

# Occupational Self Efficacy of Public Sector Employees in Indian Context – An Analysis

## Dr Ramakrishna KS

Professor & Head, Department of Management Studies, Sridevi Institute of Engineering & Technology, Tumkur 572106.

## Dr Gururaj B Urs

Professor, Head – Center for Research, RIM, Bengaluru 560054.

## Dr Lancy Dsouza

Professor & Head, Department of Psychology, Maharaja's College, University of Mysore, Mysuru 570001

### Article Type: Article

**Article Citation:** Dr Ramakrishna KS, Dr Gururaj B Urs, Dr Lancy Dsouza, Occupational Self Efficacy of Public Sector Employees in Indian Context – An Analysis. M.S. Ramaiah Management Review. 2024; 15(01), 93-107. DOI:10.52184/msrmr.v15i01.000

**Received date:** December 01, 2023

**Accepted date:** January 20, 2024

**\*Author for correspondence:**  
Dr Gururaj B Urs  Professor, Head – Center for Research, RIM, Bengaluru 560054.

### Abstract

An individual's level of coherence and competency in implementing necessary action, i.e., in being able to manage various situations is known as Self-efficacy. Work based self-efficacy is a concept which assesses employees confidence in being able to manage their respective occupational experiences. The theoretical platform forms when employees with better Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) have been observed to increasingly look forward and also tend to be successful in their work related performance.

However, when work related achievements are to be believed in, works in order to bolster an individual's self-efficacy levels through a feedback structure, i.e., in persevering subsequent performance in order to reinforce one's self-efficacy truths and beliefs.

The primary objective of this study is to understand the Occupational Self Efficacy among Managers and Engineers. The second is to assess the impact of socio-demographic issues on the Occupational self-efficacy existing between the types of employees. This study was conducted in a manufacturing plant, i.e., a Public Sector Unit, located in the Industrial suburbs of Mysore city. The sample chosen consisted of a hundred and twenty respondents, as per the criteria of inclusion and exclusion. Using the demographic data sheet and the occupational self-efficacy scale, the data was collected and analyzed using Regression analysis, two-way ANOVA, Duncan's Multiple Range Test, and Descriptive statistics.

The main findings are, that Engineers and Managers did not differ significantly in their scores across occupational self-efficacy; Second, the interaction effect between the type of occupation, income, age, and work experience, is found to be non-significant, which shows that the occupational self-efficacy scores are similar among

employees. To summarize, OSE is concerned with the belief in one's capacity and competency, to manage one's functioning and thereby the events that affect one's life. However, belief in a person's efficacy affects their life, which is based on the choices, along with levels of motivation, quality of life, and handling adversity well.

**Key words :** Occupational Self Efficacy, Demographic variables, Managers, Engineers, Demographic variables.

## 1. Introduction

Bandura (1977), a behavioral psychologist in the 1970s conceptualized the concept of Self-efficacy in which the “convictions that an individual can execute the behaviour needed to obtain specific outcomes”. Gecas (1989) reports that Self-efficacy as a concept is linked with many a favourable consequence, with a specific focus on mental and physical health. Further, is strongly correlated with achievement, reliance on self and mastery of a concerned concept. However, Bandura (1977) reports that Self-efficacy as a skill is developed via several mechanisms, as in model learning and mastery of experience. Further, evaluation of Self efficacy on various levels of specific outcomes related to tasks and jobs. However, Bandura (1977) has reiterated that self-efficacy as being task-specific; Forester, *et al.*, (2004) has formulized it as being very specific to the domain or the area, and finally as put by Sherer, *et al.*, (1982) and Chen, *et al.*, (2001) as the general scenario based self-efficacy.

Gist & Mitchell (1992) debate that In trying to understand the link between the concept of self efficacy with its outcomes, is to be understood with the specificity level of the evaluation must be linked to the specificity level of the outcome which is to be predicted. Salanova, *et al.*, (2002) reported the differential values between two sets, as in domain based versus general self-efficacy

based, and this could be illustrated using an individual's employees case of being a burnout (occupational).

