

**PREVALENCE OF SELF – EFFICACY AMONG COLLEGE PRINCIPALS  
: A COMPARATIVE STUDY****Dr. Ujjwala Sadaphal***Assistant Professor, Swavalambi College of Education, Wardha***Abstract:**

*Principals play central role in cultivating college environment that supports quality and innovative educational practices. The review shows that individual with Higher Self – Efficacy approaches difficult tasks as a challenge. The aim is to find the level of self - efficacy and to compare self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses. Normative survey method is used and the area covered is Maharashtra state in India. Professional courses considered are from Pharmacy, Law and Education. Non-professional courses considered are from Arts, Science and Commerce. Total 245 Principals are selected randomly as a sample. The tool used is Self-efficacy Scale by G. P. Mathur and R. K. Bhatnagar. Collected data are analyzed using statistical measures to draw conclusions. The findings shows a significant difference in self – efficacy of principals of Professional courses and non-professional courses.*

**Key Words:** *Self – efficacy, Principals of professional and non – professional courses*



Aarhat Publication & Aarhat Journals is licensed Based on a work at <http://www.aarhat.com/amierj/>

**Introduction:**

Higher education institutions are expected to achieve the accreditation bench marks and impart quality education. And like a captain of a ship, the principal is entrusted with the responsibility of steering the college in challenging tides. College principals play central role in cultivating college environment that supports quality and innovative educational practices. High expectancy of role performance from stakeholders, pressure of quality output and competition results in multitude of challenges to be faced by principals.

The review of research in the field has shown that individual with Higher Self – Efficacy approaches difficult tasks as a challenge and not as a threat to be avoided. The higher is the



sense of efficacy, the greater are the efforts, persistence and resilience. It can be noted that self – Efficacy beliefs exercise a powerful influence on the level of accomplishment individual ultimately realize. (Pajares and Miller, 1994) Bandura (1977) has introduced the Self – efficacy concept. It is derived from social cognitive theory. Self – efficacy is a judgment regarding one’s capability to successfully perform specific tasks or behavior. It is an estimation of one’s capacity to deal with any particular task.

Bandura (1986) has stated that Self – efficacy influence several aspects, like

- The choices that individual makes and the course of action he takes.
- It determines the quantum of efforts and duration of efforts an individual will put to complete a task.
- It also influences the amount of stress and anxiety an individual experience while performing a task.
- It influences the task completion or success in task.

Sethi (2016) has denoted the characteristics of self – efficacy as follows

- Self – efficacy is an important psychological trait that affects individual behavior. It is a strong predictor of behavior
- It is related to the level of aspiration positively and works as an intrinsic motivation.
- It determines individual’s actions and it tends to vary according to the task.
- Past experience plays a crucial role in the development of self – efficacy. Past success increases self – efficacy beliefs and failures lessens it.
- It enables an individual to accomplish more challenging tasks. And enables a person to recover from setbacks.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) found that principal self – efficacy was highly correlated with principal behavior. Principal’s perceptions of their own abilities influenced their behavior relative to developing people within the school, setting the direction of the school, managing instruction and redesigning the organization. Postma (2019) indicated that principal self – efficacy is significantly and positively related to principal job satisfaction. Fox (2018) in a correlational study found a significant positive relationship between mentoring support and self – efficacy for management. Baroudi & Hojrij (2020) have revealed the extent to which principals’ self – efficacy plays a role in their leadership and highlights the importance of the



interaction effect of age and gender on self – efficacy levels.

Knowing the important role of self – efficacy in determining the individual behavior and determining the efforts an individual will put in for accomplishing a given task, the researcher wants to compare the level of self – efficacy among college principals of professional and non – professional courses. There are number of studies on self – efficacy but study focusing on principals of colleges from professional and non – professional courses is rare. This clearly indicates a research gap and a need to undertake this study. The aim of the study is to find the level of self - efficacy and to compare self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.

