

# THE INFLUENCE OF SELF-EFFICACY AND VISIONARY LEADERSHIP ON WORK PRODUCTIVITY

Edward Efendi Silalahi

Bhayangkara University, Greater Jakarta, Indonesia

## Abstract

This research aims to examine the relationship between visionary leadership and self-efficacy and employee work productivity. The research was conducted at the company PT Anugrah Sejahtera in November 2023. The research population was 168 employees and the sample size was 118 employees using proportional random sampling. Data collection for each variable studied used a questionnaire with a Likert scale. The analysis technique uses partial correlation and multiple correlation. The research results show that there is a positive relationship between visionary leadership and employee work productivity (correlation coefficient  $r_{y1} = 0.530$  and coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y1} = 0.281$ ), there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and employee work productivity (correlation coefficient  $r_{y2} = 0.472$  and coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y2} = 0.222$ ) and there is a positive and very significant relationship between visionary leadership and self-efficacy together with employee work productivity (correlation coefficient  $r_{y12} = 0.562$  and coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y12} = 0.316$ ). Thus it can be concluded that work productivity can be increased through visionary leadership and self-efficacy both partially and jointly.

**Keywords** work productivity, visionary leadership, self-efficacy.

## INTRODUCTION

Employees or human resources (HR) are the component that has the most influence on achieving quality product or service processes and results. Employee work productivity is very necessary so that the company's goal of producing quality products or services is achieved (Dessler, 2016). This is important because when employees have high productivity then employees definitely have the ability, enthusiasm for work and always develop their potential (Terry & Rue, 2016).

An employee's belief in their potential to plan and determine appropriate actions to complete tasks and be able to overcome obstacles so as to achieve better goals is a form of self-efficacy possessed by an employee which can also increase productivity at work (Gibson, 2001). The problem is then formulated into the

following questions: (1). Is there a relationship between visionary leadership and employee work productivity? (2). Is there a relationship between self-efficacy and employee work productivity? (3). Is there a relationship between visionary leadership and self-efficacy together with employee work productivity?

## Work productivity

According to Elaho & Odion (2022), Joseph & U. Okorekoti (2022) work productivity is the comparison between output and input, where the output must have added value and better processing techniques. Asio (2021), Siebers et al., (2008) state that productivity is a comparison between the totality of expenditure at a certain time divided by the totality of input during a certain period. The International Labor Organization (ILO) states that productivity is a scientific comparison between the amount

produced and the amount of each resource used during production. In line with the ILO, Rahman & Annuar (2023) state that productivity is the best comparison between the results obtained and the number of resources used.

Singh & Chaudhary (2022) state that productivity is the ratio of output to input, which is a measure of a manager's efficiency in using limited organizational resources to produce goods and services. According to Gibbs et al., (2021), Almaamari & Alaswad (2021) productivity is how to produce or increase the highest possible output of goods and services by utilizing resources efficiently. According to Singh & Solkhe (2022) Productivity is a measure of the use of the resources of an organization and is usually expressed as a ratio of the output obtained by uses resources to the amount of resources employed.

Based on theories from experts and previous research discussed previously, it can be concluded that employee work productivity is a comparison between work results (output) and the resources used (input), where the output must have better added value to realize company goals.

### **Visionary Leadership**

Atthirauong & Bunnoiko (2021), Karwan et al., (2021) state that leadership that is relevant to job demands and desired for productivity is leadership that has a vision or visionary leadership, namely leadership that is focused on engineering a future that is full of challenges. A vision is created from the leader's creative thinking as a reflection of professionalism and experience or the result of elaboration and in-depth thinking with other personnel, namely in the form of ideas about the future ideals of the organization that we want to realize together. Buss et al., (2023), Eral & Altinok (2022) explain literally the meaning of vision is a realistic view of the future (future) that wants to be realized within a certain period of time. Vision is not a utopia, vision is not the same as mission but vision is more substantive than mission.

Ariani et al., (2023), Khoiri (2020) stated that

vision is a means for visionary leadership. Vision plays a role in determining the future of the organization if it is implemented comprehensively. According to Robbins (2003), the visionary leadership style is the ability to create a realistic, trustworthy and attractive vision of the future of the organization. In contrast to the opinion above, Jaqua & Jaqua (2021), Cai et al, (2023) state that visionary leadership is a leadership pattern that is shown to give meaning to the work and efforts that need to be carried out together by company members by providing direction and meaning. on work and efforts carried out based on a clear vision.

From the theories of experts and previous research discussed previously, the synthesis of visionary leadership is behavior that is oriented towards achieving a vision and is able to invite employees to commit to this achievement.

