

Self-Efficacy In The Work Place: Implications For Work Motivation

Dr.P.S. Manjula¹, Sindhura.K²

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, University of Madras, Chennai-600005.

²Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, University of Madras, Chennai-600005.

Abstract: *The present research aims to empirically examine the self-determination theory and social learning theory in work environment. The research study examined whether Self-efficacy of the employees influences their work motivation in an IT consulting company. The levels of the self-efficacy and work motivation of the employees were measured using standardized tools. Survey method was adopted to collect data from the employees. 150 employees were selected randomly and of that 120 employees responded to the survey. The survey was conducted online with the help of HR survey portal of the company. The confidentiality of the responses was ensured to the employees. Data analysis was done by using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics like regression analysis. Results revealed the influence of types of work motivation on self-efficacy. Three types of work motivation namely, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and intrinsic motivation had positive influence on self-efficacy of the employees while amotivation had negative influence on self efficacy of the employees. The study proves the influence of work motivation on self-efficacy of the employees.*

Keywords: *Self-Efficacy, Work motivation, Identified regulation, Amotivation*

1. INTRODUCTION

The organisation expects the employees to perform well in the assigned roles and responsibilities. The employees are the great investment for the organisation to compete with other organisation to render their services, market their products, scale up their activities etc. To achieve these activities, organisation takes care to board in the right staff with specific skill sets to execute their roles and intense efforts are taken to refine the skill sets of the employees. Given this context, the department of Human Resource Management (HRM) observes that some of the employees excel in their work; some stay very committed in their work, while some show less interest in their work. Therefore it becomes important to understand the reasons behind the employees' own belief to excel and execute at work and the possible factors which influence their beliefs. This will help the organisation to invest on their Human Capital.

In the recent days, the conception about human ability has undergone lot of changes. The theories of Social Cognition on Self-determination are studied by many scholars in the perspective of individual's work behavior. In the social cognitive theory Bandura (1977a) states

that self-efficacy is one's belief in one's ability to succeed and accomplish the task assigned. The sense of individual's self-efficacy plays a vital role in how an individual approaches his goals, tasks and challenges (Luszczynska & Schwarzer, 2005). Since self-efficacy is influenced by external factors, the inherent personality traits may allow self efficacy to develop into behaviour. It is perceived by the psychologists that ability is not a fixed attribute which is in the list of behavioral attributes but it is generated. The Social cognitive, motivational and behavioral skills have to be packaged in a manner to serve multiple purposes (Bandura, 1993).

Self-efficacy of an individual plays a vital role in the cognitive development and functioning. If individuals' perceived self-efficacy is high, the individuals set themselves for higher commitment (Bandura, 1991). Self-efficacy is dynamic characteristics which are influenced by internal personal and external factors. Research studies have highlighted that specific personality traits and self-efficacy act as predictors for the performance in the work (Judge & Ilies, 2002; Barrick & Mount, 1993).

The self-determination theory focuses on multidimensional view on motivation. It also states the way in which the different types of motivation in the individual can be encouraged or discouraged. The different theories in the field of human behaviour can be applied to understand the employees in their work settings. The self-determination theory focuses on multi-dimensional work motivation and the social cognitive theory focuses on the self-efficacy. Understanding the influence of these human behaviour one against the other helps the organisation to design organisation development programs.

Three main categories of motivation are - Amotivation which refers to absence of motivation towards an activity, Intrinsic motivation which includes doing an activity because it is interesting for the individual and Extrinsic motivation which includes engaging in an activity as it gives approval/avoid criticism/ rewards/ attain the personal valued goal (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Measure of self-efficacy can predict motivation and performance if adopting different endeavors. Employees with low self-efficacy prefer to avoid certain tasks and involve in such tasks based on the belief of capability (Schunk, 2008). Moreover each of self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation and job satisfaction variables will also predict the job performance of industrial workers (Olusola, 2011). There has been relationship between different performance dimensions and self-efficacy (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Moritz et al., 2000).

This study attempts to explore the influence of work motivation on self-efficacy of employees. In this study self-efficacy act as an independent variable and work motivation is the dependent variable. The findings will help the organizations to understand their employees and develop training programs for better performance of the employees.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To measure the levels of self-efficacy of the employees.
2. To measure the levels of multi-dimensional work motivation of the employees.
3. To predict the influence of work motivation on self-efficacy of the employees.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

The study was conducted among the employees of an IT consulting firm in Chennai. Survey method was used to obtain data from 120 employees. The survey was administered to 150 employees and 120 responded. The respondents were selected randomly and the survey was administered through the company online survey tool, “Survey Monkey”. The study participants took an average of 12 to 15 minutes to answer the survey. Each response was made mandatory and forms which were incomplete were not allowed to submit. The survey is accessible only once from the same computer and company email-id. The study participants were employees from various departments and their identity like name and mail-id was not collected and the survey was titled as “Human Capital Assessment” to avoid biased responses. The title of the scales was not revealed.

