
STUDY OF SELF EFFICACY IN ORGANIZATIONAL MANAGERS WORKING IN DIFFERENT ENVIRONMENTS

Shreya Panwar, Research scholar, Mewar University, Chittorgarh.

D.M.Bansal,Asso.Prof.and HOD Economics,N.R.E.C.College ,Khurja.

Abstract

Executive or managers at all level play a vital role in charting a course for organizational growth. Consequently, events that impact on their leadership skill have been the subject of great scrutiny among researcher. In this regard, the need to achieve and perform successfully has been shown to affect organizational performance. This study is an effort to compare managers working in two types of environment i.e. Business schools and corporate on the basis of an important Psychological variable i.e. self efficacy. Managers are the community that visibly stands apart in present-day business organization, although heterogeneous and difficult to unequivocal defining. Where as self efficacy is the individuals' assessment of their capability to organize and execute actions required to achieve successful level of performance The study included 200 managers from business schools and corporate and were administered a self efficacy scale by Jerusalem & Schwarzer burger .The obtained data was processed statistically to give meaning to the findings. This study indicated the significant difference in the self efficacy levels of managers working in business schools and corporate. Where as no relation was found between length of service and self efficacy levels of managers.

Key words: Managers, Business school, corporate and self efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational behavior occurs in the context of an intricate social framework that involves shaping corporate strategies, determining personnel moves, establishing managerial styles, and in a general sense, making decisions. The scenario in modern organization is that everyone is being asked to be more creative, and to think more and do things differently (Mishra, 2004). The top management decides over the policy matters and the middle level management i.e. the manager's tries to convert those policies in to reality by exercising supervisory control over lower management. In the business encyclopedia, manager is described as a person, who fulfills the primordial managerial functions (planning, organizing, motivating and controlling) and is the superior of given human team (Encyclopedia biznesu1995). Whereas R.W.Griffin defines manager as a person who first of all is responsible for realization of management process. In particular manager is the person that makes plans and decisions, organizes, supervises and controls human, finance and information resources (**Griffin 2000**). A. Poczowski also holds the view that manager is the profession which essence is the management—the art of reaching goals by proper using the finance, material and human resources (**Poczowski 1997**).

Work force diversity acknowledges a work force of women and men, many racial and ethnic groups, individuals with a variety of physical or psychological abilities and people who differ in age and sexual orientation. Managing this diversity is a global concern. The future of an organization rests firmly on the competencies and dynamism of its managerial .Some organization can conduct discipline management training for their supervisor and mangers to help them to understand the tactic of managing discipline among the employees effectively .The purpose of such training is to ensure that when the mangers discipline their subordinates, they do so in a just and fair manner. This is essential to avoid the changes of bias and prejudice and steer clear of legal problems at a later stage.

With the change in workforce demographics, employee's expectations and attitude also have shifted. Traditional allurements such as job security, attractive remuneration, housing and the like do not attract

and motivate today's workforce. Employees demand empowerment and expect equality with the management. Previous notations about managerial authority are giving way to employee influence and involvement along with mechanism for upward communication and due process. This sense of seeking empowerment by the managers led the researchers to probe in to an important psychological variable "self efficacy" in these managers.

As self-efficacy pertains to specific tasks, people may simultaneously have high self- efficacy for some tasks and low self-efficacy for others. For instance, a manager may have high self-efficacy for the technical aspects of her role, such as management accounting, but low self-efficacy for other aspects, such as dealing with employees' performance problems. A person's self-efficacy is a strong determinant of their effort, persistence, strategizing, as well as their subsequent training and job performance. Self-efficacy was defined by Albert Bandura as a person's belief in their capability to successfully perform a particular task. Together with the goals that people set, self-efficacy is one on the most powerful motivational predictors of how well a person will perform at almost any endeavor.

A high degree of self-efficacy leads people to work hard and persist in the face of setbacks, as illustrated by many great innovators and politicians who were undeterred by repeated obstacles, ridicule, and minimal encouragement. Thomas Edison, believing he could eventually succeed, reputedly tested at least three thousand different unsuccessful prototypes before eventually developing the first incandescent light bulb. High self-efficacy was also exhibited by Abraham Lincoln in response to the numerous and repeated public rebukes and failures he incurred prior to his eventual political triumphs. Research has found that self-efficacy is important for sustaining the considerable effort required to master skills involved in, for instance, public speaking, losing weight, and becoming an effective manager.

