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Abstract: This study aims to analyze whether self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation can influence employee performance. The analysis was carried out using the Structural Equation Model (SEM) method using the AMOS version 24. The sample amounted to 200 people who are employees of various sectors of private companies in the Jabodetabek area. The results showed that self-efficacy led to increased employee performance. The higher self-efficacy in work, the employee performance will increase. Meanwhile, the motivation that affects employee performance is extrinsic, not intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation is a mediator that strengthens the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance. The implication for the company is that the company must continue to improve the self-efficacy of employees through managers provides counseling continuously to employees in determining work goals/targets following KSA (knowledge, skills, and abilities). In addition, managers also need to assign clear, detailed, and measurable tasks to employees. In a pandemic like now, extrinsic motivation must be focused more. Various forms of extrinsic motivation that managers can do, such as: creating attractive incentive/bonus/commission programs, giving praise to employees who have completed tasks, and giving recognition for good employee work. Further research can add variables that mediate the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance such as creativity variables, and the addition of independent variables such as transformational leadership that can affect self-efficacy, or add moderator variables such as job levels.
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Since the Covid 19 pandemic, the behavior of the Indonesian people has changed. Many activities are carried out at home, either working or shopping for daily necessities. This change will also have an impact on employees. Working together in an office by working alone at home will have a different effect on each employee. Employee personality is closely related in this regard. Work in an office, where employees can communicate at any time of their work. Every problem encountered will be immediately resolved because there is a boss or coworker in the office who will help. However, it is different from work-
ing at home, the problems faced must be resolved by yourself because there are no colleagues or superiors who are on standby at home. Even though you can communicate via telephone, WhatsApp, email, video conference, communication is still different from face to face. It is hoped that employees’ performance working from home will be the same as when working in an office. This performance problem is faced by many companies during the Covid 19 pandemic.

In the current work environment, during the Covid 19 pandemic, increasing employee motivation has become a human resource (HR) issue. Many organizations try to improve, maintain and develop their HR strategy for high performance and success both in the short and long term because of their motivated employees. Increased interest in the personal role of performance, motivation, and related outcomes has been shown in recent years. Barrick and Mount (2005) suggested that predictors of work outcomes such as performance are personality as an individual factor. They strongly argued that the main mediating role between performance and personality is motivation, meaning that personality affects behavior through performance motivation such as expectations, self-efficacy, and goals.

an assessment made by individuals about the abilities needed to do their job is job self-efficacy (Jungert et al., 2013). Bandura and Schunk (1981), suggest that a greater interest in the activity itself may be aroused by personal efficiency, than when the person feels the opposite, which means the perceived ineffectiveness. In this study, we approach self-efficacy as an important resource for individuals in the workplace that can provide an internal environment that allows for intrinsic motivation to occur.

Ryan and Deci (2000), stated that intrinsic motivation is defined as doing an activity for inherent satisfaction rather than for some separable consequence, as well as doing something because it is inherently enjoyable or interesting. Intrinsic motivation includes challenges, aesthetic value, novelty, interest, and enjoyment as opposed to monetary rewards or external pressure. Employees who are supported by autonomy and competence are more likely to develop intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, refers to doing something because it leads to separable results.

Previous research by Cetin and Askun (2018), examined intrinsic motivation which can be a mediator of self-efficacy on performance. Meanwhile, this study wanted to find out whether self-efficacy can also increase extrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation to be a mediator of self-efficacy on performance. This study aims to demonstrate the importance of job self-efficacy for employee performance through increasing intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. In addition, since maintaining the motivation of high-performing employees is so important in today’s business environment, we think that the findings of this study, will be of concern to managers and organizational leaders.

This research has a novelty (state of the art research) that distinguishes it from previous studies is the existence of extrinsic motivation variables. Extrinsic motivation is studied to determine whether self-efficacy increases employee extrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation as a mediator between the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW
Self-Efficacy
Santrock (2007), defined that self-efficacy is a person’s belief in his ability to control situations and produce something beneficial. Self-efficacy is the result of interactions between the external environment, education, experience, personal abilities, and coping mechanisms (Niu, 2010). Self-evaluation reactions to one’s behavior can be an important determinant of self-motivation (Bandura and Schunk, 1981).

Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), stated that Self-efficacy is one of the strongest predictors of employee performance. It is defined as an individual’s belief about her or his ability to mobilize the actions needed, cognitive resources, and motivation to successfully carry out a particular task in a particular context. Self-efficacy is positively associated with the difficulty of self-determined goals (Vancouver
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et al., 2008), which in turn results in better job performance and resource allocation (Locke and Latham, 1990).

