

## Employees: Occupational Self-Efficacy and Work Stress

Prahara, S.A<sup>1</sup>, Indriani, N<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta  
✉sowanya\_hara@yahoo.com

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 10 October 2019

Received in revised form

20 December 2019

Accepted 25 December  
2019

Available online 20 January  
2020

#### Keywords:

Occupational self-efficacy,  
Work stress,  
Employee

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress on production employees. The hypothesis is that there is a negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress on production employees. The subjects in this study amounted to 60 people who have the characteristics of production employees and have a service life of between one to six years. The sampling technique used in this study is the purposive sampling method. The data collection tool in this study uses a Likert Scale, Work Stress Scale, and Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale. The results of data analysis using the product-moment correlation test between occupational self-efficacy and work stress on production employees showed a Pearson correlation value of  $(R) = -0.614$  with a significance of  $p = 0,000$  ( $p < 0.050$ ). These results indicate that there is a significant negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress.

Copyright © Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction (Heading 1)

The times have brought many technological changes in life. These changes support companies in increasing human resources or work equipment used (Tunjungsari, 2011). Increasingly modern work equipment and increasing workload will require more considerable employee energy than before (Sucipto, 2014). The demands in achieving high company targets will also make employees feel burdened to have particular expertise and be able to keep up with the changes that exist (Lidyansah, 2014).

Especially employees in the production department, they have a high workload and job risk. There are always employees who work overtime because they have to complete work by the production targets to be achieved. The workload exceeds the ability of employees to cause physical fatigue and work stress. Production employees also work by operating large machinery, which must be done very carefully and under the SOP because the machine has the potential for work accidents. By the results of research from Rachman (2017) shows that production employees experience work stress due to interpersonal conflict, job uncertainty, and variations in workload. The results of research from Annisa (2013) also showed that production employees have a substantial level of workload mentally, mind, and also physically so that production employees have higher levels of work stress than non-production employees. The situation requires employees to be able to adapt to survive in a dangerous environment. If the employee is unable to adapt immediately, then the situation will be interpreted as pressure (Tunjungsari, 2011). The pressure experienced will threaten him and over time, will cause stress for the employee.

According to Robbins and Judge (2013), stress is a dynamic condition in which individuals are faced with opportunities, requests, or resources related to individual desires whose results are uncertain and vital. Further explained that individuals could be said to experience work stress viewed from three aspects, namely psychological aspects, physiological aspects, and behavioral aspects. Psychological aspects arise, such as anxiety, confusion, tension, irritability, mental fatigue, and boredom. Physiological aspects arise, such as increased heart rate, physical fatigue, sleep disorders, and headaches. Behavioral aspects emerge, such as procrastinating, avoiding work, declining performance, and work productivity.

According to data obtained from Workplace Options, employee health program providers over the past three years, cases of employees related to work stress increased by 28 percent (Umardini, 2016).

Data obtained from Annisa's (2013) research results show that production employees have higher levels of work stress than non-production employees. That is because production employees experience pressure when approaching the end of the month, but the production target has not been reached. In this case, production employees are required to work harder for the achievement of production targets so that employees quickly experience fatigue. The results of research conducted by Putri and Tualeka (2014) in CV X also stated that production employees who experienced work stress reached 77 percent.

Employees should be able to work well without experiencing work stress (Munandar, 2014). Further work stress can be directed at positive, innovative, and constructive ideas in the work environment. In responding to the demands of the job, employees should be able to manage work stress well through stress management (Sucipto, 2014). Further understanding of how to deal with and manage work stress is essential for employees in the company to be able to work effectively and not harm the employees themselves or the company.

Job stress is an issue that needs to be discussed because of its critical position concerning employee work productivity (Sucipto, 2014). It is reinforced by the results of research conducted by Arifin (2016), showing that there is a negative impact between work stress on employee work productivity. The higher the job stress, the lower the productivity and vice versa, the lower the work stress, the higher the work productivity. Job stress also affects employee performance following the results of research Suroso and Siahaan (2006) show there is a negative impact between work stress on employee performance, the lower the job stress, the higher the employee performance is generated and conversely the higher the job stress, the lower the employee performance resulting from. The results of research conducted by Felanny and Moekardjono (2013) showed a negative impact between job stress and job satisfaction. The higher the job stress, the lower the job satisfaction, and vice versa, the lower the job stress, the higher the job satisfaction.