This showcases that an evaluation of self-efficacy is deemed not to be exact, even though studying and being able to predict certain conceptual frameworks related to work / task / job. Self-efficacy has its origins in clinical applications in Psychology, however it has been widely understood and implemented in the aspect of organisational work and related context (Judge & Bono, 2001; Berings, *et al.*, 2007; Garofano & Salas, 2005; Abele & Spurk, 2009). Self-efficacy is a significant variable with respect to organisational performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998), task based persistence (Multon *et al.*, 1991), and as put by Sexton & Tucker (1991), the approach being adopted by employees with regards to their changing tasks is also one of the many interphases. This is a depiction of the centrality of self-efficacy in order to be known as a significant resource in any organisation. Self-efficacy, which is perceived and understood is an individual's beliefs about one's capabilities to bring out specific levels and aspects of performance, which have exercised significant impact over related events which have affected the lives of individuals and communities.

An individual's assessment regarding one's self efficacy determines the aspects of an individual, as in how he/she thinks, feels, is motivated, behaves and interacts

with self and others. Beliefs as the one mentioned previously, bring out relevant diverse effects through certain mechanisms, which are four in number, as in affective, cognitive, motivational, along with selection processes; and as being important for the one's progress, growth and development.

## 2. Review of Literature

The establishment of Self-efficacy as the primary concept in Social Learning by Bandura (1978) has been widely accepted. An understanding regarding an individual's ability to display a behavior or its pattern so as to achieve a necessiated goal is another aspect. Expectations concerning Self-efficacy comprise basic determinant/s of one's cognitive makeup, whether or not a person will attempt any given behavior in any social scenario. Self-efficacy has considerable potential explanatory power over such behavior patterns as in, academic persistence and success, achievement strivings, self-regulation, career competency, coping mechanisms, career selection, its opportunities and related others as informed by Bandura, (1982), Lent & Hackett, (1987). However, the elementary input, is the empirically established relationship between work related performance, jobs and tasks (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998; Gist & Mitchell, 1992).

Social Cognitive Theory perceives people as proactive, self-reflective, self-organizing, self-regulative and all related positive selves (Bandura, 1999). These individual's assessment of actuality and behaviors in turn, are influenced with the level to which they have been perceived, and that most of them continue to influence and control the movement in their lives, as reported by Federici & Skaalvik, (2011). Schaufeli, *et al.*, (2002)

visualized engagement at work as a motivational construct by saying it is "a fulfilling, positive, work-related mind set, configured by absorption, dedication and vigor". Luthans & Yuseef (2007) report that as certain people with better self-efficacy in their respective occupations, are way more motivated intrinsically to pursue their objectives, along with the belief one has the competency of being able to meet their respective work specifications and needs, thus showing that such patten of behaviors trigger better levels of engagement at their work places.

A strong relationship between self-efficacy and engagement at work, has been reported and such people having an increased level of Self-efficacy, are possibly in better mindset, to deliver better with regards to their tasks and jobs. Further, an individual's self-efficacy, is one of the most crucial component in the engagement at their work places (Bakker, *et al.*, 2002; Xanthopoulou, *et al.*, 2009).

An individuals' thinking, feeling, and behavior is affected by Self efficacy; also the time duration, the among of effort and thus energy, invested into a task is influenced by Self efficacy (Bandura, 1999). Persons with increased levels of Self-efficacy exhibit greater confidence and self-esteem in their abilities; persevere to obtain the goals; and when faced with setbacks, show case themselves not be be affected by increasaed levels of stress, and thus display their commitment to their jobs and tasks (Lane, *et al.*, 2004; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). Self-efficacy is positively linked and is a strong predictor of commitment to the organization (Meyer, *et al.*, 2002). Strong commitment is displayed by the employees towards their organization, bassed on their belief that they are skilled in their task / job performance (Park & Jung, 2015).