Thus the researchers were interested in knowing the self efficacy levels of these managers working in two extremely different environments i.e., business schools and corporate. Pertaining to corporations - Corporations are the most common form of business organization, and one which is chartered by a state and given many legal rights as an entity separate from its owners. This form of business is characterized by the limited liability of its owners, the issuance of shares of easily transferable stock, and existence as a going concern. The process of becoming a corporation, called incorporation, gives the company separate legal standing from its owners and protects those owners from being personally liable in the event that the company is sued (a condition known as limited liability). Incorporation also provides companies with a more flexible way to manage their ownership structure. In addition, there are different tax implications for corporations, although these can be both advantageous and disadvantageous. In these respects, corporations differ from sole proprietorships and limited partnership.

On the other end business school, is an educational institution that focuses on teaching business-related courses while business schools may offer courses ranging from undergraduate degrees to postdoctoral programs, their prime offering is the Master of Business Administration (MBA) program Top-tier business schools are usually renowned for the high quality of their graduates, many of whom climb the corporate ladder steadily to eventually become among the highest ranking executives in their organizations. Business schools may operate as a certain entity or may be available within another school. For example, George Mason University has its own School of Management.

This self-efficacy has significant relationships with job performance and emotional states (Gil-Monte, Garcia-Juesas and Caro- Hernandez, 2006; Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998), which result in the importance of beliefs as a predictor of success in what it takes. Entrepreneurship, meanwhile, is being associated with technological progress (Moriano, Palace and Morales, 2006),As in other areas of application of self-efficacy, research on entrepreneurial behavior are two different approaches (Moriano *et al.*, 2006). Thus,

in one case, it includes self-efficacy in a broad and general sense, pointing to the belief or confidence in one's ability to perform successfully (Markman, Balkin & Baron, 2002), while from another side, the studies focus on the development of self-efficacy scales specific to the domain of entrepreneurs (Chen *et al.*, 1998). In regard to gender and entrepreneurial self-efficacy in recent years, research has shown the predictive power of self-efficacy perceptions on the formation of entrepreneurial intentions, which self-efficacy is an intervening variable, both directly and through their influence by its association with other variables (Segal, Borgia, and Schoenfeld, 2005; Zhao *et al.*, 2005). Some authors have found higher levels of entrepreneurial self-efficacy in men compared with women (Chen, Greene, and Crick, 1998; Scherer, Brodzinski, and Wiebe, 1990).

Litt (1988) finds that self-efficacy expectations affect performance beyond what would have been expected from past performance alone. In a study on Leadership Self-efficacy and Managerial Job Performance in Nigerian Commercial Banks Shehu *et al.*, (2012) showed that leadership self efficacy is related to managerial job performance. This study measures the multi dimensionality of managerial job performance and leadership self efficacy and the relationship was found to be significant.

Where as, in an Indian study on the role of self efficacy and gender differences among adolescents no significant difference was seen in adolescent studying in Government colleges of Chandigarh (Rajesh & Roshan, 2006). In another Indian study on Occupational self efficacy of Government and Private sector Executives Nita Gupta & Esha Sawhney (2010) ,concluded that government and private sector executives perceive their occupational self-efficacies quite differently. The result of the present study showed that private executives have better perceived self-efficacies and hence uplifting their organizations.

In light of the above literature and research studies following objectives were framed to ascertain the role of self efficacy on managers

OBJECTIVES

1. To study the differences in self efficacy of managers working in business schools & Corporate
2. To find out the genders differences in self efficacy of these managers
3. To see the effect of length of service on self efficacy of these managers

HYPOTHESES :

Based on the above objectives the following hypotheses were formulated for empirical testing:-

1. There is no significant difference in self efficacy of managers in business schools & corporate.
2. There is no significant difference between male & female managers
3. There is no effect of length of service on self efficacy of these managers.

