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Abstract
The study focused on the relationship between management styles and job satisfaction of employees in the organization. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between management style, using Theory X and Y management style and job satisfaction as moderated by employees’ self-efficacy and gender. The study involved N = 137 participants from two different Swedish organizations in the engineering and manufacturing sector based in Stockholm and Växjö, Sweden. The data was collected through surveys from each participant. Study findings showed that there was a positive correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Additionally, results revealed that the relationship between theory X and Y and job satisfaction is not moderated by either self-efficacy and gender. Based on the study, it was observed that job satisfaction is greatly impacted by management styles which are oriented more towards theory Y than theory X in the relationship between management and employees in organizations in Sweden. Thus, the study highlights the importance of employee-oriented leadership style for the organizations and how this influences job satisfaction of employees.
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The Relationship Between Theory X/Y Management Styles and Job Satisfaction: Moderation Roles of Self-Efficacy and Gender

The growth of organizations over the decades, and particularly so in the 21st century, has seen an enormous shift in focus to highlight the quality of working life of employees in the way organizations operate and function. This shift in focus comes with a psychological desire (and to some extent physical desire) to highlight, among others, such organizational factors as management styles that influence and impact how organizations function and perform, and a sense of confidence among employees in their ability to perform their work and how happy employees feel in their workplaces. This raises a concern of how management and employees interact in organizations. More specifically, this points to such organizational concerns as the need to understand how management styles using theory X and Y, self-efficacy and job satisfaction interact to impact organizational and employee’s wellbeing.

There are several management theories that have been proposed by various organizational researchers, and each management style affects employees in different ways, nonetheless, Theory X and Y was the focus as a management style in this research. Theory X and Y as proposed by McGregor was essentially seen from two contrasting polar ends in which he labeled one end theory X and the other theory Y (Gannon & Boguszak, 2013). To this end, Theory X is predicated on the idea that employees tend to be passive or resistant to work, therefore management’s role should include organizing, controlling, directing, and modifying employees’ behaviors, while Theory Y has a perspective that people are not passive and management’s duty is to give their employees opportunities to develop themselves and to create environments where they will use their own potentials at the highest level (Gannon & Boguszak, 2013). Ultimately, one can make a case that, the implementation of each of these management styles has an impact on employees' job satisfaction, as observed by Tepret and Tuna (2015).

As organizations have developed and become more complex, the level of employee’s job satisfaction being vital has become an area of fundamental concern to most organizational scholars. Organizational psychologists are particularly interested in the job satisfaction of employees and seek to understand this concept in the workplace. According to Robbins and Judge (2013), job satisfaction is a positive feeling as a result of people’s evaluation of their job characteristics and the people with high level of job satisfaction have positive feelings
about their jobs while the lower ones have negative feelings. A substantial body of research has demonstrated the undeniable value and contribution job satisfaction makes to both employees and organizations alike. For instance, several studies have demonstrated a positive relationship between job satisfaction with variables such as performance (Wanous, 1974), low stress (Rahman & Sen, 1987), motivation (Golizade, Masoudi, Maleki, Aeenparast & Barzegar, 2014), productivity (Fassoulis & Alexopoulos, 2015), organizational effectiveness (Ostroff, 1992), as well as increasing the well-being of the employees (Satuf et al., 2018). Additionally, research shows that high levels of job satisfaction have a positive effect on other variables such as reduced turnover (Lu, Lin, Wu, Hsieh, & Chang, 2002).

The relationship between management styles and job satisfaction can be influenced by different factors, like self-efficacy and gender of employees. Bandura (1982), viewed self-efficacy as that which affects thought patterns, actions, and emotional arousal and relates to individuals' beliefs about how well they can exhibit the behavioral pattern required to cope with possible situations. Even though significant studies on employee job satisfaction and management style have been conducted in the literature, it would appear there is little research evidence to indicate works done involving theory X/Y, self-efficacy and job satisfaction. Therefore, there is a need for more detailed studies involving these variables to provide a further understanding of the nature of the development of the organizations in a competitive environment. This research thus presents an opportunity in continuing to make an effort in understanding these organizational factors, and these are further explored below.

Literature Review

Theory X and Y

Theory X and Y as a management style is well rooted in the study and understanding of motivation in organizations. The theory is attributed to Douglas McGregor who viewed human beings in two separate ways as being either negative - which he called theory X or positive - which he called theory Y (Robbins, Judge & Vohra, 2012). McGregor, from his studies of managers and their employees, concluded from managers’ interactions with employees that human nature is predicated on some assumptions that influence managers to act a certain way towards their personnel. To this end, he argued that managers under theory X, believed that employees do not like work and must be closely guided, even coerced into
performing their work, while those under theory Y, he argued, believed employees considered work as essentially something natural like rest or play, thus the average employee would accept and seek more responsibilities or work (Robbins et al., 2012).

It is believed that theory X had a conventional understanding of management upon which its expectations were hinged. First, the idea that the typical individual had an inborn dislike of work and thus would avoid it at any given opportunity, second, and as a result of this, it was assumed that coercing, controlling, directing or threatening some employees with punishment would have them put more effort towards the progression of organizational objectives, and finally, that the average individual desires to be directed, and would rather avoid responsibility and largely wants security with little ambitions (McGregor, 1960). It is worth noting however that, McGregor was of the view that these assumptions were by and large, observable only to one studying organizational systems and structures and thus not necessarily overt actions managers employed nor cognizant of, in their interactions with employees (McGregor, 1960).

While the basis of theory X is premised on managers pushing employees by largely any means to get the work done including force or coercion, it is interesting to note that McGregor (1960), posited that this could either have what he called a soft approach or a hard approach. For instance, given the need to achieve an outcome to meet production goals in a company, one manager using a soft approach may coerce his teams to work long hours for huge bonuses at the end of the month and eventually not give the employees those bonuses when the work is done, while another manager using a hard approach may threaten to fire some employees in his team if they fail to meet production targets at the end of the month even though he or she may not have the authority to do so, as long as it would compel their team members to work even harder out of fear. Thus, a theory X manager was one who had a conventional use of imposed management styles by using strict organizational patterns and controls.

