

PERCEIVED MICROMANAGEMENT, PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING: A SMALL-SCALE EXPLORATORY SURVEY-BASED STUDY

SHAHED ALADWAN¹ – SZABOLCS FEKETE²

Abstract

This article examines perceived micromanagement, psychological safety, supervisory authority, and employee well-being through a small-scale exploratory questionnaire study. The analysis is based on a cross-sectional online survey completed by 71 participants. Its purpose is descriptive and interpretive rather than confirmatory: formal statistical modelling and standalone qualitative analysis fall outside the scope of the present manuscript. The survey responses indicate that stronger and more intrusive supervisory control was often reported together with lower psychological safety, reduced autonomy, weaker employee voice, and less favourable work-related well-being. At the same time, the article keeps a clear distinction between close supervision and micromanagement. Supervision was described as less problematic when it was task-relevant, predictable, proportionate, and experienced as supportive rather than distrustful. The study contributes to discussions on leadership, authority, and employee well-being by clarifying how necessary managerial oversight may differ from autonomy-reducing control. Its main value lies in formulating cautious, survey-based observations and identifying directions for future research with larger samples, validated instruments, and fuller statistical reporting.

Keywords: micromanagement; psychological safety; employee well-being; supervisory authority; workplace autonomy; leadership; organizational behavior

Introduction

Supervisory practices have a direct influence on everyday workplace experience. They shape how employees interpret expectations, how they communicate concerns, and how secure they feel within the organization. Micromanagement remains a contested form of managerial control because it is not always easy to distinguish from legitimate supervision. It is usually associated with excessive monitoring, frequent intervention in routine decisions, close checking of work processes, and limited delegation of authority. Over time, these behaviours may weaken autonomy and reduce trust between supervisors and employees (Allcorn, 2022).

The distinction between supervision and micromanagement is important. Most organizations need some degree of oversight, especially where accountability, quality assurance, safety, compliance, or technical precision are central to the work. Professional supervision can provide structure, guidance, and clear expectations. It

¹ social worker, Research Center for Social Inclusion and Social Economy, University of Pécs; shahedmadwan@gmail.com; ORCID: 0009-0006-4502-7831

² Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Head of Research Center, Research Center for Social Inclusion and Social Economy; University of Pécs; fekete.szabolcs@pte.hu; ORCID: 0009-0001-8640-2494

becomes problematic when control is disproportionate to the task, when it communicates distrust, or when it unnecessarily narrows employees' professional judgement. In practice, the boundary between helpful oversight and intrusive control is often negotiated in everyday interactions rather than defined in advance.

Psychological safety is relevant to this boundary. Edmondson (1999) defines psychological safety as a shared belief that people can take interpersonal risks without fear of humiliation or punishment. In workplaces where supervisory control is experienced as intrusive, employees may become more cautious about speaking up, asking questions, admitting mistakes, or raising concerns. Psychological safety is therefore not only a matter of workplace comfort. It also affects communication, learning, cooperation, and the organization's ability to detect and address problems.

Employee well-being is another key dimension of the workplace experience. In this study, well-being refers broadly to participants' reported emotional comfort, perceived stress, vitality, and general psychological functioning in the work environment. Restrictive supervisory practices may become stressful when they reduce perceived competence, autonomy, and control over one's own work. These experiences may be linked with frustration, lower engagement, and reduced psychological comfort. The present article approaches these issues descriptively through questionnaire responses.

Supervisory authority also requires careful treatment. Authority is not inherently harmful. Managers may need authority to coordinate tasks, allocate responsibility, uphold standards, and protect organizational or client interests. French and Raven's (1959) classic typology of social power shows that authority may rest on different bases, including legitimate, expert, reward, coercive, and referent power. This distinction matters because employees may interpret similar supervisory actions differently depending on whether they experience them as expert guidance, professional support, punitive surveillance, or rigid interference.

The present study is exploratory. It identifies preliminary survey-based observations about perceived micromanagement, psychological safety, supervisory authority, and employee well-being in a small convenience sample. Rather than testing causal models, it examines how these themes appear in the questionnaire material and uses the findings to clarify questions for more systematic future research.

