SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF ACCOUNTANCY, MANAGEMENT, AND FINANCE
ECONOMIT JOURNAL

The Effects of Self-Efficacy and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah

Jaudah Ismatul Farah[1], Sari Laelatul Qodriah[2], Risdianto[3]
[1,2,3]Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Muhammadiyah Cirebon, Indonesia
Email: isma.farah06@gmail.com, sari.lq@umc.ac.id, risdianto@umc.ac.id

Abstract:
This study examines the effects of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance at PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah, both individually and jointly. A quantitative approach with an associative research method was employed. The population comprised 277 employees, and 162 respondents were selected using simple random sampling. Sample size was determined using the Isaac and Michael approach at a 5% error level. Data were collected through questionnaires and interviews and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25 through validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, an F-test, and the coefficient of determination. Self-efficacy had a positive and significant effect on performance ($B = 0.765$; $\beta = 0.343$; $t = 5.249$; $p < 0.001$), as did work discipline ($B = 0.762$; $\beta = 0.417$; $t = 6.380$; $p < 0.001$). The joint effect was significant ($F(2, 159) = 40.922$; $p < 0.001$). The model explained 34.0% of the variation in employee performance ($R^2 = 0.340$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.332$). Work discipline had the stronger relative effect based on standardized coefficients. The findings suggest that the company should strengthen employee self-efficacy through training, mentoring, and leadership support while enforcing working hours, break schedules, and workplace rules consistently.
Keywords:
Self-Efficacy; Work Discipline; Employee Performance.

I. Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

Human resources are an important asset for organizational sustainability because employees implement company policies and operational activities. Work quality and quantity are essential to improving organizational achievement and progress (Irmayanti & Suarmanayasa, 2020). Employee performance represents the work outcomes achieved in accordance with assigned duties, responsibilities, and organizational standards (Lakidende & Tenggara, 2022).

PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah, also known as Surabraja Food Industry, is a food and beverage manufacturer producing soy sauce, chili sauce, syrup, honey, and herbal products. Employee performance is therefore important for smooth operations and the achievement of company targets.

Self-efficacy refers to individuals' beliefs in their ability to plan and carry out the actions required to complete particular tasks (Wulandari, 2024). Employees with high self-efficacy tend to be more confident, persevere when facing obstacles, and strive to achieve their goals. Prasetyono et al. (2023) and Husain and Santoso (2023) demonstrate a relationship between self-efficacy and performance.

Work discipline is also important because it ensures that employees comply with working hours, procedures, instructions, and responsibilities. Fitriani and Muhyadi (2018), Maia and Natsir (2022), and Pradnyana et al. (2026) report positive effects of discipline on performance. However, Rafi Muhammad Farhan (2023) reports different findings, indicating a remaining

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23681087*

research gap.

At PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah, there are indications that self-efficacy and work discipline remain suboptimal. Attendance data from November 2025 to April 2026 show that absenteeism peaked in January 2026 at 21.64%. A preliminary survey also identified problems with punctuality, compliance with break schedules, dependence on supervisors' instructions, and delays in completing work. These conditions provide the basis for examining the effects of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance.

II. Review of Literature

2.1Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to organize and execute the actions required to achieve particular outcomes (Wulandari, 2024). This study measures self-efficacy through level, strength, and generality.

2.2 Work Discipline

Work discipline refers to compliance with workplace rules and responsibilities. Its dimensions include time discipline, adherence to regulations, and fulfillment of responsibilities (Meliani, 2022; Siswanto, 2019).

2.3 Employee Performance

Employee performance refers to work outcomes assessed against organizational standards. This study uses indicators of quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, independence, and work commitment.

2.4 Hypotheses

H1: Self-efficacy has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. H2: Work discipline has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. H3: Self-efficacy and work discipline jointly have a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

III. Research Methods

3.1 Research Methods

This study employed a quantitative approach with an associative research method. The population comprised 277 employees of PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah. A sample of 162 employees was determined using the Isaac and Michael approach at a 5% error level. Probability sampling with a simple random sampling technique was used, giving every member of the population an equal opportunity for selection. The study was conducted from April to June 2026 at PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah in Cirebon Regency. Data were collected through interviews and questionnaires using a five-point Likert scale.

Self-efficacy was measured using eight items covering level, strength, and generality. Work discipline was measured using nine items covering time discipline, adherence to regulations, and fulfillment of responsibilities. Employee performance was measured using 18 items covering quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, independence, and work commitment. IBM SPSS Statistics 25 was used for validity and reliability tests, classical assumption tests, multiple linear regression, t-tests, an F-test, and the coefficient of determination. The classical assumption tests assessed residual normality, multicollinearity, and heteroskedasticity. Hypotheses were evaluated at the 5% significance level. SPSS significance values displayed as 0.000 are reported as $p < 0.001$.