### **Self-Efficacy**

Damianus et al., (2021), Gibson (2001) stated that self-efficacy refers to the assessment that a person makes about their ability to carry out the actions needed to face a prospective situation. The assessment determines how much effort they will put in and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles or stressful experiences.

Alexsandra et al. (2005) define self-efficacy as the belief that a person has the abilities needed to carry out the behavior required for task success. Self-efficacy is a kind of self-confidence or task-specific version of self-esteem. Self-efficacy relates to the belief in being able to carry out specific behaviors necessary for success in the workplace. .

Gibson (2012) states that self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her success in overcoming difficult situations. According to Homa & M.Thai (2014), self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her capability to organize and carry out a series of actions needed to produce certain achievements. Mariana et al. (2019), Judge et al. (2007) stated that beliefs about one's own capabilities to be able to complete the task at hand well are part of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a person's inner belief

regarding the ability and competence to carry out tasks successfully Peiffer & Preckel (2020).

Based on theories from experts and the results of previous research, it can be concluded that self-efficacy is a person's attitude in believing that he is able to complete his tasks well.

## **MATERIALS AND METHOD**

This research is a correlational study research. The primary data needed is data related to visionary leadership and self-efficacy and their relationship to employee work productivity.

This research will be conducted at companies located in Tangerang. The research was conducted from September 2022 to November 2022. The population in this study were employees of a company engaged in the chemical materials business called PT Anugrah Sejahtera. The population is 168 employees. With a sample of 118 employees. The sample was determined using proportional random sampling. Data collection for each variable uses a questionnaire with a Likert scale. Data analysis techniques use partial correlation and simultaneous correlation.

### **Testing Requirements Analysis**

#### **1. Normality test**

The results of the normality test calculation of the estimated standard error ( $Y-\hat{Y}_1$ ) of the employee work productivity variable (Y) on the Visionary Leadership variable (X1) obtained an Lcount value of 0.081 while the Ltable value was at a significance level of 0.05 and  $n = 118$  of 0.082. The normal requirement is  $Lcount < Ltable$ , so the estimated standard error ( $Y-\hat{Y}_1$ ) of the employee work productivity variable (Y) on the Visionary Leadership variable (X1) has data that is normally distributed.

The results of the normality test calculation of the estimated standard error ( $Y-\hat{Y}_2$ ) of the employee work productivity variable (Y) on the Self-Efficacy variable (X2) obtained an Lcount value of 0.080 while the Ltable value was at a significance level of 0.05 and  $n = 118$  of 0.080. The normal requirement is  $Lcount < Ltable$ , so the estimated standard error ( $Y-\hat{Y}_2$ ) of the employee work productivity variable, (Y) on the

Self-Efficacy variable (X2) has data that is normally distributed.

#### **2. Homogeneity Test**

Testing for homogeneity of variance was carried out using the Bartlett test. The requirement for homogeneous data is if the  $\chi^2_{count}$  value is smaller than  $\chi^2_{table}$  at the 5% significance level. From the results of the homogeneity test calculation of the employee work productivity variable on the Visionary Leadership variable, the  $\chi^2_{count}$  value is 31.62, while the  $\chi^2_{table}$  is at a significance level of 5% and  $dk = 41$  is 56.94. Because  $\chi^2_{count} < \chi^2_{table}$ , it can be concluded that the group of employee work productivity data on the Visionary Leadership variable comes from a homogeneous population.

Homogeneity testing was carried out using the Bartlett test. Based on the test results, the value of  $\chi^2_{count} = 48.24$ , while  $\chi^2_{table} = 49.80$  with an error of 5% and degrees of freedom of 35. The data requirement is homogeneous if  $\chi^2_{count} < \chi^2_{table}$ . Thus, the group of employee Work Productivity (Y) data scores on Self-Efficacy (X2) comes from a homogeneous population ( $\chi^2_{count} = 48.24 < 49.80 = \chi^2_{table}$ ).

#### **Hypothesis test**

1. The relationship between Visionary Leadership (X1) and employee Work Productivity (Y)

From the results of calculations carried out using significance tests, the strength of the relationship between Visionary Leadership and employee work productivity is shown by the correlation coefficient  $r_{y1} = 0.530$  and the coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y1} = 0.281$ . This means that Visionary Leadership contributes 28.1% to employee Work Productivity, while 71.9% of employee Work Productivity is influenced by other factors.

