

SELF-EFFICACY: STAIRCASE TO THE INTENTION OF EMPLOYEES' TURNING-OVER

Johansyah Anwar,* R. Madhakomala**

State University of Jakarta

r.madhakomala@unj.ac.id

johansyahanwar@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore and to analyze the impact of self efficacy to employees, mostly considered as those performing ones who have their own certain level of self efficacy, and its effect to turnover intention. Attempting to assess the influence of self efficacy on the intention of individuals to leave the organization, it is observed that individuals having high level of self-efficacy, though reveal in such a positive effect in their cooperation to attain the objectives of the organization, appears to be one among the reasons why they intend to leave the organization and to look for entering a new one. The writer has put his best effort to identify the main implications of self efficacy of employees and following up to increase the level of motivation to more perform in such an efficient and effective manner, and at the same time to minimize employee turnover. It is all for the sake of retaining those employees with high level of self efficacy for the well-being of the organization to achieve its sustainable corporate competitive advantage.

Keywords: *self efficacy, employee turnover intention.*

The era of globalization requires a speedy pace of change in the highly competing economy. It places a high premium on efficiency and innovation, which merely depends on human capital in an organization. It is not only to produce goods and services in such a manner to satisfy and improve the lives of users, but also to providing jobs and enhancing workers' quality of life. They are employees who produce goods and services, they are employees who invent and create machineries, and they are employees who have to change themselves by learning and experience. They are employees who may change the world. They are human capital, who from time to time have to face and to cope with challenges.

Challenges from ever angle of social and technological development would much affect to someone's feeling in terms of prediction whether he (or she) is able or not able to perform a certain task. It is a prediction of how he is able to efficiently and effectively organize and execute courses of required action for a productive accomplishment of a task or job . The prediction which appears to be his personal judgement that he can do the task, job, or assignment. This belief is the so-called self-efficacy. Ivancevich and Konopaske (2013, p. 222) briefly define that self efficacy is the belief that one can perform well in a given situation. Robbins and Judge refer self-efficacy to an individual's belief that he or she is capable of performing a task (2011, p. 251). Lam Helena (2012, p. 15) introduces Bandura's referring self-efficacy as people's belief about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Nuzsep Almigo et al (2014, p. 528) stipulate the definition of Baron and Byrne that self efficacy is an individual assessment of the ability or competence to perform a task, achieve a goal, and produce something. And as to show relation to someone's living, Nuzsep

Almigo also stipulates the definition by Schultz that self efficacy is individual feelings towards adequacy, efficiency, and or ability to cope with life.

To resume, self efficacy is someone's belief and feeling of confidence that he (or she) is able to take chance of the opportunity given and to cope with the task, pictures in accordance with his capability to come out with accountable performance; all which is taken into form prior to his commencement of the task. It pictures how self-efficacy features someone's perception of doing something which may be more positive than the real track of how to accomplish the task. It is more about what he believe in his ability to coordinate and orchestrate his skills and practices, which are demanded in the accomplishment of the task. Albert Bandura (2002, p. 2) describes that people make causal contributions to their own psychological functioning through mechanism of personal agency. Among the mechanism of agency, none is more central or pervasive than people's belief of personal efficacy.

Individuals with self efficacy will conduct their activities to perform in accordance with behavioral process and expected outcome. Quoting William and Stokes, Concessa and Egwakhe (2012, p. 5) infix that people regulate and distribute effort in accordance with behavioral process and expected income. Both conclude that as a result, behavior is predicted and determined from internalized beliefs than from the actual consequences of actions. Bandura (2002, p. 3) again describes that the findings of diverse causal tests, in which efficacy beliefs are systematically varied, are consistent in showing that such beliefs contribute significantly to human motivation and attainments. Lunenburg (2011, p. 2) quotes Kanter that think of self-efficacy as a kind of self-confidence and quotes Brockner that self-efficacy is a specific version of self esteem.

