

## Hardiness and Self-efficacy among University Students Studying in Madhya Pradesh



### Psychology

**KEYWORDS:** Hardiness, Self-efficacy, Control, Commitment, Challenge.

**Ansarullah Tantry**

Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Barkatullah University, Bhopal (M.P).

**Dr. Anita Puri Singh**

Head, Department of Psychology, Govt. MLB Girls PG Autonomous College, Bhopal (M.P)

### ABSTRACT

This co-relational study examines the relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy among 100 university students studying in Madhya Pradesh. The sample was selected on purposive basis. These dimensions with reference to demographic factors are included for analyses and their relationships with the levels of self-efficacy measured by Jerusalem & Schwarzer's General Self-efficacy Scale (1995) and hardiness measured by Bartone's Dispositional Resilience Scale (DRS-15) (1995) are investigated. In addition, possible socio-economic status and gender differences in the pattern of associations are explored. The data were compiled using self-administered questionnaires, and the collected data were processed and interpreted using comparative statistics (t-test & ANOVA) and correlation analyses. The results indicate that there is a significant positive and meaningful correlation between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students. The results also showed that there is a significant difference in the levels of self-efficacy between male & female students. In contrast, there is no significant difference in the levels of hardiness between male and female students. Moreover, no significant difference in hardiness and self-efficacy is found among the students with different socio-economic status.

### INTRODUCTION

**Hardiness:** Different people have different coping power and resistance for psychological distresses and other obstacles in life. This resistance against stress is known as hardiness. Therefore, the level of hardiness varies across people (Ansarullah & Anita, 2016). To be described as hardy means to be strong and tolerant of stressful situations. According to the Oxford Dictionary, "Hardiness is the ability to endure difficult conditions". While as "English Collins Dictionary" states Hardiness as "the condition or quality of being hardy, robust or bold".

The construct of hardiness was first introduced by Kobasa (1979), who defined it as a resistance resource in the encounter with stressful situations. Maddi and Kobasa (1984), believe that the foundation of an individual's ability to successfully cope with stress and remain healthy is personality style, which they termed "Hardiness". Psychologically "hardy" individuals have a different view of themselves and of the world. Moreover, according to Kobasa (1979), Hardiness is defined in terms of more specific dimensions of control, commitment and challenge characteristics that may influence both cognitive appraisal and behavior in response to stressful events. Higher control reflects the belief that persons can exert an influence on their surroundings, such persons feel that they have the power to turn an unfortunate situation into an advantageous one. Higher commitment is defined in terms of an individual's full engagement in activities and strongly committed people have a sense of purpose and self-understanding, allowing them to uncover meaning in which they are and value in, such persons seem to perform in cheerful and effortless manner. Highly challenged individuals believe that change rather than stability characterizes life. Such persons anticipate change as affording them an opportunity for further development.

**Self-efficacy:** According to Bandura (1977), Self efficacy is a person's evaluation of his or her ability or competency to perform a task, reach a goal, or overcome an obstacle. Similarly, Nebitt (2009) defined Self efficacy is a person's ability to take knowledge and skill and then change it into a positive coping strategy. Self-efficacy can have an impact on everything from psychological states to behavior and to motivation. Self-efficacy beliefs are defined as an individual's "judgments about his or her capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated performances" (Bandura, 1986). Researchers have created strong support for the effect of self-efficacy on the career decision-making process of individuals since the distinctive study conducted by Betz and Hackett (1981), which tried to explain the notion of career-related self-efficacy (Multon, Brown, and Lent, 1991). A sense of personal control whether generally true of one's life or true with respect to specific goals, plays an important self regulatory role in helping

people plan and make progress towards their future. Performance in both physical (Courneya and McCauley, 1993 & Gould and Weiss, 1981) and academic (Sanna and Pusecker, 1994) task performance on the job (Huang, 1998), and ability to deal with anxiety and depression (Cheung and sun, 2000) is enhanced by strong feelings of self-efficacy. Unless people believe that they are able to achieve a goal (such as giving up drugs) as the result of what they do, they have little all no incentive to act (Bandura 1999). People high in such self confidence also tend to stop working on unsolvable tasks more quickly than those who are low instead; they prefer to allocate their time and effort to tasks that can be solved (Aspin wall and Richter, 1999).

### Objectives

- 1) To study hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in M.P.
- 2) To study the relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy in university students studying in M.P.
- 3) To study the significance of difference in hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in M.P with reference to their gender, and socio-economic status.

