



SELF EFFICACY OF EMPLOYEES IN PUBLIC SECTOR ENTERPRISES WITH REFERENCE TO SALEM STEEL PLANT

Dr.N.Brindha* P.Chelladurai**

*Assistant Professor, College of Business, University of Buraimi, Sultanate of Oman.

**Entrepreneur, Salem, India.

Abstract

Virtually all people can identify goals they want to accomplish, things they would like to change, and things they would like to achieve. The employees in public sector might have the difference with private sector employees. This thought enhances this study to be conducted in Salem Steel Plant. The objective of this descriptive study proceeded with the identification of level of self-efficacy of employees, the relationship between the level of self-efficacy and the democratic variables and the factors affecting the self-efficacy of the employees. The questionnaire made with four main variables given by Albert Bandura Mastery experiences, psychological state, Social persuasion, and self-modelling. Four hundred employees were taken for the study through convenient sampling. The findings identified that employees are very often or almost very often according to their situation they are utilizing these variables. Only few democratic variables are positively related to the self-efficacy.

INTRODUCTION

Human life is the combination of too many characteristics of their personality. The inner drive leads them to travel with their needs and wants and attain their desired destiny. Virtually all people can identify goals they want to accomplish, things they would like to change, and things they would like to achieve. However, most people also realize that putting these plans into action is not quite so simple. Bandura and others have found that an individual's self-efficacy plays a major role in how goals, tasks, and challenges are approached.

According to Albert Bandura, self-efficacy is "the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations." In other words, self-efficacy is a person's belief in his or her ability to succeed in a particular situation. Bandura described these beliefs as determinants of how people think, behave, and feel (1995).

Since Bandura published his seminal 1977 paper, "Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral Change," the subject has become one of the most studied topics in psychology. Why has self-efficacy become such an important topic among psychologists and educators? As Bandura and other researchers have demonstrated, self-efficacy can have an impact on everything from psychological states to behavior to motivation.

SOURCES OF SELF-EFFICACY

Bandura (1997a)⁶ identified four sources of information that affects self-efficacy:

Mastery Experiences

Mastery experience is our personal past life experience with success or failure.

Vicarious Experiences – Self Modelling

Self-efficacy can be affected by observing the experiences of others. The learners can imitate their skills or copy the strategies that they're using.

Verbal Persuasion – Social Persuasion

Employing verbal feedback to convince or encourage the learners to accomplish the tasks. Bandura pointed out that negative messages have an even greater influence on lowering efficacy expectations than positive messages do on increasing efficacy.

Physiological State

Anxiety, nervousness, rapid heart rate, sweating...when these symptoms occur, you're probably facing a big challenge that requires your competence to conquer it. These physical symptoms or mental states reflect the learners' perception of their self-efficacy and they affect their performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the past five decades the researchers have written so many conceptual models and ideas on self-efficacy. Here the implications of Bandura have taken in account in series of his research. Self-efficacy theory can be applied for work related performance in terms of motivating different employee related facts as well as organizational pursuits (Bandura (1977))¹. In the meta-analysis which analyses the individual research findings which pertain to the relationship between self-efficacy,

employee motivation and work related performance of the employee. Staffself-efficacy is the perception of his or her ability to perform required professional tasks and to regulate relations involved in the process of teaching and educating students and perform organizational tasks, become part of the organization and its political and social processes (Bandura (1982))². Self-efficacy also affects employee's level of effort and persistence when learning difficult tasks (Bandura (1986))³. In case of training, what trainees believe they know about a training programs reputation may have more of an influence on what they get out of the training program than many other variables including managerial support, self-efficacy and pre training motivation (Bandura (1982))². Ethical leadership was positively and significantly related to employee performance as rated by their immediate supervisors and it was fully mediated by leader-member exchange, self-efficacy and organizational identification controlling for procedural fairness (Bandura (1986))³. Self efficacy of change negatively relates to job stress, and supports the general notion that self-efficacy will effect job stress (Bandura (1997a))⁶. Self-efficacy of individuals and high individualism in the national culture are desirable characteristics worthy of being nurtured and honoured (Bandura (1997b))⁷. Coaching and self-efficacy both had a significant positive effect on the level of entrepreneurial behaviour. This coaching attention is particularly devoted to the reduction of role conflicts in relation to being entrepreneurial and accountable for efficiency and effectiveness (Bandura (1995))⁵. These studies drive the intension of researcher to handle the research in public sector regarding the self efficacy of the employees.

