



ISSN: 0975-833X

## RESEARCH ARTICLE

### SOCIAL SELF-EFFICACY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL STRAIN AMONG THE INDIAN MANAGERIAL EMPLOYEES IN DIFFERENT SECTORS

\*Bellamkonda Raja Shekhar and Syed Samiullah

Department of Psychology, Sri Venkateswara University, India

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received 29<sup>th</sup> January, 2012  
Received in revised form  
22<sup>nd</sup> February, 2013  
Accepted 24<sup>th</sup> March, 2013  
Published online 13<sup>th</sup> April, 2013

##### Key words:

Social self-efficacy,  
Psychological strain,  
Middle level, Lower level,  
Public sector, Private sector,  
Short job tenure, Long job tenure.

#### ABSTRACT

This study investigated the role of social self-efficacy and psychological strain among various managerial employees in different sectors across the levels and job tenures in India. The sample included 400 managerial employees from several organizations. The results of the ANOVA were significant for few variables. Duncan multiple range test was conducted to know the significant differences among the groups for both social self-efficacy and psychological strain. Study found the strong relationship between social self-efficacy and psychological strain. Discussions are made based on the results of the survey.

Copyright, IJCR, 2013, Academic Journals. All rights reserved.

#### INTRODUCTION

In recent days, self-efficacy has become a critical issue of human behaviour. In many modern organizations the employees performance and the stress associated with the decisions are closely associated with their self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as expectation one can successfully perform behaviour (Bandura, 1977). Social self-efficacy refers to individuals' beliefs that they are capable of initiating social contact and developing new friendships (Gecas, 1989). Loneliness has generally been associated with negative feelings about interpersonal relationships (Jong-Gierveld, 1987). Lonely people have been judged to be less interpersonally competent than people who are not lonely (Jones *et al.*, 1982), and research has shown a negative correlation between social skills and loneliness (Riggio, Watring and Throckmorton, 1993). Therefore, it appears that if freshmen can enhance their social self-efficacy, they may decrease their feelings of loneliness and sub-sequent depression. McFarlane, Bellissimo, and Norman, (1995) assessed the roles of family, peers, and selected social factors in the origins of depression in a school-based study of adolescents. The study found that Social self-efficacy and social support from family and peers are interrelated in their links with depression.

Constantine, Okazaki and Utsey, (2004) examined the self-concealment behaviors and social self-efficacy skills as potential mediators in the relationship between acculturative stress and depression in a sample of 320 African, Asian, and Latin American international college students. They found several significant differences by demography with regard to the study's variables. Most of the research on academic and career self-efficacy beliefs has been motivated by Hackett and Betz's (1981) assertion that these beliefs may help to determine the educational and career behavior. There is a relationship between low perceived social self-efficacy and difficulties in career decision-making. A study by Betz and Schifano, (2000) showed that social self-confidence, as measured by the SCI, is related

to Career Indecision, as measured by the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, 1987), confirmed that individuals with low perceived social self-efficacy may have difficulty in choosing a career. Many recent studies have also shown that social support moderates the relationship between environmental stress and psychological strain. Tromp, van Rheede and Blomme, (2010) examined the turnover of highly educated employees in the hospitality industry and confirmed that the most important cause is psychological strain for turnover. They did not find significant interaction effects with gender in the study. Van Gelderen, Heuven, van Veldhoven, Zeelenberg and Croon, (2007) examined the relationship between psychological strain and emotional job demands during a working day of 65 Dutch (military) police officers and found that emotional dissonance partly mediated the relationship between psychological strain at the start and psychological strain at the end of a work shift. Mansell, Brough and Cole (2006) were conducted a survey within the New Zealand Customs Service to find the impact of perceived job conditions on individual and organizational health outcomes. They concluded that stable predictors of job satisfaction were minor daily stressors, positive work experiences, job control, and perceived supervisor support. From the above literature review, it can be found that very few studies were conducted in the area of social self-efficacy and psychological strain of managers and the relationship between social self-efficacy and psychological strain in public and private sectors. Hence, the present study was aimed to evaluate the social self-efficacy and psychological strain of Short Job Tenure (SJT) and Long Job Tenure (LJT) of middle and lower level managers in private and public sectors. The study also analysed the impact of sector, level and job tenure and the interaction among these factors on social self-efficacy and psychological strain by using the Duncan's multiple range test.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Instruments:** Two types of instruments were used to measure self-efficacy and psychological strain and the questionnaire also contain demographics of the managers.

\*Corresponding author: brmsuh@gmail.com

**Social Self-efficacy scale (SSEQ)**

To measure the self-efficacy of the middle level and lower level managers, the present study adopted the social self-efficacy (SSE) scale developed by Sherer *et al.* (1982) which contains 6 items related to measure the ability of managers to produce a desired amount of outcome.