TOOLS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

The study used standardized tools which were already used in many other studies. The two scales were

- 1) The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995). The scale consists of 10 items which are mixed at random into a larger pool of items that have similar response format. The scale is self-administered and requires less than 5 minutes for answering the items. The responses will be made on a 5 point scale. The scale has reliability, alphas ranged from 0.70 to 0.80.
- 2) The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale (MWMS) developed by Gagne et al., (2015). The scale consists of 19 items which are rated on a 5 point scale and it measures amotivation, extrinsic regulation-social, extrinsic regulation-material, introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. The scale has reliability, alphas ranged from 0.70 to 0.80.

STATISTICS

The data obtained was analyzed using the statistical software SPSS-version 23. Regression analysis was done to understand the relationship between the Independent Variable and the Dependent variable. Descriptive analysis was done for computing the means for measuring the levels of the self-efficacy and work motivation types.

4. RESULTS

The major findings of the study are presented below in the tables.

Table 1: Levels of self-efficacy and work motivation of the employees

| Variables | Mean | S.D |
|------------------------|------|------|
| Self-Efficacy | 4.13 | 0.68 |
| Extrinsic Social | 2.79 | 1.56 |
| Extrinsic Material | 3.20 | 1.77 |
| Introjected Regulation | 5.24 | 1.57 |
| Identified Regulation | 5.79 | 1.46 |
| Intrinsic Motivation | 5.55 | 1.41 |

| | | |
|-------------|------|------|
| Amotivation | 1.59 | 0.88 |
|-------------|------|------|

The table 1 above shows the mean values of self-efficacy and the types of work motivation of the employees. The mean of self-efficacy was 4.13 among the employees. The mean of identified regulation, intrinsic motivation and introjected regulation was high among the employees.

Table 2: Demographic variables of the employees

| S.No | Variable | Education | n | Percentage |
|------|---|-------------|-----|------------|
| 1 | Education | UG | 56 | 46.7 |
| | | PG | 62 | 51.6 |
| | | Diploma | 2 | 1.7 |
| 2 | Age | <=25 Years | 34 | 28.3 |
| | | 26-30 Years | 45 | 37.5 |
| | | 31-35 Years | 18 | 15.0 |
| | | 36-40 Years | 12 | 10.0 |
| | | >41 Years | 11 | 9.2 |
| 3 | Gender | Male | 60 | 50.0 |
| | | Female | 60 | 50.0 |
| 4 | Marital status | Unmarried | 60 | 50.0 |
| | | Married | 60 | 50.0 |
| 5 | Total work experience in years | <=5 Years | 71 | 59.2 |
| | | 5-10 Years | 31 | 25.8 |
| | | >10 years | 18 | 15.0 |
| 6 | Work experience in an IT consulting company | <=5 Years | 98 | 81.7 |
| | | 5-10 Years | 19 | 15.8 |
| | | >10 years | 3 | 2.5 |
| 7 | Number of years in current role | <=5 Years | 105 | 87.5 |
| | | 5-10 Years | 14 | 11.7 |
| | | >10 years | 1 | 0.8 |

Table 2 highlights the demographic variables of the employees. The percentage of employees at the age of 25 years and less was 28.3%, between the age of 26 and 30 was 37.5%, between 31 and 35 was 15%, between 36 and 40 was 10% and above 41 years was 9.2%. Higher percentage of the employees was in the age group of 25 to 30 years. The employees who have completed UG were 46.7%, PG was 51.6% and Diploma was 1.7%. The employees were equally selected from both genders male employees were 50% and female employees were 50%. Among the employees who were studied, the married employees were 50% and unmarried employees were 50%. The total work experience of the employees - less than 5 years was 59.2%, between 5 and 10 years was 25.8% and less than 10 years was 15%. Higher percentage of the employees had work experience less than 5 years. Their total work experience in the present IT consulting company was less than 5 years 81.7%, between 5 and 10 years was 15.8% and less than 10 years was 2.5%. Higher percentage of the employees had work experience in the present company less

than 5 years. The employees experience in the current role in the present company less than 5 years was 87.5%, between 5 and 10 years was 11.7% and less than 10 years was 0.8 %.

