



**Research Article**

**JOB RELATED SELF - EFFICACY - A STUDY OF TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES OF BHARAT SANCHAR NIGAM LIMITED HAMIRPUR (HIMACHAL PRADESH)**

**Sharma D.D<sup>1\*</sup> and Suman Kanta<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Social Sciences

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Management, Dr. YS Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Solan (HP)-173230

**ARTICLE INFO**

**Article History:**

Received 14<sup>th</sup> March, 2018  
Received in revised form 12<sup>th</sup>  
April, 2018 Accepted 20<sup>th</sup> May, 2018  
Published online 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2018

**Key words:**

Self-efficacy, Job security, Integration, confrontation, Professional growth, Incentives.

**ABSTRACT**

Self-efficacy refers to a person's self beliefs in his/her ability to perform specific task and is considered to be a reliable predictor of employees' personal goal setting. The study conducted on a proportionate sample of 70 employees' of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL), Hamirpur (HP) revealed that Job security followed by Integration, Relationship and Confrontation were the prominent factors in their job related self-efficacy. A significant majority of them perceived that they were doing useful and important work in their organization (81 %), by using their training and knowledge very well (79 %), working as per the pre-decided schedule and given direction (68 %). They experienced enough mutual help in the organization (86 %) and helped the sub-ordinates in case any problem was brought to them for its solution. Lack of appropriate resources to do their work effectively, not sanctioning of leave when urgently required, lack of co-operation from superiors, lack of freedom in performing job and lack of opportunities for professional growth etc. were some of the serious problems related with their job efficacy. Hence, the respondents suggested that the work should be assigned as per their skill/talent, their participation in decision making be encouraged, provision for pursuing their area of interest, freedom to take initiative in giving new ideas in the meeting and there should be proper incentives for honest, sincere and hard working employees.

Copyright©2018 Sharma D.D and Suman Kanta. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**INTRODUCTION**

Self-efficacy refers to person's self belief in his or her ability to perform a specific task; and is considered to be a reliable predictor of employees' personal goal setting. Every organization seeks to optimize the performance of its productivity, efficiency and effectiveness. Job related self-efficacy is an underlying characteristic required for performing a given task, activity or role successfully. Carmona *et al.* (2008) have found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and academic performance. Similarly, employees with high assurance in their capabilities take difficult tasks as challenges rather than threats to be avoided. Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL) is one of the largest Indian cellular services provider in India. Through the BSNL has made a great dent in in the field of telecommunication in the entire country yet in recent years, its revenue and market share plunged in to heavy losses due to intense competition in the Indian telecommunication sector. Lack of job related self-efficacy of its employees might be one of the main reasons for the low productivity of the organization. Keeping this in view, the present study was undertaken with the following specific objectives:

**Objectives**

- To determine the level of self-efficacy pertaining to job of employees working in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited Hamirpur (H.P.)
- To identify the main factors affecting the job related self-efficacy among the employees.
- To identify the main problems /reasons (if any) in the Job Related Self-Efficacy of the employees.
- To provide suggestive measures for improving job related self-efficacy among the employees.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study was conducted in Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited located at Hamirpur district of Himachal Pradesh. Out of the total 51 branches (as per the list provided by the Head office), 10 branches were randomly selected. A list of all the technical employees comprising of different categories like Telephone Mechanic/Technical Assistant, Sub-Divisional Engineer/Officer, Junior Technical Officer, Regional Manager, Assistant General Manager working at the branches was prepared. Out of this list, a proportionate sample of 75 technical employees was taken, but the data could be collected from 70 employees due to one reason or the other.

\*Corresponding author: **Sharma D.D**  
Department of Social Sciences

The respondents' response was collected with the help of pre-tested interview schedule which was divided into five parts. Part 'A' was designed to seek the information on the demographic profile such as name, age, gender, marital status, qualification, monthly salary and experience. Part 'B' included statements based on 3-point continuum scale (Very important, Important & Not important) to evaluate the factors affecting job related self efficacy. The factors were categorized into three dimensions viz; Job Making, Hole Centering and Job linking. Job Making included Integration, Pro-activity, Creativity and Confrontation. Hole Centering consisted of Centrality, Influence, Growth and Job Linking included Linkage, helping attitude and super-ordination. Part-C constituted statements pertaining to identify the level of self-efficacy. The statements were evaluated by the respondents on 3- point continuum. A score of 3 was given to the statement showing 'Good perception', a score of 2 was given to statement showing 'Fair perception' and a score of 1 was given to a statement showing poor perception. Part-D dealt with the severity of the problems encountered by the respondents. The degree of severity of the problem was determined on the basis of mean score. The suggestions provided by respondents were got ranked by them on the basis of their importance in Part-E.

