Impact of Self-Efficacy and Work Discipline on Employee Performance in Sociopreneur Initiatives
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ABSTRACT
Understanding the determinants of employee performance is crucial for achieving organizational success. This study investigates how self-efficacy and work discipline affect employee performance at Panti Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan. Using a full sample of 50 employees, the research employed various analytical techniques, including tests for validity, reliability, normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity, as well as multiple linear regression, correlation analysis, F tests, and T-tests. The T-test results indicated that both self-efficacy (t-count 2.056 > t-table 2.012, p < 0.05) and work discipline (t-count 4.868 > t-table 2.012, p < 0.05) have significant positive effects on employee performance. The multiple correlation analysis demonstrated a strong positive relationship between self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance (correlation coefficient 0.844). The coefficient of determination (R²) was 0.713, showing that these two factors account for 71.3% of the variance in employee performance, with the remaining 28.7% attributed to other variables not included in this study, such as work motivation, compensation, work environment, and leadership. These findings indicate that boosting self-efficacy and reinforcing work discipline are essential for enhancing employee performance. Therefore, organizations should invest in comprehensive training and development programs to cultivate these qualities and maintain high performance levels among their staff.
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1. INTRODUCTION
In today’s society, adults generally work to fulfill their own and their family’s needs through various jobs that may require either intellectual or physical effort. Some jobs require specialized skills and deep knowledge, while others may focus more on physical strength [1]. Among the various options available, working at a social welfare facility like Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan becomes a choice for those interested in social services and elderly care. According to the Indonesian Department of Social Affairs, elderly homes serve as a sanctuary for the elderly and those aged over 60 years, providing services that ensure their safety and
comfort, free from anxiety or worry about old age [2]. In this context, elderly homes not only offer shelter but also function as health and social activity centers that ensure a better quality of life for their residents. As age advances, health becomes increasingly important and a top priority, especially after the COVID-19 pandemic, which has heightened awareness and demands for more comprehensive and high-quality healthcare services. The role of sociopreneurs in this sector is critical, as they drive innovation and improvements in service delivery, ensuring that the needs of the elderly are met in a compassionate and efficient manner [3].

Therefore, the existence and role of elderly homes like Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan are crucial. They must adapt to changing health needs and continuously improve their service standards. This includes integrating the latest health technologies, enhancing the skills of medical staff, and ensuring that all activities within the home are geared towards supporting the physical, mental, and social health of the elderly [4]. Sociopreneurs play a vital role in this process by introducing innovative solutions and practices that address the unique challenges faced by elderly care facilities. With these improvements, the homes provide not only physical safety but also emotional and mental support, which are vital for the well-being of the elderly in their later years [5].

Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan, located at Jalan Pusdika, RT 8 RW 7, Cibubur, Kec. Ciracas, East Jakarta, Jakarta Capital Special Region 13720, is a three-story facility that houses 77 elderly individuals (42 females and 35 males), along with 35 external seniors who attend the daycare services three times a week. The elderly who wish to reside at Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan must voluntarily apply and meet several criteria including being healthy, independent, free from communicable diseases, cognitively sound, and having at least three designated caregivers. The home provides medical services such as a clinic, regular health check-ups, and rewards for those who are ill [6]. Currently, Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan continually strives to improve the quality of its services to align with its vision of “Serving others by providing comprehensive and holistic care—physically, mentally, socially, and spiritually—to the elderly”.

According to [7], there are five factors that can affect performance: personal, leadership, disciplinary, systemic, and contextual/situational. Performance, as defined by [8], is the result of work completed by fulfilling assigned duties and responsibilities within a specified time frame. [9] describes performance as the outcome achieved by an organization, whether profit-oriented or not, over a given period [10].

