

THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT: A COMFORTABLE WORK ENVIRONMENT MOTIVATES AND IMPROVES THE SELF-EFFICACY OF INDONESIAN VILLAGE EQUIPMENT

Suherdi¹

¹Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia

Ahmad²

²STIE La Tansa Mashiro, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received:

Accepted:

Published:

Keywords:

Work Environment, Work
Motivation, Self-Efficacy,
Performance

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of the work environment and motivation on the performance of the village apparatus in Lebak Regency. This study has a total sample of 98 respondents. This research method uses research methods with a quantitative approach, survey methods, and model analysis techniques using the SPSS version 24 application. Data collection techniques include distributing questionnaires to respondents. The analysis technique used in this study is multiple linear regression, correlation coefficient analysis, and the coefficient of determination (R²). Based on the results of multiple regression analysis, with the results of the T test showing a t count value of $2.847 > t$ table 1.988 , this means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means that the work environment has a significant effect on the performance of village officials. Furthermore, the results of research on work motivation affect the performance of village apparatus, as evidenced by the results of the T test, which show a t count of $3.429 > t$ table 1.988 . This means that H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted, which means that work motivation has a significant effect on the performance of the village apparatus.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh lingkungan kerja, motivasi kerja, efikasi diri terhadap kinerja aparatur desa di Kabupaten Lebak. Umlah sampel sebanyak 98 responden. Metode penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian dengan pendekatan kuantitatif, metode survei, dan teknik analisis model dengan menggunakan aplikasi SPSS versi 24. Teknik pengumpulan data dengan menyebarkan kuesioner kepada responden. Teknik analisis yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah regresi linier berganda, analisis koefisien korelasi, dan koefisien determinasi (R²). Berdasarkan hasil analisis regresi berganda, dengan hasil uji T menunjukkan nilai t hitung $2,847 > t$ tabel $1,988$ ini berarti H_0 ditolak dan H_a di terima dan hal ini berarti lingkungan kerja berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kinerja aparatur desa. Selanjutnya, hasil penelitian motivasi kerja berpengaruh terhadap kinerja aparatur desa dan efikasi diri berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kinerja, hal ini dibuktikan dengan hasil uji T yang menunjukkan nilai t hitung $3,429 > t$ tabel $1,988$ ini berarti H_0 ditolak dan H_a di terima dan hal ini berarti motivasi kerja berpengaruh signifikan terhadap kinerja aparatur desa.

How to Cite:

Suherdi, Ahmad. (2023) The Role of Management: a Comfortable Work Environment Motivates and Improves the self-efficacy of Indonesian Village Equipment. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi, Perkantoran dan Akuntansi*, 7(2), 101-111. <https://doi.org/10.21009/JPEPA.007.x.x>

INTRODUCTION

Village officials or village apparatus are considered as public service officials who are required to carry out their duties to serve the community optimally and maximally. Based on the importance of the roles and responsibilities of village officials, village officials are required to have the ability, expertise, responsibility, and a spirit of self-sacrifice in providing social services to the community above their own personal interests. This research was conducted in several villages in Lebak Regency which is one of the underdeveloped districts in Banten Province.

The performance level of the village apparatus in several villages in Lebak Regency is still relatively low, this causes delays in services at the village office and hinders the community. In this regard, other factors that cause the village government's performance to be not optimal are the absence of a work-based wage system, the absence of fears that village officials will be fired if they are not successful in their work. This is what causes the institution to be unable to motivate its village apparatus or apparatus.

Problems that occur in several villages in Lebak Regency regarding the work environment lead to a poor physical and non-physical work environment. Work environment problems such as a narrow work space will affect the performance of village officials, employees will find it difficult to move to do work and will affect the acquisition of low work performance, when compared to employees who have a large work space, this also does not rule out checking confidence in doing work for those who feel low in comparing their competencies so that the self-efficacy of village officials can change and the level of self-efficacy is uneven.

