

# A Study on the Influence of Self-Esteem and Self-Efficacy on Job Satisfaction among Working People

E. Dharshana Priya<sup>1</sup>, Veerasamy Sandhiya<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Psychology, Sree Saraswathi Thayagaraja College, Pollachi

## Abstract

This study examined the levels and interrelationships of job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy among working people. In today's competitive work environment, employees face increasing demands and pressures. Understanding the psychological factors influencing their well-being and performance is essential. A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive design was adopted with a sample of 203 working adults aged 20 to 45 years selected using convenient sampling. Three standardized instruments were used: the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES), the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE), and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ Short Form). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent samples t-test, one-way ANOVA, and Pearson correlation. Findings revealed that self-efficacy had a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction ( $r = .187, p < .01$ ), while self-esteem showed a significant negative relationship ( $r = -.379, p < .01$ ). Significant demographic differences were found in self-esteem, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction based on gender, marital status, sector of work, occupational type, educational qualification, and residence. The study highlights the importance of fostering self-efficacy in organizational settings to enhance employee well-being and satisfaction.

**Keywords:** Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Working People, Psychological Well-Being

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background of the Study

In today's competitive and rapidly changing work environment, employees face increasing demands, expectations, and pressures. Organizations are not only concerned with productivity and performance but also with the well-being and psychological state of their employees. Among the various factors influencing employee performance, job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy play a significant role. Although each of these factors has been studied individually, there is a growing need to understand how they are interrelated among working people. The interaction between these psychological factors can significantly influence employee behavior, productivity, and overall organizational effectiveness.

Therefore, this study aims to examine the levels of job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy among working people and to explore the relationship between these variables. Understanding these relationships can help organizations develop better strategies to improve employee well-being, motivation, and performance. The population consists of working people from various sectors such as private companies, government organizations, educational institutions, and other workplaces.

Job satisfaction is the level of contentment individuals feel about their work, influenced by factors like salary, work environment, job security, and relationships at the workplace. Self-esteem reflects a person's sense of self-worth, and self-efficacy refers to the belief in one's ability to achieve goals. Employees with high self-esteem and self-efficacy tend to be more confident, motivated, and better able to handle challenges, leading to improved job satisfaction and performance.

## **1.2 Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem refers to a person's overall sense of self-worth or personal value. It reflects how individuals evaluate themselves and their abilities. According to Morris Rosenberg (1965), self-esteem is a positive or negative attitude toward oneself. Self-esteem influences how people think, feel, and behave in different situations. People with high self-esteem tend to have a positive view of themselves, believe in their abilities, and feel capable of achieving their goals. In contrast, individuals with low self-esteem may doubt their abilities, feel insecure, and have a negative perception of themselves.

Self-esteem develops through life experiences such as family support, social interactions, achievements, and feedback from others. Positive experiences and encouragement can strengthen a person's self-esteem, while repeated criticism or failure may weaken it.

### **1.2.1 High Self-Esteem**

High self-esteem means that a person has a positive view of themselves and believes in their abilities and strengths. People with high self-esteem generally feel confident, capable, and worthy of respect. They are more likely to accept challenges, express their opinions, and handle criticism in a healthy way. In the workplace, employees with high self-esteem tend to be more motivated, productive, and willing to take responsibility.

### **1.2.2 Low Self-Esteem**

Low self-esteem refers to a negative perception of oneself, where individuals doubt their abilities and feel less confident about their value. People with low self-esteem may frequently criticize themselves, fear failure, and avoid challenges. In work settings, low self-esteem can lead to poor performance, lack of motivation, and difficulty expressing ideas or making decisions.

### **1.2.3 Theories of Self-Esteem**

1. William James Theory: Self-esteem depends on the relationship between successes and expectations.  $\text{Self-Esteem} = \text{Success} / \text{Pretensions}$ . People can improve self-esteem either by increasing achievements or by adjusting expectations realistically.
2. Sociometer Theory (Leary): Self-esteem acts as a psychological meter measuring how accepted or rejected a person feels in social relationships. When people feel accepted, self-esteem increases; when rejected, it decreases.
3. Terror Management Theory (Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski): Self-esteem helps people cope with the fear of death and existential anxiety by living according to cultural values and beliefs.
4. Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan): Self-esteem develops when three basic psychological needs are satisfied: competence, autonomy, and relatedness.
5. Reflected Appraisal Theory: A person's self-esteem develops based on how they believe others perceive and evaluate them. Positive feedback leads to higher self-esteem, while negative criticism may lower it.

