Universe International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research
(Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal)
© UIJIR | ISSN (O) – 2582-6417
SEP. 2020 | Vol. 1 Issue 4
www.uijir.com

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SELF-EFFICACY OF ATHLETES AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OF COMPETITIONS

Author Name: Parveen Gahlawat
Affiliation: Assistant Professor, Post Graduate Govt. College for Girls, Chandigarh, Punjab, India
E-Mail: gahlawatparveen@gmail.com

Abstract

The aim of the study was to find out the differences in Self-Efficacy of athletes at different levels of competitions. For the present study random sampling technique was used. The sample comprised 100 male athletes in each of the three levels making a total of 300 (i.e. 100 from the district, 100 from the state and 100 from the national level) from different Universities and District Training Centers of Haryana state. To measure Self-Efficacy, Riggs et al. (1994)Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) was used. The SPSS software was used for statistical analysis of data of the study. ANOVA and Scheffe post hoc test were used to see the significance of differences between self-efficacy of athletes at various levels of competitions. The level of significance is set at 0.05. Results found that athletes of the national level have highest level of self-efficacy than those of district and state level athletes. However, the district level athletes possess the lowest level of self-efficacy.

***Keywords**: Analysis,Efficacy,Compititions*

INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is the belief that one is capable of performing in a certain manner to attain certain goals (Ormrod, 2006). It is a belief that one has the capabilities to execute the courses of actions required to manage prospective situations. Unlike efficacy, which is the power to produce an effect (in essence, competence), self-efficacy is the belief (whether or not accurate) that one has the power to produce that effect. For example, a person with high self efficacy may engage in a more health related activity when an illness occurs, whereas a person with low self efficacy would harbor feelings of hopelessness.

Self-efficacy beliefs are not judgments about one's skills, objectively speaking, but rather are judgments of what one can accomplish with those skills (Bandura, 1986). In other words, self-efficacy judgments are about, what one thinks one can do, not what one has done. These judgments are a product of a complex process of self appraisal and self-persuasion that relies on cognitive processing of diverse sources of efficacy information (Bandura, 1990). Bandura (1977, 1986) categorized these sources as past performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. Others have added separate categories for emotional states and imaginable experiences (Marsh and Jackson 1980).

Performance accomplishments are the most influential source of efficacy information because they are based on one's own mastery experiences (Bandura, 1997). One's mastery experiences affect self-efficacy beliefs through the cognitive processing of such information. If one has repeatedly viewed these experiences as successes, self-efficacy beliefs will increase; if these experiences are viewed as failures, self-efficacy beliefs will decrease. Furthermore, the self-monitoring or focus on successes provides more encouragement and enhance self-efficacy more than the self-monitoring of one's failures. One must be careful, however, not to become complacent by success. Bandura suggests that letdowns after easy successes and intensifications after failure are common sequences in competitive struggles. The continued setting of challenging goals and the positive reactions to substandard performances help to elevate the intensity and level of motivation.

Have you noticed how those who are confident about their ability tend to succeed, while those who are preoccupied with feeling tend to fail? Perhaps that explains the comparative golfing, performance of your authors one consistently stays in the fairways and hits the greens. The other spends the day thrashing through the underbrush wading in water hazards, and blasting out of sand traps. At the heart of his performance mismatch is a specific dimension of self-esteem called self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is a person’s belief about his or her chances of successfully accomplishing a specific task. One writer rightly says that self-efficacy arises from the gradual acquisition of complex cognitive, social, linguistic, and for physical skills through experience.

Kimble (1988) suggested that the ability to form self-efficacy increases with age, intelligence, education and socio-economic level. Studies on children’s concepts revealed that there is a pattern of development similar for all children, though the time needed to developed concepts and the level of development attained will depend partially upon the child’s intelligence and partly upon opportunities for learning. Many conclusions from various studies have been drawn on the relationship of self-efficacy and intelligence. It has been found that intelligent players have rich or strong self-efficacy while dull players have poor self-efficacy.

