



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

Placement, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction Effects on Employee Performance

Dina Emil Indriana Telaumbanua^{1*}, Elperida J Sinurat², Tiur Rajagukguk³

^{1,2,3} Department of Management, Faculty of Economics, Methodist University of Indonesia

[*dinaemil797@gmail.com](mailto:dinaemil797@gmail.com)

Abstract

Employee placement optimization, self-efficacy enhancement, and job satisfaction improvement constitute critical determinants influencing performance effectiveness within public sector organizations. This research examines placement practices, self-efficacy beliefs, and job satisfaction impacts on employee performance at North Sumatra Provincial Inspectorate Office. Employing quantitative methodology with saturated sampling approach, 61 functional auditors participated as research subjects. Data analysis utilizes multiple linear regression technique. Empirical findings reveal placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction exert positive and significant influences on employee performance both partially and simultaneously, explaining 56.1% performance variance with remaining 43.9% attributed to unexamined organizational factors.

Keywords: Placement, Self-efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance, Public Sector

Introduction

Optimal employee placement within North Sumatra Provincial Inspectorate Office constitutes fundamental element enhancing supervisory performance effectiveness and preventing administrative deficiencies that potentially compromise internal oversight functions (Robbins & Judge, 2020). Strategic placement analysis proves essential supporting Inspectorate's critical governmental responsibilities. Contemporary organizational environments demand comprehensive understanding regarding placement influences on performance outcomes, particularly within governmental audit institutions requiring specialized competencies (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020).

Self-efficacy represents individuals' conviction regarding their capabilities successfully executing tasks and confronting specific challenges (Bandura, 2020). Employees demonstrating elevated self-efficacy levels exhibit greater confidence and competence performing duties, whereas individuals possessing diminished self-efficacy tend toward powerlessness and premature abandonment (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021). Comprehending self-efficacy's performance implications facilitates identifying personal development necessities among Inspectorate personnel, ultimately strengthening organizational effectiveness.

Job satisfaction emerges as pivotal determinant influencing employee performance trajectories (Judge & Kammeier-Mueller, 2021). Employees experiencing appreciation and contentment demonstrate heightened loyalty, motivation, and superior work quality, contributing substantially toward institutional goal achievement in maintaining accountability and transparency (Bakker & Demerouti, 2022). Satisfied employees exhibit stronger commitment accomplishing established organizational targets and sustaining performance excellence.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundation

Placement

Placement constitutes systematic process determining appropriate work positions for employees based upon competencies, experiences, and individual characteristics (Dessler, 2020). According to Noe et al. (2020), proper placement enhances work comfort, reduces occupational stress, and increases productivity outcomes. Strategic placement alignment between employee capabilities and job requirements fundamentally determines organizational effectiveness (Boselie, 2022). Placement misalignment with employee expertise or interests



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

potentially diminishes effectiveness and satisfaction, ultimately impacting performance negatively (Cascio & Aguinis, 2021).

Self-Efficacy

Individuals must develop robust beliefs regarding personal capabilities to accomplish assigned responsibilities effectively (Bandura, 2020). Self-efficacy development positively impacts various life dimensions. Bandura (2021) conceptualizes self-efficacy as beliefs individuals possess concerning their capability or incapability performing specific behaviors or behavioral sequences. Similarly, Luthans et al. (2021) describe self-efficacy as individual conviction regarding ability executing tasks or actions necessary achieving particular outcomes. Self-efficacy determines effort expenditure confronting occupational challenges (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021). Employees possessing elevated self-efficacy demonstrate greater confidence, persistence, and task completion capability, directly correlating with performance enhancement (Stajkovic & Luthans, 2023).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction represents positive or negative affective states employees experience regarding their work (Spector, 2022). According to Greenberg & Baron (2020), job satisfaction constitutes pleasant emotional attitude and work affection. This attitude manifests through work morale, discipline, and performance outcomes. Job satisfaction encompasses experiences within workplace environments, external work contexts, and combined internal-external promotional opportunities (Locke & Latham, 2020). Employees lacking job satisfaction produce suboptimal performance outcomes. Enhanced satisfaction correlates positively with performance improvement, establishing positive relationships between satisfaction and performance variables (Saari & Judge, 2021).