### 1.3 Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a psychological concept referring to a person's belief in their ability to successfully perform tasks and achieve specific goals. The concept was introduced by Albert Bandura as part of Social Cognitive Theory. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy influences how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and behave when facing different situations.

People with high self-efficacy tend to believe that they can successfully handle tasks and overcome obstacles. They are more confident, persistent, and motivated to achieve their goals. On the other hand, individuals with low self-efficacy often doubt their abilities, may avoid difficult situations, and have a higher likelihood of giving up when challenges arise.

#### 1.3.1 Types of Self-Efficacy

1. General Self-Efficacy: Overall belief in one's ability to handle different situations and challenges in life.
2. Task-Specific Self-Efficacy: Belief in one's ability to successfully perform a particular task or skill.
3. Social Self-Efficacy: Confidence in one's ability to interact effectively with others in social situations.
4. Academic Self-Efficacy: A student's belief in their ability to perform well in academic tasks.
5. Emotional Self-Efficacy: Belief in one's ability to manage and control emotions effectively.

#### 1.3.2 Theories of Self-Efficacy

1. Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura): Behaviour is influenced by the interaction between personal factors, behaviour, and the environment. High self-efficacy leads to greater effort and persistence.
2. Self-Regulation Theory: Self-efficacy plays a key role in helping individuals plan, monitor, and regulate their actions to achieve personal goals.
3. Expectancy Theory: People are more motivated when they believe their effort will lead to successful outcomes. Self-efficacy is central to this belief.
4. Attribution Theory: Individuals with high self-efficacy attribute success to their abilities and efforts, whereas those with low self-efficacy may blame failure on external factors.

### 1.4 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to the level of contentment, happiness, and positive feelings that an employee has toward their job. According to Edwin A. Locke (1976), job satisfaction can be defined as a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences.

Job satisfaction is influenced by several factors such as working conditions, salary and benefits, recognition, promotion opportunities, job security, work-life balance, and relationships with supervisors and coworkers. Low job satisfaction may lead to stress, lack of motivation, poor performance, absenteeism, and higher turnover.

#### 1.4.1 Theories of Job Satisfaction

1. Two-Factor Theory (Herzberg): Motivator factors (achievement, recognition, responsibility) lead to satisfaction, while hygiene factors (salary, supervision, job security) prevent dissatisfaction.
2. Hierarchy of Needs Theory (Maslow): Job satisfaction increases when a job helps employees fulfill physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization needs.
3. Equity Theory (Adams): Employees evaluate satisfaction by comparing their efforts and rewards with those of other employees. Unfair treatment leads to dissatisfaction.
4. Expectancy Theory (Vroom): Employees are motivated when they believe effort leads to good performance and performance results in rewards.

5. Job Characteristics Theory (Hackman & Oldham): Job satisfaction depends on five core characteristics: skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback.

## 2. Review of Literature

**Ghaleh et al. (2024)** investigated the relationship between self-efficacy, self-esteem, and job satisfaction among 234 nurses in Iran. Using the General Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, Coppersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, and Minnesota Job Satisfaction Questionnaire, findings indicated that self-efficacy and self-esteem were significantly positively correlated with job satisfaction. The cross-sectional design limits causal conclusions.

**de Oliveira et al. (2016)** examined the protective effect of job satisfaction on self-esteem and well-being among 971 Portuguese-speaking adults. Results indicated significant positive relationships between job satisfaction and self-esteem, health, happiness, and subjective well-being, suggesting that job satisfaction plays a protective role in enhancing employees' emotional and mental health.

**Alavi & Askaripur et al. (2003)** explored the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction among organizational personnel in government organizations. Findings showed that employees with higher self-esteem had significantly greater job satisfaction, supporting a positive and meaningful link between self-evaluation and workplace satisfaction.

