



HAL
open science

Bureaucratic management style and workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges

Abun Anusabun@gmail.Com Damianus, Damianus Abun, Shannare Mica T Calamaan, Theogenia Magallanes, Mary Joy Encarnacion, Micah Sallong

► To cite this version:

Abun Anusabun@gmail.Com Damianus, Damianus Abun, Shannare Mica T Calamaan, Theogenia Magallanes, Mary Joy Encarnacion, et al.. Bureaucratic management style and workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 2021, 10, pp.477 - 489. 10.20525/ijrbs.v10i3.1094 . hal-03219035

HAL Id: hal-03219035

<https://hal.science/hal-03219035v1>

Submitted on 6 May 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Business & Social Science
IJRBS

Research in Business & Social Science

IJRBS VOL 10 NO 3 ISSN: 2147-4478

Available online at www.ssbfnct.com
Journal homepage: <https://www.ssbfnct.com/ojs/index.php/ijrbs>

Bureaucratic management style and workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges

Damianus Abun^{(a)*}, Shannare Mica T. Calamaan^(b), Theogenia Magallanes^(c)

Mary Joy Encarnacion^(d), Micah Sallong^(e)



^(a) Professor, School of Business, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

^(b) Program Head, School of Nursing, Divine Word College of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Philippines

^(c) President, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

^(d) Assistant Professor, School of Business, Divine Word College of Vigan, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

^(e) Dean, School of Values Education, Saint Benedict College of Northern Luzon, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 18 March 2021

Received in rev. form 06 April 2021

Accepted 08 April 2021

Keywords:

Bureaucratic management, workplace well-being, autonomy, competence need, relatedness need

JEL Classification:

I20, I21, I28

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the effect of bureaucratic management on the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges. To establish the theoretical foundation of the study, related literature was reviewed. The study used descriptive assessment and correlational research design and the data were gathered through research questionnaires. To interpret the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used, and therefore, weighted mean was used to determine the level of bureaucratic management, and workplace well-being. While Pearson r correlation was used to determine the correlation between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being. The finding of the study indicated that there is no correlation between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being. Therefore, the hypothesis of the study is rejected. The output of this study contributes to a complex discussion about the effect of bureaucratic management on workplace well-being.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

Max Weber, the original author of bureaucratic management had somehow promised all people who adopted his management theory efficiency and stability. The organizations that are implementing bureaucratic strategies are certainly stable and efficient. Is it true? This is the question to be answered and to be proven. Because of such promise, many organizations, public and private, and even private individuals have adopted this style of management and leadership. Ever since the government organizations have been adopting a bureaucratic management style up to now. The same case with private organizations. They too have adopted this style. Take some examples such as McDonald's and GM (General Motors). The presence of McDonald's around the globe is touted to be the fruits of bureaucratic management practices. By standardizing its practices and applying strict control and monitoring, it achieves efficiency, productivity, and success. All its employees are expected to adhere to the rigid rules, regulations that are already in place (Fata, 2020). Alfred P Sloan, the appointed chairman of the board of the GM (General Motor) revitalized the GM by applying bureaucratic leadership and management style. He favored strict rules, regulations, and a hierarchy of command throughout the company. The workers are oriented to follow strict rules and never violating the rules and procedures that have already been established by the company (Fata, 2020). Collin Powel as a former military applies bureaucratic leadership. His leadership style is influenced by military experience which is adhering to rules and regulations and chain of command. Winston Churchill is another leader known to be a bureaucratic leader. His victory during the Second World War is credited to his bureaucratic leadership styles. He established the structure of command and instructed everyone to adhere to the structure of commands and carry out their task as

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9693-1541

planned (Kukreja, 2018). So, the question has been answered that bureaucratic management and leadership bring efficiency and success. The next question is: is it a perfect style to be adopted? Let us see how others see it.

Without denying its contribution to the advancement of corporations and society around the globe, people also have recognized its weaknesses. We have seen the disadvantage of bureaucratic leadership or management style. Undeniably, strict adherence to rules, regulations, and chain of command would prevent individual creativity. Consequently, individual capability and desire to express his/her capability to introduce new ways of doing things would not be possible because bureaucratic leaders are happy to see the same results. Consequently, the company may not be able to adapt to the dynamic environment and great opportunities can be lost (Kukreja, 2018). A certain study found that perceived increases in the division of labor and hierarchy of authority in an organization lead to diminished job satisfaction (Snizek & Bullard, 1983). Lost of job satisfaction may cost the organization financially. Hammel and Zanini (2017) contended that bureaucracy may affect the economy negatively. Hammel and Zanini (2017) considered the bureaucracy as a hindrance to coping up with the dynamic environment which is fast-moving because it does not respond to external stimuli coming from the environment. Bureaucratic management is accused to be the source of the slowness of technological development because it curtails freedom and creativity, and individual autonomy. Thus, bureaucratic management is not a perfect system to be adopted in any context. On one hand, it may contribute to efficiency and productivity but on the other hand, it does not make the employee happy and satisfied because of loss of freedom, autonomy, and creativity.

Taking the cue from the study of Snizek & Bullard (1983), the current study is interested to find out the effect of a bureaucratic environment on the employees' workplace well-being which includes autonomy need, competence need, and relatedness need. There has been no study yet related to this topic. The researchers are interested to investigate this topic because of the very reason that they have been working within the bureaucratic environment as middle managers. It is a fact that the Catholic Schools are known to be very bureaucratic and thus, the current research is interested to see if the bureaucratic management style affects the workplace well-being of their employees. Bureaucratic management has been criticized for its emphasis on rules and compliance to the rules and therefore affects freedom and autonomy or well-being.

This research will be divided into several parts. The first is the rationale or introduction which discusses the primary background of the paper and the direction of the paper. The second part is the review of related literature in which it discusses the theories of the study concerning different theories of management and workplace well-being as the dependent variable of the study. The third part is about the research methodology of the study that discusses the research design, population of the study, the locale of the study, data gathering procedures, ethical procedures, gathering instruments, and statistical treatment of data. The fourth is the empirical data presentation and analysis and finally the fifth is the result and discussion and conclusion.