Literature review

Micromanagement in the workplace

Micromanagement can be understood as a managerial pattern characterized by excessive supervision, close control over work processes, and limited delegation of decision-making authority. In micromanaged settings, managers do not only define goals or monitor outcomes. They may become closely involved in how employees complete routine tasks, request frequent updates, intervene in minor decisions, or correct details that could reasonably be left to employees' professional judgement. The effect is not always immediate, but repeated interventions may gradually reduce employees' sense of autonomy and trust.

A key distinction must be maintained between micromanagement and legitimate professional supervision. Supervision is often necessary for coordination, accountability, quality assurance, and safety. In the literature, control tends to be

treated as most problematic when it is disproportionate, when it focuses more on surveillance than support, or when it signals that employees are not trusted to use professional discretion. For this reason, micromanagement is generally discussed as a negative leadership behaviour because it may restrict autonomy, undermine trust, and contribute to disengagement (Allcorn, 2022).

Self-Determination Theory offers a useful explanation for why excessive control may matter psychologically. Deci and Ryan (2000) argue that autonomy, competence, and relatedness are central psychological needs. When supervision limits discretion and conveys distrust, these needs may be frustrated. The possible consequences include lower motivation, weaker confidence, reduced initiative, and less willingness to take responsibility for work outcomes.

Micromanagement, psychological safety, and employee voice

Psychological safety refers to whether people feel able to speak up, ask questions, admit mistakes, and express concerns without fear of negative consequences (Edmondson, 1999). It is especially relevant in the context of micromanagement because excessive control may create an evaluative workplace climate. Even without explicit punishment, constant monitoring can make employees feel that mistakes, alternative ideas, or independent decisions will be judged harshly.

In such environments, employees may self-censor. They may avoid raising concerns, withhold ideas, or wait for managerial approval even when they have the competence to act independently. This matters because psychological safety is connected to learning behaviour, communication, and collective problem-solving. If employees do not feel safe to speak up, organizations may lose access to important information about errors, inefficiencies, and potential improvements.

Employee well-being

Employee well-being is a broad construct that may include emotional comfort, perceived stress, vitality, engagement, and general psychological functioning. In the present study, well-being is approached through participants' self-reported experiences and through the WHO-5 Well-Being Index as a concise indicator of general mental well-being (WHO, 1998; Topp et al., 2015). The well-being-related material is therefore interpreted descriptively rather than diagnostically.

Theoretically, micromanagement may be linked with less favourable well-being-related experiences because it reduces perceived control over work. Employees who experience continuous monitoring may feel that they are not trusted, that their competence is questioned, or that they cannot act without permission. Such experiences may contribute to stress and frustration. At the same time, well-being is shaped by many other factors, including workload, organizational culture, job security, interpersonal relations, and personal circumstances. For this reason, the present study avoids treating micromanagement as a single direct cause of well-being outcomes.

Supervisory authority as a contextual factor

Supervisory authority shapes how control is interpreted. Authority can be used to provide clarity, coordination, and professional guidance. It can also be exercised in rigid, punitive, or intrusive ways. French and Raven's (1959) typology of power is

useful because it shows that formal authority is only one element of the broader power relationship between supervisors and employees. Expert, referent, reward, and coercive forms of power may all affect how employees interpret managerial behaviour.

Leadership research similarly suggests that the exercise of authority can influence employee experiences. Controlling or authoritarian leadership may be associated with lower autonomy and weaker optimism, while more supportive leadership may help employees understand expectations without feeling unnecessarily constrained (De Hoogh–Den Hartog, 2008). Transformational and autonomy-supportive leadership perspectives also emphasize guidance, support, and meaningful participation rather than command-and-control supervision (Avolio–Bass, 2004; Deci–Ryan, 2000).

This study examines supervisory authority descriptively as a contextual factor rather than as a statistically tested moderator. In the survey material, authority appeared less problematic when it was predictable, supportive, task-relevant, and proportionate. It appeared more problematic when it was rigid, punitive, distrustful, or weakly connected to the requirements of the task.

