

# Self-efficacy and job satisfaction of women employees: A case of Royal University of Bhutan

Bijoy Hangmo Subba<sup>1</sup>, Yangdon<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Email: bhsbba.sce@rub.edu.bt

<sup>2</sup> Email: yangdon.sce@rub.edu.bt

Samtse College of Education, Bhutan

**ABSTRACT:** *The Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) currently has 1220 faculty members and staff working under the ten constituent colleges and the Office of the Vice Chancellor. This figure comprises of 402 women employees compared to 818 men (IMS, 2021). This number indicates that gender equality has not been reached within RUB. The present study explored the self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels of female RUB employees and how they are related. A mixed method, sequential explanatory design was adopted for the study. The quantitative data were gathered from 95 participants and the qualitative data were gathered from 38 participants. The participants included female employees working in different colleges of RUB and the Office of the Vice Chancellor. A thematic analysis following descriptive statistical analysis was used for the quantitative data and the qualitative data were analyzed along the same themes. The findings revealed that the participants' levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction are high. The study also highlighted a repertoire of factors that affect self-efficacy and job satisfaction. A study to explore the most effective and sustainable source of self-efficacy and job satisfaction is recommended.*

**KEYWORDS:** Self-efficacy, job satisfaction, mixed method, thematic, impact.

→ Received 12/11/2021 → Revised manuscript received 09/12/2021 → Published 30/12/2021.

## 1 Introduction

The Royal University of Bhutan (RUB) is one of the top tertiary education institutions in Bhutan, comprised of ten constituent colleges and two affiliated colleges. Currently, there are 1220 faculty members and staff working under the ten constituent colleges and the Office of the Vice Chancellor. This figure comprises of 402 women employees compared to 818 men (IMS, 2021). This number indicates that gender equality has not been reached within RUB. The underrepresentation of Bhutanese women in the job market has been one of the key issues faced in terms of establishing gender equality in Bhutan. Gender equality in many forms including workplace gender balance is a priority in Bhutan. Several government initiatives and national policies have been geared towards narrowing gender disparities and empowering women. Despite the encouraging government schemes, progress on women's representation in the national workforce has been slow.

According to the report by The Asian Development Bank (2018), there is a visible

gender gap in the educational outcomes and unemployment. The report also states that even though many people believe Bhutan does not face any notable gender equality issues, this stance could manifest gender stereotype and norms more than the factual evidence. Based on this, it is crucial to understand the nature of behavioural patterns and outcomes of Bhutanese women in the labour force. This would help in recognising organisational behaviour of women workers and to adopt necessary strategies to help them overcome challenges at workplace. In the context of RUB, it is useful to study how women employees view themselves and their position, and how content they are with their current employment status. One of the useful theoretical frameworks that explores the career development of women is the self-efficacy theory (Hackett & Betz, 1981). The theory of self-efficacy proposes that gender occupational segregation and underrepresentation of women in working profession could be due to women's lack of strong personal self-efficacy. In the career domain, self-efficacy theory suggests

that gender differences at workplace are a result of socialization experiences. This theory has been linked to numerous variables like workplace wellbeing, work performance, and most importantly job satisfaction (Bargsted et al., 2019). Job satisfaction is one of the biggest factors that influence the performance and retention of women in the workplace (Yousaf et al., 2014). Taking this into account, the present study explored the self-efficacy beliefs of female RUB employees and how they are related to their level of job satisfaction. No prior study has been conducted on this topic in the context of Bhutan specifically for RUB.

## 2. Research Question

The research study was guided by the following main question and sub-questions.

### *Main question*

What is the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction?

### *Sub-questions*

What is the level of self-efficacy of the women employees of RUB?

What is the job satisfaction level of the women employees of RUB?

## 3. Review of Literature

The review of literature provides a discussion of relevant literature pertaining to self-efficacy, importance of self-efficacy and factors affecting self-efficacy. Additionally, a discussion of job satisfaction, its importance and factors affecting it are also provided.

### *Self-efficacy*

Self-efficacy is defined as an individual's belief in his or her capacity to muster the cognitive, motivational and behavioural resources required to perform in a given situation (Bandura, 1997). That is, self-efficacy is a situation-specific competence belief. Self-efficacy has been seen as a cognitive process through which an individual judges his or her aptitude in accomplishing a given task (Fitzgerald & Schutte, 2010). The authors further state that as a situation-specific competence belief, self-efficacy influences an individual's internal and external behaviours. In recent years, self-efficacy is one of the most

widely studied variables in the fields of education, psychology and organizational sciences.

Self-efficacy beliefs determine how individuals feel, think, motivate themselves and behave (Bandura, 1994). According to Diseth (2011), low self-efficacy beliefs negatively impact an individual's abilities, whereas high self-efficacy beliefs positively impact the performance of the individual. Individuals with high self-efficacy beliefs are able to maneuver challenging tasks; are persistent and enduring against negativities; can recover their self-efficacy beliefs after failures; and associate their failure to insufficient efforts and acquirable skills (Bandura, 1994). On the other hand, individuals with low self-efficacy beliefs avoid difficult tasks; reduce the efforts that they show in case of encountering a challenge; give up easily; and explain the reason of their failure with lack of ability (Bandura, 1994).

To understanding self-efficacy better, Bandura (1997) has provided the following four sources:

**Mastery Experiences:** The most effective way of developing a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. Performing a task successfully strengthens one's sense of self-efficacy. However, failing to adequately deal with a task or challenge can undermine and weaken self-efficacy.

