



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A Comparative Study On Psychological Hardiness And Self Efficacy Of Trained And Untrained Female Students

Krishna Kundu, M.P.Ed Student¹,

Dr. Pallob Kumar Mondal, Assistant Professor²,

State Institute of Physical Education for Women, Hastings House, Alipore - 27

Abstract

Purpose: The purpose of the study was to assess self-efficacy and personality hardiness of trained and untrained female students. **Methods:** A total of one hundred (N=100) female graduate students were selected, out of which (n=50) fifty were from general degree students (untrained) and (n=50) fifty were from physical education students (trained), as the subject for the study. The subjects were randomly selected from the colleges. **Criterion Measured:** Psychological traits i.e., self-efficacy and personality hardiness were the criterion measured for this study. The selected criterion was measured by different standard questionnaire. Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and independent t-test was used for data analysis and interpretation and the significant level was set at $p < 0.05$ level of confidence. **Results:** The mean and SD values of the different dimensions of psychological hardiness of each group was commitment (38.84 ± 4.0 , 39.54 ± 4.16), control (37.42 ± 3.93 , 38.24 ± 3.35) and challenge (37.28 ± 4.05 , 36.40 ± 3.47) and no significant different was observed in these three dimensions of personality hardiness traits between trained and untrained female group. On the other hand, the results of different dimensions of self-efficacy of trained and un-trained groups were: self-regulatory skill (5.94 ± 1.62 , 5.500 ± 1.82); self-influence (10.84 ± 1.87 , 11.60 ± 2.01), self-confidence (10.36 ± 1.15 , 10.04 ± 1.36) social achievement (8.94 ± 1.60 , 8.32 ± 1.46), Self (11.14 ± 1.92 , 11.32 ± 1.95), self-evaluation (11.02 ± 1.84 , 10.50 ± 1.75), self-esteem (4.10 ± 1.31 , 3.70 ± 1.46) self-cognition (10.92 ± 2.14 , 10.44 ± 1.99). No significant difference was observed between the groups except social achievement skills. **Conclusions:** On the basis of the findings of the study, it could be concluded that personality hardiness of both trained and untrained female students were similar in nature. On the other hand, self-efficacy of both trained and untrained female students were similar though it is seen that trained female students were more socially adjusted than untrained female students.

Key Words: Trained, Untrained, Psychological Hardiness Self-Efficacy

Introduction: Psychology is the study of mind and behaviour (Wikipedia, n.d.). Psychological hardiness, alternatively referred to as personality hardiness or cognitive hardiness in the literature, is a personality style that was first introduced by Kobasa in 1979 (Kobasa, 1979). Kobasa described a pattern of personality characteristics that distinguished managers and executives who remained healthy under life stress, as compared to those who developed health problems. In the following years, the concept of hardiness was further elaborated in a book (Maddi & Kobasa, 1984). In early research on hardiness, it was usually defined as a personality structure that functions as a resistance resource in encounters with stressful conditions.

The personality structure is composed of the three related general dispositions: (Kobasa et.al., 1982). Commitment is the tendency to involve oneself in activities in life and to have a genuine interest in and curiosity about the surrounding world (activities, things, and other people). Control is the tendency to believe and act as if one can influence the events taking place around oneself through one's own efforts. Challenge is the belief that change, rather than stability, is the normal mode of life and constitutes motivating opportunities for personal growth rather than threats to security (Kobasa, 1979). Maddi characterized

hardiness as a combination of three attitudes (commitment, control, and challenge) that provide the courage and motivation needed to turn stressful circumstances from potential calamities into opportunities for personal growth. (Maddi, 2006). Bartone in 2006 considers hardiness as something more global than mere attitudes. He conceives of hardiness as a broad personality style or generalized mode of functioning that includes cognitive, emotional, and behavioural qualities. This style of functioning affects how one views oneself and interacts with the world around (Bartone, 2006).

In psychology, self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their capacity to act in the ways necessary to reach specific goals (Self-Efficacy Teaching Tip Sheet, n.d.). Self-efficacy affects every area of human endeavour. By determining the beliefs, a person holds regarding their power to affect situations, self-efficacy strongly influences both the power a person actually has to face challenges competently and the choices a person is most likely to make. These effects are particularly apparent, and compelling, with regard to investment behaviours such as in health, (Krishnan, 2024; Pramila, (Krutikova & Sofya, 2013). A strong sense of self-efficacy promotes human accomplishment and personal well-being. A person with high self-efficacy views challenges as things that are supposed to be mastered rather than threats to avoid. These people are able to recover from failure faster and are more likely to attribute failure to a lack of effort. The approach threatening situations with the belief that they can control them. These things have been linked to lower levels of stress and a lower vulnerability to depression (Bandura, 2010). In contrast, people with a low sense of self-efficacy view difficult tasks as personal threats and shy away from them. Difficult tasks lead them to look at the skills they lack rather than the ones they have. It is easy for them to lose faith in their own abilities after a failure. Low self-efficacy can be linked to higher levels of stress and depression (Bandura, 2010).