IV. Result and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Characteristics

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	87	53.70
	Female	75	46.30
Length of service	1–3 years	98	60.49
	4–6 years	64	39.51

The study included 162 respondents: 87 men (53.70%) and 75 women (46.30%). Regarding length of service, 98 respondents (60.49%) had worked for 1–3 years, while 64 (39.51%) had worked for 4–6 years.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2. Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Category
Self-Efficacy	3.44	Good
Work Discipline	3.39	Moderate
Employee Performance	3.29	Moderate

The descriptive analysis yielded a mean self-efficacy score of 3.44, categorized as good. Work discipline had a mean of 3.39 and employee performance a mean of 3.29, both categorized as moderate. These results indicate that employees generally expressed confidence in their abilities, while work discipline and performance still required improvement. The discussion highlights confidence in handling difficult tasks, compliance with working hours and break schedules, and attention to detail as areas for managerial attention.

4.3 Instrument and Classical Assumption Tests

Table 3. Reliability Test Results

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	Assessment
Self-Efficacy	0.816	Reliable
Work Discipline	0.844	Reliable
Employee Performance	0.903	Reliable

All eight self-efficacy items, nine work discipline items, and 18 employee performance items were found to be valid. Cronbach's Alpha values were 0.816, 0.844, and 0.903, respectively, exceeding the 0.70 threshold and indicating adequate internal consistency. The Kolmogorov–Smirnov test of regression residuals produced a test statistic of 0.046 and a significance value of 0.200, indicating no evidence against normality at the 5% level. Both independent variables had tolerance values of 0.972 and VIF values of 1.029, indicating no multicollinearity. The Glejser test produced significance values of 0.693 for self-efficacy and 0.081 for work discipline, indicating no evidence of heteroskedasticity at the 5% level.

4.4 Regression and Hypothesis Tests

Table 4. Multiple Linear Regression and t-Test Results

Variable	B	Beta	t	p-value
Constant	16.441	–	3.273	0.001
Self-Efficacy	0.765	0.343	5.249	< 0.001
Work Discipline	0.762	0.417	6.380	< 0.001

Based on the coefficients in Table 4, the regression equation is $Y = 16.441 + 0.765X_1 + 0.762X_2$, where Y denotes employee performance, X_1 self-efficacy, and X_2 work discipline. Holding work discipline constant, a one-unit increase in self-efficacy is associated with a 0.765-unit increase in predicted performance. Holding self-efficacy constant, a one-unit increase in work discipline is associated with a 0.762-unit increase in predicted performance. Self-efficacy had a positive and significant effect ($t = 5.249$; $p < 0.001$), supporting H1. Work discipline also had a positive and significant effect ($t = 6.380$; $p < 0.001$), supporting H2. Standardized beta coefficients indicate a stronger relative effect for work discipline ($\beta = 0.417$) than for self-efficacy ($\beta = 0.343$).

Table 5. Coefficient of Determination and Joint Significance Test

Indicator	Value
R	0.583
R Square	0.340
Adjusted R Square	0.332
F-statistic (df = 2, 159)	40.922
p-value (F-test)	< 0.001

The multiple correlation coefficient was $R = 0.583$. The R Square value of 0.340 indicates that self-efficacy and work discipline jointly explained 34.0% of the variation in employee performance, while the remaining 66.0% was not explained by the model. Adjusted R Square was 0.332, and the standard error of the estimate was 8.341. The ANOVA yielded $F(2, 159) = 40.922$ with $p < 0.001$, indicating that the two predictors jointly had a significant effect on employee performance and supporting H3.

4.5 Discussion

Self-efficacy had a positive and significant effect on employee performance. Employees who believe in their abilities are more likely to approach challenging tasks confidently, seek solutions, and sustain effort when difficulties arise. This finding is consistent with Husain and Santoso (2023) and Wulandari (2024). Although the descriptive table classifies overall self-efficacy as good, the discussion identifies continuing difficulties with confidence in complex tasks, motivation after failure, and handling work pressure. Training, mentoring, effective leadership, and recognition of achievements may help employees translate their abilities into more consistent performance.

Work discipline had a positive and significant effect on employee performance and the larger standardized coefficient of the two predictors. Compliance with working hours, break schedules, standard operating procedures, instructions, and responsibilities supports orderly and effective task execution. This finding is consistent with Fitriani and Muhyadi (2018), Maia and Natsir (2022), and Pradnyana et al. (2026). The descriptive results indicate moderate overall discipline and identifies concerns about limited preparation before work, extended breaks, and inconsistent enforcement of rules. Clear expectations, effective supervision, and consistent, proportionate sanctions are therefore important priorities for improvement.