**Social Modelling:** Witnessing other people successfully completing a task is another important source of self-efficacy. Seeing people similar to oneself succeed by sustained effort raises observers' beliefs that they too possess the capabilities to master comparable activities to succeed.

**Social Persuasion:** People could be persuaded to believe that they have the skills and capabilities to succeed. Getting verbal encouragement from others helps people overcome self-doubt and instead focus on giving their best effort to the task at hand.

**Psychological Responses:** People's own responses and emotional reactions to situations also play an important role in self-efficacy. Moods, emotional states, physical reactions, and stress levels can all impact how a person feels about their personal abilities in a particular situation.

Bandura (1997) claims that any given influence, depending on its form, may operate through one or more of these sources of efficacy information.

### ***Importance of self-efficacy***

Over the past two decades, self-efficacy has become one of the most widely studied variables in the educational, psychological, and organizational sciences. Research demonstrates a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and motivational, affective, and behavioral outcomes in organizational settings (Bandura, 1989). Further, Situmorang and Wijayanti (2018) found that women with high self-efficacy accomplished tasks. Self-efficacy beliefs are also found to positively impact work effort, persistence, job performance (Gist, 1987) and job satisfaction (Abele & Spurk, 2009). Individuals with high self-efficacy beliefs are able to navigate through difficult situations, attain intrinsic satisfaction from their jobs, successfully perform task, set more challenging goals for themselves, invest more time, and fare better in overcoming failing experiences (Heuven et al., 2006). People with high self-efficacy are more likely to make efforts to complete a task and to persist longer in those efforts compared to those with low self-efficacy (Schunk, 1990). The stronger the self-efficacy, the more intense the efforts (Stajkovich, 2003). Self-efficacy is also an important component of motivation because if it is low, an individual will not act (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994). In a similar line, Bandura (1997) suggests that people's beliefs towards their capacities to carry out their work would influence their motivation to seek or avoid certain tasks.

### ***Factors affecting self-efficacy***

Literature highlights numerous factors affecting self-efficacy. In a study by Shaukat et al. (2018), it was found that characteristics like age, academic education, and teaching experience had significant influence on self-efficacy beliefs. Additionally, other factors have been linked to self-efficacy. These factors include supportive school environment which increases self-efficacy (Lee et al., 2019) and burnout and stress which decrease self-efficacy (Zhu et al., 2006). Research also shows other factors that boost

self-efficacy such as training (Eden & Aviram, 1993); positive feedback (Beattie et al., 2015); role model and social support (Levan, 2010); positive engagement (Bakker, 2009); and high self-esteem (Afari, 2012).

### ***Job satisfaction***

Job satisfaction is defined as something that is enjoyable and pleasant which usually produces positive output (Locke, 2001); extent to which people like their jobs (Hirschfeld, 2000); enthusiasm and happiness with one's work (Osakwe, 2014); and the level of contentment a person feels regarding his or her job (Maharjan, 2019). Okoth (2003) asserts that job satisfaction is a positive state, stemming from the appraisal of one's job experiences; the totality of positive feelings and beliefs individuals have about their job. Job satisfaction relates to individual's perception and evaluation of their job affected by their own unique needs, values, and expectations (Sempane et al., 2002). According to Armstrong (2006), positive and favourable attitudes indicate job satisfaction, while negative and unfavourable attitudes signify job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction is an important characteristic the employees of an organization must possess because satisfied employees will be cooperative and motivated while the dissatisfied ones will not contribute much to the organization (Oshagbemi, 2003).

### ***Importance of job satisfaction***

Literature highlights that job satisfaction of workers is imperative for the success of the organization (Brown & Lam, 2008) because job dissatisfaction may result in brain drain, tardiness, apathy, and low job performance, which will have repercussions on the organizational effectiveness (Osakwe, 2014). A satisfied employee would have an emotional bond with the organization and take pride in their membership, which is good for the health of the organization (Shaju & Subhashini, 2017). There is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and retention of women in workplace. When employees feel that their organization is supportive and provide them a good work life balance, their job satisfaction increases, which reduces their turnover intentions (Forsyth & Polzer-Debruyne, 2007). Moreover,

Gardner and Oswald (2002) contend that job satisfaction is positively related to well-being. Job satisfaction leads to enhanced level of job performance; positive work values; high levels of employee motivation; and lower rates of absenteeism, turnover, and burnout (Ngo et al., 2009). Swamy et al. (2015) maintain that satisfied employees are a crucial asset to the organization.

### ***Factors affecting job satisfaction***

There are research studies that identify factors that affect job satisfaction. According to Rose (2003), job satisfaction is affected by the terms and conditions of the employment contract, work hours, financial rewards, work situation, work orientation, gender and job satisfaction of individual employee. George and Jones (2008) posit that the kind of work, co-workers, supervisors, and pay affect job satisfaction. According to Bavendum (2000), job satisfaction is promoted by opportunity, good leadership, work standards, fair reward, and adequate authority. Other factors include professional recognition, professional advancement, favourable working conditions, job security, interpersonal relationship, work efficiency, achievement in work and timely promotion (Osakwe, 2003; Uddin et al., 2005; You et al., 2015). Further personal interest in the work, rewards for performance, ability to work on one's initiative and high self-esteem also affect job satisfaction (Rhodes & Hammer, 2000; Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998). In a study by Saif et al. (2016), it was found that participation in decision making, available leave facilities, attitude of top management, time for family, flexible working hour, corporate culture, and managerial style affect job satisfaction. Studies also showed that increase in employees' education levels and age brought about increased job satisfaction (Meziroğlu, 2002). According to Baron and Greenberg (1990), job satisfaction is affected by self-efficacy, stress levels, seniority, and self-monitoring.

