



Self-Efficacy, Work Environment Support, and Employee Productivity in Philippine Trading Companies

Cherry Ann Marie H. Espelita, MBA¹, Ramon George O. Atento, PhD²

¹University of Cabuyao, Laguna

²First Asia Institute of Technology and the Humanities, Tanauan, Batangas

Corresponding author: cherryespelita@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examined the association between employees' self-efficacy and employee productivity in selected trading companies in Laguna, Philippines. Using a quantitative descriptive–correlational design, purposive sampling was applied to full-time employees with at least one year of tenure, yielding 187 qualified responses. Data were collected through a validated questionnaire measuring five self-efficacy domains (general, occupational, task-specific, entrepreneurial, and work environment/support) and five productivity domains (task completion/efficiency, work quality, adaptability/problem solving, collaboration/communication, and goal achievement/initiative) using a 4-point Likert scale. Pearson correlation and multiple linear regression were used for analysis. Results indicated moderate levels of both self-efficacy and productivity, with Significant positive correlations across domains. In regression, the self-efficacy dimensions collectively explained a substantial proportion of productivity variance ($R^2 = 0.738$), with Work Environment and Support emerging as the strongest predictor ($\beta = 0.395$, $p < .001$), alongside task-specific, entrepreneurial, and occupational self-efficacy as significant predictors. Findings suggest that productivity in trading firms is more closely linked to role-relevant confidence and perceived workplace support than to generalized self-beliefs, highlighting the value of support-rich environments and targeted capability-building interventions.

Keywords: *self-efficacy; work environment support; employee productivity; trading companies; Philippines; organizational development*

1. Introduction

Trading companies operate at the intersection of supply continuity, customer responsiveness, and cost discipline. In the Philippine context, this sector spans distribution, wholesale and retail trade, and trade-linked logistics, where performance expectations are shaped by fluctuating demand, competitive price pressures, service-level requirements, and accelerating digitalization of transactions and coordination. Within this environment, “productivity” is not merely an output metric; it reflects the organization’s ability to execute reliably—meeting volume targets, sustaining quality standards, resolving operational disruptions, and maintaining service responsiveness under time and resource constraints.

Productivity challenges in trading firms are often addressed through process redesign, technology adoption, and tighter performance management. These interventions can be necessary,

but they are rarely sufficient when the workforce experiences uncertainty, role ambiguity, or capability gaps. Operational targets ultimately depend on employees’ sustained effort, adaptive problem solving, and willingness to engage in continuous improvement. Hence, attention increasingly shifts to psychological and behavioral drivers that shape whether employees initiate tasks with confidence, persist under pressure, and interpret challenges as manageable rather than threatening.

Self-efficacy—understood as an individual’s belief in the capacity to organize and execute actions required to attain desired performance—provides a theoretically grounded lens for explaining performance-related behavior in organizations. Anchored in Social Cognitive Theory, self-efficacy influences the goals employees choose, the effort they invest, their persistence when confronted with difficulty, and the strategies they deploy in ambiguous conditions. In trading settings



characterized by frequent adjustments (e.g., shifting priorities, customer exceptions, supply variability, and technology-mediated workflows), efficacy beliefs may be consequential for both routine task execution and non-routine problem solving. Employees with stronger efficacy beliefs are more likely to approach work demands as controllable and improvable, while those with weaker efficacy beliefs may respond with avoidance, hesitation, or reduced initiative—patterns that can compound productivity constraints.

However, self-efficacy is not a purely internal attribute that develops independently of context. Workplace conditions can strengthen or erode efficacy beliefs through opportunities for mastery, coaching and feedback, resource availability, and the degree of psychological safety embedded in daily supervision and team interactions. In practice, supportive leadership, clarified expectations, and developmental opportunities can translate into greater confidence in role performance and a stronger willingness to take initiative. Conversely, environments perceived as punitive, unclear, or weakly resourced may depress confidence even among technically capable employees, limiting performance through disengagement or risk aversion. This interaction between individual belief systems and environmental support aligns with complementary perspectives such as the Job Demands–Resources framework, which emphasizes how resources and supports buffer demands and enable performance, and with leadership perspectives that underscore how guidance, inspiration, and reinforcement shape employee motivation and engagement.

Within the Philippine trading sector—particularly in high-activity commercial regions such as Laguna—these dynamics are salient. Trading firms in such contexts often rely on employees who must deliver consistent outcomes amid operational variability, customer expectations, and evolving tools and processes. Yet, organizational development initiatives frequently prioritize technical training and compliance controls, while comparatively less attention is given to the differentiated domains of self-efficacy that may drive productivity in practice. A more diagnostic approach is needed—one that recognizes that self-efficacy is multidimensional (e.g., general confidence, role-based confidence, task-specific confidence, entrepreneurial or initiative-related confidence, and the efficacy-supporting features of the work environment) and that productivity likewise manifests across multiple domains (e.g.,

efficiency, quality, adaptability, collaboration, and initiative).

Accordingly, the present study examined employee self-efficacy and employee productivity in selected trading companies in Laguna, Philippines, with particular attention to the role of work environment support as a self-efficacy domain that may be especially consequential for performance. The study was designed to generate evidence suitable for organizational and human resource interventions by identifying which self-efficacy dimensions are most strongly associated with productivity and which dimensions significantly predict productivity when considered jointly. In addition to contributing to theory-informed understanding of performance dynamics in trading organizations, the study provides an empirical basis for a practical action plan focused on strengthening employee capability, empowerment, engagement, leadership support, and organizational influence.

In line with this purpose, the study aimed to: (1) determine the level of employees' self-efficacy in terms of general self-efficacy, occupational self-efficacy, task-specific self-efficacy, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and work environment and support; (2) determine the level of employee productivity in terms of task completion and efficiency, work quality and attention to detail, adaptability and problem solving, collaboration and communication, and goal achievement and initiative; (3) test whether self-efficacy is significantly related to employee productivity; and (4) determine which self-efficacy dimensions significantly predict employee productivity in the regression model.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 *Self-Efficacy and Employee Productivity: Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Evidence*

The relationship between an employee's belief in their own capabilities and their subsequent performance at work is a cornerstone of organizational behavior research. Drawing primarily from Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, a substantial body of literature confirms that employee self-efficacy has a significant positive relationship with employee productivity across a diverse range of organizational contexts. Quantitative studies consistently demonstrate that higher self-efficacy enhances an employee's confidence and intrinsic motivation, which translates directly into superior



performance and productivity outcomes (Danica et al., 2024; Purwantini et al., 2025; Purwaningsih et al., 2025; Lestari et al., 2024). This relationship is not merely direct; self-efficacy also functions as a critical mediating mechanism through which other organizational factors exert their influence. For instance, research by Arifian et al. (2025) and Silalahi (2024) found that leadership and organizational culture boost employee performance primarily by strengthening employees' self-efficacy, underscoring its central role in driving work outcomes. Furthermore, intrinsic motivation has been identified as a key mediator in this dynamic, reinforcing the idea that a belief in one's capabilities fuels the internal drive necessary for high productivity (Purwantini et al., 2025). The robustness of this finding is evident across various sectors, including manufacturing, public service, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and even sociopreneur initiatives, suggesting that interventions designed to bolster self-efficacy are a viable strategy for improving organizational results universally (Purwaningsih et al., 2025; Lestari et al., 2024; Rahadi & Wening, 2025).

This body of evidence aligns with broader psychological theories of behavior. Espelita et al. (2025), for example, operationalize the Theory of Planned Behavior and Theory of Reasoned Action to demonstrate that awareness—a knowledge-based cognitive construct—shapes perceptions and subsequently predicts behavioral outcomes such as saving and investing among students. This mediation pathway, where cognitive appraisals shape behavioral intentions and subsequent performance, directly parallels the hypothesized mechanism through which self-efficacy beliefs influence workplace productivity. In a related vein, a review by Bermido, Quinto, and Atento (2025) implicitly supports the self-efficacy hypothesis by documenting how psychological states—particularly those involving the perceived capability to meet demands—mediate educational and professional outcomes. Their emphasis on "moral fatigue" and its inverse relationship with performance capacity offers indirect evidence that positive efficacy beliefs are likely a key enhancer of productivity.

