A comparative study on self efficacy among volleyball and basketball players

Dr Raghavendra.K Physical Education Director Govt First Grade College Ranebennur

Abstract

The objective of the study was to compare self-efficacy among Volleyball Players and Basketball Players. For this study 40 subject in which 20 Volleyball Players and 20 Basketball Players. The age group of samples ranged from 18 - 25 Years. All the samples selected on random basis. The selected samples from Akal College of Physical Education and Sports Authority of India Centre Mastuana Sahib, Sangrur, (Punjab) to measure Self Efficacy between Volleyball and Basketball Players. To assess self- efficacy level of selected subjects, Self-Efficacy Inventory prepared by A.S. & Noonan was used. This inventory is high reliable and valid to measure the Self Efficacy of selected samples. To compare the Self Efficacy level of selected samples, 't'- test was used. Result of the study have found that Self Efficacy of Basketball Players have better as compare Volleyball Players.

Keywords: Self-efficacy, volleyball players, basketball players etc.

Introduction

The psychological theory of self-efficacy grew out of the research of **Albert Bandura**. He noticed that there was a mechanism that played a huge role in people's lives that, up to that point, hadn't really been defined or systematically observed. This mechanism was the belief that people have in their ability to influence the events of their own lives.

Bandura proposed that perceived self-efficacy influences what coping behavior is initiated when an individual is met with stress and challenges, along with determining how much effort will be expended to reach one's goals and for how long those goals will be pursued (1999). He posited that self-efficacy is a self-sustaining trait; when a person is driven to work through their problems on their own terms, they gain positive experiences that in turn boost their self- efficacy even more.

Self-efficacy is the belief we have in our own abilities, specifically our ability to meet the challenges ahead of us and complete a task successfully (Akhtar, 2008). General self-efficacy refers to our overall belief in our ability to succeed, but there are many more specific forms of self-efficacy as well (e.g., academic, parenting, sports).

Although self-efficacy is related to our sense of self-worth or value as a human being, there is at least one important distinction. Self-esteem is conceptualized as a sort of general or overall feeling of one's worth or value (Neill, 2005). While self is focused more on "being" (e.g., feeling that you are perfectly acceptable as you are), self-efficacy is more focused on "doing" (e.g., feeling that you are up to a challenge).

High self-worth can definitely improve one's sense of self-efficacy, as high self-efficacy can contribute to one's sense of overall value or worth, but the two stands as separate constructs. Since self-efficacy is related to the concept of self-control and the ability to modulate your behavior to reach your goals, it can sometimes be confused with self-regulation. They are related, but still separate concepts. Self-regulation refers to individual's "self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are systematically designed to affect one's learning" (Schunk & Zimmerman, 2007), while self-efficacy is a concept more closely related to an individual's perceived abilities. In other words, self-regulation is more of a strategy for achieving one's goals, especially in relation to learning, while self-efficacy is the belief that he or she can succeed.

International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health

Similarly, although self-efficacy and motivation are deeply entwined, they are also two separate constructs. Self-efficacy is based on an individual's belief in their own capacity to achieve, while motivation is based on the individual's desire to achieve. Clearly, those with high self-efficacy likely have high motivation and vice versa, but it is not a foregone conclusion.

Still, it is true that when an individual gains or maintains self- efficacy through the experience of success—however small— they generally get a boost in motivation to continue learning and making progress (Mayer, 2010). The relationship can also work in the other direction to create a sort of success cycle; when an individual is highly motivated to learn and succeed, they are more likely to achieve their goals, giving them an experience that contributes to their overall self-efficacy. It's relatively easy to spot because those with high self-efficacy tend to be those who achieve, accomplish, and succeed more often than others. High self-efficacy can manifest as one or more of the following traits and behaviors, among others:

- A student who is not particularly gifted in a certain subject but believes in her own ability to learn it well.
- A man who has had bad luck with relationships so far, but retains a positive outlook on his ability to connect with his upcoming date.

- An expectant mother who is nervous about caring for a new baby, but believes that she has what it takes to succeed, no matter how difficult or scary it is.
- A new graduate who takes a high-profile, high-status job that she has never done before, but that she feels she can succeed in.
- An entrepreneur who pours his heart and soul into establishing his business, but quickly moves on to his next great idea when his business is hit with an insurmountable and unexpected challenge.

Methodology

The subject for the study 40 players in which 20 Volleyball Players and 20 Basketball Players, selected from A.C.P.E. and

S.A.I. Centre Mastuana Sahib Sangrur, Punjab. The age group of sample ranged from 18-25 Years. To measure self efficacy level, Self Efficacy Inventory prepared by A.S. & Noonan was used. This inventory is highly reliable and valid to measure the Self Efficacy, of selected samples, and to compare both the group't'- test was used.

Results:

The raw data of selected subject of Self Efficacy was subject to appropriate statistical and the results of both group presented in the table no. 1:

Table 1: Mean Difference of Positive Self Efficacy of Volleyball and Basketball Players

Group	N	Mea	S.D	M.D.	't'
		n	•		
Volleyball Players	20	19.5	8.9 6	3	5.74*
Basketball Players	20	22.5	10. 5		

^{&#}x27;t' at 0.05 = 2.02

From table no.1; results found that Basketball Players have shown high positive self efficacy (M=22.5, SD=10.5) as compare to Volleyball Players (M=19.5, SD=8.96). The calculated value of 't' is 5.74 which is greater than the tabulated value; so that there is high significance difference has been found at 0.05 level.

Table 2: Mean Difference of Negative Self Efficacy of Volleyball and Basketball Players

Group	N	Mean	S.D	M.D.	't'
			•		
Volleyball Players	20	9.25	3.3 8	3.35	2.94*
Basketball Players	20	12.6	7.8 0		

^{&#}x27;t' at 0.05 = 2.02

From table no.2; results found that Volleyball Players have shown low negative self-efficacy level (M=9.25, SD=3.38) as compare to Basketball Players (M=12.6, SD=7.80). The calculated value of 't' is 2.94 which is greater than the tabulated value, so that there is significance difference has been found at 0.05 level.

Conclusion

It is concluded that Basketball Players have shown better Self Efficacy level as compare to Volleyball Players.

References

- 1. Bandura A. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 2. Bandura A. Self-efficacy mechanism in physiological activation and health-promoting behavior. In J Madden, IV (Ed.), Neurobiology of learning, emotion and affect New York: Raven, 1991, 229-270.
- 3. Lent RW, Hackett G. Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1987; 30:347-382.
- 4. Maddux JE, Stanley MA. (Eds.) Special issue on self- efficacy theory. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,
- 5. Schunk DH. Self-efficacy and cognitive skill learning. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), Research on motivation in education. Goals and cognitions. 1989; 3:13-44.
- 6. Schwarzer R. (Ed.). Self-efficacy: Thought control of action. Washington, DC: Hemisphere, 1992.
- 7. White J. Rejection. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley- Wood, R. E., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. Academy of Management Review. 1982; 14:361-384.