Jacob Cherian and Jolly Jacob (2013, p. 81) quote that there has been a great deal of evidence which has linked the importance of employee self efficacy and his performance including the ability to adapt to advanced technologies in the workplace like internet or software (Hill et al., 1987), ability to cope with current changes in career plan (Stumpf et al, 1987), ability to generate new ideas and grow to managerial level (Gest, 1989), ability to perform better as a team (Wood et al., 1990), and ability to acquire more skills (Mitchell et al., 1994).

Cherian and Jacob also quotes Lent et al that self efficacy actually refers to people's judgement of their capabilities to organize and to execute courses of action required attaining designated types of performance. It is then very clear enough that self-efficacy is not only a matter of feeling or belief of having capability to perform, it also covers as showing someone's ability to organize and execute performance. This is the outmost positive picture of self efficacy. It reflects the psychological mechanism in the innerside of individuals to move forward and execute, including where needed, to avoid or not to take any action; all those for the best accomplishment of the job, task, or assignment.

Ballout (Cherian and Jacob, 2013, p.83/Ballout, 2009) examined the impact of self efficacy on employee career development. The study identified that self efficacy and career commitment were positively linked and impacted employee performance.

Kellet, et.al. (Cherian and Jacob, 2013, p. 83/Kellet et.al., 2009) studied the impact of collective efficacy and self efficacy on performance of an employee and his career development was identified. The results of the study indicated that collective efficacy rather than self efficacy had a direct impact on task performance of an employee and his career development.

Liu et.al. (Cherian and Jacob, 2013, p.84/Liu et.al., 2010) examined the association between leadership, self efficacy, and employee satisfaction. The results indicated that self efficacy of a leader mediates the relationship between leadership and employee satisfaction and performance.

Self efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and job satisfaction were factors that were studied by Alusula in 2011 in order to investigate their influence on industrial workers performance in order to discover a way to increase employees' productivity in Nigeria industrial settings. The research study's results indicated two things. The first identified that self efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and job satisfaction will predict the job performance of industrial workers. The second presented the idea that each of these variables will predict the job performance of workers (Cherian and Jacob, 2013, p. 84).

It is good to take a special notification that self efficacy has its influence on job satisfaction. Performance and career development as studied by Kellet et.al. may improve the employees' sense happiness and well-being, which lead employees to job satisfaction by performing well and developing well. While Liu et.al. released their indication that self efficacy mediates the relationship between employee satisfaction and performance, Alusula's study indicated on side-back that job satisfaction will predict the job performance.

Level of self efficacy may boost through an impression of a successful efforts demonstrated by work colleagues, raising the motivation to do better as well. Assuring someone by verbal persuasion that he is capable to attain a certain performance would positively affects self efficacy; however, this type of assurance requires a harmony in the relation and communication between supervisors and subordinates. Emotional cues would be taken into account convincing self efficacy. The feeling of over-loading assignment, complication due to lack of information, or regard an under-standardized task with disdain; are sources of a negative impact to self efficacy. Self efficacy is an assurance beyond a shadow of a doubt based on past performance together with high level of motivation, that someone personally believe in his capability to accomplish a certain assignment or task as required.

Believing something to be true can make it really true. Self efficacy is nothing but a belief. A belief of someone's ability to accomplish a task, a job, or an assignment; however with an expectation of better effect in his or her lives. It is a reflection of what someone believes in his capabilities. Nonetheless, it is worth to take note on the events that affect their lives and expected outcome. As Lunenburg (2011, p. 1) quotes Albert Bandura, self efficacy has powerful effects on learning, motivations, and performance, because people try to learn and perform only those tasks that they believe they will be able to perform successfully. The great effect of this learning process will lead to higher degree of self efficacy, automatically will lead to enthusiasm of additional responsibility; by which, at the end of the day, to be more valued by the organization through recognition, advancement, additional remuneration, and better working conditions. This process of learning actually motivates to perform better and better, as employees will keep trying to learn and to perform tasks or jobs that they are sure they are able to successfully perform. This is how self efficacy is detected among employees to be its importance as it grows.