### 3. Rationale

Research work done earlier have displayed that as employees in various occupations with differing levels of OSE exerts more effort and persistence on the individual employee. This sets even more challenging goals as in, a higher level of self-efficacy is bound to be associated with a higher motivational state toward one's work and its engagement ( Guarnaccia, *et al.*, 2018). The focus of research studies in Indian settings is less in this area of study (Chaudhary, *et al.*, 2012), especially involving industrial units and it personnel, which are public sector based. Hence, this study has been planned in order to assess the impact of an public sector employee's secondary demographic variables like age, gender, family type, marital status, educational background, income, experience at work, on the one hand and occupational self-efficacy, on the other.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1 Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses have been developed and are as follows

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no difference in the Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) scores of engineers and managers.

H<sub>02</sub> : Income has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees.

H<sub>03</sub> : Age has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees.

H<sub>04</sub> : Experience has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees

H<sub>05</sub> : Family type has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees.

H<sub>06</sub> : Educational has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees

H<sub>07</sub>: Marital status has no influence on the OSE scores of the employees.

### 4.2 Universe

The universe considered for the purpose of this research work, is a Public Sector Unit in the Mysore Industrial Area.

#### 4.2.1 Sample Design

Stratified random sampling has been adopted to collect the data from the respondents and the details are given below.

**TABLE NO 1.** Sample size.

Company	Type of employees		Total
	Managers	Engineers	
Public Sector Unit	60	60	120

#### 4.2.2 Inclusion criteria

1. The age of the respondents should be within 22 to 55 years
2. The minimum educational qualification for, a. Managers is a bachelor's degree and above; b. Engineer is a Diploma and above
3. The respondent should not have undergone the above mentioned test earlier
4. A minimum of five years of work experience is a must.

#### 4.2.3 Exclusion criteria

1. Age below 22 and above 55 years.
2. Minimum qualification for; a. Managers : below Degree and above; b. Engineers : below Diploma
3. Less than five years of work experience.

### 4.3 Tools used

1. Socio-demographic information sheet  
This information sheet was set up by the researcher. This sheet consists of the socio-demographic details such as age,

gender, educational qualification, marital status, type of family, work experience, designation at work place, income, and other related issues.

## 2. Occupational Self Efficacy scale

Occupational Self Efficacy scale (OSEs) has been standardized by Pethe S, Chaudhari S and Dhar U. This scale has been administered to assess the level of OSE among the employees. There are 19 items in this scale, each item is to be rated on the five point rating scale. There are six sub-scales viz., command, confidence, adaptability, positive attitude, personal effectiveness, and individuality. The odd even reliability of the scale was determined by calculating reliability co-efficient, corrected for its full length. The reliability co-efficient of the OSE scale is 0.98

### 4.3.1 Pilot study

The researcher conducted a pilot study, during which the socio-demographic data sheet and the OSE was administered to twenty employees at the unit. The respondent sheets were collected post the completion of the filling in of the data. They were later scored and statistically analyzed. The results of the pilot study were as follows -

1. During the initial phase, the respondents expressed few reservations to answer the questions, as the questions were directly related to their work.
2. The employees expressed their displeasure against information pertaining to more number of the questions (in the OSEs).
3. During the data collection, few of the respondents expressed the need for clarification, about certain issues and were discussed.

4. Three of the twenty respondents gave back incompletely filled questionnaire.

The above mentioned findings (of the pilot study) were incorporated into the various parts of the main study.

## 4.4 Main study

The main study was done in two phases. They are -

### Phase 1 :

The researcher gathers about ten employees in a given venue / room, introduces himself and the study being conducted, tools, methodology, rationale and other aspects. The assurance regarding the confidentiality of the responses (of the respondents) were provided.

### Phase 2 :

During this phase, the data sheet along with the OSE scale, were administered to all the respondents, with a request to fill up all the statements. The respondents were requested to return the completed questionnaire in about thirty minutes to a quarter an hour. Similarly, the sample were divided equally among twelve groups (of ten employees / respondent in each group) and data collection was done.

Those response sheets, which were not properly/ incompletely / incorrectly filled, were discarded and the remaining response sheets were scored, coded and master chart was prepared. The master chart was analysed using IBM SPSS 30.0.1.

## 5. Data Analysis

The below mentioned statistical techniques were used to analyse the data and they are -

- Regression (Step Wise Multiple)

- Duncan's Multiple Range Test
- Two way Analysis of Variance (General Linear Model)
- Descriptive statistics

Results obtained after the analysis were tabulated and have been given as follows.