**Objectives:**

- 1) To study the level of self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.
- 2) To compare the level of self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.

**Hypothesis:**

- 1) There is no significant difference in the level of self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.

**Limitations and Delimitations:**

The scope of the study is limited to the study of the variable self – efficacy among college principals of professional and non-professional courses. Only 245 principals at the under graduate level are considered. The area is limited to the Maharashtra state in India. Only three professional and three non-professional courses are considered.

**Methodology:**

Normative survey method is used for the research. The geographical area covered is Maharashtra state in India. All the principals of the colleges from the three professional and three non-professional courses from the area represent the population for the study. The Professional courses considered are from Pharmacy, Law and Education faculties. And non - professional courses considered are from Arts, Science and Commerce faculties. Total 245 Principals at under graduation levels are selected randomly as a sample for the study. The data are collected using Self-efficacy Scale by G. P. Mathur and R. K. Bhatnagar. The collected

data are analyzed according to the test norms. Statistical measures like Mean, Standard Deviation and ‘t – test’ are applied to draw conclusions.

### 1) Level of Self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.

Table no.1 shows Level of Self-efficacy among principals of total sample. Out of 245 Principals, 51 (20.81%) have high Self-efficacy, 148(60.41%) have Moderate Self-efficacy and 46(18.78%) have low Self-efficacy.

**Table no.1:** Level of Self-efficacy among principals (N = 245)

Sr. No.	Level of Self-efficacy	Number of Principals	Percentage %
1	High Self-efficacy	51	20.81
2	Moderate Self-efficacy	148	60.41
3	Low Self-efficacy	46	18.78

**Table no.2:** Level of Self-efficacy among principals of Professional (Pharmacy, Law, Education) and non-professional (Arts, Science, Commerce) courses

	Courses	N	Self-efficacy					
			High	%	Moderate	%	Low	%
Professional Courses	Pharmacy	16	13	81.25	3	18.75	00	--
	Law	12	00	--	2	16.67	10	62.5
	Education	56	35	62.5	20	35.71	1	1.79
Non - Professional Courses	Arts	59	1	1.69	25	42.37	33	55.93
	Science	56	1	1.79	54	96.43	1	1.79
	Commerce	46	1	2.17	44	95.65	1	2.17
Total sample		245	51	20.81	148	60.41	46	18.78

Table no. 2 denotes Level of Self-efficacy among principals of Professional and non-professional courses. From total 16 Pharmacy principals 13 (81.25%) have high, 3 (18.75%) have moderate and none of the principal has low Self-efficacy. Out of 12 Law principals none of the principal has high Self-efficacy, only 2 (16.67%) have moderate and 10 (62.5%) have low Self-efficacy. From the total 56 Education principals 35 (62.5%) have high 20 (35.71%) have moderate and 1 (1.79%) has low Self-efficacy. Out of 59 principals from Arts only

1(1.69%) has high, 25 (42.37%) have moderate and 33 (55.93%) have low Self-efficacy. From 56 Science principals only 1(1.79%) has high 54 (96.43%) have moderate and 1 (1.79%) has low Self-efficacy. Out of total 46 Commerce principals 1(2.17%) has high 44 (95.65%) have moderate and 1(2.17%) have low Self-efficacy.

## 2) Comparing Level of Self - efficacy among the principals of professional and non – professional courses.

**Table No. 3:** The values of Mean, S. D. and N for Self-efficacy among the principals of professional and non-professional courses.

	Courses	N	Mean	S. D.
Professional Courses	Pharmacy	16	86.69	3.55
	Law	12	55.83	6.42
	Education	56	81.14	8.59
Non-Professional Courses	Arts	59	61.90	10.38
	Science	56	71.05	6.88
	Commerce	46	71.91	7.35

Table No. 3 shows the values of Mean, S. D. and N for Self-efficacy among the principals of professional and non-professional courses. Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score of the Principals of Pharmacy faculty are 86.69 and 3.55 respectively. In case of Principals of Law faculty Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score are 55.83 and 6.42 respectively. For the Principals of Education faculty Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score are 81.14 and 8.59 respectively. The Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score of the Principals of Arts faculty are 61.90 and 10.38 respectively. For the Principals of Science faculty the Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score are 71.05 and 6.88 respectively. In case of the Principals of Commerce faculty the Mean and S. D. of Self-efficacy score are 71.91 and 7.35 respectively.