Literature Review

In the review of related literature, it is important to contrast different theories of management for the reader to see the difference between theories of management and know the consequences of their application to the well-being of employees. The literature reviews provide the theoretical foundation of the study.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

Bureaucratic Management and Its characteristics

Bureaucratic management is originated from Max Weber (1947), a German sociologist, philosopher, jurist, and political economist. As a sociologist, jurist, and political economist, he introduced bureaucracy to manage or administer the government. He considered bureaucracy as the most efficient and rational way of managing large organizations such as the government through a systematic process and organizational structure to maintain order (Mulder, 2017). By following the established rules, processes, procedures, and following the hierarchy of command, efficiency can be attained and favoritism or nepotism can be avoided (Swedberg & Agewal, 2005). In short, bureaucratic management relies heavily on rules and procedures to ensure efficiency (CEoPedia, 2019), and often time these rules and procedures are seldom changed or revised. In its development, bureaucracy is not just being applied to manage the public organizations but it is also applied to any large private organization (Howard, 2012). Therefore the modern definition of bureaucracy is no longer referring to government organization alone but also refers to any form of organization. Nowadays, it simply means the rationalization of an organization which is marked by structure, formalized functions, and impersonality of human relations (Aron, 1994, Giddens, 1997, cited by Serpa & Ferreira, 2019).

Barnet and Finnemore (2004) have classified modern bureaucracy into four categories and they are hierarchy, continuity, impersonality, and expertise. However, emanated from the definition of bureaucracy, Reynolds (2018) expanded the characteristics of bureaucracy and has identified six characteristics of bureaucracy. *The first is a formal hierarchical authority.* A bureaucratic organization is identified by its hierarchical structure of management from top management down to the lower of managers and down to the employees. Reports and communication follow the line and therefore, one cannot go directly to the top and the top cannot go directly to the lower level. The same true with the communication channel, it goes through the layers. The problems encountered by the employees have to be reported to the lower or immediate superior before it goes up if the lower level cannot solve the problem. The decisions are not to be made by the person who is knowledgeable about the situation like the front liners but by top management who is far from reality. *The second is that bureaucracy depends on the rules.* Doing a job and solving problems should follow the

established rules and procedures. The managers or the employees are not free to do what they want to do according to what they know. They can only do things within the rules of engagement. There are many dos and don'ts and each employee is provided with a job description. When there are problems, the rules and procedures are to be blamed, and therefore, this kind of organization regularly reviews its policies and procedures. *The third is the division of labor.* One is confined within one job according to his skills and specialization and one is given the job description. He/she is not concerned with other parts of the organization if it is not within their territory. *Fourth is performance-based promotion.* Promotion or advancement is based on performance. Each manager and individual employee is given the objective to be achieved and salaries, benefits, and promotions are based on the attainment of such a pre-signed objective. *The fifth is efficiency.* One has to accomplish the assigned objectives with little time and effort. To increase efficiency, the organization has to re-evaluate its written rules and guidelines to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. *Sixth is impersonality.* There is nothing personal in the bureaucratic organization because what matters is the achievement of the objectives and efficiency. Rules, regulations, and the structure of decision-making are the tools to achieve them. The organization does not care about the personal situation of the employees. It does not answer the personal needs of the employees. To keep it efficient, this kind of organization gives attention to reduce red tape by involving the employees in decision making and continue to re-assess its objectives.

Based on what we have presented, we accept that on one hand, bureaucratic management can be praised because of its efficiency but on the other hand, bureaucratic management has its side effect. Hammel and Zanini (2017) have pointed out its weakness for several reasons: *the first is bloating.* It creates more layers which means more managers and more managers mean higher cost and at the same time reducing efficiency. *The second is friction.* It creates too much work and processes that can delay decision-making. Consequently, the organization is irresponsive to the dynamic of the external environment. Hammel and Zanini (2017) argued that it wastes much time and it is full of paper works and neglects the opportunity. *The third is insularity.* Managers consume so much time discussing or solving internal problems and fail to respond to the emerging trends in the external environment and miss the opportunity to improve better service to the customers. *The fourth is disempowerment.* Employees are not given the freedom and autonomy to do things on their own. It creates conflict between management and the employees. The majority of employees are powerless to improve the working environment because they have no participation in decision-making to change the environment as they wish. They feel that they are not valued and this feeling leads them not to take responsibility for any issues that affect the organization. Weber himself had seen the negative consequences of bureaucratic management style. He had seen that implementing bureaucratic management could cause human freedom in which people are no longer exercising their autonomy in carrying out their duties and responsibilities but only to follow the rules and the job description given to them. Ritzer (2004) criticized that practicing bureaucracy could mean treating a human being as an impersonal "iron cage" of rule-based, rational control. *The fifth is risk aversion.* Because of a lack of autonomy and freedom, the employees learn not to take the risk. They tend to follow the rules and procedures prescribed by the administrators because they are afraid of failure. They prefer to stay on the safe route and consequently, they tend to repeat doing the same thing over and over because its result is predictable. Employees are afraid to explore new experiments and discover new ways of doing things and thus innovation is dead. *Sixth is inertia.* Lacking interest in taking the risk leads the employees not to respond to change. Employees do not want to change and do not initiate change because they believe that the change starts at the top. As a result of this kind of management, the organization cannot respond to the opportunities presented by the external environment. *The seventh is politics.* Hammel and Zanini pointed out that bureaucratic organization is preoccupied with politics. Too much energy is wasted to gain power and influence. Everybody is trying to gain power and influence and consequently, it encourages politicking and creates enemies within the same organization. It also creates an environment of saving face in which people do not want to take the blame but always assigning the blame to others. Another side effect is promotion is given not based on merits but political connection.