In this regard, apart from these problems that cause the performance of the village apparatus to be less than optimal because the motivation of the village apparatus is still low, this can be seen in terms of the average income received by village apparatus which is classified as low income, so that the interest of the community to become village apparatus is very minimal. Village officials seem to work individually so that group values are thought to be less motivated between one village official and another.

RESEARCH THEORITICAL

Work environment

The work environment is the social, psychological and physical life in an organization that influences workers in carrying out their duties. Edy Sutrisno (2010) explains that the work environment is the overall work facilities and infrastructure around employees who are doing work so that they can influence the implementation of work, such as: workplace, facilities (funds, work aids), cleanliness, lighting, calm, including working relationship between the people in it.

According to Diana (2013) explains that in general the work environment is influenced by several factors, such as work facilities, salary and benefits and work relations. The work environment is something that exists around workers and influences them in carrying out assigned tasks (Nitisemito, 1992).

According to Bambang (1991), the work environment is one of the factors that influence the performance of an employee. An employee who works in a work environment that supports him to work optimally will produce good performance, and vice versa. According to Sedermayanti (2001) the work environment is divided into two types, namely the physical work environment which is all physical conditions that exist around the workplace that can affect employees either directly or indirectly.

As well as the non-physical work environment which is all the conditions that occur related to work relationships, both relationships with superiors, as well as relationships with fellow co-workers or relationships with subordinates. In relation to this theory, it is

synthesized that the work environment is a work environment that is both physical and non-physical, with indicators including work facilities, work comfort, and spatial planning.

Work Motivation

Motivation is a psychological process and is one of the main elements of a person's behavior, including employees. According to Hampton (2006), employee motivation is the behavior of a person acting because he is interested in his needs. According to Soemanto (1987) generally defines motivation as a change in energy which is characterized by effective encouragement and reactions to achieving goals. According to Brady (2008) the dimensions of work motivation include:

1. Fulfillment motive, related to the need to work that provides opportunities for workers to achieve maximum potential. This motive is divided into two sub dimensions, namely orientation towards success and mission orientation.
2. The self-esteem motive, related to the use of responsibility at work, as well as the need to achieve performance in workers. This motive consists of 2 sub dimensions, namely managing others and task orientation.
3. Affiliation motive, related to the employee's need for acceptance of support from superiors and co-workers. This motive consists of 2 sub dimensions, namely relations with superiors and relations between workers.
4. Survival motive, related to the employee's need for salary and benefits as well as a safe work environment. This motive consists of 3 sub dimensions, namely working conditions, income, and profits.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy (self-efficacy) was first introduced by Bandura (1986). Self-efficacy is a matter of the individual's perceived ability to deal with specific situations in relation to the assessment of the ability to perform an action that has to do with a specific task or a particular situation. Self-efficacy is an individual's assessment of self-confidence in his ability to carry out tasks so as to obtain results as expected.

Self-efficacy is a personal factor that becomes an intermediary or mediator in the interaction between behavioral factors and environmental factors. Self-efficacy can be a determinant of the success of performance and execution of work. According to Bandura (1986) self-efficacy is an individual's subjective consideration of his ability to arrange the actions needed to complete the specific tasks at hand. Self-efficacy is not directly related to the skills possessed by individuals, but rather to self-assessment about what can be done from what can be done, without being related to the skills possessed. The basic concept of self-efficacy theory is the problem of the belief that each individual has the ability to control his thoughts, feelings and behavior. Thus self-efficacy is a matter of subjective perception. This means that self-efficacy does not always describe actual abilities, but is related to the beliefs that individuals have (Bandura, 1986).

Performance

According to As'ad (2003) the notion of performance or work performance is a person's success in carrying out a job. According to Guritno and Waridin (2005) performance is a comparison of work results achieved by employees with predetermined standards. According to Singh and Billingsley (2000) said that performance is the result of work done by employees in accordance with the goals to be achieved in the work done.