As Lunenburg quotes Bandura (2011, p. 2/Bandura, 1997), self efficacy affects learning and performance in three ways: (1) Self efficacy influences the goals that employees choose for themselves. Employees with low levels of self efficacy tend to set relatively low goals for themselves. Conversely, an individual with high level of self efficacy is likely to set high personnel goals. Research indicates that people not only learn but also perform at levels consistent with their self efficacy beliefs. (2) Self efficacy influences learning as well as the effort that people exert on the job. Employees with high level of self efficacy generally work hard to learn how to perform new tasks, because they are confident that their efforts will be successful. Employees with low level of self efficacy may exert less effort when learning and performing complex tasks, because they are not sure the effort will lead to success. And (3) Self efficacy influences the persistence with which people attempt new and difficult tasks. Employees with high level of self efficacy are confident that they can learn and perform a specific task. Thus, they are

likely to persist in their efforts even when problems surface. Conversely, employees with low self efficacy who believe they are incapable of learning and performing a difficult task are likely to give up when problems surface.

It is a more important influencing factor for employees as they will be motivated in ways they believe will arrive to the outcomes – as result to what they have been performing – that are self-satisfying. Motivation is enhanced when employees perceive they are performing skillfully and becoming more competent. Lack of success may come; however, will not necessarily lower self efficacy if individuals believe they still can perform better by putting more effort, using effective strategies, or by being more efficient in some ways of doing things. Tai (Cherian and Jacob, 2013, p. 83/Tai, 2006) identified the impact of training framing on the motivation and self efficacy of employees. The findings indicate that supervisor training was found to impact employee self efficacy and motivation and ultimately, affected their reaction, learning, and transfer motivation. Nevertheless, this study did not take into account some contextual determinants including post training accountability and organizational climate which is a limitation which needs to be acknowledged.

Self efficacy is definitely important when it plays on the sense of control over employees behavior, their thoughts and feelings for performing, success, and happiness. When they behave as able to control their performing the tasks, when they look at the world seems predictable and controllable, and when they believe they are able to undergo any foreseen challenges; this is the point of the essential feeling of happiness and sense of well-being, which gradually but sure keep growing and demanding.

So does self efficacy need to constantly grow, which in return, will positively affect the organization. Sometimes employees are able to overcome difficult problems in their performing the tasks, maybe sometimes they need professional help to guide them how to perform which eventually to guide them how to behave in the pursuit of happiness and well-being. As quoted before, employees with self efficacy generally work hard to learn how to perform new tasks, because they are confident that their efforts will be successful.

The effect of this learning process will lead to higher degree of self efficacy, automatically will lead to enthusiasm of additional responsibility. At the end of the day, additional responsibility will drag the employees to be more valued by the organization through recognition, advancement, additional remuneration, and better working conditions, and eventually for the feeling of happiness and sense of well-being. Lunenburg (2011, p. 2) quoted Bandura who has identified the four principal sources of self efficacy: (1) past performance, (2) vicarious experience, (3) verbal expression, and (4) emotionale cues.

As the first source of self efficacy, experience of succeeding on job-related tasks as past performance would provide more confidence to perform similar tasks in the future assignment by employees having high level of self efficacy compared to those experiencing unsuccessful performance in the past.

Vicarious experience as the second source of self efficacy is the way how employees look at their coworkers succeed in performing a special tasks, may boost self efficacy. According to Bandura, vicarious experience is most effective when you see yourself as similar to the person you are modeling.

The third source is the way of persuading and convincing other people that they have the ability to accomplish a certain particulartask, namely the verbal persuasion. It is a sort of believing something to be true can really make it true. In pactice, subordinates can perform at a higher level of performance when their managers feel confident that they perform. However, according to Eden as quoted by Lunenburg (2011, p. 3) the power of persuasion would be contingent on the leaser's creditability, previous relationship with the employees, and the leaser's influence in the organizations.