Purpose of the Study:

1. To assess the personality hardiness and self-efficacy between trained and untrained students.
2. To assess the differences in personality hardiness and self-efficacy between trained and untrained female students.

Methodology: A total of one hundred (N=100) female graduate students out of which (n=50) fifty were from general degree students (un-trained) and (n=50) fifty were from physical education students (trained) selected as the subject of the study. Self-efficacy and Personality hardiness were the criterion measured for the study. The selected criterion was measured by different standard questionnaire. Personality hardiness was measured by personality hardiness scale (Singh, 2008) and self-efficacy was measured by self-efficacy scale (Mathur & Bhatnagar, 2012). Descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) and independent t-test was used for data analysis and interpretation. The significant level was set at $p < 0.05$ level of confidence.

Results & Discussions:

Table-1: Dimensions of Psychological Hardiness of Trained and Un-trained Female Students

Dimensions	Group	Mean $\pm$ SD	t- ratio	Sig. level
Commitment	Trained	38.84 $\pm$ 4.00	0.86 ^{NS}	0.39
	Un-Trained	39.54 $\pm$ 4.16		
Control	Trained	37.42 $\pm$ 3.93	1.12 ^{NS}	0.27
	Un-Trained	38.24 $\pm$ 3.35		
Challenge	Trained	37.28 $\pm$ 4.05	1.17 ^{NS}	0.25
	Un-Trained	36.40 $\pm$ 3.48		

$t_{0.05} (98) = 1.99$; * = Significant; NS = Not Significant

Table-1 represents the mean, SD and t-ratio values of different components of psychological hardiness of two groups. The mean and SD values of commitment, control and challenge of both trained and untrained group was (38.84 $\pm$ 4.0; 39.54 $\pm$ 4.16), (37.42 $\pm$ 3.93, 38.24 $\pm$ 3.35.) and (37.28 $\pm$ 4.05, 36.40 $\pm$ 3.47) respectively and no significant difference was observed in the different dimensions of personality hardiness trait between the groups.

Table-2: Psychological Hardiness of Trained and Un-trained Female Students

Parameter	Group	Mean $\pm$ SD	t- ratio	Sig. level
Personality Hardiness	Trained	113.54 $\pm$ 9.52	0.36 ^{NS}	0.72
	Un-Trained	114.18 $\pm$ 8.23		

$t_{0.05} (98) = 1.99$; * = Significant; NS = Not Significant

Table-2 represents the mean, SD and t-ratio values of psychological hardiness trait of trained and untrained group. The mean and SD values of commitment, control and challenge of both groups were (113.54 $\pm$ 9.52; 114.18 $\pm$ 8.23) respectively. The results shows that the trained and untrained female students bear moderate level of personality hardiness trait (Sing, 2008) and no significant difference was observed in personality hardiness trait between the groups.

Table-3: Different Dimensions of Self Efficacy of Trained and Untrained Female Students

Dimensions	Group	Mean $\pm$ SD	t- ratio	Sig. level
Self-Regulatory Skill	Trained	5.94 $\pm$ 1.62	1.28 ^{NS}	0.21
	Un-Trained	5.50 $\pm$ 1.82		
Self-Influence	Trained	10.84 $\pm$ 1.88	1.95 ^{NS}	0.06
	Un-Trained	11.60 $\pm$ 2.01		
Self Confidence	Trained	10.36 $\pm$ 1.16	1.26 ^{NS}	0.21
	Un-Trained	10.04 $\pm$ 1.37		
Social Achievement	Trained	8.94 $\pm$ 1.61	2.02*	0.04
	Un-Trained	8.32 $\pm$ 1.46		
Self	Trained	11.14 $\pm$ 1.93	0.46 ^{NS}	0.64
	Un-Trained	11.32 $\pm$ 1.95		
Self-Evaluation	Trained	11.02 $\pm$ 1.85	1.46 ^{NS}	0.15
	Un-Trained	10.50 $\pm$ 1.75		
Self Esteem	Trained	4.10 $\pm$ 1.31	1.44 ^{NS}	0.15
	Un-Trained	3.70 $\pm$ 1.46		
Self-Cognition	Trained	10.92 $\pm$ 2.15	1.16 ^{NS}	0.25
	Un-Trained	10.44 $\pm$ 1.99		