Research gap and research questions

The present article addresses a deliberately focused question: what general survey-based observations can be made from a small convenience sample regarding perceived supervisory control, psychological safety, employee voice, and well-being-related experiences? The article therefore uses descriptive research questions rather than hypotheses. This framing is important because the study does not aim to establish causality, estimate population-level effects, or validate a measurement model.

The present study addresses the following descriptive research questions:

- RQ1: What general trends emerge from survey responses regarding perceived micromanagement and supervisory control?
- RQ2: How do participants describe psychological safety and employee voice in relation to perceived supervisory control?
- RQ3: What general tendencies are visible in well-being-related survey responses in relation to perceived supervisory control?
- RQ4: How is supervisory authority presented as a contextual dimension in participants' survey responses?

Methodology

Study design

This study used a cross-sectional online survey design to explore employees' perceptions of micromanagement, supervisory authority, psychological safety, and well-being. The aim was not to produce a representative estimate, test a causal model, or validate a measurement instrument. Instead, the study was designed as a small-scale exploratory survey-based study that could identify preliminary patterns and support the development of future research questions.

A cross-sectional design was appropriate for this exploratory purpose because it allowed participants' perceptions to be collected at a specific point in time. However, this design also limits interpretation. Cross-sectional survey data cannot establish temporal order or causality. The findings therefore show perceived patterns and possible associations in the survey material, rather than evidence that one variable causes another.

Participants and recruitment

The final dataset included 71 valid responses. Participants were employed adults with experience of workplace supervision and were recruited through online channels, including professional networks, social media platforms, and email invitations. The sample should be understood as a convenience sample. It included participants from varied professional backgrounds, but it was not designed to be statistically representative of a particular country, industry, or occupational group.

The exploratory value of the sample lies in the range of workplace experiences it captures. At the same time, the relatively small sample size and limited demographic breakdown restrict the extent to which sectoral, cultural, or regional differences can be analyzed systematically. Any references to variation across work environments should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

Measures

The questionnaire included items related to perceived micromanagement and supervisory control, psychological safety, and psychological well-being. Perceived micromanagement and supervisory control were assessed through items adapted from published concepts and literature on supervisory control and micromanagement. These items focused on monitoring, intervention in decisions, frequent requests for updates, limited delegation, and perceived restrictions on autonomy.

Psychological safety was assessed through selected items based on Edmondson's work on team psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999). The items addressed whether participants felt able to speak up, share ideas, ask questions, and express concerns without fear of negative consequences. This construct was central to the study because close supervision may influence not only autonomy but also the willingness to take interpersonal risks at work.

Well-being-related experiences were explored through survey items informed by the WHO-5 Well-Being Index, a short measure of general mental well-being focused on positive mood, vitality, and general emotional functioning (WHO, 1998; Topp et al., 2015). The present manuscript does not report formal WHO-5 scoring, diagnostic categories, or causal claims. Well-being is therefore treated as part of a broader descriptive account of participants' self-reported workplace experiences.

Because several items were adapted from existing concepts rather than administered as full validated scales, the measurement approach should be considered exploratory. This limits the strength of measurement-related conclusions and points to the need for fuller reliability reporting in future research.

Procedure and ethics

Participants completed the questionnaire online. Before beginning the survey, they received information about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, the anonymous handling of responses, and their right to withdraw. No personally identifying information was required. This was intended to protect participant privacy and reduce concerns about discussing sensitive workplace experiences.

The questionnaire first collected basic background and employment-related information, followed by items concerning supervisory control, psychological safety, supervisory authority, and well-being. Although the survey included opportunities for additional written reflection, these responses are treated only as supplementary background and are not used to support independent qualitative claims.

Narrative survey-based summary

Survey responses were summarized narratively to identify preliminary patterns in participants' perceptions. The analysis is limited to narrative description and does not include formal quantitative modelling or qualitative coding. Additional written responses, where provided, are not treated as a standalone qualitative dataset. The article therefore does not make qualitative claims based on coding procedures, thematic saturation, or direct participant quotations.

This positioning is deliberate. The manuscript is best understood as a small-scale exploratory survey-based research report. Its purpose is to organize and interpret the questionnaire material cautiously, while making clear what future studies would need to examine more rigorously.

