The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between job autonomy and work outcomes (job performance, job satisfaction and job stress), self efficacy as a mediating variable. This research also investigated the impact of job satisfaction on job performance and job stress on job performance. Variables in this research were measured via a survey of 190 banking salespersons in D.I. Yogyakarta and Solo. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) were used to examine the effects of job autonomy on work outcomes, job satisfaction on job performance, and job stress on job performance. Results showed that the estimated model in this research is acceptable based on its score of the goodness of fit index. The structural relationship showed that job autonomy significantly related to job satisfaction and performance, but not significant with job stress. It also showed that self efficacy partially mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job performance, and job stress on job performance. In addition, this research found that self efficacy not mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job stress. There was no significant relationship between job autonomy and job performance but this research showed that job satisfaction significantly related to job performance. Finally, these results had an important implication to managers in designing job.
task. This perceives positively effects their intrinsic motivation and the effectiveness in working.

Several researches found positive association between job autonomy and job satisfaction (DeCarlo and Agarwal, 1999; Finn, 2001; Liu et al., 2005; Nguyen et al., 2003; Thompson and Prottas, 2005). Workers that given high autonomy will fall that the results of their job are determined by their efforts, actions and decisions so, they will fell more satisfied.

Another work outcomes that related to job autonomy is job stress. Job autonomy allow individuals to limit their exposure to stressors and able to choose their task or allow individuals to limit the more stressful tasks, thereby reducing feelings of threat and encouraging positive coping behaviors (Elsass dan Veiga, 1997). Thompson and Prottas (2005) support this finding. They found that job autonomy significantly negative to job stress, turnover intention, and work and family conflict. Furthermore, Kauffeld (2006), Nonaka et al., (2000) in Smith et al. (2003) also found positive association between job autonomy and worker’s competency and creativity.

Generally speaking, researches in job autonomy have showed the consistent relationship between job autonomy and work outcomes. However, research on job autonomy has left several questions unanswered. This present study focuses on question: what are the processes by which job autonomy effects work outcomes? To answer that question, this research used self efficacy as an intervening variable between job autonomy and work outcomes (performance, satisfaction and job stress). This research is going to explain the process of job autonomy effects work outcomes. This study is important for the following reasons. First, it contributes to the literature by used self efficacy to explain how job autonomy effects work outcomes. Second, this study also contributes an empirical evidence in investigated the relationship within the work outcomes occurred on job autonomy, such as the effects of job satisfaction on performance and the effects of job stress on performance. Third, the results of this study may have important implications for human resource managers in designing job.

Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses Development

Job Autonomy, Self Efficacy and Job Performance

Job autonomy is defined as the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the individual in scheduling work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out. Job autonomy is one of several core job design characteristic (the others are skill variety, task identity, task significance and feedback from the job) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1975). According to Hackman and Oldham (1975), autonomy leads to the critical a psychological state of “experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work”, which in turn leads to outcomes such as high work effectiveness and high internal work motivation.

Researches in job autonomy have showed a consistent and positive association between job autonomy and performance. Gellately and Irving (2001) found positive effect of perceived autonomy on contextual performance. Managers who report greater autonomy in their work have a better performance than managers who report lower autonomy. Claessens et al., (2004) found that perceived autonomy in time was positively related to job performance and job satisfaction and negatively to work strain. According to Langfred and Moe (2004), job autonomy enhances job performance because they perceive themselves capable and more resourceful in performing the task. Psychologically, employee will more motivate to do the best and leads to higher performance. Therefore, a positive linkage is hypothesized between job autonomy and job performance.

Hypothesis 1: Job autonomy is positively related to job performance.

A high level of autonomy as perceived by employees has sends a message that supervisor has confidence in his or her capability therefore allows the employees to carry out the task the way he or she wish. This message has a positive effect on employees’ self efficacy. Wang and Netemeyer (2002) test the effects of job autonomy and self efficacy. The result showed a positive association between job autonomy and self efficacy. The higher job autonomy leads to higher confidence in performing the task. According to Bandura (1997), this confidence will affect the effort invested to attain the best performance. Therefore, a positive linkage is hypothesized between job autonomy, self efficacy and job performance.