$t_{0.05} (98) = 1.99$; * = Significant; NS = Not Significant

Table-3 represents the mean, SD and t-ratio values of self-efficacy trait of trained and untrained group. The mean and SD values of different dimensions of self-efficacy was for self-regulatory skill: (5.94 $\pm$ 1.62; 5.50 $\pm$ 1.82), self-influence: (10.84 $\pm$ 1.88, 11.60 $\pm$ 2.01), self-confidence: (10.36 $\pm$ 1.16, 10.04 $\pm$ 1.37) social achievement: (8.94 $\pm$ 1.61, 8.32 $\pm$ 1.46), self: (11.14 $\pm$ 1.93, 11.32 $\pm$ 1.95), self-evaluation: (11.02 $\pm$ 1.85, 10.50 $\pm$ 1.75), self-esteem: (4.10 $\pm$ 1.31, 3.70 $\pm$ 1.46), self-cognition (10.92 $\pm$ 2.15, 10.44 $\pm$ 1.99) respectively and significant difference was observed only in social achievement skill out of the eight dimensions of self-efficacy.

Table-4: Self efficacy of trained and untrained female students

Parameter	Group	Mean $\pm$ SD	t-ratio	Sig. level
Self-efficacy	Trained	73.26 $\pm$ 4.84	1.81 ^{NS}	0.07
	Un-Trained	71.42 $\pm$ 5.30		

$t_{0.05} (98) = 1.99$; * = Significant; NS = Not Significant

Table-4 represents the mean, SD and t-ratio values of self-efficacy trait of trained and untrained group. The mean and SD values of self-efficacy of trained and untrained group was 73.26 $\pm$ 4.84 and 71.42 $\pm$ 5.30 respectively. The mean value of self-efficacy of trained female students was greater than the mean value of untrained students. However, significant difference was not observed between the groups.

Discussion: High in commitment and control, people show fewer psychological disturbances than who possessed low level of commitment and control (Mizes, 1988). Personality hardiness was more concerned with health outcomes among males but not among females (Lawler, 1986). However, personality hardiness predicted both physical and mental health among women (Rhodewalt & Zone, 1989). People who have high level of self-efficacy, they devote their attention and efforts to overcome critical situations than those who have low level of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986). Many studies indicated that active people had having higher level of self-efficacy than non-active people (Williams & Williams, 2010; Lewis, 2006).

In this study, psychological trait of trained and untrained female students was measured by two aspects i.e., one is personality hardiness and another is self-efficacy. Results of personality hardiness of trained and untrained female students' shows that both groups were similar in nature. On the other hand, self-efficacy of both groups were at par except the social achievement skill. Social achievement skills of trained female group was better in compare to un-trained female group. So, trained female group was very much socially adjusted than un-trained female group.

Conclusion: On the basis of the findings of the study it could be concluded that

Personality hardiness of both trained and un-trained female students were at par. On the other hand, different dimensions of self-efficacy of both trained and un-trained female students was similar except only the social achievement skills out of other eight dimensions of self-efficacy trait. The trained female students was more socially adjusted than un-trained female students.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H. Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2010). "Self-Efficacy", *The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology*, American Cancer Society.
- Bartone, P.T. (2006). "Resilience under military operational stress: Can leaders influence hardiness?" "Teaching Tip Sheet: Self-Efficacy". American Psychological Association. Retrieved 6-2-2024.
- Bartone, P.T. (2006). "Resilience under military operational stress: Can leaders influence hardiness?". *Military Psychology*. 18:S131–S148. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.529.7394. doi:10.1207/s15327876mp1803s_10. S2CID 9515376.
- Fernald, L.D. (2008). *Psychology: Six perspectives*. Sage Publications.
- Hardiness (psychology). (2023). In Wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Hardiness_\(psychology\)&oldid=1190013846](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Hardiness_(psychology)&oldid=1190013846)
- Kobasa, S.C. (1979). "Stressful life events, personality, and health – Inquiry into hardiness". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Krishnan, P., Krutikova, S. (2013). "Non-cognitive skill formation in poor neighbourhoods of urban India"
- Maddi, S.R. (2004). "Hardiness: An operationalization of existential courage". *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*.
- Maddi, S.R. (2006). "Hardiness: The courage to grow from stresses". *Journal of Positive Psychology*.
- Maddi, S.R.; Kobasa, S.C. (1984). *The hardy executive: Health under stress*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Psychology—Wikipedia. (n.d.). Retrieved February 21, 2024, from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Psychology>
- Rhodewalt, F., & Zune, J. B. (1989). Appraisal of life change, depression, and illness in hardy and non-hardy women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 81-88.
- Self-Efficacy Teaching Tip Sheet. (n.d.). Retrieved February 21, 2024, from <https://www.apa.org/pi/aids/resources/education/self-efficacy>
- Westen, Drew (1999). "The Scientific Status of Unconscious Processes: Is Freud Really Dead?". *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*. 47 (4): 1061–1106. doi:10.1177/000306519904700404. ISSN 0003-0651. PMID 10650551. S2CID 207080.
- Williams, T., & Williams, K. (2010). Self-efficacy and performance in mathematics: Reciprocal determinism in 33 nations.