According to Colquitt (2015) performance has three (3) dimensions including the following:

1. Task performance is the skill or proficiency of an individual in carrying out core tasks at

work.

2. Citizenship behavior is behavior that supports the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which this work is carried out.
3. Counterproductive behavior is behavior that endangers the welfare of the organization.

Hypothesis

H1 : There is a positive and significant influence between the work environment on the performance of village apparatus

H2: There is a positive and significant influence between work motivation on village apparatus performance

H3 : There is a positive and significant influence between self-efficacy and village apparatus performance

METHOD

This research was conducted in several villages in Lebak Regency with a population of 130 respondents, with a sample of 98 respondents. This research method uses a quantitative approach research method, survey method and model analysis techniques using the SPSS version 24 software application. The data collection technique used in this research is a questionnaire or questionnaire.

Questionnaires or questionnaires are a data collection technique by providing and distributing a list of questions to respondents in the hope of being able to provide a response or a list of these questions and researchers use this collection technique to obtain data about the influence of the work environment, work motivation, and performance. This study used a direct and closed questionnaire in the form of a rating check, where the list of questions was answered directly by the respondents themselves by selecting the answers that were already available.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

The characteristics of the respondents are shown in table 1 with a total of 98 respondents consisting of 66 (67%) male respondents and 32 (33%) female respondents. Respondents in this study were dominated by 30-35 year olds totaling 35 (36%) respondents, the majority of whom had high school/equivalent education as many as 38 (39%).

In this regard, based on status and length of service, the majority were dominated by married respondents with 72 (73%) respondents, and the majority of employees based on length of service were dominated by the range of 6-10 years with 47 (48%) respondents. And the majority of respondents were dominated by village apparatus with data staff positions of 45 (45%) respondents.

Table 1. Respondents' Demographic Characteristics

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|----|-----|
| Age | 20-29 th | 15 | 15% |
| | 30-39 th | 35 | 36% |
| | 40-49 th | 30 | 31% |
| | >50 th | 18 | 18% |
| Gender | Man | 66 | 67% |
| | Woman | 32 | 33% |
| Marital status | Not married yet | 26 | 27% |
| | Marry | 72 | 73% |
| Last education | SLTP/Equivalent | 25 | 25% |
| | SLTA / equivalent | 38 | 39% |
| | S1/S2 | 35 | 36% |
| Years of service | 1-5 th | 33 | 34% |
| | 6-10 th | 47 | 48% |
| | 11> th | 18 | 18% |
| Position | Village head | 11 | 11% |
| | Head of Affairs | 22 | 22% |
| | Head of Section | 22 | 22% |
| | Supporting Staf | 45 | 45% |

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Normality test

The normality test was carried out using the Kolmogorov – Smirnov test, provided that if the significance test results are > 0.05 , it can be said that the data is normal.

Table 2. Normality Test Results

| One -Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----|------|--------------|----|------|
| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
| | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Work environment | ,085 | 98 | ,078 | ,982 | 98 | ,208 |
| Work motivation | ,077 | 98 | ,179 | ,981 | 98 | ,173 |
| Performance | ,086 | 98 | ,073 | ,981 | 98 | ,156 |
| Self Efficacy | ,081 | 98 | 0,69 | ,979 | 98 | ,202 |

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Based on table 2 above, it can be seen that the variable data are Performance (Asymp. Sig. 0.073), work environment (Asymp. Sig. 0.078), self-efficacy (Asymp. Sig. 0.69) and work motivation (Asymp. Sig. 0.179) this means that the four variables are normally distributed because of the Asymp value. Sig. (2tailed) is greater than the value $\alpha = 0.05$.