On the other hand, theory Y was viewed as having a contemporary style of management which involved incorporation of employees, allowing freedom and self-control of workers in the organization (McGregor, 1957). According to McGregor (1960), managers guided by theory Y were not entirely worker-centered to the neglect of the organization, but rather, the manager set their goals and objectives high and sought the help and support of their employees and capitalized on their high-level needs to achieve them. Thus, McGregor posited
that commitment to attaining goals was essential to high performance. To this end, the manager integrated the higher levels needs and organizational goals to achieve organizational commitment (McGregor, 1957), ultimately presenting a different set of assumptions compared to those influenced by theory X manager.

The following highlight the different assumptions that govern a manager influenced by theory Y, presented in no order (McGregor, 1960: 47/8).

1. The average individual learns to accept and to seek responsibility under proper conditions.
2. The expending of physical and mental effort in work is natural like play or rest.
3. The intellectual potentialities of the average individual are partially utilized under conditions of modern industrial life.
4. The ability to exercise a high degree of ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.
5. The most significant rewards are those that satisfy needs for self-respect and personal involvement. Commitment to objectives is dependent on rewards associated with their achievement.
6. Bringing about effort towards organizational objectives can be achieved through other means besides external control and the threat of punishment. An individual will exercise self-control in service of objectives to which he is committed.

Given a thoughtful observation of the noted assumptions guiding theory Y managers, it seems to be, that a manager is only restricted by his or her ingenuity to the extent that he/she can utilize the team to achieve planned goals. While the focus of theory Y seems to be on the inborn ability of individuals for growth, it is worth noting that this does not imply that the theory overlooks the role external factors play among employees in the organization but rather seen as having a different perspective to allow for meaningful engagement between employees and management. Thus, it has been observed that these assumptions present similarities that are consistent with the higher order needs as presented by Maslow in his hierarchy of needs theory (whereas theory X are consistent with lower order needs) (McGregor, 1960). Suffice to state that managers under theory Y generally underscore the need for autonomy and self-control.

Given the contributing foundation, McGregor’s theory X and Y has made to understanding management styles in organizations, the theory has not been without
shortcomings and various criticisms have been labeled towards the theory (Vroom & Deci, 1970). Some of the major criticisms observed as noted by Vroom and Deci have included among others; the disagreement that, while management’s perceptions of employees may be up to point, human behavior is not only a result of man’s innate nature; that it overlooks the fact that a satisfied need is not a motivator of behavior as people constantly seek to satisfy other needs when the sought needs have been met; and also its presentation of treating people from two opposing positions, have been some of theory X and Y shortcomings in managers’ dealings with employees. Despite these shortcomings, the theory has time and again been used in various studies to understand management styles in organizations.

For instance, in a study by Russ (2011), on theory X/Y and participative decision making, the study was aimed at exploring whether McGregor’s Theory X/Y assumptions are determinants of managers’ propensity for participative decision making. Findings revealed that theory X managers perceive that participative decision making negatively impacts their power while theory Y managers perceive a positive consequence of soliciting employee participation on their supervisory power and organizational effectiveness. Russ (2011), thus proposed that managers’ predisposition for participative decision making is predicted to a large extent by their theory X/Y assumptions.

In another study by Arslan and Staub (2013), the aim of their study was to find evidence on whether leadership styles of the owners/managers of small medium enterprises (SMEs) regarding Theory X and Theory Y have a positive impact on organizational performance. Results from the study revealed significant evidence only in favor of the owners/managers who reported an increase in the past five-year turnover presented more theory Y behavior than theory X behavior dispositions, though other areas of performance were not empirically supported.

Self – Efficacy

Self – efficacy is credited to the psychologist Albert Bandura. Self-efficacy is part of social cognitive theory or social learning theory, which refers to an individual’s belief that he can perform a task (Robbins et al., 2012). Bandura (1986), defined self-efficacy as an individual's perception of his/her ability to organize and execute actions required for selected types of performances. He postulated that self-efficacy theory is based on the principle that cognitive events are induced and altered by the experience of effective performance. Thus, it
was assumed that people’s self-efficacy beliefs would vary contingent on the activity domain or situation prevailing, hence the presupposition that, the higher one's self-efficacy is, the more confidence one has in their ability to succeed on a given task, as this gives one the belief of being in control (Bandura, 1986). Suffice to say, this is true for every aspect of a domain including the workforce and organizational settings.

Bandura (1995; 1997), argued that perceived self-efficacy played a significant role in how humans perform in that it directly affects factors such as goals and aspirations, affective tendencies, outcome expectations, and perceptions of opportunities in the social environment. A belief in self-efficacy was key in influencing the analytical and strategic thinking process in the face of various difficulties. Bong and Skaalvik (2003) contend that self-efficacy is essentially what people believe they can do with the skills and abilities they possess, and not necessarily the actual skills and abilities that they have. Additionally, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) advocated a view of self-efficacy in terms of one's confidence in achieving a task and the amount of effort one would expend. They believed that before people selected their choices and initiated their efforts, people evaluate and integrate information about their supposed capabilities. They concluded that expectations of self-efficacy determine the employee's coping behavior, effort expended and time the effort would be sustained during challenging activities.

Given the fact that people are diverse in nature and personality, it is easy to deduce that people generally do have different levels of self-efficacy. To this end, Bandura opined that self-efficacy could thus be increased in four different ways through enactive mastery, vicarious modeling, verbal persuasion, and arousal, and these are expounded briefly below (Robbins et al., 2012). Bandura posited that enactive mastery was the most significant way to increase self-efficacy and this involved gaining the essential expertise on the task or job through experience. The second approach he advocated for, was through vicarious modeling which involved becoming more confident by observing someone else doing the task and learning by observation. The third approach to increasing self-efficacy being verbal persuasion entails becoming more confident because someone convinces you that you have the skills necessary to be successful, and lastly, through an increase in arousal which leads to an energized state that gets the person “heightened up” and performs better, though this generally is only useful for certain specific low key activities (Robbins et al., 2012).
Bandura thus believed the essence of self-efficacy was its ability to affect the way individuals realized their desired and undesired futures (Bandura, 1995). He believed self-efficacy had the potential to produce cherished outcomes as well as prevent undesired ones by enabling an individual to maintain a sense of power and control over various activities and tasks. He also believed self-efficacy was crucial in regulating motivation of individuals (Bandura, 1995). Additionally, he was of the view that motivation is generated cognitively in individuals, and that by motivating themselves, people tend to guide their actions and employ the exercise of foresight, and ultimately forming belief systems about themselves and what they could or could not do, and thus expect possible outcomes of their actions. Therefore, various studies have been conducted to assess the self-efficacy of people in organizations.