Scientific management

Scientific management is a theory that proposes another way of workflow or processes to improve economic efficiency and productivity (Mitcham, & Adam, 2005). The original author of scientific management theory is Fredrick Winslow Taylor (1911). The theory was born out of his working experience in the factory. Taylor had observed that workers purposely performed below their capacity or soldiering. Soldiering was caused by several reasons such as: *first was the employees' assumption.* The employees thought that if they become more productive, then fewer of them would be needed and some jobs might be eliminated. *The second is the non-incentive wage system.* Taylor had seen that the non-incentive wage system encourages low productivity when the employees receive the same pay regardless of their output. *The third is time and the rule of thumbs.* Taylor had seen that workers had wasted their time because of the rule of thumb decision making (Internet Center for Management and Business Administration, 2010). He wanted to change the situation. His concern is how to improve efficiency and productivity by minimizing the time and naturally the cost to produce an output. Reducing time and cost in producing the output would require analysis based on facts or data which is computed through statistical tools. In other words, decisions to improve efficiency and productivity must be based on statistics or data and it should not be based on the rule of thumbs or guessing game (Solomos, 2012). Research and experimentation replaced the rule of thumb through which the raw data are gathered and analyzed for a specific task (Wrege, 1991). By doing that, Taylor changed the way how the industries practiced efficiency to increase productivity by working smarter and not by working harder, or it is not necessary to exhaust themselves but applying the scientific method to improve efficiency and productivity. One example of Taylor's scientific management practice was the pig-iron case. Pig iron is allowed to flow into a gridiron of damp sand, creating bars that can be handled. Using time study, Taylor was able to gather the data to analyze the task and then determine how much time was needed

to perform the task (Wrege, 1991, cited by Solomos, 2012). By applying scientific management, Taylor can determine exactly how much time is needed for a worker to accomplish a task. The result of his study leads to the conclusion that increasing output does not need more time, more employees, raw materials, and more cost (Von Berg, 2009).

Besides using the scientific method to improve efficiency and productivity, Taylor also introduced the standardization of work. Standardization helps the company to track the process and output against the standards. Standards are used as benchmarks to determine if the outputs are according to the established standards. Workers are guided by the standards and not by the rule of thumb of the foreman or manager. Besides introducing work standards, Taylor also introduced wages and incentive-based on the complexity of the work and output. The more complex the job is the greater the pay and employees who produce output beyond the standards are receiving incentives (Solomos, 2012).

In pursuing efficiency and productivity, Taylor introduces another two ideas which are the division of labor and work specialization. The work is divided among employees and the work must be matched with the skills of the person. The employees can only perform the specific task given to them without bothering themselves with other concerns and decision-making because the latter is the job of managers. The function of managers was to monitor the work and provide guidance and determine the course of action scientifically and then train employees to perform the task accordingly (Wrege, 1991). Thus, there are four main jobs of the manager and they are defining the job scientifically and determine the best way to do it, hiring a worker that matches the job, dividing the work among employees, and monitoring their performance.

Taylor's scientific management theory changed the way how businesses or organizations are run today. His theory of using science and statistical data to make decisions are still relevant today. It contributes a lot to society and how efficiency and productivity are measured. However, given its benefits, there is also a lot of criticism. Taylor's scientific management theory concentrates on the efficiency and productivity aspect but neglecting the quality and the customer. Taylor assumed that the customer wanted quantity, however, Deming argued that the customer wanted quality (Deming, 1991). If Taylor introduced job simplification, however, Deming proposed job enlargement. Taylor introduced financial incentives to motivate workers who produced greater output than the standards, but by doing that, Deming accused Taylor of creating winners and losers and in replacement, Deming advocated team and group incentives. Besides Deming, Drury, (1918) accused Taylor of turning the workers into an "automation" or "machine" by making work monotonous and unfulfilling because of performing a small piece of work and rigidly defined work processes.

Humanistic Management

Humanistic management came out early in the 20th century as another alternative to management theory to balance bureaucratic and scientific management theory that concerned so much on productivity and profit. It is an alternative to mechanistic management. It focuses more on people and not on the technique or the procedures (Mele, 2016). Humanistic management is in contrast with the view of Taylor who saw management as a science but the proponent of humanistic management viewed management as an art (Lilienthal, 1967). This is a new development in management to break the monotony created by scientific and bureaucratic management. Instead of mechanizing business, humanistic management humanizes the business operation. This was somehow the answer to the call of Pope Leo XIII in the late 19th century. The Pope called the business owners or the capitalist to respect the dignity of human beings (Leo XIII, 1891, n. 20, cited by Mele, 2016). The call of the Pope strengthens the idea to humanize the business world. If Weber's bureaucratic management focuses on rules, processes, procedures, and the hierarchy of command to achieve efficiency and Taylor's scientific management focuses on a scientific approach to achieve efficiency and productivity, however, humanistic management proponents such as Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Clark Moustakas Mary Parker Follett, and Elton Mayo called for human-centered approach. They got away from the strong focus on rules, procedures, processes, and the scientific method to achieve efficiency and productivity which consequently to achieve profit through the instrumentalization of man as a human resource (Adaui, & Habisch, 2013), humanistic management focuses on the man, his needs and values, as the measure of all things and become the center of management, as Drucker (1950, cited by Adaui, & Habisch, 2013) argued that management is a management of man and not the management of things. In other words, humanistic management concerns persons and the human aspect of managing a business or a corporation (Mele, 2016). It recognizes that human beings have needs and values and therefore giving attention to human needs and his/their values will help the organization reaches its objectives (Drucker, 1990).

Humanistic management is thus centered on the idea that it is human beings who are responsible for the ups and downs of the organization and it is human beings who carry out rules, procedures, processes, and scientific tools. Giving attention to their needs is critical to improving efficiency and productivity. The humanistic management called for a revisit to human treatment or employee treatment. The workers must be treated as human beings. Human beings must be seen not only as economic assets that are recognized because of their contribution to economic productivity but they are persons with dignity together with needs and values (Thompson, 2019). They are not means to an end but they are the ends in themselves and they possess dignity and should be treated with respect as human beings (Wright, 2002, Kerstein, 2019).

Though humanistic management centers on human needs and values, it also recognizes profits, but profit is not the ends but the human is still the ends, in the sense that profit is used for the welfare of human beings. Unlike other concepts of management such as bureaucratic and scientific management sees profit as the end of efficiency and productivity. These two management theories are seeing profit as the end and seeing human beings as the means toward achieving such an end (Mele, 2016). Humanistic management is criticizing bureaucratic and scientific management which focused on one-dimensional management objective which is to maximize

profits. Humanistic management sees human beings as the center of management and the end of economic activities (Humanistic Management Center, 2018). Humanistic management takes human needs, values, desires, and emotions as the center of the management approach and focuses on employees' motivation. The basic consideration of humanistic management theory is that productivity and organizational goals can only be achieved through motivated and satisfied employees (Swart, 1973). Therefore, issues such as motivation, satisfaction, working relationship, and productivity become a new way of how to improve productivity. It is along with this basic concept, humanistic managers place people first above economic objectives (Von Kimakowitz, et.al., 2011) and this concept also leads us to the concept of unconditional respect which is to treat human beings with dignity in economic activities. Respect for human dignity demands the recognition of human freedom and at the same time, it demands human participation in decision making (Gabelli School of Business, n.d). In the sense that management should not use human beings merely as the means toward achieving the economic goals but treat the human being as a subject, as a person with dignity (Humanistic Management Center, 2018) as Pirson (2017) argued that the focus of humanistic management is the protection of human dignity and the promotion of well-being.