### ***Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction***

Research studies have demonstrated significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001; Luthans et al., 2006; Türkoğlu et al., 2017). Individuals possessing high self-efficacy are able to overcome

difficulties more effectively and are more likely to attain valued outcomes through persistence leading to satisfaction from their jobs (Luthans et al., 2006). According to Pinquart et al. (2003), individuals with higher levels of self-efficacy experience higher levels of job satisfaction and are less likely to become unemployed and more likely to be satisfied with their jobs. In a study by Muhammet et al. (2017), the finding revealed self-efficacy as a significant predictor of job satisfaction. High levels of self-efficacy promote people's attitudes and behaviours leading to job satisfaction (Bargsted et al., 2018). People with high self-efficacy beliefs have higher level of job satisfaction because they invest their efforts (Judge et al., 2002); possess more optimistic thoughts (Salanova et al., 2005); and are able to complete the work (Judge & Bono, 2001). Self-efficacy energizes employees, directs their efforts and promotes persistence which favour job satisfaction (Stajkovich & Luthans, 1998).

## **4. Methodology**

The details of methodology such as paradigm choice, research design, data gathering strategies and sampling strategies are explicated in the following sections.

### ***Research paradigm***

This study is guided by the pragmatic paradigm. Pragmatism is compatible with mixed method approach as its underlying assumptions provide the essence for mixing research methods (Mitchell, 2018). Additionally, Creswell (2014) posits that pragmatism allows mixing paradigms, assumptions, approaches and methods of data collection and analysis; it is all about "what works". This indicates that pragmatism leads "action-oriented" research procedures (Cameron, 2011). Thus, the unique features of the pragmatic perspective are congruent with the nature of this research.

### ***Research design***

The study used a sequential explanatory mixed methods design consisting of two distinct phases: quantitative followed by qualitative. First the quantitative data were collected and analysed followed by the collection and analysis of qualitative data. The qualitative data helped

explain the quantitative results. The two phases were connected in the intermediate stage in the study. The rationale for this approach was that the quantitative data and their subsequent analysis provided a general understanding of the research problem. The qualitative data and their analysis refined and explained the statistical results by exploring participants' views in more depth (Creswell, 2003).

### ***Sampling***

In the first phase of the study, quantitative data were collected. A total of 95 out of 402 female RUB employees from different colleges and the Office of the Vice Chancellor completed a survey questionnaire. In the second phase of the study, qualitative data were gathered from 38 participants from across the different colleges and the Office of the Vice Chancellor. A random sampling was used for both the survey questionnaire and the email interview. This sampling strategy helped eliminate sampling bias.

### ***Data collection method***

The data for the present study were gathered through survey questionnaire and email interview. These two methods are discussed in the following section.

### ***Survey questionnaire***

The first phase of data collection used survey to gather objective data on the respondents' perceptions and opinions related to the objective of the study. An anonymous online survey was constructed using Qualtrics software. Participation link was distributed through emails and various social media platforms. Online consent was obtained from the participants. The survey questionnaire consisted of demographic information and two scales (GSE and JS) to measure general self-efficacy and job satisfaction levels respectively. The 10-item psychometric scale of General Self-Efficacy (GSE) developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1981) was adapted and then administered to assess women's self-efficacy level in terms of optimistic beliefs to cope with variety of difficult demands in life. Four items related to the sources of self-efficacy were added to the list. The original GSE scale has a 4-point scale response format (1- not

at all true, 2- hardly true, 3- moderately true, 4-exactly true). The present study modified the response to a 6-point scale to (1- strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-somewhat disagree, 4-somewhat agree, 5-agree, 6-strongly agree). The creators of the scale found Cronbach's alpha ranged from .76 to .90 in samples from 23 nations. This is consistent with the results of reliability test conducted for the present study that yielded Cronbach's alpha of .87. A 17-item Job Satisfaction (JS) scale was adapted from Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire to assess the employee's satisfaction with his or her job. The original scale is tri-dimensional including; Intrinsic Satisfaction, Extrinsic Satisfaction, and General Satisfaction scale. Distinctions between these subscales were not emphasised considering the scope of the study. Three items on the scale were removed after pilot testing to improve relevancy of items in the context of the current study. The response scale was changed from 5 points (1-very dissatisfied, 2-dissatisfied, 3-neither, 4-satisfied, 5- very satisfied) to (1-Very dissatisfied, 2- dissatisfied, 3-somewhat dissatisfied, 4-somewhat satisfied, 5-satisfied, 6-very satisfied). Coefficient alpha for Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire was found stable and reliable in many previous researches (Martins & Proença, 2012). JS scale generated an excellent Cronbach's Alpha of .91 for the present study.

### ***Email interview***

Face to face interview could not be conducted owing to travel restrictions posed by Covid-19 Pandemic. The qualitative data, therefore, were gathered using email interview. The email interview was conducted with 38 female participants. The interview questions (17 questions), information sheet and the consent letter were emailed to the participants. They were returned after completion. The email interview empowered the participants to tell their stories and they also had the opportunity to reflect and edit their responses (Beck, 2005).

### ***Pilot testing***

Both the survey questionnaire and the interview questions were pilot tested prior to their implementation. The pilot test enabled to establish the effectiveness of the instruments

in terms of both the content and process of administration. The participants for the pilot test comprised of some women employees of RUB. Verbal consent was sought from the participants before the pilot test. The purpose of the pilot test was explained to the participants and they were requested to provide suggestions and comments for improvement.