In a study by Sampath (2018), he wanted to investigate the impact of self-efficacy on task performance and contextual performance of the employees in the banking sector in Sri Lanka. The results of the study indicated that self-efficacy significantly and positively correlated with task performance and contextual performance. Findings revealed that the employees’ trust in their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to accomplish the task was significantly and positively correlated with the behaviors that are directly related with the completion of the job and with the extra role supporting behaviors which are not directly related to the job.

In another study conducted by Agarwal and Mishra (2016), they aimed at exploring the relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment and to find the extent to which self-efficacy significantly predicts organizational commitment among revenue personnel. Results revealed a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. A positive significant relationship was also found between self-efficacy and the three subscales of organizational commitment namely affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. Further analysis from their study revealed that self-efficacy significantly predicts organizational commitment among revenue personnel.

**Job Satisfaction**

One of the commonly used definitions of this concept by Spector (1997, p.2) is that “Job satisfaction is how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs, it is the extent to which people like or dislike their jobs”. On the other hand, Hulin and Judge (2003),
defined job satisfaction as a multidimensional reaction of employees toward their work that includes three different components: cognitive, affective and behavioral. Furthermore, Locke (1969), defined job satisfaction as a positive emotional state that arises as a result of one's job evaluation based on achieving one's job values. For the purposes of this study, job satisfaction will be defined as the positive attitudes of employees to their work (Çelik, 2011). These multidimensional responses can be organized as bad-good or positive-negative.

In terms of the historical development of job satisfaction, one of the greatest contributions has been the Hawthorne studies conducted by Elton Mayo between 1924-1933, which showed that the employees' work objectives were not just payment, and it encouraged the researchers to investigate other factors that cause job satisfaction (Bisen, 2000). In addition to this research, many studies have been carried out about how much people are satisfied with their jobs. Research on general job satisfaction in the United States showed that overall job satisfaction was high and stable until the beginning of the 1970s, while post-1970 surveys indicated a decrease in overall job satisfaction (Chelte, Wright, & Tausky, 1982). However, as the work is a complex structure, besides the general job satisfaction, employees’ job satisfaction varies depending on many different factors such as working conditions, colleagues, salary and management, and some studies have revealed the effects of these factors on the job satisfaction of the employees in different ways (Robbins & Judge, 2013).

**Factors Impacting Job Satisfaction**

There are a lot of opinions about what determines employees’ job satisfaction because many factors can affect the level of job satisfaction as mentioned above. In this respect, different researchers in literature have focused on different dimensions that will determine the job satisfaction of the employees. In this section, the management/leadership factors and individual factors will be emphasized.

Although different factors related to the reasons for job satisfaction are highlighted in the studies, generally it has been stated that management satisfaction is one of the important factors affecting the overall job satisfaction, particularly in terms of its role on employee’s career and performance (e.g. Scarpello & Vandenberge, 1992; Wrigt & Bonett, 1992). Besides, there are many studies in the literature that show the effect of different management styles on the employee’s job satisfaction, and the research results showed that the differences in management style affect the employees' job satisfaction in different ways (Belias & Koustelios, 2014). For instance, Madlock (2008), in his study found a significant positive
relationship between supervisor communication competence, task and relational leadership styles and employees job satisfaction. In another study conducted by Havig, Skogstad, Veenstra, and Romøren (2011) results indicated significant relations of job satisfaction to task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership styles. Moreover, the results suggested that the effect of two different leadership styles varied depending on wards, as the employees in different wards used different leadership styles.

Personality characteristics also have a role in determining the level of employee job satisfaction (Robbins & Judge, 2013). One study found a significant relationship between job satisfaction and self-core evaluation that includes four specific traits such as self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism with the mediator role of perceived job characteristics and job complexity (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000). They also found that core self-evaluation was associated with job satisfaction over time by showing the connection of self-evaluation that was measured both in childhood and in adulthood with job satisfaction. In addition, research has asserted that individuals whose self-core evaluation is positive have a higher level of job satisfaction compared to those whose self-core evaluation is negative (Robbins & Judge, 2013). Moreover, a study by Best, Stapleton, and Downey (2005) indicated the effect of core self-evaluations on job satisfaction through the perception of the work environment. That is, they found that individuals who had low self-core evaluations and perception of constrictive work environment were more probable to be dissatisfied with their jobs.

**Theories of Job Satisfaction**

As job satisfaction is influenced by many factors, over the years several theories have been proposed by researchers focusing on different areas of job satisfaction. They can be categorized as situational theories, dispositional approach and interactive theories (Judge, Parker, Colbert, Heller, & Ilies, 2001). However, given a bias towards personality factors orientation, dispositional approach and interactive theories like Locke’s value-percept theory and Vroom’s valence expectancy theory will be highlighted. While the dispositional approach suggests that job satisfaction results from the personality structure, interactive theories suggest that job satisfaction is the result of the interaction of personal and situational factors (Judge & Klinger, 2008).
Interactive theories

**Locke’s value-percept theory.** This theory asserts that job satisfaction is related to the perception and values of an individual (Locke, 1969). That is, job satisfaction is determined by the perceived relationship between what is wanted and the perception of what is received. Therefore, according to Locke, a job by itself does not determine job satisfaction, thus the relationship between person and environment called interactive approach is necessary. This model emphasizes the role of individual differences in terms of values and work outcomes (Judge & Klinger, 2008; Judge et al., 2001).