The fourth source is emotional cues. Lunenburg (2011, p. 4) described that a person who expects to fail at some task or finds something too demanding is likely to experience certain psychological symptoms; a pounding heart, feeling flushed, sweaty palms, headaches, and so on. He further described that the symptoms vary from individual to individual, but if they persist may become associated with poor performance.

Bandura (2002, p. 3) said that the findings of diverse causal tests, in which efficacy beliefs are systematically varied, are consistent in showing that such beliefs contribute significantly to human motivation. It clearly shows that self-efficacy pictures the inner condition of individual as (1) believe of capable in accomplishing a special task or job, (2) believe to manage the time consumed, (3) believe of capable to undergo any mistake in the operational process, to make adjustment and to gain experience, (4) enjoy in doing the task or job and at the same time, expecting more challenging task or job, and (5) ensure himself that accomplishing the task or job is number one despite of relationship with superiors or peers.

Whether related or not related to self-efficacy, the process of employee turnover has been one of the most widely researched organizational phenomenon. The writer reviewed literatures published in the period from the year 2000 until 2014.

In the world of increasing unemployment rate, numerous companies are still seeking and searching for new employees; and a lot of performing categorized employees with high level of self-efficacy are intending to leave their present employers assuring themselves to be able to look for and to join a new organization. This is an indication that even in a growing unemployment rate, those with high level of efficacy are still around to move from one organization to another without any sticky problem. This employee turnover intention is the miserable part of the human resource management, provided it does not pay a very special recognition to those well-performing employees with high level of efficacy.

Landry (2003, p. 9) quotes Warshaw and Davis that intention refers to the degree to which a person has formulated conscious plans to perform or not to perform some special future behavior. He further quotes that intention involves making a behavioral commitment to perform or not to perform an action whereas expectation is one's estimated likelihood of performing the action even a commitment has not been made. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975, p. 288) write that they have defined intention as a person location on a subjective probability dimension involving a relation between himself and some action. A behavioral intention, therefore, refers to a person's subjective probability that he will perform some behavior. They both continue to explain that intentions involve four different elements: the behavior, the target object at which the behavior is directed, the situation in which the behavior is to be performed, and the time at which the behavior is to be performed. Summing it up, intention is the individual inner-side component which influences the possibility of taking up a certain action. This is the individual's inner sense of assurance which set up his attitude and then after, turn up into passion for the implementation of happiness and well-being in daily life.

Employee turnover is defined by Armstrong (2012, p. 241) as the rate which people leave an organization. He further described that It can be disruptive and costly. It is understandable as any leaving employee out from an organization may negatively affect the operation of the organization and needs replacement. Recruitment would take place which means nothing but an additional spending for the organization to select and recruit and in the next step, to train new comers.

Noe, et.al. (2010, p. 460) said as follows. Every executive recognizes the need for satisfied, loyal customers. Customers provide financial resources that allow the company to survive. However, not every executive understands the need to generate satisfaction and loyalty among employees. Yet, retention rates among employees are related to retention among customers.

Leigh Branham (2012, p. 38-201) explained that there are seven hidden reasons why employee leave: (1) job was not as expected, (2) mismatch between job and person, (3) too little coaching and feedback, (4) too few growth and advancement, (5) feeling unrecognized, (6) work life imbalance, and (7) lack of trust and confidence in senior leaders.

From the company point of view, any release of employee is a loss. Williams (2005, p. 503) states that employee turnover is the loss of employees who voluntarily choose to leave the company. It is so often that the cause of employee turnover intention are not always remuneration or work life, the confident belief that they are qualified to achieve higher job requirement plays more role in it. This confident belief is the self-efficacy.

Prior to decide leaving the organizations, generally those turning-over employees have the intention which they might have been considering in ample time. Employee turnover intention is the desire of individuals to leave the organization and to move to another organization upon their own will; and of course, before they actually take the action to leave. Kim and Stoner (2008, p. 5-25) said that turnover intention occurs when the employee seeks other employment.