Vancouver et al. (2002), found that self-efficacy had a negative effect on performance. A high level of self-efficacy can make a person feel very confident about his readiness and produce a feeling of submission to complete a task which makes him relatively unmotivated to think of alternatives. (Bandura and Locke, 2003). High levels of self-efficacy can reduce the perceived mismatch between the current state and the goal. In the end, it reduces the allocation of resources such as manpower and time and has a negative impact on performance (Schmidt and DeShon, 2010).

Motivation

Robbins and Coulter (2014), described motivation as a process where one’s efforts are energized, directed, and maintained to achieve goals. The word motivation comes from the Latin word “movere”, which means “transfer” or “push”. Motivation as an internal mechanism that guides behavior (Sansone and Harackiewicz, 2000). Steer (1994), argued that the goal of motivation is to enable employees to increase productivity, increase efficiency and improve overall organizational performance. This can be used as a catalyst for employees to improve their performance to achieve organizational performance (Sekhar et al., 2013). Organizations need to find the factors that motivate employees to perform to their full potential. Employees are assumed to value extrinsic and intrinsic rewards. The majority of research on motivation studies tend to use the intrinsic and extrinsic factor models of the Herzberg model.

Deci and Ryan (1985), introduced Self Determination Theory which states that more self-motivation comes from human personality and needs (Ryan and Deci, 2000). For basic human needs, a list of the basic needs of competence, autonomy, and linkage has been made. As part of this theory, they have introduced the terms intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. They describe intrinsic motivation as an innate tendency to develop one’s capacities, to seek new and challenging ones, and to explore and learn. This type of motivation comes from doing activities for its own sake, meaning that individuals feel satisfaction only by doing the activity itself. In contrast, extrinsic motivation directs individuals to achieve external results. In other words, the activity itself does not produce any satisfaction, but its consequences. Therefore, individuals carry out it to achieve the desired results (Ryan and Deci, 2000).

Employee Performance

Performance is one way to measure the extent to which employees work effectiveness. Pang and Lu (2018), Stated that the need for the ability to set goals and objectives for achieving employee performance and how to improve overall organizational performance is undoubtedly the most important organizational goals and objectives.

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Self-Efficacy and Intrinsic Motivation

Burr and Cordery (2001), in a study conducted with employees working in wastewater treatment plants, have found that task-related self-confidence fully mediates the relationship between work method control and task motivation. Here they look at their findings from a job design perspective where the increase in work motivation will depend on the development of the job design. Zhang et al. (2018), found that self-efficacy and attributional feedback had major effects on motivational interactions. Similarly, placing self-efficacy as a key variable in the model of the motivation relationship (Locke, 1991 in Fu et al., 2009). Fu et al. (2009), while studying the antecedents for sales efforts and new product sales, found that self-efficacy increased sales of new products indirectly through self-defined efforts and goals. However, the investigators were unable to find a significant association between self-efficacy and performance.

In a study of the Malaysian retail industry conducted with full-time employees working in supermarkets and department stores, Ayupp and Kong (2010), found a direct effect of self-efficacy on employee cooperation and effort behavior leading them to conclude that self-efficacy involves potential motivation for behavior. work that mainly con-
tributes to their organization. Research by Cetin and Askin (2017), with a sample of 76 employees from various organizations operating in organized industrial estates in Turkey resulted in an increase in intrinsic motivation with employee self-efficacy. Therefore, the first hypothesis is compiled as follows:

H1: Self-efficacy causes improvement in intrinsic motivation.

Self-Efficacy and Extrinsic Motivation

Schunk (1981), stated that the need for future research that will exploit the effect of self-efficacy on motivational outcomes. In the following years, self-efficacy as an independent variable or a mediator in a research model that places motivation as an outcome variable. To maximize training motivation among a participating group of health care workers in the UK, Carter (2008), conducted a study which resulted in the conclusion that positive self-efficacy beliefs were strongly associated with high levels of support from supervisors, low task constraints, influence on decisions or understanding of role expectations. With theoretical support from Bandura’s social cognitive theory, about humans, motivation, and SDT by Deci and Ryan, this study can suggest that self-efficacy has a predictive relationship with intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Therefore, a second hypothesis can be developed as follows:

H2: Self-efficacy causes an increase in extrinsic motivation.

Self-Efficacy and Employee Performance

Several studies suggest that self-efficacy and performance are closely related. For example, Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of 114 studies examining the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance. Overall, the results of the meta-analysis have shown that self-efficacy is strongly and positively related to job-related performance. Several recent studies have also reported a positive predictive relationship between self-efficacy and performance. Alessandri et al. (2015), found that self-efficacy beliefs other than job involvement served as a key mechanism moderating the relationship between positive orientation and job performance relationships in their study with a sample of male safety agents. Monteiro and Vieira (2016), found that self-efficacy along with adaptability explained subjective performance in their study with the sales team as a sample, and using multilevel analysis. Miao et al. (2017), concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and company performance. Research by Cetin and Askin (2017), also provides results that self-efficacy in work leads to increased employee performance. From the positive implications of the theory above, a third hypothesis is compiled:

H3: Self-efficacy in cause employee performance improvement.