**Table No. 4:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Arts faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't – value'
Pharmacy	16	86.69	3.55	15.36**
Arts	59	61.90	10.38	

d. f. = 73

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 4 reveals Mean, S. D. and ‘t’ – value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Arts faculties. For mean difference of 24.79 in favor of Principals of Pharmacy faculty, ‘t’ – value is significant at .01 level.

**Table No. 5:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Science faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	‘t – value’
Pharmacy	16	86.69	3.55	12.21**
Science	56	71.05	6.88	

d. f. = 70                      \*\* Significant at 0.01 level

Table No. 5 reveals Mean, S. D. and ‘t’ – value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Science faculties. For mean difference of 15.64 in favor of Principals of Pharmacy faculty, the obtained value is higher than the value at .05 level and .01 level. Hence it is significant.

**Table No. 6:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Commerce faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	‘t – value’
Pharmacy	16	86.69	3.55	10.56**
Commerce	46	71.91	7.35	

d. f. = 60                      \*\* Significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level

Table No. 6 shows Mean, S. D. and ‘t’ – value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Pharmacy and Commerce faculties. For mean difference of 14.78 is in favor of Principals of Pharmacy faculty, ‘t’ – value’ is significant at 0.01 level.

**Table No. 7:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Law and Arts faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	‘t – value’
Law	12	55.83	6.42	2.65**
Arts	59	61.90	10.38	

d. f. = 69                      \*\* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table No. 7 reveals Mean, S. D. and ‘t’ – value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Law and Arts faculties. The mean difference of 6.07 is in favor of Principals of Arts faculty, ‘t’ – value is significant at 0.01level.

**Table No. 8:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Law and Science faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't - value'
Law	12	55.83	6.42	7.35**
Science	56	71.05	6.88	

d. f. = 66                      \*\* Significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level

Table no. 8 shows the mean difference of 15.22. It is in favor of Principals of Science faculty when compared with law faculty principals. The 't' - value is significant at .01 level. .

**Table No. 9:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Law and Commerce faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't - value'
Law	12	55.83	6.42	7.48**
Commerce	46	71.91	7.35	

d. f. = 56                      \*\* Significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level

Table No. 9 indicates Mean, S. D. and 't' - value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Law and Commerce faculties. For mean difference of 16.08 in favor of Principals of Commerce faculty, calculated 't' - value is significant at .01 level.

**Table No. 10:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Education and Arts faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't - value'
Education	56	81.14	8.59	10.81**
Arts	59	61.90	10.38	

d. f. = 113                      \*\* Significant at 0.01 level.

Table No. 10 reveals Mean, S. D. and 't' - value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Education and Arts faculties. The mean difference of 19.24 is in favor of Principals of Education faculty, calculated 't' - value is significant at .01 levels.

**Table No. 11:** Comparing Self-efficacy of the Principals of Education and Science faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't - value'
Education	56	81.14	8.59	6.86**
Science	56	71.05	6.88	

d. f. = 110                      \*\* Significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level

Table No. 11 point out the Mean, S. D. and 't' - value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of





Education and Science faculties. For mean difference of 10.09 in favor of Principals of Education faculty, 't' – value calculated is 't = 6.86' which is significant at .01 level.

**Table No. 12:** Comparing Self-efficacy of Principals of Education and Commerce faculties

Faculty	N	Mean	S. D.	't – value'
Education	56	81.14	8.59	5.84**
Commerce	46	71.91	7.35	

d. f. = 100

\*\* Significant at 0.05 level and 0.01 level

Table No. 12 reveals Mean, S. D. and 't' – value for Self-efficacy of the Principals of Education and Commerce faculties. The mean difference of 9.23 is in favor of Principals of Education faculty. The 't' – value is significant at .01 level.