As per table No's 2 & 3, Engineers and Managers did not differ significantly in their mean OSEs. F value of .503 with 1 and 86 df's is found to be non-significant ( $P < .480$ ). The mean OSEs for engineers and managers are 74.86 and 73.40 respectively, which are almost the same and has statistically contributed for the non-significant difference. Between income groups also, a non-significant difference existed in the mean self-efficacy scores of employees ( $F = .006$ ;  $P < .994$ ). The employees with different

levels of income like below 30,000, 30,001 to 45,000; 45,000 to 60,000 is 74.72, 74.15 and 75.00 respectively.

The interaction effects between the occupation type and the income is found to be non-significant ( $F = .162$ ;  $P < .688$ ), indicating that pattern of OSE is same in employees of different income groups irrespective of the occupation they have.

Employees with different age groups did not differ significantly in their mean self-efficacy scores ( $F = .332$ ;  $P < .810$ ). The mean scores of employees with different age groups like below 30, 31-40, 41-50 and 50 and above 73.33, 73.78, 75.45 and 75.36, which are same statistically and have contributed to non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type

**TABLE NO 2.** Showing the mean OSE score of Managers, Engineers and levels of Income

Occupation	Income (in Rs)	Mean	S.D
Engineers	<30,000	75.10	5.19
	30,001 to 45,000	74.36	9.95
	45,001 to 60,000	75.00	9.48
	Overall	74.86	7.48
Managers	<30,000	72.88	4.48
	30,001 to 45,000	73.75	8.48
	45,001 to 60,000	-	-
	Overall	73.40	7.30
Total	<30,000	74.72	5.16
	30,001 to 45,000	74.15	9.44
	45,001 to 60,000	75.00	9.48
	Overall	74.85	7.44

**TABLE NO 3.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Managers and Engineers having differing levels of income.

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	28.889	1	28.889	.503	.480
Income (B)	0.695	2	0.348	.006	.994
Interaction (A X B)	9.322	1	9.322	.162	.688
Error	4935.806	86	57.393	--	--

**TABLE NO 4.** Mean OSE score of Engineers and Managers having different age groups

Occupation	Age (in years)	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Below 30	73.33	7.57
	31-40	73.89	7.53
	41-50	75.57	7.14
	50 +	77.78	8.33
	Overall	74.86	7.48
Managers	Below 30	-	-
	31-40	73.14	5.24
	41-50	75.13	7.49
	50 +	71.00	10.25
	Overall	73.40	7.37
Total	Below 30	73.33	7.57
	31-40	73.78	7.18
	41-50	75.45	7.10
	50 +	75.36	9.30
	Overall	74.54	7.44

**TABLE NO 5.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers having different age groups

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	97.439	1	97.439	1.718	.194
Income (B)	54.767	3	18.256	.322	.810
Interaction (A X B)	96.494	2	48.247	.851	.431
Error	4764.676	84	56.722		

and age groups is also found to be non-significant ( $F=.851$ ;  $P<.431$ ) indicating that patterns of occupational self efficacy is the same in the employees of different age groups irrespective of the occupation they are.

Employees with different levels of experience did not differ significantly in their mean self efficacy scores ( $F = 1.736$ ;  $P<.150$ ). The mean scores of employees with different levels of work experience (in years) like below 4, 5-7, 8-12, 13-17 and 17 and above are 68.00, 64.00, 74.74, 75.00 and 74.88 respectively, which are same statistically contributed to non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type and experience is found

to be non-significant ( $F=1.325$ ;  $P<.271$ ) indicating that pattern of OSE is same in employees of different years of service irrespective of the occupation they have.