Vogelzang (2008, p. 7) quoted Arnold and Feldman that turnover intention is the final cognitive variable immediately and having a direct causal impact on turnover. Jessica (2007, p. 12) quoting Tan and Tan wrote that turnover intention is considered as a conscious and deliberate willingness to leave the organization.

Study reveals as Harnoto (2009) quoted himself that indications of employee turnover intention are: (1) absenteeism increased, (2) lazy, (3) operational actions against the operating procedures, (4) complaints increased, and (5) moving out of positive behavior.

This is an issue of the talents. Unlike tangible assets, companies cannot own employees, who are free to quit at will. The risk of employee turnover is the problem, since companies may lose their most critical assets, if they are dissatisfied, underpaid, or even unmotivated. Moreover in many cases, competing rivals raid troubled companies to hire away their best talents. Any opening vacancy in other organizations may be look as a way to pursue career opportunities, which mostly would be additionally intended to look for increase in remuneration. Talents who in their contributing to their employers, are categorized as having high level of self-efficacy. Maintaining talents with high level of self-efficacy would be one of the wise policies to avoid turnover and eventually, to sustain the companies' competitive advantage. Nevertheless, it is good to recognize that most of the time, individuals with self-efficacy won't innovate. They don't want to put new ideas, of which they will shoulder the blame when the promising ideas fail to make it.

METHOD

This study is based on quantitative method by path analysis at the object of study, PT Anabatic Technologies Tbk in Jakarta. It was a direct ground survey by questioners to collect responses. It is to understand the impact of self efficacy to employee turnover intention. It took two months survey in December 2015 until January 2016, which was comprehensively conducted in the offices. Information obtained from the object of study that the latest turning over in 2014 shows an extremely high of thirty percent out of the total employees. Utilizing the Slovin formula by simple random sampling, out of 525 employees, study was conducted among 230 employees hypothesizing that self efficacy has its positive direct impact to employee turnover intention. The questioners were considered valid and reliable as priorly tested. Respondents were given 30 questionnaires for each of self efficacy and employee turnover intention.

RESULT

It reveals that self efficacy has a positive direct impact to employee turnover intention, saying that any increase in the level of self efficacy may positively and directly affecting the increase of employee turnover intention. This result of study is in line with the result of study conducted by Troutman, Burke, and Beeler (p. 71) that the results of the current study indicates that self efficacy, assertiveness, stress are significant contributors to intention to turnover.

The writer conducted a study at a publicly-listed information technologies and systems company, PT Anabatic Technologies Tbk, Jakarta, dealing in the era of growing technological information. It is considered hiring mostly skilled and well-trained employees attached with levels of self-efficacy. Established in 2002 with 70 employees, it is presently hiring more than 525 employees. As a matter of fact, the company is experiencing a high level of employee turnover in the last four years (see Table 1).

Table 1. Annual Employee Position

Year	Released	Total	Turnover
2011	65	297	22%
2012	84	415	20%
2013	120	514	23%
2014	156	525	30%

Source: PT Anabatic Technologies Tbk

A growing percentage of employee turnover exposed an increase of eight percent in four years, which significantly comes to one third of the total employees. It was further noted that most of the releasing employees are the well performing ones with high level of self-efficacy.

This intention of moving out may be recognized and indicated by: (1) absentism rate of employees which increases with what ever reason, and (2) low spirit which tends to exhibit laziness, assuming their expectation that they may enjoy more benefits from a new company.

A theoretical understanding of how organizations or companies are able to retain employees despite of financial facets are: (1) improve satisfaction with supervision by raining and selecting people to provide learning opportunities, promote employee participation, provide recognition, and to be fair, (2) improve and increase satisfaction by managing group demography and social activities to create team-based work environment, (3) enhance satisfaction with promotion by structuring career paths so that assignments are offered as rewards, and (4) the work itself, which is particularly important to professionals who often seek autonomy and input, something that may be inexpensive to provide. A strong culture may help a firm cope with both the threat of turnover and information dilemmas. In case of turnover, once employee are acculturated, it may be very hard for the to find a match at rival firms. Thus, firm with strong or high commitment cultures tend to experience low turnover rates. (Burton and Spender, 2013).