Based on the results of simple regression analysis, the regression constant or  $a = 38.859$  and the regression coefficient or  $b = 0.625$  are obtained. Thus, the functional relationship model between Visionary Leadership and employee

Work Productivity can be expressed in a simple linear regression  $\hat{Y} = 38.859 + 0.281X_1$ . The linearity test with the F test is carried out to test whether the regression equation is linear or not.

### **2. The relationship between Self-Efficacy (X<sub>2</sub>) and employee work productivity (Y)**

From the results of calculations carried out using significance tests, the strength of the relationship between Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity is shown by the correlation coefficient  $r_{y2} = 0.472$  and the coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y2} = 0.222$ . This means that Self-Efficacy contributes 22.2% to employee work productivity, while 77.8% of employee work productivity is influenced by other factors.

Based on the results of the F-test, it was obtained that  $F_{count}$  was 33.15 and  $F_{table}$  was 3.92 (dk numerator = 1; dk denominator = 116;  $\alpha = 0.05$ ) and  $F_{table}$  was 6.86 (dk numerator = 1; dk denominator = 116 ;  $\alpha = 0.01$ ). Because  $F_{count}$  is greater than  $F_{table}$  at the significance level of both  $\alpha = 0.05$  and  $\alpha = 0.01$ , it can be concluded that the correlation coefficient  $r_{y2}$  is very significant. In addition, based on the results of the t-test calculations, the  $t_{count}$  value was 5.76 and the  $t_{table}$  value at 5% error was 1.98 and at 1% error was 2.62. Because  $t_{count} > t_{table}$ , the correlation coefficient between Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity is very significant.

### **3. The relationship between Visionary Leadership (X<sub>1</sub>) and Self-Efficacy (X<sub>2</sub>) together with Work Productivity (Y)**

Based on the results of the F test in the ANOVA table, it can be seen that the calculated F value is 26.51, while the F table with dk in the numerator = 2 and dk in the denominator = 115 at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$  is 3.08 and a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.01$  of 4.79. It can be concluded that the calculated F value  $> F_{table}$ , this shows that the regression equation  $\hat{Y} = 10.019 + 0.455X_1 + 0.390X_2$  can be used to predict the level of employee work productivity through Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together.

The strength of the relationship between

Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together with employee Work Productivity is shown by the correlation coefficient  $r_{y12} = 0.562$  and the coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y12} = 0.316$ . This means that Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together contribute 31.6% to employee work productivity, while 68.4% of employee work productivity is influenced by other factors. In addition, based on the results of the t-test calculations, the  $t_{count}$  value was 7.28 and the  $t_{table}$  value at 5% error was 1.98 and at 1% error was 2.62. Because  $t_{count} > t_{table}$ , the correlation coefficient between Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together with employee Work Productivity is very significant.

### **Partial Correlation Test**

Based on the results of the first partial correlation test calculation, the partial correlation value was obtained between Visionary Leadership (X<sub>1</sub>) and employee Work Productivity (Y) where Self-Efficacy (X<sub>2</sub>) was controlled ( $R_{y1.2}$ ) = 0.364. Based on the results of the significance test, this value is very significant because  $t_{count}$  is greater than  $t_{table}$ . Thus, it can be concluded that there is a very significant positive relationship between Visionary Leadership and employee Work Productivity where the Self-Efficacy variable is controlled.

The results of the calculation of the second partial correlation test obtained a partial correlation value between Self-Efficacy (X<sub>2</sub>) and employee Work Productivity (Y) where Visionary Leadership (X<sub>1</sub>) was controlled ( $R_{y2.1}$ ) = 0.248. Based on the results of the significance test, this value is very significant because  $t_{count}$  is greater than  $t_{table}$ . Thus, it can be concluded that there is a very significant positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity where the Visionary Leadership variable is controlled.

### **CONCLUSION**

1. Positive Relationship Between Visionary Leadership and Employee Work Productivity

The results of hypothesis testing of the relationship between Visionary Leadership and

employee work productivity show that the relationship strength value  $r_{y1}$  is 0.530 in the medium interval category (0.40 – 0.599) and the coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y1}$  is 0.281

which means Visionary Leadership contributes to increasing employee Work Productivity by 28.1%. The significance of this relationship was that very significant results were obtained at the significance levels of  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $\alpha=0.01$ .

There is a positive relationship between Visionary Leadership and employee Work Productivity. This can be seen in the functional relationship between Visionary Leadership and employee Work Productivity which is shown by the regression equation  $\hat{Y} = 38.859 + 0.625$

Buss et al., (2023) explain that visionary leadership is the leader's ability to create, formulate, communicate, socialize, transform and implement ideal thoughts that originate from themselves or as a result of social interactions between organizational members and stakeholders which are believed to be ideals. -the future goals of the organization that must be achieved or realized through the commitment of all personnel. Visionary leaders are able to support employee work productivity to be even better.