Workplace Well-being

Workplace well-being is part of the psychology domain and we are not going to problematize its domain, however, we borrow its concept on workplace well-being to help us understand how certain management style affects human being psychologically. The concept of workplace well-being is broader but in general, it is about the feeling that workers have about themselves and their work. The feeling is a product of how employers treat their employees in their workplace. ILO (2020) contends that workplace well-being is about any aspect of working life which includes the working environment, safety, health, the climate at work, and how the employees feel about their work. But for Ryan and Deci (2000) workplace well-being refers to three basic psychological needs such as autonomy needs (deCharms, 1968), competence needs (Harter, 1978), and relatedness need (Baumeister, & Leary, 1995). Black Dog Institute added the dimensions of workplace well-being which include work satisfaction, organizational respect for the employees, employer care, and the intrusion of work into private life. Based on the dimensions of workplace well-being offered by Deci and Ryan (2000) and Black Dog Institute, the current study choose to dwell on three dimensions of workplace well-being which include autonomy needs, competence needs, and relatedness needs. These dimensions are chosen because they reflect the opposite elements of the bureaucratic management style.

Job Satisfaction

Cambridge Dictionary defines job satisfaction as the feeling of pleasure and achievement that one experienced when he/she knows that the job is worth doing. While Spector (1997) defined job satisfaction as the feeling of contentedness with the job which can be measured through three different dimensions such as cognitive, affective, and conative (behavioral) components (Hulin & Judge, 2003). All these definitions are related to psychology and thus Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a "pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304). It is the psychological disposition of the person toward his/her work (Schultz, 1982). This is similar to what Siegal and Lance (1987) defined job satisfaction as 'emotional response defining the degree to which people like their job'. In short, job satisfaction is about a person's feeling toward the job which motivates the person to perform the job (Shiyani, n.d). This is also the case of Smith, et.al (1969) who considered job satisfaction as the emotional state of a person toward the job. Contrary to those definitions, Hoppock and Spiegler (1935, cited by Shiyani, n.d) extends the concept of job satisfaction beyond emotional feeling to include the physical aspect and thus they contend that job satisfaction is not just about the emotional aspect of the person but it also includes physical aspect and therefore it is about the psychological, physiological and environmental circumstance that influence the person to feel satisfied with the job.

Job satisfaction has been a contributing factor toward job performance as pointed out by the study of Vroom (1964) and other studies. Vroom's study found that work performance is a natural outcome of the fulfillment of the needs of employees. After his study, there have been a lot of studies measuring the relationship between job satisfaction and work performance such as Landy (1989 cited by Judge, et.al., 2001) who considered the relationship between job satisfaction and performance as "a Holy Grail" which means that job satisfaction is a significant factor that contributes to job performance. Even later studies of other organizational researchers pointed out consistently the same result as to the link between job satisfaction and organizational performance such as the study of Bakotic (2016), Balasundaram, & Brabete, (2010), Inuwa, (2016), and Alromaihi, et.al., (2017).

Autonomy Needs

Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines autonomy as a "state of being self-governing especially the right of self-government" or it is "self-directing freedom and especially moral independent". Merriam-Webster's definition is similar to the definition of the Cambridge Dictionary that defines autonomy as "the ability to make your own decisions without being controlled by anyone else". More specifically Lexico defines autonomy as "freedom from external control or influence". Concerning the current investigation, autonomy means freedom from external control or pressures in determining what one wants to do in his/her work. Under the Self-Determination Theory, autonomy need is considered as one of the basic psychological needs of human beings. It is an inner desire of human beings not to be controlled by external forces but to be independent in determining what they are going to do in their life and their workplace (deCharms, 1968, Deci & Ryan, 2000). Legault (2018) defines autonomy as "experience of volition and self-direction in thought, feeling, and action". This is called intrinsic motivation that comes from within the person which provides a reason why a person pursues certain activity in which person pursues certain activity because he/she finds enjoyment by doing the

task or activity. Fulfilling this need will help the individual to find meaning in his/her work and experience wellness and the frustration of this need will affect his/her wellness (Zammarripa, et.al, 2020).

Studies have shown the relationship between the fulfillment of basic psychological needs and happiness. For example, Sapmaz, et.al (2012) conducted a study on the relationship between basic psychological needs and happiness among university students and the study found that basic psychological needs are significantly correlated to happiness. This was also proven by the study of Niemiec and Ryan (2013) that when the need for autonomy is fulfilled, then people become more engaged and happy. In other words, when the need is not realized, the person feels otherwise as pointed out by the study of Moller and Deci (2010). For the autonomy need to be realized, it needs a certain social environment that allows freedom and creativity to grow (Reeve, 2014).

Competence Need

Competence is defined by Merriam Webster Dictionary as a “state of having sufficient knowledge, judgment, skills or strength”. While the Cambridge Dictionary defines competence as “the ability to do something well”. It is a “measurable knowledge, skills, and abilities” (Knowles, 1975). Deci and Ryan (1985, 2000) in their Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and Intrinsic Motivation in Human Behavior and Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being had classified competence as one of the basic psychological needs of human beings to be fulfilled. It is an inner desire or drive to possess a certain level of capability to be able to cause an effect on the environment. Thus, Legault (2017) defined competence as a “psychological need to exert a meaningful effect on one’s environment”. People need to master certain tasks by learning different skills. By possessing certain skills, people can have the self-confidence to pursue certain activities and achieve their goals (Cherry, 2019). This competence needs to motivate a person to pursue challenging activities and maintain the level of persistence in pursuing his/her goals (Legault, 2017). This is called intrinsic motivation in which a person pursues a certain activity for the sake of enjoyment derived from the activity itself. The realization of this intrinsic motivation produces the well-being of the human person (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

The competence need does not exist in a vacuum because it depends on a certain kind of social environment for it to grow. It requires an environment in which the competence need of the person is allowed to be developed. According to Reeve (2014, cited by Legault, 2017), three social environment components that facilitate the growth of competence need and they are first, providing structure and guidance, second, relaying information and feedback, and the third is tolerating errors and failures. Structure and guidance are needed because the employees or persons should know where to go asking for guidance in pursuing certain activities. Besides structure and guidance, it is important to provide feedback and relaying those feedbacks to the person to improve its performance. Lastly is allowing a certain level of errors for the person to learn from his/her errors. Discouraging mistakes or errors will not help the person to try different ways of doing things because they are afraid of committing mistakes. These are the kind of environments that provide a venue where employees can develop their competence (Clifford, 1990).