Linearity Test Between Variables

1. Linearity Test Y atas X₁

The results of the linearity test for the performance variable (Y) for the work environment variable (X₁) can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. The results of the Y linearity test on X₁

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Performan ce * Work Environm ent | Between Groups | (Combined) | 827,522 | 21 | 39,406 | 2,420 | ,003 |
| | | Linearity | 554,014 | 1 | 554,014 | 34,025 | ,000 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 273,508 | 20 | 13,675 | ,840 | ,659 |
| | Within Groups | | 1237,468 | 76 | 16,282 | | |
| Total | | | 2064,990 | 97 | | | |

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the value of the Deviation from Linearity Sig. is 0.659 greater than 0.05. Furthermore, the Fcount value of 0.840 is obtained which is smaller than the Ftable value of 1.71 based on the significance value and the F value. It can be concluded that there is a linear relationship between the employee performance variable (Y) and the work environment variable (X₁).

2. Linearity Test Y atas X₂

The results of the linearity test for the performance variable (Y) on the work motivation variable (X₂) can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. The results of the Y linearity test on X₂

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Performan ce * Work Motivation | Between Groups | (Combined) | 1003,236 | 21 | 47,773 | 3,420 | ,000 |
| | | Linearity | 605,785 | 1 | 605,785 | 43,362 | ,000 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 397,451 | 20 | 19,873 | 1,422 | ,138 |
| | Within Groups | | 1061,754 | 76 | 13,970 | | |
| Total | | | 2064,990 | 97 | | | |

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the value of the Deviation from Linearity Sig. is 0.138 greater than 0.05. Furthermore, the Fcount value is 1.422 which is smaller than the Ftable value of 1.71 based on the significance value and the F value. It can be concluded that there is a linear relationship between the performance variable of the village apparatus (Y) and the work motivation variable (X₂).

3. Linearity Test Y atas X₃

The results of the linearity test for the performance variable (Y) on the self-efficacy variable (X₃) can be seen in the following table:

Table 5. The results of the Y linearity test on X₃

| ANOVA Table | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|------|
| | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Performance * Self Efficacy | Between Groups | (Combined) | 931,275 | 21 | 57,773 | 3,411 | ,000 |
| | | Linearity | 667,719 | 1 | 615,785 | 42,362 | ,000 |
| | | Deviation from Linearity | 422,411 | 20 | 20,873 | 1,511 | ,143 |
| Within Groups | | | 1161,754 | 76 | 13,970 | | |
| Total | | | 2164,990 | 97 | | | |

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Based on the data above, it can be seen that the value of the Deviation from Linearity Sig. is 0.143 greater than 0.05. Furthermore, the Fcount value is 1.511 which is smaller than the Ftable value of 1.71 based on the significance value and the F value. It can be concluded that there is a linear relationship between the performance variable of the village apparatus (Y) and the self-efficacy variable (X₃).

Multiple Linear Regression Test

Based on linear regression analysis through the SPSS 24 program, a summary of the output results is obtained below:

Table 6. Output Model Summary

| Model Summary ^b | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1 | ,591 ^a | ,349 | ,335 | 3,762 | 1,852 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Work Environment, Self-Efficacy

b. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

The value of R Square is 0.349. This indicates that simultaneously the effect of X₁, X₂ and X₃ on Y is 34.9% while the remaining 65.1% is contributed by other variables not included in this study.

Tabel 7. Model Anova

| ANOVA ^a | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 720,467 | 2 | 360,234 | 25,453 | ,000 ^b |
| | Residual | 1344,523 | 95 | 14,153 | | |

| | | |
|---|----------|----|
| Total | 2064,990 | 97 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Kinerja | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Work Environment, Self-Efficacy | | |

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Testing the significance through the F test with reference to the output results in the table above obtained Fcount of 25.453 greater than Ftable of 3.09. This means that simultaneously the work environment variable (X1), work motivation variable (X2) and self-efficacy (X3) have a positive and significant effect on the performance of village apparatus (Y).