2.2 A Sectoral Gap: Self-Efficacy in the Trading and Commercial Distribution Industry

Despite the wealth of general evidence supporting the self-efficacy–productivity link, there is limited direct research specifically linking these variables within the trading or commercial

distribution industry. One multi-sector study, which included manufacturing and services, found that self-efficacy moderates the negative effects of techno-stress on counterproductive behaviors, indirectly suggesting its positive role in maintaining productivity-related outcomes (Kim & Lee, 2021). However, research specifically focused on management practices in the trade sector, such as that by Bloom et al. (2020), demonstrates that better management improves firm performance through efficiency and quality but does not explicitly address the psychological factor of self-efficacy. Similarly, studies on entrepreneurial self-efficacy in related fields like tourism or startups highlight its importance for business performance and persistence, offering potentially relevant insights for commercial distribution without being industry-specific (Setyawan & Wibowo, 2023; Madawala et al., 2023). Even research on optimizing distribution processes, such as in the agro-industrial business, tends to emphasize cost and logistics factors affecting sales volume, overlooking psychological factors like employee self-efficacy (Bilukha & Mnukhina, 2025). This scarcity of specific empirical studies within the trading or commercial distribution sector constitutes a significant gap, warranting further investigation.

Atento and Atento (2025), in their multinomial analysis of investment winners and laggards, provide indirect evidence that is particularly relevant to this sector. Their finding that cash-flow-based valuation (Price-to-Cash) is the most stable discriminator of performance tiers suggests that in commercial distribution—where liquidity and efficient cash-flow management are critical—metrics capturing operational efficiency are paramount. Extending this logic to the individual level, it can be hypothesized that an employee's self-efficacy related to specific tasks like cash-flow management, inventory control, and customer collections may be more predictive of their productivity than general efficacy beliefs, a point that underscores the need for domain-specific investigation in this field.

2.3 The Moderating Role of the Work Environment

The translation of individual self-efficacy into tangible productivity gains does not occur in a vacuum; it is significantly influenced by the organizational context. A substantial body of research shows that a supportive work environment, including leadership and peer support, significantly enhances the effect of self-efficacy on employee performance. As previously noted, Arifian et al.



(2025) demonstrated that leadership and organizational culture boost performance fully through self-efficacy, indicating that supportive environments are effective primarily because they strengthen employees' confidence. Studies also find that perceived environmental support—from both the organization and peers—partially mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and job performance, highlighting the critical role of a supportive context in maximizing employee outcomes (Na-Nan et al., 2019; Santoso & Lindawati, 2024). Concrete work environment factors such as access to training, motivational climate, and adequate resources have significant direct effects on performance and serve to amplify the positive influence of self-efficacy (Cahyani & Febrian, 2025; Utami et al., 2025; Hidayatullah & Tiarapuspa, 2023; Wardana et al., 2025). Furthermore, perceived organizational support acts as a mediator connecting self-efficacy with employee performance, reinforcing that employees who feel valued and supported are more likely to convert their confidence into higher productivity (Nugraha & Kharismasyah, 2024). These findings align well with the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that supportive work conditions serve as critical job resources that enhance the motivational benefits of personal resources like self-efficacy on performance (Arifian et al., 2025; Na-Nan et al., 2019; Nugraha & Kharismasyah, 2024).

This micro-level dynamic has parallels in conceptual frameworks proposed at the organizational and systems levels. Atento, Quinto, Espelita, and Castañeda (2025) propose the Dual Outcomes Framework, which positions organizational alignment as a moderator of the relationship between analytics capability and decision quality. The framework's principle that individual capability translates into outcomes only when environmental conditions are favorable directly mirrors the hypothesized moderating role of the work environment in the self-efficacy–productivity relationship. Similarly, Atento (2025) frames domestic governance integrity as the foundation of diplomatic credibility, an argument that internal conditions enable external effectiveness. This systems-level logic mirrors the micro-level proposition that supportive internal work environments are necessary for individual capability to fully manifest as organizational productivity. Finally, Bermido et al. (2025) synthesize evidence that challenges in health professions education are an "interconnected system," with leadership as a central balancing mechanism. Their emphasis on leadership as a

mediating function directly supports the proposition that work environment factors—particularly leadership support—are crucial moderators of the relationship between individual capability and performance outcomes.

2.4 The Specificity Principle: Domain-Specific vs. General Self-Efficacy

While general self-efficacy provides a foundational sense of confidence, research increasingly demonstrates that domain-specific forms of self-efficacy, such as task-specific or entrepreneurial self-efficacy, tend to be stronger predictors of job performance. General self-efficacy often serves as a precursor, predicting domain-specific efficacy beliefs, but these specific beliefs are more directly and robustly related to performance in particular contexts or tasks (Grether et al., 2018). For example, Hermann and Voeth (2025) found that negotiation-specific self-efficacy strongly predicts objective negotiation outcomes across distributive, integrative, and efficiency dimensions, highlighting the critical importance of domain relevance for accurate performance prediction. In a high-stakes training environment, Pennings et al. (2025) demonstrated that task-specific self-efficacy measured during military training showed a closer association with actual performance and error rates than general self-efficacy. Meta-analytic evidence further supports this view, confirming that while self-efficacy enhances both task and contextual (non-task) performance, domain-specific efficacy provides more precise predictive power for relevant behaviors (Fida et al., 2025). In summary, while general self-efficacy influences an employee's broader confidence level, domain-specific self-efficacy captures the nuanced skills and contextual beliefs that better explain variations in job performance across different roles and industries (Grether et al., 2018; Fida et al., 2025; Pennings et al., 2025; Hermann & Voeth, 2025).

2.5 Career Stage as a Contextual Factor

The dynamics of the self-efficacy-productivity relationship are not static but can evolve over the course of an individual's career. Employees in the early or middle stages of their careers (e.g., aged 26-35, with less than 5 years of experience) exhibit distinct patterns, often influenced by factors like career adaptability and work readiness. For early career employees, self-efficacy strongly correlates with career adaptability, which in turn supports effective performance and adjustment to workplace demands (Holderman & Wijono, 2024). Studies on



early career project managers reveal a nuanced profile: while they feel confident in communication and leadership skills, they often report lower self-efficacy in technical knowledge and handling complex workplace challenges, suggesting that targeted developmental interventions could significantly enhance their productivity (Borg et al., 2023). Research on early career teachers shows that higher self-efficacy mediates lower burnout and fosters better social-emotional competencies, indirectly supporting sustained job performance during these critical formative years (Jugović et al., 2025). Quantitative studies across various sectors also confirm that self-efficacy positively influences employee performance through its interaction with motivation and career development, emphasizing its role in enhancing productivity among less experienced workers (Hanafi et al., 2025; Nuraini et al., 2025; Haris et al., 2025). Collectively, these findings suggest that self-efficacy interacts with career stage-specific factors like adaptability, motivation, and skill development to shape productivity patterns, indicating that organizational interventions should be tailored accordingly (Holderman & Wijono, 2024; Borg et al., 2023; Jugović et al., 2025). This perspective is reinforced by Bermido et al. (2025), who explicitly address generational differences in their synthesis, identifying "intergenerational gaps" and varying definitions of success across generations. Their emphasis on how success definitions and learning preferences differ generationally directly supports the proposition that the self-efficacy–productivity relationship may operate differently across career stages.

2.6 Synthesis of Literature and Literature Gaps

Synthesis of Literature

Across organizational and occupational settings, the literature converges on a consistent proposition: self-efficacy is a consequential psychological resource that is positively associated with employee performance and productivity. Drawing from Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, empirical studies repeatedly show that employees with stronger efficacy beliefs demonstrate higher confidence, stronger intrinsic motivation, greater persistence, and more adaptive coping in the face of work demands—mechanisms that translate into higher productivity outcomes (Danica et al., 2024; Purwantini et al., 2025; Purwaningsih et al., 2025; Lestari et al., 2024). Importantly, the evidence indicates that self-efficacy is not only a direct predictor of performance but also a pathway through

which organizational factors exert influence, including leadership, organizational culture, and motivational processes (Arifian et al., 2025; Silalahi, 2024; Purwantini et al., 2025). This pattern suggests that interventions designed to improve productivity may be more effective when they strengthen employees' confidence in executing role-relevant tasks, rather than focusing exclusively on procedural or structural changes.

