

Self-efficacy among the collective games players

KENIOUA MOULOUD¹, ANTONIO MANUEL FONSECA², BOUMESJED ABDELKADER³

¹Institute of physical education and sport, Ouargla University, ALGERIA

²Faculty of sport, Porto University, PORTUGAL

³Institute of physical education and sport, Mostaganem University, ALGERIA

Published online: December 26, 2015

(Accepted for publication December 6, 2015)

DOI:10.7752/jpes.2015.04123

Abstract:

This study investigated the self-efficacy among collective games players. The research group consisted 65 male undergraduate students. The research was used the self- efficacy scale. Results indicated that student-players obtained high level of self-efficacy .while no significant difference was observed among student-players (football players, handball players, volleyball players).

Key words: self-efficacy, student-players, collective games.

Introduction

Self-efficacy is posited as the basis for such conduct in the sense that it influences the strength of decisions, the quantity of energy invested in the effort, the level of perseverance in the face obstacles and failures or the resilience to adversity. In this sense, this psychological dimension is an individual resource to adapt to situations and contexts of activity grueling interesting sports psychology as the Health psychology and Occupational Psychology (decamps, 2012).

The concept of self-efficacy dates back several decades, and psychologist Albert Bandura was one of the first researchers exploring this topic. Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy theory was developed within the framework of social cognitive theory. Although, originally, the theory was proposed to account for the different results achieved by diverse methods used in clinical psychology for the treatment of anxiety, it has since been expanded and applied to other domains of psychosocial functioning including health and exercise behavior (McAuley, 1992; McAuley & Mihalko 1998; O'Leary, 1985), and sport and motor performance. (Feltz, 1988). The reasons why athletes want to compete depend in the contrast between internal and external rewards as well as an athlete's performance assessment. In other words, if an athlete believes he or she can be successful, he or she is more likely to participate. In sport psychology, this is generally referred to as self-confidence or self-efficacy. High self-efficacy is judgment about one's capability to perform a particular task at an elevated level, with certainty, and repeatedly over time. Motivationally, athletes with higher self-efficacy tend to try harder, persist longer, choose greater challenges, experience effort more positively, and feel less anxious. NHL players who can picture winning a Stanley Cup, for example, will bust their butts come playoff time (and year-round, for that matter), but minor-league rookie who is enticed by a call-up for the postseason, yet thinks of himself as unready and cannot see himself competing with the "big boys", may be afraid to put his all on the line and may end up slacking off in practice (Murphy, 2005). Self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the source of action required to manage prospective situations (bandura, 1997). The concept of self-efficacy is vital to coaches, athletes, and even spectators, for several reasons. First, as a coach, knowing what athletes feel and think about their skills, abilities, and talents is important in the development of those characteristics. Second, a better understanding of an athlete's psyche can significantly improve the resulting sport performance (Moritz, Feltz, Fahrbach, & Mack, 2000).

Self-efficacy refers to athletes' beliefs that they can execute the behaviors required to produce desired outcomes, and they are distinct from outcome expectations, which involve beliefs that certain actions lead to specific consequences. For example, a javelin thrower might believe he is able to execute the correct technique and attain a certain distance. His outcome expectation is that the distance will result in him winning a competition. Both self-efficacy and outcome expectations influence behavior and performance. Athletes who do not believe a desired outcome will result from a specific behavior (low outcome expectancy) may less motivated to try or persist in those actions. Even if they do think a specific behavior will result in a desired outcome, they may still lack motivation if they doubt their ability to perform that behavior (low self-efficacy), (Tod, 2014).

There are three dimensions along which self-efficacy can vary, including level, generality and strength. Level refers to the standard of performance athletes believe they can achieve or the degree of difficulty they perceive they can surmount. For example, Chris from the opening case example might be confident he could achieve eight out of ten attempts at the free throw line, whereas John might believe he could only get two out of

ten attempts. Regarding generality, people may view themselves as capable across a range of domains (e.g. sport, education and career) or only in small number of areas of functioning. Generality also varies across types of activities, capability modality (e.g. thinking, emotion and behavior), different situations and the types of people with which athletes interact. For example, a hockey player might believe she can play well both defensively and offensively in an upcoming game. Her self-efficacy, however, might vary depending on the type of surface she will play on (natural or artificial turf) or the opposition the team is up against. Self-efficacy also varies in strength. Weak self-efficacy is easily negated by disconfirming experiences, whereas people with strong self-efficacy have tenacious beliefs in their abilities and typically persevere in their efforts despite difficulties and obstacles. These athletes are not put off by adversity. Self-efficacy strength not related to choices athletes make about what tasks to attempt in a straightforward way. A minimum threshold of self-efficacy is needed before they will initiate an attempt, but stronger levels of self-assurance result in the same behaviors. Stronger self-efficacy, however, leads to greater perseverance and likelihood that the chosen activity will be performed successfully (Tod, 2014).