Intrinsic Motivation and Employee Performance

The results showed that intrinsic motivation is inherently autonomous and has a more positive effect on well-being and performance (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Self-determination theory studies have shown that more self-determined motivation (e.g. identified intrinsic and regulatory motivation) is associated with greater persistence, academic performance, social functioning, and physical and psychological health in academia and sport (Zhang et al., 2016). Zhang et al. (2016), stated that theory and empirical results can help in exploring the relationship between types of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and work performance in the work domain. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is compiled as follows:

H4: Intrinsic motivation causes an increase in employee performance.

Extrinsic Motivation and Employee Performance

The multidimensional conceptualization of motivation and thus provides a more nuanced way of exploring the relationship between motivation and job performance. Self-determination theory suggests that external regulation is the least self-determined type of extrinsic motivation, with introjects and iden-
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Intrinsic Motivation as a mediator of Self-Efficacy and Employee Performance

Task motivation serves as a mediator in the relationship even though it is partially (Erez and Judge, 2001). Likewise, the study by Joo et al. (2010), found a partial mediating role of intrinsic motivation in the relationship between core self-evaluation and performance in that role. Here, the authors also note the importance of carrying out this type of study in a non-Western context as not much research has been conducted in this part of the world. Lastly, et al. (2014), found a mediator role for job enjoyment when trying to predict the effects of self-efficacy and daily work craft on job performance.

Cetin and Askun (2017), propose a positive relationship between self-efficacy and motivation, between self-efficacy and performance, they also suggest that intrinsic motivation might serve as a mediator between self-efficacy and performance as an important workplace outcome. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis can be structured as follows:

H6: Intrinsic motivation serves as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and the performance of employees.

Extrinsic Motivation Mediators Self-Efficacy and Employee Performance

Lawnler (2005), stated that the relationship between employees and the organization should not focus solely on the task itself. Organizations must take the initiative to develop an effective motivation system to increase employee motivation towards their work. This will help improve work quality and efficiency for organizations to achieve the results of their performance. Bhatti et al. (2011), studied the influence of motivation on individuals and how it contributes to organizational performance with the conclusion that organizations must define a clear strategy for linking performance with rewards. Aguinis et al. (2013), determined that monetary incentives are an important factor of motivation and employee achievement that contribute significantly to organizational-level performance returns. Based on the research above, shows that motivation will ultimately improve employee performance. The motivation here follows the model from Herberg’s theory that there are intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Intrinsic motivation comes from doing activities for its benefit, meaning that individuals feel satisfaction only by doing the activity itself. Conversely, extrinsic motivation comes from individuals who excel in achieving external results. (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Based on the previous research above, this study proposes a seventh hypothesis, namely:

H7: Extrinsic motivation serves as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance.

METHOD

The unit of analysis used in this study is an individual, namely respondents who are employees of private companies in the Jabodetabek area (Jakarta, Bogor, Depok, Tangerang, and Bekasi). The design in this study uses hypothesis testing (hypotheses testing). The sampling method in this study is convenience sampling, which is sampling based on the convenience that the researcher can do. The number of samples is 200 people according to Hair et
B. Medina Nilasari, M. Nisfiannoor, Florensia Rosary Meida Devinta al. (2013), that the recommended sample size is in the range of 100 - 400.

The source of this research uses primary data and secondary data. Primary data is data obtained directly from the object under study. Data were collected using a questionnaire technique. The questionnaire is distributed online to facilitate data collection, with the link: https://bit.ly/MMUsaktiRisetSDM.

Secondary data used is existing data, namely data from previous research, case studies, notes in the library, online data, company websites, and general data on the internet (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016).

The time horizon of this study is cross-sectional, meaning that information is collected only once even though it is possible to do it for a certain period so it is often known as a one-shot (Sekaran and Bougie, 2016). Adopting a cross-sectional design. One shot of this research at a certain time in November - December 2020. The method of analysis used in this research is the Structural Equation Model (SEM) using the AMOS 24 program.