**Operational Definitions**

**Job Related Self –Efficacy**

Self efficacy refers to people’s beliefs about their capability to produce designated level of performance. But for purpose of present study, it was operationalised as an employee’s perception of his/her ability to cope with different situations arising in performing his job. It was measured with the help of scale developed by Albert Bandura (2006) with little modifications. The factors affecting Job related self-efficacy were identified by consulting pertinent literature, internet and experts having rich experience in the field. In all, fourteen factors were identified viz; Integration, Confrontation, Pro-activity, Creativity, Centrality, Influence, Growth, Linkage, Helping attitude, Relationship, Super-ordination, Pay/ wages, Job security and Congenial working environment. The opinion of respondents on each factor was obtained on the three point continuum i.e. very important, important, and not important with respective scores of 3, 2 and 1 respectively and accordingly mean score on each factor was calculated. The respondents were classified into the following three categories on the basis of their mean Job Related Self-Efficacy score and Standard Deviation:

- High level of Job Related Self-Efficacy (>Mean + SD)
- Medium level of Job Related Self-Efficacy (Mean ± SD)
- Low level of Job Related Self-Efficacy (<Mean- SD)

**Age**

It refers to the respondent’s chronological age in terms of completed years (whole numbers) at the time of data collection. The respondents were categorized into the following three age groups:-

1. 25-35
2. 35-45
3. 45 and above

**Educational Status**

It refers to the respondent’s academic qualifications through formal schooling. The respondents were divided into five categories namely Matric, Higher Secondary, Diploma Holder, Graduation and Post-Graduation.

**Job Experience**

It refers to the number of years spent by an employee in his/her job at BSNL. The data were collected by personally interviewing the respondents. The association between the respondents’ selected socio-personal traits and job related self-Efficacy was also determined by using X<sup>2</sup> tests.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The findings of the study are discussed as under:

**Demographic profile of the respondents (n=70)**

The socio – economic characteristics of the respondents are being discussed in Table 1:

**Table 1** Respondents’ demographic profile (n=70)

Sr. No.	Socio – Personal Traits	F	Percentage
<b>I. Age( Years)</b>			
	25-35	07	10.00
	35-45	28	40.00
	45 And Above	35	50.00
<b>II. Gender</b>			
	Male	66	94.28
	Female	04	05.72
<b>III. Marital Status</b>			
	Married	67	95.72
	Unmarried	03	04.28
<b>IV. Designation/Position</b>			
	Telephone Mechanic/Telephone Technical Assistant	42	60.00
	Sub-divisional Engineer/Sub-divisional Officers/Junior Technical Officers	20	28.57
	Regional Manager/Assistant General Manager	08	11.43
<b>V. Educational Status</b>			
	Matric	20	28.57
	Higher Secondary	05	07.14
	Diploma Holder	15	21.42
	Graduation	27	38.58
	Post- Graduation	03	04.29
<b>VI. Family Background</b>			
	Rural	57	81.43
	Semi Urban	10	14.28
	Urban	03	04.29
<b>VII. Job Experience (Years)</b>			
	Up To 5	03	04.28
	5-10	04	05.71
	10-15	17	24.29
	15-20	18	25.71
	20-25	17	24.29
	25-30	08	11.43
	30 & Above	03	04.29
<b>VIII. Monthly Salary (₹)</b>			
	15000-25000/-	29	41.43
	25000-35000/-	19	27.14
	35000-45000/-	04	05.72
	45000-55000/-	13	18.57
	55000/- Or More	05	07.14
<b>IX. Spouse in Job</b>			
	Yes	15	21.43
	No	55	78.57

It has been concluded from the above data that a majority of the respondents were telephone/ technical assistants (60 %), male (94.28 %), married (95.72 %) and more than 35 years of

age (90 %). They were graduates/diploma holders (60 %), belonged to rural areas (81.43 %) and had a service experience of more than 10 years. They were single earners with a salary in the range of 15000 to 35000/rupees per month.