**Rahman & Akther et al. (2024)** examined self-esteem and job satisfaction among 120 teachers in Bangladesh. Government teachers demonstrated significantly higher self-esteem than non-government teachers, and college teachers showed greater job satisfaction than school teachers. Purposive sampling limits generalizability.

**Khot and Dwivedi et al. (2022)** compared self-esteem and self-efficacy between 110 employed and 110 unemployed women aged 25 to 50 years. Employed women had significantly higher self-esteem, but no significant difference in self-efficacy was found between groups.

**Yeptho & Yadav et al. (2025)** examined the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among 150 secondary teachers in Nagaland, India. A strong positive correlation was found ( $r = 0.63$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), showing that higher self-efficacy was associated with greater job satisfaction.

**Judge & Durham et al. (1997)** conducted a meta-analysis synthesizing 274 correlations from multiple studies. Self-esteem and generalised self-efficacy were positively correlated with job satisfaction, suggesting self-efficacy may be a stronger predictor of job satisfaction than self-esteem.

**Tufail & Rasool et al. (2024)** examined self-efficacy and job satisfaction among 350 employees in Multan, Pakistan. Significant positive correlations were found between self-efficacy, locus of control, emotional stability, and job satisfaction.

**Gunawan et al. (2017)** examined the relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among 158 employees in Indonesian government organizations using path analysis. A significant positive relationship was found, and the study concluded that enhancing self-efficacy through training could improve satisfaction.

**Ahmeti et al. (2023)** investigated the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction among 150 academic staff in Kosovo and North Macedonia. High self-esteem was positively correlated with greater job satisfaction, particularly with coworkers, nature of work, and salary.

**Bilal et al. (2023)** studied job satisfaction among 100 primary school teachers in Pakistan. Overall satisfaction was moderately high, with highest satisfaction for the job itself and lowest for salary. No significant gender differences were found.

**Maqbool et al. (2020)** examined the relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction among 80 doctors in Pakistan. A significant positive correlation was found (Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale), while age was positively associated with both variables.

**Machmud et al. (2017)** examined the effect of self-efficacy on work perception and job satisfaction among 117 government agency employees in Indonesia using SEM analysis. Self-efficacy significantly influenced work perception and job satisfaction.

**Aydogmus et al. (2022)** investigated the mediating role of self-efficacy between mindfulness and career satisfaction among 479 working adults. Self-efficacy significantly mediated the relationship between mindfulness and career satisfaction.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Aim

The aim of the study is to examine the influence of self-esteem and self-efficacy on job satisfaction among working people.

#### 3.2 Objectives

- To examine the influence of self-esteem and self-efficacy on job satisfaction among working people.
- To explore the impact of demographic factors such as age, gender, type of organization, work experience, income level, and marital status on job satisfaction among working people.

#### 3.3 Research Questions

- What is the level of job satisfaction among employees?
- Is there a relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction?
- Does self-efficacy influence job satisfaction?

#### 3.4 Variables

Independent Variables: Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

#### 3.5 Hypotheses

- H1<sub>1</sub>: There is a significant difference between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on gender among working people.
- H1<sub>2</sub>: There is a significant difference between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on age among working people.
- H1<sub>3</sub>: There is a significant difference between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on educational qualification among working people.
- H1<sub>4</sub>: There is a significant difference between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on work experience among working people.
- H1<sub>5</sub>: There is a significant relationship between job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy among working people.
- H1<sub>6</sub>: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on marital status among working people.
- H1<sub>7</sub>: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on sector of work (public/private) among working people.
- H1<sub>8</sub>: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on years of work experience among working people.

- H1<sub>9</sub>: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on occupational type among working people.
- H1<sub>10</sub>: There is a significant difference in job satisfaction, self-esteem, and self-efficacy based on mode of job among working people.

### **3.6 Research Design**

A quantitative, cross-sectional descriptive research design was adopted. The sample size for this study is 203. Convenient sampling was used for data collection. The population consists of working people employed across various sectors.

### **3.7 Tools Used**

1. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES): Developed by Morris Rosenberg (1965). This 10-item scale measures self-esteem using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Cronbach's alpha ranges from 0.77 to 0.88.
2. General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE): Developed by Jerusalem (1995). This 10-item scale measures self-efficacy using a 4-point Likert scale. Internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha) ranges between 0.76 and 0.90.
3. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire - Short Form (MSQ): Developed by Weiss et al. (1966). This 20-item scale measures intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5). Cronbach's alpha is greater than 0.7.