Locke (1969) stated that there are three elements in the process of evaluating job satisfaction, and these include the perception of the individual against some aspects of work, the standards of individual’s value, and judging the relationship between the individual's perception and values. At the end of this evaluation process, individuals might have different levels of job satisfaction. Therefore, according to this theory, job satisfaction might be different depending on the individual's value, even though people have the same amount of difference between the perception of what they received and what they want to receive.

**Vroom’s valence expectancy theory.** Like Locke’s value percep theory, expectancy perspective asserts that a person's evaluation of job satisfaction is determined by the difference between what a person expects from work and what a person gets from work (Jayaratne, 1993). In Vroom’s model, three basic beliefs that include valence, expectancy, and instrumentality are highlighted (Čiarnienė, Kumpikaitė, & Vienažindienė, 2010; Mitchell & Albright, 1972; Thiagaraj & Thangaswamy, 2017): First, valence signifies people's emotional orientation towards outcomes, how deep an employee wants external rewards like money or internal rewards like satisfaction. Second, expectancy indicates that employees are different in terms of expectations and confidence levels about what they can do. Third, instrumentality is the employees’ perception about whether they will achieve what they want, even when promised by a manager. According to this perspective, the motivation of individuals can be achieved by believing that efforts and performance are positively correlated, appropriate performance will lead to the desired reward, the reward will satisfy the important need of the person and the desire for satisfying the needs is strong enough to endeavor (Čiarnienė, Kumpikaitė, & Vienažindienė, 2010).

As a classic model of expectancy perspective, the person-environment fit model emphasizes that how compatible a person’s personality characteristics such as the needs and
abilities with environmental characteristics such as resources and demands (Caplan, 1979). From this point of view, in some cases, although environmental characteristics are identical, different behaviors may be exhibited by people due to individual differences, or a completely new behavior may be formed as a result of the interaction between the environment and the person. In short, there can be very different examples of behavior depending on the harmony of the person and environmental characteristics. Essentially, this theory emphasizes the impact of an individual’s expectations on job satisfaction. In the literature, it is observed that unmet expectations have a negative effect on many factors and lead to low job satisfaction (Turnley & Feldman, 2000; Wanous, Poland, Premack, & Davis, 1992).

**Dispositional approach.** This approach states that job satisfaction of the individual depends on the dispositional basis of the individuals; in other words, individual’s job satisfaction varies according to the personality traits independent of the job characteristics (Judge & Mount, 2002; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986). In this respect, according to dispositional researchers, job satisfaction is a result of differences in people’s personality characteristics, because people’s responses to the same situations vary (Spector, 2005). Researchers in this area studied the individual’s specific features such as core self-evaluation construct, individualism-collectivism, and human needs (Judge at al., 2001).

These studies conducted in the literature can be categorized as direct and indirect studies (Judge & Klinger, 2008; Judge & Larsen, 2001). That is, indirect studies explain the relation of dispositions to job satisfaction through inference, while direct studies explain the relationship between personality traits and job satisfaction based on direct measurement. As an indirect study, Staw and Ross (1985), for instance, made an inference about the relation of job satisfaction to disposition based on the study result which showed that job satisfaction tends to be stable over time. Therefore, they stated that individuals' consistency of job satisfaction both over time and across the situations could be a permanent characteristic of individuals (Staw & Cohen-Charash, 2005). For example, a study by Levin and Stokes (1989), found a relation of the negative affectivity which makes people more prone to pessimism and dissatisfaction to job satisfaction. That is, people who have higher level negative affectivity tend to have a lower level of job satisfaction.

The core self-evaluation model (CSE) was proposed by Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) is also the important model of the dispositional theory. They stated that the individual's tendency towards job satisfaction is determined by four core self-evaluations
which are self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. According to this model, a higher level of self-confidence and self-efficacy, internal locus of control, and lower level of neuroticism result in higher level of job satisfaction (Judge et al, 1998). In this way, researchers emphasized the direct relationship between job satisfaction and CSE. In other respect, other researchers discussed the indirect relationship between job satisfaction and CSE (Dormann, Fay, Zapf, & Frese, 2006). According to them, the influence of CSE on job satisfaction can be explained in two ways. First, CSE affects what kind of environment people want to work in, and this leads them to have specific work experiences that affect job satisfaction level. Second, CSE shape how people perceive the world, and this perception has an impact on the forming of some behaviors that determine the level of job satisfaction.

Drawing observations from the dispositional approach and focusing on personality as a factor affecting job satisfaction among others, we thus can infer that there are differences between men and women in terms of how they respond to the interaction between management styles and their levels of job satisfaction. This is more so given the fact that studies in personality have shown significant differences between the genders particularly in the levels of neuroticism with females being relatively high and men low as well as differences in interests which may affect the type of management styles preferred based on the genders of the employees (Giolla & Kajonius, 2018).

**Current Study**

Given the foregoing literature on theory X and Y management styles, self-efficacy and job satisfaction, a case can be made for the utility of a relationship among the interacting variables and their impact on employees and organizations, and thus a need to continuously study these factors and how they could best be applied in the way institutions function. Hence the imperative in the present study to contribute to the understanding of interactions of these variables in organizational wellbeing. Therefore, to lay a foundation for the present study, summaries of the following studies where observed:

A meta-analytic study by Judge and Bono (2001), focused on the relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits with job satisfaction and job performance. The study focused on the relationship of four traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability (low neuroticism)—with job satisfaction and job performance. With respect to job satisfaction, the estimated true score correlations were .26 for self-esteem, .45 for generalized self-efficacy, .32 for internal locus of control, and .24 for emotional stability.
With respect to job performance, the correlations were .26 for self-esteem, .23 for generalized self-efficacy, .22 for internal locus of control, and .19 for emotional stability. In total, the results based on 274 correlations suggest that these traits are among the best dispositional predictors of job satisfaction and job performance.

