den Heuvel, Demerouti, Bakker, & Schaufeli, 2010; Petrou et al., 2018). Such changes especially require the efforts of managers in order to promote positive employee behavior for achieving the organization’s goals and objectives (Petrou, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2017). Organizations require the leadership and self-motivation of decision-makers in order to utilize talented employees and assess their skills through continuous training and education programs during the change process (Caves, 2018; Abuhashesh et al., 2019a; Mehmood et al., 2019). Organizational change is needed frequently in organizations to update technology and deal with the demands of the competitive market (Shah et al., 2017). According to Cullen, Edwards, Casper, and Gue (2014), the perceived uncertainty regarding organizational changes in the work environment creates job stress for employees.

In addition, it is difficult to ignore the relationship between job stress and job satisfaction (Darmody & Smyth, 2016). According to Lu et al. (2017), job stress influences the factors of job satisfaction. Job stress is considered to cause job dissatisfaction and has a major impact on employees’ productivity (Brewer et al., 2003). There are numerous factors that make jobs more stressful and difficult for employees in the services or manufacturing industries. Job stressors affect interpersonal relationships at work, such as by leading to conflict with supervisors, colleagues, subordinates, or organizational policies (Man-soor, Fida, Nasir, & Ahmad, 2011; Hoboubiet al., 2017).

The current research paper is organized as follows; after this introduction, the second section presents the literature review and research hypotheses. Then, the research methodology presents details about the study sample, the measures used in the study and the data analyses performed. Finally, the conclusions section offers the discussion of the findings, implications, limitations, and directions for further research.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Organizational Change

The main purpose of organizational changes is to improve the mission and vision in order to adapt to global changes (Castillo et al., 2018). Organizations struggle to develop and apply different kinds of changes to respond to the rapid developments of the external environment (caused due to technological, social, economic, and political forces). Thus, organizations must react effectively to these challenges and take advantage of the opportunities (Heckelman, 2017; Abu Zayyad et al., 2020). Organizational change is also related to high expectations of improving performance (Schneider, Brief, & Guzzo, 1996). Changes come in different forms; whereas some changes impact the organization as a whole, others only affect certain departments, teams, or processes (Yousef, 2017). Both expected and unexpected pressures (external or internal) can force organizations to take corrective measures, such as restructuring, strategies, policies, culture, or approaches, to support organization sustainability and attain competitive advantage (Alshurideh, 2010; Shah et al., 2017). Successful organizational change requires the acceptance of employees (Fairbrother & Warn, 2003). Employees’ attitudes are influenced by understanding the changing conditions as well as the level of impact on them (Cullen et al., 2014; Abuhashesh et al., 2019b). Most employees do not have enough experience and motivation to feel satisfied with organizational change, which is a reason for resistance to change (Alshurideh et al., 2012). Organizations must develop effective change strategies (Bateh, Castaneda, & Farah, 2013; Alshurideh et al., 2019). Researchers agree that communication is the most effective strategy to enhance employee acceptance, which is necessary as employees play a critical role in organizational change (Petrou et al., 2018). The quality of communication during organizational change depends on an organization’s ability to provide timely, useful, and relevant information (Wanberg & Banas, 2000; Petrou et al., 2018; Alshurideh et al., 2019; Al Kurdi et al., 2020b). The changes are more effective when the three levels within an organization (i.e., individual, group, and organizational) work together (Heckelman, 2017). Organizational change comprises a series of efforts to change the structure, goals, technology, and processes of the organization (Carnall, 1986; Yousef, 2000; Yousef, 2017). Golembiewski (1995) defines organizational change as a process of transition between the current situation and the future targeted situation. It is also a normal daily process of working life, in the form of processes such as mergers, relocations, and salary freezes (Castillo et al., 2018). S. et al. (2012) measured organizational change by three dimensions, namely, behavioral resistance to change, behavioral support for change, and creative behavior for change. However, Dahl (2011) used the following six dimensions to measure organizational change: enhanced skills/knowledge, increased effectiveness, adaptation to turbulent environments, and increased cooperation and coordination within the organization (Kh et al., 2018). Leadership is significantly related to the process of change dimension due to its role of providing rewards and efficiently communicating with employees (Kh et al., 2018).