Relatedness Need

Oxford Dictionary defines relatedness as “the state or fact of being related or connected” or the fact of being connected with something/somebody in some way”. The relatedness need is cross-cultural in the sense that this need exists in all human beings across the boundary. It is not just the value of the “Eastern” as pointed out by Markus and Kitayama (2003) or it is not just the concern of females as pointed out by Jordan, et.al (1991). Under the Self-Determination Theory of Ryan and Deci (1985, 2000) relatedness need is one of the basic psychological needs and this is called intrinsic motivation. It is a need that is deep within oneself and it is the desire of all human beings to be realized. It is the basic need of human beings to be in a relationship, to be connected with others. Maslow calls it social need, a need to establish a social relationship (McLeod, 2010) and Alderfer calls it relatedness need. The satisfaction of this need is important to achieve well-being or happiness (Ryan & Deci, 2019). In other words, the frustration of this need lead to unhappiness.

Studies have shown that physical and social environments are important factors in the realization of basic psychological needs. In other words, the realization of these needs is dependent on the physical and social environment. For example, the study of Sjöblom, et.al. (2016) found that the “physical environment can support or thwart the fulfillment of the basic psychological needs. The physical environment was a source of procedural facilitation”. Besides the physical environment, the social environment is also playing important role in the fulfillment of the relatedness need. Self-Determination Theory pointed out the growth of basic psychological needs is dependent on the social and cultural environment (Legault, 2017). In another sense, the relatedness need can only grow when the social environment allows the needs to be developed. An organization where there is no space for social interaction among employees can thwart the realization of the relatedness need of employees.

Conceptual Framework




Figure 1: The conceptual framework reflects the relationship between the bureaucratic environment and workplace well-being. Workplace well-being is dependent on the bureaucratic environment; *Source:* Langer, et.al (2019);Nishimura & Zuzuki (2016)

Statement of the Problems

The study aims to investigate the influence of a bureaucratic environment on workplace well-being. It specifically seeks to answer the following questions:

- i. *What is the bureaucratic management of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region?*
- ii. *What is the workplace well-being of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region in terms of*
 - a. *Autonomy Need?*
 - b. *Competence Need?*
 - c. *Relatedness Need?*
- iii. *Is there a relationship between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being?*

Assumption

The study assumes that a bureaucratic environment affects workplace well-being and can be measured.

Hypothesis

Self-Determination theory argues that the growth of basic psychological needs is dependent on the social and cultural environment (Legault, 2017). Thus based on this theory, the current study hypothesizes that the exercise of bureaucratic and humanistic management styles correlates with the workplace well-being of employees.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study delimits its investigation on three dimensions of workplace well-being offered by Ryan and Deci (2000), as cited by Nishimura, and Zuzuki, (2016) and it limits its coverage to the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region which is the Divine Word College of Laoag and Divine Word College of Vigan. The study may not reflect the whole situation of Divine Word Colleges in the Philippines.

Research Methodology

This part classifies the methodology in conducting the investigation. The study follows the rule of engagement in carrying out the study by determining its research design, data gathering instruments, the population of the study, the locale of the study, the data gathering procedures, data gathering instruments, and statistical treatment of data.

Research Design of the study

The study used a descriptive assessment and correlational research design to determine the level of the bureaucratic environment of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region, and its effect on workplace well-being. Ariola (2006) contended that a descriptive correlation study is intended to describe the relationship among variables without seeking to establish a causal connection. While descriptive research is simply to describe a population, a situation, or a phenomenon. It is also used to describe profiles, frequency distribution, describe characteristics of people, situations, or phenomena. In short, it answers the question of what, when, how, where, and not why question (McCombes, 2020).

The locale of the Study

The locale of the study was Divine Word Colleges in Ilocos Sur and Ilocos Norte.

Population

Those who answered the questionnaires are the faculty and employees of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region. The total enumeration sampling was used and thus all faculty and employees (128) were taken as respondents of the study.

Data Gathering instruments

The study adapted validated questionnaires of Langer, et.al (2019) on Routine and centralized work environment questionnaires and Nishimura, and Zuzuki (2016) on Basic Psychological need satisfaction and Frustration.

Data Gathering Procedures

Before the researcher distributes the questionnaires, letters were sent to the Presidents of the colleges to request them to allow the researcher to float his questionnaires in their respective institutions. In the process of collecting the data, the researcher requests employees’ representatives to retrieve the data from different individual employees before they are submitted to the researcher.

Ethical Procedures

The study was carried out after the research ethics committee examined and approved the content of the paper if it does not violate ethical standards and if it does not cause harm to human life and the environment.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To analyze the data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. The weighted mean was used to determine the level of bureaucratic management and workplace well-being of the schools and the Pearson r was used to measure the correlation between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being.

The following ranges of values with their descriptive interpretation will be used:

<i>Statistical Range</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.21-5.00	Strongly agree/ Very high
3.41-4.20	Agree/High
2.61-3.40	Somewhat agree/Moderate
1.81-2.60	Disagree/Low
1.00-1.80	Strongly disagree/Very low

Empirical data and Analysis

Scientific research is always based on evidence or data. These data are gathered through research questionnaires. This section presents the data gathered through research questionnaires and the presentation follows the arrangement of the statement of the problems.

Problem 1: What is the bureaucratic management of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region?

