

A STUDY OF SELF-EFFICACY AMONG URBAN AND RURAL COLLEGE STUDENTS

Abhishek Sharma
Diploma In Guidance And Counselling
ANNAMALI UNIVERSITY

Abstract: - This Study purpose that a Study of Self-Efficacy among Urban and Rural College Students. **Objectives:-** To examine Self-Efficacy among Urban and Rural College Students. **Hypotheses:-** There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Self Confidence, Efficacy expectation, Positive attitude and Outcome expectation. **Methodology-Sample:** Total sample of present study 120 College Students, in which 60 were Urban and 60 Rural College Students, Both groups sample College Students from Aurangabad Dist. in Maharashtra. **Non-Probability purposive of Accident dental Sample Design was selected and the subject selected in this sample was age group of 18-21 year. Variables-** The independent variables are Area of Residence (Urban and Rural Students) and Dependent variables are Self-Efficacy (Self Confidence, Efficacy expectation, Positive attitude and Outcome expectation). **Research Design:** 2x2 Factorial Designs used in the present study. **Research Tools-** Self-Efficacy Scale by Dr. A.K.Singh, Dr. Shruti Narain. **Statistical Treatment:** Mean SD and ANOVA. **Conclusions:** 1) Urban Students high Self Confidence than Rural Students. 2) Rural Students high Efficacy expectation than Urban Students. 3) Rural Students high Positive attitude than Urban Students. 4) No significant difference between Urban and Rural Students on Outcome expectation. 5) Rural Students high Self-Efficacy than Urban Students.

Key words: - Urban, Rural, Self-Efficacy, Self Confidence, Efficacy expectation, Positive attitude and Outcome expectation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Self-efficacy is commonly defined as the belief in one's capabilities to achieve a goal or an outcome. Students with a strong sense of efficacy are more likely to challenge themselves with difficult tasks and be intrinsically motivated. These students will put forth a high degree of effort in order to meet their commitments, and attribute failure to things which are in their control, rather than blaming external factors. Self-efficacious students also recover quickly from setbacks, and ultimately are likely to achieve their personal goals. Students with low self-efficacy, on the other hand, believe they cannot be successful and thus are less likely to make a concerted, extended effort and may consider challenging tasks as threats that are to be avoided. Self-efficacy as it is commonly known, is one of the most enabling psychology models adopted into positive psychology. It is the optimistic self-belief in our competence or chances of successfully accomplishing a task and

producing favorable outcomes.

Self-efficacy plays an important role in determining our chances for success; in fact, some psychologists rate self-efficacy above talent in the recipe for the success. We need to devote special attention to self-efficacy, while determining the goal to make sure that our self-beliefs are in consonance with the aims and not working against them.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Hardré & Hennessey (2010) this study revealed that students from rural areas had the same self-efficacy level, perceived ability and success expectations to urban and suburban area's students. Mani M., and M. Mahendra Prabu, (2019) this study found that 1) the rural higher secondary school students have a high level of self-efficacy. 2) There is a significant difference between self-efficacy of rural students in higher secondary schools. 3) There is a significant difference between self-efficacy of urban students in higher secondary schools. Moomin Jan, (2015) this study found that significant difference was found between rural and urban students on their self-efficacy. Rajesh Kumar and Roshan Lal, (2006) this results revealed that the urban self efficacious students significantly outperformed rural self-efficacious students and the females of rural and urban backgrounds competed equally well with males in self efficacy.

Roshan Lal Zinta(2020) this study results revealed that the urban self efficacious students significantly outperformed rural self-efficacious students and the females of rural and urban backgrounds competed equally well with males in self efficacy. Siraj Khan, Amjad Reba, Adnan shahzad, (2021) this study revealed that there was no significant difference found in the academic self efficacy level of the participants on the basis rural and urban region of district Peshawar. Usher & Weidner, (2019) this study found that students of rural and urban areas were quite similar in their levels of self-efficacy in the subject of math. Both the students of urban and rural area depend greatly on mastery experiences to enhance their general math self-efficacy.

3. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A Study of Self-Efficacy among Urban and Rural College Students

Objectives of the study

- To examine Self Confidence among Urban and Rural College Students.
- To examine Efficacy expectation among Urban and Rural College Students.
- To examine Positive attitude among Urban and Rural College Students.

- To examine Outcome expectation among Urban and Rural College Students.
- To examine Self-Efficacy among Urban and Rural College Students.

Hypotheses of the study

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Self Confidence.
- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Efficacy expectation.
- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Positive attitude.
- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Outcome expectation.
- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension on Self-Efficacy.

4. METHODOLOGY

Sample

Total sample of present study 120 College Students, in which 60 were Urban and 60 Rural College Students, Both groups sample College Students from Aurangabad Dist. in Maharashtra. Non-Probability purposive of Accident dental Sample Design was selected and the subject selected in this sample was age group of 18-21 year.

Research design:-

2x2 Factorial Designs used in the present study

VARIABLES USED FOR STUDY

Independent Variables - Area of Residence- Urban Students
2) Rural Students

Dependent Variables - Self-Efficacy –

- 1) Self Confidence, 2) Efficacy expectation
- 3) Positive attitude 4) Outcome expectation

5. RESEARCH TOOLS

Self- Efficacy scale

The Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Dr. Arun Kumar Singh and Dr. Shruti Narain in the year 2014 and it consists of 20 questions. There are five responses Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree. The Self-Efficacy Scale measures four sub-scales i.e., Self-Confidence, Efficacy Expectation, Positive Attitude and Outcome Expectation. This scale is meant for Adolescents of the age range 12 years and above. The scale generally takes about 10 to 15 minutes for completion. There are 16 positive items and 4 negative items. The scoring of positive items of the Scale was done by giving a score of 5,4,3,2 or 1 for Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree respectively and negative items were scored as 1,2,3,4, and 5 respectively. Higher the score, higher the self-efficacy level.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS:

Rural: - Students reside since 15 years continuously in rural area.

Urban: - Students reside since 15 years continuously in urban area.

Self - Efficacy: - Self efficacy is the belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the sources of action required to manage prospective situations.

PROCEDURES OF DATA COLLECTION:-

For the present study 60sample was used and two instruments were administered individuals as well as a small group will be adopted. The subjects were called in a small group of 21-25 subjects. Following the instructions and procedure suggested by the author of the test. Tests were administered and a field copy of each test was collected. Following the same procedure the whole data was collected.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

At the first stage data were treated by descriptive statistical techniques i.e. mean and standard Deviation and ANOVA was done by using SPSS Software.

6. RESULTS

Table No. 01. Summary of Area of Residence on Self-Efficacy

| Table No | Factor | Area of Residence | Mean | SD | N | DF | F Value | Sign. |
|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|------|----|-----|---------|-------|
| Table No 01 (A) | Self Confidence | Urban Students | 11.35 | 2.13 | 60 | 118 | 4.750 | 0.05 |
| | | Rural Students | 12.05 | 1.71 | 60 | | | |
| Table No 01 (B) | Efficacy expectation | Urban Students | 13.61 | 2.11 | 60 | 118 | 27.63 | 0.01 |
| | | Rural Students | 15.20 | 1.82 | 60 | | | |
| Table No 01 (C) | Positive attitude | Urban Students | 15.63 | 1.55 | 60 | 118 | 4.49 | 0.05 |
| | | Rural Students | 16.16 | 1.58 | 60 | | | |
| Table No 01 (D) | Outcome expectation | Urban Students | 17.10 | 1.64 | 60 | 118 | 1.116 | NS |
| | | Rural Students | 16.83 | 1.79 | 60 | | | |
| Table No 01 (E) | Self-Efficacy | Urban Students | 57.70 | 3.53 | 60 | 118 | 25.34 | 0.01 |
| | | Rural Students | 60.25 | 3.14 | 60 | | | |

DISCUSSION

Area of Residence on Self Confidence

Hypothesis - 01

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Self Confidence.