Employee Performance

Performance represents work results employees achieve conforming to organizational standards (Sonnenstag & Frese, 2022). Mathis & Jackson (2020) state performance encompasses work quality and quantity employees achieve executing responsibilities according to assigned accountabilities. Similarly, Colquitt et al. (2021) describe performance as results achieved quantitatively and qualitatively from task accomplishment assigned to individuals or groups, referencing achievement standards and implementation criteria. Performance serves crucial reference evaluating employee quality to maintain organizational productivity (Aguinis, 2023). Therefore, factors including placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction theoretically constitute important performance determinants (Motowidlo & Kell, 2020).

Hypotheses Development

The Effect of Placement on Employee Performance

Appropriate placement enables employees to optimize competencies and skills matching job requirements (Dessler, 2020). When employees occupy positions aligned with qualifications and interests, they demonstrate enhanced performance and organizational contribution (Noe et al., 2020). Strategic placement reduces role ambiguity and increases work engagement, directly impacting performance outcomes (Boselie, 2022).

H₁: Placement has positive and significant effect on Employee Performance

The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Employee Performance

Employees possessing high self-efficacy demonstrate greater confidence confronting challenges and persisting despite obstacles (Bandura, 2020). Self-efficacy influences goal setting, effort investment, and performance persistence (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021). Higher self-efficacy correlates with superior task accomplishment and performance excellence (Stajkovic & Luthans, 2023).

H₂: Self-Efficacy has positive and significant effect on Employee Performance



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

Satisfied employees exhibit heightened motivation, commitment, and performance quality (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2021). Job satisfaction reduces turnover intentions and absenteeism while enhancing organizational citizenship behaviors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2022). Positive work experiences foster performance improvement and organizational effectiveness (Spector, 2022).

H₃: Job Satisfaction has positive and significant effect on Employee Performance

Simultaneous Effects

Employee performance represents complex outcome influenced by multiple interconnected organizational factors (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020). Placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction collectively create organizational contexts determining performance levels. Synergistic interactions among these factors enhance overall performance effectiveness (Robbins & Judge, 2020).

H₄: Placement, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction simultaneously have significant effects on Employee Performance

Methods

Research Design

This research employs quantitative methodology utilizing survey approach. Research objectives include analyzing placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction effects on employee performance within governmental audit institution (Creswell & Creswell, 2023).

Population and Sample

Research population comprises functional auditors at North Sumatra Provincial Inspectorate totaling 61 personnel. Sampling technique utilizes saturated sampling (census), whereby entire population serves as research sample, considering manageable respondent numbers (Sekaran & Bougie, 2020).

Data Collection Techniques

Data collection employs structured questionnaires distributed directly to respondents. Questionnaires utilize five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Questionnaire encompasses four main variable sections: Placement (X₁), Self-Efficacy (X₂), Job Satisfaction (X₃), and Employee Performance (Y) (Hair et al., 2021).

Variable Measurement

Placement (X₁):

Measured through indicators including competency alignment, job-person fit, position suitability, skill utilization, and task appropriateness (Dessler, 2020).

Self-Efficacy (X₂):

Assessed using magnitude, strength, and generality dimensions reflecting confidence levels in task execution (Bandura, 2020).

Job Satisfaction (X₃):

Evaluated through work content, compensation, supervision, coworkers, and promotion opportunity indicators (Spector, 2022).

Employee Performance (Y):

Measured via work quality, quantity, timeliness, effectiveness, and independence indicators (Mathis & Jackson, 2020).



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

Results and Discussion

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis

Table 1. Regression Coefficient Results

Model	B
(Constant)	2.113
Placement	.167
Self-Efficacy	.175
Job Satisfaction	.123

Source: SPSS processed data, 2025

Regression equation model:

$$Y = 2.113 + 0.167X_1 + 0.175X_2 + 0.123X_3$$

Interpretation:

1. Constant value 2.113 indicates baseline employee performance when all independent variables equal zero
2. Placement coefficient 0.167 demonstrates one-unit placement increase enhances employee performance by 0.167 units
3. Self-efficacy coefficient 0.175 indicates one-unit self-efficacy increase improves employee performance by 0.175 units
4. Job satisfaction coefficient 0.123 shows one-unit satisfaction increase elevates employee performance by 0.123 units

Hypothesis Testing

Partial Test (t-test)