In another study by Law and Guo (2016), their study was aimed at exploring the correlation of hope and self-efficacy with job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational commitment for correctional officers in the Taiwan prison system while controlling for the shared effects of the nature of the institution (i.e., for male or female inmates) and personal characteristics of the officers (i.e., gender, age, and years of work experience). The participants were 133 correctional personnel from two correctional institutions, one with male inmates and the other with female inmates, in central Taiwan. The results of ordinary least squares regression analysis indicated that hope had a significant positive association with job satisfaction and a significant negative association with job stress. Additionally, self-efficacy had a significant positive association with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Finally, job satisfaction had a significant positive association with organizational commitment.

In a simple correlational research study by Řuricová and Šugereková (2017), the aim of their study was to examine a manager’s self-concept as a potential source of their leadership philosophy. The study focused on the verification of the relationship between aspects of a manager’s self-concept (self-esteem and self-efficacy) and of their employees’ leadership style in the context of theory Y. The research sample consisted of 77 middle management level managers (89.6% males, 10.4% females), aged between 23 and 61 ($M = 38.82, SD = 8.75$). Research results showed a moderately positive, statistically significant correlation between self-esteem and managerial attitude, and they concluded from the correlation that there was no correlation between perceived manager’s self-efficacy and their managerial attitude in the sense of theory Y. Additionally, they also confirmed a relationship between both aspects of self-concept.

A study by Fiman (1973), examined the impact of managers’ theory X/Y assumptions over affective outcomes. He tested the link between managers’ theory X/Y orientation and employees’ satisfaction. The sample participants consisted of 200 workers randomly chosen from 20 different work-groups of female secretarial and clerical workers and their office managers in the corporate headquarters of a large retailing organization in New York. He
found that employees with theory Y managers exhibit greater satisfaction on all five targeted dimensions (i.e. satisfaction with supervisor, work, people, pay, and promotions) than employees with theory X managers. Additionally, results showed that supervisors who were perceived to display a high degree of Y behavior were more effective with subordinates who would also display a high degree of Y behavior. Similarly, he also observed that supervisors with a low degree of Y behavior were more effective with subordinates who show a low degree of Y behavior as a supervisor, as employees like a similar leader.

Lastly, a study on leadership preference and gender differences of employees by Bellou (2011), aimed to investigate the employee’s perception about the preferred managers based on the gender differences of employees. The sample participants consisted of 2008 employees in Greek public sector with age range between 18-64 years old, of which 53.7 % of the participants were females. Results showed that men and women have different perspective in terms of preferred ideal leader behaviors. More specifically, female employees are more prone to prefer people and change-oriented leaders than males. However, the results did not confirm that male employees tend to have leaders with a task-oriented style. Also, Hattangadi (2015) asserted that management style of theory X managers is quite task-oriented, but managers with theory Y management style care about their employee’s self-esteem, happiness, confidence, success, respect of others. In this respect, it can be said that a manager who has a theory Y management style is more people focused.

Based on the foregoing literature, the following hypotheses were developed:

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a positive relationship between employees’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

**Hypothesis 2:** The relationship between theory X/Y management styles and employee’s job satisfaction is moderated by employee’s self-efficacy such that, employees with higher levels of self-efficacy will have higher levels of overall job satisfaction when they have managers who have theory Y management style, while employees who have lower levels of self-efficacy will have higher levels of overall job satisfaction with theory X management style.

**Hypothesis 3:** Gender moderates the relationship between management style and job satisfaction, such that female employees will have higher levels of overall job satisfaction when they have theory Y managers, while male employees will have higher levels of overall job satisfaction with theory X managers.
Aim and Research Question

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship among the variables being Theory X and Y management style and self-efficacy in relation to job satisfaction of employees. Therefore, the primary research question was, does self-efficacy and gender moderate the relationship between theory X and Y management style and employee job satisfaction?

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from two private organizations in Sweden and sampled conveniently. Organization A is a Swedish company in Växjö that is basically responsible for developing and manufacturing customized aluminum extrusions and components. Organization B is also a Swedish company based in Stockholm that plans and designs living spaces and cities of the future, and provides services in the fields of consulting, engineering, environmental technologies, and architecture. A total of 137 participants (20 from Organization A, 117 from Organization B) took part in the study. From the 146 questionnaires that were collected representing a 58% response rate, 3 unfinished data and 6 outlier data were excluded. Participants were 35% (N = 48) females and 65% (N = 89) males. Their work experience ranged from 3 months to 40 years. The age range of the participants was between 22 and 67 years old with a mean age of 35.16 years (SD = 10.72). Participants’ levels of education included high school (N = 18), bachelors (N = 51), Magister (N = 14), masters (N = 44), PhD (N = 1) and other qualifications (N = 8), while education data was not provided by one participant.

Measurements

The research used three psychometrically validated instruments to study theory X and Y management style (see Appendix A), self-efficacy (see Appendix B) and job satisfaction (see Appendix C). Demographic data of the participants collected included: age, gender, qualifications, job title and years of work experience (see Appendix D). The measurements were available in both Swedish and English versions of the scale given the nature of the sample participants. All the questionnaires were answered in Swedish.

Theory X and Y Questionnaire. Theory X and Y management styles were measured using the Theory X and Y Questionnaire (Burton, 1990). The self-report questionnaire with
20 items asked participants to evaluate their management style with a five (5) point Likert scale rating ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree, to (5) Strongly Agree. While half of the items measured theory X management style, the other half measured theory Y management style. Examples of items representing theory X included “Most people do not like to work” and theory Y included “People are internally motivated to achieve goals to which they are committed”. The highest score a participant could obtain on either the X or Y scale is 50, indicating a preference for the high score scale while the minimum score is 10 indicating low preference in the scale with the lowest score as the scales are basically the inverse of each other. However, in this study because participants were asked to evaluate their managers from their perspective, subject of each question was changed and presented like “I think my boss believes most people do not like to work” and “I think my boss believes people are internally motivated to achieve goals in to which they are committed”. Testing for reliability coefficients of the two scales demonstrated Cronbach’s alpha levels with theory X scale 0.51, and theory Y scale 0.76, which is within acceptable range (Schmitt, 1996). In the study, a Swedish version of the Theory X and Y Questionnaire was used. The questions were translated from English to Swedish several times by different people and confirmed by two people who had advanced levels in both English and Swedish, and final version of the scale was confirmed by two other consultants competent in both the Swedish and English languages.