RESULTS

For an actual study with as many as 200 respondents, the limiting factor loading value must reach 0.40 (Hair et al., 2013). The validity test with SPSS 25 software can be seen based on the values contained in the Corrected Item-Total Correlation column. The results of the validity test in this study can be seen in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Validity Test Results

| Item | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Criteria | Decision |
|------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|
| SE1  | 0.697                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| SE2  | 0.663                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| SE3  | 0.660                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| SE4  | 0.634                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| SE5  | 0.570                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| SE6  | 0.651                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| IM1  | 0.687                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| IM2  | 0.783                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| IM3  | 0.663                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| IM4  | 0.820                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| IM5  | 0.788                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM1  | 0.434                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM2  | 0.436                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM3  | 0.459                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM4  | 0.058                           | < 0.4    | Not Valid|
| WP1  | 0.518                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| WP2  | 0.744                           | > 0.200  | Valid    |
| WP3  | 0.592                           | > 0.200  | Valid    |
| WP4  | 0.638                           | > 0.200  | Valid    |

Source: Results of Processing with SPSS 25 (2021)

Based on the Table above, it can be seen that the Corrected item-total Correlation value is smaller than 0.4, namely the extrinsic motivation variable of the EM4 indicator, so it can be declared invalid. Therefore, these indicators must be issued as indicators of extrinsic motivation variables. After being issued, then a re-validity test was carried out with the following results:

| Item | Corrected Item-Total Correlation | Criteria | Decision |
|------|---------------------------------|----------|----------|
| SEM1 | 0.447                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM2  | 0.536                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |
| EM3  | 0.562                           | > 0.4    | Valid    |

Source: Results of Processing with SPSS 25 (2021)

Testing the reliability of the questionnaire instrument using the Alpha Cronbach technique. The questionnaire is declared reliable if the test results obtained have a Cronbach Alpha value greater than 0.6. If a measuring device is used twice to measure the same symptoms and the measurement results obtained are relatively consistent, then the measurement tool is reliable. The results of the reliability test in this study can be seen in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Reliability Test Results

| Variable             | Cronbach Alpha |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Self-Efficacy        | 0.856          |
| Intrinsic Motivation | 0.898          |
| Extrinsic Motivation | 0.692          |
| Employee Performance | 0.804          |
Based on the descriptive analysis in Table 3 shows that all variables, namely Self Efficacy, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation, and Employee Performance have a high category mean.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

| Variable          | Indicator                                                                 | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------|
| Self-Efficacy     | 1. I can remain calm when facing difficulties in my job because I can rely on my abilities. | 4.21  | 0.785          |
|                   | 2. When I am confronted with a problem in my job, I can usually find several solutions. | 4.14  | 0.702          |
|                   | 3. Whatever comes my way in my job, I can usually handle it.                | 4.00  | 0.799          |
|                   | 4. My past experiences in my job have prepared me well for my occupational future. | 4.38  | 0.727          |
|                   | 5. I meet the goals that I set for myself in my job.                        | 4.15  | 0.755          |
|                   | 6. I feel prepared for most of the demands in my job.                       | 4.15  | 0.841          |
|                   | Mean:                                                                      | 4.1692|                |
| Intrinsic Motivation | 1. Because I derive much pleasure from learning new things.                | 4.38  | 0.793          |
|                   | 2. For the satisfaction, I experience from taking on interesting challenges. | 4.14  | 0.874          |
|                   | 3. For the satisfaction, I experience when I am successful at doing difficult tasks. | 4.34  | 0.786          |
|                   | 4. Because I think that this activity is interesting                        | 4.22  | 0.803          |
|                   | 5. Because this activity is fun                                             | 4.16  | 0.805          |
|                   | Mean:                                                                      | 4.2480|                |
| Extrinsic Motivation | 1. I will have expensive possession                                        | 3.25  | 1.069          |
|                   | 2. I will have financial success                                            | 4.16  | 0.851          |
|                   | 3. I will have social recognition                                           | 3.56  | 1.092          |
|                   | Mean:                                                                      | 3.6567|                |
| Employee Performance | 1. I fulfill the organizational rules and procedures.                      | 4.26  | 0.785          |
|                   | 2. Reports submitted by me are reliable and trustworthy.                   | 4.29  | 0.742          |
|                   | 3. I produce a high quality of work outcomes.                              | 4.16  | 0.849          |
|                   | 4. I am strict about doing the job right the ïrst time.                    | 4.16  | 0.855          |
|                   | Mean:                                                                      | 4.2213|                |

Source: Results of Processing with SPSS 25 (2021)

Results of AMOS-SEM Analysis

Figure 3. Structural Model (Standardized Solutions)
Source: Results of Processing with AMOS 24 (2021)
Based on the Goodness of Fit values obtained from data processing, there are several measures included in the Good Fit criteria, namely RMR, IFI, and CFI, it can be concluded that the model proposed in this study meets the Goodness of Fit criteria.

For more details about the results of calculations with AMOS 24 software.