Table 2. Partial Significance Test Results

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	2.113	.194		10.866	.000
Placement	.167	.031	.466	5.448	.000
Self-Efficacy	.175	.035	.432	5.022	.000
Job Satisfaction	.123	.023	.453	5.272	.000

Source: SPSS processed data, 2025

Results interpretation:

1. **Placement:** t-calculated 5.448 > t-table 2.002 with significance 0.000 < 0.05, confirming H₁ acceptance. Placement exerts positive and significant effect on employee performance
2. **Self-Efficacy:** t-calculated 5.022 > t-table 2.002 with significance 0.000 < 0.05, confirming H₂ acceptance. Self-efficacy demonstrates positive and significant effect on employee performance
3. **Job Satisfaction:** t-calculated 5.272 > t-table 2.002 with significance 0.000 < 0.05, confirming H₃ acceptance. Job satisfaction exhibits positive and significant effect on employee performance



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

Simultaneous Test (F-test)

Table 3. Simultaneous Significance Test Results

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.572	3	.191	26.588	.000
Residual	.409	57	.007		
Total	.981	60			

Source: SPSS processed data, 2025

F-calculated value $26.588 > F\text{-table } 2.77$ with significance $0.000 < 0.05$, confirming H_4 acceptance. Placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction simultaneously exert positive and significant effects on employee performance.

Coefficient of Determination (R^2)

Table 4. Determination Coefficient Results

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.764	.583	.561	.084673

Source: SPSS processed data, 2025

Adjusted R Square value 0.561 (56.1%) indicates placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction explain 56.1% employee performance variance. Remaining 43.9% receives influence from unexamined variables including work motivation, organizational culture, leadership, or work environment factors (Robbins & Judge, 2020).

Discussion

The Effect of Placement on Employee Performance

Statistical analysis confirms placement exerts positive and significant effects on employee performance ($t = 5.448$, $p = 0.000$), supporting H_1 acceptance. This finding emphasizes appropriate placement enables employees optimizing competencies matching job requirements (Dessler, 2020). Strategic placement reduces role ambiguity, enhances work engagement, and directly improves performance outcomes (Noe et al., 2020). When employees occupy positions aligned with qualifications and interests, they demonstrate enhanced motivation and organizational contribution (Boselie, 2022). This research validates placement as critical determinant of governmental employee performance effectiveness.

The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Employee Performance

Self-efficacy demonstrates positive and significant effects on employee performance ($t = 5.022$, $p = 0.000$), confirming H_2 acceptance. This finding underscores employees possessing elevated self-efficacy exhibit greater confidence confronting challenges and persisting despite obstacles (Bandura, 2020). Self-efficacy influences goal setting, effort investment, and performance persistence (Schunk & DiBenedetto, 2021). Higher self-efficacy correlates with superior task accomplishment and performance excellence within audit responsibilities requiring analytical capabilities and professional judgment (Stajkovic & Luthans, 2023). This research substantiates self-efficacy as fundamental psychological factor determining employee performance quality.

The Effect of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

Job satisfaction exerts positive and significant effects on employee performance ($t = 5.272$, $p = 0.000$), supporting H_3 acceptance. This finding confirms satisfied employees exhibit heightened motivation, commitment, and performance quality (Judge & Kammeyer-Mueller, 2021). Job satisfaction reduces turnover



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

intentions and absenteeism while enhancing organizational citizenship behaviors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2022). Positive work experiences foster performance improvement and organizational effectiveness, particularly within governmental audit institutions requiring integrity and professional dedication (Spector, 2022). This research validates job satisfaction as essential determinant of sustainable performance excellence.

Simultaneous Effect Analysis

F-test results ($F = 26.588$, $p < 0.001$) demonstrate placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction collectively exert significant effects on employee performance, confirming H_4 acceptance. Adjusted R^2 value 0.561 indicates these three variables explain 56.1% performance variations, suggesting substantial explanatory power (Armstrong & Taylor, 2020). This finding confirms performance represents complex outcome influenced by multiple interconnected organizational factors (Robbins & Judge, 2020).

Synergistic interactions among placement, self-efficacy, and job satisfaction create organizational contexts determining performance effectiveness. Employees experiencing appropriate placement, elevated self-efficacy, and high satisfaction achieve optimal performance outcomes (Colquitt et al., 2021). The remaining 43.9% unexplained variance suggests other factors including work motivation, organizational culture, transformational leadership, compensation systems, and work environment quality also influence performance trajectories (Bakker & Demerouti, 2022).