A second integrative insight concerns contextual enablement. The conversion of personal capability beliefs into measurable productivity appears strongly contingent on the work environment, particularly through leadership support, organizational support, training access, motivational climate, and resource adequacy (Na-Nan et al., 2019; Nugraha & Kharismasyah, 2024; Cahyani & Febrian, 2025; Utami et al., 2025; Hidayatullah & Tiarapuspa, 2023; Wardana et al., 2025; Santoso & Lindawati, 2024). The emerging interpretation is aligned with the JD–R model: work conditions operate as job resources that amplify the motivational benefits of personal resources such as self-efficacy, thereby strengthening performance outcomes (Arifian et al., 2025; Na-Nan et al., 2019; Nugraha & Kharismasyah, 2024). This context–capability logic is also echoed in more macro-level models emphasizing alignment and enabling conditions for performance. For example, the Dual Outcomes Framework positions organizational alignment as a moderator that allows capability to translate into decision outcomes (Atento, Quinto, Espelita, & Castañeda, 2025), while governance-based arguments propose that internal integrity enables external effectiveness (Atento, 2025). Although these works operate at different levels of analysis, they reinforce a shared principle: capability produces outcomes more reliably when systems and environments are supportive.

A third synthesis point is the specificity principle: self-efficacy appears more predictive when it is domain-relevant. While general self-efficacy provides baseline confidence, multiple strands of evidence indicate that task-specific or role-specific efficacy measures better predict performance in specific work contexts (Grether et al., 2018; Hermann & Voeth, 2025; Pennings et al., 2025; Fida et al., 2025). This has practical implications for trading and commercial environments, where performance is often contingent upon specific competencies (e.g., accuracy under time pressure, coordination, handling exceptions, and operational problem solving). In parallel, the literature suggests that



career stage may further condition efficacy–performance links, because early- and mid-career employees face distinct adaptation demands and capability development trajectories (Holderman & Wijono, 2024; Borg et al., 2023; Jugović et al., 2025; Hanafi et al., 2025; Nuraini et al., 2025; Haris et al., 2025). Finally, cognition-to-behavior mediation patterns shown in adjacent fields—where awareness shapes perceptions and behavioral outcomes—provide conceptual support for treating efficacy beliefs as a proximal predictor of workplace behavior and performance (Espelita et al., 2025), while broader syntheses highlight how psychological states and leadership conditions operate within interconnected systems that shape outcomes (Bermido, Quinto, & Atento, 2025).

Literature Gaps

Despite strong general support for the self-efficacy–productivity relationship, several empirical and contextual gaps remain relevant to the present study:

1. Sectoral gap in trading/commercial distribution contexts.

Much of the empirical evidence is drawn from manufacturing, public service, SMEs, and other organizational settings. Direct studies testing self-efficacy and productivity within trading or commercial distribution firms remain limited, while many trade-sector studies emphasize management practices, process efficiency, logistics, or quality without explicitly modeling employee self-efficacy as a productivity driver (Bloom et al., 2020; Bilukha & Mnukhina, 2025). The limited sector-relevant evidence tends to be indirect (Kim & Lee, 2021; Setyawan & Wibowo, 2023; Madawala et al., 2023), reinforcing the need for industry-specific examination.

2. Domain-specific efficacy testing is under-applied in industry-based productivity studies.

The specificity principle is well supported in high-stakes and performance-critical contexts (Grether et al., 2018; Hermann & Voeth, 2025; Pennings et al., 2025; Fida et al., 2025), yet many organizational studies still rely on generalized measures. Trading-company productivity is likely to depend more on role- and task-relevant efficacy than on generalized confidence, an inference also consistent with performance logic emphasizing operational efficiency and liquidity-sensitive priorities in trade-linked environments (Atento &

Atento, 2025). Empirical studies that test multiple efficacy domains simultaneously as predictors of productivity remain comparatively sparse.

3. The role of the work environment is often modeled as a mediator/moderator but not operationalized as a measured domain aligned to efficacy dimensions.

Prior studies emphasize leadership, organizational support, peer support, and resource adequacy as key contextual mechanisms (Arifian et al., 2025; Na-Nan et al., 2019; Santoso & Lindawati, 2024; Nugraha & Kharismasyah, 2024), yet fewer studies integrate these as a structured, measurable dimension alongside efficacy domains in a unified predictive model. This creates a gap in identifying whether “support” acts mainly by strengthening self-efficacy, by directly enabling productivity behaviors, or by operating in both ways.

4. Career stage is acknowledged but not routinely integrated into productivity-oriented efficacy models.

Although evidence suggests efficacy patterns vary across early and mid-career cohorts (Holderman & Wijono, 2024; Borg et al., 2023; Jugović et al., 2025), many productivity studies do not explicitly interpret results in light of career-stage dynamics. This gap matters for organizations that must design differentiated interventions for employees at different experience levels, consistent with generational and developmental differences highlighted in broader syntheses (Bermido et al., 2025).

5. Context-specific evidence in the Philippine setting is limited.

Much of the cited empirical work is derived from non-Philippine contexts. Given differences in organizational culture, labor dynamics, and resource constraints across settings, there remains a need for localized evidence that tests whether the same efficacy–support–productivity patterns hold in Philippine trading companies, particularly in commercially active provinces.

Collectively, these gaps justify the present study’s focus on Philippine trading companies and its use of a multidimensional approach that examines general, occupational, task-specific, entrepreneurial, and work environment/support efficacy domains in relation to multidimensional productivity outcomes.



3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative, descriptive–correlational research design to determine the level of employee self-efficacy and employee productivity and to examine the statistical relationship between these constructs among employees in selected trading companies. The design was non-experimental and cross-sectional, focusing on the measurement of variables as they naturally occurred in the workplace setting. In addition to describing the prevailing levels of self-efficacy and productivity across their respective dimensions, the study tested the strength and direction of association between the variables and estimated the predictive contribution of self-efficacy dimensions to productivity through regression modeling.

3.2 Research Locale

The study was conducted in the Province of Laguna, Philippines, a commercially active area characterized by the presence of diverse trading and distribution enterprises that support manufacturing, retail, and service-sector supply chains. The locale did not represent the entire province as a complete population frame; rather, the investigation focused on selected trading companies operating within Laguna that agreed to participate in the research. The selection of Laguna as the study setting was justified by its strategic role as part of the CALABARZON growth corridor, where trading firms routinely manage time-sensitive operations, customer responsiveness, and coordination across sales, warehousing, and distribution functions. These conditions make the locale appropriate for examining self-efficacy and productivity dynamics in trading organizations, particularly the role of perceived work environment support in enabling employees to sustain performance under operational variability.

3.3 Respondents and Sampling Design

The respondents were full-time employees from selected trading companies in Laguna who had rendered at least one (1) year of continuous service. This criterion was adopted to ensure that participants possessed sufficient exposure to organizational routines, performance expectations, and workplace conditions relevant to the measurement of both self-efficacy and productivity. Employees were drawn from multiple functional groupings typically present

in trading organizations, including sales, operations, and administrative roles, to capture productivity behaviors beyond a single department perspective.

Purposive sampling was employed, reflecting the practical and ethical constraints of accessing organizational respondents and ensuring compliance with inclusion criteria. Sample adequacy was evaluated using G*Power (version 3.1.9.7) to estimate the minimum required number of respondents for correlation analysis under a medium effect size assumption ($\rho = 0.30$), an alpha level of 0.05, and statistical power of 0.95. The resulting minimum sample requirement was 115. While the initial target was 150 respondents, a total of 187 qualified responses were obtained and retained for analysis after screening for eligibility and completeness, thereby exceeding the minimum requirement and strengthening the precision of estimates.

3.4 Instrumentation

Data were gathered using a structured survey questionnaire administered through an online platform. The instrument was designed to measure two principal variables: employee self-efficacy and employee productivity. Each variable was operationalized as a multidimensional construct represented by five domains, with each domain measured through a set of Likert-type items. The instrument employed a four-point response format to reduce neutral responding and to encourage clearer expression of perceived confidence and performance behaviors.

Employee self-efficacy was measured using thirty-five (35) items distributed across five domains: general self-efficacy, occupational self-efficacy, task-specific self-efficacy, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and work environment and support. These domains were intended to capture both broad beliefs about capability and more context-sensitive efficacy beliefs relevant to work tasks, role demands, initiative, and perceived environmental enablement. Employee productivity was likewise measured using thirty-five (35) items distributed across five domains: task completion and efficiency, work quality and attention to detail, adaptability and problem solving, collaboration and communication, and goal achievement and initiative. These domains reflect productivity as a composite of both task performance and contextual performance, including quality, adaptability, coordination, and proactive achievement orientation.



For interpretive consistency, the response anchors were defined in construct-appropriate terms. For self-efficacy items, the scale ranged from “not confident” to “highly confident,” while productivity items ranged from “not productive” to “highly productive.” The instrument was designed for aggregate domain-level interpretation rather than item-by-item reporting, consistent with common practices in organizational survey research.