2.2 Job Stress

Job stress has become an important subject to be researched, due to the magnitude of its effects, especially physical disorders such as high blood pressure (Brewer & McMaha, 2003). Employees suffer from job stressors daily, beginning from uncooperative supervisors or co-workers, to family problems (DeTienne et al., 2012). Stress leads to exhaustion employees’ resources and reduces the quality of their social lives, such as their relationships with family and friends (Hobfoll, 2002; Castillo et al.,
2018). Job stress stems from individual and environmental interactions, and can be a cause for tension that leads to long-term depression and heart disease (Queri, 2016). According to a previous researcher, poor management and inadequate communications are the main causes of job stress (Smollan, 2015). Mansoor et al. (2011) defined job stress as “a condition which happens when one realizes the pressure on them, or the requirements of a situation, are wider than their recognition that they can handle. If these requirements are huge and continue for a longer period of time without any interval, mental, physical, or behavioral problems may occur.” Stress is defined as a negative emotional experience in a specific environment, associated with feelings of anxiety, frustration, anger, and tension (Ouellette et al., 2018).

According to Yang et al. (2015), job stress occurs when an employee’s ability cannot meet the job requirements. Barzideh, Choobineh, and Tabatabaei (2014) indicated that inappropriate job conditions increase job stress and may lead to harmful health consequences. The reaction to job stress could be immediate, or occur later on, at any time and place (Barzideh et al., 2014). Job stress has been classified into challenge stress and hindrance stress. Challenge stress refers to employees’ job stress that they are able to overcome, and which benefits their career growth, such as job responsibility and time urgency; on the other hand, hindrance stress refers to employees’ job stress that they are unable to overcome, such as the stress caused by organizational politics (Yang et al., 2017). Job stress may reduce work commitment and performance (Reilly, Dhingra, & Boduszek, 2014; Abuhashesh et al., 2019c), and affects the organization as well as the employee's mental, behavioral, and physical outcomes, including commitment, job satisfaction, and performance (Hoboubi et al., 2017). Various studies have reported that negative psychosocial conditions, such as poor support, lack of cooperation, and lack of staff, are stressful for employees (Allisey, Noblet, Lamontagne, & Houdmont, 2014).

Mouza and Soughamvání (2016) measured job stress using three dimensions: occupational insecurity, performance appraisals via the forced distribution method, and the reduction of salary and benefits. Another study examined job stress through three dimensions: cognitive-appraisal coping, emotion-focused coping, and problem-solving coping (Jung & Yoon, 2016). Hayes, Douglas, and Bonner (2015) measured job stress using the following dimensions: inadequate preparation, lack of support, conflict with managers and colleagues, workload, and uncertainty regarding treatment. Mansoor et al. (2011) measured job stress using three dimensions: conflict at work, physical environment, and workload. Hunter and Thatcher (2007) indicated in their study that job stress is related to a feeling of time constraint, anxiety, and concerns regarding job responsibilities. In the present research, the job stress variable is measured using the time stress and anxiety dimensions, through a scale developed by Parker & DeCotiis (1983; Yongkang, Weixi, Yalin, Yipeng, Liu, 2014; Setar, Buitendach, & Kanengoni, 2015; Thomson, Tourangeau, Jeffs, & Puts, 2018). This scale has been used frequently to assess overall job stress and has good psychometric properties (Jamal, 2016). The first dimension is time stress, which has been defined by Thomson et al. (2018) as insufficient time provided to accomplish numerous job responsibilities. The feeling of time stress, or of being under time pressure (Parker & DeCotiis, 1983) is one of the key factors that affect job stress (Mark & Smith, 2012). Time stress is significantly correlated to job satisfaction, with there being a negative relationship between the two variables (Linzer et al., 2000). The second dimension is anxiety, which is defined by Gaudry and Spielberger (1971) as the “relative stable proneness within each person to react to situations seen as stressful.” Anxiety is a feeling of worry related to the job (Parker & DeCotiis, 1983), and is an unhappy emotional state (Thomson et al., 2018). A specific component for anxiety is physiological hyperarousal, which is connected to depression.