A recapitulation of exit interview in eight months (see Table 2) while this study was conducted reveals that “joining other company” ranks the highest reason and “unexepected pay” ranks the second from the lowest. It was further noticed that all these releasing employees were immediately employed by other companies. Although “joining other company” seems to be a least step of releasing from the

company, it is quite sure enough that there might be numerous reasons of leaving which have been to be an unspoken during the interview.

Table 2. Recapitulation of Exit Interview

REASON OF LEAVING	OCT 2014	NOV 2014	DES 2014	JAN 2015	FEB 2015	MAR 2015	APR 2015	MEI 2015
Unexpected Pay	3	2	2	0	2	4	5	1
Management & Treatment Problem	3	3	2	0	3	4	4	1
Joining Other Company	1	5	2	4	5	5	4	1
Fulfillment for Family and Society	2	6	4	0	0	5	5	1
Location Convenience	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	0
Total	10	17	12	4	10	20	20	4

Source: Extracted from Monthly Exit Interview Report PT Anabatic Technologies Tbk

It was not a surprise at all when their previous supervisors and colleagues commented that all those exiting employees were categorized as well-performing and highly-performing employees whom considered as having high level of self efficacy at their time of service.

Additionally to support the study with PT Anabatic Technologies Tbk in Jakarta, at the same time similar study was conducted at a production and editing house, Tuner Corporation in Jakarta, which hires people mostly with thorough knowledge of photography and computer-work. The company has an average range of fifty employees, who have to work with high level of competency and integrity. Working overtime is an obligation to meet customers' scheduling together with innovation to create something special and new in the program which would be appealing for customers; thus demonstrating the employees' high level of self-efficacy. Nevertheless, this company suffers a rate of employee turnover at forty percent in 2013 and 2014. It presently turns out that twenty four out of fifty two employees are intending and working to move out to another companies. When asked for the reason why such intention appears to be in their mind, twenty one out of twenty four of them said that they were looking for more knowledge to learn and seeking for more challenges that they might overcome to attain more valuable knowledge. Three out of twenty four responded that they were looking for better remuneration.

On top of that, competing rivals of Tuner Corporation are straightening their eyes toward those employees. Knowing how excellent the employees of Tuner Corporation have been performing their jobs, competing rivals of this company are offering more and more sweeteners to attract them.

Mathisen & Bronnick (2009, p. 21-29) quotes Bandura that self-efficacy is best achieved by combining the development of knowledge of rules and strategies for the person's actual area of interest, while being self-assured that they can use these rules and strategies well. Thus improvements in self-efficacy result from the cognitive processing of information about one's capability provided by performance success or failure. This is the process which strongly inspires and arouses individual's secure

feelings that he is able to overcome any obstacle in the accomplishment of an assignment or task. A positive self-efficacy will act as a dominant determinant to show off the performance as required.

CONCLUSION

It is observed that people are normally motivated in ways they believe will come to outcomes that are providing satisfaction for lives. Thus it becomes necessary to look out, seek, and identify the practical outcomes related to improving someone self efficacy. It is not only to motivate for the improvement of further performance, nor for additional pay; it is principally for the creation of strong loyalty to the organization or company. As they work on and accomplish task or assignment, they need and require information regarding how well they have been doing. Regardless of pay or praise, this information influences their level of self-efficacy which increases their learning process and further fulfillment. This is the important sense of sense of self-efficacy for learning which is essential to motivates individual to keep learning from time to time.

High level of self-efficacy only will not produce maximum performance, unless attached with requisite skills, knowledge, successful past performance, and satisfaction for lives. However, present employer has to enhance employees' satisfaction by which is related to the job itself and to the lives of the employees.

It is also useful to acknowledge the role of learning and training. Most studies resulted in the confirmation that creative self efficacy can be developed through both learning and training. Providing specific and credible feedback are also expected to raise motivation and self efficacy. Simply telling employees "good job" is not apt to have much effect unless they clearly understand which aspects of performance are good.