Preliminary survey-based observations

Due to the small convenience sample, the following section presents descriptive observations highlighting general trends in the questionnaire responses. These observations should not be interpreted as causal, representative, or confirmatory findings.

Reported patterns of supervisory control

Survey responses pointed to workplace experiences involving frequent monitoring, repeated requests for updates, close checking of details, or limited space for independent decision-making. These observations suggest that behaviours associated with micromanagement were not perceived only as isolated managerial actions, but sometimes as recurring supervisory practices that shaped the everyday experience of work.

Participants who reported stronger supervisory control often emphasized the cumulative effect of small interventions. Frequent checking, repeated approval requirements, and limited delegation were described as practices that could slow down work and reduce the sense of being trusted. The issue was therefore not simply that supervisors were present, but that their presence was sometimes experienced as narrowing professional discretion.

At the same time, the survey material also indicated that not all forms of control were interpreted negatively. Some participants appeared to distinguish

between task-relevant guidance and unnecessary interference. This distinction is important for the article's argument because it prevents micromanagement from being reduced to any form of close supervision.

Psychological safety and employee voice

Participants who reported more intrusive supervisory control also tended to describe lower psychological safety. In the survey material, close monitoring was connected with caution, reduced willingness to express concerns, and difficulty speaking openly about mistakes or alternative ideas. This pattern is consistent with Edmondson's theoretical account of psychological safety, although it should be tested more directly in future research.

The survey material suggested that employees may become more careful about what they say when supervision feels evaluative rather than supportive. Participants described situations in which raising questions, challenging decisions, or admitting uncertainty seemed risky. These responses indicate a plausible perceptual pattern, not a confirmed causal mechanism.

The observations also indicate that psychologically safer environments were described as more open, supportive, and less punitive. In such contexts, participants appeared more willing to communicate, ask for clarification, and contribute ideas. Psychological safety therefore helps interpret the reported connection between supervisory control and employee voice.

Reported well-being-related experiences

The narrative summary suggests that stronger perceived micromanagement may be connected with less favourable well-being-related experiences. Participants who reported intrusive control also described stress, frustration, reduced emotional comfort, and a weaker sense of control over their work. Without formal statistical outputs, these patterns offer direction rather than definitive conclusions.

Participants' well-being-related experiences appeared to be shaped by more than the amount of supervision alone. The meaning of supervision mattered. When control was described as supportive, predictable, and connected to legitimate task requirements, it appeared less problematic. When it was described as distrustful or autonomy-reducing, it appeared more clearly connected with discomfort and stress.

This point helps avoid an overly simple conclusion. The study does not show that all close supervision weakens well-being. Rather, it suggests that close supervision may be connected with less favourable well-being-related experiences when it reduces discretion, undermines trust, or discourages employee voice.

Supervisory authority as a contextual dimension

Supervisory authority appeared to shape how participants interpreted close control. Authority was reported less negatively when it provided clear expectations, professional guidance, and predictable decision-making. In these cases, control could be experienced as task-relevant support rather than micromanagement.

By contrast, authority appeared more problematic when it was reported as rigid, punitive, or excessive. Participants who framed supervisory authority in this way tended to describe a stronger sense of being watched, judged, or professionally

constrained. This observation suggests that authority may influence the meaning employees attach to close supervision.

A conceptually important distinction therefore emerges. Close supervision may be necessary in some high-risk, technical, or highly regulated environments. However, the present sample does not allow systematic sector-specific comparison. The distinction should therefore be treated as a conceptual implication of the survey material and the literature, not as a sector-specific empirical finding.

Discussion

This article examined how respondents in a small exploratory questionnaire study reported supervisory control, psychological safety, supervisory authority, and employee well-being. The observations are consistent with the idea that micromanagement is experienced as more than strict supervision. Participants described intrusive control, frequent monitoring, limited delegation, and reduced decision-making space as features that may distinguish micromanagement from legitimate managerial oversight.