**Self-Efficacy:** The General Self-Efficacy Scale was used to study self-efficacy, which measures a person's perceived personal mastery over general situations and behaviors (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1992). The scale contained 10 items and had a Swedish version with a four (4) point Likert scale rating ranging from (1) Not at all true, to (4) Exactly true. Examples of items included: “I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events” and “I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort”. The maximum score each participant could obtain on the scale is 40, indicating high-level self-efficacy, while the minimum score is 10 indicating low-level self-efficacy. The scale’s overall Cronbach alpha was .80 (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1992).

**Job Satisfaction:** The Minnesota Job Satisfaction Scale was used to study job satisfaction, which measures a person's perceived personal mastery over general situations and behaviors (Spector, 1997; Buitendach & Rothmann, 2009). The scale contained 20 items with a five (5) point Likert scale rating ranging from (1) Very Dissatisfied, to (5) Very
Satisfied. Examples of items included: “Being able to keep busy all the time” and “The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities”. The maximum score a participant could obtain is 100 indicating the participant was highly satisfied, while the minimum score is 20 indicating low-level job satisfaction. The scale’s overall Cronbach alpha was about .80 (Spector, 1997; Buitendach & Rothmann, 2009).

Procedure

Before the data was collected, the authorities of the two organizations were contacted in Sweden and information was given about the purpose of the study. After getting approval from both organizations, the appropriate time was set for the data collection. Ethical standards were taken into consideration during the entire research and data collection period to prevent any harm to the participants. Participants were briefly informed about the study before the questionnaires were distributed. The study was voluntary, and participants were assured their responses would only be used for research purposes, with an assurance of anonymity. Instructions were given to the each of the participants verbally and written on the cover letter. Questionnaires were collected using paper and pencil survey at the workplace of employees. However, due to the safety reasons in one of the organizations, the questionnaires were distributed, and the necessary information was given by the authorized person of the human resources. Data collection process was completed in two weeks. It took approximately 10-15 minutes for the participants to complete the questionnaires.

Results

To test Hypothesis 1, a Pearson Product-moment Correlation was computed. Results of the correlation analysis indicated that there was a positive relationship between job satisfaction and self-efficacy of the participants. Preliminary analysis was performed to ensure there were no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. There was a medium positive correlation between the two variables, \( r = .41, p = .001 \), indicating an association between job satisfaction and self-efficacy in that as job satisfaction increased, self-efficacy seemed to increase, without implying a causal relationship between the variables. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was supported. The results of the correlational analysis are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

Selected Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Theory Y</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Theory X</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-efficacy</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 137, M = mean, SD = Standard deviation, * = Coefficient significant at *p = .001, **p < .001 (2 tailed)

To test hypothesis 2, a two separate multiple linear regression analysis was applied to predict job satisfaction level based on management style using theory X and Y with employees’ self-efficacy as moderator. Preliminary investigations showed that no assumptions were violated. The assumptions confirmed a linear relationship and normal distribution of residuals. Homoscedasticity was checked through residuals in scatterplots. A check of Mahalanobis distance indicated no multi-varied outlier was observed. Additionally, a correlational analysis indicated that some independent variables were highly correlated. Therefore, variables that were predicted to have problematically high multicollinearity were centered, thus multicollinearity was fulfilled as observed by collinearity statistics (Tolerance and VIF) which were within the range. To address concerns of high multicollinearity with the interaction term, the variables were centered and an interaction term between the predictor and moderator variable was created.

Table 2

Model Coefficient and Beta Values for Each Predictor (Theory Y)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Y</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThY*Self-eff</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 137, ThY = Theory Y, Self-eff = Self-efficacy, ThY*Self-eff = Interaction effect, SE = Standard error
The results of the first regression involved theory Y (Table 2), self-efficacy, and interaction of theory Y and self-efficacy explained 32% of the variance and the model was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $F(3, 133) = 20.74, p < .001$. Theory Y management style contributed significantly to the model ($p < .001$), and self-efficacy also contributed significantly to the model ($p < .001$). However, the moderation effect was not significant ($p = .97$). The results of the second regression involved theory X (Table 3), self-efficacy, and interaction of theory X and self-efficacy explained 32% of the variance and the model was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $F(3, 133) = 21.05, p < .001$. Self-efficacy contributed significantly to the model ($p < .001$), and theory X management style also contributed significantly to the model ($p < .001$). However, the moderation effect was not significant ($p = .21$). Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Table 3

| Model Coefficient and Beta Values for Each Predictor (Theory X) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | $B$  | SE | Beta | $p$ |
| (Constant) | 3.99 | .04 |  | <.001 |
| Theory X | -.34 | .06 | -.39 | <.001 |
| Self-Efficacy | .44 | .09 | .36 | <.001 |
| ThX*Self-eff | .20 | .16 | .09 | .21 |

Note. $N = 137$, ThX = Theory X, Self-eff = Self-efficacy, ThX*Self-eff = Interaction effect, SE = Standard error

Table 4

| Descriptive Statistics for Gender Among Study Variables |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Theory Y | Theory X | Self-efficacy | Job satisfaction |
|   | $M$  | $SD$ | $M$  | $SD$ | $M$  | $SD$ | $M$  | $SD$ |
| Female | 3.79 | .40 | 2.35 | .60 | 3.03 | .44 | 3.99 | .52 |
| Male | 3.73 | .41 | 2.36 | .56 | 2.99 | .40 | 3.98 | .50 |
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To test hypothesis 3, another two separate multiple regression analysis using process in SPSS was applied to predict job satisfaction based on management style using theory X and Y with employees’ gender as a moderator. Preliminary investigations showed that no assumptions were violated. The assumptions confirmed a linear relationship and normal distribution of residuals. Homoscedasticity was checked through residuals in scatterplots. A check of Mahalanobis distance indicated no multi-varied outlier was observed. Additionally, multicollinearity was fulfilled as observed by collinearity statistics (Tolerance and VIF) which were within the range.

