



# The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Work Environment on Employee Performance Through Employee Job Satisfaction

Rido Hermawan<sup>1</sup>

Faculty of Ecobomics and Business, Hasanuddin University, Makassar, Indonesia

ridohermawan6720@gmail.com

**Abstract.** This research aims to determine the influence of self-efficacy and work environment on performance through job satisfaction in Service Units in Makassar City. The research method used is quantitative research. The number of samples in this study was 100 person. The data collection techniques used in this research are document study, questionnaires and interviews. The data analysis technique uses Structural Equational Modeling (SEM) using Smart-PLS. The research results show that: (1) Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by self-efficacy (2) Job happiness is positively and significantly impacted by self-efficacy (3) Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by the work environment, (4) Job satisfaction is positively and significantly impacted by the workplace (5) Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by job satisfaction, (6) Through job satisfaction and other factors, self-efficacy has a positive and considerable impact on employee performance, (7) Through job satisfaction, the work environment has a favorable and considerable impact on employee performance.

Keywords: Self-Efficacy, Work Environment, Employee Performance, Job Satisfaction

## 1. Introduction

In an organization, the thing that needs to be improved is the development of organizational management so that the ability to compete becomes independent. The existence of an organization certainly has a goal that it wants to achieve or implement. Organizations need people who have goals and priorities in advancing their organizations. The objectives achieved can be seen from the success of the work program that has been implemented which is the result of employee performance. Performance according to Hakim (2023), states that performance is defined as a description of the composition of what is achieved from planning activities with goals, objectives, vision and mission, in a strategic design planned by the organization [1]. Meanwhile Koopmans, et al (2014) define performance as a relevant outcome measure of work performance achieved by each employee [2].

Performance measurement to see that the implementation of activities is running optimally and successfully can be achieved through self-efficacy. A person's confidence in their ability to behave correctly in specific situations is known as self-efficacy. A person with high self-efficacy will accomplish his or her goals to the best of their ability because they are highly motivated, have well-defined objectives, stable emotions, and can perform well.

The second factor that can influence performance is the work environment. It is possible for the work environment to directly affect how well employees perform or finish their tasks. The work environment is declared comfortable if employees can carry out activities without experiencing discomfort at work so that the results achieved can be optimal. Work improvement can also be influenced by job satisfaction. An emotional condition known as "job satisfaction" affects how happy or unhappy one feels while working. If employees feel satisfied with their work, of course they can enjoy the implementation process, while employees who do not feel satisfied will certainly not enjoy the work process, which will affect the goals achieved. The recognition received from the leadership, both materially and intangibly, such as being appointed to a position that is delegated through a system of trust and being promoted to a higher rank or class to hold a position at a higher career level, is one of the things that can make employees feel satisfied.

As for previous research related to self-efficacy on employee performance, according to Prasetyono (2023), Employee performance is positively impacted by self-efficacy [3]. However, as an intervening variable, work pleasure has no influence on employee performance due to self-efficacy. This is also supported by research conducted by Saputri (2019) [4]. According to Indriyani, et al (2023) [5], and Mayasari (2022) [6] who stated believe employee performance is unaffected by the workplace. And according to Hanafi and Yohana (2017) who showed the findings of their study, which found that job happiness functions as an intervening variable and that the work environment has a favorable and substantial impact on employee performance [7]. Meanwhile, according to Saputri (2019), the work environment has no effect on employee performance through job satisfaction as an intervening variable. Given the research gap as explained above, the researcher will conduct research with the title "The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Work Environment on Employee Performance through Employee Job Satisfaction".

## **2. Methodology**

The research method used is quantitative research with the aim of seeing the influence of Self-efficacy (X1) and Work Environment (X2) on Performance (Y2) through the intervening variable Job Satisfaction (Y1). The population in this study were all employees in 27 departments in Makassar City. In this study, one hundred participants served as samples. Primary data, or information gathered directly from research items by researchers via questionnaires, is what is employed in this study. The Likert scale is the measurement scale that is used to determine how long and how short the intervals are in the measuring device. This study employed a quantitative data analysis approach that makes use of statistical techniques. Using Smart-PLS, structural equation modeling, or SEM, is the statistical technique employed.