It has found that players with good self-efficacy are less anxious and are judged to be better in mental health. More theorists assert that self-efficacy is changeable, as it is a product of social and psychological factors such as socio-economic condition, life experiences and life stresses, mental health, anxiety and certain other social and personal factors effect the self-efficacy to a large extent.

METHODOLOGY:

The present study was conducted on 300 athletes at various levels of competitions (i.e. 100 from district level, 100 from state level and 100 from national level) from different Universities and district training centres of Haryana state.

TOOL USED:

To measure Self-Efficacy, Riggs et al. (1994)Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) was used. It is a scale comprised ten items covering work-related skills and abilities. The response to each items was recorded on a four-point scale in terms of 'not at all', 'somewhat', 'moderately' and 'very much'.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

The SPSS software was used for statistical analysis of data of the study. ANOVA and Scheffe post hoc test were used to see the significant of differences between self-efficacy of athletes at various levels of competitions. The level of significance is set at 0.05.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION:

Table -1ANOVA RESULTS OF THE ATHLETES AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF COMPETITIONS ON THE PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIABLE: SELF-EFFICACY

Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-value
SELF-EFFICACY	Between Groups	509.927	2	254.963	42.093*
	Within Groups	1798.990	297	6.057	
	Total	2308.917	299		

Table 1 indicates that the calculated 'F' value is 42.093, which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. From the results it is clear that self-efficacy significantly varies among athletes at various levels of competitions (i.e. district, state and national). Hence, the Scheffe's post-hoc Test has been applied to find out the paired mean difference among the athletes at various levels of competitions.

TABLE – 1.1

THE SCHEFFE'S POST-HOC TEST FOR THE MEAN DIFFERENCE IN SELF-EFFICACY AMONG THE ATHLETES AT VARIOUS LEVELS OF COMPETITIONS

Variable	District (Mean)	State (Mean)	National (Mean)	Mean Difference	Sig.
SELF-EFFICACY	30.56	32.71	X	-2.15*	0.01
	30.56	X	33.68	-3.12*	0.01
	X	32.71	33.68	-0.97*	0.02

*Significant at 0.05 level

From Table 1.1, it is obvious that the mean difference between district and state, district and national level athletes, state level and national have been found to be significant at 0.05 level of confidence.

Further the table implies that national level athletes have the highest mean score (33.68), whereas district level athletes have the lowest mean score (30.56). So national level athletes have higher level of self-efficacy and district level athletes have the lowest level of self-efficacy among the athletes at various levels of competitions.

INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS:

The result depicted in Table 1 with regard to Self-Efficacy among athletes at various levels of competitions reveals that between the group values are Ss =509.927, df =2, Ms = 254.963 and F-value being 42.093 which is significant. Within the group values are Ss = 1798.990, df = 297 and Ms = 6.057. The values for total are Ss = 2308.917, df = 299. As Table 1.1 shows that on self-efficacy the lowest mean score is in case of district level athletes (M= 30.56) and the highest is in case of national level athletes (M= 33.68). Hence national level athletes have higher level of self-efficacy among the athletes at various levels of competitions. These results are supported by Kadyan (2009).

REFERENCES:

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review. 84, 191-215.

- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. Journal of Applied Sport Psychology. 2, 128-163.
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.
- Kadyan, P (2009). Study of motivation, locus of control, self efficacy and personality of players in relation to performance at different levels of participation. Unpublished Doctor Thesis, Kurukshetra University, pp 180-181.
- Kimble, D.P. (1988). Biological psychology. New York: Halt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Marsh, H.W. & Jackson, S.A. (1980). Development and validation of a scale measures general motivation: New York: Norton.
- Ormrod, J. E. (2006). Educational Psychology: Developing Learners (5th ed.), "glossary". N.J., Merrill: Upper Saddle River.
- Riggs, I., Diaz, E and Riggs, M. (1994). Self-efficacyscale (SES). Anaheim: CA.