### ***Ethical consideration***

Prior to the commencement of data collection for the study, ethical approval was sought and obtained from the Office of the Dean of Research and Industrial Linkages, Samtse College of Education. Informed consent was obtained from the participants involved in the study. Participation in the research was voluntary and participants were assured that they were free to withdraw from participating at any time. Anonymity of informants was ensured in the transcript files as well as in the data segments quoted in this research report. Pseudonyms were used to maintain confidentiality. All survey and interview data gathered from the participants- both in print and electronic forms- are stored in a secured location.

### ***Data analysis***

The survey data were entered in Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 22) for analysis. Prior to the analysis, data screening, missing values analysis, reversing and recoding was carried out for one negative item. As the missing values were less than 5%, data have been trimmed and winsorised for the analysis. The data was then analysed using descriptive statistics through the measure of mean. Inferential statistics was also used to analyse the linear relationship between Self- efficacy and Job Satisfaction using Pearson correlation coefficient. The mean was used to analyze participants' ratings. Participants' ratings on the frequency were grouped into six distinct levels employing Best and Kahn's criteria (1988). Best and Kahn (1998) suggest that each grouping needs to maintain an interval width of 1.0. For clarity, the mean scores of the frequency were interpreted in terms of the ranking as reflected in Table 1. The ranking of the mean range is classified according to the range of mean scores

that indicate the frequency of occurrence.

**Table 1: Likert scale converted to numerical mean.**

Sl. No	Mean Range	Rank
1	0.01-1.00	Strongly disagree
2	1.01-2.00	Disagree
3	2.01-3.00	Somewhat disagree
4	3.01-4.00	Somewhat agree
5	4.01-5.00	Agree
6	5.01-6.00	Strongly agree

The mean of the responses is converted to three different levels: low, moderate, and high. The mean range has been calculated by dividing range of the Likert scale value by required number of levels. An interval of 1.66 has been maintained in each grouping as reflected in Table 2. The three distinct levels are classified according to the range of the mean scores.

**Table 2: Mean of responses converted to levels.**

Sl.No.	Mean Range	Level
1.	1.00 - 2.66	Low
2.	2.67 - 4.33	Moderate
3.	4.34 - 6	High

The analysis of the qualitative data involved studying the email transcripts and analysing around the three survey themes: Self-efficacy; Job satisfaction; and Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction. The data were also arranged around the two emergent themes: factors affecting self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

## **5. Results**

This section presents the results generated from the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data. The results of the survey and the interview are coalesced and discussed under each of the three different themes. A discussion is also provided of the two emergent themes: factors affecting self-efficacy and job satisfaction.

**Table 3: Mean of participants' responses on self-efficacy**

Sl.No.	Item	Mean	SD	Scale
SE1	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	5.11	.88	Strongly Agree
SE2	If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	4.19	1.01	Agree
SE3	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	4.49	.97	Agree
SE4	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	4.46	.84	Agree
SE5	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	4.34	.78	Agree
SE6	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	5.08	.71	Strongly Agree
SE7	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	4.45	1.01	Agree
SE8	When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	4.49	.73	Agree
SE9	If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	4.56	.75	Agree
SE10	I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	4.61	.73	Agree
SE11	I have developed many of my skills through hands-on experience.	4.98	.79	Agree
SE12	Watching others make mistake has taught me how to be more effective while doing things.	4.97	.84	Agree
SE13	When people I respect tell me I will do well at doing a task, I believe them.	4.93	.79	Agree
SE14	The idea of solving difficult problems makes me nervous.	3.04	1.11	Somewhat Agree
	<b>Average</b>	<b>4.62</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>Agree</b>

### *Self-efficacy*

As shown in Table 3, the average mean and standard deviation (mean=4.62 and SD=.50) of 14 items indicate that all the respondents (n=95) agree that they are self-efficacious. Further, the average mean indicates that respondents have a high level of self-efficacy as shown in Table 2. In the interview, 37 out of 38 participants stated that they have a high self-efficacy. This claim is exemplified in the quote by R37: "I am very self-efficacious". Participants highlighted that they have high level of self-efficacy because they believe in their own abilities (R26), confidence (R7), aptitude (R13), efficiency (R2), capabilities (R36), skills (R23) and they possess enthusiasm

and motivation (R36). Participants have contended that their self-efficaciousness has enabled them to hit all deadlines (R37); deal with challenges and make good decisions (R25); produce good results (R7); earn respect from colleagues and students (R3); and solve problems, remain calm, and deal with unforeseen circumstances (R2). Further, they have also expressed that they are independent (R25); good at time management, organizing and prioritizing work (R26); and can efficiently deal with situation and emergencies and handle issues and everyday tasks (R28). Participant R2 stated that the key to self-efficacy is constant effort.