| Dependent variable | R | R Square | Adjusted R square | Std. Error of the Estimate | F | ANOVA Significance | Independent Variable | B | t | Regression Significance |
|-------------------------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|--------|--------|-------------------------|
| Extrinsic Social | 0.175 | 0.031 | 0.022 | 1.55 | 3.173 | 0.056 | Constant | 4.453 | 5.081 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | -0.404 | -1.927 | 0.056 |
| Extrinsic Material | 0.060 | 0.004 | -0.005 | 1.77 | 0.426 | 0.515 | Constant | 3.850 | 3.829 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | -0.157 | -0.652 | 0.515 |
| Introjected Regulation | 0.221 | 0.049 | 0.041 | 1.53 | 6.079 | 0.015 | Constant | 3.124 | 3.592 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | 0.512 | 2.466 | 0.015 |
| Identified Regulation | 0.426 | 0.181 | 0.174 | 1.33 | 26.145 | 0.000 | Constant | 1.999 | 2.660 | 0.009 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | 0.919 | 5.113 | 0.000 |
| Intrinsic Motivation | 0.332 | 0.110 | 0.103 | 1.34 | 14.645 | 0.000 | Constant | 2.684 | 3.537 | 0.001 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | 0.694 | 3.827 | 0.000 |
| Amotivation | 0.296 | 0.088 | 0.080 | 0.85 | 11.348 | 0.001 | Constant | 3.179 | 6.634 | 0.000 |
| | | | | | | | Self-efficacy | -0.386 | -3.369 | 0.001 |

Table 3: Regression table for Self-efficacy

Table 3 shows the model summary. The adjusted R square for Extrinsic Motivation material is 0.022, Extrinsic Motivation Social is -0.005, Introjected regulation is 0.041, Identified regulation is 0.174, Intrinsic Motivation is 0.103 and Amotivation is 0.080. The ANOVA was found to be significant (0.000) at 5% significance level for Introjected regulation, Identified regulation, Intrinsic Motivation and Amotivation. The F value for Introjected regulation is 6.079, Identified regulation is 26.145, Intrinsic Motivation is 14.645, Amotivation is 11.348 and hence these models are fit models. Examining the coefficient values table, it was found that the following work dimensions were significant. The value read as Introjected Regulation (0.512), Identified regulation (0.180), Intrinsic Motivation (0.694) and Amotivation (-0.386). Therefore it can be inferred that self efficacy has implication on four work motivation dimensions. To rate the level of the self-efficacy implication on work motivation dimensions -identified regulation and intrinsic motivation followed by Introjected regulation is considerably high when compared to other dimensions.

Self-efficacy will be more if amotivation is less and this is proved through Simple regression analysis. Thus the regression equations obtained are as follows:

$$\text{Introjected Regulation} = 3.124 + (0.512 * \text{Self-efficacy})$$

$$\text{Identified Regulation} = 1.999 + (0.180 * \text{Self-efficacy})$$

$$\text{Intrinsic Motivation} = 2.684 + (0.694 * \text{Self-efficacy})$$

$$\text{Amotivation} = 3.179 + (- 0.386 * \text{Self-efficacy})$$

5. DISCUSSION

The study findings highlights that the social cognitive theory framed by Albert Bandura which encompasses self efficacy as one of the components (Redmond, 2010). Bandura (1977b) states that self efficacy helps an individual to explore his capacity and arrive at actions to manage situations. Higher the level of self efficacy the individuals have higher expectations for performances, to be persistent and confident. Employees with higher levels of self efficacy are expected to have higher level of motivation. It is developed by the employees themselves by their past experiences, observations, emotions and external motivational stimuli. It can be understood that employee's self-efficacy plays a vital role in the performance of the organisation. On the other hand, it becomes important to understand whether the self-efficacy of the employees has implications on the work motivation. The study has highlighted that the employees have high level of self-efficacy.

The study findings highlight that the study participant's employees from the IT consulting company have high self-efficacy and the mean was 4.13. When the means were computed for the multi dimensions of work motivation it was observed that self efficacy has implication on three types of motivation and amotivation. The introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation had higher mean values (5.24, 5.79, & 5.55 respectively). Further the mean of the dimension amotivation was least (1.59). Therefore the employees' high level of self efficacy has implication on their work motivation dimensions.

Cherian & Jacob (2013) states that self-efficacy had an effect on motivation as well as performance of employees as supported by Bandura. They also found that there is positive correlation between the self-efficacy of an employee and mediated effect on work related performance. Lunenburg (2011) has highlighted in his study self-efficacy in the workplace and

its implications for motivation and performance. The study refers to Bandura's thoughts on how self-efficacy affects learning and performance in three ways (Bandura, 1982): 1. The employees with low levels of self efficacy tend to set relatively low goals and employees with high levels of self efficacy set high personal goals. Their performances are consistent with their self-efficacy beliefs. 2. The employees with high self efficacy work hard to learn new tasks in contrary the employees with low self-efficacy will put less effort. 3. Employees with high self efficacy are persistent in their work attempt. This shows that self-efficacy is a powerful determinant for the employees' performance.