### 2.3 Job Satisfaction

According to Abekah-Nkrumah and AyimbillahAtieng (2013), job satisfaction affects employees’ behavior and work outcomes. The work of several researchers has indicated that job satisfaction has a massive effect on attitudes and work outcomes of employees (Suifan, Diab, & Abdallah, 2017). Previous researchers have agreed that employee satisfaction is one of the most important factors for employees’ productivity and loyalty (Alshurideh, 2014; Amin, Aldakhil, Wu, Rezaei, & Cobanoglu, 2017). Satisfied and positive employees result in customer satisfaction, which ultimately leads to high financial performance (Sarraf, 2018; Ghannejah et al., 2015). According to Ahmad, Jasmuddin, and Kee (2018), job satisfaction is a measure of the degree to which the employees have a positive or negative feeling toward the internal or external aspects of their jobs. Job satisfaction is a combination of evaluative emotions that employees feel regarding the work environment (Sarraf, 2018). According to Spector (1997), job satisfaction is the feeling that determines whether to remain in an organization or seek another job. Measuring job satisfaction is a constant challenge for both researchers and managers (Masa’deh, 2016). Haque, Karim, Muqtadir, and Anam (2012) classified job satisfaction into the dimensions of personal factors and organizational factors. The first dimension includes religion, gender, age, and race, whereas organizational factors include leadership, organizational change, and technology innovation. Al-Abdullat and Dababneh (2018) measured job satisfaction through several dimensions: overall life satisfaction, self-esteem, stress, physical and mental illness, productivity and performance, absenteeism, turnover, and even counterproductive behavior. Job satisfaction was examined by Hayes et al. (2015) using the following six dimensions (pay, autonomy, task requirements, organizational policies, interaction, and professional status). In the present research, job satisfaction has been measured using the dimensions intrinsic job satisfaction and extrinsic job satisfaction (Tarcan, 2017; Tsounis and Sarafis, 2018), as they are considered to be valid and reliable. According to Masa’deh (2016), factors of job satisfactions are related to aspects of the job environment, such as working conditions, coworkers, and pay. Extrinsic job satisfaction includes related to insurance coverage, company policies and practices, opportunities
for occupational progression, wages, human relations and leadership/management techniques, colleagues, and working conditions (Tarcan, 2017).

2.4 Organizational Change and Job Satisfaction

Previous research has reported that job satisfaction has an impact on organizational change, and plays an important role in the acceptance of organizational change, as satisfied employees are more likely to willingly accept the change (Yousef, 2000; Yousef, 2017). Haque et al. (2012) indicated that employees respond positively to organizational change by enhancing their satisfaction and enthusiasm for work, and providing good services. However, according to Castillo et al. (2018), managers sometimes fail to consider the impacts of organizational change on employee satisfaction, morale, and productivity, in the form of desertion, absenteeism, and resistance to change. Lack of trust, self-interest, a difference in the assessment of misunderstandings, and low tolerance for change are the main reasons for resistance to organizational change (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008; Castillo et al., 2018). Hatjidis and Parker (2018) studied the influences of job satisfaction and commitment on the association between relationship quality and an individual's behavioral intention toward organizational change in the hospitality industry. They found that the relationship quality has a positive association with an individual's behavioral intention toward change; in addition, organizational commitment and job satisfaction play a mediating role in the relationship between relationship quality and behavioral intentions toward change. Shah et al. (2017) studied the effects of organizational loyalty, salary, job promotion, and organizational identity on job satisfaction, while suggesting and mediating employee readiness for organizational change; they identified these intrinsic and extrinsic factors that enable organizational change. Adigwe and Oriola (2015) studied the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction, and found that organizational change affects job satisfaction, but the satisfaction levels of employees depend on the effectiveness of organizational change. Cullen et al. (2014) investigated employees' adaptability and perceptions of organizational change-related uncertainty, and the mediating role of perceived organizational support as an explanation for employees' job satisfaction and performance. Their findings reveal that perceived organizational support explains the impact of perceived organizational change-related uncertainty and individual differences in adaptability on job satisfaction. Claiborne et al. (2013) investigated the role of climate and job satisfaction in employees' perception of readiness for change. According to their findings, not all climates or satisfaction factors are recognized equally while supporting change. Judge et al. (1999) examined the managerial responses to organizational change, and found that organizational change was related to extrinsic (job performance, salary, plateauing, job stress level) and intrinsic (job satisfaction, organizational commitment) factors.