Table 4. Hypothesis Testing Results

| H | Path | Beta  | C.R   | p value | Decision |
|---|------|-------|-------|---------|----------|
| H₁ | Self-Efficacy → Intrinsic Motivation | 0.825 | 8.788 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H₂ | Self-Efficacy → Extrinsic Motivation | 0.468 | 4.341 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H₃ | Self-Efficacy → Employee Work Performance | 0.629 | 4.068 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H₄ | Intrinsic Motivation → Employee Work Performance | 0.118 | 0.938 | 0.348 | Not supported |
| H₅ | Extrinsic Motivation → Employee Work Performance | 0.186 | 2.286 | 0.022 | Supported |
| H₆ | Self-Efficacy → Intrinsic Motivation → Employee Work Performance | 0.097 | 0.933 | 0.351 | Not supported |
| H₇ | Self-Efficacy → Extrinsic Motivation → Employee Work Performance | 0.087 | 2.023 | 0.043 | Supported |

Source: Results of Processing with AMOS 24 (2021)

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that the value of Beta (β) = 0.825, the value of C.R = 8.788, with p-value = 0.000 <0.05. Because the p-value <0.05, hypothesis 1 is supported, which means that self-efficacy causes an increase in intrinsic motivation. Thus the higher/better self-efficacy, the higher/better intrinsic motivation, conversely, the lower/worse self-efficacy, the lower/worse intrinsic motivation.

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that the Beta value (β) = 0.468, the value of C.R = 4.341, with p-value = 0.000 <0.05. Because the p-value <0.05, hypothesis 2 is supported, which means that self-efficacy causes an increase in intrinsic motivation. Thus the higher/better self-efficacy, the higher/better intrinsic motivation, conversely, the lower/worse self-efficacy, the lower/worse intrinsic motivation.

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that the value of Beta (β) = 0.629, the value of C.R = 4.068, with p-value = 0.000 <0.05. Because the p-value <0.05, hypothesis 3 is supported, which means that self-efficacy causes an increase in employee performance. Thus the higher/better self-efficacy, the higher/better the employee’s performance, on the contrary, the lower/worse self-efficacy, the lower/worse the employee’s performance.

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that the value of Beta (β) = 0.118, the value of C.R = 0.938, with p-value = 0.348 > 0.05. Because the p-value > 0.05, hypothesis 4 is not supported, which means that intrinsic motivation does not cause an increase in employee performance. Thus the higher/better the intrinsic motivation, the higher/better the employee’s performance is not necessarily, on the contrary, the lower/worse the intrinsic motivation, the lower/worse the employee’s performance is not necessarily.

Based on the results of data analysis, it is known that the value of Beta (β) = 0.186, the value of C.R = 2.286, with p-value = 0.022 <0.05. Because the p-value <0.05, hypothesis 5 is supported, which means that extrinsic motivation causes an increase in employee performance. Thus, the higher/better the extrinsic motivation, the higher/better the employee’s performance, conversely, the lower/worse the extrinsic motivation, the lower/worse the employee’s performance.

Based on the results obtained, it is known that the indirect effect of self-efficacy on employee performance through intrinsic motivation is the Beta
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value ($\beta$) = 0.097, the value of C.R = 0.933, with p-value = 0.351 > 0.05. Because the p-value > 0.05, hypothesis 6 is not supported, which means that intrinsic motivation does not function as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance.

Based on the results obtained, it is known that the indirect effect of self-efficacy on employee performance through extrinsic motivation is the value of Beta ($\beta$) = 0.087, the value of C.R = 2.023, with p-value = 0.043 < 0.05. Because the p-value < 0.05, hypothesis 7 is supported, which means that extrinsic motivation serves as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance. The mediating effect of extrinsic motivation between self-efficacy and employee performance is positive and significant. It means that the higher / positive extrinsic motivation will further strengthen the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to analyze whether self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and extrinsic motivation can influence improving employee performance.

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Intrinsic Motivation

Based on the results obtained, it is known that not all findings from the research hypothesis test have similarities with the proposed research hypothesis and are based on the findings of the journal referred to. The results of hypothesis testing 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 have similarities with the proposed research hypothesis. However, the results of hypothesis testing 4 and 6 have no similarities with the proposed research hypothesis and are not following the findings of the referred journal.

The results of the first hypothesis test, show that self-efficacy in work causes an increase in intrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation in jobs such as new jobs, jobs that are challenging, interesting, and fun. The results of this study support the results of previous research conducted by Cetin and Askun (2017), which found that self-efficacy led to increased intrinsic motivation. This shows that the employee’s personality influences the intrinsic motivation that arises in him. Self-efficacy in the form of belief in one’s abilities will lead to motivation that comes from the work itself. Thus, it can be concluded that if the self-efficacy in work is higher, the intrinsic motivation will increase.