Employees with different types of marital status differed significantly in their mean Self efficacy scores ( $F=4.998$ ;  $P<.028$ ). The mean scores of employees with different levels of marital status like married and unmarried are 67.20 and 74.79 respectively. From the mean values, it is sure that married employees had significantly higher OSE scores in comparison to unmarried employees. The interaction effect between occupation type and marital status is found to be non-significant ( $F=.394$ ;  $P<.532$ ) indicating that pattern of OSE scores is

**TABLE NO 6.** Mean OSE score of Engineers and Managers having different years of work experience

Occupation	Experience (in years)	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Below 4 years	68.00	-
	5 to 7	64.00	8.49
	8 to 12	74.38	7.93
	13-17	75.71	3.31
	17+	76.08	8.17
	Total	74.86	7.48
Managers	Below 4 years	-	-
	5 to 7	-	-
	8 to 12	80.00	.00
	13-17	70.00	.00
	17+	73.00	7.82
	Total	73.40	7.37
Total	Below 4 years	68.00	-
	5 to 7	64.00	8.49
	8 to 12	74.74	7.79
	13-17	75.00	3.65
	17+	74.88	8.08
	Total	74.54	7.44

**TABLE NO 7.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers having different years of work experience

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	8.335	1	8.335	.154	.696
Income (B)	376.259	4	94.065	1.736	.150
Interaction (A X B)	143.602	2	71.801	1.325	.271
Error	4497.525	83	54.187	-	-

**TABLE NO 8.** Mean OSE score of Engineers and Managers having different marital status

Occupation	Marital status	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Unmarried	68.50	5.20
	Married	72.24	7.45
	Overall	74.86	7.48
Managers	Unmarried	62.00	-
	Married	74.00	7.05
	Overall	73.40	7.37
Total	Unmarried	67.20	5.36
	Married	74.97	7.34
	Overall	74.54	7.44



**TABLE NO 9.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers having different marital status

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	45.455	1	45.555	0852	.358
Income (B)	266.511	1	266.511	4.998	.028
Interaction (A X B)	21.009	1	21.009	.394	.532
Error	4639.179	87	53.324	-	-

**TABLE NO 10.** Mean OSE score of Engineers and Managers having different family types

Occupation	Family Type	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Joint	73.32	7.37
	Nuclear	75.86	7.47
	Overall	74.86	7.48
Managers	Joint	72.50	8.07
	Nuclear	74.30	6.09
	Overall	73.40	7.37
Total	Joint	72.11	7.46
	Nuclear	75.57	7.32
	Overall	74.54	7.44

**TABLE NO 11.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers having different family types

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	21.908	1	21.908	.395	.531
Income (B)	72.700	1	72.700	1.312	.255
Interaction (A X B)	2.109	1	2.109	.038	.846
Error	4821.870	87	55.424	-	-

same in employees having different marital status irrespective of the occupation they have.

Employees with different types of family, did not differ significantly in their mean self efficacy scores ( $F=1.312$ ;  $P<.255$ ). The mean scores of employees with different family types like joint and nuclear type are 73.11 and 75.57 respectively, which are same statistically contributed to non-significant difference. The interaction effect between occupation type and experience is found to

be non-significant ( $F=.038$ ;  $P<.846$ ) indicating that pattern of OSE scores is same in employees of different types irrespective of the occupation they have.

Employees with different levels of education differed significantly in their mean self -efficacy scores ( $F=3.542$ ;  $P<.033$ ). The employees with different levels of education like Technical (lower) level, Technical and others are 75.61, 70.76 and 76.33 respectively. Further Duncan's Multiple Range Test revealed that only employees with

**TABLE NO 12.** Mean OSE score of Engineers and Managers having different levels of education

Occupation	Education	Mean	S.D
Engineers	Tech (Lower)	76.44	6.35
	Tech	70.76	8.64
	Other	80.00	.00
	Overall	74.86	7.48
Managers	Tech (Lower)	73.13	8.23
	Tech	-	-
	Other	74.50	1.73
	Overall	73.40	7.37
Total	Tech (Lower)	75.61	6.95
	Tech	70.76	8.64
	Other	76.33	3.14
	Overall	74.54	7.44

**TABLE NO 13.** Results of 2-way ANOVA for mean OSEs of Engineers and Managers having different levels of education

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F Value	Significance
Occupation (A)	93.192	1	93.192	1.542	.181
Income (B)	363.813	2	181.906	3.542	.033
Interaction (A X B)	5.742	1	5.742	.112	.739
Error	4416.372	86	51.353	-	-

technical education had least OSE scores and employees with technical and other educational background had significantly higher OSE scores. The interaction effect between occupation types and education is found to be non-significant ( $F=.112$ ;  $P<.739$ ) indicating that pattern of OSE score is same in employees of different levels of education irrespective of the occupation they have.