For the purposes of the current study, two hypotheses were formulated:

H_0: There is no statistically significant impact of organizational change on job satisfaction.

H_1: There is no statistically significant mediating impact of job stress in the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction.

2.5 Organizational Change and Job Stress

Change has become a cause of stress and frustration for the organization, including both internal and external change related to process and production, technology, government laws and regulations, political situation, and globalization of the business (Yousef, 2000). DeGhetto, Russell, and Ferris (2017) reported job stress to be another negative outcome associated with organizational change. Managing the change effectively puts organizations under pressure (Mehta, 2016). Castillo et al. (2018) recognized that during negative organizational change, individuals go through six emotional stages: denial and anger, bargaining, depression, revising, deserting and acceptance, and understanding; controlling these emotions during the change process eliminates employee resistance. Organizational changes generate uncertainty, which further translates to high levels of job insecurity among employees that generally lead to job stress (Castillo et al., 2018). According to Shah et al. (2017), change affects the entire organization by increasing employees’ stress, anxiety, uncertainty, and resistance, which affects the success or failure of an organization’s new strategy. It must be understood that the employees’ success depends on the organization's success as well as on their coworkers (Caves, 2018). According to Wright, Christensen, and Isett (2013), communication regarding the changes can help reduce stress, anxiety, and uncertainty among employees, which affects their response to the organizational changes. DeGhetto et al. (2017) investigated how employees perceive their uncertain environments, the politics, and work stress, and concluded that negative organizational change could create dysfunctional consequences, such as reducing effectiveness, resistance to change, uncertainty, and politics in the work environment, which in turn lead to increased employee stress. Mouza and Souchangvali (2016) examined the impact of Greece’s unplanned organizational changes on the stress levels of primary school teachers; according to the finding, there was an increase in the perceived stress related to factors such as job insecurity, wages, and assessments. Smollan (2015) investigated the causes of stress before, during, and after organizational change and found that the transition stage was most stressful due to feelings of insecurity, lack of information, uncertainty, workloads, and lack of management support. Dahl (2011) studied the relationship between organizational change and job stress, and found that change increases job stress. Tavakoli (2010) examined stress as a mediator between organizational change and resistance to change, and concluded that the way employees are treated during organizational change is the main cause of job stress and employee resistance. For the purposes of the current study; this hypothesis was developed:
H$_{02}$: There is no statistically significant impact of organizational change on job stress.

2.6 Job Stress and Job Satisfaction

Many researchers have reported that stress is negatively correlated with job satisfaction (Lu et al., 2017). According to Haque et al. (2012), job stress decreases the satisfaction of employees regarding matters such as routine works, physical environments, and workload. Lu et al. (2017) studied the relationship between job satisfaction, stress, work–family conflict, and turnover intention, and explored the elements associated with intention for turnover. According to their results, turnover intention is negatively and directly correlated with job satisfaction, and positively, directly, and indirectly correlated with work–family conflict and work stress; furthermore, job satisfaction is affected by work stress. Kula (2017) investigated the job stress associated with job satisfaction, work-related burnout, and supervisor support in the Turkish Police, and reported that the higher the job stress, the lower the job satisfaction, and the higher the burnout levels. In his study, Hayes (2015) explored nurses’ perceptions of their work environment, job satisfaction, job stress, and burnout; the results indicated that there is an indirect impact of job satisfaction on burnout (emotional exhaustion) through job stress.