Avoiding the negative impacts of self efficacy to employee turnover intention may be assisted and supported by: (1) implementing the policy of life-time learning organization, which is directly related to the development of human resource, (2) increasing positive communication between superiors and subordinates, (3) increasing the way of coaching and mentoring, especially when it comes to a challenging task or job, (4) increasing the way of mentoring to harmonize the non-technical operational-related task or job, and (5) providing appreciation to those highly performing employees.

It is advisable for organizations to put their best effort to maintain and improve the levels of self efficacy, not only for the sake of the organizations to attain their goals and to achieve the level of organizational sustainability by their competitive advantage, but also for the sake of developing human resource in the organizations.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Rahim, Muhamad Hamim bin, *Chasing the Elusive Chasing the Elusive Work-life Balance*, Singapore, Partridge Publishing House, 2014
- Amstrong, Michael, *Amstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice, 12th Edition*, London, UK, Ashford Colour Press, 2012
- Anabatic Technologies, PT. Jakarta, Prospektus, 2015
- Anonim, *Work Life Balance, 2nd Edition*, Lexington, USA, Iland Business Pages, 2013

- Bandura, Albert, *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*, Cambridge, UK, The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 2002.
- Branham, Leigh, *The Seven Reasons Employees Leave: How to Recognize the Subtle Signs and Act Before It's Too Late, 2nd Edition*, New York, AMACOM, a division of American Management Association, 2012
- Burton, Alan-Jones & J-C. Spncer, *The Oxford Handbook of Human Capital*, Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press, 2013
- Cherian, Jacob & Jolly Jacob, *Impact of Self Efficacy on Motivation and Performance of Employees*, Abu Dhabi University, Abu Dhabi, UAE, Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education, *International Journal of Business and Management Vol 8, No 14, 2013*
- Concessa, Riassa and Johnson A. Egwakhe, *Self-efficacy and Entrepreneurial Tendency: The Views from Rwanda*, Saarbrucken, Germany, 2012
- Dedeng, Abdul G., "Modul Manajemen Strategis", STIE, Purwakarta, 2010
- Gibson, James L., James H. Donnelly, Jr., John M. Ivancevich, & Robert Konopaske, *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes, 14th Edition*, Singapore, McGraw Hill Companies, Inc., 2012
- Lam, Tara Helena: *The Role of Self-efficacy in Information-seeking Behavior*. Saarbrucken, Germany, LAMBERT Academic Publishing, 2012
- Lunenburg, Fred C., *Self-efficacy in the Workplace: Implications for Motivation and Performance*, Sam Houston State University, USA, *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration Volume 14 Number 1, 2011*
- Maddux, James E., *Self-efficacy: The Power of Believing You Can*, George Mason University, New York, Oxford University Press, 2000
- Mathisen, Gro Ellen & Kolbjorn S. Bronnick, *Creative self-efficacy: An intervention study*, University of Stavanger, Norway, *International Journal of Education Research 48 (2009) 21-29*
- Newman, William H., E.Kirby Warren, & Jerome E.Schnee, "The Process of Management; Strategy, Action, Results", *5th Edition*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1982, h. 321
- Noe, Raymond A., John R. Hollenbeck, Barry Herhart, & Patrick M. Wright, *Human Resource Management, Gaining a Competitive Advantage*, Singapore, McGraw Hill Education (Asia), 2010
- Schunk. Dale H., *Self Efficacy, Motivation, and Performance*, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology 7(2) 112-137*, 1995
- Wheelen, Thomas L. & J. David Hunger, *Strategic Management and Business Policy, Toward Global Sustainability, 13th Edition*, Boston, USA, Pearson Education, Inc. 2012
- Wu, Xiangping, *Factors Influencing Employee Turnover Intention: The Case of Retail Industry in Bangkok, Thailand*, 2012 Thesis, University of the Thai Chamber of Commerce