SUMMARY

The company "Salem Steel Limited" was registered on October 25, 1972. It was a Government of India undertaking and subsidiary of SAIL. It posted its productivity with the vision of 'To be a respected world Class Corporation and the leader in Indian steel business in quality, productivity, profitability and customer satisfaction'. The Plant has around 1344 employees on its pay roll and most of them are with good educational and training background. In the main production department alone considered for the research. The study concise with main production based employees. It was counted those 780 employees. Almost the fifty percentage employees were taken for the study with simple random sampling. The data collected through the structured questionnaire. Since all the employees are educated and trained they were interested to see the research questionnaire and made their entry. Only the limitation was they could not make good time in between their work.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To find out the level of self-efficacy among the employees in Salem Steel Plant (SAIL) in the aspects of Bandura's four features.
- To know the relationship between self-efficacy variables and democratic variables of employees.
- To identify the influencing factors of self-efficacy among employees of Salem steel plant (SAIL).

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

SAIL has the history of around 43 years and the respondents in the production are mostly in the age of 41 to 50 yrs. It seems that experienced employees are handling production. Regarding educational qualification the basic education was ITI or any other technical qualification related to machinery handling. More than one third employees are experienced more than a decade. Their salary scale was decent.

The features of Bandura's self-efficacy are mastery experience, psychological state, social persuasion, and self-modelling. These were measured with the structured questionnaire and the level of self-efficacy identified with five point scale. All the features are measured with weighed mean and identified with maximum scale with around 3.5 to 4 points. Which implies their self-efficacy level is invariably high. (Table 1).

In case of demographic variables, age factor of the respondents is not correlated with the self-efficacy variables. Their Educational qualification and designation is positively related with socialmodelling. (Table 2,3,4 and 5).All the taken demographic variables are positively increasing the self-efficacy of the employees.

Here the study of Bandura (1997a)⁶ 'People's beliefs in their efficacy are developed by four main sources of influence. They include mastery experiences, seeing people similar to oneself manage task demands successfully, social persuasion that one has the capabilities to succeed in given activities, and inferences from somatic and emotional states indicative of personal strengths and vulnerabilities' is identified in Salem Steel Plant.

CONCLUSION

Business in competitive markets is very difficult to run. Every organization has must to know the employees proficiency and level of self-efficacy to uphold their product into a successful way. The organization is fully responsible for improving

employee's level of self-efficacy for their relatively escalating career development. In SAIL, the research identified that their employees are high in self efficacy and the demographic variables are positively connected with their self-efficacy.

REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman.
2. Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37, 122–147.
3. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
4. Bandura, A. (1989, September). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 44, 1175–1184.
5. Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University.
6. Bandura, A. (1997a, March). Insight.Self-efficacy. *Harvard Mental Health Letter*, 13(9), 4–6.
7. Bandura, A. (1997b). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. 15

TABLE-1,WEIGHTED MEAN OF SELF-EFFICACY VARIABLES

S. No	Variable	Score	Scale
1	Mastery Experience	4.4	Very often
2	Psychological State	4.07	Very often
3	Social Persuasion	4.37	Very often
4	Self Modeling	4.23	Very often

TABLE -2,RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND SELF-EFFICACY VARIABLES

H₀: There is no association between Age and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and Self-modelling.

H₁: There is an association between Age and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and self-modelling.