**Psychological strain Questionnaire**

The Psychological Strain of the respondents was measured by using Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) which was developed by Osipow (1998). The Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) embraces 40 items related to four different types of strains namely: (a) vocational strain (b) psychological strain (c) interpersonal strain and (d) physical strain. The present study measures only the psychological strain of middle and lower level managers by using the 10 items of psychological strain of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ).

**Questionnaire for managers' Demographic Specifications**

This part includes questions such as sector, designation, experience, age, gender, marital status, type of family, number of working hours per week and number of subordinates reporting.

**Participants**

The total participants of the study were 400 managers from both public and private sectors. The categorization of the sample is shown in the Table 1. The sample was chosen based on three criteria a) sector b) level and c) job tenure. Fifty samples were collected from each combination of these three criteria. The demographical distributions of the participants are shown in the Tables 2a and Table 2b. Table 2a shows the personal characteristics gender, age and family type of the participants; Table 3 shows the job characteristics of the participants.

**Table 1. Sample frame**

Sector	Middle level		Lower Level		Total
	Long Job Tenured	Short Job Tenured	Long Job Tenured	Short Job Tenured	
Public Sector	50	50	50	50	200
Private Sector	50	50	50	50	200
Total	100	100	100	100	400

**Table 2a. Personal Characteristics**

		Public	Private	Total
Gender	Female	68	56	124
	Male	132	144	276
Age (in years)	Below 25	8	22	30
	25-30	29	59	88
	30-35	13	58	71
	35-40	30	27	57
	40-45	33	17	50
Family	45-50	34	8	42
	Above 50	53	9	62
	Nuclear family	137	141	278
	Joint family	63	59	122

**Table 2b. Job Characteristics**

Variable		Public	Private	Total
Experience	Short Job Tenured	100	100	200
	Long Job Tenured	100	100	200
Designation	Middle level manager	100	100	200
	Lower level manager	100	100	200
Number of Employees Reporting	Below 5	97	102	199
	5-10	23	26	49
	10-15	30	28	58
	15-20	10	8	18
	Above 20	40	36	76

**RESULTS**

**Social Self-Efficacy**

The study was a descriptive in nature and used various statistical tools include descriptive and inferential. The data was analyzed using SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for Social Science). Mean and Standard Deviation (SD), analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Duncan's Multiple range test, Correlation and multiple regression were used. Table 3 shows mean and Standard Deviation scores for Social Self-Efficacy of the participants.

**Table 3. Summary of descriptive data (means and SD) of Social Self-Efficacy scores**

		Middle level manager		Lower level manager	
		SJT	LJT	SJT	LJT
Public Sector	Mean	20.16	22.26	21.64	20.38
	S.D	3.519	3.083	3.641	4.379
Private Sector	Mean	21.62	21.36	22.08	20.8
	S.D	2.968	3.618	3.355	3.338
Total	Mean	20.89	21.81	21.86	20.59
	S.D	3.321	3.375	3.49	3.88

Table 3 indicates that, the means of social self-efficacy for LJT and of lower and SJT of middle level managers were almost same in both the public sector and private sector. Long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in public sector managers has secured highest mean (22.26) for social self-efficacy Score in the same way the Short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in public sector has secured least mean score i.e., 20.16 for Psychological Strain. Table 4 presents the output of ANOVA to measure the influence of three variables namely sector, designation and experience on social self-efficacy. It can be observed from Table 4 that The F-value for the main effect of sector, designation and experience came out to be 1.022, 0.127 and 0.248 respectively, which is not significant at 0.05 levels. It may also be noted from the Table 4 F-value of interactive effect of designation and experience turned out to be 9.726 (p<0.05), which is significant at 0.05 level. This is indicative of the fact that significant main effects of designation and experience are dependent of each other to explain social self-efficacy among managers at different levels. F-value of interactive effect of sector X designation, sector X experience and sector X designation X Experience turned out to be 0.046, 2.872 and 2.776 respectively, which is not significant at 0.05 level.

**Table 4. Summary of ANOVA for Social Self-Efficacy scores**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	207.318 <sup>a</sup>	7	29.617	2.402	.020
Intercept	181263.063	1	181263.063	14703.229	.000
Sector	12.603	1	12.603	1.022	.313
Designation	1.562	1	1.562	.127	.722
Experience	3.062	1	3.062	.248	.618
Sector * Designation	.563	1	.563	.046	.831
Sector * Experience	35.402	1	35.402	2.872	.091
Designation * Experience	119.902	1	119.902	9.726	.002
Sector * Designation * Experience	34.223	1	34.223	2.776	.096
Error	4832.620	392	12.328		
Total	186303.000	400			

This is indicative of the fact that interactive effect of sector X designation, sector X experience and sector X designation X Experience are independent of each other to explain social self-efficacy among managers at different levels. The study used Duncan's Multiple Range Test (DMRT) to measure the significant difference among the eight groups of managers. Tables 5a – 5c shows the outputs of Duncan's multiple range test. The table 5a shows the output of ANOVA which exhibits the significant relationship among the eight groups of managers.