Observation of the Table No 01 (A) indicated that the mean value of two classified group seems to differ from each other on Self Confidence. The mean and SD value obtained by the Urban Students was 11.35, SD 2.13 and Rural Students were 12.05, SD 1.71. Both group ‘F’ ratio was 4.750 at a glance those Urban Students shows Miner high score than Rural Students. Area of Residence effect represents the Self Confidence was significant (F- 4.750, 1 and 118, P-0.05). This is significant at 0.05 (6.76) levels because they obtained ‘F’ value are high than table values at 0.05. That is to say that this null hypothesis is rejected and Alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that Urban Students high Self Confidence than Rural Students.

Area of Residence on Efficacy expectation
Hypothesis - 02

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Efficacy expectation.

Observation of the Table No 01 (B) indicated that the mean value of two classified group seems to differ from each other on Efficacy expectation. The mean and SD value obtained by the Urban Students was 11.61, SD 2.11 and Rural Students were 15.20, SD 1.82. Both group 'F' ratio was 27.63 at a glance those Rural Students shows high score than Urban Students. Area of Residence effect represents the Efficacy expectation was significant (F- 27.63, 1 and 118, P-0.05 and 0.01). This is significant 0.01 (3.89) and at 0.05 (6.76) levels because they obtained 'F' value are high than table values at 0.01 and 0.05. That is to say that this null hypothesis is rejected and Alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that Rural Students high Efficacy expectation than Urban Students.

Area of Residence on Positive attitude
Hypothesis - 03

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Positive attitude.

Observation of the Table No 01 (C) indicated that the mean value of two classified group seems to differ from each other on Positive attitude. The mean and SD value obtained by the Urban Students was 15.63, SD 1.55 and Rural Students were 16.16, SD 1.58. Both group 'F' ratio was 4.49 at a glance those Rural Students shows high score than Urban Students. Area of Residence effect represents the Positive attitude was significant (F- 4.49, 1 and 118, P- 0.05). This is significant at 0.05 (6.76) levels because they obtained 'F' value are high than table values at 0.05. That is to say that this null hypothesis is rejected and Alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that Rural Students high Positive attitude than Urban Students.

Area of Residence on Outcome expectation
Hypothesis - 04

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension Self-Efficacy on Outcome expectation.

Observation of the Table No 01 (D) indicated that the mean value of two classified group seems to differ from each other on Outcome expectation. The mean and SD value obtained by the Urban Students was 17.10, SD 1.64 and Rural Students were 16.83, SD 1.79. Both group 'F' ratio was 1.116 at a glance those Urban Students shows Miner high score than Rural Students. Area of Residence effect represents the Outcome expectation was no significant (F- 1.116, 1 and 118, P-NS). This is no significant 0.01 (3.89) and at 0.05 (6.76) levels because they obtained 'F' value are low than table values at 0.01 and 0.05. That is to say that this null hypothesis is accepted and Alternative hypothesis is

rejected. It means that there is no significant difference between Urban and Rural Students on Outcome expectation.

Area of Residence on Self-Efficacy
Hypothesis - 05

- There is no significant difference Between Urban and Rural College Students with dimension on Self-Efficacy.

Observation of the Table No 01 (E) indicated that the mean value of two classified group seems to differ from each other on Self-Efficacy. The mean and SD value obtained by the Urban Students was 53.70, SD 3.53 and Rural Students were 60.25, SD 3.14. Both group 'F' ratio was 25.34 at a glance those Rural Students shows high score than Urban Students. Area of Residence effect represents the Self-Efficacy was significant (F- 25.34, 1 and 118, P-0.05 and 0.01). This is significant 0.01 (3.89) and at 0.05 (6.76) levels because they obtained 'F' value are high than table values at 0.01 and 0.05. That is to say that this null hypothesis is rejected and Alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that Rural Students high Self-Efficacy than Urban Students.

7. CONCLUSIONS

- 1) Urban Students high Self Confidence than Rural Students.
- 2) Rural Students high Efficacy expectation than Urban Students.
- 3) Rural Students high Positive attitude than Urban Students.
- 4) No significant difference between Urban and Rural Students on Outcome expectation.
- 5) Rural Students high Self-Efficacy than Urban Students.

