



Research Article

Self-efficacy of working and non-working women

■ R.V. MANKANI AND GANGA V. YENAGI

Article Chronicle :

Received :

04.10.2011;

Revised :

02.11.2011;

Accepted :

01.12.2011

SUMMARY : The study was conducted on self-efficacy of working and non-working women. The random sample consisted of 90 working and 90 non-working women which was selected from Dharwad district in Karnataka state. The purpose of the present study was to examine the self-efficacy of working and non-working women. Self-efficacy scale and personal information schedule were used. Results revealed that there was no significant association between self-efficacy of working and non-working women. The working women had high self-efficacy as compared to non-working women. Social participation had positive and significant relationship with working women.

How to cite this article : Mankani, R.V. and Yenagi, Ganga V. (2012). Self-efficacy of working and non-working women. *Agric.Update*, 7(1&2): 8-10.

Key Words :

Self-efficacy,

Working and non-

working women,

Social participation

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

People have beliefs about themselves that are the key elements to the behaviour and motivation of the people and also to the exercise of control and personal agency. The process of creating and using beliefs is rather simple and intuitive. Self-efficacy is considered to be the most unique human capacity which enables people to evaluate and alter their own thinking and behaviour (Barlow and Durand, 2000). Self-efficacy (SE), or beliefs about one's capabilities and potential to meet situational demands, influences effort, perception of control, personal choices, thought patterns, depression, and perceived stress (Bandura, 1995). Self-efficacy refers to a personal judgment about a person's perceived ability to mobilize resources over events and has been related to both general and specific behaviours (Cruess *et al.*, 2002). Behavioral interventions emphasize and increase self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994) by providing opportunity to model and practice behaviours. Group cognitive behavioral interventions provide skills, such as re-framing of stressors (looking at stressors from another perspective), coping, relaxation, assertiveness, and anger management, while promoting attitude and behavioural change regarding stressors

through increased self-efficacy (ISE) and collective (group) efficacy.

Self-efficacy is an individual's estimate or personal judgment of his/her own ability to succeed in reaching a specific goal (Wikipedia, 2005). The most effective way of developing a strong sense of efficacy is through mastery experiences. Performing a task successfully strengthens our sense of self-efficacy. However, failing to adequately deal with a task or challenge can undermine and weaken self-efficacy. Witnessing other people successfully completing a task is another important source of self-efficacy. Seeing people similar to oneself succeed by sustained effort raises observers' beliefs that they too possess the capabilities master comparable activities to succeed. Bandura (1995) also asserted that people could be persuaded to believe that they have the skills and capabilities to succeed. Getting verbal encouragement from others help people overcome self-doubt and instead focus on giving their best effort to the task at hand. Our own responses and emotional reactions to situations also play an important role in self-efficacy. Moods, emotional states, physical reactions, and stress levels can all impact how a person feels about their personal abilities in a particular situation. A person who becomes

Author for correspondence :

GANGA V. YENAGI

Department of
Agricultural Extension
Education, University of
Agricultural Sciences,
DHARWAD
(KARNATAKA) INDIA
Email:
gangayenagi@yahoo.co.in

See end of the article for
authors' affiliations

extremely nervous before speaking in public may develop a weak sense of self-efficacy in these situations. However, Bandura (1994) also notes “it is not the sheer intensity of emotional and physical reactions that is important but rather how they are perceived and interpreted”. By learning how to minimize stress and elevate mood when facing difficult or challenging tasks, people can improve their sense of self-efficacy Bandura (1994). In the present study, an attempt is made to assess the self-efficacy of working and non-working women.

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present study was carried out in the year 2010-2011. The population for the study comprised of working and non-working women from rural and urban area. The sample consisted of 90 working and 90 non-working women. The age range of the sample was from 18-40 years. Data were collected with the help of questionnaires.

- Personal information schedule included age, caste, education, type of family and size of the family.
- Self-efficacy scale: Self-efficacy of the working and non-working women was assessed using self-efficacy scale developed by Sud *et al.* (1998). This scale consists of 10 statements with four alternative answers like exactly true, moderately true, barely true and not at all true and rated on four point scale and the scoring is 4,3,2,1, respectively.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The background characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. It was revealed that 41.1 per cent of the working women belonged to 34-40 years of age group followed by 40 per cent and 18.9 per cent in 26-33 years and 18-25 years of age group, respectively. Among the non-working women, 53.3 per cent were found in 26-33 age group, 26.7 per cent and 20 per cent of the respondents in 18-25 years and 34-40 years of age group, respectively. Regarding caste, 50 per cent of the working women belonged to other backward communities (OBCs), followed by 32.2 per cent, 13.3 per cent and 4.4 per cent belonged to upper caste, dalits and tribal, respectively. Among the non-working women, 51.1 per cent of the respondents belonged to upper caste followed by 38.9 per cent, 7.8 per cent and 2.2 per cent belonged to other backward communities (OBCs), tribal and dalits, respectively. The educational level of working women indicated that 27.8 per cent of the respondents had completed graduation followed by 22.2 per cent, 16.7 per cent, 14.4 per cent and 13.3 per cent with post graduation, PUC, Primary School, High School, respectively and only 5.6 per cent were illiterates. Among the housewives, 38.9 per cent had completed graduation, while 35.6 per cent, 13.3 per cent, 7.8 per cent and 4.4 per cent had