## 6. Discussion

A. The main findings of the study are -

1. Engineers and Managers did not differ significantly in their OSE scores.
2. The interaction effect between occupation type and different income,

age, years of work experience, are found to be non-significant indicating that pattern of OSE is same in employees of irrespective of the occupation they have.

B. The hypothesis formulated, have been tested and are as follows -

$H_{01}$ : "There is no significant difference in the Occupational Self Efficacy (OSE) scores of employees belonging to different designations like engineers and managers". This hypothesis has been accepted on the basis that OSE scores of employees belonging to various designations are found to be significant amongst engineers and managers.

$H_{02}$  : "Income has no significant influence on the OSE scores of the employees".

H<sub>03</sub>: “Age has no significant influence on the OSE scores of the employees”.

H<sub>04</sub>: “Experience has no significant influence on the OSE scores of the employees”.

H<sub>05</sub>: “Family type has no significant influence on the OSE scores of the employees”.

The hypothesis 2,3,4 and 5 have been accepted; because there is no relationship between occupational type and income, age, experience and family types are found to be non-significant, indicating that pattern of OSE is same in employees of irrespective of the occupation they possess. Occupational self-efficacy reflects the conviction of a person that he/she can execute behaviors relevant to their own work. Schyns and Collani (2002) report that occupational self-efficacy is found to be stable because of its positive correlation and relationships to personality characteristics of employees.

H<sub>06</sub>: “Educational has not significant influence on the OSE of the employees”. This hypothesis has been rejected on the basis that educational level has significantly influenced OSE scores of the employees. Employees with technical educational had least OSE and employees with technical (lower) and other educational background had significantly higher OSE; probably because a technically educated employee’s perception may not be proper, as it may be affected with high sense of self and high self esteem. This high ego level and self esteem sometimes may not comply with realistic demands of the environment in which these employees work and live. Therefore, we find that technically lower qualified persons have better OSE than when compared to higher qualified employees. However, OSE may be understood as less stable upon comparison with general self-efficacy. It encompasses the allowance to compare among the various types of jobs and tasks

(Schyns & von Collani, 2002), thus making it applicable for certain investigations pertaining to the context of work and their respective organisations.

H<sub>07</sub>: “Marital status has not significant influence on the OSE of the employees”. This hypothesis has been rejected on the basis that marital status has significantly influenced OSE of the employees. Married employees had significantly higher OSE compared to unmarried employees. Marital status does positively influence OSE. Marriage is very important to every individual’s life. Marriage brings in the kind of settlement in terms of physical (sexual), psychological, social, financial and future generational issues, in which the individual feels complete and fulfilled in many issues. All these issues bring the employee to work and perform better at work place.

## 7. Practical Implications

A basic sense of better self efficacy enhances an employee’s achievement along with subjective well-being in many aspects. Employees possessing higher self assurance in their capabilities, usually approach and attempt to resolve bigger tasks as problems to be undertood, workred and reigned upon. But to view them as threats and blocks, and thus avoided. Efficacious outlook as these, fosters a self interest and a deeper involvement in their respective taks and jobs. These employees put up for themselves many a formidable objectives and thus perserver with a strong commitment to work around and complete the tasks. These individuals perserver with themselves to complete their tasks. Further, they recover their sense of efficacy rather very quickly, even after repeated setbacks or failures. The attribution of linking the setbacks

and failures to be correlated to insufficient effort or deficit in skills and competency is an admirable aspect of these individuals. They perceive threatening situations with increased self assurance, in order exercise control over themselves. Possessing an efficacious outlook such as these produces a whole lot of personal achievements and accomplishments, also helps to reduce stress and the proness to depression and many a psychological disorder. In contrast, individuals doubting their competencies, generally walk from their assigned tasks, which they perceive as personal threats, along with having weak commitment and aspirations to the objectives, they usually choose to pursue. They do not concentrate on how to perform to perform a job or a task successfully.