Self-efficacy is essential in balancing employee performance, as it instills a belief in individuals capabilities to efficiently complete tasks assigned by their superiors in a timely manner. This concept, developed by [11], is widely adopted for various purposes, not only in education but also in enhancing employee performance [12]. Individuals with high self-efficacy believe they have the necessary skills to perform specific tasks, are able to make the required effort, and face no external obstacles that could prevent them from achieving expected performance levels [13], [14]. High self-efficacy typically leads to behaviors that promote success, such as persistence, creative problem-solving, learning from setbacks, envisioning success, and stress reduction [15], [16]. Based on the above discussion, the researcher was motivated to conduct a study entitled “The Influence of Self-Efficacy and Work Discipline on Employee Performance” at Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan Elderly Home [17].

This research explores how self-efficacy and work discipline influence employee performance at Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan Elderly Home [18], [19]. It seeks to determine whether these factors individually affect employee performance and how sociopreneurs, through innovative and socially responsible practices, can enhance these aspects. The study aims to identify key personal and organizational factors that improve employee efficiency and care quality [20]. Theoretically, it adds to academic discussions on self-efficacy and work discipline, serving as a reference for future research. Practically, the findings can guide the elderly home’s management policies to improve employee performance. Additionally, it enriches the researcher’s knowledge and provides valuable insights for academics in human resources management [21].

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the context of this research examining the influence of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance at Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan, a deep understanding of these theories helps in formulating how these elements interact in the specific setting of an elderly care facility. The self-efficacy of employees might predict how effectively they handle demanding caregiving tasks, while work discipline can directly affect the consistency and quality of their work output [22]. Both factors are expected to contribute empirical evidence to effective HRM practices and enhance the quality of services to the elderly [23].
2.1. Human Resource Management (HRM)

HRM involves a series of strategies and practices designed to manage people effectively to gain a competitive advantage [24]. These practices include performance evaluation, career development, and employee relations to ensure alignment between organizational needs and employees. In line with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 8: Decent Work and Economic Growth, modern HRM views employees as strategic partners who help achieve competitive excellence, promoting sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth by fostering a work environment that values and enhances employee performance [25]. Additionally, aligning HRM practices with SDG 3: Good Health and Well-being ensures that the well-being of employees is prioritized, leading to a healthier and more productive workforce [26].

2.2. Functions of Human Resource Management

HRM encompasses various essential functions for effective HR management, outlined by [27], including workforce planning, organizing, directing, controlling, staffing, developing, compensating, integrating, and maintaining. Each function plays a critical role in supporting employees and aims to create a productive and supportive work environment. For example, workforce planning ensures that the organization has the right number and type of employees to meet future needs [28]. Meanwhile, the development function aims to enhance employees abilities through training and continuous learning, crucial for adapting to changing business environments [29].

2.3. Performance

Performance is a measure of the effectiveness and efficiency of an individual in carrying out assigned tasks. [30] defines performance as the level of success an individual achieves in performing tasks based on established standards and targets [31]. Performance reflects not only what employees do but also how they do it, determining their value to the organization. [32] state that performance essentially is what employees do or do not do. Performance management is a series of activities conducted to enhance the performance of the company or organization, including the performance of individual employees and work groups therein. According to [33], performance is the outcome of work and work behavior achieved in completing tasks and responsibilities given over a specific period [34].

2.4. Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy, described by [16], is knowledge about one’s capabilities that influences an individual’s actions in achieving goals. An individual’s level of self-efficacy contributes to their ability to face challenges and predict potential outcomes of their actions. This is highly relevant in an organizational setting as it affects how employees tackle complex and challenging tasks. High self-efficacy can spur employees to take initiative, face greater challenges, and persevere through difficulties, while low self-efficacy may lead to reluctance to commit to more ambitious goals.

Sociopreneurs emphasize the development of self-efficacy and work discipline among employees. Self-efficacy, as defined by [11], is the belief in one’s capabilities to execute tasks successfully. Sociopreneurs foster self-efficacy by creating an environment that encourages learning, growth, and empowerment. They provide training programs, mentorship, and opportunities for professional development, which enhance employees’ confidence in their abilities and motivate them to achieve higher performance levels [35]. Work discipline, on the other hand, is cultivated through the establishment of clear rules, expectations, and a supportive organizational culture. Sociopreneurs understand the importance of discipline in maintaining high standards of care and ensuring consistent service delivery. They implement systems that promote accountability, punctuality, and adherence to best practices, which in turn improve overall employee performance.