Based on the literature discussed above, the following hypothesis was generated:

H$_{03}$: There is no statistically significant impact of job stress on job satisfaction.

3. Research Methodology

The research model was built on the basis of a previous literature review and is presented in Fig. 1. Organizational change is the independent variable, job stress is the mediating variable, and job satisfaction is the dependent variable. The participants in this research were taken from three telecommunication companies in Jordan. A convenience sample was selected from among the employees. The total number of employees working at these companies has crossed 3,636. According to Sekaran and Bougie (2016), the represented sample size includes 348 employees of telecommunication companies in Jordan. To this end, 500 questionnaires were distributed and 442 were returned. Of these, 20 were considered invalid and disregarded; the data of the remaining 422 questionnaires was used, with a response rate of 84%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Mediating variable</th>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Research Reliability

The result shows that all variables (organizational change, job satisfaction, job stress) have met the recommended rule (when alpha is close to one, the internal consistency is considered good. Values less than 0.60 are considered poor (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). This is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Reliability of Overall Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of Change</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness of Change</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>deleted 0.776</td>
<td>deleted 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Stress</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STRESS</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicking</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Research Results

4.1 Answering the Research Question

Before hypothesis testing, the measured central tendency of the collected data was utilized to determine the relative importance of each item in the research variables. Based on the Mean, the ranks were categorized as follows; the low degree ranging from 0 to <2.67, the moderate degree ranging from 2.67 to 3.67 and the high degree starts from 3.67 (Al-Nuaimi, 2013).
Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation values, the relative importance of the dimensions, and the main variables of the research. Independent variable: the level of importance of organizational change dimensions; it was found that the dimensions process of change (mean = 3.7950; standard deviation = 0.7082) and readiness for change (mean = 3.8872; standard deviation = 0.7185) were high, but the climate of change was moderate (mean = 3.2528; standard deviation = 0.6855).

Dependent variable: the level of importance of job satisfaction dimensions; it was found that the dimensions of intrinsic job satisfaction (mean = 3.9529; standard deviation = 0.7943) and extrinsic job satisfaction (mean = 3.8803; standard deviation = 0.8072) were high.

Mediating variable: the level of importance of job stress dimensions; it was found that the dimensions of time stress (mean = 2.8335; standard deviation = 1.0245) and anxiety (mean = 2.8258; standard deviation = 1.1993) were moderate. Table 2 shows the level of importance of the overall main variables; it was found that the dependent variable of job satisfaction (mean = 3.9166; standard deviation = 0.7269) was high, whereas the independent variable of organizational change (mean = 3.6450; standard deviation = 0.5439) and the mediating variable of job stress (mean = 2.8297; standard deviation = 1.0121) were moderate.

### Table 2
Mean and Standard Deviation Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Relative Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of Change</td>
<td>3.7950</td>
<td>0.70827</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
<td>3.2528</td>
<td>0.68558</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>3.8460</td>
<td>0.81095</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.7749</td>
<td>0.77668</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>3.6890</td>
<td>0.84387</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>2.7891</td>
<td>1.08883</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>3.8395</td>
<td>0.78859</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>3.1943</td>
<td>0.90024</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>3.8057</td>
<td>0.98150</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE</td>
<td>3.6450</td>
<td>0.54398</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness of Change</td>
<td>3.8872</td>
<td>0.71855</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>3.9529</td>
<td>0.79425</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>3.9585</td>
<td>0.90876</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>3.8803</td>
<td>0.80723</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>2.6001</td>
<td>1.03454</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>3.9166</td>
<td>0.72685</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>3.8160</td>
<td>0.78120</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Time Stress</td>
<td>2.8335</td>
<td>1.02448</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.8258</td>
<td>1.19934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB STRESS</td>
<td>2.8297</td>
<td>1.01216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Normality Test

Normality test was performed using skewness and kurtosis tests. Skewness test is performed to test the asymmetry, which revealed the manner of clustered items, whereas kurtosis test is performed to test the flat-toppedness of a curve, and whether it is normal or bell shaped (Kothari, 2004). It is important to assess the generalizability assessment and sample representativeness of the population (Ghasemi & Zahediasl, 2012). The type of distribution curve is necessary to be identified, as statistical methods have particular assumptions (Kothari, 2004; Hair et al., 2010). Measuring the normality by skewness and kurtosis has a significant influence on the statistical analysis (Cain, Zhang, & Yuan, 2016). The results in Table 3 show the normality for the research variables, the values of the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were less than +2, and more than -2.