## 8. Limitations and Scope for Further Research

The study has attempted to analyse the Occupational Self Efficacy of the Public Sector employees in Indian context. However, the study is not without any limitations. The sample is drawn from one particular geographical area in the state of Karnataka, it is recommended to extend the study by considering other states of India and economies while increasing the sample size with respect to various geographical areas. The survey data was collected from the Managers and Engineers, however the study can be extended to other levels of employment in the Public Sector or other sectors. This study serves as a pilot study to gather basic information, however the study can be further extended to develop the conceptual model and test the model statistically. This was a quantitative cross-sectional study, and the survey data was

collected at a single point of time. Hence there are chances of time bias. Future scholars may conduct a longitudinal study to analyze the evolutionary nature of the factors by considering the time lag effect

## 9. Conclusion

Developing a strong sense of self-efficacy does play an significant role in all aspect of life. Life is full of threats, opportunities and challenges; the presence of high levels of self-efficacy can feel better and learn to deal with positive and negative issues effectively. One's belief in the abilities, can predict how motivated one feels, how one feels about self, and to combine it all, the amount of effort and perserverance one puts into pursuing and completing the goals that we have set for ourselves.

## References

- Abele, A. E. & Spurk, D. (2009). The longitudinal impact of self-efficacy and career goals on objective and subjective career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 53-62.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 63, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>
- Bakker, A. B., Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Taris, T. W. (2008). Work engagement: An emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work & Stress*, 22, 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370802393649>
- Bandalos, D. L. (2002). The effects of item parceling on goodness-of-fit and parameter estimate bias in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 9, 78-102. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0901\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0901_5)

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191>
- Bandura, A. (1978). Reflections on self-efficacy. *Advances in Behavioral Research and Therapy*, 1(4), 237-269.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 21-41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00024>
- Berings, M. G. M. C., Poell, R. F., Simons, P. R. & van Veldhoven, M. J. P. M. (2007). The development and validation of the On-the-job Learning Styles Questionnaire for the Nursing Profession. *Journal for Advanced Nursing*, 58, 480 - 492.
- Buric, I., & Macuka, I. (2018). Self-efficacy, emotions and work engagement among teachers: A two wave cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 19, 1917-1933. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-017-9903-9>
- Chaudhary, R., Rangnekar, S., & Barua, M. K. (2012). HRD climate, occupational self-efficacy and work engagement: A study from India. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 15, 86-105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10887156.2012.676938>
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
- Dagher, G. K., Chapa, O., & Junaid, N. (2015). The historical evolution of employee engagement and self-efficacy constructs: An empirical examination in a non-western country. *Journal of Management History*, 21, 232-256. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMH-05-2014-0116>
- Del Libano, M., Llorens, S., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). About the dark and bright sides of self-efficacy: Workaholism and work engagement. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 15, 688-701. [https://doi.org/10.5209/rev\\_SJOP.2012.v15.n2.38883](https://doi.org/10.5209/rev_SJOP.2012.v15.n2.38883)
- Eden, D. (1988). Pygmalion, goal setting, and expectancy: Compatible ways to raise productivity. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 639-652.
- Federici, R. A., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2011). Principal self-efficacy and work engagement: Assessing a Norwegian Principal Self-Efficacy Scale. *Social Psychology of Education*, 14, 575-600. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-011-9160-4>
- Forester, M., Kahn, J. H. & Hesson-McInnis, M. S. (2004). Factor structures of the three measures research self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12, 3-16.
- Guarnaccia, C., Scrima, F., Civilleri, A., & Salerno, L. (2018). The role of occupational self-efficacy in mediating the effect of job insecurity on work engagement, satisfaction and general health. *Current Psychology*, 37, 488-497. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9525-0>
- Gardner, D.G., & Pierce, J.L. (1998). Self-esteem and self-efficacy within the organizational context. *Group & Organizational Management*, 23, 48-70.
- Garofano C M and Salas E (2005). What influences continous employee development decisions ? *Human Resources Management Review*, 15, 281-304.
- Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 291-316.
- Gist, M.E., & Mitchell, T.R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 183-211.
- Hirschi, A. (2012). Callings and work engagement: Moderated mediation model of work meaningfulness, occupational identity, and occupational self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59, 479-485. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028949>
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits--self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and