**Factors Affecting Job Related Self-Efficacy**

The factors affecting Job Related Self- Efficacy were identified and the respondents’ opinion was taken on the degree of importance of these factors, the response is depicted in Table 2.

**Table 2** Factors affecting Job Related Self-Efficacy (as per degree of importance)

Sr.No.	Factors	Degree of Importance			Mean Score $\bar{X}$
		Very Important (F%)	Important (F%)	Not Important (F%)	
1.	Integration	84.29	15.71	0.00	2.84
2.	Proactivity	44.29	55.71	0.00	2.44
3.	Creativity	30.00	68.56	0.14	2.67
4.	Confrontation	78.57	21.43	0.00	2.79
5.	Centrality	37.14	60.00	2.86	2.57
6.	Influence	48.57	50.00	1.43	2.49
7.	Growth	55.71	44.29	0.00	2.56
8.	Linkage	57.14	42.86	0.00	2.57
9.	Helping Attitude	70.00	30.00	0.00	2.70
10.	Relationship	84.28	14.29	1.43	2.83
11.	Super Ordination	40.00	58.57	1.43	2.39
12.	Pay/Wages	72.86	27.14	0.00	2.73
13.	Job Security	87.14	12.86	0.00	2.87
14.	Congenial Working Environment	34.29	65.71	0.00	2.34

As evident from the data, the employees’ had considered Job security ( $\bar{X}=2.87$ ) as the most important factor for Job related self-efficacy i.e. if a person feels that his job is safe then he is likely to possess high self efficacy and likewise, his performance will be better. The second important factor was Integration ( $\bar{X}=2.84$ ) i.e. the persons’ Job should be as per his liking, training and aptitude. More the role a person performed, the higher the efficacy is likely to be. The third importance was given to the factor Relationship ( $\bar{X}=2.83$ ) and fourth importance was given to factor Confrontation ( $\bar{X}=2.79$ ). Confrontation means the tendency to face problem in the organization, talk about problems and finding solution to those problems. Likewise, the other factors which were important to the employees of BSNL were Pay or Wages ( $\bar{X}=2.73$ ), Creativity ( $\bar{X}=2.67$ ) and Centrality ( $\bar{X}=2.57$ ). Higher the opportunity to show creativity and feeling oneself ‘Central’ in the organization, higher was the perceived level of self efficacy among them. These findings were in consonance with those of Xanthopoulou *et al.* (2008) who found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and performance in goal setting like academic performance. The researcher stated that self-efficacy not only relates more strongly to task performance but also a better predictor of task performance. The study implied that a person with high self-efficacy in group work perceived himself/herself more emotionally competent than the one with low self-efficacy.

**Perception on selected parameters of job related self- efficacy**

The respondents’ perception on the various parameters influencing Job related self efficacy was obtained and depicted in Table 3. Parameter- wise perception is given as under:

