

Impact of Self Efficacy on Work Performance: A Study of Theoretical Framework of Albert Bandura's Model (A Review of Findings)

Ravindra Kumar

(Research scholar, Faculty of Commerce & Business Administration, D.N.P.G College, Meerut)

Dr. B. K. Agarwal

(Assistant Professor, Faculty of Commerce & Business Administration, D.N.P.G College, Meerut)

Abstract

Research has shown that self-efficacy is one of the most significant personal resources in the work context. This article aims to expand previous theory regarding self-efficacy & its impact on work performance in the workplace.

The article examined the correlation between Self Efficacy and Work Performance using Albert Bandura's Social Cognition Theory as a theoretical framework.

Self-efficacy refers to what you believe about yourself, rather than how you truly are. Out-of-balance self-efficacy affects productivity. An employee with low self-efficacy run the risk of performing tasks below his/her actual ability level. On the other hand, self-efficacy that runs too high may give an individual an unrealistic picture of his ability to do a certain task.

Self-efficacy is similar to self-esteem, but differs from self-esteem in that it is specific to task performance.

Introduction

Albert Bandura's social cognitive theory that was published in the year 1986 focuses mainly on the concept of self-efficacy, which is considered as “one of the most theoretically, heuristically and practically useful concepts formulated in modern psychology” (Betz et al., 1996, p. 47).

Many authors have also given their opinions on the concept. For example, Lent et al. (1996) states that self-efficacy actually refers to “people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required attaining designated types of performance” (p. 83).

The base for personal achievements, personal well being and human motivation is provided by self-efficacy. Bandura (1977) regards the role of self-efficacy beliefs in human functioning as “people's level of motivation, affective states, and actions are based more on what they believe than on what is objectively true” (p.2).

A central idea posed in social cognitive theory is that success experiences raise self efficacy but repeated failures lower self-efficacy. Moreover, enhanced self-efficacy, secondary to repeated successes often generalizes to new situations (Bandura, 1977).

Krishnan et al. (2002) [3] noted that complex position setting will influence the self-efficacy directly. Wood and Bandura (1989) also mentions that self-efficacy will affect the belief of self-ability, mobility of positing, cognitive resources, and the activities that need to practice in live.

Scholars mostly feel there have a considerable extent correlation between self-efficacy and performance. Wood and Bandura (1989) proposed a persuasive discussion. It says high level self-efficacy will raise the personal performance. Since self-efficacy grows over time, employees could learn how to deal with the conflicts that happened in workplace.

McDonald and Siegall (1992) proposed that Self-Efficacy, Effort, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention: The Effect of Personal Characteristics on Organization Performance Ming-Cheng Lai and Yen-Chun Chen International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, Vol. 3, No. 4, August 2012 387 self-efficacy and job satisfaction have a positive correlation. Bradley and Roberts (2004) discover that self-efficacy rise the job satisfaction. Lam, Lo, and Chan (2002) point out that the show of turnover intention of enterprise may cause a huge cost. Boshoff and Allen (2000) showing the effective services could restore the performance and reduce employee’s turnover intention. Viator (2001)point out that the performance and turnover intention have a negative correlation.

The study & its objective

The main objective of this study was to find:

1. To find out the relationship between self efficacy and work performance
2. To find out the impact of self efficacy on work performance



Literature Review

Self-Efficacy

An employee's self-belief or self-efficacy is linked with the performance of employee at workplace (Lev & Kieslowski, 2009). It persuades the work stress of employee by performing regular tasks or duties in an organization. As managers are always keen to know the impacts of self-efficacy on performance and motivation of employees, it is associated with the job performance of employees at workplace so (Chaudhary, Rangnekar, & Barua, 2012). Self-efficacy influences the goal setting and selecting for him to perform in the organization. That shows their commitment and motivation toward the work. Those employees who believe in themselves and their self-efficacy choose difficult tasks as compared to those who are less affected by self believe (Chaudhary et al., 2012).