Luthans (2006) suggested that one of the causes of stress is self-efficacy. It is confirmed by Diana (Waluyo, 2013) who said that the critical factor of stress is the individual's perception of the condition and ability of individuals to deal with or take advantage of the situation at hand. The individual's ability is related to one of the personality characteristics, namely the aspect of belief in one's abilities, which Bandura calls self-efficacy. Self-efficacy used in this study is occupational self-efficacy because the research is conducted in the domain of the work area. It is also in line with the results of research conducted by Hulda (2008), which shows that there is a negative relationship between self-efficacy and work stress. That is, the higher the self-efficacy, the lower the job stress, conversely the lower the self-efficacy, the higher the work stress experienced. This research was conducted in the work domain, so researchers specifically chose occupation self-efficacy as an important factor affecting work stress.

Self-efficacy is an individual's belief about his ability to perform the tasks or actions needed to achieve specific results (Bandura, 1997). In contrast, occupation self-efficacy is defined as a belief that a person has an even complete the work he has because he has the behavior required by a job (Schyns and Sczesny 2010). In a company, occupational self-efficacy is considered more suitable because it can compare the level of self-efficacy in employees even though employees have different tasks in a company (Rigotti, Schyns & Mohr, 2008). Occupational self-efficacy does not focus on specific-task self-efficacy; that is, one's belief in doing specific tasks. The emphasis of occupational self-efficacy is more on the domain or work area in general, which is broader in scope than specific tasks. According to Bandura (1997), occupational self-efficacy in each individual will differ from one individual to another based on three dimensions. The three dimensions are the level dimension, strength dimension, and generality dimension.

Someone who has high occupational self-efficacy believes that he has more ability to succeed at work (Robbins & Judge, 2013). High occupational self-efficacy makes employees more actively working, striving, able to overcome difficult work situations, and be more creative in completing work (Kreitner & Kinicki, in Sulistyowati & Widjajani 2012). Someone who has occupational self-efficacy believes that he can try harder to overcome challenges in work (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2014). Furthermore, occupational self-efficacy also plays an essential role in motivating employees to complete their work and increase work productivity. Anxiety and low employee confidence can be influenced by occupational self-efficacy. When work problems arise, a high feeling of occupational self-efficacy encourages workers to stay afloat and remain calm to find solutions in completing their tasks, but for employees who have low occupational self-efficacy will tend to give up easily in completing their work. Someone who has a high occupational self-efficacy will feel confident in his ability to successfully do the various jobs encountered and will do much work with enthusiasm without experiencing fatigue. However, individuals who have low occupational self-efficacy, only mastering specific tasks, individuals will try jobs that they feel capable of doing and avoid jobs that are beyond their abilities or skills. Therefore, occupational self-efficacy directly or indirectly affects work stress on employees (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2014).

It is supported by the results of Schwarzer and Hallum's research (2008), which proves that occupational self-efficacy is a predictor of the emergence of work stress. The results of research from Hulda (2008) on employees of PT Yamaha Mataram Sakti Motor Semarang also showed a very significant negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress. That is, the higher occupational self-efficacy, the lower the job stress, conversely the lower the occupational self-efficacy, the higher the work stress experienced. Thus, the researchers formulated the problem in this study, namely whether there is a relationship between occupational self-efficacy with work stress on production employees?

## 2. Methods

The variables in this study are occupational self-efficacy as the independent variable and work stress as the dependent variable. The subjects in this study were 60 employees at PT X. The technique used in this study was purposive sampling, which is a technique for determining samples based on predetermined characteristics. Characteristics of subjects with a minimum service life of 6 years. According to Prabowo (2009), there is a significant relationship between work tenure and work stress, namely three to six years of work having a high-stress level. Furthermore, production department employees, according to Annisa (2013), production employees have higher levels of work stress compared to non-production employees. □

The measuring instrument used in this study is the Work Stress Scale and the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale. The Work Stress Scale compiled by researchers refers to the aspects of work stress proposed by Robbins and Judge (2013), namely psychological, physiological, and behavioral. The Work Stress Scale consists of 18 items. The scale of the trial results shows that 3 items died with a range of item discrimination values from 0.317 to 0.759. Based on the calculation results, the alpha reliability coefficient is 0.921. Thus, the Job Stress Scale is a reliable measurement.

The organizational culture in this study was compiled with the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale compiled by researchers about the Occupational Self-Efficacy aspects of Bandura (1997), namely level, strength, and generality. The Occupational Self-Efficacy scale consists of 15 items. The results of the trial scale show that there are no autumn items with a range of item discrimination values from 0.357 to 0.681. Based on the calculation results, the alpha reliability coefficient is 0.885. Thus, the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale is a reliable measurement. Data were analyzed using the Karl Pearson product-moment correlation analysis.