**Table 3** Respondents’ perception on the selected parameters of Job related Self-Efficacy

Sr.No.	Parameters	F	Percentage*
<b>I. Centrality Vs Peripherally</b>			
	My job is very important in this organization i.e. I feel central here.	12	17.14
	I am doing useful and fairly important work.	57	81.43
	Very little importance is given to me in my job in the organization i.e. I feel peripheral here.	01	01.43
<b>II. Linkage Vs Isolation</b>			
	My training and expertise are not fully utilized in my present job.	08	11.43
	My training and knowledge are used up to little extent in my present job.	07	10.00
	I am able to use my knowledge and training very well here.	55	78.57
	Others in the organization see my job as significant to their work.	20	28.57
	I am a member of the task force or committee in the Organization	22	31.43
	I do I do not work in any committee.	28	40.00
<b>III. Proactivity Vs Reactivity</b>			
	I have little freedom in my job; I have to work as per the orders of my supervisors.	05	07.14
	I operate according to the directions given to me.	40	57.14
	I can take initiative and act on my own in my job.	25	35.72
	I do a good job according to a pre decided schedule.	44	62.86
	I am able to be innovative in my job.	16	22.85
	I have no opportunity to be innovative or do something new.	10	14.29
<b>IV. Creativity Vs Routinity</b>			
	I am doing usual routine work in my job.	32	45.72
	In my job I am able to use my creativity and do something new.	33	47.14
	I have no time for creative work in my job.	05	07.14
	I learn a great deal in my job.	35	50.00
	I learn a few new things in my job.	34	48.58
	I am involved in routine or unrelated activities and have learned nothing.	01	01.42
<b>V. Helping Attitude Vs Hostility</b>			
	Hostility rather than cooperation is evident here.	04	05.71
	I experience enough mutual help here.	60	85.72
	People work in more isolation here.	06	08.57
	Whenever I have a problem, others help me.	62	88.57
	I get very hostile responses when I ask for help.	08	11.43
<b>VI. Influence Vs Powerlessness</b>			
	I contribute to some decisions.	18	25.72
	I have no power here.	27	38.57
	My advice is accepted by my seniors.	25	35.71
	I have little freedom in my job.	23	32.86
	I have a great deal of freedom in my job.	16	22.86
	I have enough freedom in my job.	31	44.29
<b>VII. Growth Vs Stagnation</b>			
	Some of what I do adds to my learning.	53	75.72
	I have tremendous opportunities for professional growth in my job.	17	24.28
	I regret that I do not have the opportunity to contribute to the society in my job.	24	34.28
	What I am doing in my job is likely to help other organization or the society.	16	22.86
	In my job, I have the opportunity to serve large segment of the society.	30	42.86
<b>VIII. Confrontation Vs Avoidance</b>			
	When a subordinate brings a problem to me, I help him/her in finding a solution.	59	84.28
	I refer the problem to my boss or to some other person.	11	15.72
	When people bring problems to me, I tend to ask them to work out themselves.	07	10.00
	I enjoy solving problems related to my work.	58	82.86
	I dislike being bothered with interpersonal conflict.	05	07.14
<b>IX. Super Ordination Vs Deprivation</b>			
	I am able to contribute something to the organization in my job.	39	55.71
	I am able to serve the larger parts of the society in my job.	11	15.72

I wish I could do some useful work in my job.	20	28.57
I am able to influence relevant decisions.	09	12.86
I am sometimes consulted on important matters.	42	60.00
I cannot make any independent decisions.	19	27.14
<b>X. Integration Vs Distance</b>		
I do not enjoy my job in this organization.	01	01.43
I enjoy my job very much here.	45	64.28
I enjoy some parts of my job and not others.	24	34.29
No one in the organization responds to my ideas and Suggestions.	02	02.86
I work in close collaboration with some other colleagues.	67	95.72
I am alone and have almost no one to consult in my job.	01	01.42

\*multiple responses

**Centrality Vs. Peripherally**

From the data it may be interpreted that 81.43 percent of employees in BSNL perceived that they were doing useful and important work on their organization. It means that maximum number of employees feel central in the organization. There were a few employees (1.43 %) who felt peripheral in the organization.

**Linkage Vs. Isolation**

A significant percentage of employees (78.57%) were able to use their training and knowledge very well in the organization but about 11.43 percent of them thought that their training and expertise were not fully utilized in their present job. About one third employees were members of task force or a committee in the organization. However, 40 percent of employees were not involved in any committee which seems to be quite disappointing. Though there is good linkage between the employees' expertise and skill to do their job but non-involvement of two fifth of the employees in any task force or committee seems to be worrisome which make them feel isolated.

**Pro-activity Vs. Reactivity**

A substantial percentage of employees (63 %) were of the opinion that they were doing good job as per the pre-decided schedule and working according to the direction given to them. However, about 15 per cent of them perceived that they had no opportunity to be innovative in the organization. A little more than one third of them, 35.72 percent of employees stated that they could take initiative and act on their own way.

**Creativity Vs. Routines**

A cursory look on the data in the table 3 clearly shows that 53 percent of the employees reported that they were doing routine work without any creativity in their job. However, about 50 per cent of them perceived that they had used creativity and learnt a great deal in their job.

**Helping Attitude Vs. Hostility**

A significant percentage of the employees (85.72) experienced enough mutual help in the organization while 8.57 percent of them felt hostility in the organization. Similarly, 88.57 percent of the employees perceived that other helped them whenever they needed help. However, there were a few employees (11.43%) who stated that they got hostile response whenever they asked for help, which may not be a productive sign for an organization.

**Influence Vs. Powerlessness**

A little more than one third of the employees (36%) perceived that their advice is accepted by their seniors and they positively contributed to some of the decisions taken up in the organization. However, those who reported that they had no power and little freedom in their job were about 39 per cent and 33 per cent respectively.