Employee gains knowledge of new skills, perform well in the organizations and provide his full efforts as per his self-efficacy beliefs.

Self-efficacy theory presents precise guidelines on how to enable people to exercise some influence over how they live their lives. Research reveal that efficacy beliefs influence the courses of actions that people choose to pursue, the goals and commitment they set for themselves, how much effort they invest in their activities, the outcomes they expect their efforts to produce, and their resilience to adversity (Schunk, 1981; Schunk & Hansen, 1985; Schunk, Hanson, & Cox, 1987).

Work/ task/ Job Performance

The task performance of an individual plays essential role in an organization. His performance is important for himself as well. High performance of an individual brings self-efficacy, satisfaction and motivation in his career (Arvey & Murphy, 1998; Sonnentag, Volmer, & Spsychala, 2008).

Efficacy-Performance Relationship

Self-efficacy is a construct that has been frequently linked to performance. Self-efficacy has a positive association with multiple types of performance (Bandura, 1997). The exact method by which Efficacy affects work performance depends on the situation (Locke, Frederick, Lee, & Bobko, 1984; Locke & Latham, 1990; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Wood & Bandura, 1989). In this study, self-efficacy is not treated a global personality trait which is constant across all situations, but rather a state that varies depending on the situation (Bandura, 1989;

Silver, Mitchell, & Gist, 1995). Self-efficacy may affect performance through various pathways (Bandura, 1997)

Stanford University psychologist “Albert Bandura” comprehensively researched the relationship between self efficacy and performance and found that, “the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required” has been shown to have a positive effect on performance.

His work has more recently been substantiated by a meta-analysis encompassing over 21,000 subjects who found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and Work performance. Thus, when self-efficacy increases, so does work performance.

Managers attempting to boost self-efficacy in employees must first recognize its source. Following are 4 principle (09) sources of self-efficacy in the workplace:

1. Past Performance

Bandura affirmed that the most effective way of increasing a strong sense of efficacy and confidence is through mastery experiences.

Employees who have previous experience with on the job success have more confidence to complete similar tasks (high self-efficacy) than those who do not (low self-efficacy).

2. Modeled Behavior

Another source of self-efficacy is through learning from modeled behavior. When an employee observes that a co-worker successfully accomplished a task, they will feel more confident that they can also complete the similar one.

According to Bandura, “Seeing people similar to oneself succeed by sustained effort raises observers’ beliefs that they too possess the capabilities master comparable activities to succeed”.

3. Social Persuasion And Feedback From Others

Employees can be convinced to believe that they have the skills necessary to successfully complete a task. Both positive encouragement as well as convincing others that they have the ability to succeed at the particular task can facilitate self-efficacy.

When managers are confident that their employees can successfully perform a task, they perform at a higher level.

4. Physiological Responses

The emotional, physiological and psychological response of an individual can influence their level of perceived self efficacy.

A person who expects to fail at a task, or finds the task too demanding will experience a set of emotional cues: Racing heart, blushing, sweating, headaches etc.

If these physiological cues are persistent and severe enough, they contribute to a sense of weak self-efficacy in the employee.

The aforesaid 4 sources of self-efficacy in the workplace contribute to an employee's perceived ability to perform a task. It is therefore an important construct to identify and to understand how it affects employee's workplace performance.

Impact of self efficacy on work performance

Success in a realm is closely linked to self-efficacy in the realm (Bandura, 1997). Higher self-efficacy in a realm is associated with good outcomes, ranging from greater job satisfaction and performance (Judge & Bono, 2001), to better physical and mental health (Bandura, 1997), to better academic performance (Bandura, 1997; Robbins et al., 2004).