Conclusion

Based upon empirical findings and comprehensive data analysis, following conclusions emerge:

1. **Placement** partially demonstrates positive and significant effect on employee performance at North Sumatra Provincial Inspectorate Office ($t = 5.448$, $p = 0.000$). Appropriate placement enhances competency utilization, reduces role conflict, and improves performance effectiveness.
2. **Self-Efficacy** partially exhibits positive and significant effect on employee performance ($t = 5.022$, $p = 0.000$). Elevated self-efficacy strengthens confidence, persistence, and task accomplishment capability, directly enhancing performance quality.
3. **Job Satisfaction** partially demonstrates positive and significant effect on employee performance ($t = 5.272$, $p = 0.000$). Enhanced satisfaction increases motivation, commitment, and work quality, contributing substantially toward performance excellence.
4. **Placement, Self-Efficacy, and Job Satisfaction** simultaneously exert positive and significant effects on employee performance ($F = 26.588$, $p < 0.001$), explaining 56.1% performance variance. This confirms performance represents complex outcome influenced by multiple interconnected organizational factors.
5. Remaining 43.9% performance variance receives influence from unexamined factors including work motivation, organizational culture, leadership styles, compensation adequacy, and work environment conditions requiring further investigation.

Recommendations

For Management:

1. Implement competency-based placement systems ensuring alignment between employee qualifications and job requirements
2. Develop self-efficacy enhancement programs through training, mentoring, and skill development initiatives
3. Improve job satisfaction through fair compensation, career development opportunities, and supportive work environments
4. Establish performance management systems integrating placement optimization, self-efficacy building, and satisfaction enhancement



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

For Policy Makers:

1. Formulate governmental regulations supporting merit-based placement practices in public sector organizations
2. Allocate resources toward employee development programs strengthening self-efficacy and professional competencies
3. Design policies promoting work satisfaction through improved working conditions and career progression opportunities
4. Implement monitoring mechanisms ensuring effective human resource management practices

For Future Research:

1. Incorporate additional variables including work motivation, organizational culture, leadership styles, compensation systems, and work environment quality
2. Examine moderating effects of demographic characteristics, organizational tenure, and educational backgrounds
3. Conduct longitudinal studies tracking performance evolution over extended periods
4. Explore qualitative dimensions of placement effectiveness, self-efficacy development processes, and satisfaction determinants
5. Investigate comparative studies examining performance factors across different governmental institutions and organizational contexts

References

Aguinis, H. (2023). *Performance management for dummies* (4th ed.). Wiley.

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2020). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice* (15th ed.). Kogan Page.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2022). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 27(1), 75–91.

Bandura, A. (2020). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control in human agency. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71, 243–267.

Bandura, A. (2021). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective on human nature. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 345–372.

Boselie, P. (2022). *Strategic human resource management: A balanced approach* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Cascio, W. F., & Aguinis, H. (2021). *Applied psychology in talent management* (9th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Wesson, M. J. (2021). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dessler, G. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Pearson Education.

Judge, T. A., & Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D. (2021). Job attitudes and performance: Recent advances in theory and research. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 8, 115–145.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2020). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 75(6), 834–850.

Luthans, F., Luthans, K. W., & Luthans, B. C. (2021). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (14th ed.). Information Age Publishing.

Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2020). *Human resource management* (16th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2020). Job performance. In I. B. Weiner & W. E. Craighead (Eds.), *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology* (5th ed., pp. 1–3). Wiley.



International Conference on Finance, Economics, Management, Accounting and Informatics

“Digital Transformation and Sustainable Business: Challenges and Opportunities for Higher Education Research and Development”

Noe, R. A., Hollenbeck, J. R., Gerhart, B., & Wright, P. M. (2020). *Human resource management: Gaining a competitive advantage* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2020). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson Education.

Saari, L. M., & Judge, T. A. (2021). Employee attitudes and job satisfaction. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 395–407.

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2021). Self-efficacy and human motivation. *Advances in Motivation Science*, 8, 153–179.

Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2020). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (8th ed.). Wiley.

Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2022). Performance concepts and performance theory. In S. Sonnentag (Ed.), *Psychological management of individual performance* (pp. 3–25). Wiley.

Spector, P. E. (2022). *Job satisfaction: From assessment to intervention* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (2023). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 149(2), 216–237.