**Table 5a. ANOVA for eight groups of social self-efficacy**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	207.318	7	29.617	2.402	.020
Within Groups	4832.620	392	12.328		
Total	5039.938	399			

**Table 5b. Duncan's multiple range test for social self-efficacy**

Groups	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
G1	50	20.16	
G4	50	20.38	
G8	50	20.80	20.80
G6	50	21.36	21.36
G5	50	21.62	21.62
G3	50	21.64	21.64
G7	50		22.08
G2	50		22.26

**Table 5c. summary of Duncan's multiple range test for social self-efficacy**

Groups	G1	G4	G8	G6	G5	G3	G7	G2
	20.16	20.38	20.8	21.36	21.62	21.64	22.08	22.26
G1	20.16	@	@	@	@	@	**	**
G4	20.38		@	@	@	@	**	**
G8	20.8			@	@	@	@	@
G6	21.36				@	@	@	@
G5	21.62					@	@	@
G3	21.64						@	@
G7	22.08							@
G2	22.26							

\*\* Significant @ Not significant

G1 - Short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in public sector; G2 - Long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in public sector  
 G3 - Short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in public sector; G4 - Long job tenure (LJT) of lower level managers in public sector  
 G5 - Short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in private sector; G6 - Long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in private sector  
 G7 - Short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in private sector; G8 - Long job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in private sector

Among the eight groups significant differences are found between groups G1-G7; G1-G2; G4-G7 and G4-G2, all other differences are not significant. Among the eight groups of managers group five (G2) has highest General Self-Efficacy score (22.26) and group three (G1) has least score (20.16) followed by other groups.

**Psychological strain**

Table 6 indicates that, the means of psychological strain for LJT of middle and lower level managers were almost same in both the public sector and private sector. The short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers of public sector has secured highest mean (30.36) for Psychological Strain Score in the same way the short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers of private sector has secured least mean score i.e., 25.78 for Psychological Strain.

**Table 6. Summary of descriptive data (means and SD) of Psychological Strain Score**

		Middle level manager		Lower level manager	
		SJT	LJT	SJT	LJT
Public Sector	Mean	27.26	25.94	30.36	28.68
	S.D	7.091	6.796	4.217	6.066
Private Sector	Mean	25.78	28.28	26.58	27.50
	S.D	6.109	5.863	5.529	6.732
Total	Mean	26.52	27.11	28.47	28.09
	S.D	6.626	6.423	5.248	6.402

Table 7 presents the output of ANOVA to measure the influence of three variables namely sector, designation and experience on Psychological Strain Score. From the above Table it can be observed that designation has significant impact on psychological strain of managers. Besides interaction effect of sector and designation and sector and experience have influence on psychological strain of managers. The remaining variables: sector, experience and the other interactions of these three variables were not having significant impact on Psychological Strain of managers.

**Table 7. Summary of ANOVA for Psychological Strain Score**

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Sector	105.063	1	105.063	2.815	.094
Designation	214.622	1	214.622	5.750	.017
Experience	1.102	1	1.102	.030	.864
Sector *	211.703	1	211.703	5.672	.018
Designation					
Sector *	257.603	1	257.603	6.901	.009
Experience					
Designation *	23.523	1	23.523	.630	.428
Experience					
Sector *	9.302	1	9.302	.249	.618
Designation *					
Experience					
Error	14632.180	392	37.327		
Total	319001.000	400			

The study used Duncan's Multiple Range Test(DMRT) to measure the significant difference among the eight groups of managers. Tables 8a – 8c shows the outputs of Duncan's multiple range test. The Table 8a shows the output of ANOVA which exhibits the significant relationship among the eight groups of managers.