According to Bandura (12), self-efficacy affects learning and performance in the workplace in five ways:

- 1- Self-Efficacy Influences The Goals That Employees Choose For Themselves
- 2- Self-Efficacy Influences Learning And Exerted Effort
- 3- Self-Efficacy Influences The Persistence With Which People Attempt New And Difficult Tasks
- 4- self-efficacy influences how resilient employees will be in the face of adverse situations
- 5- Self-Efficacy Influences The Amount Of Stress And Anxiety Individuals Experience When They Engage In A Task

Lunenburg (2011) postulated that self-efficacy or self confidence influences the tasks employees choose to learn and the goals they set for themselves. Self-efficacy also influences employees' level of effort and perseverance when learning difficult tasks.

Review of Findings

The present study attempted to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and work performance.

The study investigates & indicated the direct effect of self-efficacy on employee's performance. Employee's performance is measure by job satisfaction, job commitment and

absenteeism in public hospital of Lahore, Pakistan (13). The results indicate that self-efficacy has significant relationship with job performance factors. Employees are more commitment at work place with no absenteeism at public hospitals.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy may not be relevant directly to work performance, but may act as a factor or combination with other factors or variables. Therefore, the extent to which self-efficacy alone, outside other factors impact on performance is not known. This is an area or line of direction for future research (7).

Judge et al (2007) in their research estimated the unique contribution of self-efficacy to work-related performance controlling for personality (the Big 5 traits), intelligence or general mental ability, and job or task experience (7).

From the Positive viewpoint, self-efficacy may act as a re-source and capacity, applying intervention practices to increase self-efficacy values makes sense because it aims to promote the factors that allow individuals and organizations to thrive, and healthy employees are mostly those who present higher levels of self-efficacy (Schauefli & Salanova, 2008).

Conclusions

In all the researchers studied, it seems that there is no direct impact of self-efficacy on work performance but it plays an important role job commitment, performance & low absenteeism. Various prevailing, moderating and mediating variables like commitment, job satisfaction, working climate, and personality traits were discovered to be mixed up in the self efficacy-work performance relationships.

References

- 1- <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/selfefficacy-theory-workplace-10330.html>
- 2- R. Wood and A. Bandura, "Social cognitive theory of organizational management," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 14, no.3, 1989.
- 3- Lai Ming-Cheng and Yen-Chun Chen , "Self-Efficacy, Effort, Job Performance, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intention: The Effect of Personal Characteristics on Organization Performance, *International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology*, Vol. 3, No. 4, August 2012

- 4- Timothy A. Judge, Christine L. Jackson, John C. Shaw, Brent A. Scott and Bruce L. Rich
- 5- “Self-Efficacy and Work-Related Performance: The Integral Role of Individual Differences” *Journal of Applied Psychology* Copyright 2007 by the American Psychological Association, 2007, Vol. 92, No. 1, 107–127.
- 6- Randhawa Gurpreet “**Self-Efficacy and Work Performance: An Empirical Study**” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (Jan., 2004), pp. 336-346
- 7- Manasseh N. Iroegbu, “Self Efficacy and Work Performance: A Theoretical Framework of Albert Bandura's Model, Review of Findings, Implications and Directions for Future Research”, *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences* 2015; 4(4): 170-173 Published online July 12, 2015(<http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/j/pbs>) 10.11648/j.pbs.20150404.15 ISSN: 2328-7837 (Print); ISSN: 2328-7845 (Online)
- 8- Loeb Carina “Self-Efficacy at Work social, Emotional, And Cognitive Dimensions”, *Mälardalen University Press Dissertations No. 208*
- 9- Bandura, A. (1977). *Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- 10- Stajkovic, Alexander D., and Fred Luthans (1998). *Self efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin* 124.2: 240.
- 11- Bandura, A. (1982). *Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American psychologist* 37.2: 122.
- 12- <https://www.talkdesk.com/resources/ebooks/a-guide-to-increasing-self-efficacy-in-the-workplace/>
- 13- Muhammad Salman¹, *, Mula Nazar Khan¹, Umer Draz¹, Muhammad Javaid Iqbal¹, Kamran Aslam² “Impact of Self-Efficacy on Employee’s Job Performance in Health Sector of Pakistan” *American Journal of Business and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 3, 2016, pp. 136-142.