Self-efficacy that is maintained and even enhanced, such as: being calm and confident in one’s abilities when facing difficulties; can find solutions when faced with problems at work; can overcome anything that gets in the way of work; take lessons from past experiences, and set a target yourself in every job.

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Intrinsic Motivation

The results of the second hypothesis test, show that self-efficacy in work causes an increase in extrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation in jobs such as expensive possession, financial success, and social recognition. The results of this study support Self Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985), namely the theory of self-determination which states that more self-motivation comes from human personality and needs. Deci and Ryan’s theory shows that self-efficacy has a predictive relationship with intrinsic motivation or extrinsic motivation. Self-efficacy in the form of belief in one’s abilities will lead to extrinsic motivation. Thus, it can be concluded that if the self-efficacy in work is higher, the extrinsic motivation will increase.

Effect of Self-Efficacy on Employee Performance

The results of the third hypothesis test, show that self-efficacy in work causes an increase in employee performance. Self-efficacy at work such as one’s confidence in one’s abilities, controlling situations, and producing something profitable. The results support a previous study conducted by Cetin and Askun (2017), which found that self-efficacy led to increased employee performance. For this reason, companies need to strive for high self-efficacy in employees, such as employees remain calm when facing difficulties at work, employees can find solutions when faced with problems, employees can overcome anything that hinders their work, employees have clear goals in their work, and employees
feel ready for all the demands of the job. Thus, it can be concluded that if self-efficacy is higher, employee performance will increase.

**Effect of Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance**

The results of the fourth hypothesis test, show that intrinsic motivation does not cause an increase in employee performance. Intrinsic motivation in jobs such as new jobs, jobs that are challenging, interesting, and fun. The results of this study do not support the results of previous research conducted by Zhang et al. (2016), which states that there is a relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and work performance. Thus, it can be concluded that if intrinsic motivation is high, it does not mean that employee performance will increase.

**The Effect of Extrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance**

The results of the fifth hypothesis test, show that extrinsic motivation causes an increase in employee performance. Extrinsic motivation in jobs such as expensive possession, financial success, and social recognition. The results of this study support the results of previous research conducted by Zhang et al. (2016), which states that there is a relationship between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and work performance. Thus, it can be concluded that if extrinsic motivation is high, the employee’s performance will be more positive.

Forms of extrinsic motivation that are maintained and even enhanced, such as allowing owning a luxury item provide a good compensation so that it is financially successful, and provide social recognition.

**Intrinsic Motivation as a Mediator of Self-Efficacy and Employee Performance**

The results of the sixth hypothesis test show that intrinsic motivation does not function as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance. Intrinsic motivation in jobs such as new jobs, jobs that are challenging, interesting, and fun. The results of this study do not support the results of previous research conducted by Cetin and Askun (2017), which found that intrinsic motivation does not function as a mediator between self-efficacy and performance. Thus, it can be concluded that if intrinsic motivation is high, it does not necessarily does not strengthen the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance.

**Extrinsic Motivation as a Mediator of Self-Efficacy and Employee Performance**

The results of the seventh hypothesis test show that extrinsic motivation serves as a mediator in the relationship between self-efficacy and employee performance. Extrinsic motivation in jobs such as expensive possession, financial success, and social recognition. Thus, it can be concluded that if extrinsic motivation is high, it will further strengthen the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance. This result is a novelty in this study because no one has ever examined extrinsic motivation as a mediator between employee performance and self-efficacy.

The results of the fourth and sixth hypothesis testing are not the same as the results of previous studies. Previous research by Cetin and Askun (2017), using a sample of employees from various sectors in the country of Pakistan, turned out to be different from this study which used a sample of employees from various industries in Indonesia. Perhaps the difference in results was due to the time this research was carried out during the Covid 19 pandemic. During the pandemic, every region in Indonesia carried out Large-Scale Social Restrictions so the company had to regulate the number of employees working in the office at 50% of room capacity. Therefore, the company divides the work schedule of employees in various ways, such as a day working at the office - a day working at home, a week working at the office - a week working at home. Automatically this has an impact on the amount of income received by employees is less than before the pandemic. Many companies have laid off their employees (layoffs), because business was quiet during the pandemic that has occurred in Indonesia since early March 2020 until now. Current difficult conditions, for all employees in Indonesia and even in the world, make intrinsic motiva-
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motion does not affect performance, instead, extrinsic motivation affects performance.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study indicate that self-efficacy affects intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation; self-efficacy affects employee performance; intrinsic motivation does not affect employee performance whereas extrinsic motivation affects employee performance; not intrinsic motivation as a mediator of self-efficacy on employee performance, but extrinsic motivation.