Thus, the results for hypothesis 3 were, in the first model for theory Y, $F(3, 133) = 9.30, p < .001, R^2 = .17$. Theory Y had a significant predictor, $B = .61, t(133) = 3.61, p < .001$ that is for every 1 (one) unit increase in theory Y management style, we get .61 unit increase in job satisfaction. Gender difference was not significant, gender (woman vs man) $B = .03, t(133) = .34, p = .73$. Interaction of gender and theory Y was not significant, thus there was no interaction effect, $B = -.15, t(133) = -.71, p = .48$. In the second model for theory X, $F(3, 133) = 10.06, p < .001, R^2 = .19$. Theory X had a significant predictor, $B = -.38, t(133) = -3.42, p < .001$ that is for every 1 (one) unit increase in theory X management style, we get -.38 unit increase in job satisfaction. Gender difference was not significant, gender (woman vs man) $B = -.003, t(133) = -.04, p = .97$. Interaction of gender and theory X was also not significant, thus there was no interaction effect, $B = .004, t(133) = -.02, p = .98$. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported. Additionally, descriptive statistics of gender among variables are shown in Table 4.

Discussion

The study was undertaken to investigate the relationship between management style as viewed through the lens of theory X and Y, and job satisfaction of employees in the organizations as moderated by self-efficacy and gender of employees. Of the three hypotheses, only hypothesis 1 was supported.

As earlier noted, the results of Hypothesis 1 indicated a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction, indicating that the hypothesis was supported. The results are consistent with previously observed research that also demonstrated a positive correlation between self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001; Law & Guo, 2016). This consistency speaks to the fact that self-efficacy is an essential attribute for
employees to possess in organizations. This, I believe, is because employees who feel confident can perform better and contribute significantly to the organization which in turn makes them more satisfied with their jobs. When employees feel confident in their abilities and perceive their self-efficacy as such, this can make them feel meaningful with a better outlook in their jobs and ultimately impacting on their job satisfaction, which is in line with the views espoused by the core self-evaluation model (CSE) (Judge et al, 1998). Therefore, that the results are consistent goes further in demonstrating the importance of having employees who are confident in their abilities to perform. Hence, understanding the association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction is paramount to the wellbeing of the employee’s performance and the organization.

Hypothesis 2, on the other hand, which indicated that the relationship between theory X/Y management styles and employee’s job satisfaction as moderated by employee’s level of self-efficacy was not supported. Contrary to expectations, self-efficacy did not impact the relationship between theory X/Y management styles and job satisfaction. However, individual variables theory X, theory Y, and self-efficacy had effects on job satisfaction. While theory Y and self-efficacy had a positive contribution to job satisfaction of employees, theory X had a negative contribution to employees’ job satisfaction. These results present similarities with findings by Fiman (1973), in which he observed that employees were generally satisfied with theory Y oriented leaders. Additionally, he observed that employees with low theory Y behaviors were more satisfied with low theory Y leaders, as was the case for high theory Y employees towards high theory Y leader behavior. Based on these observations, we can infer that personal factors have an effect on the relationship between theory X/Y management styles and employee’s job satisfaction level, as well as the management style characteristic of Swedish organizations.

Suffice to say, management style in Sweden may have most likely influenced the results being non-significant. As observed by Birkinshaw (2002) and Li (2011), Swedish management style is characterized as being more human-oriented, high empowerment and less hierarchy. This entails that the distinction that generally exists between employees and those in management does not affect the employee-management relations, thus creating a pleasant environment which is tolerant to employees and greatly supports employees sense of job satisfaction, notwithstanding the level of self-efficacy, which is typical of theory Y leadership, and contrary to theory X. In this respect, it can be said that theory Y leadership
style is quite common in Swedish business world, which is preferred and has been adopted as a norm in Swedish organizational society. Additionally, it is worth noting given that theory X and self-efficacy are hardly investigated in literature, an inference was made that theory X would have an opposite effect compared to theory Y.

The results for hypothesis 3, revealed that gender did not moderate the relationship between theory X and Y management style and job satisfaction as the results were not significant, contrary to expectations, thus the hypothesis was not supported. However, unlike the second hypothesis, it was observed that only theory X and Y were significant individual predictors of job satisfaction, while gender as a moderator was not a significant individual predictor of job satisfaction, and no interaction effect was observed between theory X and Y and gender, thus could not confirm evidence from the study that established gender differences in preference for leaders by Bellou (2011). Given the outcome of the results not being significant, this could be attributed to the fact that the gender representation of the participants was not fairly balanced as females represented about 35% of the sample size. It is rather an odd and interesting occurrence that gender results were not significant especially given the fact that, studies have substantially shown the gender differences (Giolla & Kajonius, 2018) that exist in Scandinavian (Sweden) countries in terms of occupations where males tend to be inclined to the engineering fields with few females as evidenced by the sample representation.

The fact of Sweden being a highly gender-neutral country coupled with the model of leadership style in which organizational hierarchy in management is almost flat (Alexander, 2010), could be one plausible explanation that negates gender, moderating the relationship between theory X/Y management styles and job satisfaction. This perhaps gives support to most research studies that have demonstrated inconclusive evidence to indicate any possible effect of gender on job satisfaction in organizations (Nielsen & Madsen, 2017). However, it is worth noting that some studies have shown that differences exist while others do not seem to show any differences, save a few studies done especially among medical doctors (Al-Ajmi, 2006). This by no means elucidate the presence of the differences, but rather the differences that have been noted, have been attributed to be due to the differences in, among other factors, remuneration and working hours where males generally tend to earn more particularly as a result of working more hours (Al-Ajmi, 2006). Therefore, this may have led to the supposed differences in preference for management style which are more akin to theory X aspects,
whereas females tend to prefer styles more akin to theory Y leaders and have different impact on job satisfaction of employees based on work styles and gender (Bellou, 2011; Hattangadi, 2015).