One important interpretive point concerns autonomy. Participants who reported stronger supervisory control also described reduced decision-making freedom and less opportunity to use their own professional judgement. This pattern can be interpreted through Self-Determination Theory, which emphasizes autonomy and competence as important psychological needs (Deci-Ryan, 2000). When employees feel that even minor decisions are taken out of their hands, their confidence, initiative, and sense of professional competence may gradually weaken.

The observations are also consistent with the concept of psychological safety. The survey material suggests that intrusive supervision may be connected with caution, silence, and reduced willingness to speak up. This matters because psychological safety supports communication, learning, and collective problem-solving. The present study cannot establish the strength or direction of this relationship, but it identifies it as an important issue for future analysis.

Well-being-related experiences were also connected with how participants reported supervisory control. Participants who described intrusive control often referred to stress, frustration, and reduced emotional comfort. Alternative explanations remain possible because of the cross-sectional design and self-reported data. For example, employees who are already dissatisfied or under pressure may be more likely to interpret supervisory behaviour as intrusive.

Supervisory authority emerged as a key contextual dimension. Authority itself was not necessarily experienced as harmful. In some responses, authority provided structure, clarity, and task-relevant support. In others, it was experienced as rigid, punitive, and autonomy-reducing. This distinction helps avoid a simplistic opposition between control and autonomy. Organizations often need supervision, but the legitimacy of supervision depends on proportionality, explanation, trust, and relevance to the task.

A balanced interpretation is therefore necessary. Close supervision is not automatically micromanagement. In the survey material, control appeared most problematic when it was described as exceeding the needs of the work, communicating distrust, restricting professional judgement, and discouraging employee voice. This distinction is particularly important for organizations that operate in high-risk, regulated, or technically demanding environments, where

control may be necessary but still needs to be exercised in a psychologically safe and autonomy-supportive manner.

Although preliminary, the observations suggest that organizations may benefit from supervisory practices that balance accountability with autonomy. In practice, reducing micromanagement may begin with clarifying delegation norms, limiting unnecessary approval steps, and building a supervisory culture in which feedback is experienced as guidance rather than surveillance. These implications should be understood as practice-oriented reflections derived from the questionnaire responses and the literature.

Limitations

The study has several important limitations. First, it used a small convenience sample of 71 participants. This limits generalizability and means that the findings cannot be treated as representative of all employees, sectors, or cultural contexts. The sample is useful for exploratory insight, but not for broad population-level conclusions.

Second, the study used a cross-sectional design. The data capture participants' perceptions at one point in time. As a result, the study cannot establish whether micromanagement leads to lower psychological safety or weaker well-being over time. Longitudinal research would be needed to examine temporal order and possible causal mechanisms.

Third, the study relied on self-reported data. Participants' responses may have been influenced by mood, recent workplace experiences, conflict with supervisors, or personal interpretation. It is also possible that employees who were already stressed, dissatisfied, or uncertain at work interpreted ordinary supervisory guidance as intrusive control. Because micromanagement is partly a perceptual phenomenon, self-reports are relevant, but future studies would benefit from combining employee responses with supervisor perspectives, organizational indicators, or observational data.

Fourth, the analysis is limited to narrative description. The absence of inferential statistics, item-level data, scale score distributions, and reliability coefficients restricts the empirical weight of the findings. Future versions of this research should include frequency distributions, scale-level descriptive statistics, and basic demographic information.

Fifth, the manuscript does not report reliability coefficients for the scales. Several items were adapted from existing concepts rather than administered as complete validated scales. This limits the strength of measurement-related interpretation. Future research should use validated instruments, report internal consistency, and provide clearer information on scale construction and scoring.

Sixth, the demographic and sectoral breakdown of the sample is limited. This prevents systematic comparison across industries, regions, organizational levels, or cultural contexts. The study can suggest that context matters, but it cannot show how specific contexts differ from one another.

Seventh, although additional written responses were collected, they are not treated as a standalone qualitative dataset. The manuscript does not include participant quotations, coding procedures, or an audit trail. Future research should include transparent coding and illustrative quotations if qualitative claims are made.

Future research would benefit from larger, more representative samples, validated instruments, and fuller statistical reporting. It should also examine whether psychological safety mediates the relationship between supervisory control and well-

being, and whether supervisory authority or sector-specific task requirements shape this relationship.