IMPLICATIONS

Even during a pandemic, self-efficacy still affects intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and employee performance. However, employee motivation during the pandemic has changed. What can affect current employee performance is extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation does not affect employee performance. So that companies can improve employee performance, self-efficacy is maintained and extrinsic motivation is increased. Companies today must focus more on forms of extrinsic motivation in improving employee performance.

LIMITATIONS

This research was conducted with a limited number of samples and the samples were employees of various private companies in the industry. For further research, you can add the number of samples and with certain criteria, namely employees of online transportation companies or online food/goods delivery companies, which during the pandemic are rapidly increasing. Therefore, in subsequent studies, samples were taken from employees in the same industry and the same profession so that the results could be more accurate. The addition of variables that mediate the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance, such as the creativity variable (Huur et al., 2019). The addition of independent variables such as transformational leadership which can affect self-efficacy or adding moderator variables such as job levels (Clercq et al., 2017).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Companies must continue to improve employee work self-efficacy because it is proven to be able to improve employee performance. Managers need to increase employee self-efficacy so that employees can meet the goals set at work by providing ongoing counseling to employees in determining their work goals/targets following KSA (knowledge, skills, abilities). In addition, managers also need to assign clear, detailed, and measurable tasks to employees so that employees feel ready for most of the demands of their work.

Companies must continue to improve employee work self-efficacy because it is proven to be able to increase the intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation of its employees. In a pandemic like now, extrinsic motivation must be focused more because this motivation is the cause of increased employee performance. There are various forms of extrinsic motivation that managers can do, such as: creating an attractive incentive/bonus/commission program, giving praise to employees who have completed tasks, and giving recognition for good employee work.

REFERENCES

Aguinis, H., Joo, H., and Gottfredson, R. K. 2013. What Monetary Rewards Can and Cannot Do: How To Show Employees the Money. Business Horizons, vol 56 no 2, pp. 241-249.

Alessandri, G., Borgogni, L., Schaufeli, W. B., Caprara, G. V., and Consiglio, C. 2015. From Positive Orientation to Job Performance: The Role of Work Engagement and Self-Efficacy Beliefs. Journal of Happiness Studies, vol 16 no 3, pp. 767-788.

Ayupp, K. and Kong, W. 2010. The Impact of Task and Outcome Interdependence and Self-Efficacy on Employees’ Work Motivation: An Analysis of the Malaysian Retail Industry. Asia Pacific Business Review, vol 16 no 1/2, pp. 123-142.

Bandura, A. and Locke, E. A. 2003. Negative Self-Efficacy and Goal Effects Revisited. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 88 no 1, pp. 87-99.

Bandura, A. and Schunk, D. H. 1981. Cultivating Competence, Self-Efficacy, and Intrinsic Interest through Proximal Self-Motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol 41 no 3, pp. 586.
Barrick, M. R. and Mount, M. K. 2005. Yes, Personality Matters: Moving on To More Important Matters. Human Performance, vol 18 no 4, pp. 359-372.

Bhatti, W. A., Waris, S., Zaheer, A., and Rehman, K. U. 2011. The Effect of Commitment and Motivation on Human Talents and Its Contribution to Organizational Performance. Management and Marketing, vol 6 no 3, pp.471-482.

Burr, R. and Cordery, J. L. 2001. Self-Management Eficacy as a Mediator of the Relation between Job Design and Employee Motivation. Human Performance, vol 14 no 1, pp. 27-44.

Carter, R. 2008. Self-Eficacy, Motivation and Employee Engagement: Empowering Workers Using Forum Theatre, MGSM, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Cetin, F. and Askun, D. 2018. The Effect Of Occupational Self-Efficacy In Work Performance Through Intrinsic Work Motivation. Management Research Review, vol 41 no 2, pp. 186-201. DOI 10.1108/MRR-03-2017-0062

Clercq, D. D., Haq, I. U., and Azeem, M. U. 2017. Workplace Ostracism and Job Performance: Roles of Self-Efficacy and Job Level. Personnel Review, DOI 10.1108/PR-02-2017-0039.

Deci, E. L. and Ryan, R. M. 1985. Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Erez, A. and Judge, T.A. 2001. Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations to Goal Setting, Motivation, and Performance. The Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 86 no 6, pp. 1270-1279.

Fu, F. Q., Richards, K. A., and Jones, E. 2009. The Motivation Hub: Effects of Goal Setting and Self-Efficacy on Effort and New Product Sales. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, vol 29 no 3, pp. 277-292.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., and Black, W. C. 2013. Multivariate Data Analysis. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Huur, W. M., Moon, T. W., and Lee, J. H. 2020. The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Job Performance through Creativity: The Moderating Roles of Customer Incivility and Service Scripts. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, DOI 10.1108/APIML-03-2019-0138.