2.5. Indicators of Self-Efficacy

According to [36], there are three primary indicators of self-efficacy:

- Magnitude or Level: This indicator refers to an individual’s perception of their capacity to complete tasks, assessed through the task difficulty level. This difficulty encompasses dimensions such as intelligence, effort, accuracy, productivity, or self-regulation, all critical aspects of performance behavior.

- Generality: Generality measures the general belief that one can handle difficult tasks, indicating a high level of self-efficacy. Conversely, individuals with low self-efficacy tend to believe they are only capable of handling easier tasks.
Strength: Strength refers to an individual’s assessment of their abilities in specific situational contexts, depicting a general pattern and level of confidence in their success. It involves assessing core beliefs about oneself and how they manage and direct their lives based on these beliefs.

2.6. Work Discipline

Work discipline is the compliance of employees with organizational rules and norms. According to [37], work discipline is a crucial tool for enhancing employee awareness and adherence. [38] view discipline as adherence to organizational regulations, both written and unwritten. Discipline is important not only for operational efficiency but also for creating a conducive work environment. According to [39], discipline is the readiness and willingness of an individual to follow and adhere to the prevailing norms and regulations in their surroundings [40].

3. RESEARCH METHOD AND FRAMEWORK

This research employs a detailed methodology to explore the effects of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance within an organizational setting, focusing on two main variables: employee performance as the dependent variable, and self-efficacy and work discipline as independent variables. Employee performance is evaluated based on task effectiveness and efficiency, self-efficacy is gauged by individuals’ confidence in performing tasks, and work discipline is assessed through adherence to organizational standards. Data is collected quantitatively using the Likert scale, as [41] suggests, to reliably measure attitudes toward self-efficacy and work discipline among 50 permanent employees at Panti Sasana Treisna Weirida RIA Pembangunan Cibubur, excluding top management, using a total sampling method for comprehensive data coverage. Questionnaires are distributed using Google Forms to facilitate ease of distribution and data compilation, and designed to gather detailed information on the variables studied. Responses are analyzed using SPSS Statistics 25.0, conducting various statistical tests to provide insights into the relationships and effects observed [42].

3.1. Variables and Measurement in Research

In this study, two main types of variables will be investigated: dependent and independent variables.

• Dependent Variable:
The dependent variable is the variable whose outcome is influenced by other variables, known as independent variables. In the context of this research, the dependent variable is employee performance. Employee performance is understood here as the effectiveness and efficiency with which employees complete assigned tasks and responsibilities. Evaluation of employee performance will cover various aspects such as productivity, quality of work, adherence to company regulations, and collaboration with colleagues.

• Independent Variables

Independent variables are those that influence or cause changes in the dependent variable. In this research, the independent variables being studied are self-efficacy and work discipline:

– Self-Efficacy: Refers to the levels, strength, and generality of an individual’s belief in their capability to complete specific tasks. In a work context, high self-efficacy can motivate employees to effectively face challenges, show greater resilience against work-related stress, and maintain a more innovative and solution-oriented approach to problems.

– Work Discipline: Pertains to the extent to which employees adhere to organizational standards and policies and demonstrate punctuality, consistency, and commitment to their tasks. Good discipline directly contributes to smooth operations and effective resource management within the organization.

3.1.1. Measurement

Measurement in this research will utilize the Likert scale, as described by [43], who states that the scale is an agreement used as a reference to determine the lengths of intervals within a measuring tool, thereby producing quantitative data. The Likert scale is a commonly used method in social research for measuring people’s attitudes, perceptions, and values toward certain aspects quantitatively [44]. In this study, the Likert
scale will be employed to measure the levels of self-efficacy and work discipline among respondents and to allow the researcher to assess how these two variables influence employee performance.