Self-efficacy and work discipline jointly had a significant effect on employee performance. These factors complement one another: self-efficacy supports confidence and persistence in meeting work demands, while discipline helps employees apply their abilities in accordance with procedures, schedules, and responsibilities. The findings are consistent with Husain and Santoso (2023) and Pradnyana et al. (2026). The model explained 34.0% of performance variation, indicating that these two factors provide a partial explanation and that additional influences remain outside the model. Management should combine confidence-building support with consistent disciplinary practices and regular evaluation of work quality, particularly attention to detail.

V. Conclusions

Self-efficacy and work discipline each had a positive and significant effect on employee performance at PT Siraj Badawi Cukup Rupiah in a sample of 162 employees selected from a population of 277 through simple random sampling. Self-efficacy had a standardized coefficient of 0.343 ($t = 5.249$; $p < 0.001$), while work discipline had a standardized coefficient of 0.417 ($t = 6.380$; $p < 0.001$), indicating the stronger relative effect of discipline. Their joint effect was significant, $F(2, 159) = 40.922$, $p < 0.001$. The model explained 34.0% of performance variation ($R^2 = 0.340$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.332$). The company should reinforce confidence through training, mentoring, leadership support, and recognition while clarifying break schedules and applying workplace rules consistently. Future research should examine the role of leadership in employee confidence and discipline and compare employees across departments or types of work.

References

Fitriani, R., & Muhyadi, M. (2018). Pengaruh disiplin kerja dan motivasi kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan di Favehotel Malioboro Yogyakarta [The effects of work discipline and work motivation on employee performance at Favehotel Malioboro Yogyakarta].

Husain, A., & Santoso, A. B. (2023). Pengaruh Self Esteem dan Self Efficacy Terhadap Kinerja [The effects of self-esteem and self-efficacy on performance]. 3(April).

Irmayanti, P. A., & Suarmanayasa, I. N. (2020). Pengaruh kompetensi dan budaya kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan [The effects of competence and work culture on employee performance]. Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis, 2(1), 111–119.

Lakidende, U., & Tenggara, U. S. (2022). Motivasi intrinsik terhadap kinerja pegawai pada bagian organisasi dan kepegawaian Sekretariat Daerah Kabupaten Konawe [Intrinsic motivation and employee performance in the organization and personnel division of the Konawe Regency Regional Secretariat]. 3(1), 63–73.

Maia, G. E. S., & Natsir, M. (2022). The Influence of Organizational Culture, Motivation and Work Discipline on Employee Performance at the Department of Food Security and Fisheries of Malaka District, Indonesia. 3(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.47505/IJRSS.2022.V3.2.1

Meliani, M. S. (2022). Pengaruh Disiplin Kerja dan Komunikasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Sat Nusapersada Tbk [The effects of work discipline and communication on employee performance at PT Sat Nusapersada Tbk]. 4(07), 437–449.

Pangestu, D. A., & Ardiana, I. D. K. R. (2024). Pengaruh Self Efficacy, Self Esteem, dan Employee Engagement terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT Usaha Utama Bersaudara Surabaya [The effects of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and employee engagement on employee performance at PT Usaha Utama Bersaudara Surabaya]. Manajemen Kreatif Jurnal, 2(3).

Pradnyana, M. G. K., Parwita, G. B. S., & Carina, T. (2026). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, self efficacy dan beban kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PT BPR Parasari Badung [The effects of work discipline, self-efficacy, and workload on employee performance at PT BPR Parasari Badung]. EMAS, 7(1), 1–13.

Prasetyono, A., Indriasih, D., & Hanfan, A. (2023). Pengaruh Self Esteem dan Self Efficacy terhadap Kinerja Karyawan [The effects of self-esteem and self-efficacy on employee performance]. ISBM, 1(1), 20–32.

Rafi Muhammad Farhan, K. I. (2023). The Influence Of Work Discipline, Work Motivation And Work. 72–83.

Sinaga, S. P., Karundeng, M. L., & Hutabarat, F. M. (2024). Pengaruh Self Efficacy dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT Meerkats Flexipack Indonesia [The effects of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance at PT Meerkats Flexipack Indonesia]. 4, 2672–2683.

Siswanto, B. (2019). Pengaruh Motivasi Kerja Dan Disiplin Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan [The effects of work motivation and work discipline on employee performance]. 7(2), 77–87.

Sugiyono, P. D. (2020). Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D [Quantitative, qualitative, and research and development methods]. Alfabeta.

Wulandari, R. P. (2024). Pengaruh Self Efficacy, Kompetensi dan Dukungan Organisasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada PT Indo Bismar Surabaya [The effects of self-efficacy, competence, and organizational support on employee performance at PT Indo Bismar Surabaya]. 4(1), 188–200.

Yogi, I. G. A. A. P., Puspitawati, N. M. D., & Purnawati, N. L. G. P. (2024). Pengaruh Self Efficacy, Disiplin Kerja dan Lingkungan Kerja Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Kantor Camat Abiansemal [The effects of self-efficacy, work discipline, and work environment on employee performance at the Abiansemal District Office]. Jurnal EMAS, 5(6), 14–26.