**Limitations and Recommendations**

There were various challenges faced during the research period thus limiting the outcome of the study. However, before that, it is worth noting that the sample participants where actual employees working for well-established firms. Therefore, we can reliably trust the study outcome as they are quite a good representation of employees in Swedish firms. Nonetheless, the study was not without limitations that greatly affected the results. One of the major challenges faced was the fact that, while relatively acceptable (Cohen, 1992), the sample size of the study was quite small and thus this could have affected the outcome of the results, particularly so considering the lack of effect observed in the moderation. The instruments were in self report format which presents challenges that come with self report responses, and lead to social desirability concerns. In addition to the small sample size, the gender representation was slightly skewed towards men, thus affecting analysis involving gender which was found not significant. However, this was expected given the observation on gender differences and how they affect career choices which meant the firms being considered where in engineering and manufacturing domains which are essentially male-dominated areas of interest for occupations. Another challenge also involved proper translation of one instrument which was not available in Swedish and thus had to be translated from English. Although individuals fluent in both languages translated the instrument from one language to the other several times until a well-agreed version was arrived, it appears many participants struggled with understanding some words and thus might have affected their response. Thus demonstrating possibility of common method biases. Biases in perception responses may also have affected the outcome of the study. Given these limitations, there is a need to interpret these findings with caution in terms of generalization.

Therefore, to address the highlighted limitation faced, the following recommendations could be observed in future studies: the need to have a relatively larger sample size of anywhere above 200 and the possibility of a balanced gender representation would be vital more so if the need to observe gender differences would be relevant. Additionally, using well-trained translators would also be a good approach as that would address the issues of
wording consistency and accuracy of the translation from one language to another. Another recommendation worth noting is that, while the sample was a good representation of the Swedish workforce, the sample was nonetheless mainly employees from the private sectors which may affect how the variables interact in understanding management styles and employee job satisfaction hence inclusion of public sector employees may help in giving an accurate picture of the subject under consideration.

**Conclusion**

From the preceding undertaking of the study, indications to the role that management styles play in the level of job satisfaction of employees are inevitably great. While findings did not support the moderation effects of self-efficacy and gender on the relationship between management style and job satisfaction, the study did confirm a positive relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. That noted, it is very important that organizations provide an enabling environment in which employees can explore their capabilities and enhance their skill set for the benefit of not only the individuals but also the organization, in that organizations do greatly benefit from employees being confident in their ability to perform and how they perceive themselves. Additionally, the study has also shown credence to the fact that the wellbeing of proper organizational functioning is largely dependent on how management conducts itself in dealing with the employee. This is well illustrated in the saying that “Good employees do not quit organizations, they quit bad leaders” – Anonymous. We thus can conclude that this area is of great importance for employers to be aware of the consequences of different leadership styles and to help the employees to increase their job satisfaction, as well as the fact that theory Y leadership style prominent feature of management in some Swedish organizations.

Future studies may wish to explore how organizational support could leverage how the level of job satisfaction of employees and leaders who are oriented towards theory X could be particularly aided in terms of realizing job satisfaction in the organization. Additionally, studies could be undertaken to provide support for a causal link among the variables, and how these could be used to benefit the organizations and their employees to enhance job satisfaction of employees and thus enhance the productivity of the workforce. Also, studies could specifically investigate how the level of job satisfaction would be affected if women have low-level self-efficacy and men have high-level self-efficacy.
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Appendix A

Theory X and Y Questionnaire

Please answer the following by rating each statement that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement. Work through and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. There are five possible responses to each statement ranging from ‘Strongly Disagree’ (number 1) to ‘Strongly Agree’ (number 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that most people do not like to work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that if chances are given to think for themselves, most people are bright</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people are internally motivated to achieve goals in to which they are committed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that managers must control employees to get work done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that all workers want security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people will accept responsibility if treated properly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people prefer that someone else tell them what to do on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that workers may have to be coerced to get things done properly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that work is natural as play</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I think my boss believes that workers can be creative on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people show little ambition at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that some people will not work unless threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that some workers will pursue goals if rewarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that most employees avoid work whenever possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that Most employers do not use the full potential of their employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that some workers can be innovative problem solvers if chances are given</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people usually avoid responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that superiors must direct the activities of their subordinates to achieve group goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that people will seek responsibility under proper conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think my boss believes that it is not natural for people to dislike work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

General Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

Please answer the following by rating each statement that best reflects your degree of agreement or disagreement. Work through and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. There are five possible responses to each statement ranging from ‘Not at all true’ (number 1) to ‘Exactly true’ (number 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all true</th>
<th>Hardly true</th>
<th>Moderately true</th>
<th>Exactly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I can usually handle whatever comes my way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Job Satisfaction Questionnaire

Ask yourself: How satisfied am I with this aspect of my job?
- **Very Sat.** means I am very satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **Sat.** means I am satisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **N** means I can't decide whether I am satisfied or not with this aspect of my job.
- **Dissat.** means I am dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.
- **Very Dissat.** means I am very dissatisfied with this aspect of my job.

On my present job, this is how I feel about …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The chance to work alone on the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The chance to do different things from time to time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The way my boss handles his/her workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The competence of my supervisor in making decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The way my job provides for steady employment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The chance to do things for other people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The chance to tell people what to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The way company policies are put into practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My pay and the amount of work I do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The chances for advancement on this job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The freedom to use my own judgment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The working conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The way my co-workers get along with each other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The praise I get for doing a good job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Informed Consent Letter and Demographic Information Form

I am MSc Student in Work and Organizational Psychology at Linnaeus University conducting a thesis study in Organizational psychology and kindly request you answer the questionnaire. The aim of the project is to investigate how people feel about their work from different perspectives. There are no right or wrong answers. Kindly note that it is voluntary and anonymous, and the results are for academic purposes only. Your participation is highly appreciated with utmost sincere gratitude. Thank you.

Kind Regards
Minel Aykut

____________________________

Gender: Female( ) Male( ) Other( )

Age: ____

Years of work experience: ________

Job title: _______________________

Your highest educational qualification:

- High school Level or similar ( )
- Bachelor’s or similar ( )
- Magister or similar ( )
- Master or similar ( )
- PhD ( )
- Professor ( )
- Other ( )