### Hypotheses

- 1) There is no significant relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in M.P.
- 2) There is no significance of difference in hardiness among university students with reference to their gender and socio-economic status.
- 3) There is no significance of difference in self-efficacy among university students with reference to their gender and socio-economic status.

### METHODOLOGY

**Design:** A structured questionnaire was distributed to a purposively selected sample of 100 university students studying in M.P. The sample was compared with reference to some demographic variables including socio-economic status and gender. The distribution corresponds to the distribution on campus with 50% females and 50% males. The questionnaire consisted of structured questions. The data collected from the sample was analysed by various statistical techniques such as Mean, SD, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson Correlation with the help of SPSS.

The present study is a co-relational and descriptive study. Only the data collected from the university students studying in M.P. were included in current study.

**Sample:** The research consists of 100 university students studying in M.P. (50 males and 50 females), who were selected by purposive

sampling.

**Inclusive Criteria:** The university students studying in M .P. **Exclusive Criteria:** They students of M. P. studying outside of their State.

**Statistical Techniques:** For achieving the desired objectives, the collected data will be analysed by using the following statistical techniques: Descriptive statistics such as Mean, SD etc. shall be used in order to make raw data tangible. Pearson's product moment correlation shall be used to measure the relationship between different variables. T-test & ANOVA shall also be applied to assess the difference between different variables.

**Tool Description:** The following standard tools shall be administered to gather the information from the participants for the present study:

**General Self-efficacy Scale:** General Self-Efficacy scale developed by Matthias Jerusalem and Ralf Schwarzer 1995. The usually is self administered, it consists of 10 items. Items had a response range from 1 (not at all true) to 4 (exactly true). The internal consistency of this scale ranges from .76 to .90.

**The Dispositional Resilience Scale (DRS-15):** Hardiness was measured using the 15-item scale developed by Bartone (1995) consisting of three dimensions including commitment, control and challenge. For this instrument participants respond on a 4-point scale indicating the level at which each of the 15 statements apply to them as follows: 0 (not at all true); 1 (a little true); 2 (quite true); & 3 (completely true). Scores are obtained by reverse coding the appropriate and summing items for each dimension. The overall hardiness score is obtained by summing all 15 items.

**Operation Definitions of the Variables**

**Hardiness:** According to Maddi (1990), "Hardiness refers to a personality trait that indicates the manner in which a person might interpret a critical incident, life stress, or traumatic event".

In the present study hardiness means the scores obtained by subjects on the Dispositional Resilience Scale (DRS-15) developed by Bartone (1995).

**Self-efficacy:** According to Bandura (1977), "Self -efficacy is a person's evaluation of his or her ability or competency to perform a task, reach a goal, or overcome an obstacle". Self-efficacy can have an impact on everything from psychological states to behavior and to motivation. Self-efficacy beliefs are defined as an individual's "judgments about his or her capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated performances".

In the present study self-efficacy will mean the scores obtained by subjects on General Self-Efficacy scale developed by Matthias Jerusalem and Ralf Schwarzer.

**RESULTS: Table 1: Shows correlation between hardiness and Self-efficacy among university students studying in M. P.**

**Correlations**

		Hardiness	Self-efficacy
Hardiness	Pearson Correlation	1	.470**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	100	100
Selfefficacy	Pearson Correlation	.470**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	100	100

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

Table 4.3 shows that the relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in M. P. is significant (N =

100, p = .000 < .01). There is a positive correlation (r = .470) which is fair and it is highly significant at the .01 level of significance (2-tailed). It can be concluded that the university students studying in M. P. who have higher levels of hardiness are inclined to report higher levels of self-efficacy. Hence, our null hypothesis, "there is no significant relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in M. P." is rejected.

**Table 2: Showing means difference of hardiness and self-efficacy between male and female subjects.**

Gender	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Hardiness	Male	43.88	4.736	.505	98	.615 <sup>NS</sup>
	Female	43.32	6.258			
Self-efficacy	Male	28.50	3.996	-2.077	98	.040*
	Female	30.32	4.736			

\*Significant difference at 0.05 level of significance.

<sup>NS</sup> =Not significant.

The results presented in the above table reveal the t-value of the mean scores of hardiness and self-efficacy with reference to gender.

There is no significant difference in the levels of hardiness between male and female university students. The mean level of hardiness in the females was 43.32 (SD=6.258), and the mean for males was 43.88 (SD = 4.736); t (98) = .505. Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in hardiness between male and female university students" is accepted. In contrast, females have higher levels of self-efficacy (N = 50, M = 30.32, SD = 4.756) than males (N = 50, Mean = 28.50, SD = 3.996); (t = -2.077, df = 98, p < .05, two-tailed). Therefore, there is a significant difference in the levels of self-efficacy between male and female university students studying in M.P. Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in self-efficacy between male and female university students studying in M.P." is rejected.