Table 1: Background information of the respondents

Sr. No.	Particulars	Working women	Non-working women	
1.	Age (years)			
	18-25	17(18.9)	24(26.7)	
	26-33	36(40.0)	48(53.3)	
	34-40	37(41.1)	18(20.0)	
	2.	Caste		
		Upper caste	29(32.2)	46(51.1)
OBC		45(50.1)	35(38.9)	
Dalits		12(13.3)	2(2.2)	
	Tribal	4(4.4)	7(7.8)	
3.	Education			
	Post graduation and above	20(22.2)	12(13.3)	
	Graduation	25(27.8)	35(38.9)	
	PUC	15(16.7)	32(35.6)	
	High School	12(13.3)	7(7.8)	
	Primary School	13(14.4)	4(4.4)	
	Illiterate	5(5.6)	-	
4.	Type of family			
	Nuclear	72(80.0)	66(73.3)	
	Joint	18(20.0)	24(26.7)	
5.	Size of family			
	Small	74(82.2)	70(77.8)	
	Large	16(17.8)	20(22.2)	

completed PUC, post graduation, High School, Primary School, respectively. The comparison of the working and non-working women indicated that 80.0 per cent of the working and 73.3 per cent of non-working women belonged to nuclear family whereas 20.0 per cent of working and 26.7 per cent of the non-working women belonged to joint family. It was found that 82.2 per cent of working women and 77.8 per cent of the non-working women belonged to small family size whereas only 17.8 per cent of working women and 22.2 per cent of non-working women belonged to large family, respectively.

The results of the Table 2 revealed that 77.8 per cent of working women and 71.1 per cent of non-working women exhibited high self-efficacy while 22.2 per cent of working women and 28.9 per cent of non-working women had moderate

Table 2: The distribution of working and non-working women on self-efficacy (n=180)

Category	Total sample	
	Working women (n=90)	Non-working women (n=90)
High	70(77.8)	64(71.1)
Moderate	20(22.2)	26(28.9)
Low	-	-
Chi square	2.157 ^{NS}	

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages NS=Non-significant

level of self-efficacy. It was interesting to note that none of the respondents belonged to low level of self-efficacy. There was no significant association between self-efficacy of working and non-working women.

There was no significant difference between self-efficacy of working and non-working women but the working women had high self efficacy as compared to non-working women (Table 3). The findings of the results are supported by study of Sahu and Rath (2003) were reported that working women had higher self-efficacy compared with non-working women.

Table 3: Comparison between working and non-working women on self-efficacy (n=180)

Respondents	Mean	S.D.	't' value
Working women	34.07	4.87	0.88NS
Non-working women	33.43	4.84	

NS= Non-significant

The results of the Table 4 revealed that social participation was positively and significantly related to self-efficacy (0.272) of working women but in case of other demographic variables self-efficacy was not significantly related. Hence, there is a need to enhance the self-efficacy level of working and non-working women.

Table 4: Relationship between demographic variables, self efficacy of the working and non-working women (n=180)

Demographic variables	Respondents	Self efficacy
Age	Working women	0.124
	Non-working women	0.014
Education	Working women	0.037
	Non-working women	0.016
Income	Working women	-0.089
	Non-working women	0.042
Family size	Working women	-0.137
	Non-working women	0.141
No .children	Working women	0.172
	Non-working women	-0.158
Total socio-economic status	Working women	0.061
	Non-working women	0.0042
Social participation	Working women	0.272**
	Non-working women	0.093

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Conclusion:

The present study, it was found that most of the working and non-working women had high self-efficacy. There was no significant difference found between working and non-working women but the working women had better self-efficacy as compared non-working women.

Authors' affiliations:

RENUKA MANKANI, Department of Human Development, Rural Home Science College, University of Agricultural Sciences, DHARWAD (KARNATAKA) INDIA Email: mrenuka356@gmail.com

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, Academic Press, New York. Reprinted in *Encyclopedia of mental health* by H. Friedman, Ed., 1998, San Diego: Academic Press, **4**: 71-81.

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge University Press.

Barlow, D. and Durand, V.M. (2000). *Abnormal psychology – An integrative model*. 2nd Edn., Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, California, pp. 560-565.

Bharati, S.J. and Shekhar, B. (2009). Enhancement of self- efficacy in working women through positive therapy. *Indian Psy. Rev.*, **72**(2):75-78.

Cruess, S., Antoni, M.H., Hayes, A., Penedo, F.J., Ironson, G., Fletcher, M.A. and Schneider Man, N. (2002). Changes in mood and depressive symptoms and related change processes during cognitive behavioral stress management in HIV-infected men. *Cognitive Therapy & Res.*, **26**(3): 373-392.

Sahu, F.M. and Rath, S. (2003). Self-efficacy and wellbeing in working and non-working women: The moderating role involvement. *Psy. Developing. Soc.*, **15**(2): 187-200.

Sud, S., Schwarzer, R. and Jerusalem, M. (1998). Self-efficacy scale, [http://userpage.fuberline. De](http://userpage.fuberline.de).

Wikipedia, S. (2005). Self-efficacy-definition.

WEBLIOGRAPHY

<http://www.def.com/self%23efficacy>