### *Job satisfaction*

**Table 4: Mean of participants' responses on job satisfaction**

Sl.No.	Item	Mean	SD	Scale
JS1	Being able to keep busy all the time.	4.99	.82	Satisfied
JS2	The chance to work alone on the job.	4.82	.90	Satisfied
JS3	The chance to do different things from time to time.	4.51	1.16	Satisfied

Sl.No.	Item	Mean	SD	Scale
JS4	The way my boss handles his or her work.	4.59	1.25	Satisfied
JS5	The competence of my supervisor in decision making.	4.42	1.11	Satisfied
JS6	Being able to do things that don't go against my conscience.	4.54	1.02	Satisfied
JS7	The chance to tell people what I do.	4.59	.83	Satisfied
JS8	The chance to do something that make use of my abilities.	4.60	.98	Satisfied
JS9	The way workplace polices are put in practice.	4.21	1.13	Satisfied
JS10	My pay and the amount of work I do.	4.94	1.0	Satisfied
JS11	The chances for advancement on this job.	4.24	1.30	Satisfied
JS12	The freedom to use my own judgement.	4.40	1.11	Satisfied
JS13	The chance to try my own methods of doing the job.	4.64	.92	Satisfied
JS14	The working conditions.	4.58	1.02	Satisfied
JS15	The relationship with my co-workers.	4.95	.83	Satisfied
JS16	The praise I get for doing a good job.	4.31	1.11	Satisfied
JS17	The feeling of accomplishment I get from doing the job.	4.87	.87	Satisfied
	<b>Average</b>	<b>4.60</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>Satisfied</b>

As depicted in Table 4, the average mean and standard deviation (mean= 4 .60 and SD= .68) for the 17 items on job satisfaction show that the respondents (n=95) are satisfied with their job. The average mean also indicates that respondents have a high level of job satisfaction as shown in Table 2. In the interview, 36 out of 38 participants expressed that they are very satisfied with their job. For instance, R37 said: "I am very satisfied with my job. All the responsibilities I shoulder are within my area and every task I carry out is a labour of love." Participants expressed that they are satisfied with their job since they able to: do justice to their job (R2); enjoy doing their job (R7, R16); achieve what one desires (R13); provide service and contribute to the organization (R9); and make progress in the job (R19). Participants have highlighted that the opportunity to upgrade their knowledge and skills (R11, R26), being able to draw a decent salary (R33, R22), being appreciated and recognized for their efforts (R27), working in a conducive environment (R1) and flexibility to do things (R5) have contributed to their job satisfaction. All these qualities have provided them with a sense of contentment and accomplishment (R3, R4); intense positive

feelings (R6); and a sense of attainment (R5, R14).

### *Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction*

**Table 5: Descriptive statistics**

	Mean	SD	N
Self-Efficacy	4.62	.50	95
Job Satisfaction	4.60	.68	95

### *Correlations*

		Self-Efficacy	Job satisfaction
Self-Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	1	.45**
	Sig.(2 tailed)		.000
	N	95	95
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.45**	1
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	
	N	95	95

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



A bivariate Pearson's correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction as shown in Table 5. A significant positive (moderate) correlation was found between self-efficacy and job satisfaction with  $r(93) = .45, p < .001$ , with 20.25 % ( $r^2$ ) of the variance in job satisfaction explained by self-efficacy. The relation signifies that high self-efficacy leads to high job satisfaction. In the interview, 35 participants concurred that there is a relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. This is demonstrated in the following quote by R31: "Self-efficacy affects job satisfaction. High level of self-efficacy contributes positively to job satisfaction." This idea is expanded by R28 who stated, "A self-efficacious person accomplishes any work with more confidence and positivity which in turn engenders satisfaction in both work and life." High self-efficacy according to the participants resulted in: better job performance (R29); giving 100% to their job (R22); confidence to execute the job well (R7); timely accomplishment of work (R28); overcoming challenges at the workplace (R26); and achieving the desired outcome (R13). Further participants also posited that high self-efficacy instils a love for the job and enhances one's capacity (R26); enables to do justice to one's job (R22); boosts motivation to perform the job well (R32); and inculcates interest in the job (R22), which are antecedents to job satisfaction. On the other hand, three participants postulated that self-efficacy does not affect job satisfaction. This is evident in the quote by R38: "Self-efficacy does not affect job satisfaction. You could have higher level of self-efficacy but low job satisfaction."

#### **Factors affecting self-efficacy**

The qualitative data showed that participants have highlighted a number of factors that promote as well as weaken their self-efficacy. These factors relate to the four sources of efficacy propounded by Bandura (1997) which are discussed below.

**Mastery experiences:** Participants have expressed that their previous experience of accomplishment, satisfaction, success, positivity and confidence in performing tasks positively affect their self-efficacy (R8, R10). According

to the participants, these positive experiences are sourced from hard work, perseverance, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, clear goals, good time management skills, strong work ethics, high self-esteem (R1), self-motivation (R2), good education and knowledge (R3), learning from mistakes (R12), and taking challenges (R14). Additional sources include determination and performance (R18), good organizational skills (R20), being able to prioritize task (R25), conducive working environment (R1), opportunities for professional growth (R4), availability and accessibility of required resources (R6), and manageable workload (R15). Conversely participants have expressed that failure (R3, R8), negativity (R8), lack of experience (R9), and focusing on personal failings and negative outcomes (R13) impede their self-efficacy.

**Social modelling:** Participants have raised that their self-efficacy is promoted by drawing confidence by observing others successfully perform tasks (R26), observing others accomplish tasks (R36) and inspirational and hardworking people around (R2). They have expressed that lack of these factors deteriorate their self-efficacy (R7, R9).

**Social persuasion:** It was expressed by the participants that their self-efficacy is enhanced when the organization believes in their capabilities and provides constructive feedback (R23), when they receive support and appreciation from family, peer and leaders (R2, R5), and when family, friends and leaders offer compliments and encouragement (R4). All these factors according to the participants enable them to take challenges (R14), and they are determined to perform and succeed (R18, R19). On the other hand, participants highlighted that getting judged (R18), lack of recognition, motivation and acknowledgment (R28), lack of appreciation, cooperation and support from colleagues and leaders (R3, R14), discrimination in the work environment (R22), underestimation of competencies by colleagues and leaders (R4), challenging behaviour of colleagues (R30), and prejudice (R25) diminish their self-efficacy.