Conclusion

Based on a small convenience sample, the study suggests that perceived micromanagement may be associated with lower psychological safety and poorer reported well-being. Respondents who described stronger supervisory control also tended to report reduced autonomy, weaker employee voice, stress, frustration, and reduced emotional comfort. These observations should not be read as causal or statistically tested conclusions.

Psychological safety helps explain why intrusive supervision may affect whether employees feel able to speak up, ask questions, and express concerns. When employees feel able to raise such issues without fear of negative consequences, supervisory control may be less likely to be experienced as threatening. Conversely, when control is interpreted as evaluative or distrustful, employee voice may become more cautious.

The study also highlights the contextual role of supervisory authority. Close supervision is not necessarily harmful. In some high-risk, technical, or regulated environments, it may be professionally justified. In the survey material, control appeared more problematic when it was reported as excessive, distrustful, or unrelated to the actual requirements of the task. This distinction remains conceptual and should be examined more carefully in future sector-specific research.

Overall, the study underlines the importance of balanced leadership. Organizations may benefit from supervisory practices that maintain standards and accountability while preserving autonomy, trust, and employee voice. Future research should examine these preliminary observations with larger samples, validated instruments, and full statistical reporting.

References

- Allcorn, S. (2022): Micromanagement in the workplace. *Organisational and Social Dynamics*, 22(1), pp. 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.33212/osd.v22n1.2022.83>
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. (2004): *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire: Manual and sampler set* (3rd ed.). Mind Garden.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., Den Hartog, D. N. (2008): Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), pp. 297–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.03.002>
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2000): The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), pp. 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Edmondson, A. C. (1999): Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), pp. 350–383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>

French, J. R. P., Jr., Raven, B. (1959): The bases of social power. In: D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*, pp. 150–167. University of Michigan.

Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., Bech, P. (2015): The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 84(3), pp. 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000376585>

World Health Organization. (1998): Wellbeing measures in primary health care/the DepCare Project: *Report on a WHO meeting, Stockholm, Sweden, 12–13 February 1998*. WHO Regional Office for Europe.

ÉSZLELT MIKROMENEDZSMENT, PSZICHOLÓGIAI BIZTONSÁG ÉS MUNKAVÁLLALÓI JÓLLÉT:

KIS MINTÁS EXPLORATÍV KÉRDŐÍVES TANULMÁNY

SHAHED ALADWAN – FEKETE SZABOLCS

A tanulmány kis mintás, exploratív kérdőíves vizsgálat alapján elemzi az észlelt mikromenedzsment, a pszichológiai biztonság, a vezetői autoritás és a munkavállalói jóllét kapcsolatát. Az online kérdőívet 71 résztvevő töltötte ki. Az elemzés célja leíró és értelmező jellegű; a formális statisztikai modellezés és az önálló kvalitatív elemzés nem tartozik a kézirat vállalásai közé. A válaszok alapján az erősebb és beavatkozóbb vezetői kontroll gyakran alacsonyabb pszichológiai biztonsággal, korlátozottabb autonómiával, gyengébb munkavállalói hanggal és kedvezőtlenebb munkahelyi jólléti tapasztalatokkal együtt jelent meg. A tanulmány ugyanakkor következetesen különbséget tesz a szoros szakmai felügyelet és a mikromenedzsment között. A vezetői kontroll kevésbé volt problémásként leírható akkor, ha feladathoz kötött, kiszámítható, arányos és támogató módon jelent meg. A tanulmány a vezetésről, az autoritásról és a munkavállalói jóllétről szóló szakmai diskurzushoz azzal járul hozzá, hogy árnyaltan vizsgálja a szükséges irányítás és az autonómiát korlátozó kontroll közötti határt. Fő értéke az előzetes kérdőíves megfigyelések megfogalmazása, valamint további kutatási irányok kijelölése nagyobb mintával, validált mérőeszközökkel és részletesebb statisztikai adatközléssel.

Kulcsszavak: mikromenedzsment; pszichológiai biztonság; munkavállalói jóllét; vezetői autoritás; munkahelyi autonómia; vezetés; szervezeti viselkedés