According to [45], the population is defined as a generalized area consisting of objects that have specific qualities and characteristics determined by the researcher for study and from which conclusions are drawn. In this study, the population consists of 50 employees at Panti Sasana Treisna Weirdha RIA Pembangunan Cibubur, excluding the head of the facility and department heads. The sampling method used is total sampling, where all 50 permanent employees at the facility are included as the sample for this research.

### 3.1.2. Data Collection Techniques

Data collection for this study is conducted using questionnaires and interviews. Questionnaires are administered to the 50 employees of Panti Sasana Treisna Weirdha RIA Pembangunan Cibubur, excluding top management, to gather information on self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance. Researchers distributed the questionnaires to 45 respondents using Google Forms. The data collected is then processed using SPSS Statistics 25.0 for analysis, after which conclusions are drawn based on the analyzed data. This approach ensures a comprehensive understanding of the impact of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance within the organization.

### 3.1.3. Validity Test

The results of the validity test are crucial for determining which questionnaire items are reliable indicators of the constructs being measured in this case, self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance. By applying the product moment correlation technique, the study ensures that only those items with a Pearson correlation coefficient exceeding 0.3 are included in the final analysis. This threshold indicates a moderate to strong relationship between the questionnaire items and the overall construct, thereby confirming their validity. For this study, the Pearson correlation coefficients were compared against the critical values in the Pearson table (r-table) at a 0.05 significance level. Items that did not meet this criterion were excluded to prevent potential biases and inaccuracies in the data analysis.

The validity test results as summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3 showed that most items for the constructs of self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance were valid, with R-count values greater than the R-table value of 0.444. These valid items were retained for further analysis. The few items that did not meet the validity criteria were excluded to maintain the robustness and reliability of the research findings. This rigorous validation process ensures that the subsequent statistical analyses, including the regression and correlation analyses, are based on accurate and reliable data, leading to more credible and generalizable results.

### 3.1.4. Reliability Test

Reliability is a measure that determines how consistent or reliable a questionnaire is in measuring the variables or constructs being studied, as described by [46]. A questionnaire is said to be reliable or dependable
if respondents answers to the statements are consistent or stable over time. In this research, the consistency of the responses is measured to ensure that the research instrument can reliably gather accurate and consistent data regarding self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance.

By employing both these tests, this study ensures that the data collected are valid and reliable. This validation and verification process is crucial for reducing potential biases and errors in data analysis, thereby enhancing confidence in the research findings. The systematic application of validity and reliability tests also supports the methodological integrity of the study, providing a robust foundation for the conclusions drawn from the data obtained.

### 3.1.5. Data Analysis Method

The data analysis methodology used in this research combines several statistical tests aimed at ensuring the reliability and accuracy of the findings. Initially, descriptive statistics were used to summarize and describe the characteristics of the data collected, especially through calculating the mean to provide general or specific conclusions as explained by [47]. Then proceed with the normality test which according to [48] is very important to prove that the distribution of the independent and dependent variables in the regression model is normal. The multicollinearity test as explained by [49] assesses whether there is correlation between independent variables in the regression model. This is important because a good regression model does not have to show correlation between independent variables.

Additionally, a heteroscedasticity test is performed to check for constant variance across the residuals of the regression model, because non-constant variance heteroscedasticity can affect the efficiency of the regression model and the accuracy of coefficient estimates. The multiple linear regression test explained by [50] explains the relationship between one dependent/response variable (Y) and two or more independent variables so as to provide a comprehensive picture of the interactions between variables (X₁, X₂, ..., Xₙ). The simple correlation test [51] helps determine the strength of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, whose correlation value ranges from \(-1 \leq r \leq 1\). The coefficient of determination (R²), which measures the percentage of variance in the dependent variable that can be predicted from the independent variable, also calculated as \(R^2 \times 100\%\).