### **3.8 Procedure**

A total of 203 participants aged between 20 and 45 years were selected using a descriptive, cross-sectional research design and convenient sampling method. Prior to data collection, formal permission was obtained from the Guide and Head of the Department. Participants were informed about the purpose and nature of the research, and written informed consent was obtained. Participation was voluntary and confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the research process.

### **3.9 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

#### **Inclusion Criteria:**

- Working people aged between 20 and 45 years.
- Individuals currently employed in public or private sectors.
- Employees working in full-time jobs.
- Individuals with at least six months of work experience.
- Working people who are willing to participate and provide informed consent.

#### **Exclusion Criteria:**

- Unemployed individuals.
- Students who are not currently working.
- Retired employees.
- Participants with incomplete questionnaire responses.
- Individuals unwilling to participate in the study.

### **3.10 Statistical Analysis**

The data collected were analyzed using appropriate statistical techniques. Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were calculated to summarize the data. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationship between study variables. Additionally, independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA were conducted to compare differences based on demographic variables. Statistical analyses were carried out using Excel and SPSS-26.

### 3.11 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in adherence to ethical research principles, ensuring the protection of participants' rights and well-being. Written or digital consent was obtained before data collection. Confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained. Participation was entirely voluntary, with no incentives or pressure applied. Data integrity and honesty were upheld throughout the study by following ethical guidelines for psychological research.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

**Table 4.1: Frequency Table of Demographic Characteristics**

| Demographic Characteristics |            | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
| Age                         | 20-25      | 67        | 33.0           |
|                             | 26-30      | 75        | 36.9           |
|                             | 31-35      | 28        | 13.8           |
|                             | 36-40      | 18        | 8.9            |
|                             | 41-45      | 15        | 7.4            |
| Gender                      | Female     | 119       | 58.6           |
|                             | Male       | 84        | 41.4           |
| Marital Status              | Single     | 105       | 51.7           |
|                             | Married    | 98        | 48.3           |
| Residence                   | Urban      | 77        | 37.9           |
|                             | Semi Urban | 80        | 39.4           |
|                             | Rural      | 46        | 22.7           |
| Education Qualification     | 10th       | 3         | 1.5            |
|                             | +2         | 11        | 5.4            |
|                             | UG         | 93        | 45.8           |
|                             | PG         | 77        | 37.9           |
|                             | Diploma    | 19        | 9.4            |
| Occupation                  | Teacher    | 72        | 35.5           |
|                             | Doctor     | 27        | 13.3           |
|                             | Lawyer     | 28        | 13.8           |
|                             | Employees  | 56        | 27.6           |
|                             | Nursing    | 20        | 9.6            |

|                           |              |     |      |
|---------------------------|--------------|-----|------|
| Sector                    | Private      | 167 | 82.3 |
|                           | Government   | 36  | 17.7 |
| Occupational Type         | Blue Collar  | 129 | 63.5 |
|                           | White Collar | 74  | 36.5 |
| Mode of Job               | Full Time    | 187 | 92.1 |
|                           | Part Time    | 13  | 6.4  |
|                           | Contractual  | 3   | 1.5  |
| Interested in Current Job | Yes          | 150 | 73.9 |
|                           | No           | 53  | 26.1 |

Table 4.1 shows the demographic characteristics of the working people respondents. The majority of respondents belonged to the 26-30 age group (36.9%), followed by the 20-25 age group (33.0%). Females were more represented (58.6%) compared to males (41.4%). Most respondents were single (51.7%), from semi-urban areas (39.4%), and held undergraduate qualifications (45.8%). Teachers formed the largest occupational group (35.5%). Most respondents had 1-5 years of work experience (75.9%) and were employed in the private sector (82.3%) on a full-time basis (92.1%).