		Age	Mastery Experience	Psychological State	Social Persuasion	Self modelling
Age	Pearson Correlation	1	-.090	-.029	.118	.042
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.373	.775	.241	.680
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Mastery Experience	Pearson Correlation	-.090	1	.756**	.626**	.646**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.373		.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Psychological State	Pearson Correlation	-.029	.756**	1	.628**	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.775	.000		.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Social Persuasion	Pearson Correlation	.118	.626**	.628**	1	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.241	.000	.000		.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Self modelling	Pearson Correlation	.042	.646**	.696**	.600**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.680	.000	.000	.000	
	N	100	100	100	100	100

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

TABLE – 3, RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN QUALIFICATION AND SELF-EFFICACY VARIABLES

H₀: There is no association between Qualification and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and self-modelling.

H₁: There is an association between Qualification and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and self-modelling.

		Qualification	Mastery Experience	Psychological state	Social Persuasion	Self modeling
Qualification	Pearson Correlation	1	.098	.033	.095	.200*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.333	.744	.347	.046
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Mastery Experience	Pearson Correlation	.098	1	.756**	.626**	.646**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.333		.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Psychological state	Pearson Correlation	.033	.756**	1	.628**	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.744	.000		.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Social Persuasion	Pearson Correlation	.095	.626**	.628**	1	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.347	.000	.000		.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Self modeling	Pearson Correlation	.200*	.646**	.696**	.600**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.000	.000	.000	
	N	100	100	100	100	100
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

TABLE – 4, RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DESIGNATION AND SELF-EFFICACY VARIABLES

H₀: There is no association between Designation and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and self-modelling.

H₁: There is an association between Designation and Self efficacy variables Mastery experience, Psychological state, Social Persuasion and self-modelling.

		Designation	Mastery Experience	Psychological state	Social Persuasion	Self modeling
Designation	Pearson Correlation	1	.095	.177	.117	.218*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.345	.079	.247	.030
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Mastery Experience	Pearson Correlation	.095	1	.756**	.626**	.646**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.345		.000	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Psychological state	Pearson Correlation	.177	.756**	1	.628**	.696**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.000		.000	.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Social Persuasion	Pearson Correlation	.117	.626**	.628**	1	.600**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.247	.000	.000		.000
	N	100	100	100	100	100
Social modeling	Pearson Correlation	.218*	.646**	.696**	.600**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	.000	.000	.000	
	N	100	100	100	100	100
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).						
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).						

TABLE – 5, REGRESSION ANALYSIS BETWEEN DEMOCRATIC VARIABLES AND SELF-EFFICACY

H₀: The independent variables Age, Qualification, Department, Designation, Experience and Salary are does not affecting Self efficacy of the respondents.

H₁: The independent variables Age, Qualification, Department, Designation, Experience and Salary are affecting Self efficacy of the respondents.

Model	R	R Square
1	.292 ^a	.085
a. Predictors: (Constant), Salary, Department, Qualification, Designation, Experience, Age		

ANOVA						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.694	6	.616	1.448	.205 ^b
	Residual	39.540	93	.425		
	Total	43.234	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Self efficacy						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Salary, Department, Qualification, Designation, Experience, Age						

Co efficient						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.400	.361		3.873	.000
	Age	.178	.127	.240	1.406	.163
	Qualification	.059	.049	.133	1.193	.236
	Experience	-.040	.110	-.057	-.358	.721
	Department	.036	.070	.056	.516	.607
	Designation	.121	.081	.183	1.487	.140
	Salary	-.153	.089	-.210	-1.718	.089
a. Dependent Variable: Self efficacy						

Self-efficacy= Age+ Qualification+ Department+ Designation+ Experience+ Salary

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all we are thankful to Salem Steel plant, for the permission to make out the study possible one. We thank the officials and the employees for the support to complete the study in time.

We are also grateful to the University of Buraimi and our Dean of Management Studies for the encouragement towards the research and publications. Thus their support has been essential to enrich my career record.

Nevertheless, we express our gratitude toward our families and friends for their kind co-operation and encouragement which help us in completion of this research.

Dr.N.Brindha & P.Chelladurai