## 3. Findings and Discussion

The results showed a significant negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress with a correlation value ( $r_{xy}$ ) of  $r = -0.614$  and  $p = 0,000$ . This correlation shows the correlation of occupational self-efficacy with work stress is in a strong category. This correlation proves that occupational self-efficacy has a critical role in working stress on production employees. It is consistent with the hypothesis proposed that there is a significant negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and job stress, the higher the occupational self-efficacy, the lower the job stress on production employees. Conversely, the lower occupational self-efficacy, the higher the job stress on production employees. The results of this study support previous research conducted by Hulda (2008) that occupational self-efficacy has a very significant negative relationship with work stress, the higher the occupational self-efficacy, the lower the job stress. Research conducted by Sumitro, Frieda, and Putra (2009) also showed similar results, namely a negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress. The relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress means that every aspect of occupational self-efficacy contributes to work stress on production employees.

According to Bandura (1997), occupational self-efficacy is an individual's beliefs about his ability, organizing, displaying the actions needed to complete a job, and striving for the best performance in completing his work assignments. Umam (2010) states that work stress is an individual reaction that comes from all work conditions that employees perceive as demands that have an impact on psychological, physiological, and behavioral reactions. The correlation shows that occupational self-efficacy influences work stress.

The results of the categorization of work stress variables are high categorization by 55% (33 subjects), medium category by 45% (27 subjects), low category by 0% (0 subjects). The occupational self-efficacy variable categorization is high categorization by 0% (0 subjects), medium category by 50% (30 subjects), and low category by 50% (30 subjects). The results of the categorization show that the majority of production employees at UPT X have low occupational self-efficacy and high work stress.

According to Bandura (1997), occupational self-efficacy is an individual's beliefs about his ability to perform the tasks or jobs needed to achieve specific work outcomes. Furthermore, occupational self-efficacy influences whether a person is optimistic or pessimistic. It also influences the actions chosen in work, the challenges and goals they face, how much effort is done, how much is the expected outcome, how long is able to survive in facing obstacles, how great stress experienced in dealing with environmental demands and achievements that have been achieved in a job. Occupational self-efficacy becomes an essential aspect because occupational self-efficacy is a belief that appears in individuals. Individuals who have confidence in their abilities make individuals able to obtain success in carrying out a job (Ardi, Astuti, & Sulisty, 2017). Individuals who have high occupational self-efficacy believe that they can do the work around them while individuals with low occupational self-efficacy consider themselves unable to do work around them (Ghufron & Risnawita, 2014). Furthermore, occupational self-efficacy has three dimensions, namely the level dimension, the strength dimension, and the generality dimension.

At the level dimension (level), according to Bandura (1997), the level is the level of difficulty of the task done by an individual. Individuals with low-level ability will tend to easily give up on challenging jobs and are deemed incompatible with their abilities (Ghufron and Risnawita, 2014). So that individuals will have negative feelings towards themselves; individuals will give up their abilities and prefer to postpone or avoid work that they find difficult (Waluyo, 2013). It is what causes individuals to experience work stress. It is in line with field findings when employees are faced with complicated and challenging work, and employees feel unsure of being able to complete it thoroughly and with excellent results. Employees become unable to set strategies for completing work so that employees who deal with the situation will delay and avoid work that is unable to deal with it. Employees who cannot complete the demands of arduous work and cannot manage work that has deadlines will cause work to be delayed so that work productivity and employee performance will decrease (Munandar, 2014).

On the strength dimension, according to Bandura (1997), strength is an assessment of the strength of a person's individual beliefs in carrying out their duties, strong beliefs will encourage employees to survive and remain calm in completing their duties (Sulistyowati & Widjajani, 2012). Individuals with weak strength tend to be discouraged in facing obstacles in work that cause individuals to contemplate their inability rather than looking for solutions, which is what causes confidence and performance (performance) on employees to decline (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2014). It also shows that employees are not optimistic about completing work properly following predetermined targets; employees consider themselves unable to face obstacles in work because they feel limited skills possessed. It shows the lack of employee confidence and perseverance in completing work, resulting in job dissatisfaction and decreased employee productivity.

In the generality dimension, according to Bandura (1997), generality is how healthy an individual's beliefs are in carrying out various tasks and in a variety of situations. Individuals with low generality will consider themselves not able to do everything simultaneously so that it causes the individual to be uninspired and reduce employee confidence (Ghufron & Risnawati, 2014). It also shows that employees tend to be pessimistic and are not sure that they can complete several jobs given at once effectively, in addition to that employees also do not want to be transferred in other parts because employees are not sure of the expertise they have to do new jobs. When employees are faced with a variety of jobs and are not sure they can do new jobs, it will cause anxiety and tension in the employee so that it leads to work stress (Munandar, 2014).

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is a correlation in each aspect of occupational self-efficacy with work stress. Occupational self-efficacy directs a person's feelings of competence that are broad and stable to effectively cope with various situations that cause work stress (Sulistyawati, Nurtjahjanti & Prihatsanti, 2012). It is according to Verlitasari's research (2014), which states that there is a negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress on the employees of CV X Karanganyar, Central Java.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on the results of research and discussion, it can be concluded that there is a negative relationship between occupational self-efficacy and work stress on production employees.