**Table 4.2: Difference in Gender on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables | Male  | Female | t     | df     | p      |     |       |
|-----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
|           | M     | SD     | M     | SD     |        |     |       |
| SE        | 20.08 | 5.607  | 19.77 | 5.007  | .406   | 201 | .685  |
| SEF       | 24.25 | 7.748  | 27.29 | 6.023  | -3.004 | 201 | .003* |
| JS        | 71.73 | 18.691 | 69.63 | 15.731 | .841   | 201 | .402  |

The independent samples t-test revealed that gender significantly influenced self-efficacy ( $t = -3.004$ ,  $p = .003$ ), with females scoring higher. No significant differences were found in self-esteem ( $p = .685$ ) or job satisfaction ( $p = .402$ ) between males and females.

**Table 4.3: Difference in Marital Status on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables | Single | Married | t     | df    | p     |     |       |
|-----------|--------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
|           | M      | SD      | M     | SD    |       |     |       |
| SE        | 20.94  | 4.975   | 18.90 | 5.570 | 2.763 | 201 | .006* |
| SEF       | 25.64  | 6.609   | 25.37 | 7.867 | .266  | 201 | .790  |

|    |       |        |       |        |       |     |      |
|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-----|------|
| JS | 68.96 | 18.108 | 72.90 | 16.713 | -1.61 | 201 | .110 |
|----|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-----|------|

Marital status significantly influenced self-esteem ( $t = 2.763$ ,  $p = .006$ ), with single respondents scoring higher. No significant differences were observed in self-efficacy ( $p = .790$ ) or job satisfaction ( $p = .110$ ).

**Table 4.4: Difference in Sector on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables | Private | Government | t     | df     | p      |     |       |
|-----------|---------|------------|-------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
|           | M       | SD         | M     | SD     |        |     |       |
| SE        | 20.47   | 4.913      | 17.58 | 6.635  | 2.987  | 201 | .003* |
| SEF       | 24.89   | 6.755      | 28.39 | 8.636  | -2.678 | 201 | .008* |
| JS        | 69.83   | 17.260     | 75.64 | 18.149 | -1.814 | 201 | .085  |

Sector of work significantly influenced self-esteem ( $p = .003$ ) and self-efficacy ( $p = .008$ ), with government employees scoring higher on self-efficacy and private employees scoring higher on self-esteem. No significant difference was found in job satisfaction ( $p = .085$ ).

**Table 4.5: Difference in Occupational Type on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables | Blue Collar | White Collar | t     | df     | p     |     |       |
|-----------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------|-------|-----|-------|
|           | M           | SD           | M     | SD     |       |     |       |
| SE        | 20.24       | 5.137        | 19.46 | 5.720  | 1.000 | 201 | .319  |
| SEF       | 24.70       | 6.475        | 26.92 | 8.234  | -2.12 | 201 | .035* |
| JS        | 67.55       | 17.550       | 76.64 | 15.995 | -3.66 | 201 | .000* |

Occupational type significantly influenced self-efficacy ( $p = .035$ ) and job satisfaction ( $p = .000$ ), with white-collar workers scoring higher on both. No significant difference was observed in self-esteem ( $p = .319$ ).

**Table 4.6: Difference in Work Interest on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables | Yes   | No     | t     | df     | p      |     |       |
|-----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-----|-------|
|           | M     | SD     | M     | SD     |        |     |       |
| SE        | 18.43 | 4.890  | 24.28 | 4.134  | -7.788 | 201 | .000* |
| SEF       | 25.52 | 8.233  | 25.41 | 2.939  | .042   | 201 | .967  |
| JS        | 75.41 | 16.417 | 58.00 | 13.837 | 6.899  | 201 | .000* |

Working interest significantly influenced self-esteem and job satisfaction (both  $p = .000$ ). Respondents interested in their job reported higher job satisfaction and lower self-esteem scores. No significant differ-

ence was observed in self-efficacy ( $p = .967$ ).

### Table 4.7: ANOVA - Birth Order on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

One-way ANOVA results showed no statistically significant differences across birth order groups (First Born, Second Born, Third Born, Last Born, Single Child) on self-esteem ( $F = 1.373$ ,  $p = .245$ ), self-efficacy ( $F = 1.156$ ,  $p = .332$ ), or job satisfaction ( $F = 1.222$ ,  $p = .303$ ). Birth order does not significantly influence these variables.