**Psychological responses:** Participants have

expressed that strong emotional stability and physical state boost their self-efficacy (R5, R25), however, anxiety and laziness (TS29) decrease their self-efficacy.

### **Factors affecting job satisfaction**

Participants have highlighted factors that positively as well as negatively affected their job satisfaction. These factors are discussed as intrapersonal, interpersonal and organizational factors.

**Intrapersonal factors:** Participants have expressed that their job satisfaction is enhanced by personal satisfaction (R5), experiences (R8), positive thinking (R10), personal interest and ability to perform the given task (R12, R13), commitment, aptitude, positive attitude (R13), self-development (R29), ability and potential to make a difference in the community (R32, R34, R36), time management, being creative (R39), and self-motivation (R37). Further participants R2 and R19 stated that the ability to overcome new challenges also fueled their job satisfaction. However, it was pointed out by the participants that lack of hard work/commitment (R5), lack of skills and knowledge and (R12), and lack of interest, low self-esteem (R13) weaken their job satisfaction.

**Interpersonal factors:** The interpersonal factors that the participants identified as bolstering their job satisfaction include supportive colleagues (R4, R3), good leadership (R3), and cooperative and supportive students and leaders, fair work load (R16). Conversely, it was stated by the participants that lack of support/appreciation from leaders and colleagues (R3, R10), poor leadership (R4, R7), and negative and malicious criticism (R9, R11) negatively affect their job satisfaction.

**Organizational factors:** According to the participants, their job satisfaction is facilitated by conducive working environment (R1, R2), good salary (R2), recognition of one's work (R1, R5), opportunity for training (R1, R4) fairness (R7, R14), timely promotion (R1), availability and accessibility of required resources (R6, R28), job security (R17), well defined job (R19), and effective feedback system for improvement (R28). Conversely job satisfaction is hindered

by unfavorable working environment (R1, R2), poor infrastructure (R4), lack of opportunity for professional growth (R4, R9), lack of support and competitive environment system (R6, R14), lack of resources (R6, R23) and excessive work load (R7, R12). Additional factors include lack of transparency and incentives (R11, R12), lack of fair policies and promotion (R17), lack of practice to take feedback from employees (R29), monotonous work routine (R29, R36) and lengthy administrative procedures (R31).

## **6. Discussion and Implications**

This section presents an interpretation and implications of the major findings from both the quantitative and qualitative perspectives. The findings are discussed in light of literature.

### **Self-efficacy**

One of the findings of the study is that the participants possess a high level of self-efficacy. They have identified a number of indicators of their high self-efficacy such as believe in their own abilities (R26), confidence (R7), aptitude (R13), efficiency (R2), capabilities (R36), skills (R23) enthusiasm and motivation (R36). Further participants have indicated that their self-efficacious has enabled them to confidently deal with challenges and barriers and successfully complete tasks. Congruent with this finding, literature shows that self-efficacy is individual's belief in his or her capacity to muster the cognitive, motivational, and behavioural resources required to perform in a given situation (Bandura, 1997). Further in a study by Situmorang and Wijayanti (2018), it was found that women with high self-efficacy were motivated and they accomplished tasks. Although the finding shows that participants are self-efficacious, it is imperative to put in place enabling conditions to uphold their self-efficacy. If their self-efficacy weakens, it will have detrimental effect on the overall health of the organization. Employees with low self-efficacy beliefs avoid difficult tasks, reduce the efforts that they show in case of encountering a challenge and they give up easily (Bandura, 1994).

### **Job satisfaction**

The finding on job satisfaction shows that

participants have a high level of job satisfaction. They have identified the yard stick of job satisfaction as enjoying their job (R7, R16), being able to achieve one's desire (R13) and making progress in the job (R19). Further participants have also mentioned that job satisfaction provides them with a sense of contentment and accomplishment (R3, R4); intense positive feelings (R6); and a sense of attainment (R5, R14). This finding is corroborated by literature which indicates that job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs (Hirschfeld 2000); enthusiasm and happiness with one's work (Osakwe, 2014); and the level of contentment a person feels regarding his or her job (Maharjan, 2019). The implication of this finding is that although participants are satisfied with their job, relevant stakeholders need to explore for strategies and implement them to sustain and promote the employees' job satisfaction. In the absence of such a measure, there is a high likelihood of deterioration in the job satisfaction level of the employees. Job satisfaction of workers is imperative for the success of the organization (Brown & Lam, 2008) because job dissatisfaction will have consequences on the organizational effectiveness (Osakwe, 2014).

#### **Self-efficacy and Job satisfaction**

The finding on self-efficacy and job satisfaction indicated a positive correlation. Participants contended that high self-efficacy result in: better job performance (R29); confidence to execute the job well (R7); timely accomplishment of work (R28); overcoming the challenges at the workplace (R26); and love for the job and enhances one's capacity (R26) which are antecedents to job satisfaction. This finding is supported by research studies that have demonstrated significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Judge et al, 2001; Luthans et al., 2006; Türkoğlu et al., 2017). Individuals possessing high self-efficacy are able to tackle difficulties more effectively and are more likely to attain valued outcomes through persistence leading to satisfaction from their jobs (Luthans et al., 2006). People with higher professional self-efficacy beliefs have more optimistic thoughts that leads to their

commitment and job satisfaction (Salanova et al., 2005). Thus, those individuals with higher general self-efficacy are bound to be satisfied with their jobs. This finding implies that since self-efficacy impacts job satisfaction, organization needs to maintain and keep their employees' self-efficacy level always high. A low self-efficacy of the employees will adversely affect their job satisfaction which will have repercussions on the overall growth and progress of the organization.