### 2. Positive Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Employee Work Productivity

Based on the results of data analysis calculations, the correlation value between Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity is obtained,  $r_{y2} = 0.472$  and the coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y2} = 0.222$ , which means that the relationship between Self-Efficacy and Work Productivity has a fairly strong relationship and Self-Efficacy contributes 22.2% in increasing employee work productivity. The significance of this relationship was that very significant results were obtained at the significance levels of  $\alpha=0.05$  and  $\alpha=0.01$ .

There is a positive relationship between Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity. This can be seen in the functional relationship between Self-Efficacy and employee Work

Productivity which is shown by the regression equation  $\hat{Y} = 15.889 + 0.785X_2$ , meaning that every one unit increase in the Self-Efficacy score can increase the employee's Work Productivity score by 0.785 at a constant of 15.889.

The results of this research are supported by Damianus et al., (2021) in their article entitled "Employees' Self Efficacy and Work Performance of Employees as Mediated by Work Environment", showing that there is a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and organizational climate together. the same as employee work productivity. This can be seen in the correlation coefficient ( $r_{y12}$ ) of 0.60 with the regression equation  $\hat{Y} = 48.46 + 0.359X_1 + 0.365X_2$ .

### 3. Positive Relationship Between Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together with employee Work Productivity

The joint relationship between the variables Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy and employee Work Productivity has a correlation coefficient of  $r_{y12} = 0.562$  and a coefficient of determination  $r^2_{y12} = 0.316$  so it can be concluded that 31.6% of employee Work Productivity can be increased through the variables Visionary Leadership and Self-Efficacy together.

Partially, the results of this multiple correlation test show a correlation coefficient value of 0.364 when Self-Efficacy is kept constant and 0.248 when Visionary Leadership is kept constant. This shows that Visionary Leadership has a more dominant strength than Self-Efficacy.

Based on the analysis of the research data, it can be concluded that there is a very significant positive relationship between visionary leadership and employee work productivity, between self-efficacy and employee work productivity, between visionary leadership and self-efficacy together with employee work productivity.

Based on the results of this research, increasing employee work productivity can be done by increasing visionary leadership and improving

self-efficacy.

**REFERENCES**

1. Aleksandra, Luszczynska., Benicio, Gutierrez-Dona & Ralf, Schwarzer. (2005). General Self-efficacy in Various Domains of Human Functioning: Evidence from five Countries. *International Journal of Psychology*. Volume 40, 2005-ISSUE 2.
2. Almaamari, Qais.A., Alaswad, Husain.I. (2021). Factors Influencing Employees' Productivity- Literature Review. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, Volume. 27, Issue.3.1528-2686-27-3-531
3. Ariani, Rifa., Hardienata, Soewarto., Entang, M. (2023). Increasing work productivity through organizational culture, visionary leadership, and achievement motivation. *Journal of Education and Learning Review*, Vol.2.Issue.2.DOI:doi.org/10.56943/sujana.v2i2.324. <https://journal.jfpublisher.com/index.php/sujana>
4. Asio, John. M. (2021). Determinants of work productivity among selected tertiary education employees: A preCOVID-19 pandemic analysis. *International Journal of Didactical Studies*, Volume 2, Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.33902/IJODS.2021167470>
5. Atthirauong, Walailak., Bunnoiko, Kaseam., Panprung, Wariya. (2021). Identifying Factors Influencing Visionary Leadership: An Empirical Evidence from Thai Manufacturing Industry. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, Vol. 10, pp. 39-53. [www.CIKD.CA](http://www.CIKD.CA)
6. Buss, Martin., Kearney, Eric., Gandhi, Nilima. (2023). Antecedents and Effects of Visionary Leadership: When and How Leadership Work Centrality is Linked to Visionary Leadership and Follower Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, Volume 30. Issue 4. [.https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518231203637](https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518231203637)
7. Cai, Wenjing., Fan, Xueling., Wang, Qiqi. (2023). Linking visionary leadership to creativity at multiple levels: The role of goal-related processes. *Journal of Business Research*, Volume 167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbuspres.2023.114182>
8. Damianus Abun., Marlene T. Nicolas., Esterella P. Apollo., Theogenia Magallanes., Mary Joy. Ecaracion. (2021). Employees' self-efficacy and work performance of employees as mediated by work environment. *International Journal of Research on Business and Social Science*.Vol.10.No.7.
9. Dessler, Gary. (2016). *Human Resources management*, Prenticehall Inc
10. Elaho,Omoruyi.B.,Oclion,Amuen.S.(2022).The Impact of Work Environment on Employee Productivity:A Case Study of Business Centers in University of Benin Complex. *Amity Journal of Management Research*,Vol.5.Issue1, pp. 782-797
11. Erol, ME & Altinok, S. (2022). "The Importance of Visionary Leadership in Organizational Structure". *International Journal of Social Science Innovation and Educational Technologies*, Volume: 3 Issue: 12 pp: 226-233. [issjournal.com](http://issjournal.com)
12. Gibbs,Michael.,Mengel,Friederike.,Siemroth, Christoph.(2021).Work From Home&Productivity:Evidence from Personnel&Analytics Data on IT Professionals.Becker Friedman Institute.Working Paper.NO.2021-56
13. Gibson, CB (2001). "Me and Us: Differential Relationships Among Goal-setting Training, Efficacy and Effectiveness at the Individual and Team level". *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.22,789-808.
14. Homa, Khorasani. E., Mohd, Taib. H. (2014). Relationship of Social Self-efficacy and Workers's Job Satisfaction. *European Journal of Business and Management*. Vol.6,No.5.