Evidence of validity and reliability was established prior to and during the main study. Content validity was supported through expert review by individuals with relevant background in organizational behavior, human resource management, and quantitative research methodology. A pilot test was conducted among respondents comparable to the target population but not included in the final sample to assess clarity, readability, and internal consistency. Reliability was evaluated through Cronbach’s alpha coefficients, using the conventional acceptability threshold of $\alpha \geq 0.70$. In the main study, internal consistency remained high across self-efficacy domains ($\alpha = 0.866$ to 0.934) and productivity domains ($\alpha = 0.882$ to 0.905), indicating strong scale reliability.

3.5 Evaluation and Scoring

To determine the level of the study variables and their domains, weighted mean scores were computed using the four-point scale. For employee self-efficacy, mean scores were interpreted using the following ranges: 3.50–4.00 as highly confident (high self-efficacy), 2.50–3.49 as confident (moderate self-efficacy), 1.50–2.49 as slightly confident (low self-efficacy), and 1.00–1.49 as not confident (very low self-efficacy). For employee productivity, mean scores were interpreted using parallel ranges: 3.50–4.00 as highly productive (high productivity), 2.50–3.49 as productive (moderate productivity), 1.50–2.49 as slightly productive (low productivity), and 1.00–1.49 as not productive (very low productivity). These interpretive thresholds provided a consistent basis for describing the prevailing levels of self-efficacy and productivity across the sample.

3.6 Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to data collection, appropriate permissions were secured from participating organizations and relevant authorities. Data collection was conducted through an online survey link distributed to eligible employees. An informed consent statement preceded the questionnaire and

explained the study’s purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, the expected time to complete the survey, and the confidentiality measures adopted. Respondents were instructed to answer honestly based on their current work experiences. The online survey format was selected to accommodate varying work schedules and to facilitate efficient consolidation of responses. Data collection was conducted within a defined administration period, during which follow-up reminders were provided to maximize response yield. After the survey period closed, responses were screened to ensure that only qualified participants meeting the inclusion criteria and providing sufficiently complete data were retained for statistical analysis.

3.7 Treatment of Data and Statistical Analysis

The analysis combined descriptive and inferential procedures appropriate to the research design and objectives. Respondent demographic and work-related profile variables were summarized using frequencies and percentages. To address the descriptive objectives, weighted means were computed for each self-efficacy and productivity domain, and these were interpreted using the study’s predefined scale ranges.

To test the relationship between employee self-efficacy and employee productivity, Pearson product–moment correlation coefficients were computed at the domain level, assessing both the direction and magnitude of association. To estimate the predictive contribution of self-efficacy domains to productivity, multiple linear regression analysis was conducted with employee productivity as the criterion variable and the self-efficacy domains as predictor variables. Regression diagnostics were evaluated to support interpretability of results, including indicators of multicollinearity (e.g., variance inflation factors) and residual autocorrelation (e.g., Durbin–Watson statistic). Statistical decisions were based on an alpha level of 0.05.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Ethical safeguards were applied throughout the study. Participation was voluntary, and respondents provided informed consent prior to answering the questionnaire. Confidentiality was protected by avoiding the collection or reporting of personally identifying information and by presenting findings only in aggregated form. Digital data were handled in a manner consistent with privacy and confidentiality standards, and all information collected was used exclusively for academic and



research purposes. The study adhered to the principles of responsible research conduct and was aligned with the requirements of the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Respondent Profile

A total of 187 qualified responses were included in the analysis. The respondent group was slightly male-dominated (57.8% male; 42.2% female). Most respondents were in the 26–30 age bracket (57.8%), and the sample reflected a predominantly college-educated workforce (93.6%). In terms of tenure, the respondents were largely early-career employees, with 88.2% reporting five years or less of work experience. Functionally, the largest proportion came from the Sales Department (51.3%), followed by Operations (21.4%) and Administration (12.8%). In job level, most respondents were rank-and-file (63.6%), while 28.2% occupied supervisory or managerial roles. Collectively, these characteristics indicate that the results primarily represent a young, early-career, and sales-facing workforce in selected trading companies.

4.2 Reliability of the Study Measures

Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha for each subscale. All coefficients exceeded the commonly accepted threshold ($\alpha \geq .70$), indicating strong reliability for both the self-efficacy and productivity measures. For employee self-efficacy, alpha coefficients ranged from 0.866 (General Self-Efficacy) to 0.934 (Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy). For employee productivity, coefficients ranged from 0.882 (Collaboration and Communication) to 0.905 (Adaptability and Problem Solving). These values support the adequacy of the instrument for domain-level interpretation and subsequent correlational and regression analyses.

4.3 Level of Employee Self-Efficacy

Results indicated moderate self-efficacy across all five measured domains. General self-efficacy registered a domain mean of 3.33, while occupational self-efficacy yielded 3.34. Task-specific self-efficacy obtained 3.37, entrepreneurial self-efficacy showed the highest mean at 3.44, and work environment and support registered 3.38. Taken together, the composite pattern suggests that respondents generally perceived themselves as

confident in performing work demands, with the strongest confidence expressed in initiative- and opportunity-oriented beliefs (entrepreneurial self-efficacy), while maintaining a consistently moderate level across general, role-based, and task-based efficacy beliefs.

At the indicator level, the highest general self-efficacy item reflected goal-directed confidence ("I can accomplish my goals if I put my mind to it," $M = 3.51$), whereas the lowest reflected managing unpredictability ("I can efficiently deal with unexpected events," $M = 3.12$). In occupational self-efficacy, the strongest item pertained to capability development ("I can learn new skills required for my job," $M = 3.53$), while the lowest reflected sustained functioning under strain ("I can remain productive despite work pressures," $M = 3.15$). For task-specific self-efficacy, planning and organization was highest ("I can effectively plan and organize my workload," $M = 3.49$), while motivation under difficulty was lowest ("I remain motivated when working on difficult assignments," $M = 3.18$). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy was strongest in competitive confidence ("I am sure the business can compete," $M = 3.48$) and comparatively lower in expansion confidence ("I am sure the business can expand," $M = 3.39$). For work environment and support, collegial support emerged most strongly ("Support from colleagues enhances my belief in my success," $M = 3.50$), while perceived organizational valuing was comparatively lower ("I feel valued and supported by my organization," $M = 3.13$). These item-level patterns indicate that, even when overall efficacy is moderate, efficacy beliefs tend to be stronger in planning, learning, and peer-enabled confidence than in resilience under pressure and perceptions of organizational recognition.

4.4 Level of Employee Productivity

Employee productivity was also assessed at the domain level and was generally interpreted as moderate across all five dimensions. Task completion and efficiency recorded a domain mean of 3.30, work quality and attention to detail recorded 3.32, adaptability and problem solving recorded the lowest mean at 3.18, collaboration and communication recorded the highest mean at 3.47, and goal achievement and initiative recorded 3.36. This distribution suggests that productivity strengths were most pronounced in collaborative functioning and communication, while adaptability-related performance—particularly proactive problem solving and flexibility under changing demands—was comparatively the weakest domain.



At the indicator level, efficiency was strongest in prioritization (“I prioritize tasks effectively based on urgency,” $M = 3.47$) and lowest in sustained focus (“I stay focused and avoid distractions while working,” $M = 3.09$). In work quality, careful compliance with expectations emerged as highest (“I follow instructions carefully to meet job expectations,” $M = 3.46$), while reduced need for corrections was lowest (“I rarely need corrections from supervisors,” $M = 3.09$). Adaptability and problem solving displayed the lowest cluster overall, with the highest indicator reflecting constructive orientation (“I stay positive and open-minded when facing difficulties,” $M = 3.25$) and the lowest reflecting proactive solution-seeking (“I actively seek solutions rather than waiting for instructions,” $M = 3.10$). Collaboration and communication showed consistently high indicator means, with listening behavior highest (“I actively listen to others’ input before making decisions,” $M = 3.52$). For goal achievement and initiative, sustained motivation was highest (“I stay motivated to achieve my professional goals,” $M = 3.46$), while consistently exceeding performance goals was lowest (“I meet or exceed my performance goals consistently,” $M = 3.13$). Overall, the productivity profile suggests reliable performance in coordination and communication, with improvement opportunities in adaptability and proactive problem solving.