#### **Factors affecting self-efficacy**

The result of this research shows that participants' self-efficacy is affected by factors from four sources of mastery experience, social modelling, social persuasion, and psychological responses.

Mastery experience consists of previous experience of accomplishment, satisfaction, success and positivity (R8, R10). For social modelling, participants have identified observing others accomplish tasks (R36). The factor for social persuasion comprises constructive feedback (R23) and support and appreciation from family, peer and leaders (R2). Similarly, for psychological responses, it is strong emotional stability and physical state (R5, R25). Participants have stated that the absence of all these enablers impede their self-efficacy. Consistent with this finding, Bandura (1997) has identified mastery experience, social modeling, social persuasion and psychological responses as sources of an individual's self-efficacy. Literature also shows that self-efficacy is increased by supportive school environment (Lee et al., 2019), positive feedback (Beattie et al., 2015), social support (Levan, 2010) but decreased by burnout and stress (Zhu et al., 2006). This finding points that increasing attention must be paid to enhance the enablers of self-efficacy and invest time, resources and effort to overcome its inhibitors. If these inhibitors outdo the enablers, both the self-efficacy of the workers and the organization will be at stake.

#### **Factors affecting job satisfaction**

One of the findings of the study is that job satisfaction is affected by factors at the individual, interpersonal and organizational level. Intrapersonal factors include commitment,

aptitude, being positive (R13). Similarly, interpersonal factor is good leadership (R3) and the organizational factors are conducive working environment (R1, R2) and recognition of one's work (R1, R5). It was also found that a low level of these factors deteriorates self-efficacy. This finding is consistent with literature which indicates that the kind of work, co-workers, supervisors and pay affect job satisfaction (Jones, 2008). Further literature also highlights that job satisfaction is promoted by good leadership (Bavendum, 2000), and professional recognition, good salary, interpersonal relations, job security, professional advancement, favourable working conditions, supervision, achievement in work and promotion (Osakwe, 2003). This finding suggests that to promote job satisfaction of the workers, efforts must be made to augment the factors that boost job satisfaction and eliminate the factors that inhibit it. A satisfied employee would take ownership of the organization and would be an asset in propelling the organization to greater heights. Additionally, job satisfaction is one of the biggest factors that influence the

performance and retention of women in the workplace (Yousaf et al., 2014).

## 7. Conclusion

This study was undertaken to explore the participants' levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction and the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction. The conclusions of this research are 1) the participants have a high level of self-efficacy; 2) their level of job satisfaction is high; and 3) self-efficacy has a positive effect on job satisfaction. The finding also revealed four different sources of self-efficacy such as mastery, social modelling, social persuasion, and psychological responses. However, the present study did not study the most effective source of self-efficacy. Hence future research can explore this topic. The empirical results indicate that job satisfaction is affected by intrapersonal, interpersonal and organizational factors. Future research to gauge the most sustainable source of job satisfaction is recommended.

## References

- Abele, A. E., & Spurk, D. (2009). The longitudinal impact of self-efficacy and career goals on objective and subjective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 74(1), 53–62.
- Afari, E. (2012). Global self-esteem and self-efficacy correlates: Relation of academic achievement and self-esteem among Emirati students. *International Education Studies*, 5(2), 49-57.
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice* (10th ed.). Kogan Page.
- Bakker, A. J. (2009). *Building engagement in the workplace*. Erasmus University Rotterdam. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.395.2276&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122–147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122>
- Bandura, A. (1989). A social cognitive theory of action. In J. P. Forgas, & M. J. Innes (Eds.), *Recent advances in social psychology: An international perspective* (pp. 127-138). Elsevier.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Regulative function of perceived self-efficacy. In M.G. Rumsey, C.B. Walker, & J.H. Harris (Eds.), *Personal selection and classification* (pp. 261-271). Erlbaum.
- Bargsted, M., Ramírez-Vielma, R., & Yeves, J. (2019). Professional self-efficacy and job satisfaction: The mediator role of work design. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(3), 157-163.
- Baron, R.A., & Greenberg, J. (1990). *Behavior in organization: Understanding and managing the human side of work* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- Bavendum, J. (2000). *Managing job satisfaction*. New York Research Inc.
- Beattie, S., Woodman, T., Fakehy, M., & Dempsey, C. (2015). *The role of performance feedback on the self-efficacy - performance relationship*. American Psychological Association. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/spy-spy0000051.pdf> <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/features/spy-spy0000051.pdf>
- Beck, C.T. (2005). Benefits of participating in internet interviews: Women helping women. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(3), 411-422.
- Begley, T. M., & Czajka, J. M. (1999). Job satisfaction: Organizational-commitment; Labor- turnover; employees health and hygiene; job-stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 552-556.
- Best, J., & J. Kahn. (1998). *Research in education* (8th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