Furthermore, [52] the F test is used to determine the overall suitability of the regression model

\[ H_0: \text{Does not meet eligibility requirements} \quad H_a: \text{Meets eligibility} \]

Criteria: If Fcount < F-table, then \(H_0\) is rejected and \(H_a\) is accepted If Fcount < F-table, then \(H_a\) is accepted and \(H_0\) is rejected.

Finally, the T-test tests the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable at a significance level of 5%, where \(H_0\): there is no influence between variable x on variable y \(H_a\): there is an influence between variable x on variable y Criteria: If t-count < t-table, then \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_a\) is rejected. If t-count > t-table, then \(H_a\) is rejected and \(H_0\) is accepted This approach is used to find out whether each independent variable influences the dependent variable significantly. This comprehensive data analysis approach ensures that research findings are robust and statistically validated.

### 3.2. Framework

In the context of this research, self-efficacy is defined as an individual’s belief in their ability to complete tasks successfully. According to [11] theory of self-efficacy, these beliefs play an important role in determining how individuals regulate their drives and actions. Figure 1 shows the two hypotheses of this research where the first hypothesis (H₁) in this research states that higher self-efficacy (X₁) will be positively related to increased employee performance (Y). It is based on the idea that employees who believe in their abilities tend to be more motivated, effective at solving problems, and therefore more productive at work.

Furthermore, work discipline refers to how well employees follow the rules, regulations, and standards set by the organization. High work discipline (X₂) is hypothesized (H₂) to have a positive impact on employee performance (Y), as discipline helps ensure that tasks are carried out in an orderly and efficient manner, reducing downtime and increasing consistency in work performance.

#### 3.2.1. Hypothesis Methodology

In the dynamic field of human resource management, understanding the factors that significantly influence employee performance is crucial for organizational success. This study seeks to explore two such factors,
self-efficacy and work discipline. The relationship between these variables and employee performance is examined through a hypothesis-driven approach. Specifically, the study proposes two key hypotheses:

**H₁:** There is a positive influence between self-efficacy and employee performance. It will be tested using linear regression to determine how strongly self-efficacy influences performance, by controlling for other variables that may have an impact on performance.

**H₂:** Work discipline has a positive effect on employee performance. Just like H₁, the effect of work discipline will be tested using linear regression analysis to measure the strength and significance of its relationship with employee performance.

In testing this hypothesis, data will be collected through surveys that measure employees' perceptions of their self-efficacy and work discipline as well as objective performance assessments from supervisors or through organizational performance records. The use of advanced statistical techniques such as multiple linear regression will allow separating the effects of each independent variable on the dependent variable while controlling for potential interactions or confederation between the variables.

4. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the validity test results in Table 1 it is known that the results of the validity test of the employee performance variable (Y) from the 12 statement items submitted are declared valid because R-count > R-table (0.444), so the statement can be used for further research data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>R-Count</th>
<th>R-Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the validity test presented in Table 2, the self-efficacy variable (X₁) was evaluated using 12 statement items submitted to 20 respondents. Out of these, 10 statements were found to be valid, while 2 were invalid, based on the criterion that R-count must be greater than R-table (0.444). This means that the 10 valid statements can reliably measure the self-efficacy construct and are suitable for use in further data collection and analysis. The exclusion of the 2 invalid statements ensures that the data collected will be accurate and consistent, thereby enhancing the reliability and validity of the research findings. By using these validated items, the study can more effectively assess the impact of self-efficacy on employee performance, providing a
solid foundation for drawing meaningful conclusions and making informed recommendations. This rigorous validation process underscores the importance of using reliable measurement instruments in research to obtain credible and generalizable results.

Table 2. Results of the validity of the self-efficacy variable (X₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>R-Count</th>
<th>R-Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Generality</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Generality</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Generality</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Generality</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the validity test results in Table 3, it is known that the validity test results of the work discipline variable (X₂) of the 12 statement items submitted to 20 respondents, there are 9 valid statements and 3 invalid statements if R-count > R-table (0.444), then these 9 statements can be used to collect data for further research.