4.5 Relationship Between Employee Self-Efficacy and Employee Productivity

Pearson correlation results indicated Significant positive relationships between all five self-efficacy domains and all five productivity domains, with $p < .001$ across all domain pairings. Correlation magnitudes ranged from $r = 0.422$ to $r = 0.718$, reflecting moderate-to-strong associations. The strongest observed relationship was between Work Environment and Support and Collaboration and Communication ($r = 0.718$, $p < .001$), indicating that employees who reported stronger workplace support also reported higher collaborative and communication effectiveness. Work Environment and Support also showed strong associations with productivity domains such as task completion and efficiency ($r = 0.673$, $p < .001$), work quality and attention to detail ($r = 0.663$, $p < .001$), and goal achievement and initiative ($r = 0.652$, $p < .001$).

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy exhibited strong relationships with goal achievement and initiative ($r = 0.610$, $p < .001$) and collaboration and

communication ($r = 0.583$, $p < .001$), suggesting that initiative-oriented confidence aligns with proactive and cooperative performance. Task-specific self-efficacy also maintained consistent positive associations across productivity dimensions, supporting the proposition that role-relevant confidence is systematically related to productivity behaviors across efficiency, quality, adaptability, collaboration, and initiative.

4.6 Predictive Contribution of Self-Efficacy Dimensions to Employee Productivity

Multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to estimate the predictive contribution of the five self-efficacy domains to employee productivity. The model demonstrated strong explanatory power, with a multiple correlation coefficient of $R = 0.859$ and a coefficient of determination of $R^2 = 0.738$, indicating that approximately 73.8% of the variance in employee productivity was explained by the self-efficacy domains included in the model. The adjusted R^2 remained high at 0.731, supporting the stability of the model given the number of predictors.

In terms of standardized effects, Work Environment and Support emerged as the strongest predictor of productivity ($\beta = 0.395$, $p < .001$). Task-Specific Self-Efficacy also had a Significant positive contribution ($\beta = 0.171$, $p = .001$), followed by Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy ($\beta = 0.134$, $p = .002$) and Occupational Self-Efficacy ($\beta = 0.104$, $p = .044$). General Self-Efficacy did not significantly predict productivity when the other efficacy domains were included in the model ($\beta = 0.053$, $p = .315$). This pattern indicates that productivity in the sampled trading companies was more strongly associated with context-relevant efficacy beliefs—particularly perceptions of workplace support, task-aligned confidence, and initiative-related confidence—than with generalized self-beliefs.

4.7 Regression Assumption Checks

Key regression assumptions were evaluated to support interpretability of the regression results. The Durbin–Watson statistic was approximately 1.99, indicating no meaningful autocorrelation in the residuals. Variance inflation factor values ranged from approximately 2.0 to 2.3, which are below commonly cited thresholds and indicate that multicollinearity was not a concern. These diagnostics support the stability of the regression estimates and the interpretability of the relative predictor contributions.



4.8 Discussion of Findings

4.8.1 Interpreting the Overall Levels of Self-Efficacy and Productivity

The descriptive results indicate that respondents reported moderate levels of employee self-efficacy across general, occupational, task-specific, entrepreneurial, and work environment/support dimensions. A parallel pattern emerged for employee productivity, which was likewise evaluated as moderate across efficiency, work quality, adaptability/problem solving, collaboration/communication, and goal achievement/initiative. This convergence suggests a workforce that is generally functional and competent in meeting core job demands, yet not operating at a consistently “high” or maximally optimized level. In practical terms, moderate profiles are often consistent with work contexts where employees can perform routine responsibilities reliably but may experience constraints in sustaining peak performance under pressure, handling complex exceptions, or consistently exceeding performance standards. This interpretation aligns with the study’s item-level patterns, where confidence and performance are relatively higher in planning, learning, prioritization, and collaboration, but comparatively lower in resilience under work pressure, sustained focus, proactive solution seeking, and perceptions of organizational recognition. Such a profile implies that productivity improvements are plausible through targeted organizational development rather than through remediation of severe deficits.

4.8.2 Self-Efficacy as a Consistent Correlate of Productivity

The correlational findings provide strong support for the theoretical premise that self-efficacy is systematically related to productivity. All self-efficacy domains demonstrated statistically significant positive relationships with all productivity domains, indicating that employees who reported stronger efficacy beliefs also reported stronger productivity behaviors. This pattern is consistent with Social Cognitive Theory, which posits that efficacy beliefs influence goal-setting, effort, persistence, and coping—behavioral mechanisms that underpin performance and productivity outcomes. In the present context, trading organizations require employees to coordinate with multiple internal and external actors, handle time-sensitive tasks, and navigate operational variability; therefore, employees’

confidence in their capability to meet these demands plausibly aligns with their ability to complete tasks efficiently, maintain quality, collaborate effectively, adapt to challenges, and sustain initiative.

Beyond the confirmation of a general efficacy–productivity linkage, the domain-level correlations suggest that efficacy beliefs are not uniformly important in the same way; rather, efficacy that is proximal to work execution and workplace functioning tends to align strongly with productivity outcomes. In particular, the strongest observed association was between Work Environment and Support and Collaboration and Communication, indicating that employees’ perceptions of a supportive environment correspond closely to collaborative and communicative productivity. In trading companies—where performance frequently depends on coordination across sales, inventory, warehousing, customer concerns, and administrative documentation—collaboration and communication are not peripheral behaviors; they are productivity mechanisms. Thus, the strength of this relationship suggests that the “social infrastructure” of work (peer support, supportive supervision, and a climate that enables interdependence) is strongly linked to whether employees exhibit effective coordination behaviors that sustain productivity.

4.8.3 Work Environment and Support as the Dominant Predictor of Productivity

The regression findings sharpen the interpretation further by identifying which domains of self-efficacy remain consequential when considered simultaneously. The model explains a large proportion of variance in employee productivity, indicating that the set of efficacy-related dimensions captured in this study collectively maps closely to productivity behavior in the sampled firms. More importantly, Work Environment and Support emerged as the strongest predictor of employee productivity in the multivariate model. This result provides a substantive inference for trading organizations: productivity is not only a function of employees’ internal confidence, but also of whether the environment sustains that confidence and enables effective work execution.

This finding aligns with the Job Demands–Resources (JD–R) perspective, wherein organizational resources—such as supportive leadership, adequate training, and access to enabling resources—increase motivation and sustain



performance. When employees perceive that colleagues and leaders provide assistance, guidance, and reinforcement, they are more likely to engage actively, sustain effort, and coordinate effectively, especially under operational pressures. The observed strength of support as a predictor also resonates with prior studies that position leadership and organizational support as mechanisms that strengthen efficacy and performance outcomes. However, the present results go beyond a generic statement that “support matters” by demonstrating that support-related efficacy is empirically more consequential than generalized efficacy in explaining productivity variance in this context.

From an organizational development standpoint, this suggests that productivity interventions in trading companies should not be limited to individual-level training alone. Instead, they should also include managerial and organizational practices that increase perceived support, such as structured coaching routines, clearer feedback cycles, team-based problem solving systems, resource facilitation, and recognition mechanisms that help employees interpret demands as manageable and roles as valued.

4.8.4 The Specificity Principle: Task-Relevant and Initiative-Related Efficacy Outperform General Efficacy

A key insight of the model is that task-specific self-efficacy, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and occupational self-efficacy contributed significantly to productivity, while general self-efficacy did not remain statistically significant once the other domains were included. This pattern is theoretically meaningful and consistent with the specificity principle in self-efficacy research: efficacy beliefs predict behavior more strongly when they match the domain of performance being assessed. General self-efficacy may function as a broad foundational belief, but it can become less informative when domain-specific beliefs capture the more proximal determinants of performance in a specific organizational setting.

In the trading-company context, productivity is driven by concrete execution behaviors: managing work priorities, handling customer and documentation requirements, coordinating with teams, responding to operational disruptions, and sustaining initiative in pursuit of targets. Consequently, it is plausible that employees’ confidence in performing their actual role tasks (task-specific efficacy), adapting to job expectations

(occupational efficacy), and taking initiative or opportunity-oriented actions (entrepreneurial efficacy) corresponds more directly to measurable productivity behaviors than generalized confidence does. The non-significance of general self-efficacy in the multivariate model should therefore not be interpreted as “general confidence is irrelevant,” but rather that its contribution may be indirect or shared with more specific forms of efficacy that explain productivity more precisely.

This result also offers a practical design implication: if organizations seek to improve productivity, they may achieve better outcomes by strengthening domain-relevant efficacy through targeted training, supervised practice, performance coaching, and structured opportunities for mastery. General motivational programs may help, but interventions tied to role tasks and workplace enablement are more likely to yield productivity improvements that can be observed in efficiency, quality, adaptability, collaboration, and initiative.