Hypothesis 2: Job autonomy is positively related to job performance, self efficacy as an intervening variable.

Job autonomy, Self Efficacy and Job Satisfaction

Job autonomy is believed could influence job satisfaction. More autonomy is expected to be associated with greater job satisfaction because employees have more freedom to determine their own effort and work schedule. Previous research in this area has found the significant and consistent results. Morison et al. (2005) explain that job autonomy became a critical factor in enhancing employees’ intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction. Finn (2001) found that job autonomy became the important component in nurses’ job satisfaction. Copper and Withe (2005) also support this finding; job autonomy is found significantly effect job satisfaction both permanent and temporaries employment. A cross cultural study by DeCarlo and Agarwal (1999) examines the effects of job autonomy on salesperson’s job satisfaction. In general, this study finding suggests perceived job autonomy is an important antecedent to job satisfaction among salesperson from Australia, India and U.S. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 3: Job autonomy is positively related to job satisfaction.

Job autonomy will enhance employees’ self efficacy because they fell they can go about job basically by themselves without much guidance, resulting in a stronger autonomy-efficacy linkage. Research indicates that high job autonomy enhances employee feelings that job outcomes are a result of his/her efforts (Wang and Netemeyer,
linkage is hypothesized between job autonomy and job stress.

**Hypothesis 5: Job autonomy is negatively related to job stress.**

The literature suggests that people’s perception on job autonomy enhance their self efficacy because this autonomous job allows people to use their skill, knowledge, and creativity to choose and formulate sales strategies without others’ interference. According to Bandura (1997), people with high self efficacy will more likely to persist when encountering obstacles or negative experiences. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 6: Job autonomy is negatively related to job stress, self efficacy as an intervening variable.**

**Job Autonomy, Self Efficacy and Job Stress**

Some researchers suggest that the need for personal control may be an intrinsic, ongoing desire (Elsass and Veiga, 1997). Although the need for personal control appears to vary among individuals, as well as across time and situations in a single individual, it may be that a desire for personal control is an inherent motivation. Therefore, when individual loss of control in her/his work (low job autonomy), it will associated with increased level of stress.

Previous researches have documented compelling evidence linking how level of job autonomy with the incidence of negative stress-related outcomes. High job autonomy will lead to reducing job stress because the presence of control may encourage individuals to believe positive outcomes are possible, thereby reducing feelings of threat (Spector, 1986; Elsass and Veiga, 1997). Karasek (1979) examined the effects of job control and level of depression and the result show that job control has a negative association with employees’ level of depression. The higher job autonomy, the lower level of stress he/she have. This condition happens because high autonomy allows employees to carry out the job the way he/she wishes to and lead to reducing feelings of threat. Therefore, a negative

shown to play a role in a number of key job-related attitudes (organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and behavior, such as turnover (Sager, 1994). Moreover, stress can lead to physical illness and chronic diseases such as heart disease, mental ill-health, depression or other problems such as alcoholism (Eckles, 1987 in Moncrief et al. 1997).

Narayanan et al. (1999) examined stressful incidents at work for three different occupations (clerical workers, university professors and sales associates). Lack of control and work overload were reported as major stressors by clerical group and interpersonal conflict as a major stressor by the academic and sales group. Gender differences in stress were also found in this research. Therefore, it can be conclude that stress occurred in all kind of job and affects the individual, group and organization’s performance. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 7: Job autonomy is positively related to job performance**

Understanding job stress is a major concern of organization research because it has been shown to play a role in a number of key job-related attitudes (organizational commitment, job satisfaction) and behavior, such as turnover (Sager, 1994). Moreover, stress can lead to physical illness and chronic diseases such as heart disease, mental ill-health, depression or other problems such as alcoholism (Eckles, 1987 in Moncrief et al. 1997).