SAMPLE

The study was conducted on 200 managers working in business schools & corporate .This sample of 200 mangers was divided on the basis of their organizations they are working in, their gender and length of service .All the participants are the one holding master's degree in management, commerce or IT with minimum four years of experience in managerial capacity. The corporate managers were taken firms like P&G, L.G, Samsung, Tata Motors, etc and business school manager from universities like Subharti, Amity, Venkateshwara etc. from Meerut and NCR.

TOOLS FOR DATA COLLECTION

- 1 Self devised inventory for demographic details .
- 2 Generalized Perceived self efficacy scale. Jerusalem and Schwarzer originally developed the German version of this scale in1981, first as a 20-item version and later as a reduced 10-item version (Jerusalem & Schwarzer, 1992). The scale consists of 10-items and four responses / choices were provided for each item. It has been used in numerous research projects, where it typically yielded internal consistencies between alpha=.75 and .91. This scale is not only parsimonious and reliable; it has also proven valid in terms of convergent and discriminate validity.

Result & Discussion**Table 1.** Means, SD's and t values for self efficacy scores of managers in Business schools &Corporate.

	Org	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig
SE	BS	100	26.82	6.658	3.698	P<0.01
	Corporate	100	23.65	5.400		

Table 2. Means, SD's and t values for self efficacy scores of managers(Male& Female)

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	sig.
SE	Male	100	27.17	5.876	4.593	P<0.01
	Female	100	23.30	6.039		

Table 3. Comparison of Length of service & Self Efficacy levels of managers

			Self Efficacy			Total
			HSE	ASE	LSE	
Length of service 0-6	Count	37	29	16	82	
	Expected Count	31.6	33.6	16.8	82.0	
7-12	Count	22	28	15	65	
	Expected Count	25.0	26.7	13.3	65.0	
+12	Count	18	25	10	53	
	Expected Count	20.4	21.7	10.9	53.0	
Total	Count	77	82	41	200	
	Expected Count	77.0	82.0	41.0	200.0	

$$\chi^2=3.097; df=4;p=N.S$$

Research has found that self-efficacy is important for sustaining the considerable effort required to master skills involved in, for instance, public speaking, and losing weight, achieving merit in sports or becoming an effective manager. People are inclined to become anxious and/or depressed when they perceive themselves as unable to manage aversive events or gain what they value highly. Thus, self-efficacy is also related to the experience of stress and occupational burnout. Specifically, low self-efficacy can readily lead to a sense of helplessness and hopelessness about one's capability to learn how to cope more effectively with the challenges and demands of one's work. When this occurs, low self-efficacy can be distressing and depressing, thereby preventing even highly talented individuals from performing effectively.

Organizations need to identify key abilities of employees that will lead to success, and employees need to have certain abilities that will make them a valuable addition to an organization. Finally, managers need to understand what abilities will lead to a good fit with certain employee. As globalization spreads, more foreign firms are entering Indian market and the challenge before domestic firms is going to be much more severe in the years to come. The corporate or business schools are operating in vast sheltered markets, International careers and expatriates are becoming common, International experiences is becoming a pre-requisite for career progression to many top-level managerial positions, making the task of managers more challenging.

It is evident from table no.1 that managers working in business schools and corporate significantly differ in their perceived self efficacy, business school managers scored significantly higher self efficacy scores than corporate managers identifying themselves to strive and improve their assumptions and strategies when learning complex tasks particularly, when they are under time pressures. This doesn't mean that managers in corporate sector are not eager to learn and perform a complex tasks but as compared to business schools managers their scores on self efficacy shows them to react more defensively when they receive negative feedback in the organizations. This result may give another direction to the study as self efficacy is also related to the experience of stress and occupational burnout (Bandura,2004). Low self efficacy level lead to a sense of helplessness and hopelessness in term of coping behavior and demands on one's work. Bandura was one of the first to take a positive, strengths-based approach when he posed that self efficacy can play a protective role in dealing with psychological problems and, further, emphasized enablement factors that help people, "to select and structure their environments in ways that set a successful course". Thus managers of business schools can now be identified as managers with high intrinsic motivation, developing quality circles and self managed work teams, eliminating management layers and establishing cross – functional teams in their respective organizations

Table no.2 clearly rules out for gender differences in self efficacy of business school and corporate managers. Male managers scored significantly higher self efficacy scores than female managers. This may be due to more risk taking behaviours, and outsourcing activities on part of male managers than their female counterparts. Thus, gender was found to be a factor contributing to the disparity between men and women in self efficacy levels with respect to career interests, career preferences and ultimately career oriented behaviours. These findings are consistent with previous research on adults that indicates that women are more likely than men to limit their ultimate career choices because of their lack of confidence in their abilities (Bandura 1992).