### Table 3
Test of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Std. Error</th>
<th>Skewness Statistic</th>
<th>Kurtosis Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process of Change</td>
<td>-0.866</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>-1.059</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-0.666</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>-0.792</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-0.839</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness of Change</td>
<td>-1.062</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>-1.030</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.782</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>-0.920</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of Change</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>-0.919</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policing</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.491</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>-0.979</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>-0.928</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>-1.044</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Stress</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.789</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOB SATISFACTION</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.941</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Hypotheses Testing

The purpose of testing the hypotheses is to assess the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis; when the significance level (p-value) is below 0.05, the null hypothesis (H0) will be rejected and the alternative (H1) will be accepted, which indicates a positive impact. On the other hand, the null hypothesis is accepted when the p-value is higher than 0.05 (Sekaran & Bogie, 2016). Simple linear regression was used to test the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

The Pearson correlation estimates the linear relationship between two variables (Thirumalai, Chandhini, & Vaishnavi, 2017). The values of the Pearson correlation coefficient, \( r \), range from +1 to -1. A value higher than 0 indicates a positive relationship (the value of one variable increases, while the other value also increases). A value below 0 indicates a negative relationship (the value of one variable increases, while the other decreases).

As shown in Table 4, to test the research hypotheses, the approach proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) was applied. This approach consists of four steps. In the first step, the independent variable (organizational change) was regressed to the dependent variable (job satisfaction) and beta coefficient (0.465***), which was positive and significant; therefore, hypothesis H01 was rejected. In the second step, the independent variable (organizational change) was regressed to the mediating variable (job stress) and beta coefficient (0.196***), which was positive and significant as well; therefore, hypothesis H02 was also rejected. In the third step, the mediating variable (job stress) was regressed to the dependent variable (job satisfaction) and beta coefficient (0.215***), which was negative and significant; thus, hypothesis H03 was rejected. In the fourth step, both the independent and mediating variables were regressed to the dependent variable (multiple regressions). The beta coefficient for the effect of organizational change on job satisfaction (step 1) is reduced in step 4 but is still significant. This indicates that only a partial negative mediating effect is possible. To check the significance of the mediating effect, Sobel test (1982) was used. The results of the Sobel test showed that the indirect effect is significant (test statistic = 2.14920944, \( p = 0.012 \)); therefore, hypothesis H04 was also rejected. It should be noted that the mediating effect is negative, that is, as organizational change increases, job stress also increases, which in turn will decrease job satisfaction.

Table 4
Regression analysis for the mediating effect of job stress between organizational change and job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Step 1 (H01)</th>
<th>Step 2 (H02)</th>
<th>Step 3 (H03)</th>
<th>Step 4 (H04)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Sat Satisfaction</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>Job Sat Satisfaction</td>
<td>Job Sat Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.018***</td>
<td>1.262***</td>
<td>4.372***</td>
<td>1.316***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Change</td>
<td>0.465***</td>
<td>0.196***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.425***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.215***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.319***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.196</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value</td>
<td>121.524***</td>
<td>17.502***</td>
<td>21.410***</td>
<td>100.486***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ***p < 0.01

5. Conclusions

5.1 Discussion

This research investigates the mediating role of job stress in the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction in telecommunication companies in Jordan. It is hypothesized that organizational change impacts job satisfaction through job stress. The findings demonstrate the rejection of all four hypotheses. The first finding showed that 21.6% of the variation in organizational change accounted for job satisfaction; the result indicates a significant and positive relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction. Studies have shown that some organizational change factors have a positive impact on job satisfaction, while others have a negative impact (Shah et al., 2017; Yousef, 2017). The level of satisfaction of employees depends on the effectiveness of change in the organization (Adigwe & Oriola, 2015).