**Table 8a. ANOVA for eight groups of Psychological Strain**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	822.917	7	117.560	3.149	.003
Within Groups	14632.180	392	37.327		
Total	15455.097	399			

**Table 8b. Duncan's multiple range test for Psychological Strain**

Groups	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
G5	50	25.78		
G2	50	25.94		
G7	50	26.58	26.58	
G1	50	27.26	27.26	
G8	50	27.50	27.50	
G6	50	28.28	28.28	28.28
G4	50		28.68	28.68
G3	50			30.36

**Table 8c. Summary of Duncan's multiple range test for Psychological Strain**

Groups	Mean	G5	G2	G7	G1	G8	G6	G4	G3
		25.78	25.94	26.58	27.26	27.5	28.28	28.68	30.36
G5	25.78		@	@	@	@	@	**	**
G2	25.94			@	@	@	@	**	**
G7	26.58				@	@	@	@	**
G1	27.26					@	@	@	**
G8	27.5						@	@	**
G6	28.28							@	@
G4	28.68								@
G3	30.36								

\*\* Significant @ Not significant

Among the eight groups significant differences are found between groups G5-G4; G5-G3; G2-G4; G2-G3; G7-G3; G1-G3 and G8-G3, all other differences are not significant. Among the eight groups of managers, group five (G3) has highest Psychological Strain score and group three (G5) has least followed by other groups.

### Conclusion

The study demonstrated the impact of sector, designation, experience and the interaction of these factors on social self-efficacy and psychological strain. In addition it also measured the differences among the eight groups of managers with reference to social self-efficacy and psychological strain. The designation has significant impact on both social self-efficacy and psychological strain. It shows that the designation is an important factor and it addresses the theoretical and managerial implications where middle level managers have more responsibilities and the number of subordinates also would be more than lower level managers. Therefore, middle and lower level managers have different levels of social self-efficacy and psychological strain. The top level management should understand the work and psychological stress levels of middle and lower level managers in order to take necessary actions which will reduce the stress and improve the self-efficacy. The interaction effect of sector and designation and sector and experience also have influence on psychological strain of managers. It indicates that the sector with designation and experience has also influenced the psychological strain of managers. In addition, the results of Duncan's multiple range test for social self-efficacy has shown the significant difference between short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in public sector (G3) and long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in private sector (G6), long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in public sector (G2) and short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in private sector (G5). In the same way, Duncan's multiple range test for psychological strain has also found the significant difference of short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in public sector (G3) with five other groups namely: short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in private sector (G5), long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in public sector (G2), short job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in private sector (G7), short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in public sector (G1), long job tenure (SJT) of lower level managers in private sector (G8). The long job tenure (LJT) of lower level managers in public sector (G4) has also have difference with short job tenure (SJT) of middle level managers in private sector (G5) and long job tenure (LJT) of middle level managers in public sector (G2). Despite the limitations of the study such as middle and lower level managers, these findings suggests that social self-efficacy and psychological strain have significant negative relationship, this is accordance with the previous studies stating that efficacy beliefs influence the amount of stress and anxiety individual experience as the engage in an activity (Bandura, 1997).

The designation i.e., middle and lower level managers have different levels of social self-efficacy and psychological strain. These findings are useful to the organizations to know the levels of social self-efficacy and psychological strains of the managerial employees and to design suitable training programmes to improve the organizational productivity.

### Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the help of the managerial employees of various organizations who participated in the study without whom this research would not possible.

### REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1997). "Self-efficacy: the exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Betz, N. E., and Schifano, R. S. (2000). Evaluation of an intervention to increase realistic self-efficacy and interests in college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56(1), 35-52.
- Van Gelderen, B., Heuven, E., van Veldhoven, M., Zeelenberg, M., and Croon, M. (2007). Psychological strain and emotional labor among police-officers: A diary study. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 71(3), 446-459.
- Constantine, M. G., Okazaki, S., and Utsey, S. O. (2004). Self-Concealment, Social Self-Efficacy, Acculturative Stress, and Depression in African, Asian, and Latin American International College Students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 74(3), 230-241.
- Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 291-316.
- Hackett, G. and Betz, N. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 18, 326-339.
- Jones, W. H., Hobbs, A. S., and Hockenbury, D. (1982). Loneliness and social skill deficits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 682-689.
- Jong-Gierveld, J. D. (1987). Developing and testing a model of loneliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 119-128.
- Mansell, A., Brough, P., and Cole, K. (2006). Stable predictors of job satisfaction, psychological strain, and employee retention: An evaluation of organizational change within the New Zealand Customs Service. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(1), 84.
- McFarlane, A. H., Bellissimo, A., and Norman, G. R. (1995). THE ROLE OF FAMILY AND PEERS IN SOCIAL SELF-EFFICACY. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 65(3), 402-410.
- Osipow, S. H. (1987). *Manual for career decision scale*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Incorporated.
- Riggio, R., Watring, K., and Throckmorton, B. (1993). Social skills, social support, and psychological adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15, 275-280.
- Tromp, D. M., van Rheede, A., and Blomme, R. J. (2010). The relationships between psychological strain, organizational support, affective commitment and turnover intentions of highly educated hospitality employees. *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure*, 6, 117-134.

\*\*\*\*\*