- emotional stability--with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits - self- esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability - with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 80-92.
- Judge, T.A., Locke, E.A., & Durham, C.C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluation approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151–188.
- Judge, T.A., Thoresen, C.J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T.M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A disposition perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 107–122.
- Lane, J., Lane, A. M., & Kyprianou, A. (2004). Self-efficacy, self-esteem and their impact on academic performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 32, 247-256. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2004.32.3.247>
- Lent, R.W. & Hackett, G. (1987). Career Self-Efficacy: Empirical Status and Future Directions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 30, 347–382.
- Luthans, F., & Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Management*, 33, 321-349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300814>
- McDonald, T., & Siegall, M. (1992). The effects of technological self-efficacy and job focus on job performance, attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 126, 465-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1992.10543380>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). *Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model*. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X)
- Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedents, correlates, and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 61, 20-52. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842>
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1252308>
- Multon, K. D., Brown, S. D., & Lent, R. D. (1991). Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 30-38.
- Park, I.-J., & Jung, H. (2015). Relationships among future time perspective, career and organizational commitment, occupational self-efficacy, and turnover intention. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 43, 1547-1562. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.9.1547>
- Peng, Y., & Mao, C. (2015). The impact of person-job fit on job satisfaction: The mediator role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, 121, 805-813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0659-x>
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Todor, W. D. (1985). Relationships between leader reward and punishment behavior and group processes and productivity. *Journal of Management*, 11, 55-73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920638501100106>
- Rigotti, T., Schyns, B., & Mohr, G. (2008). A short version of the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16, 238-255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707305763>
- Ricks, F., Cutt, J., Branton, G. Loken, M., & Van Gyn, G. (1993). Reflections on the cooperative education literature. *Journal of Cooperative Education*, 29(1), 6–23.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). *Test manual for the Utrecht Work Engagement*

- Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Retrieved from <https://www.schaufeli.com>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Bakker, A. B., & Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66, 701-716. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282471>
- Salanova, M., Peiro, J. M. & Schaufeli, W. B. (2002). Self-efficacy specificity and burnout among information technology workers: An extension of the job demand- control model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 1- 25.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 675-688.
- Scherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports*, 51, 663-671.
- Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology*, 57, 152-171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x>
- Srivastava, S. (2013). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment relationship: Effect of personality variables. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 17, 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262912483529>
- Schyns, B. & Collani, G. v. (2002). A new occupational self-efficacy scale and its relation to personality constructs and organisational variables. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 219-241.
- Schyns, B. & Sanders, K. (2005). Exploring gender differences in leaders' occupational self-efficacy. *Women in Management Review*, 20, 513-523.
- Schyns, B., Torck, N. & Goessling, T. (2007). Turnover intention and preparedness for change: Exploring Leader-Member Exchange and occupational self-efficacy as antecedents of two employability predictors. *Career Development International*, 12, 660-679.
- Sexton, T. L. & Tuckman, B. W. (1991). Self-beliefs and behavior: The role of self- efficacy and outcome expectation of time. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 725-736.
- Soeker, M. S. (2012). The development of the Model of Occupational Self Efficacy: An occupational therapy practice model to facilitate returning to work after a brain injury. *Work*, 43, 313-322.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 240-261.
- Van Gelderen, B. R., & Bik, L. W. (2016). Affective organizational commitment, work engagement and service performance among police officers. *Policing*, 39, 206-221. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-10-2015-0123>
- Wu, S.-Y., Wang, S.-T., Liu, E. Z.-F., Hu, D.-C., & Hwang, W.-Y. (2012). The influences of social self-efficacy on social trust and social capital--A case study of Facebook. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 11, 246-254.
- Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74, 235-244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2008.11.003>
- Zhang, J.-C., Ling, W.-Q., Zhang, Z.-Y., & Xie, J. (2015). Organizational commitment, work engagement, person--supervisor fit, and turnover intention: A total effect moderation model. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 43, 1657-666. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2015.43.10.1657>