The second finding revealed that organizational change explained 3.8% of the variation in job stress, which indicates that increasing organizational change results in increased job stress in telecommunication companies; this result is consistent with previous studies (DeGhetto et al., 2017; Shah et al., 2017; Castillo et al. 2018).

The third finding shows a negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction, with 4.6% of the explained variation in the latter accounted for by job satisfaction; this was similar to the results of previous studies, with higher job stress leading to lower job satisfaction (Kula, 2017; Lu et al., 2017).
Finally, the results indicate that job stress has a partial negative mediating effect on the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction, meaning that employees’ job satisfaction levels decrease when their job stress level increases during organizational change in telecommunication companies.

Telecommunication companies have grown to become one of the largest and leading businesses in Jordan (Al-Weshah et al., 2018). Organizations have begun providing comfortable and appropriate work environments that decrease employees’ negative emotions and increase their job satisfaction levels, in order to improve their performances, especially during organizational change processes (Lee & Chelladurai, 2018; Sarraf, 2018). The managements must take into consideration employees’ emotional readiness for change by improving the quality of the change processes, such as through support, participation, and communication (before, during, and after the change process), in addition to taking the necessary feedback for continuous improvement and corrective actions (Claiborne et al., 2013). Furthermore, the management must enhance the climate of change by improving the trust in leadership, fairness among employees, give incentives, and make efficient use of the resources available (Caves, 2018).

5.2 Practical Implications

One of the most important factors that lead to the success of organizational change is the human resources. Satisfied employees who are treated well are a great asset for the success of an organization. Telecommunication companies face numerous challenges in both internal and external environments; one of the most important internal challenges is to improve job satisfaction and reduce the stress of employees, which leads to improved performance of the organization (Abuhashesh et al., 2019d).

From the findings of this research, managers and leaders can develop several ideas for promoting job satisfaction in telecommunication companies, and guiding companies to improve organizational change, by focusing on the quality of leadership support and communication, understanding employees’ needs during change along with their expectations and involvement, which enhances job satisfaction (Aldaas et al., 2019).

Telecommunication is one of the most rapidly growing and highly competitive sectors. Thus, it is possible that telecommunication company employees feel that adopting continuous organizational change strategy is necessary to ensure sustainability in the market, and avoid the risk of losing their jobs.

Previous research suggests that any change is stressful, and stress decreases satisfaction; therefore, organizations must provide more attention to stress factors while employing all dimensions of stress in the workplace and work on reducing the negative effects of stress on job satisfaction during organizational change. This can be done by providing a comfortable environment, supporting employee creativity and innovation, training, enhancing interaction between the leadership and staff, and expanding the involvement and contribution of employees. Organizations must spread the culture of quality among employees in order to develop their efficiency. This will ultimately reflect positively on the performance of the organization.

5.3 Limitations

First, the use of convenience sampling and studying only employees of the telecommunications sector in Jordan limits the generalizability of the results. Second, there seemed to be hesitation and resistance from companies to respond and collaborate by sharing their data. Additionally, a set of questionnaires returned by employees were excluded because of their lack of appropriateness.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Research

The main contribution of this research is in examining the mediating role of job stress in the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction. The present study’s findings indicate a significant positive relationship between organizational change, job stress, and job satisfaction, as well as a significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction. The findings also revealed a partial negative mediating effect of job stress on the relationship between organizational change and job satisfaction, which means that job satisfaction (dependent variable) decreases as organizational change (independent variable) and job stress (mediating variable) increase in telecommunication companies. In another words, telecommunication companies in Jordan should focus on reducing employees’ job stress during organizational change in order to raise their job satisfaction. However, this research recommends other researchers to investigate the impact of organizational change on job satisfaction using different dimensions and sectors, which helps in determining strategies to improve employees’ job satisfaction.
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