Narayanan et al. (1999) examined stressful incidents at work for three different occupations (clerical workers, university professors and sales associates). Lack of control and work overload were reported as major stressors by clerical group and interpersonal conflict as a major stressor by the academic and sales group. Gender differences in stress were also found in this research. Therefore, it can be conclude that stress occurred in all kind of job and affects the individual, group and organization’s performance. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

**Hypothesis 8: Job stress is positively related to job performance**

Data were obtained from banking salesperson in Yogjakarta and Solo, Indonesia. Purposive sampling is used as sampling method so several criteria was applied to this study. The respondents have been working with those companies for more than 3 months. According to Gist and Mitchell (1992), judgments about self efficacy become more routinized and automatic as experience with a task increases. Therefore, setting 3 months as a criterion is relevant in reducing bias in answer self efficacy, job satisfaction, job stress and job performance. A total of 230 questionnaires were distributed to the salesperson directly through coordination with supervisor and area sales manager. A total 190 questionnaires with complete responses were returned directly to the researcher. Therefore, the response rate in this study is 89.13%.

The average age of the respondents was 26-35 years, 56.3 percent of the respondents were male and 62.9 percent received a 4-years college degree.
or higher education. The respondents have been affiliated with the companies for an average of 2 years, and their range selling experience was 2-6 years.

This study used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to examine proposed model on figure 1. Samples used in this research are 190 salespersons and this amount are not meets the requirement of MLE based on total amount of estimated parameters (minimal 355 samples). This lackness will effects on identification model process. Therefore, researcher used two step approach on SEM which each construct will be composite first so total amount of estimated parameter can be reduced based on total amount of sample collected.

**Analysis**

Data analysis was conducted in two stages. First, checking for data entry includes validity and reliability, identification outliers and normality of the data. Second, testing of the fit model was conducted by using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). Two-Step Approach to Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) was used to test the proposed model presented in figure 1. AMOS 4.01 computer program was utilized to run data from questionnaires. Goodness of fit model was based on multiple indices, selected from: the chi-square value and chi-square over degree of freedoms (normed fit index) the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Validity and Reliability of Measures**

Confirmatory Factor Analysis was used to assess the validity of each construct. Items with factor loading 0.4 or greater are considered practically significant (Hair et al. 2006). Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis asserted that final items used in this study are 20 items. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients were used to estimate the reliability of each indicator in this research. Although, there was a difference criteria in Cronbach’s Alpha’s coefficients, this research used 0.6 as a criteria. According to Hair et al. (2006) this value is threshold to accept. Table 2 provides the reliability of the measures.

**Descriptive Statistic and Correlation between Construct**

Descriptive statistic in this research involved mean, standard deviation and correlation between construct. Table 3 provides the descriptive statistic and correlation between construct. Result showed that job autonomy, self efficacy, job satisfaction and job performance correlate and significant in 0.01 while there is no correlation existed between job stress and other construct.

**Fixing the Error Terms and the Lambdas**

This study used two-step approach to test the proposed model in figure 1. Testing structural model using two-step approach requires value of lambdas (λ) and epsilon (υ). The measurement error (epsilon) terms were fixed at (1-α) X variance and the corresponding lambdas-the loading from a latent construct to its corresponding indicator were fixed at (alpha) X standard loading deviation. The lambdas and epsilon of the constructs are presented in table 4.