4.8.5 Interpreting the Weaker Domain: Adaptability and Problem Solving

Among the productivity dimensions, adaptability and problem solving exhibited the comparatively lowest mean level, and item-level patterns suggested limitations in proactive solution seeking and sustained independent problem resolution. In a trading environment, where exceptions and disruptions are common, adaptability is central to maintaining service levels and operational continuity. The moderate-to-lower position of this domain implies that respondents may be performing adequately in stable routines but may hesitate when faced with non-routine issues, possibly relying more on instruction or supervisory direction than autonomous problem solving. This is consistent with the efficacy findings, where confidence under unexpected events and sustained productivity under pressure were comparatively weaker. Taken together, these results imply that strengthening adaptability may require both capability-building (e.g., structured problem-solving tools and scenario training) and enabling support (e.g., empowerment norms, safe escalation processes, and coaching) so that employees can transition from compliance-based execution toward more autonomous decision making within defined boundaries.



4.8.6 Implications for a Productivity-Oriented Action Plan in Trading Firms

The integrated evidence supports a pragmatic conclusion: improving productivity in the sampled trading companies is likely to be most effective when interventions prioritize work environment support, while simultaneously strengthening task-specific, occupational, and initiative-related efficacy. Support functions as the strongest statistical lever in the model, implying that leadership, peer systems, and organizational enablement are central to performance improvement. Meanwhile, the significance of task-specific and entrepreneurial efficacy indicates that productivity is reinforced when employees develop confidence in executing core tasks, handling operational complexities, and taking initiative toward goals. Finally, the non-significance of general self-efficacy in the multivariate model reinforces that interventions should be designed around role-relevant mastery and environmental support, rather than relying on generalized motivational messaging alone.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn. First, employees in selected trading companies in Laguna, Philippines generally reported moderate levels of self-efficacy across the domains of general, occupational, task-specific, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and perceived work environment and support. This indicates that respondents tended to view themselves as capable of meeting work requirements, yet their confidence was not consistently at the highest level, particularly in areas associated with managing unexpected events, sustaining performance under pressure, and perceiving strong organizational valuing.

Second, employee productivity was likewise assessed at a moderate level across task completion and efficiency, work quality and attention to detail, adaptability and problem solving, collaboration and communication, and goal achievement and initiative. This implies that the workforce generally performs reliably in essential functions, with relative strengths in collaborative and communicative behaviors, but with comparatively weaker performance indicators in adaptability and proactive problem solving—competencies that are critical in trading environments where operational disruptions and customer exceptions are common.

Third, employee self-efficacy was found to have statistically significant positive relationships with employee productivity. The consistent pattern of positive correlations across domains supports the proposition that employees who report stronger efficacy beliefs also demonstrate stronger productivity behaviors. This finding is aligned with theory-based expectations that efficacy beliefs shape effort, persistence, and adaptive responses, which are foundational to performance.

Fourth, when self-efficacy domains were examined simultaneously in a regression framework, the dimensions collectively explained a substantial proportion of the variance in employee productivity. Among the self-efficacy dimensions, Work Environment and Support emerged as the strongest predictor of productivity, while task-specific self-efficacy, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and occupational self-efficacy also made significant predictive contributions. In contrast, general self-efficacy did not significantly predict productivity when the more role-proximal efficacy domains were included in the model. This pattern indicates that productivity in the sampled trading companies is more closely associated with efficacy beliefs that are directly relevant to task execution, role functioning, and initiative, as well as with employees' perception of workplace support, than with generalized confidence alone.

Finally, the overall evidence suggests that productivity enhancement in trading firms is not solely an individual-level issue but is strongly conditioned by workplace enablement. A support-rich environment, combined with targeted development of task-relevant confidence and initiative-related competence, provides the most empirically grounded pathway for improving productivity outcomes.

5.2 Recommendations

In view of the conclusions, several recommendations are offered for organizational practice and human resource interventions in selected trading companies.

First, management should prioritize strengthening work environment and support systems, given their dominant predictive contribution to productivity. This may be operationalized through clearer role expectations, structured supervisory coaching, consistent performance feedback cycles, and accessible support mechanisms for resolving work obstacles.



Recognition practices and psychologically safe escalation routines may also be institutionalized to reinforce employees' sense that the organization values their contribution and supports them in addressing operational challenges.

Second, companies should implement targeted capability-building interventions aimed at strengthening the domain-specific efficacy dimensions that significantly predict productivity. Task-specific development may include competency-based training aligned to core trading workflows (e.g., order processing, documentation accuracy, customer coordination, inventory-related decision processes) and guided practice through on-the-job coaching and mentoring. Occupational self-efficacy may be enhanced through structured onboarding, job rotation within trading functions, and competency progression pathways that clarify how employees can advance from routine execution to higher-responsibility roles. Entrepreneurial self-efficacy may be strengthened by encouraging controlled initiative through improvement projects, small-scale innovation tasks, and performance goal-setting systems that reward initiative and problem ownership.

Third, because adaptability and problem solving emerged as a comparatively weaker productivity domain, management should provide structured problem-solving and adaptability training. This may include scenario-based training, root-cause analysis tools, and guided debriefing routines following operational disruptions. Such interventions should be paired with supportive leadership practices to ensure employees are empowered to act within defined boundaries rather than defaulting to dependence on instructions during exceptions.

Fourth, organizations should adopt a differentiated development approach responsive to career stage. Given the predominance of early-career employees in the sample, the companies may benefit from structured competency-building programs that combine technical skill formation with confidence-building experiences, such as mastery experiences, mentoring, and staged exposure to complex tasks. This approach can help stabilize productivity while accelerating employee readiness for broader responsibilities.

Fifth, future researchers may extend this study by including additional explanatory variables such as leadership style, job demands, workload pressure, compensation satisfaction, or organizational commitment, and by testing mediation or

moderation pathways more explicitly. Replication across other provinces or across different types of trading companies may also strengthen generalizability. Where feasible, longitudinal designs may be considered to strengthen inference regarding directionality between efficacy beliefs, support perceptions, and productivity outcomes.

5.3 Implications

The findings carry several implications for management practice, human resource development, and future research on productivity in trading organizations.

From a managerial perspective, the results imply that productivity is meaningfully influenced by workplace support as an enabling condition. Productivity initiatives that focus solely on efficiency targets, monitoring, or procedural tightening may deliver limited gains if employees do not perceive adequate support, feedback, and resource facilitation. Leadership practices that build confidence, reduce avoidable uncertainty, and create supportive team dynamics appear central to sustaining productivity in trading environments that require interdependence and rapid coordination.

For human resource development, the results imply that effective productivity programs should be competency-based and efficacy-oriented. Rather than relying on general motivational interventions, organizations should invest in training and developmental experiences that strengthen task-specific competence, role confidence, and initiative-related capability, while simultaneously institutionalizing support mechanisms that reinforce these beliefs. The non-significance of general self-efficacy in the multivariate model further implies that generalized confidence is less actionable than domain-specific efficacy beliefs that can be developed through targeted training, supervised practice, and supportive work structures.

For organizational development, the study implies that improvement efforts should combine individual and system-level interventions. In particular, improving adaptability and problem solving requires both skill-building and an enabling environment in which employees can engage in proactive solutions without fear of punitive responses. Establishing structured problem-solving routines and coaching systems may therefore increase productivity not only through improved competence but also through enhanced psychological readiness to act.



For research and scholarly contribution, the study contributes sector-relevant evidence in the Philippine trading context by demonstrating that self-efficacy is strongly related to productivity and that work environment support is a primary predictor when multiple efficacy domains are considered jointly. This supports the broader theoretical position that capability beliefs and enabling conditions jointly shape performance outcomes and provides a practical basis for designing evidence-informed productivity interventions in trading organizations.