REFERENCES

1. Adeoyo, H. (2009) the relative effect of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy training on the scholastic achievement of some Nigerian school students. *Perspective in Education*, 25(3), 187-195.
2. Ali Arslan (2013) Investigation of Relationship between Sources of Self-efficacy beliefs of Secondary School Students and Some Variables. *Educational Sciences: The Theory and Practice*, 13(4). Educational Consultancy and Research Center. www.edam.com.tr/estp. DOI: 10.12738/estp.2013.4.1753.
3. Aurah, C. (2017). Investigating the Relationship between Science Self-Efficacy Beliefs, Gender, and Academic Achievement, among High School Students in Kenya.
4. Bandura, A. (1977) Self-efficacy: Towards a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychology Review*, 84, 191-215.
5. Bandura, A. (1991a). Self-efficacy mechanism in physiological activation and health-promoting behavior. In J. Madden, IV (Ed.), *Neurobiology of learning, emotion and affect* (pp. 229- 270). New York: Raven.

6. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. Freeman, New York.
7. Bhilota, J M. & R Meghnathi (2020). Impact of emotional intelligence and self-efficacy on the psychological well-being of adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(3), 230-234.
8. Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of Science Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Middle School Students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 43, 485-499.
9. Carol, Burgel (2010) Self-efficacy in female and male undergraduate engineering students: Comparisons among four Institutions. *ASEE Southeast Section Conference*.
10. Doods, H. (2002) Academic remediation, Stress and self-efficacy among delinquent youth. *Disabilities and Impairments*, 16(1), 19-28.
11. Endler, N.S., Speer, R.L., Johnson, J.M., AND Flett, G.L. (2001) General Self-efficacy and control in relation to anxiety and cognitive performance. *Current Psychology: Development, Learning, Personality, Social*, 20 (1), 36-52.
12. Hardre, P., & Hennessey, M. (2010). Two rural worlds: Differences of rural high school students' motivational profiles in Indiana and Colorado.
13. Harrison, W.A. (1997) Testing the Self-Efficacy-Performance Linkage of social cognitive theory. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137(1), 79-87.
14. Hassan Toozandehjani Maryam Asaadi and Mahboobeh Rad (2014) A survey on efficiency of instructing the decision-making and self-esteem skills on career Self-Efficacy, career indecision and self-esteem of students. *International Journal of Innovative and Applied Research*, Volume 2, Issue (8), ISSN 2348 – 0319, pp-72-81.
15. Houghton, L. (2008) Self-efficacy and academic achievement in Australian high school students: The mediating effects of academic aspirations and deliquescing. On published Dissertation: The University of Sydney.
16. Jamil, N. L., & Mahmud, S. N. D. (2019). Self-efficacy relationship on science achievement amongst national secondary school students. *Creative Education*, 10(11), 2509-2527.
17. Julie Bell and Max Smith (2005) Measuring Student Self-efficacy to Enhance School to Work Processes: The development of a large-scale online survey instrument. *Leading & Managing*. Vol.11. No.2. Pp-119-134.
18. Junge, M. E., & Dretzke, B. J. (1995). Mathematical self-efficacy, gender differences in gifted/talented adolescents. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39, 22-28.
19. Kiran, D., & Sungur, S. (2012). Middle School Students' Science Self-Efficacy and Its Sources: Examination of Gender Difference. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21, 619-630.
20. Kumar, Rajesh & Lal, Roshan. (2006). The role of self-efficacy and gender difference among the adolescents. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 32(3), 249-254.
21. Lent, R. W., & Hackett, G. (1987). Career self-efficacy: Empirical status and future directions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 30, 347-382.
22. Louis, R. A., & Mistele, J. M. (2011). The Differences in Scores and Self-Efficacy by Student Gender in Mathematics and Science. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 10, 1163-1190.
23. Maddux, J. E., & Stanley, M. A. (Eds.) (1986). Special issue on self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 4 (Whole No.3).
24. Mahyuddin, R., Elias, H., Cheong, L. S., Muhamad, M. F., Noordin, N., & Abdullah, M. C. (2006). The Relationship between Students' Self-Efficacy and Their English Language Achievement. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education*, 21, 61-71.
25. Martin, M. and Garcia, L. (2001) Effect of academic self-efficacy and optimism on students, academic performance. *Journal of Special Education*, 22, 3787-385.
26. Ogunyemi, O.A. (2007) Self-efficacy risk taking behaviour and mental health as predictors of personal growth initiative among university undergraduates. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*. Vol. 5(2), 349-362.
27. Ramezan Jahanian and Setareh Mahjoubi (2013) A study on the Rate of Self-efficacy's Effect on University Students' Academic Achievements. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*. 15(7):pp.1021-1027. ISSN 1990-9233. © IDOSI Publications. DOI: 10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2013.15.7.748.
28. Rawlison, C. (2005) The link between self-concept, self-efficacy and demonstration of special abilities. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 154(1), 1-17.
29. Rubin, R.B., Martin, M.M., Burning, S.S., Powers, D.E. (1993). Testy of a self-efficacy model of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication quarterly*, PP. 210-220.
30. Rudina Shkullaku (2013) The Relationship between Self – efficacy and Academic Performance in the Context of Gender among Albanian Students. *European academic research*, vol. I, issue 4, pp-467-478,
31. Salami, S.O. (2009) Emotional intelligence and academic Self-efficacy as predictors of academic performance among senior secondary school students in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Perspectives Education*, 25(3), 175-185.
32. Sawari, S. S. M., Ghazali, M. A. I., & Mansor, N. (2015). A Study of Learning Efficacy among Rural Area Students in Ledang Johor. *Sains Humanika*, 5, 1-9.
33. Schunk, D. H. (1989) Self-efficacy and cognitive skill learning. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education*, Vol. 3, Goals