**Growth Vs. Stagnation**

A little percentage of employees i.e. 24.48 employees stated that they had tremendous opportunities for professional growth while 75.72 percentage of employee were in opinion that they had learnt much in their job. Moreover, it was pleasing to note that there was no employee who felt stagnation in his/her job. A majority of the respondents (76%) reported that some of what they do something new adds to their learning. A little more than one third employees regretted that they had no opportunity in their job to contribute something to the society.

**Confrontation Vs. Avoidance**

A significant percent of employees (84.28) were reported that whenever any subordinate brought any problem to them, they helped him/her in solving the same. However 15.72 percent of employees did not like to confront with the problem and preferred to refer it to their boss or to some other persons. Those who disliked being bothered with interpersonal conflict were only 7.14 percent.

**Super-ordination Vs. Deprivation**

As is clear 55.71 percent of employees felt that they were able to contribute something to the society in their job. The employees who perceived that they were able to serve the larger part of the society were 15.72 percent only. Those who were unable to contribute something useful to the society were observed to be 28.57 percent.

**Integration Vs. Distance**

A majority of the employees (64.28%) enjoyed their job in the organization while 34.29 percent of employees enjoyed some parts of their job and not others. While a significant number of employees (95.72%) agreed to the point that they worked in close collaboration with some other colleagues, a few of them (2.86) stated that no one in the organization responded to their ideas and suggestions.

**Factor-Wise Job Related Self-Efficacy**

The response on factor-wise Job related self –efficacy was obtained from the respondents and presented in Table 4.

**Table 4** Factor-wise Job related Self-Efficacy

Sr.No.	Factors	Mean Score ( $\bar{X}$ )
1.	Centrality	02.13
2.	Linkage	02.27
3.	Pro-activity	02.19
4.	Creativity	02.44
5.	Integration	02.76
6.	Helping Attitude	02.78
7.	Growth	02.06
8.	Influence	01.93
9.	Confrontation	02.80
10.	Super-ordination	01.86

It is evident from the data that 'Confrontation' ( $\bar{X}$  = 2.80), 'Integration' ( $\bar{X}$ =2.76), 'Helping attitude' ( $\bar{X}$ =2.78) and

‘Creativity’ ( $\bar{X}$ =2.44) were found to be the most dominating job efficacy factors among the employees. The other factors like ‘Linkage’ ( $\bar{X}$ =2.27), ‘Pro-activity’ ( $\bar{X}$ =2.19), ‘Centrality’ ( $\bar{X}$ =2.13) ‘Growth’ ( $\bar{X}$ =2.08) were also found to be equally important for affecting their Job related self-efficacy. The remaining factors like ‘Influence’ ( $\bar{X}$ =1.93) and ‘Super ordination’ ( $\bar{X}$ =1.86) were also perceived to have some effect on self-efficacy of the employees. Grau *et al.* (2001) also remarked that power of self efficacy and beliefs may act as a buffer in the presence of work stressors so that their negative impact is reduced. The researcher further revealed that the workers with higher levels of self efficacy may not perceive demands as threats but as opportunities to overcome and develop their skills in order to obtain good results and achievements.

**Respondents’ Level of Job Related Self- Efficacy**

On the basis of total score obtained by the respondents on the Job related Self Efficacy, the status/level of Job Related Self- Efficacy was determined and depicted in the Table 5

**Table 5** Level of Job Related Self Efficacy

Level of Job Related Self-Efficacy	F	Percentage
High Job Related Self-Efficacy	12	17.14
Medium Job Related Self-Efficacy	46	65.72
Low Job Related Self-Efficacy	12	17.14

It is evident from the data, 65.72 percent of respondents had medium level of Job related Self-efficacy whereas 17.14 percent of respondent had high level of Job related Self-efficacy and remaining 17.14 percent were found to have poor Job related Self-efficacy. Since a few percentage of employees possessed high Job related Self-efficacy hence, the organization must make efforts to increase Job related Self-efficacy of their employees by taking corrective actions like employees counseling, using motivators, rewards, recognition, assigning some level of authority to them etc. Salanova *et al.* (2009) also reported that the employees’ levels of efficacy beliefs influenced their perception of job performance and personal resources i.e. when efficacy beliefs are high and an individual believes that he can control his environment effectively; he/she is more likely to perceive job and other personal resources as abundant. Consequently individuals were found to engage in their tasks and perform very well.