Table 3. Results of the validity of the work discipline variable (X₂)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>R-Count</th>
<th>R-Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Time Compliance</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.832</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>VALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>Comply with Regulations</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>INVALID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the reliability test presented in Table 4, it is evident that all variables have achieved a Cronbach’s Alpha value exceeding 0.6, indicating high reliability. This means the measurement instrument is consistent and dependable in measuring the constructs of self-efficacy, work discipline, and employee performance. The high reliability values suggest that the questionnaire items consistently reflect the intended variables, providing accurate and replicable data. Consequently, these items can be confidently used in subsequent data collection and analysis phases, ensuring the study’s findings are credible and the observed effects are due to the variables under study, not random errors.

Table 4. Reliability Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy (X₁)</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discipline (X₂)</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance (Y)</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure 2, the points are observed to spread around the diagonal line, indicating that the data points closely follow the direction of the diagonal. This suggests that the residuals of the regression model are normally distributed, satisfying the assumption of normality, which is crucial for ensuring the validity and reliability of the regression analysis results.

![Figure 2. Normality Test](image)

Based on Table 5, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value for the variables self-efficacy ($X_1$) and work discipline ($X_2$) is 2.666, which is significantly less than the threshold of 10. Additionally, the tolerance value of 0.375 exceeds the minimum acceptable value of 0.1. These findings indicate that there is no multicollinearity present in the data, ensuring the independence of the predictor variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Discipline</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>4.868</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Figure 3, the residual points are scattered both below and above the value of 0 on the Y-axis and do not exhibit any discernible pattern. This random distribution indicates the absence of heteroscedasticity in the data, meaning that the variance of the residuals is constant across different levels of the independent variables, thus satisfying another key assumption of regression analysis.

![Figure 3. Heteroscedasticity Test Results](image)

Based on Table 6, the following is obtained:

\[
Y = a + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + e \\
= 7.375 + 0.319X_1 + 0.795X_2
\]

The value of $a$, which is 7.375, represents the constant or the condition when the employee performance variable is not yet influenced by other variables, namely self-efficacy ($X_1$) and work discipline ($X_2$). If there are no independent variables, then the employee performance variable does not change.
Table 6. Multiple Regression Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>2.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>2.056</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Discipline</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>4.868</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B₁ (the regression coefficient value for X₁) of 0.319 indicates that the self-efficacy variable has a positive influence on employee performance, meaning that an increase of one unit in the self-efficacy variable will affect employee performance by 0.319 or 31.9%, assuming X₂=0.

B₂ (the regression coefficient value for X₂) of 0.795 indicates that the work discipline variable has a positive influence on employee performance, meaning that an increase of one unit in the work discipline variable will affect employee performance by 0.795 or 79.5%, assuming X₁=0.

Based on table 7, it can be seen that the value of the multiple correlation coefficient (R) of self-efficacy and work discipline on performance is 0.844. This shows that there is a very strong and positive correlation between X₁ (self-efficacy) and X₂ (work discipline) on Y (employee performance).

Table 7. Results of Multiple Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Std. error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>3.40628</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>58.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 8, it can be seen that the F significance value is 0.000 and Fcount is 58.329, indicating that the significance level is 0.000 < 0.05 and Fcount is 58.329 > 3.19, so it can be concluded that H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected. This means that self-efficacy (X₁) work discipline (X₂) influences the dependent variable employee performance (Y) so that these three variables can be used in this research.

Table 8. Overall Significant Test Results (F Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1353.552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>676.776</td>
<td>58.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>545.328</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1898.880</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 9, it is known that the coefficient value of determining self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance is the R square coefficient value of 0.713 or 71.3% or self-efficacy and work discipline are only able to explain 71.3%, while the remaining 28.7 is influenced by other variables which not researched, for example work environment, leadership, compensation, and motivation.