- and cognitions Pp- 13-44.
34. Sheri Robinson Bounds, (2013) Examining the relationship between career decision self efficacy, ethnic identity, and academic self-concept and achievement of African American high school students. University of Iowa, 2013. Pp-219-229.
 35. Singh, Kirandeep, and Bhalla Vidhi (2013) A Study of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy among Senior Secondary Students. *Conflux Journal of Education*. Vol.1. Issue 1. ISSN 2320-9305. Nas publishers. PP- 48-53.
 36. Siraj Khan, Amjad Reba, Adnan shahzad, (2021) A comparative study of Academic self-efficacy level of secondary school students in Rural and Urban Areas of District Peshawar, Pakistan. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*. 15, 5, 754-761.
 37. Siti Salwa Bte Md. Sawari, Norwati Bt Mansor, (2013) A study of student's general self-efficacy related to gender differences. *Refereed & Indexed Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*,1,(4), 62-67.
 38. Skaalvik, M. (2003) Academic self-concept and self-efficacy. How different and they really. *Educational Psychology, Reviewers*, 15(1), 1-40.
 39. Souza, D.S. (2010) A study of stress in students of standard X in relation to their academic self-concept, self-efficacy, focus of control and socio-economic status. *Gyan- the Journal of Education*, 6(2), 43-49.
 40. Tamaddoni, M., M. Hatami and H.H. Razini,(2010) Public Self-efficacy, academic carelessness and academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, Pp-65-86.
 41. Usher, E. L., Ford, C. J., Li, C. R., & Weidner, B. L. (2019). Sources of math and science self-efficacy in rural Appalachia: A convergent mixed methods study. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 57, 32-53.
 42. Weisgram, E. S., & Bigler, R. S. (2006). Girls and Science Careers: The Role of Altruistic Values and Attitudes about Scientific Tasks. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 27, 326-348.
 43. Yazachew, A. T. (2013). Relationship between self-efficacy, academic achievement and gender in analytical chemistry at Debre Markos college of teacher education. *African Journal of Chemical Education (AJCE)*, 3(1), 3- 28.