**Perception on the Severity of Problems Faced by the Respondents**

The opinion of the respondents on the severity of problems encountered by them in the effective performance of their job was taken and presented in Table -6.

A perusal of the data clearly indicates that “lack of appropriate resources to do their work effectively” (51.28 %) followed by “not sanctioning of leave when urgently required” (46.56 %), “lack of cooperation from superiors” (35.72%), deliberately hiding information by their seniors pertaining to various benefit schemes and policies” (30.00%) and “lack of trust and faith from their superiors” (28.57%) were considered to be very serious problems by the respondents.

**Table 6** Respondents’ distribution on the basis of severity of the problems being faced by them

Sr.No.	Problems	Degree of severity		
		Very Serious (f %)	Serious (f %)	Not Serious (f %)
1.	Less wages compared to the job / work I do.	12.86	48.57	38.57
2.	Family problems create hurdles in performing my job.	25.72	8.57	5.71
3.	Lack of cooperation from my superiors.	35.72	2.86	1.42
4.	Routine and boring job.	21.43	31.43	7.14
5.	Too much work load.	21.43	8.57	0.00
6.	Lack of trust and faith from my seniors.	28.57	41.43	30.00
7.	Role ambiguity i.e. sometimes I have to do such work which are not specified in my job	25.72	47.14	27.14
8.	Lack of freedom in performing my job.	28.57	54.29	17.14
9.	Lack of opportunity to show creativity and to do something new	24.28	45.72	30.00
10.	Lack of opportunities for professional growth.	22.86	61.42	15.72
11.	Lack of appropriate resources to do my work effectively.	51.28	28.72	20.00
12.	Sometimes deliberately hiding information by the superiors pertaining to various benefits Schemes or policies.	30.00	31.43	38.57
13.	Superiors blaming subordinate for their own mistakes.	20.00	38.57	41.43
14.	Using services of subordinate for their personal work by the Superiors.	14.28	38.58	47.14
15.	Not sanctioning of leave when urgently required.	46.56	39.16	14.28

Similarly, “Lack of opportunities for professional growth in their job (61.42%), “family problems” (58.57%), “Lack of freedom in performing their job” (54.29%), “Lack of opportunity to show creativity and to do something new”(45.72%), and “Role ambiguity i.e. sometimes they have to do such work which are not specified in their job”(47.14 %) were also considered as serious problems by the employees of BSNL. However, “Using services of subordinate for their personal work by superiors” (47.14 %) followed by “Routine and boring job”(47.14%), “Superiors blaming subordinates for their own mistake”(41.43%) , “Too much work load”(40.00%) “Less wages compared to the job they do” (38.57%) etc. were perceived less serious problems by them.

**Severity- Wise Ranking of the Problems (Employees’ Perception)**

The problems were ranked by the respondents on the basis of their severity and the response is depicted in Table- 7.

The problems were also analysed on the basis of three point continuum viz.; most serious, serious and not serious and accordingly score of 3, 2, and 1 was assigned to each problem. Then the ranks assigned to each problem as per its mean severity score. “Lack of appropriate resources to do their work effectively” (Rank I), followed by “Not sanctioning of leave when urgently required” (Rank II), “Lack of cooperation from that superiors”(Rank III) and “Lack of freedom in performing job” (Rank IV) were found to be the most serious problems affecting the Job Related Self-Efficacy of the employees. Similarly, Family problems (Rank V) followed by “lack of opportunities for professional growth” (Rank VI), “Lack of

trust/ faith from their seniors”(Rank VII) and “Role ambiguity”(Rank VIII) some other problems perceived to be serious by them.