## **3. Results and Discussion of Results**

Evaluation of the construct variables under study, as well as the viability (accuracy) and profitability (reliability) of a variable, are the goals of the measurement model analysis (outer model). The outer loading value can be used to determine whether an indicator of a construct variable is legitimate or invalid. An indicator is valid if the outer loading value is higher than (0.4). According to the convergent validity results, all indicators are valid since their outer loading values are more than 0.4. Internal Consistency Analysis: When a variable's Composite Reliability value is more than 0.60, the internal consistency test utilizing Composite Reliability values is considered trustworthy. The variable is dependable enough to be employed as a study model, according to the results, which indicate that the composite reliability value is higher than 0.60. The goal of discriminant validity is to determine if a construct variable's indicator is genuine or invalid. Specifically, a variable is said to have good discriminant validity (valid) if its square root value of the AVE value is higher than its highest correlation value with other variables. The variable has strong discriminant validity (validity) according to the results, which indicate that the AVE value is greater than the correlation value. A structural model analysis, also known as an inner model, seeks to verify the study hypothesis. The structural model's coefficient of determination (R-Square) and hypothesis testing are the components that require analysis. The purpose of the coefficient of determination, or R-Square, is to assess how well a model predicts the future. Put differently, evaluating the correlation between variations in the value of the independent variable and variations in the value of the dependent variable within a route model.

**Table 1.** Coefficient of Determination (R-Square)

Variable	R-Square	R-Square Adjusted
Job Satisfaction (Y1)	0.587	0.512
Performance (Y2)	0.664	0.614

Source: Processed data, 2023

From table 1, the conclusion from testing the R-square value is as follows: R-Square Adjusted path model I = 0.512. This means that the ability of variable X1 (Self-Efficacy) and variable Work environment) and Y1 (job satisfaction) in explaining Y2 (performance) is 61.4%.

Construct	Original Sample (O)	Sample Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (Stdev)	T Statistics ( O/Stdev )	P Values
Self-Efficacy (X1) -> Performance (Y2)	0.342	0.352	0.119	2,923	<b>0.005</b>
Self-Efficacy (X1) -> Job Satisfaction (Y1)	0.434	0.437	0.123	3,639	<b>0.002</b>
Work Environment (X2) -> Performance (Y2)	0.291	0.298	0.105	2,778	<b>0.006</b>
Work Environment (X2) -> Job Satisfaction (Y1)	0.410	0.420	0.117	3,472	<b>0.003</b>
Job Satisfaction (Y1) -> Performance (Y2)	0.485	0.496	0.147	3,970	<b>0,000</b>

**Table 2.** Direct Effect Hypothesis

Source: Processed data, 2023

Considering the table 2. Above, it is obtained; influence of X1 on Y2 has a path coefficient of 0.342 (positive), so a rise in the worth of the variable X1 will be followed by a rise in the value of Y2. Meanwhile, the influence of variable X1 on Y2 has P-Values (0.005) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of variable X1 on Y2 is significant, in accordance with Prasetyono’s findings (2023). The direct influence of X1 on Y1 has a path coefficient of 0.434 (positive), so a rise in the worth of the variable X1 will be followed by a rise in the value of Y1. Meanwhile, the influence of variable X1 on Y1 has P-Values (0.002) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of X1 on Y1 is significant.

The direct influence of X2’on Y2 has a path coefficient of 0.291 (positive), so a rise in the worth of the variable X2 will be followed by a rise in the value of Y2. The influence of the variable X2 on Y2 has P-Values (0.006) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of X2 on Y2 is significant, in accordance with Hanafi and Yohana (2017), and Sinambela et al (2018)The direct influence of X2 on Y1 has a path coefficient of 0.410 (positive), so a rise in the worth of the variable X2 will be followed by a rise in the value of Y1 [8]. The influence of variable X2 on Y1 has P- Values (0.003) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of X2 on Y1 is significant.

The direct Influence of Y1 on Y2 has a path coefficient of 0.485 (positive), so a rise in the worth of the variable Y1 will be followed by a rise in the value of Y2. The influence of variable Y1 on Y2 has P-Values (0.000) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of Y1 on Y2 is significant in accordance with the findings of Hakim et al (2023), and Sakti Nasution (2021) [9].