## THE USA JOURNALS

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS INNOVATIONS (ISSN- 2693-0811)

VOLUME 06 ISSUE02

15. Jaqua, Ecler., Jaqua, Terry. (2021). Visionary Leadership. *Quantum Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, Vol. 2 No. 6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55197/QJSSH.v2i6.109>
16. Joseph, Chukwunonso. .[www.ijtsrd.com](http://www.ijtsrd.com)
17. Judge, TA Jackson, CL, Shaw, JC, Scott, BA and Rich, BI (2007). Self-efficacy and Work-Related Performance: the Integral Role of Individual Differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol,92,107-127.
18. Karwan, Dedy.H., Hariri, Hasan., Ridwan, R. (2021). Visionary Leadership: What, Why and How. *ICOPE 2020*. DOI: 10.4108/eai.16-10-2020.2305217
19. Khoiri, Mohammad. (2020). Visionary Leadership on Transforming Organizational Change in the Era of Disruption. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligions Understanding*, Vol 7, No. 10. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i10.2053>
20. Luthans, Fred. (2014). *Organizational Behavior*, New York: McGraw-Hill, New York.
21. Luthans, Fred., Suzanne J. Peterson. (2002). Employee Engagement and Manager Self-efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*.Vol.21.
22. Mariana, Bargsted., Raul, Ramirez-Vielma, and Jesus, Yeves. (2019). Professional Self-efficacy and Job Satisfaction: The Mediator Role of Work Design. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.
23. Peiffer, H., Ellwart, T., & Preckel, F. (2020). Ability self-concept and self-efficacy in higher education: An empirical differentiation based on their factorial structure. *PLoS one*, 25(7),eO234604.
24. Rahman, ASA, Annuar, Nursyamila., Sabri, Sabiroh. Md. (2023). A Conceptual Paper of Factors Impacting Employees Productivity. *ICOFA 2023, ASSEHR 759*, pp. 158-168. <http://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-076-3.15>
25. Siebers, Peer-Olaf., Aickelin, Uwe., Battisti, Giuliana., Celia, Helen., Clegg, Chris., Fu, Xiaolan., DeHoyos, Rafael., Iona, Alfonsina., Pefrescu, Alina., Peixoto, Adriana .(2008). Enhancing Productivity: The Role of Management Practices. *AIM Working Paper Series-062-February 2008-ISSN 17440009*
26. Singh, Shivangi., Chaudhary, Nirmala. (2022). Employee Productivity: An Analysis of Dimensions and Methodology through Systematic Literature Review. *Empirical Economics Letters*, 21 (special Issue 4). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/36391302>
27. Singh, Shivangi., Solkhe, Ajay., Gautam, Poonam. (2022). What do we know about Employee Productivity?: Insights from Bibliometric Analysis. *Journal of Scientometric Research*, vol.11 No.2, pp.183-198. <https://www.jscires.org>. DOI: 10.5530/jscires.11.2. 20
28. Terry, George. R&Rue, Leslie. W. Rue. (2016). *Management Basics*. Prenticehall, London: International Inc
29. van Dinther, M., Dochy, F and Segers, M. (2010). Factors Affecting Students Self-efficacy in Higher Education. *Educational Research Review* ,6,pp95-108.
30. Zajacova, A., Scott, M., Lynch, S. M., & Espenshade, T. J. (2005). Self-efficacy, stress and academic success in college. *Research in Higher Education* ,46(6),132-143.