Table 1: The Bureaucratic Management of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region

Indicators	Mean	DR
1. Employees here do the same job, in the same way, every day.	3.40	SWA
2. Employees are not allowed to do things on their own.	3.39	SWA
3. There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.	3.57	A
4. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer.	3.49	A
5. In general, a person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged in this agency.	3.47	A
6. There are so many rules and policies to be followed.	3.52	A
7. Decisions are always delayed because they have to be going through several processes and procedures.	3.60	A
8. Lower-level managers are not free to make decisions.	3.58	A
9. People are afraid to violate the policies because it means punishment.	3.58	A
10. Ordinary employees have no voice in decision-making.	3.59	A
11. Employees are afraid to take a risk.	3.60	A
Composite Mean	3.53	A

Source: Langer, et.al (2019)

As gleaned from the data, it reveals that as a whole, the bureaucratic management of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region gained a composite mean of 3.53 which is described as "agree/high". This composite mean indicates that the bureaucratic environment of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region is not very high but high and it is also not moderate, low, or very low. This result suggests that as a whole, the respondents agree that bureaucratic management is more prevalent in the operation of the colleges. Taking the items separately, the majority of the items are evaluated within the same mean range which are described as "agree or

high" such as: "there is a little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision (3.57), even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final answer (3.49), in general, a person who wants to make his own decisions would be quickly discouraged in this agency (3.47), so many rules and policies to be followed (3.52), decisions are always delayed because they have to be going through several process and procedures (3.60), lower-level managers are not free to make decisions (3.58), people are afraid to violate the policies because it means punishment (3.58), ordinary employees have no voice in decision making (3.59), employees are afraid to take a risk (3.59), employees here do the same job, in the same way, every day (3.40) and are not allowed to do things on their own" (3.38).

Problem 2: What is the workplace well-being of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region in terms of

- a. *Autonomy Need,*
- b. *Competence Need,*
- c. *Relatedness Need?*

Table 2: The Workplace Well-being of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region as to Autonomy Need Satisfaction

Indicators	Mean	DR
1. At work, I feel a sense of choice and freedom in the things I undertake.	3.31	SWA
2. I feel that my decisions on my job reflect what I want	3.33	SWA
3. I feel my choices on my job express who I am.	3.43	A
4. I feel I have been doing what interests me in my job.	3.41	A
Composite Mean	3.37	SWA

Source: Nishimura, and Zuzuki (2016)

Based on the data presented on the table, as a whole, the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges in terms of autonomy need satisfaction obtained a composite mean of 3.37 which is interpreted as "agree/high". This result points out that the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region in terms of autonomy need satisfaction is not very high, high and it is also not low or very low but to a moderate extent. The finding suggests that the autonomy need satisfaction of employees is not very high or high but to a moderate extent. In other words, the employees have not been very highly or highly exercising autonomy in their duties and responsibilities. Taking them singly, the data shows that some items are rated within the mean of "somewhat agree" such as "feeling a sense of choice and freedom in the things that they undertake (3.31), and feeling that their decisions on their job reflecting what they want (3.33). The other two items are rated within the mean range of "agree/high" such as "feeling that their choices on their job express who they are (3.43), and feeling that they have been doing what interests them in their job (3.41).

Table 3: The Workplace Well-being of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region as to Relatedness Need Satisfaction

Indicators	Mean	DR
1. I feel that the people I care at work about also care about me.	3.32	SWA
2. I feel connected with people who care for me at work and for whom I care at work.	3.37	SWA
3. At work, I feel close and connected with other people who are important to me.	3.30	SWA
4. I experience a warm feeling with the people I spend time with at work.	3.38	SWA
Composite Mean	3.34	SWA

Source: Nishimura, and Zuzuki (2016)

As pointed out by the data on the table, it demonstrates that as a whole, the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region in terms of relatedness need satisfaction gained a composite mean rating of 3.34 which is described as "somewhat agree/moderate level". These composite means signifies that workplace well-being in terms of relatedness need satisfaction of the Divine Word Colleges is not very high or high and it is also not low or very low but to a moderate extent. This result suggests that the relatedness need of the workforce is not very highly or highly satisfied but is only moderately satisfied. Even when the items are taken separately, they all fall within the same mean range and interpreted as "somewhat agree/moderate level" such as "feeling that the people I care at work about also care about me (3.32), feeling connected with people who care me at work and for whom I care at work (3.37), felling close and connected with other people who are important to me (3.30), and experiencing a warm feeling with the people I spend time with at work" (3.38).

Table 4: Workplace Well-being of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region as to Competence Needs

Indicators	Mean	DR
1. I feel confident that I can do things well on my job.	3.47	A
2. At work, I feel capable of what I do.	3.47	A
3. When I am at work, I feel competent to achieve my goals.	3.42	A
4. In my job, I feel I can complete a difficult task.	3.45	A
Composite Mean	3.45	A

Source: Nishimura, and Zuzuki (2016)

As appeared on the data, it displays that as a whole, the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos Region in terms of competence need satisfaction gained a composite mean rating of 3.45 which is interpreted as “agree/high”. The result indicates that the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region in terms of competence need satisfaction is not very high but high and it is also not moderate, low, or very low. The findings imply that the competence needs satisfaction of the employees of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region is highly satisfied/ fulfilled. Even if the items are taken singly, they all fall within the same mean rating which is described as "agree/high" such as "feeling the confidence that I can do things well in my job (3.47), feeling capable of what I do (3.47), feeling competent to achieve my goals (3.42) and feeling that I can complete the difficult task" (3.45).

Table 5: Summary Table on Workplace Well-Being

Autonomy Needs	3.37	SWA
Relatedness Needs	3.34	SWA
Competence Needs	3.45	A
Overall Mean	3.38	SWA

Source: Nishimura, and Zuzuki (2016)

As revealed on the summary table, it appears that as whole workplace well-being of the Divine Word colleges in the Ilocos region got an overall mean rating of 3.38 which is interpreted as “somewhat agree/moderate extent”. This result implies that overall the workplace well-being of the Divine Word Colleges is not very high or high and it is not also low or very low but to a moderate extent. The finding suggests that overall employees of Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region have not been very highly or highly satisfied with their autonomy need (3.37), and relatedness need (3.34). However, taking them singly, employees are highly satisfied with their competence need (3.45). Experiencing a moderate level of workplace well-being may affect effectiveness and job performance (ILO, 2020).

Problem 3: Is there a relationship between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being?

Table 6: Relationship between Bureaucratic Management and Workplace Well-being

		Autonomy Need Satisfaction	Relatedness Need Satisfaction	Competence Need Satisfaction	Workplace Well-being As a Whole
Bureaucratic Management	Pearson Correlation	-.077	-.108	-.147	-.126
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.389	.223	.099	.158
	N	128	128	128	128

Based on the correlation table, it revealed that the result of Pearson r correlation does not find a significant correlation between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being such as autonomy need satisfaction, relatedness needs satisfaction, and competence needs satisfaction. It implies that bureaucratic management does not have any direct effect on the workplace well-being of employees. Thus, a moderate level of workplace well-being may be caused by other unrelated factors.