6. References

- Arifian, D., Barq, A., Hadiwijaya, D., & Susilo, P. (2025). The influence of leadership and organizational work culture on employee performance through self-efficacy. *Agregat: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.22236/agregat_vol9.i1.15814
- Atento, R. G. (2025). The credibility imperative 2025: Governance integrity, economic resilience, and strategic adaptability in Philippine diplomacy. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.65166/6amaz997>
- Atento, R. G. O., & Atento, A. G. B. (2025). Which fundamentals differentiate Philippine stock winners from laggards? A rank-based multinomial analysis of 2025 price appreciation. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.65166/n7t3ew73>
- Atento, R. G., Quinto, L., Espelita, C. A. M., & Castaneda, C. (2025). Integrating business and health analytics: A conceptual framework for dual outcomes in healthcare. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/04pdc866>
- Bermido, C. M., Quinto, L. F., & Atento, R. G. O. (2025). A qualitative thematic review of contemporary challenges affecting health professions education: Implications for higher education leadership. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.65166/yfm5w791>
- Bilukha, M., & Mnukhina, M. (2025). Optimization of innovative product distribution in agro-industrial business. *Proceedings of Scientific Works of Cherkasy State Technological University Series Economic Sciences*, 1(74). [https://doi.org/10.24025/2306-4420.1\(74\).2025.326274](https://doi.org/10.24025/2306-4420.1(74).2025.326274)
- Bloom, N., Manova, K., Van Reenen, J., Sun, S., & Yu, Z. (2020). Trade and management. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 103(3), 443–460. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00925
- Borg, J., Scott-Young, C., & Borg, N. (2023). Early career project managers' work readiness: Adopting a self-efficacy lens. *International Journal of Project Management*, 41(3), Article 102454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2023.102454>
- Cahyani, M., & Febrian, W. (2025). The effect of self-efficacy, training and work environment on employee performance at PT. XYZ. *Siber International Journal of Digital Business (SIJDB)*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.38035/sijdb.v2i4.236>
- Danica, T., S., & Marpaung, N. (2024). The influence of self efficacy and locus of control on employee work productivity (Study at PT Perkebunan Nusantara IV Adolina). *Journal of Finance and Business Digital*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.55927/jfbd.v2i4.6536>
- Espelita, C. A. M., Atento, R. G., Rao, L. J., & Tian, Y. (2025). Understanding monetary policy: Student awareness, perceptions, and financial behaviors in the Philippine context. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.65166/f7eayj47>
- Fida, R., Marzocchi, I., Arshad, M., Paciello, M., Barbaranelli, C., & Tramontano, C. (2025). Self-efficacy and nontask performance at work: A meta-analytic summary. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 236, Article 113179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2025.113179>
- Grether, T., Sowislo, J., & Wiese, B. (2018). Top-down or bottom-up? Prospective relations



- between general and domain-specific self-efficacy beliefs during a work-family transition. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 121, 131-139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.09.021>
- Hanafī, M., Safaria, S., & Perbanas, A. (2025). The influence of career development and motivation on employee performance through self-efficacy in employees of PT Permodalan Nasional Madani Surabaya. *Formosa Journal of Sustainable Research*, 4(4). <https://doi.org/10.55927/fjsr.v4i4.188>
- Hermann, C., & Voeth, M. (2025). Negotiation-specific self-efficacy: A key driver of effectiveness and efficiency. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v22i3.795>
- Hidayatullah, F., & Tiarapuspa, T. (2023). Apakah work environment, work motivation dan self efficacy berpengaruh terhadap employee performance. *ETNIK: Jurnal Ekonomi dan Teknik*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.54543/etnik.v2i4.180>
- Holderman, S., & Wijono, S. (2024). Self-efficacy and career adaptability in early career employees. *Philanthropy: Journal of Psychology*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.26623/philanthropy.v8i1.9207>
- Jugović, I., Marušić, I., & Bojić, J. (2025). Early career teachers' social and emotional competencies, self-efficacy and burnout: A mediation model. *BMC Psychology*, 13, Article 33. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-02323-2>
- Kim, D., & Lee, C. (2021). Exploring the roles of self-efficacy and technical support in the relationship between techno-stress and counter-productivity. *Sustainability*, 13(8), 4349. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084349>
- Leonard, F. H., Widjaja, B. T., & Purnama, E. D. (2025). The impact of self efficacy and career development on employee performance with work motivation as mediation variables (the case study on secretary general of the ministry of religious affairs). *Jurnal Ilmiah Gema Perencanaan*, 3(3), 401-410. <https://doi.org/10.61860/jigp.v3i3.179>
- Lestari, S., Watini, S., & Rose, D. (2024). Impact of self-efficacy and work discipline on employee performance in sociopreneur initiatives. *Aptisi Transactions on Technopreneurship (ATT)*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.34306/att.v6i2.403>
- Madawala, K., Foroudi, P., & Palazzo, M. (2023). Exploring the role played by entrepreneurial self-efficacy among women entrepreneurs in tourism sector. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 74, Article 103395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103395>
- Na-Nan, K., Saribut, S., & Sanamthong, E. (2019). Mediating effects of perceived environment support and knowledge sharing between self-efficacy and job performance of SME employees. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 51(6), 342-359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ict-01-2019-0009>
- Nugraha, D., & Kharismasyah, A. (2024). Perceived organizational support as mediation of work engagement and self-efficacy on employee performance. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 24(2), 130-145. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2024/v24i21230>
- Nuraini, S., S, I., & Murtaliningtyas, W. (2025). Pengaruh self-efficacy, career development, dan lingkungan kerja terhadap kinerja pegawai Kantor Kecamatan Gumukmas. *Jurnal Nasional Manajemen Pemasaran & SDM*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.47747/jnmpsdm.v6i1.2701>
- Pennings, H., George, S., & Meijer, M. (2025). Calibration accuracy of general and task-specific learning self-efficacy in a military training simulator. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*. Advance online



- publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-025-09852-8>
- Purwaningsih, D., Hadiyati, E., & Mulyono, S. (2025). Pengaruh pemberdayaan, kewirausahaan, dan self efficacy terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan UKM batik tulis di Malang Raya. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Manajemen*, 25(3). <https://doi.org/10.62951/jem.v25i3.57>
- Purwantini, M., Bagus, I., Putra, U., & Martadiani, A. (2025). The role of intrinsic motivation as a mediating influence of organizational culture and self-efficacy on employee productivity at PT Jasa Raharja Bali Branch in Denpasar. *International Journal of Environmental, Sustainability, and Social Science*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.38142/ijesss.v6i2.1333>
- Rahadi, P., & Wening, N. (2025). The role of self-efficacy and employee engagement in improving employee performance: A literature review. *International Journal of Engineering Business and Social Science*, 3(7). <https://doi.org/10.58451/ijebss.v3i7.282>
- Santoso, O., & Lindawati, T. (2024). The influence of perceived environment support on employee performance with self-efficacy as a mediating variable on MSMEs in the Central Surabaya. *Research In Management and Accounting*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.33508/rima.v7i2.5847>
- Setyawan, N., & Wibowo, B. (2023). Improving business productivity performance through entrepreneurship training and entrepreneurship self-efficacy. *Jurnal Ekuilnomi*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.36985/ekuilnomi.v5i1.539>
- Silalahi, E. (2024). The influence of self-efficacy and visionary leadership on work productivity. *The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations*, 6(2), 30-41. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajmei/volume06issue02-03>
- Utami, M., Jusriadi, E., & Maklassa, D. (2025). Human resources performance in public services through strengthening the work environment, self-leadership, and self-efficacy. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.52970/grhrm.v6i1.1220>
- Wardana, E., Kusdarinto, I., & Mustafa, S. (2025). The effect of self efficacy and work environment on employee performance at PT. Tirta Marwah Mandiri. *Journal of Applied Business, Taxation and Economics Research*, 4(6). <https://doi.org/10.54408/jabter.v4i6.436>

7. Tables

Table 2. General Self-Efficacy

Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1	I can solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.44	Moderate Self-Efficacy	2
2	I can usually think of a solution when I am in trouble.	3.42	Moderate Self-Efficacy	3
3	I remain calm when facing difficulties because I trust my coping abilities.	3.29	Moderate Self-Efficacy	5
4	I can efficiently deal with unexpected events.	3.12	Moderate Self-Efficacy	7
5	I can accomplish my goals if I put my mind to it.	3.51	High Self-Efficacy	1
6	I believe I can handle most challenges that come my way.	3.15	Moderate Self-Efficacy	6
7	I trust my ability to make good decisions under pressure.	3.39	Moderate Self-Efficacy	4
General Assessment		3.33	Moderate Self-Efficacy	

Table 3. Occupational Self-Efficacy

Occupational Self-Efficacy				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
8	I feel confident performing my job effectively, even in tough situations.	3.40	Moderate Self-Efficacy	4
9	I can learn new skills required for my job.	3.53	High Self-Efficacy	1
10	I believe I can help solve complex problems at work.	3.47	Moderate Self-Efficacy	2
11	I can remain productive despite work pressures.	3.15	Moderate Self-Efficacy	7
12	I handle my job responsibilities successfully.	3.45	Moderate Self-Efficacy	3
13	I adapt quickly to changes in my work environment.	3.20	Moderate Self-Efficacy	5
14	I can manage work-related stress effectively.	3.18	Moderate Self-Efficacy	6
General Assessment		3.34	Moderate Self-Efficacy	