**Table 1. Operationalization Each Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Operationalized</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Amount of items</th>
<th>Sample Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>The extent to which a job allows the freedom, independence and discretion to schedule work, make decision and select the methods used to perform tasks.</td>
<td>James Breanagh's Instrument: (1999) - Work Autonomy Scales</td>
<td>9 items</td>
<td>I am free to choose the methods the methods to use in carrying out my work*.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>Individual achievement that regulated based on organization’s standard and regulation</td>
<td>Instrument of Miao dkk. (2007)</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>“I am very effective in contributing to my firm’s market share”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>a pleasurable or positive and negative emotional states resulting from the appraisal of one’s job in organization.</td>
<td>Dubinsky dan Hartley’s Instrument (1986)</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>“I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>A mental and physical condition which affects an individual's productivity, effectiveness, personal health and quality of work in organization.</td>
<td>Instrument of House dan Rizzo (1972).</td>
<td>7 items</td>
<td>“I often take my work home with me in the sense that I think about it when doing other things”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Individual’s belief in his or her ability to perform job-related tasks.</td>
<td>Instrument of Bandura (1977)</td>
<td>8 items</td>
<td>“I feel I am overqualified for the job I will be doing”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2. Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) of the Construct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Number of items in the questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of item retained</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>9 items</td>
<td>9 items</td>
<td>0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>8 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
<td>0.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>0.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>7 items</td>
<td>7 items</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. Alphas (α), lambdas (λ) and Epsilon (υ)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>OTO</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>KK</th>
<th>SK</th>
<th>K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.451**</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.379**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stat.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTO</td>
<td>5.7754</td>
<td>5.2509</td>
<td>4.8193</td>
<td>3.5301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1.17973</td>
<td>1.14528</td>
<td>1.18165</td>
<td>1.16330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: Significant correlation at the level 0.01

OTO= Job Autonomy; SE= Self Efficacy; KK= Job Satisfaction; SK= Job Stress; K= Job Performance
Table 4. Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) of the Construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Alpha (α)</th>
<th>Lambda (λ)</th>
<th>Epsilon (ε)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Autonomy</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self efficacy</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Stress</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Structural Model Equation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices</th>
<th>Cut of value</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(χ²) – Chi-square</td>
<td>expected to be smaller</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Probability</td>
<td>≥ 0.05</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>≤ 0.08</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIN/DF</td>
<td>≤ 2.00</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of the Structural Model

Table 4 interpret the test of structural model proposed. Goodness of fit model was assessed based on multiple indices. The result showed that the model proposed is acceptable and has a good fit (table 5).

Test of Structural Relationship

After the criteria of goodness of fit have been fulfilled, the test of structural relationship is conducted. The relationship between constructs in output AMOS 4.01 showed by value of standardized regression weight. According to Hair et al. (2006) structural relationship is significant if estimate parameter more than 1, 96 (significance level 0.05) and ≥ 2, 58 (significance level 0.01). Regression weight model in this research provide in table 6.

Table 6 showed that critical ratio (CR) for relationship between job autonomy and job performance is 2.795 (significant at α = 0.01). It indicated that hypothesis 1 is supported; job autonomy significantly positive related to job performance. Similarly, the test showed a strong support for H2. Critical ratio for relationship between job autonomy and self efficacy is 9.459 and self efficacy on performance is 2.151. It means that, self efficacy partially mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job performance. This study also support hypothesis 3; CR for job autonomy on job satisfaction is 2.097 (significant at α = 0.05). It indicated that the higher level of job autonomy, the higher level of job satisfaction. Critical ratio for job autonomy on self efficacy, and self efficacy on job satisfaction also significant at 0.01. Therefore, self efficacy partially mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job satisfaction (Hair et al. 2006).

Furthermore, critical ratio for job autonomy on job stress is 0.079 and lower than criterion required. Therefore, this research did not support hypothesis 5. It indicated that there is no significant relationship existed between job autonomy and job stress. Similarly, CR for job autonomy on self efficacy is 9.459 (significant at 0.01) and CR for self efficacy on job stress 0.240 (not significant). Based on this, this research did not support hypothesis 6. Self efficacy did not mediate the relationship between job autonomy and job stress.

In addition, this research supports the hypothesis 7. The results showed that critical ratio for job satisfaction on job performance is 2.345 (significant at 0.05). The higher job satisfaction, the higher job performance. Table 5 also showed that CR for job stress on job performance is 0.043 and lower than 1.96 (not significant). So, it can be conclude that there is no significant relationship existed between job autonomy and job performance.