### Table 4.8: ANOVA - Residence on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

ANOVA results indicated that residence significantly influenced self-esteem ( $F = 6.317$ ,  $p = .002$ ), with rural residents scoring highest. No significant differences were found in self-efficacy ( $F = .148$ ,  $p = .862$ ) or job satisfaction ( $F = .983$ ,  $p = .376$ ).

### Table 4.9: ANOVA - Education Level on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

Educational level significantly influenced self-esteem ( $F = 2.858$ ,  $p = .025$ ) and self-efficacy ( $F = 2.914$ ,  $p = .023$ ), with PG-educated participants scoring highest on self-efficacy. Job satisfaction did not differ significantly across education levels ( $F = 2.392$ ,  $p = .052$ ).

### Table 4.10: ANOVA - Mode of Job on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

Mode of job significantly influenced self-esteem ( $F = 4.703$ ,  $p = .010$ ), with contractual employees scoring highest. No significant differences were found in self-efficacy ( $F = 2.420$ ,  $p = .092$ ) or job satisfaction ( $F = .163$ ,  $p = .850$ ).

### Table 4.11: ANOVA - Working Years on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

Working experience did not significantly influence self-esteem ( $F = 2.843$ ,  $p = .061$ ), self-efficacy ( $F = .626$ ,  $p = .536$ ), or job satisfaction ( $F = .289$ ,  $p = .749$ ).

### Table 4.12: ANOVA - Occupation on Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction

Occupation significantly influenced self-esteem ( $F = 5.583$ ,  $p = .000$ ) and job satisfaction ( $F = 2.028$ ,  $p = .045$ ). Lawyers reported the highest job satisfaction, while employees (general) reported the highest self-esteem. No significant differences were found in self-efficacy ( $F = 1.158$ ,  $p = .326$ ).

**Table 4.13: Correlation between Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction**

| Variables                | M     | SD     | 1       | 2      | 3       |
|--------------------------|-------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Self-Esteem (SE)      | 19.96 | 5.356  | 1       | .076   | -.379** |
| 2. Self-Efficacy (SEF)   | 25.51 | 7.226  | .076    | 1      | .187**  |
| 3. Job Satisfaction (JS) | 70.86 | 17.517 | -.379** | .187** | 1       |

\*\*  $p < .01$

Pearson correlation analysis revealed that self-esteem and self-efficacy had a non-significant positive relationship ( $r = .076$ ). Self-esteem and job satisfaction showed a significant negative correlation ( $r = -.379$ ,  $p < .01$ ), while self-efficacy and job satisfaction showed a significant positive correlation ( $r = .187$ ,  $p < .01$ ). These findings indicate that higher self-efficacy is associated with greater job satisfaction, whereas higher self-esteem is associated with lower job satisfaction in this sample.

## 5. Discussion

The present study examined the influence of self-esteem and self-efficacy on job satisfaction among working individuals. The findings revealed that self-efficacy has a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction, whereas self-esteem demonstrated an inverse relationship with job satisfaction.

The positive association between self-efficacy and job satisfaction is consistent with existing theoretical and empirical literature. According to Self-Efficacy Theory proposed by Albert Bandura, individuals who believe in their ability to successfully perform tasks are more likely to approach challenges with confidence, persistence, and resilience. Employees with high self-efficacy tend to perceive job demands as manageable and are more likely to engage proactively with their roles, leading to more positive work experiences.

In contrast, the finding of a negative relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction diverges from much of the existing research, which typically reports a positive association. One possible explanation is that individuals with higher self-esteem may possess higher expectations regarding their job roles, work environment, and recognition. When these expectations are not met, it may lead to dissatisfaction despite having a generally positive self-view.

The contrasting roles of self-efficacy and self-esteem suggest that belief in one's capabilities may be more directly relevant to workplace functioning than general self-worth. While self-efficacy is task-specific and action-oriented, self-esteem is broader and may not always translate into effective coping or performance in job-related situations.

From a practical perspective, these findings highlight the importance of fostering self-efficacy in organizational settings. Interventions such as skill development programs, goal-setting strategies, performance feedback, and mastery experiences can strengthen employees' confidence in their abilities, thereby enhancing job satisfaction.