According to Bandura, athletes' self-efficacy beliefs are constructed from four major sources: mastery experiences; vicarious experiences; verbal persuasion; and physiological and emotional states. These four sources can enhance or deflate self-efficacy. In ice hockey, for example, players on the bench watching teammates performing well against opponents may experience enhanced self-efficacy. Alternatively, these individuals' self-efficacy may drop if they observe teammates struggling. These sources, however, do not automatically change self-efficacy, but only when athletes interpret the information associated with that source. Benched ice hockey player's self-efficacies may not improve when observing teammates performing well if they think their teammates are much more skilled than themselves (Tod, 2014).

Some studies have touched on the self-efficacy. A study conducted by Shelangoski, Hambrick, Gross, and Weber (2014) on self-efficacy in intercollegiate athletes. The purpose of study explores gender, playing experience, and class status (e.g., first year) differences related to self-efficacy in student-athletes (over 22 years). The results indicated that students-athletes had high levels of self-efficacy and they became more self-efficacious as their status increased (i.e., progressed).

Another study conducted by Helper and Chase (2008), the purpose of study was to examine the relationship between decision-making self-efficacy and task self-efficacy, and subsequent decision-making and task performance. Sixty undergraduate students participated in this study. The results showed high self-efficacy and strength of decision-making and task self-efficacy predicted physical performance.

Study conducted by Hassen and Hamza (2007) on self-efficacy among collective sports players. The participants were 44 student-players faculty of sport Babylon University. Results suggested that players had high general self-efficacy. And there were significant differences between collective sports players in self-efficacy.

The aims of this research is to know the level of self-efficacy among collective games players in institute of physical education and sports activities in University Ouargla Algeria and the significant differences in self-efficacy among the collective games players. This area of research is significant for several reasons, but perhaps most important for students, and players, and practitioners, and others in the field to analyze how much one can accomplish with given set of goals during competition and facing problems.

For the purpose of this study, the research study questions were as follows:

SQ1. What's the level of self-efficacy among collective games players'?

SQ2. Are there significant differences in self-efficacy among the collective games players'?

Methods

Participants

The sample of study comprised 80 male undergraduate students (Third year students of the Bachelor-Specialist-) in institute of physical education and sports activities in University Ouargla Algeria, with the exception of the exploratory sample totaling 8 students, and 7 questionnaires were deleted by the statistical processor (SPSS). Thus, the number of final sample became (65) students; football players 25, handball players 21, and 19 volleyball players.

Instruments

In this study, scale of self-efficacy was used to collect data. Which was developed by Eladel (2001), and then he reviewed some of scales that were prepared previously to measure self-efficacy in foreign environments. One example is the scale prepared by Schwarzer et al (1997), to fit with many cultures, and the original version was prepared in German, it was codified on three samples of university students each from Germany, Spain, and China. The scale of 10 items had been consisted of one dimension. And Abd Elsalam (1998) has translated the scale into Arabic and codified the Egyptian sample. After that, the researcher (Eladel, 2001) has developed 50 items. The validity and reliability to calculate the correlation coefficient between the grades of students in the scale and grades in Schwarzer scale. The correlation coefficient has reached (0.64); it's an indicator to measure the validity. The total grade for the scale as a way Cronbach's alpha coefficient reached (0.77).

In this study the validity and reliability of scale has calculated the correlation coefficients (Pearson correlation coefficient) between each item and total grade of scale, it was found that the scale items associated

with the total grade of the scale, this means that there is statistically significant correlation, and there is validity the self-efficacy scale of the study sample. And the value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient equal to (0.848).

Data analyses

Data analyses were carried out by means of statistical packet for social sciences (SPSS) 20.00 software program. The results were presented as descriptive statistics. Significance level was set at 0.05 for study scale, the degree of “rarely, sometimes, often, always” were used. The scale started with “rarely” from 1 to 4 for the positive items and conversely for the negative items.

Results

In this section, the findings obtained from the data analyses related self-efficacy among the collective games players are given in detail. Findings concerning the level of self efficacy are shown in table 1.

Table1. The level of self-efficacy among players’ collective games

Game	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	theoretical average	Degree of freedom		T value	Sig.
					Calculated	Scheduled		
Football	25	144.24	15.96	125	24	6.037	1.711	yes
Handball	21	140.76	16.31	125	20	7.301	1.725	yes
Volleyball	19	146.78	18.46	125	18	5.206	1.734	yes
total	65	143.86	16.81	125	64	06.181	1.723	

In table 1, the mean value in total (143.86), and Std. deviation (16.81). As for collective games (football, handball, volleyball) the means where (144.24, 140.76, 146.78), it were higher than theoretical average (125). As can be seen in the table, calculated T value for each game was higher than scheduled T value, which indicates the presence of significant differences between the means.