This research’s result showed that job autonomy positively related to performance. This finding support the study conducted by Gellatly and Gregory (2005) which found that job autonomy became an important factor for employee’s job satisfaction. High autonomy affects salesperson’s perception about their job. They will fell that the results of their job are determined by their efforts, actions and decisions. This condition changes their judgement of self efficacy and behavior in performing the job which leads to increasing self efficacy and job satisfaction. Therefore, we can conclude that job autonomy enhance job satisfaction through self efficacy (Hair et al. 2006).

This research also support that job autonomy positively related to job satisfaction. This results support the study conducted by Morrison et al. (2005) which found that job autonomy became an important factor for employee’s job satisfaction. High autonomy affects salesperson’s perception about their job. They will fell that the results of their job are determined by their efforts, actions and decisions. This condition changes their judgement of self efficacy and behavior in performing the job which leads to increasing self efficacy and job satisfaction. Therefore, we can conclude that job autonomy enhance job satisfaction through self efficacy (Hair et al. 2006).

Job autonomy negatively related to job stress (Elbash and Veiga, 1997; Karasek, 1979; Spector, 1979). Job autonomy allows salesperson to carry out the job with the way he/she wishes to which leads to reducing feeling of threat. This condition creates a comfortable work environment and
Reducing job stress. This research did not support this relationship. There is no significant relationship existed between job autonomy and job stress. Table 2 reported that salesperson’s job stress is lower than other variables (autonomy, satisfaction, performance and self efficacy). This research also did not find the role of self efficacy in mediated job autonomy on job stress.

This inconsistency result occurred because of several factors. First, there are many antecedents of job stress. Salespersons might be exposed to the same stressors but they experience different stress levels or different stress symptoms. This happens because of individuals differences. Each of salespersons perceives the same situation differently. Each salesperson also has different thresholds of resistance to a stressor and different way to coping stressors (Greenberg and Baron, 2003). These individual difference may be the causes inconsistency the relationship between job autonomy and job stress. Second, job experience may be effects the level of salesperson’s job stress. Based on respondent’s demography in this research, 34, 21% of salespersons have been working as a salesperson for 2 until 6 years while 31, 57% have been working less than two years.

Job experience enhances salesperson’s belief that he or she has the ability to complete a task and coping the stressors successfully. Gist and Mitchell (1992) state that judgments about self efficacy become more routinized and automatic as experience with a task increases. Third, each salesperson has a different perception on stressful circumstance. Stress involves people’s cognitive appraisal of the potential stressors they face (Greenberg and Baron, 2003). Job autonomy shapes important factor in influencing salesperson’s behavior, namely self efficacy. Self efficacy changes salesperson’s perception about stressful circumstance. Salespersons perceive stressors as challenge rather than threat in work. This condition may be the causes of insignificance the role of self efficacy in mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job stress.

The testing of seventh hypothesis showed that job satisfaction positively related to job performance. Satisfied salesperson will put forth more effort and leads to increasing job performance. This result support Engko’s (2006) study which states that satisfied worker is an effective worker. Finally, this research did not found significant relationship between job stress and performance (H-7). A Meta analytic test by Lepine et al. (2005) report that inconsistent relationship among stress and performance is occurred because of previous researches did not distinguishes among positive and negative stress. Positive stress (challenge stress) is a stressful demands viewed by manager/organization as obstacles to be overcome in order to learn and achieve. Negative stress (hindrance stress) is a stressful demands viewed by manager/organization as unnecessarily thwarting personal growth and goal attainment. Therefore, Lepine et al. (2005) suggests that in further research stress must be distinguishes positive and negative stress. In this research stress is treated as negative stress and it may cause the insignificance of job stress on job performance.

**MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS**

This research has an important implication to managers in designing job. Specifically, the implication designed to banking sector due to recent research context. First, grant high autonomy will lead to increasing intrinsic motivation thereby increasing self efficacy, job performance and satisfaction. Consequently, managers must grant salesperson the freedom in performing the job in two facets; work method autonomy and work schedule autonomy. Second, the significance of job satisfaction in job performance has been shown by this study. Consequently, manager must find way to increase salesperson’s job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can be increase by granting job autonomy, provide a conducive work environments through reward and punishment system, physical work environment, facility, social support, and supervisor support.

**Limitation and Future Study**

There are four limitations worth noting in this study. First, this investigates is limited in scope of banking salesperson’s which reducing in external validity. So, in further study should involve other salespersons in different industry. Second, the final sample used in this study is relatively small which causes in difficulties fitting models with data. As a consequently, the research conducted two step approach to estimate the model proposed. Third, a self-report job performance measure was used in this study. This may be contained bias in capture the phenomena. So, in further study objective performance measure or multi-rater should be used to assess the job performance. Forth, this research treats stress as a negative stress and did not distinguish between negative and positive stress. However, researcher have been interviewed the supervisor, area sales manager and several salespersons to get the phenomena about stress in their workplace.

**CONCLUSION**

The purpose of this research is to examine the relationship between job autonomy and work outcomes (job performance, job satisfaction and job stress), self efficacy as a mediating variable. This research also investigates the impact of job satisfaction on job performance and job stress on job performance. Based on the results, can be concluding that:

1. Structural model estimated in this research acceptable fit to the data. It can be seen in several criterion of goodness of fit, such as: Chi-Square (0,494); Significance Probability (0,482); RMSEA (0,000); GFI (0,999); CMIN/DF (0,494); TLI (1,025); CFI (1,00); NFI (0,988).
2. Job autonomy positively related to job performance and satisfaction. The higher autonomy will leads to increasing salespersons job performance and job satisfaction.
3. Self efficacy partially mediated the relationship between job autonomy and job satisfaction, and relationship between job autonomy performances.
4. Job autonomy did not relate to job stress. Self efficacy also did not mediate the relationship between job autonomy and job stress. Individual difference may be the causes of insignificant this relationship.
5. Job satisfaction positively related to job performance. Satisfied salespersons will positively effects their intrinsic motivation and the effectiveness in working.
6. Job stress did not relate to job performance. This condition happens because this research did not distinguish between negative and positive stress which lead to bias.
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Appendix

Please check list to the one number which best describe your condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Rather disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Rather agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JOB AUTONOMY**

1. I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done (the methods to use).  
2. I am able to choose the way to go about my job (the procedures to utilize).  
3. I am free to choose the methods to use in carrying out my work.  
4. I have control over the scheduling of my work.  
5. I have some control over the sequencing of my work activities (when I do what).  
6. My job is such that can decide when to do particular work activities.

**SELF-EFFICACY**

1. My new job is well within the scope of my abilities.  
2. I do not anticipate any problems in adjusting to work in this organization.  
3. I feel confident that my skill and abilities equal or exceed those of my future colleagues.  
4. I have all the technical knowledge I need to deal with my new job.  
5. I have some control over what I am supposed to accomplish (what my supervisor sees as my job objectives).

**JOB STRESS**

1. I feel irritated or nervous because of my job.  
2. Problems associated with work kept me awake at night.  
3. My job tends to directly affect my health.  
4. My job makes me feel nervous before attending meetings in the organization.  
5. People or activities at work keep me awake at night.  
6. My job makes me feel nervous because of my job.  
7. I sometimes feel weak all over.

**JOB PERFORMANCE**

1. I am very effective in contributing to my firm's market share.  
2. I am very effective in generating a high level of dollar sales.  
3. I am very effective in selling to major accounts.  
4. I am very effective in exceeding annual sales targets and objectives.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

1. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job.  
2. I frequently think of quitting this job (reverse-coded).  
3. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job.  
4. Most people on this job are very satisfied with this job.  
5. People on this job often think of quitting (reverse-coded).

---