**Table 3: Showing ANOVA of hardiness and self-efficacy with socio-economic status of university students studying in M.P.**

		df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hardiness	Between Groups	2	87.069	2.961	.056 <sup>NS</sup>
	Within Groups	97	29.401		
	Total	99			
Self-efficacy	Between Groups	2	54.167	2.831	.064 <sup>NS</sup>
	Within Groups	97	19.133		
	Total	99			

<sup>NS</sup> =Not significant.

The results presented in table 3 reveal the F -value of psychological hardiness and self-efficacy among the people with different socio-economic status. In psychological hardiness the means for the lower, middle, and upper socio-economic groups are 42.12, 44.35, and 41.00 respectively, F(2, 97) = 2.961. There is no significant difference in psychological hardiness among the people with different socio-economic status. Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in psychological hardiness among the students with different socio-economic status." is accepted. Moreover, in self-efficacy the means for the lower, middle, and upper socio-economic groups are 26.12, 29.51, and 30.53 respectively, F (2, 97) = 2.831. There is no significant difference in self-efficacy among the people with different socio-economic status. Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in self-efficacy among the students with different socio-economic status." is accepted.

**Discussion:** Hardiness is the ability of an individual to combat stress. In contrast, stress is a negative emotional experience accompanied by predictable biochemical, physiological, cognitive, and behavioral changes that are directed toward altering the stressful event or accommodating to its effects (Baum, A., 1990). The main aim of this study was to assess the level of hardiness and self-efficacy in university students studying in Madhya Pradesh. The first hypothesis

of the study was that there would be no significant relationship between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students studying in Madhya Pradesh. To check this relationship correlation analysis was used. The result of present study showed that there is a significant positive and meaningful correlation between hardiness and self-efficacy among university students. So the result does not support the study hypothesis. This result is consistent with Abass Shekarey et al. (2010); Kazem et al. (2013). There is no single study that produced the opposite results that there is positive relation between hardiness and self-efficacy. The reason may be that variables, hardiness and self-efficacy are positive characteristics of personality. So these constructs produced positive and meaningful results in almost every condition.

First major part of the second hypothesis of the present study was that there would be no significance of difference in hardiness among university students with reference to their gender. To check this difference t-test was used. The result of the present study showed that there is no significant difference in hardiness between male and female university students. So the hypothesis is accepted. This result is similar with other studies such as Jaya Jotwani (2016); Kazem (2013); Rhodewalt & Agustsdottir (1984); Soderstrom, M.; Dolbier, C.; Leiferman, J.; and Mary Steinhart (2000) and Shepperd, J. A. & Kshani, J. H. (1991). While on the other hand the study conducted by Jagpreet Kaur (2011) produced the opposite results that there is gender difference in hardiness. The results of these studies showed that females possess less hardiness as compared to males. This may be attributed to the differential treatment which is given to the boys and girls in some Indian societies. There is a preference of male children in Indian context. Hence, the preferential treatment and the exposure given to the male children as compared to the female counterparts may be responsible for these results (Verma, R. K. & Ghadially, R., 1985). So these results are different and contradict to the present study. The reason may be that the populations are different. Jaspreet Kaur's research was on the population of adolescents while the present study was on the population of university students. The students at this stage of development share equal rights and freedom given by their family as well as by their society. Second part of this hypothesis of the present study was that there would be no significant difference in hardiness among university students with reference to their socio-economic status (lower, middle & upper). To check this difference ANOVA was used. The result of the present study showed that there is no significant difference in hardiness between lower, middle, and upper class university students. So the hypothesis is accepted.

One major part of the third hypothesis of the study was that there would be no significant difference in self-efficacy among university students with reference to their gender. To check this difference t-test was used. The result of the present study showed that there is a significant difference in self-efficacy between male and female university students. So the hypothesis is rejected. This result is similar with other studies such as Kazem (2013). Second part of the third hypothesis of the present study was that there would be no significant difference in self-efficacy among university students with reference to their socio-economic status. To check this difference ANOVA was used. The result of the present study showed that there is no significant difference in self-efficacy between lower, middle, and upper class university students studying in M.P. So the hypothesis is accepted.