In table2, analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) was used to test the significance differences in self-efficacy. Calculated F value reached (0.911), it was less than scheduled F value, when the degree of freedom (2), and the level of significance (0.05). Consequently, there were no significant differences between collective games players in self-efficacy.

Table2. Analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) to test the significance differences in self-efficacy

variance source	Degree of freedom	The variance	F value		Sing.
			Calculated	Scheduled	
Between groups	2	258.283	0.911	1.53	No
Within groups	62	283.580			

(0.05)

Discussion

The study, which was carried out so as to determine the level of self-efficacy among the collective games players, revealed some important information, findings, and results. As results of this study, it was concluded that the student-players in collective games had high levels of self-efficacy. And they are able to meet the challenges and sports competitions, and whatever the type of competition. “High self-efficacy will likely choose to attend training regularly, expend high levels of effort, and persist longer than those with low self-efficacy. These self-efficacious individuals will set higher goals and have more helpful thoughts and emotions. As a result, they may have a better chance of success” (Tod, 2014). Providing support for present study’s, both Helper and Chase (2008) and Shelangoski, Hambrick, Gross, and Weber (2014) examined self-efficacy as it relates to the situation and innate abilities of collegiate athletes. They found higher levels of self-efficacy produced higher levels of performance in athletes.

Results were concluded that no significant differences between collective games players in self-efficacy. Perhaps the positive expectations for student-players about their abilities have had the same feeling, and they aspire to get academic certificate, every one according his specialty. “Self-efficacy is conceived as positive predictor of motor skill acquisition, execution, and competition sport performance (Bandura, 1997).

Conclusions

Finally, there were high level of self-efficacy among the collective games players (football, handball, Volleyball) institute of physical education and sports Ouargla University, and no significant differences between collective games players in self-efficacy. Future qualitative research which covers the test having multi-variable on self-efficacy could be performed.

References

- Abdelsalam A. (1998). Introduction to mental health. Cairo: dar elnahda.
- Bandura A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura A. (1997). Self-efficacy. The Exercise of Control. New York: W.H. freeman.
- Decamps G.(2012). Sports psychology & performance. (p380). (1st Ed.). Brussels: group de boeck.
- Eladel A. (2001).trajectory analysis of the relationship between the components of ability and the self-efficacy and the trend towards risk. *Journal of education faculty*. Ain shams University, v25
- Feltz D. L. (1988). Self-confidence and sports performance. In K. B. Pandolf (Ed.) *.Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews*. (pp. 423-457). New York: MacMillan.
- Hassen N.M. and Hamza A.H. (2007) .self-efficacy among collective sports players’ .16th scientific conferences of the faculties and departments physical education and sports Babylon University ,Iraq.
- Helper T. J., and Chase, M.A. (2008).relationship between decision –making self-efficacy, task self-efficacy and the performance of sport skill. *Journal of sport sciences*, 26(6), 603-610.
- McAuley E. (1992). Self-referent thought in sport and physical activity. In T. S. Horn.(Ed.). *Advances in Sport Psychology*, (pp. 101-118). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- McAuley E. & Mihalko S. L. (1998). Measuring exercise-related self-efficacy. In J. L.Duda (Ed.). *Advancements in sport and exercise psychology measurement*. (pp .371-390).Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Mortiz S.S., Feltz D.L., Farhbach .R.K., & Mack D.E. (2000).The relation of self-efficacy measures to sport performance: A Meta analysis review. *Review quartly for Exercise and sport*, 71(11), 280-294.
- Murphy SH. (2005).the sport psych handbook. (pp.8-9). Champaign, IL: human kinetics.
- O’Leary A. (1985). Self-efficacy and health. *Behavior Therapy and Research*, 23, 437-452.
- Schwarzer R.,Born A.,Iwawaki S.,Lee Y.-M.,Saito E.,& Yue X.(1997).The assessment of optimistic self-beliefs: Comparison of Chinese,Indonesian,Japanese and Korean versions of the general self-efficacy scale.*psychologia:An International journal of psychology in the orient*,40(1),1-13.
- Shelangoski I.B. and Weber D.j. (2014) .Self-efficacy intercollegiate athletes’. *Journal of issues in intercollegiateathletes*, 7, 17-72.
- Tod A. (2014).Sport psychology the basics. (pp.83-84). (1st Ed.).New York: Routledge.