Joo, B. K. B., Jeung, C. W., and Yoon, H. J. 2010. Investigating the Influences of Core Self-Evaluations, Job Autonomy, and Intrinsic Motivation on In-Role Job Performance. Human Resource Development Quarterly, vol 21 no 4, pp. 353-371.

Jungert, T., Koestner, R. F., Houlifort, N., and Schattke, K. 2013. Distinguishing Source of Autonomy Support In Relation To Workers’ Motivation and Self-Efficacy. The Journal of Social Psychology, vol 153 no 6, pp. 651-666.

Lawler, E. E. 2005. Creating High Performance Organizations. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, vol 43 no 1, pp. 55-71.

Locke, E. A. and Latham, G. P. 1990. A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Miao, C., Qian, S., and Ma, D. 2017. The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy and Firm Performance: A Meta-Analysis of Main and Moderator Effects. Journal of Small Business Management, vol 55 no 1, pp. 87-107.

Monteiro, R. B. and Vieira, V. A. 2016. Team Potency and Its Impact on Performance via Self-Efficacy and Adaptability. Brazilian Administration Review, vol 13 no 1, pp. 98-119.

Niu, Han-Jen. 2010. Investigating The Effects of Self-Efficacy on Foodservice Industry Employees’ Career Commitment. International Journal of Hospitality Management, vol 29 no 4, pp. 743-750.

Pang, K. and Lu, C. S. 2018. Organizational Motivation, Employee Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Performance: Empirical Study of Container Shipping Companies in Taiwan. Maritime Business Review, vol 3 no 1, pp. 36-52. DOI 10.1108/MABR-03-2018-0007.

Robbins, S. P. and Coulter, M. 2014. Management, 12th ed. Boston: Pearson.

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L. 2000. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25(1), 54-67.

Sansone, C. and Harackiewicz, J. 2000. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation – The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance. Academic Press, San Diego, C.A.

Santrock J. 2007. Life Expectancy: A Topical Approach to Life-Span Development. The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Schmidt, A. M. and DeShon, R. P. 2010. The Moderating Effects of Performance Ambiguity on the Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 95 no 3, pp. 572-581.

Schunk, D. H. 1981. Modeling And Attributional Effects on Children’s Achievement: A Self-Efficacy Analy-
Changes in Motivation That Affect Employee Performance during the Covid 19 Pandemic

sis. Journal of Educational Psychology, vol 73 no 1, pp. 93.
Sekaran, U. and Bougie, R. 2016. Research Methods for Business. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
Sekhar, C., Patwardhan, M., and Singh, R. K. (2013). A Literature Review on Motivation. Global Business Perspectives, vol 1 no 4, 471-487.
Stajkovic, A. D. and Luthans, F. 1998. Self-Efficacy and Work-Related Performance: A Meta-Analysis. Psychological Bulletin, vol 124 no 2, pp. 240-261.
Steer, R. M. 1994. Introduction to Organizational Behavior, 4th Ed. Harper Collins Publisher, New York, NY.
Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., and Derks, D. 2014. Daily Job Crafting and the Self-Efficacy – Performance Relationship. Journal of Managerial Psychology, vol 29 no 5, pp. 490-507.
Vancouver, J. B., More, K. M., and Yoder, R.J. 2008. Self-Efficacy and Resource Allocation: Support for a Nonmonotonic, Discontinuous Model. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 93 no 1, pp. 35-47.
Vancouver, J. B., Thompson, C. M., Tischner, E. C., and Putka, D. J. 2002. Two Studies Examining the Negative Effects of Self-Efficacy on Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, vol 87 no 3, pp. 506-516.
Vansteenkiste, M., Niemiec, C. P., and Soenens, B. 2010. The Development of the Five Mini-Theories of Self-Determination Theory: A Historical Overview, Emerging Trends, and Future Directions, in Urdan, T. and Karabenick, S. (Eds). Advances in Motivation and Achievement, Emerald Publishing, vol 16, pp. 105-166.
Zhang, J., Zhang, Y., Song, Y., and Gong, Z. 2016. The Different Relations of Extrinsic, Introjected Identified Regulation and Intrinsic Motivation on Employee Performance. Management Decision, vol 54 no 10, pp. 2393-2412, DOI 10.1108/MD-01-2016-0007.
Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., and Li, J. 2018. The Effect of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Goals on Work Performance. Personnel Review, vol 47 no 4, pp. 2018 900-912, DOI 10.1108/PR-03-2017-0086.