**Conclusion:** Mental health of the student population deserves our special attention because not only the university students have to deal with the academic demands and heavy workloads associated with pursuing a higher education but they also have to face a wide myriad of personal, academic and social challenges in this critical and often transitional period of one's life. Society and people develop higher expectations from them as they can contribute what the society needs. The aim of the present work was to study the hardiness and self-efficacy among university students. From the analysis of the above data it has been found that there is a fair negative and

meaningful correlation between hardiness and self-efficacy as it has been already mentioned in discussion that the reasons may be because these two variables are positive characteristics of personality. Thus, it can be concluded that the university students possessing higher levels of hardiness are inclined to report higher levels of self-efficacy and vice-versa.

It can also be concluded that at the university level there is no gender difference in the levels of hardiness and psychological distress. Moreover, the university students do not differ in the levels of hardiness and self-efficacy with respect to their socio-economic status. Also males and females have similar levels of hardiness. In contrast females have higher levels of self-efficacy than those of the females.

## REFERENCES

1. Abass Shekarey, Aliakbar jabery moghadam, Fatemeh Amiri, Mostafa sedaghat Rostami (2010). The relation of self-efficacy and hardiness with the education progression among the sophomore girl students in a high school in Aleshtar city. ELSEVIER:Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 5(2010) 1905–1910.
2. Ansarulh Tantry & Anita Puri Singh (2016). A Study of Psychological Hardiness across different Professions of Kashmir (J&K), India. International Journal of Advanced Research. Vol.4, Issue 2, ISSN NO. 2320-5407.
3. Bandura A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychology Review* 84(2):191-215.
4. Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. EnglewoodCliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
5. Bartone, P.T. (1995). A short hardiness scale. <http://www.stormingmedia.us/84/8458/A845892.html>. RefType: Internet communication.
6. Betz, E. & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and man. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 28(5), 399-410.
7. Courneya & McCauley, E. (1993). Efficacy, attributional & affective responses of older adults following acute exercises. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 26, (8), 729-742. Retrieved from [http://ecommons.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/etd-01112008-132006/nickel\\_d.pdf?sequence=1](http://ecommons.usask.ca/bitstream/handle/10388/etd-01112008-132006/nickel_d.pdf?sequence=1).
8. Gould & Weiss (1981). Sport psychology effects of model similarity on self-efficacy and muscular endurance. *JSEP*, 14,(3), 237-248. Retrieved from <http://journals.human kinetics.com/>
9. Jagpreet Kaur (2011). Influence of Gender and School Climate on Psychological Hardiness among Indian Adolescents. 2011 International Conference on Social Science and Humanity IPEDR vol.5 IACSIT Press, Singapore.
10. Jaya Jotwani (2016). Hardiness and psychological distress among university students studying in MP. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*. Vol. 3, No. 6 ISSN 2348-5396 (e).
11. Kazem Shriatnia, Fatemeh Mirdoraghi, Hamideh Pakmehr, Mohammad Reza Iravani (2013). A Study of Relationship between Hardiness and Self-Efficacy with Mental Health in Iran. *J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 3(7) 760-764.
12. Kobasa, S. C. (1979). "Stressful life events, personality, and health - Inquiry into hardiness". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 37, pp. 1-11. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.1.1. PMID 458548.
13. Maddi, S. R. (1990). Issues and interventions in stress mastery. In H. S. Friedman (Ed), *Personality and disease*, (pp. 121-154). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
14. Maddi, S.R., & Kobasa, S.C. (1984). *The hardy executive: Health under stress*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
15. Multan, Karen, D., Brown, Steven, D. & Lent, W. (1991). Relation of Self efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta analytic investigation. *Journal of counseling Psychology*, 38(1), 30-38.
16. Nebitt, V. (2009). Self- efficacy in African American adolescent males living in urban public housing. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 35, (3), 295-316 cited in King, C. A. (2008).
17. The effects of social support and self-efficacy on depression in college students. Doctorate of philosophy, Savannah State University.
18. Rhonewalt, F., & Agustsdottir, S. 1984. On the relationship of hardiness to the Type A behavior pattern: Perception of life events versus coping with life events. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18, 212–223.
19. Sanna, L. J. & Pusecker, P. A. (1994). Self efficacy, Valence of self evaluation and performance. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 20, (1), 82-92.
20. Shepperd, J. A., & Kashani, J. H. 1991. The relationship of hardiness, gender, and stress to health outcomes in adolescents. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 747–768.
21. Soderstrom, Christyn Dolbier, Jenn Leiferman, and Mary Steinhart (2000). The Relationship of Hardiness, Coping Strategies, and Perceived Stress to Symptoms of Illness. Accepted for publication: January 12.
22. Verma, R. K. & Ghadially, R. (1985). Mothers sex role attitudes and demands for independence training in boys and girls. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 46, 105-110.