## References

- Annisa, D.R., (2013). *Perbedaan tingkat stres antara karyawan produksi dan karyawan non produksi pt. bara jaya energy site bantuan*. Diunduh dari <http://ejurnal.untag-smd.ac.id> tanggal 17 September 2018.
- Ardi, P.T.V., Astuti, S.E., & Sulisty, W.C.M. (2017). Pengaruh self-efficacy terhadap employee engagement dan kinerja karyawan. *Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis*, 52(1), 163-172.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Felanny & Moekardjono S.R., (2013). Hubungan stres kerja dan kepuasan kerja pada karyawan perusahaan x. *Jurnal NOETIC Psychology*, 03(02), 196-207.
- Hulda. (2008). Stres kerja ditinjau dari *self-efficacy* dalam pencapaian target penjualan produk motor di pt yamaha mataram sakti motor semarang. *Skripsi*. Semarang: Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Katolik Soegijapranata.
- Luthans, F. (2006). *Perilaku organisasi*. Yogyakarta: Andi Press.
- Lidyansah. (2014). Menurunkan tingkat stres kerja pada karyawan melalui musik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Terapan*, 02(1), 62-74.
- Munandar. (2014). *Psikologi industri dan organisasi*. Jakarta: UI-Press.
- Prabowo, Y.F. (2009). Faktor yang berhubungan dengan kejadian stres kerja pada bagian produksi industri mebel pt. Chia jiann indonesia furniture di Wedelan Jepara. *Skripsi*. Semarang: Fakultas Ilmu Keolahragaan, Universitas Negeri Semarang.
- Putri, G.W.Y., & Tualeka, A.R. (2014). Hubungan antara stres kerja dengan tingkat produktivitas tenaga kerja di CV. X. *The indonesian journal of occupational safety, health and environment*, 01(01), 144-154.
- Rachman, S.B.P. (2017). Faktor determinan terhadap stres kerja pada pekerja bagian produksi di pt indogravure tahun 2017. *Skripsi*. Jakarta: Fakultas kedokteran dan ilmu kesehatan, Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah.
- Rigotti, T., Schyns, B. & Mohr, G. (2008). A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale. Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16, 238-255.
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied psychology: An international review*, 57, 152-171.
- Schyns, B., & Sczesny, S. (2010). Leadership attributes valence in self-concept and occupational self-efficacy. *Career Development International*, 15(1), 78 -92.
- Sucipto. (2014). *Keselamatan dan kesehatan kerja*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru.
- Sulistyawati, R., Nurtjahjanti, H., & Prihatsanti, U. (2012). The relationship between work efficacy with job insecurity on production employees pt "x" Semarang. *Jurnal psikologi*, 01(01), 139-153.
- Sulistyowati, E., & Widjajani, S. (2012). Mediasi kepuasan kerja dan stres kerja pada hubungan antara *self-efficacy* dan kinerja penjual jasa asuransi. *Jurnal maksipreneur*, 02(01), 69-84.
- Sumitro, M. U., Frieda, N.R.H., & Putra, N.A. (2018). *Correlation between self efficacy to job stress of sales operation employee's PT. Nasmoco Group Semarang*. Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Diponegoro Semarang. Diunduh dari [http://eprints.undip.ac.id/10952/1/jurnal\\_skripsi.pdf](http://eprints.undip.ac.id/10952/1/jurnal_skripsi.pdf) tanggal 20 September 2018.

- Suroso, A.I., & Siahaan, R. (2006). Pengaruh stres dalam pekerjaan terhadap kinerja karyawan: Studi kasus di perusahaan agribisnis pt nic. *Jurnal Manajemen Agribisnis, 03(01)*, 19-30.
- Tunjungsari, P. (2011). Pengaruh stres kerja terhadap kepuasan kerja karyawan pada kantor pusat PT. Pos Indonesia (Persero) Bandung. *Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Komputer Indonesia, 1(1)*.
- Umam, K. (2010). *Perilaku organisasi*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia
- Umardini, T.. (2016). Stres karena kerja sebabkan banyak karyawan kehilangan waktu tidur. *Tribun Kaltim*. Diunduh di <http://kaltim.tribunnews.com/2016/03/15/stres-karena-kerja-sebabkan-banyak-karyawan-kehilangan-waktu-tidur?page=1> Tanggal 18 September 2018.
- Verlitasari, O.K. (2014). Hubungan antara *self-efficacy* dengan stres kerja pada karyawan CV. X, Karanganyar Jawa Tengah. *Naskah Publikasi*, Surakarta: Fakultas Psikologi, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Waluyo. (2013). *Psikologi industri*. Jakarta: Akademia Permata.