### 5.1 Limitations

- The study was carried out only among working people in a specific region (Tamil Nadu), limiting generalizability.
- The large number of questionnaire items may have introduced response bias.
- The study relied solely on self-report measures.
- The cross-sectional design does not allow for causal conclusions.

### 5.2 Implications

- Organizations should build self-efficacy among employees through targeted training, mentoring, and skill development programmes.
- Workplace interventions should address gender differences in self-efficacy and design support systems accordingly.
- Employers should ensure employees are placed in roles that align with their interests and competencies.
- Government organizations may consider introducing performance-based recognition systems to enhance job satisfaction.

### 5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

- Future research should include participants from different states and diverse occupational settings.
- Studies can be conducted on different groups such as students, homemakers, and retired individuals.
- Additional variables such as organizational culture, work-life balance, or emotional intelligence could be incorporated.

- Longitudinal research designs would help in understanding causal relationships over time.

## 6. Conclusion

The present study was conducted to examine the relationship between self-esteem, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction among working people. Self-efficacy showed a significant positive relationship with job satisfaction ( $r = .187, p < .01$ ), indicating that higher confidence in one's ability to perform tasks effectively is associated with greater satisfaction at work. In contrast, self-esteem showed a significant negative relationship with job satisfaction ( $r = -.379, p < .01$ ), suggesting that individuals with higher self-esteem may hold higher expectations from their work, which, when unmet, could lead to reduced satisfaction. Several demographic variables including gender, marital status, work sector, occupation type, educational qualification, and residence showed significant differences in at least one of the study variables. These findings underscore the importance of fostering adaptive self-beliefs and supportive work environments for improving employee well-being and organizational outcomes.

## Acknowledgment

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the Management of Sree Saraswathi Thyagaraja College, Pollachi, and to Principal Dr. M. R. Vanitha Mani for permitting this study. Special thanks to Mr. V. Ashwanth Kanna, Head of the Department of Psychology, for his support and encouragement. The author also thanks all the participants who generously responded to the questionnaires.

## References

1. Ahmeti, A., & Stankovska, G. (2023). The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction among full-time academic employees at state universities in Kosovo and North Macedonia. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 13(1), 135-143. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2023-0012>
2. Alavi, H. R., & Askaripur, M. R. (2003). The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction of personnel in government organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 32(4), 591-599. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600303200407>
3. Aydogmus, C., et al. (2022). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between mindfulness and career satisfaction. *Structural Equation Modeling study with 479 working adults*.
4. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
5. de Oliveira, L., et al. (2016). The protective effect of job satisfaction on self-esteem and well-being. *Study of 971 Portuguese-speaking adults*.
6. Ghaleh, R. J., et al. (2024). The relationship between self-efficacy, self-esteem, and job satisfaction among nurses. *PMC cross-sectional study of 234 nurses in Iran*.
7. Gunawan, et al. (2017). The relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction in governmental organizations. *Study of 158 employees in Indonesia's Ministry of Finance*.
8. Jerusalem, M. (1995). General Self-Efficacy Scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio*.
9. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
10. Khot, P., & Dwivedi, S. (2022). Self-esteem and self-efficacy among employed and unemployed women. *Comparative study of 220 women aged 25-50*.

11. Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Rand McNally.
12. Machmud, S., et al. (2017). The effect of self-efficacy on work perception and job satisfaction in government agencies. Study of 117 employees in Bandung, Indonesia.
13. Maqbool, S., et al. (2020). The relationship between self-esteem and job satisfaction among doctors in military hospitals in Pakistan. Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale study of 80 doctors.
14. Rahman, M., & Akther, S. (2024). Self-esteem and job satisfaction among teachers in Bangladesh. Study of 120 teachers from Chittagong region.
15. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400876136>
16. Tufail, M., & Rasool, I. (2024). Self-efficacy and job satisfaction among employees in Multan, Pakistan. Study of 350 employees using General Self-Efficacy Scale.
17. Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. University of Minnesota.
18. Yeptho, A., & Yadav, R. (2025). The relationship between self-efficacy and job satisfaction among secondary teachers in Nagaland. Study of 150 teachers.