Finally, length of service did not come out to be a predictor of self efficacy in the managers of business school and corporate. Table no.3 shows managers can not afford to adopt a trial and error

approach by making their choice in decision making on seniority basis their work experience or working years did not seem to have effect on their self efficacy.

This study once again ruled out that there is a wide gap between the tradition values of life and outlook of people in this age of globalization, technology and industrial environment. Basically the human organism is ill-equipped physiologically and psychologically to cope with the physical and social change everywhere in the world especially due to emerging corporate culture in personal and as well as working lives. Still, he has obstacles to overcome, deficiencies to be supplied and choices to be made, in term of the traditional values of life, sentiment, emotions and basic relations to other living beings. This study suggests a more deeper an elaborative study with other psychological variables on these managers in a greater number.

References

1. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
2. Bandura, A., "Social cognitive theory of self-regulation", *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 50, 1991, pp. 248-87.
3. Bernard, L.C., Hutchison, S., Lavin A. & Pennington P. (2000) Ego – strength, hardiness, self – esteem, self – efficacy optimism & maladjustment: Health related personality constructs & the Big Five Model of personality. *Assessment Reso. Inc. US*; 3: 115-131.
4. Chen, C. C., Green, P. G. and Crick, A., 1998. Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.
5. De Noble, A., Jung, D. and Ehrlich, S., 1999. *Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The development of a measure and its relationship to entrepreneurial action*. Paper presented at the Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, Waltham, MA.
6. Gil-Monte, P., García-Jueas, J. and Caro-Hernández, M., 2006. Influencia de lasobrecarga laboral y la autoeficacia sobre el síndrome de quemarse por el trabajo (burnout) enprofesionales de enfermería. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 42(1), 227-232.
7. Jerusalem, M., & Schwarcer, R. (1992). Selfefficacy as a resource factor in stress appraisal process. In R. Schwarcer (Ed.), *Self-efficacy: Thought control of action* (pp 195-211). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.
8. Gupta,N., & Sawhney,E.,2010,nternationalReferredResearchJournal ISSN- 0975-3486 VOL,I ISSUE-9 RNI: RAJBIL /2009/30097
9. K.Aswathappa,2005,Human Resource and Personnel Management,Tata Mc Graw-Hill, New Delhi.
10. Litt, M.D. (1988). Self-Efficacy and perceived control: Cognitive mediators of pain tolerance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 149-160.
11. Markman, G.D., Balkin D.B. and Baron R.A., 2002. Inventors and New Venture Formation: The Effect of General Self-Efficacy and Regretful Thinking. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 149-165.

12. Mishra ,V(2004).Understanding creativity in organizational setting :A Qualitative study .*Journal of personality &clinical studies* ,20,125-138.
13. Moriano, J. A., Palací, F. J. and Morales, J. F., 2006. Adaptación y validación en España de la escala de Autoeficacia emprendedora. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 21(1).
14. Luthans ,F.&Suzanne ,J.Employee engagement and manger self efficacy . *Journal of Management Development* ,July2001,21,5.
15. Rajesh,K.,Roshan,L.,2006.Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology July 2006, Vol. 32, No. 3, 249-254.
16. Scherer, R., Brodzinski, J. and Wiebe, F., 1990. Entrepreneur career selection and gender: a socialization approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, Abril, pp. 37-44
17. Segal,G., Borgia, D. and Schoenfeld, J., 2005. The motivation to become an entrepreneur. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour y Research*, Vol. 11. (1)
18. Shehu Inuwa Galoji*, Fais Ahmad, Husna Johari .,2012.,Leadership Self-efficacy and Managerial Job Performance in Nigerian Commercial Banks American Journal of Economics June 2012, Special Issue: 116-119 DOI: 10.5923/j.economics.20120001.26
19. Stajkovic, A. D. and Luthans, F., 1998. Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 240-261.
20. V.S.P.Rao,2010,Human Resource Management,Excel Books, New Delhi.