Table 4. Task-Specific Self-Efficacy

Task-Specific Self-Efficacy				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Self-Efficacy)	Rank
15	I am confident I can complete tasks on time, even when they are challenging.	3.41	Moderate	5
16	I can manage complex tasks that are part of my role.	3.46	Moderate	2
17	I can improve my performance with effort.	3.43	Moderate	4
18	I can meet the expectations set by my supervisors.	3.45	Moderate	3
19	I can balance multiple tasks without becoming overwhelmed.	3.19	Moderate	6
20	I can effectively plan and organize my workload.	3.49	Moderate	1
21	I remain motivated when working on difficult assignments.	3.18	Moderate	7
General Assessment		3.37	Moderate	

Table 5. Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy

Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Self-Efficacy)	Rank
22	I am sure the business can expand.	3.39	Moderate	7
23	I am sure the business gets adequate profit.	3.47	Moderate	2
24	I am sure the business can compete.	3.48	Moderate	1
25	I am sure the business can manage its resources well.	3.44	Moderate	3
26	I can help motivate other employees to keep working hard.	3.43	Moderate	4
27	I can confidently make business-related decisions.	3.43	Moderate	4
28	I believe I can identify and seize business opportunities.	3.42	Moderate	6
General Assessment		3.44	Moderate	

Table 6. Work Environment and Support

Work Environment and Support				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Self-Efficacy)	Rank
29	Positive feedback from supervisors boosts my confidence.	3.48	Moderate	2
30	Support from colleagues enhances my belief in my success.	3.50	Moderate	1
31	I can handle difficult situations when I receive adequate support.	3.40	Moderate	4
32	My work environment helps me reach my full potential.	3.45	Moderate	3
33	I feel comfortable asking for help when facing challenges.	3.34	Moderate	6
34	My workplace provides resources that help me develop professionally.	3.37	Moderate	5
35	I feel valued and supported by my organization.	3.13	Moderate	7
General Assessment		3.38	Moderate	



Table 7. Task Completion and Efficiency

Task Completion and Efficiency				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1	I complete my tasks on time, even with tight deadlines.	3.42	Moderate Productivity	3
2	I deliver high-quality work that meets expectations.	3.43	Moderate Productivity	2
3	I manage my time effectively to complete tasks efficiently.	3.33	Moderate Productivity	4
4	I rarely need to work overtime to meet targets.	3.15	Moderate Productivity	6
5	I prioritize tasks effectively based on urgency.	3.47	Moderate Productivity	1
6	I stay focused and avoid distractions while working.	3.09	Moderate Productivity	7
7	I efficiently handle multiple tasks without compromising quality.	3.25	Moderate Productivity	5
General Assessment		3.30	Moderate Productivity	

Table 8. Work Quality and Attention to Detail

Work Quality and Attention to Detail				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Productivity)	Rank
8	My work is free of errors and meets high standards.	3.11	Moderate	6
9	I rarely need corrections from supervisors.	3.09	Moderate	7
10	I pay close attention to detail in my outputs.	3.42	Moderate	4
11	I ensure accuracy and precision in all my tasks.	3.27	Moderate	5
12	I review my work carefully before submitting it.	3.44	Moderate	2
13	I take pride in producing high-quality work.	3.43	Moderate	3
14	I follow instructions carefully to meet job expectations.	3.46	Moderate	1
General Assessment		3.32	Moderate	

Table 9. Adaptability and Problem Solving

Adaptability and Problem Solving				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Productivity)	Rank
15	I quickly adjust my priorities in response to changes.	3.25	Moderate	1
16	I adapt well to new processes implemented at work.	3.20	Moderate	3
17	I find effective solutions to problems without extensive guidance.	3.11	Moderate	6
18	I remain productive under pressure.	3.18	Moderate	4
19	I handle unexpected challenges with confidence.	3.16	Moderate	5
20	I stay positive and open-minded when facing difficulties.	3.25	Moderate	1
21	I actively seek solutions rather than waiting for instructions.	3.10	Moderate	7
General Assessment		3.18	Moderate	



Table 10. Collaboration and Communication

Collaboration and Communication				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
22	I communicate effectively with colleagues to meet team goals.	3.43	Moderate	7
23	I collaborate to improve overall team productivity.	3.47	Moderate	4
24	I share resources that help my colleagues.	3.45	Moderate	6
25	I actively listen to others' input before making decisions.	3.52	High	1
26	I provide constructive feedback to help team members improve.	3.45	Moderate	5
27	I resolve conflicts professionally and respectfully.	3.48	Moderate	3
28	I ensure that my messages are clear and easily understood.	3.49	Moderate	2
General Assessment		3.47	Moderate	

Table 11. Goal Achievement and Initiative

Goal Achievement and Initiative				
Q#	Indicators	Mean	Verbal Interpretation (Productivity)	Rank
29	I meet or exceed my performance goals consistently.	3.13	Moderate	7
30	I seek ways to improve my work processes.	3.42	Moderate	4
31	I take initiative on new projects that benefit the company.	3.23	Moderate	6
32	I actively look for opportunities to grow in my role.	3.42	Moderate	4
33	I stay motivated to achieve my professional goals.	3.46	Moderate	1
34	I set personal goals to improve my job performance.	3.44	Moderate	3
35	I proactively seek feedback to enhance my work.	3.45	Moderate	2
General Assessment		3.36	Moderate	

Table 12. Correlation Matrix

INDICATOR (IV - DV)	R-VALUE	INTERPRETATION (R)	P-VALUE	INTERPRETATION (P)
General Self-Efficacy - Task Completion and Efficiency	0.495	Moderate	< .001	Significant
General Self-Efficacy - Work Quality and Attention to Detail	0.422	Moderate	< .001	Significant
General Self-Efficacy - Adaptability and Problem Solving	0.537	Strong	< .001	Significant
General Self-Efficacy - Collaboration and Communication	0.525	Strong	< .001	Significant



General Self-Efficacy - Goal Achievement and Initiative	0.533	Strong	< .001	Significant
Occupational Self-Efficacy - Task Completion and Efficiency	0.552	Strong	< .001	Significant
Occupational Self-Efficacy - Work Quality and Attention to Detail	0.449	Moderate	< .001	Significant
Occupational Self-Efficacy - Adaptability and Problem Solving	0.528	Strong	< .001	Significant
Occupational Self-Efficacy - Collaboration and Communication	0.465	Moderate	< .001	Significant
Occupational Self-Efficacy - Goal Achievement and Initiative	0.481	Moderate	< .001	Significant
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy - Task Completion and Efficiency	0.535	Strong	< .001	Significant
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy - Work Quality and Attention to Detail	0.44	Moderate	< .001	Significant
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy - Adaptability and Problem Solving	0.542	Strong	< .001	Significant
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy - Collaboration and Communication	0.528	Strong	< .001	Significant
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy - Goal Achievement and Initiative	0.548	Strong	< .001	Significant
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy - Task Completion and Efficiency	0.585	Strong	< .001	Significant
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy - Work Quality and Attention to Detail	0.504	Strong	< .001	Significant
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy - Adaptability and Problem Solving	0.469	Moderate	< .001	Significant
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy - Collaboration and Communication	0.583	Strong	< .001	Significant
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy - Goal Achievement and Initiative	0.61	Strong	< .001	Significant
Work Environment and Support - Task Completion and Efficiency	0.673	Strong	< .001	Significant
Work Environment and Support - Work Quality and Attention to Detail	0.663	Strong	< .001	Significant
Work Environment and Support - Adaptability and Problem Solving	0.584	Strong	< .001	Significant
Work Environment and Support - Collaboration and Communication	0.718	Very Strong	< .001	Significant
Work Environment and Support - Goal Achievement and Initiative	0.652	Strong	< .001	Significant



Table 13 Individual Predictor Contributions to Employee Productivity

Predictor Variable	Standardized Beta (β)	Significance (p-value)
Work Environment and Support	0.395	< 0.001
Task-Specific Self-Efficacy	0.171	0.001
Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy	0.134	0.002
Occupational Self-Efficacy	0.104	0.044
General Self-Efficacy	0.053	0.315

Table 14. Regression Assumption Checks

Assumption	Test/Statistic Used	Result	Interpretation
Autocorrelation	Durbin-Watson Statistic	1.99 (p = 0.900)	No significant autocorrelation
Multicollinearity	Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)	2.0 to 2.3	No multicollinearity (all < 5)