Table 9. Coefficient of Determination Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1353.552</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>676.776</td>
<td>58.329</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>545.328</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1898.880</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-Efficacy based on table 10, the significance level of self-efficacy is 0.045 and T-count is 2.056, this shows that the significance level is 0.045 < 0.05 and T-count is 2.056 > t-table 2.012, meaning that self-efficacy has an effect on employee performance. So it can be concluded that H₀ is accepted and H₁ is rejected, meaning that self-efficacy has a positive and significant effect on the performance of the employees of Panti Sasana Werdha RIA Pembangunan.
Table 10. T Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std.Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>4.035</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>2.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Discipline</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>4.868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work discipline Based on table 10, the significance level for work discipline is 0.000 and t count is 4.868, which means the significance level is 0.000 < 0.050 and t count is 4.868 > table 2.012, which means work discipline has a significant effect on employee performance. So it can be concluded that $H_a$ is accepted and $H_o$ is rejected, meaning that work discipline has a positive and significant effect on the performance of the employees of Panti Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan.

4.1. Discussion

4.1.1. The influence of self-efficacy on employee performance

Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s belief in their ability to perform effectively in various situations, which can be developed, altered, enhanced, or diminished through several means, including mastery experiences, accomplishments, social persuasion, and emotional states. When employees have high self-efficacy, their performance tends to improve. Statistically, a positive beta coefficient value signifies a direct correlation, indicating that as self-efficacy increases, employee performance similarly rises.

4.1.2. The influence of work discipline on employee performance

Discipline is identified as the sixth operative function of Human Resource Management (HRM). It is considered the most crucial operational function because improved employee discipline leads to higher work performance. Effective work discipline results in enhanced employee performance. Statistically, a positive beta coefficient value reflects a direct relationship, indicating that as work discipline increases, employee performance correspondingly improves.

5. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATION

The findings of this study have significant managerial implications for organizations, particularly in the context of elderly care facilities like Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pembangunan. By demonstrating the positive impact of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance, management can prioritize initiatives that enhance these attributes among their staff. This could include implementing targeted training programs to boost employees confidence in their capabilities and establish clear, consistent disciplinary standards that encourage adherence to organizational rules and norms. Moreover, fostering a work environment that supports continuous professional development and recognizes disciplined behavior can lead to higher productivity, better service quality, and increased employee satisfaction. Consequently, these measures not only improve individual performance but also enhance the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the organization, ensuring better care for the elderly residents and a more robust operational framework.

6. CONCLUSION

The data reveal that self-efficacy significantly and positively impacts employee performance. The statistical analysis indicates that the t-value for self-efficacy is 2.056, which surpasses the t-table value of 2.012 with a significance level of 0.045. This indicates a statistically significant result, affirming that higher self-efficacy is associated with enhanced employee performance. Employees who possess confidence in their abilities and skills tend to perform better, handle tasks more effectively, and overcome workplace challenges more efficiently.

In a similar vein, the study finds that work discipline has a substantial and positive effect on employee performance. The t-value for work discipline stands at 4.868, which is well above the t-table value of 2.012, with an exceptionally low significance level of 0.000. This result underscores the importance of strict adherence to work rules and maintaining high levels of discipline in boosting employee performance. Employees who consistently follow organizational protocols and maintain disciplined work habits contribute more effectively
to their tasks and responsibilities, thereby enhancing overall productivity and efficiency at Panti Sasana Tresna Werdha RIA Pemabngunan.

These conclusions highlight the essential roles of both psychological factors (such as self-confidence and belief) and behavioral factors (such as adherence to discipline) in influencing employee performance. Boosting self-efficacy empowers employees to feel more capable and competent, while promoting strict work discipline ensures that these capabilities are directed towards productive and efficient outcomes. Consequently, the organization should consider investing in comprehensive training and development programs to enhance self-efficacy and reinforce the importance of discipline, thereby sustaining high-performance levels among its workforce.
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