Result and Discussion

Based on the finding of the study, it shows that management is highly bureaucratic, and here are the elements of bureaucracy such as hierarchical authority, rules, division of labor performance-based promotion, efficiency, and impersonality(Reynolds, 2018). Though it has been recognized to improve efficiency, however, it has been also criticized to be impersonal and focusing on too many rules and procedures which causes the delay in decision making, responsiveness to the changes in the environment. Much of the time

managers are spent discussing internal issues. Within a bureaucratic environment, decision-making is centralized and employees are not given the freedom to make decisions on their own (Hamel & Zanini, 2017). It is along with this concern, Ritzer (2004) criticized bureaucracy to be treating a human being impersonal just like machines subjected to be manipulated or controlled in which freedom and autonomy are not allowed. It is assumed that practicing bureaucratic management will necessarily affect the well-being of employees. However, the finding of the study indicated that in the context of the Divine Word Colleges in the Ilocos region bureaucratic management does not affect the workplace well-being of the employees such as autonomy, relatedness need, and competence need.

Looking into the result of the statistics, the weighted mean of bureaucratic management is higher than the weighted mean of workplace well-being which is considered a moderate level. But looking into the Pearson r correlation, the lower weighted mean of workplace well-being is not necessarily caused by bureaucratic management. It implies that a moderate level of need satisfaction such as autonomy need, relatedness need, and competence need is caused by other factors and not related to bureaucratic management. The result of this study is similar to the finding of Langer, et.al. (2017) related to the influence of bureaucratic and entrepreneurial environment on job satisfaction and the study found that job satisfaction has a direct negative relationship with the centralized work environment. The employees are not affected by the bureaucratic management because they have been living in such an environment, even outside of the school context. In other words, employees may be affected if they are new to such an environment.

The result of this study contributed to the complex discussion concerning the effect of bureaucratic management on workplace well-being. Bureaucratic management has been criticized for its heavy emphasis on rules and demand compliance on rules and therefore minimizing freedom and autonomy in performing the job. However, the result of the current study revealed that in the context of the Divine Word Colleges, it does not show that bureaucratic management affects workplace well-being particularly autonomy, competence, and relatedness needs.

Conclusion

The study aimed to determine the effect of bureaucratic management on workplace well-being such as autonomy needs, relatedness needs, and competence needs. The study hypothesizes that there is a correlation between bureaucratic management and workplace well-being. The result showed that bureaucratic management got a higher weighted mean of 3.54 than workplace well-being of 3.38. Employees agree that the management style of the colleges is bureaucratic. However, the result of the Pearson r correlation found that there is no correlation between bureaucratic management practices and workplace well-being. Therefore the hypothesis of the study is rejected.

The finding of the study contributes to the complex discussion on the effect of bureaucratic management on the employees' well-being. The finding is a bit controversial because it goes against the general assumption of the effect of bureaucratic management on the well-being of employees. In a certain context, bureaucratic management may affect the workplace well-being but not all context and culture. The study recognizes its limitation because of its limited population coverage and therefore, it needs further study to include more schools and more respondents. In future studies, it is important to investigate other work environmental aspects as mediating factors to workplace well-being.

References

- Adaui, C.R.L. & Habisch, A. (2013). Humanistic management, Chapters, in: Bruni, L & Zamagni, S. (ed.), *Handbook on the Economics of Reciprocity and Social Enterprise*, chapter 18, 91-200. Massachusetts: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Alromaihi, M.A., Alshomaly, Z.A., & George, S. (2017). Job Satisfaction and Employees Performance: A Theoretical Review of the Relationship of the Two Variables. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 6(1).
- Ariola, M.M. (2006). *Principles and Methods of Research*. Manila: Rex Book Store
- Aron, R. (1994). *The Stages of Sociological Thinking*. Lisboa: Publica coes Dom Quixote.
- Bakotic, D. (2016). Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance. *Journal of Economic Research*, 29 (1).
- Balasundaram, N. & Brabete, V. (2010). Job satisfaction and Employees' Work Performance: A Case Study of People's Bank in Jaffna Peninsula, Sri Lanka. *Marketing and Management Journal, University of Craiova, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration*, 10 (1), 43-47.
- Barnett, M. & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules of the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 17-18
- Baumeister, R., & Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong. The desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Black Dog Institute (n.d). *Workplace Well-Being*. Retrieved from <https://blackdoginstitute.org.au/docs/default-source/factsheets/workplacewellbeing.pdf>
- CEOPedia (2019). *Bureaucratic Leadership*. CEOPedia Management Online. <https://ceopedia.org>
- Cherry, K. (2019). *Self-Determination Theory and Motivation*. Retrieved from <https://www.verywellmind.com>
- Clifford, M. M. (1990). Students need a challenge, not an easy success. *Educational Leadership*, 48,22-26
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal Causation*. New York: Academic Press

- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of Behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R.M. (2000). "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions". *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 25 (1): 54- 67. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Deming, W.E. (1991). *Quality, Productivity, and Competitive Position*. California: Quality Enhancement Seminars, Inc.
- Drucker, P. (1950). *The New Society: The Anatomy of Industrial Order*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Drucker, P. (1990). *The New Realities*. London: Mandarin
- Drury, H. B. (1918). *Scientific Management: A History and Criticism*. Retrieved from <https://www.arcvive.org>
- Fata, E. (2020). *Five Examples of Bureaucratic Leadership in Action*. Starting Business. Retrieved from <https://www.startingbusiness.com>
- Gabelli School of Business (n.d). *Center for Humanistic Management*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1997). *Sociologia (Sociology)*. Lisboa: Funda cao Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Hammel, G. & Zanini, M. (2017). *Assessment: Do You Know How Bureaucratic Your Organization Is?* Harvard Business Review. Retrieved from <https://hbr.org>
- Harter, S. (1978). *Effecting motivation is reconsidered: toward a developmental model*. *Human Development*, 1, 661-669.
- Hoppock, R. & Spiegler, S. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper and Brothers
- Howard, P.K. (2012). *To Fix America's Education Bureaucracy, We Need to Destroy It*. The Atlantic. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com>
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). *Job attitudes*. In Borman, W.C., Ligen, D.R. & Klimoski, R.J. (Eds.). *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 255-276.
- Humanistic Management Center (2018). *The Three Stepped Approach to Humanistic Management*. Retrieved from <http://humanisticmanagement.org>
- ILO (2020). *Workplace Well-Being*. Retrieved from <https://www.ilo.org>
- Inuwa, M. (2016). *Job satisfaction and Employee Performance: An Empirical Approach*. *The Millenium University Journal*, 1 (1).
- Internet Center for Management and Business Administration, (2010). *Frederick Taylor and Scientific Management*. Retrieved from <http://www.netmba.com>
- Jordan, J. V., Kaplan, A. G., Miller, J. B., Stiver, L. P., & Stiver, J. L. (Eds.). (1991). *Women's growth in connection*. New York: Guilford Press
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). *The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127 (3), 376-407.
- Kerstein, S. (2019). *Treating Persons as Means*. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu>
- Knowles, M. (1975). *Self-Directed Learning*. New York: Association Press.
- Kukreja, S. (2018). *Bureaucratic Leadership Guide: Definitions, Pros & Cons, Examples*. Retrieved from <https://www.managementstudyhq.com>
- Landy, F.J. (1989). *Psychology of Work Behavior*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole
- Langer, J., Feenay, M.K., & Lee, S.E. (2019). *Employee Fit and Job Satisfaction in Bureaucratic and Entrepreneurial Work Environments*. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 39(1) 135–155.
- Legault, L. (2018). *The Need for Autonomy*. New York: Springer International Publishing.
- Legault, L. (2017). *The Need For Competence*. New York: Springer International Publishing
- Leo XIII (1891). *Encyclical-Letter "Rerum Novarum"*. Retrieved from <https://www.vatican.va>
- Lilienthal, D.E. (1967). *Management: A Humanist Art*. New York: Carnegie Institute of Technology.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). *The nature and causes of job satisfaction*, in Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1297-349.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (2003) *Culture, Self, and the Reality of the Social*, *Psychological Inquiry*, 14:3-4, 277-283, <https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2003.9682893>
- McLeod, S. (2020). *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*. *Simply Psychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org>.
- Mele, D. (2016). *Understanding Humanistic Management*. *Humanistic Management Journal*, 1, 33-55.
- Mitcham, C. & Adam, B. (2005). "Management", *Encyclopedia of Science, Technology, and Ethics*. Macmillan: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Moller, A. C., & Deci, E. L. (2010). *Interpersonal control, dehumanization, and violence: A self-determination theory perspective*. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 13, 41–53
- Mulder, P. (2017). *Bureaucratic Theory by Max Weber*. *Toolshero*. Retrieved from <https://www.toolshero.com>
- Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). *What makes for a life well lived? Autonomy and its relation to full functioning and organismic wellness*, In *The Oxford handbook of happiness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 214-226
- Nishimura, T., & Zuzuki, T. (2016). *Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction and Frustration in Japan: Controlling for the Big Five Personality Traits*. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 2016, 58 (4), 320–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12131>
- Pirson, M. (2017). *Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Reeve, J. (2014). *Understanding motivation and emotion*. Hoboken: Wiley
- Reynolds, L. (2018). *Six Characteristics of Bureaucracy*. *Bizfluent*. Retrieved from <https://bizfluent.com>

- Ritzer, G. (2004). *Enchanting a Disenchanted World: Revolutionizing the Means of Consumptions*. Thousands of Oaks, California: Pine Forge Press.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2019). Brick by Brick: The origins, Development, and Future of self-Determination Theory. *Advance in Motivation Science*, 6.
- Sapmaz, F., Dogan, T., Sapmaz, S., Temizel, S., & Tel, F.D. (2012). Examining Predictive Role of Psychological Need Satisfaction on Happiness in terms of Self-Determination Theory. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 861-868.
- Schultz, D. (1982). *Psychology and Industry Today*. New York: MacMillian Company.
- Serpa, S. & Ferreira, M. (2019). The Concept of Bureaucracy by Max Weber. *International Journal of Science Studies*, 7 (2).
- Shiyani, V. (n.d). Job Satisfaction: Meaning, Definition, Importance, factors, Effects, and Theories. Retrieved from <https://www.businessmanagementideas.com>
- Siegal & Lance (1987). *Personnel and Organizational Psychology*, Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc
- Sjöblom, K., Mälkki, K, Sandström, N., & Lonka, K. (2016). Does Physical Environment Contribute to Basic Psychological Needs? A Self-Determination Theory Perspective on Learning in the Chemistry Laboratory. Finland: University of Helsinki. Retrieved from <https://journals.sfu.ca>
- Smith, P.C., Kendal, L.M. & Hulin, C.L. (1969). *Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally
- Snizek, W.E. & Bullard, J.H. (1983). Perception of Bureaucracy and Changing Job satisfaction: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32 (2), 275-287.
- Solomos, D.K. (2012). Taylor’s Scientific Management. *Review of General Management*, 16 (2), 150.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Swart, J.C. (1973). The Worth of Humanistic Management: Some Contemporary Examples. *Business Horizons*, 16(3), 41-50
- Swedberg, R. & Agewal, O. (2005). *The Max Weber Dictionary: Key Words and Central Concepts*. California: Stanford University Press
- Taylor, F.W. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Norton
- Thompson, S. (2019). Challenges of Humanistic Management. *Management*. Retrieved from <https://bizfluent.com>
- Von Berg, A. (2009). Humanisierung der Arbeit. Neue Formen der Arbeitsgestaltung als Determinante von Arbeitszufriedenheit am Beispiel teilautonomer Arbeitsgruppen. Georg- August Universität: Göttingen, 1–2.
- Von Kimakowitz, E., Pirson, M., Dierksmeier, C., Spitzack, H. & Amann, W. (2011). *Introduction to Humanistic Management in Practice*. New York: Fordham University Press
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Wiley
- Wrege, C.D. (1991). *Frederick W. Taylor: The Father of Scientific Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Wright, R. G. (2002). Treating Persons as Ends in Themselves: The Legal Implications of Kantian Principle. *University of Richmond Law Review*, 36 (1).
- Zamarripa, J., Medellin, R.R., Perez-Garcia, J.A., Otero-Saborido, F., & Delgado, M. (2020). Mexican Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction and Frustration Scale in Physical Education. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 11:253. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00253>

Publisher’s Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.