Tabel 8. Model Coefficients

| Coefficients ^a | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|-------------------------|-------|
| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | Sig. | Collinearity Statistics | |
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | | Tolerance | VIF |
| (Constant) | 14,727 | 2,879 | | 5,115 | ,000 | | |
| Work environment | ,297 | ,104 | ,298 | 2,847 | ,005 | ,625 | 1,600 |
| Work motivation | ,326 | ,095 | ,359 | 3,429 | ,001 | ,625 | 1,600 |
| Self Efficacy | ,339 | ,122 | ,276 | 2,988 | ,004 | ,625 | 1,600 |

a. Dependent Variable: Performance

Source: Data Processed by Researchers (2023)

Further significance testing is continued with individual testing through the statistical parameter t. Based on the output table, the results of individual testing also show a significant effect, where the significance values of the three variables namely X1 = 0.005 and X2 = 0.001 and X3 = 0.004 are smaller than 0.05.

These results provide the conclusion that simultaneously and partially, work environment and work motivation can be used as predictor variables for the performance of village apparatus. By paying attention to the value of the coefficients B, the empirical causal effect between variables can be described through the equation $Y = 14.727 + 0.297 X1 + 0.326 X2 + 0.339 X3$. This shows that each increase of one score in variable X1 results in an increase in the variable Y of 0.297 at a constant of 14.727 and an increase of one score in variable X2 will result in an increase of 0.326 in variable Y at a constant of 14.727, and an increase of one score in variable X3 will result in an increase of 0.339 in variable Y at a constant of 14.727.

Discussion

1. The Influence of the Work Environment on the Performance of Village Apparatuses

Based on value Sig. for the influence of X1 on Y is equal to $0,005 < 0,05$ and value $t_{\text{count}} 2,847 > t_{\text{tabel}} (0,025,95) 1,988$, so that it can be concluded that H1 is accepted, which means that there is an influence of X1 on Y. This finding can be interpreted that the work environment (X₁) positive direct effect on the performance of the village apparatus (Y). That is, an increase in the work environment will result in an increase in the performance of the village apparatus.

The findings of this study are supported by the results of Yanti Komala Sari's research (2014) which revealed that there is a significant contribution between the work environment and employee performance simultaneously and partially in a positive direction, meaning that if the work environment is high enough then employee performance will increase.

In this regard, it means that village apparatus in Lebak Regency must be aware of the importance of work environment factors that can positively influence the performance of village apparatus in carrying out their duties. This also means that the relationship between the achievement of good village apparatus performance is closely related to the condition of the work environment where the village apparatus works.

2. The Effect of Work Motivation on Village Apparatus Performance

Based on the value of Sig. for the effect of X2 on Y is $0.001 < 0.05$ and the value of t_{count} is $3.429 > t_{\text{table}} (0.025.95) 1.988$, so it can be concluded that H1 is accepted which means that there is an effect of X2 on Y. These findings can be interpreted that work motivation (X₂) has a positive direct effect on the performance of the village apparatus (Y). That is, an increase in work motivation will result in an increase in the performance of the village apparatus.

This is supported by the results of research conducted by Tresna Ariana (2014), which revealed that there is a significant contribution of motivation to employee performance simultaneously and partially in a positive direction, this means that if motivation is high, employee performance will increase.

In this regard, the village apparatus in Lebak Regency must realize the importance of increasing work motivation so that they can motivate the village apparatus to give their best performance. This also means that the relationship between achieving good village apparatus performance is related to a high level of work motivation in the village apparatus concerned.

3. The Effect of Self-Efficacy on the Performance of Village Officials

Based on the value of Sig. for the effect of X3 on Y is $0.004 < 0.05$ and the value of t_{count} is $2.988 > t_{\text{table}} (0.025.95) 1.988$, so it can be concluded that H1 is accepted which means that there is an effect of X3 on Y. These findings can be interpreted that self-efficacy (X₃) has a positive direct effect on the performance of the village apparatus (Y). That is, an increase in self-efficacy will result in an increase in the performance of the village apparatus.

This is supported by the results of research conducted by Drago et al., (2018), which revealed a significant contribution of self-efficacy to employee performance simultaneously and partially in a positive direction, this means that if self-efficacy is high, employee performance will increase.