### Conclusions

- 1 Self-efficacy of total sample is found to be nearing normal distribution but Self-efficacy among principals significantly vary across professional and non-professional courses.
- 2 The number of principals higher on self – efficacy is very less in case of non- professional courses Arts, Science and Commerce faculty. Whereas principals of Professional courses Pharmacy (81.25%) and Education (62.5%) are found to be higher in self – efficacy. None of the Principals of Law faculty are found to be higher in self – efficacy.
- 3 Total 62.5% and 55.93% of principals of Law and Arts faculties respectively are found to be lower in level of self – efficacy. Whereas number of Principals lower in self – efficacy are less in case of Education, Science and Commerce faculties. In case of principals of pharmacy none is found to be lower in self – efficacy level.
- 4 Principals of Pharmacy faculty differ significantly in self – efficacy from principals of Arts, Science and Commerce faculties.
- 5 Principals of Education faculty differ significantly in self – efficacy from principals of Arts, Science and commerce faculty.
- 6 Pharmacy faculty principals with higher and significant mean difference of self – efficacy from principals of Arts, Science and Commerce faculties indicate that they are higher in self-efficacy than principals of non-professional courses.
- 7 There is significant mean difference in favor of Education faculty principal from Arts, Science and Commerce faculties principal in self – efficacy. This indicate higher self –





efficacy level of Education faculty Principals as compared to the self – efficacy of principals of non-professional courses.

- 8 There is significant difference in self – efficacy among principals of Law faculty when compared with principals of non-professional courses viz. Arts, Science and Commerce. But in this case, the mean difference is in favor of principals of non- professional courses indicating lower level of self – efficacy among principals of Law faculty.

Thus it can be concluded that there is a significant difference in self – efficacy of principals of Professional courses and non-professional courses.

### **Implications**

The study points out differences in self – efficacy of principals of Professional courses and non-professional courses. As self-efficacy affect overall performance of the principal, it is very important to consider this factor by all the policy makers and stake holders. The need for Developing strategies, training programs, counseling and remedial courses for improving Self - efficacy is indicated by the study.

### **References:**

- Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (1999): *Research in Education*. Prentice – Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.
- Garrett H. (1981): *Statistics in Psychology and Education*. Vakils, Feffer and Simons Ltd. Bombay.
- Mathur, G. P. & Bhatnagar, R. K. (2012): *Self-efficacy Scale*. Manasvi, Agra
- Pajares, F. & Miller, M. D. (1994): The role of self – efficacy and self – concept beliefs in mathematical problem – solving: A path analysis. *Journal Educational Psychology*. 86, 193 – 203.
- Bandura, A. (1977): *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice – Hall, New Jersey.
- Bandura, A. (1986): *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice – Hall.
- Fox, Merrie (2018): *Mentoring Support and Self – efficacy of public school Principals: A Correlational study*. ProQuest LLC Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=self+efficacy+of+principals&id=ED584632> on 20/01/2021



- Baroudi, Sandra & Hojrij, Zeina (2020): The role of self – efficacy as an attribute of principals’ leadership effectiveness in K – 12 private and public institutions in Lebanon. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 2020, Vol. 23, No. 4, Pp. 457 – 471. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=self+efficacy+of+principals&id=EJ1259543> on 20/01/2021
- Postma, Kerry L. (2019): *The influence of self – efficacy on job satisfaction in New Jersey public school principals*. ProQuest LLC. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=self+efficacy+of+principals&id=ED609528> on 20/01/2021
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 496-528.
- Sethi, Aradhana (2016): *A study of self – efficacy, job involvement and organizational commitment among school teachers*. Retrieved from <http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/handle/10603/138792> retrieved on 28/08/18