Biglan (1987) and Schunk & Pajares (2001) research findings confirm that self-efficacy influences motivation and it is a consistent predictor of behavioral change. Employees who have introjected regulation are motivated by internal pressure like shame, guilt, ego, etc. Employees who have identified regulation are motivated only if the organization's goal aligns with their personal goal. Amtmann et al., (2012) has stated that self efficacy beliefs influence the action of employees and their beliefs about their capabilities to succeed in life influences their level of motivation.

The authors of the present study have found that self-efficacy of the employees is high. Among these employees the dimensions of work motivation which was significant were introjected regulation, identified regulation and intrinsic motivation. Amotivation was negatively significant since self-efficacy of the employees was high. Therefore the study findings have predicted that social cognitive theory (self-efficacy) influences the self-determination theory (work motivation). The study has the limitations since the data was collected from a single IT consulting company.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The study findings help the company to understand their employees and help them through trainings for increasing their work motivation. Though the levels of self-efficacy are high among the employees, it is important to convert that belief system into work motivation. The study has proved that the social cognitive theory (self-efficacy) influences self-determination theory (work-motivation).

When the employee's organizational goal is aligned with his/her personal goal, their belief that they can achieve the goal influences their self-efficacy. The employer should understand the personal goal of the employee to have the goal of the company to be accomplished. The organisation has to take efforts to help the employee to understand the goals of the company very well.

The study can be replicated in any organisation setting and it will be useful for their Human resource development practices keeping in front the mission and vision of the company.

7. REFERENCES

- [1]. Amtmann, D, Bamer, A.M., Cook, K.F., Askew, R.L, Noonan, V.K., and Brockway, J.A. (2012). University of Washington Self-Efficacy Scale: A New Self-Efficacy Scale for People with Disabilities, *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 93(10), 1757-65.

- [2]. Bandura, A. (1977a). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [3]. Bandura, A. (1977b). Self- efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioural change *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- [4]. Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency, *American Psychologist*, 37, 122-147.
- [5]. Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, [online] 50(2), 248-287.
- [6]. Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived Self-Efficacy in Cognitive Development and Functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- [7]. Barrick, M. R., and Mount, M. K. (1993). Autonomy as a moderator of the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and job performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 (1), 111-118.
- [8]. Biglan, A. (1987). A Behavior-Analytic Critique of Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory, *The Behavior Analyst*, 10(1), 1-15.
- [9]. Cherian, J. and Jacob, J. (2013). Impact of Self Efficacy on Motivation and Performance of Employees, *International Journal of Business and management*, 8(14), 80-88.
- [10]. Gagné, M., Forestb, J., Vansteenkistec, M., Crevier-Braudd, L., Van den Broecke, A., Aspelif ,A.K., Belleroseg ,J., C Benaboub ,C., Chemollia ,E., Güntherth ,S.T., Halvarif,H., Laksmi Indiyastuti, D., Johnsonj ,P.A., Molstadf ,M.H., Naudink , M., Ndaol ,A., OlafsenfA.H. , Rousselm, P., Wanga, Z. & Westbyef, C. (2015). The Multidimensional Work Motivation Scale: Validation evidence in seven languages and nine countries, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 24(2), 178-196.
- [11]. Judge, T.A. and Ilies, R. (2002) Relationship of Personality to Performance Motivation: A Meta-Analytic Review, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 797-807.
- [12]. Lunenburg, F.C. (2011). Self-Efficacy in the Workplace: Implications for Motivation and Performance, *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 14 (1), 1-6.
- [13]. Luszczynska, A., and Schwarzer, R. (2005). *Social cognitive theory*. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting health behavior* (2nd ed., pp. 127–169). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- [14]. Moritz, S.E., Feltz, D.L., Fahrback, K.R. and Mack, D.E. (2000). The relation of self-efficacy measures to sport performance: A meta-analytic review, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 71(3), 280-94.
- [15]. Olusola.O (2011) Intrinsic Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Self-Efficacy as Predictors of Job Performance of Industrial Workers In Ijebu Zone of Ogun State, *The Journal of International Social Research*, 4(17), 570-577.
- [16]. Redmond, B.F. (2010). Self-Efficacy Theory: Do I think that I can succeed in my work? *Work Attitudes and Motivation*. The Pennsylvania State University; World Campus.
- [17]. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of Self-determination Theory: An organismic-dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci& R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research*.3-33. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester Press.

- [18]. Schunk, D.H. & Pajares, F. (2001). The development of academic self- efficacy. In A.Wigfield & J. Eccles (Eds). *Development of Achievement Motivation*. San Diego: American Press.
- [19]. Schunk, D.H. (2008). Self-efficacy, Motivation and Performance, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 112-137.
- [20]. Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- [21]. Stajkovic, A.D.and Luthans, F. (1998).Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A metaanalysis, *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240-261.