<b>Construct</b>	<b>Original Sample (O)</b>	<b>T Statistics ( O/Stdev )</b>	<b>P Values</b>
<b>Self-Efficacy (X1) -&gt; Job Satisfaction (Y1) -&gt;Performance (Y2)</b>	0.295	3,172	<b>0.027</b>
<b>Work Environment (X2) -&gt; Job Satisfaction (Z) -&gt; Employee Performance (Y)</b>	0.188	2,311	<b>0.032</b>

**Table 3.** Indirect Effect Hypothesis

Source: Processed data, 2023

Considering the table 3 above, it is obtained; The indirect influence of X1 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable has a path coefficient of 0.295 (positive), so variable Y1 mediates a rise in the worth of variable The influence of variable X1 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable has a P-Values (0.027) <  $\alpha$ (0.05), so the

influence of X1 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable is significant.

The indirect influence of X2 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable has a path coefficient of 0.188 (positive), so the variable Y1 mediates a rise in the worth of the variable. The influence of the variable X2 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable has a P-Values (0.032) <  $\alpha$  (0.05), so the influence of X2 on Y2 through Y1 as an intervening variable is significant, this result is in accordance with the findings of Hakim et al (2023) and Jopanda (2021) [10].

#### 4. Conclusion

The direct influence hypothesis was tested, and the results showed that variable X1, or self-efficacy, significantly and favorably affects variable Y2, or employee performance. It can be inferred from the testing of the direct influence hypothesis that variable X2, or work environment, significantly and favorably affects variable Y2, or employee performance. It is possible to conclude that variable X1 (self-efficacy) has a positive and substantial effect on variable Y1 (work satisfaction) based on the findings of the direct influence hypothesis test. The direct influence hypothesis was tested, and the results showed that variable X2, or work environment, significantly and favorably affects variable Y1, or job satisfaction. The direct influence hypothesis was tested, and the results showed that variable Y1 (job satisfaction) significantly and favorably affects variable Y2 (employee performance). We can conclude that variable Y1 (work satisfaction) mediates the influence of variable X1 (self-efficacy) on variable Y2 (employee performance) based on the findings of testing the indirect influence hypothesis. It is possible to conclude that variable Y1 (job satisfaction) mediates the influence of variable X2 (work environment) on variable Y2 (employee performance) based on the findings of testing the indirect influence hypothesis.

#### References

1. Hakim., A., Effendy., S., Tanjung., H. *The Influence of the Work Environment, Leadership Style on Employee Performance at Higher Education Service Institutions Region I, North Sumatra, Mediated by Employee Job Satisfaction*. Maneggio: Master of Management Scientific Journal, 6(1), 28- 33 (2023).
2. Koopmans, L., Bernardis, CM, Hildebrant, VH, Vet, HCW de, Beek, AJ vander. *Construct Validity of the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire*. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 56(3), 331-337 (2014).
3. Prasetyono, Agus. *The Influence of Self Esteem and Self Efficacy on Employee Performance with Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable (Case Study at PT. Bank Syariah Indonesia Tbk in Tegal City)*. Journal Information Systems & Business Management: Volume 1 Number 1 March 2023 (2023).
4. Saputri, Yulia Purwaningtyas.. *The Influence of Motivation, Self-Efficacy and Work Environment on Employee Performance with Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable*. Thesis: Salatiga State Islamic Religious Institute (2019).
5. Indriyani, Desak Nyoman, et al. *The Influence of Competency, Self-Efficacy and*

*Work Environment on the Performance of General Bureau Office Employees and Protocols of the Regional Secretariat of Bali Province. VALUES, Volume 4, Number 1, 2023 (2023).*

6. Mayasari. *The Influence of Job Environment and Organizational Justice on Employee Performance mediated by Employee Engagement in Hospital Employees (2022).*
7. Hanafi, Bayu Dwilaksono and Corry Yohana. 2017. *The Influence of Motivation and Work Environment on Employee Performance, with Job Satisfaction as a mediating variable at PT BNI Lifeinsurance. Journal of Economics and Business Education (JPEB), Vol.5 No.1 (2017).*
8. Sinambela, E., & Tanjung, H. *The Influence of Training, Competency, Work Environment on Employee Performance. Manggeio: Master of Management Scientific Journal, 1(1), 46–58 (2018).*
9. Sakti Nasution, Indra. *The Influence of Supervision and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance Through Organizational Citizenship Behavior at the Regional Office of the Ministry of Religion, Sumatra Province (2021).jop*
10. Jopanda, H. *The Influence of Leadership Style and Work Environment on Employee Performance Through Job Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable. Journal of Management, 6(1), 84-101 (2021).*

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