- Boyd, N.G., & Vozikis, G.S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 63-77.
- Brown, S. P., & Lam, S. K. (2008). A meta-analysis of relationships linking employee satisfaction to customer responses. *Journal of Retailing*, 84 (3), 243-255.
- Cameron, R. (2011). Mixed methods research: The five Ps framework. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 9 (2), 96-108.
- Clark, A. (2001). What really matters in a job? *Labour Economics*, 8(2), 223-242.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. Sage Publication.
- Eden, D., & Avirma, A. (1993). Self-efficacy training to speed reemployment: Helping people help themselves. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 352-360.
- Forsyth, S., & Polzer-Debruyne, A. (2007). The organisational pay-offs for perceived work-life balance support. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 45(1), 113-123.
- Gardner, J., & Oswald, A. J. (2006). *Money and Mental Wellbeing: A Longitudinal Study of Medium-Sized Lottery Wins*, IZA Discussion Papers 2233, Institute of Labour Economics (IZA).
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2008). *Understanding and managing organizational behaviour* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Prentice Hall.
- Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 18, 326-339.
- Hirschfeld, R. R. (2000). Does revising the intrinsic and extrinsic subscales of the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire short form makes a difference? *Educational Psychological Measures*, 60(2), 255-270.
- Jerusalem, M., & Schwarzer, R. (1981). Fragebogen zur Erfassung von "Selbstwirksamkeit. In Schwarzer, R. (Ed.), *Skalen zur Befindlichkeit und Persoenlichkeit* (Forschungsbericht No. 5). Institut fuer Psychologie, Freie Universitaet.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 374-407.
- Lee, H.J., Kim, B., & Choi, J. (2019). How does learner-centered education affect teacher self-efficacy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 45-57.
- Levan, A. J. (2010). *If you think you can't think again: The sway of self-efficacy*.  
<https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/flourish/201002/if-you-think-you-can-t-think-again-the-sway-self-efficacy>
- Locke, E. (2001). Motivation by goal setting. *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour*, 2, 43-54.
- Luthans, F., Zhu, W., & Avolio, J. B. (2006). The impact of efficacy on work attitudes across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 41(2), 121-132.
- Maharjan, R. (2019). Job satisfaction, gender and salary: A study on correlation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 5(1), 59-69.
- Martins, H., & Proença, M. T. (2012). Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire: psychometric properties and validation in a population of Portuguese hospital workers. *Conferência – Investigação E Intervenção Em Recursos Humanos*, (3).
- Meziroğlu, M. (2005). *Measurement of primary school teachers and junior high school teachers' job satisfaction* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Zonguldak Karaelmas University, Institute of Social Sciences, Zonguldak.
- Mitchell, A. (2018). A review of the mixed methods, pragmatism and abduction techniques. *The Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 16, 103-116.
- Muhammet, E. T., Ramazan, C., & Hanifi, P. (2017). Examining relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 765-772.
- Ngo, H. Y., Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2009). Family friendly work practices, organizational climate, and firm performance: A study of multinational corporations in Hong Kong. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30 (5), 665-680.
- Okoth, L. A. (2003). *A survey of the factors that determine the level of job satisfaction among teachers in top ranking private schools in Nairobi* (Unpublished MBA Project). University of Nairobi.
- Osakwe, N. R. (2014). Factors affecting motivation and job satisfaction of academic staff of universities in South-South Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria. *International Education Studies*, 7(7), 43-51.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: Empirical evidence from UK Universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), 1210-1232.
- Rhodes, L.D., & Hammer, E. (2000). The Relation between job satisfaction and personality similarity in supervisors and subordinates. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 5, 56-59.
- Rose, M. (2003). Good deal, bad deal? Job satisfaction in occupations. *Work Employment & Society*, 17(3), 503-530.
- Salanova, M., Grau, R. M., & Martínez, I. M. (2005). Demandas laborales conductas de afrontamiento: el rol modulador de la autoeficacia profesional. *Psicothema*, 17, 390-395.
- Shaju, M., & Subhashini. D. (2016). A study on the impact of job satisfaction on job performance of employees working in automobile industry, Punjab, India. *Journal of Management Research*, 9(1), 117-130.

- Sempene, M., Rieger, H., & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28, 23-30.
- Schunk, D. H. (1990). Goal setting and self-efficacy during self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 25, 71-86.
- Shaukat, S., Vishnumolakala, V. R., & Al Bustami, G. (2019). The impact of teachers' characteristics on their self-efficacy and job satisfaction: A perspective from teachers engaging students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 19(1), 68-76.
- Situmorang, N. Z., & Wijayanti, F. (2018). *The effect of self-efficacy and gender on the work-family balance of employees in Yogyakarta*. Proceedings of the 3rd ASEAN Conference on Psychology, Counselling, and Humanities (ACPCH 2017).
- Stajkovich, A., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-26.
- Stajkovich, D. A. (2003) Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Implications for motivation theory and practice. In R. M. Steers, L.W. Porter, & G.A. Bigley (Eds.), *Motivation and leadership at work* (8th ed.).
- Swamy, D. R., Nanjundes, T. S., & Rashmi, S. (2015). Quality of work Life: Scale development and validation. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 8(2), 281-300.
- Türkoğlu, M. E., Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2017). Examining relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 5(5), 765-772.
- You, S., Kim, Y. A., & Lim, A.S. (2015). Job satisfaction among secondary teachers in Korea: Effects of teachers' sense of efficacy and school culture. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 45(2), 284-297.
- Saif, M., Uddin, M., Haque, A., Rahma, M., & Mamum, M. (2016). Factors affecting job satisfaction of female employees of private commercial banks in Bangladesh: An empirical investigation. *Human Resource Management Research*, 6(3), 65-72.
- Yousaf, S., Humayon, A. A., Rasheed, I. M., Ahmed, M.H., & Danish, Q. R. (2014). Factors affecting female employees in an organization. *Journal of Basic Applied and Science Research*, (4)7, 2-9.
- Zhu, M., Liu, Q., Fu, Y., Yang, T., Zhang, X., & Shi, J. (2018). The relationship between teacher self-concept, teacher efficacy and burnout. *Teachers and Teaching*, 24(7), 788-801.