In this regard, village apparatus in Lebak Regency must realize the importance of increasing confidence in doing work so that they can increase the professionalism of village apparatus work to give their best performance. This also means that the relationship between the achievement of good village apparatus performance is related to the high level of employee self-efficacy in the village apparatus concerned..

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on research that has been carried out using scientific research procedures, using the SPSS version 24 software application, the results of this study can be concluded that there is an influence of the work environment on the performance of village apparatus. This shows that, improving the work environment will be able to improve the performance of the village apparatus. The existence of a positive and comfortable work environment will certainly affect work comfort for village officials and this will certainly be able to achieve good performance.

Furthermore, based on the results of the research that has been done, there is an effect of work motivation on the performance of village officials. This shows that there is a role of work motivation in improving the performance of village apparatus. High work motivation can improve the performance of village apparatus, so that this will be able to achieve the desired output.

Then, based on the results of the research that has been done, there is an effect of self-efficacy on the performance of the village apparatus. This shows that high self-efficacy in the soul of employees will encourage other employees to convince themselves to be able to carry out tasks thoroughly in improving the performance of village officials. High self-efficacy is able to improve the performance of the village apparatus, so that this will be able to achieve the desired organizational goals.

REFERENCE

- As'ad, Moch. (2001). *Seri Ilmu Sumber Daya manusia, Psikologi Industri*. Liberty
- Brady, (2008) "*Dimensi Motivasi Kerja*", *Jurnal Binus University*" 2011-2-00050-PSBab2001
- Colquitt, (2015:51). "*Organizational Behavior: Improving Performance and Commitment in the Workplace (4th)*". New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Edy Sutrisno. (2011). *Manajemen Sumber Daya Manusia*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Guritno, Bambang dan Waridin. (2005). "*Pengaruh Persepsi Karyawan Mengenai Perilaku Kepemimpinan, Kepuasan Kerja Dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja*". *JRBI*. Vol 1. No 1. Hal: 63-74
- Sedarmayanti (2001). *Sumber Daya Manusia dan Produktivitas Kerja*. Mandar Maju, Bandung., Asia dan Timur Jauh, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta
- Ajzen, I. (2002). Perceived behavioral control, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb00236.x>

- Arazzini Stewart, M., & De George-Walker, L. (2014). Self-handicapping, perfectionism, locus of control and self-efficacy: A path model. *Personality and Individual Differences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.038>
- Bakotić, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organisational performance. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja* . <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2016.1163946>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Desianty, S. (2005). Pengaruh Gaya Kepemimpinan Terhadap Komitmen Organisasi Pada PT Pos Indonesia (Persero) Semarang. *Program Studi Manajemen*, 2, 69–84.
- Drago, A., Rheinheimer, D. C., & Detweiler, T. N. (2018). Effects of Locus of Control, Academic Self-Efficacy, and Tutoring on Academic Performance. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116645602>
- Gruman, J. A., & Saks, A. M. (2011). Performance management and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.09.004>
- Gunawan, K. J., & Sutanto, E. M. (2013). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasional Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Self Efficacy Dan Temperamen Di Pt. Nutrifood Surabaya. *Agora*.
- Lung-Guang, N. (2019). Decision-making determinants of students participating in MOOCs: Merging the theory of planned behavior and self-regulated learning model. *Computers and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.02.004>
- Nadhiroh, S. A. (2010). Pengaruh Kompleksitas Tugas, Orientasi Tujuan dan Self Efficacy terhadap Kinerja Auditor dalam Pembuatan Audit Judgment. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*.
- Pajares, F. (2002). *Overview of Social Cognitive Theory and of Self - Efficacy*. Emory University.
- Priambodo, E. P., Darokah, M., & Diah Sari, R. E. Y. (2019). Peran Self Efficacy dan Iklim Organisasi dalam membentuk Employee Engagement melalui Komitmen Organisasi. *Psychopathic : Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.15575/psy.v6i2.4974>