**Table 7** Ranking of problems on the basis of severity

Sr. No.	Problems	Mean score	Rank
1)	Less wages compared to the job / work I do.	01.74	XII
2)	Family problems create hurdles in performing my job.	02.10	V
3)	Lack of cooperation from my superiors.	2.14	III
4)	Routine and boring job.	1.72	XIII
5)	Too much work load.	1.73	XIV
6)	Lack of trust and faith from my seniors.	1.98	VII
7)	Role ambiguity i.e. sometimes I have to do such Work which are not specified in my job.	1.99	VIII
8)	Lack of freedom in performing my job.	02.11	IV
9)	Lack of opportunity to show creativity and to do something new.	01.94	IX
10)	Lack of opportunities for professional growth.	02.07	VI
11)	Lack of appropriate resources to do my work effectively.	02.36	I
12)	Sometimes deliberately hiding information by the superiors pertaining to various benefits schemes or policies.	01.91	X
13)	Superiors blaming subordinates for their own mistakes.	01.76	XI
14)	Using services of subordinates for their personal work by the Superiors.	01.67	XV
15)	Not sanctioning of leave when urgently required.	02.24	II

**Suggestive Measures for Enhancing the Job Related Self-Efficacy of the Employees**

Suggestions were elicited from the respondents on how to enhance their Job Related Self-Efficacy, The suggestions were taken on three-point continuum scale i.e. Very relevant, Relevant and Not Relevant with respective scores of 3,2,&1. The frequency of the respondent under each score was calculated and then multiplied with their respected score to determine total score. The ranks were assigned on the basis of total scores and presented in table -8.

**Table 8** Suggestions for Improving Job Related Self-Efficacy

Sr.No.	Suggestions	Total Score	Rank
1	There should be active participation of the employees in decision making.	492	II
2	The skill and training of the employees should match with the functions of Job that he or she has to perform.	579	I
3	There should be special facilities for the employees to pursue their line area of interests.	366	III
4	The employees should have freedom to take initiative in giving ideas at the meeting.	302	VI
5	The supervisors should encourage subordinates to seek their help whenever they desire for it.	370	IV
6	There should be proper mechanism for incentives to honest, sincere and hardworking employees.	366	V
7	The superiors should listen to their subordinates, respect their views and use these wherever possible.	251	VII
8	There should be provision for the employees to visit other organizations so that they may get the opportunity to learn new things.	131	IX
9	Efforts should be made for professional development / career growth of the employees.	237	VIII

As is evident from the data in the Table -8, “The most prominent suggestions were that the skills and training of

employees should match with the functions they have do in their job” ( Rank-I), “There should be active participation of the employees in decision making process” (Rank- II), “There should be special facility for the employees to pursue their line/ area of interest”( Rank-III), “Supervisor should encourage their subordinate to take their help whenever their desire for it” (Rank-IV) and “There should be proper incentives for those employees who are honest, sincere and hard working employees”(Rank- V).

Similarly, “Freedom should be given to take initiative in giving ideas at the meetings” (Rank-VI), “Superiors should listen to the subordinates, respect their views and utilize them whenever needed”(Rank-VII), “Sincere efforts should be made for professional development and career growth of the employees” ( Rank-VIII) and “There should be provision for the employees to visit other organizations so that they can get the opportunity to learn more& new things” (Rank-IX) were also some of the other suggestions provided by the respondents to enhance their Job Related Self-Efficacy in the organization, which, in turn, facilitates in developing leadership skill among the employees. These findings were in agreement with those of Kirkpatrick *et al.* (1993) who studied the relationship between transformational leadership and efficacy belief and found that the transformational leaders enhance followers’ perception of self-efficacy by emphasizing positive visions, communicating high performance expectations and adequate feedback. They expressed confidence in their followers’ abilities to contribute to the organization mission and goals. However, these findings were found in contrast with those of Vancouver *et al.* (2001) who found a significant and negative relationship between very high self efficacy and the subsequent performance, that is, more the self efficacy of the students towards the exams, the worse was their performance in the exams as this led to over confidence among them resulting in less efforts on their side.

**CONCLUSIONS**

It has been concluded that a majority of the employees had medium job related self-efficacy. Confrontation followed by Integration, Helping attitude, Creativity and Linkage were the dominating factors in their job related self efficacy. The study implies that participation of employees’ in decision making be encouraged, the work should be assigned as per their skill/talent, freedom to give any new idea, opportunity for professional development and there should be provision of incentives for honest, sincere and hard working employees for enhancing their Job related self-efficacy.

**References**

Carmona, C. Buunk, A., Dijkstra, A &Peiro, J.M. (2008). The relationship between goal orientation, social comparison responses, self-efficacy and performance. *European Psychologist*, 13 :188-196.

Grau,R. Salvanova, M and Peiro J M. (2001). Moderator effects of self-efficacy on occupational stress *.Psychology in Spain*, 5:63-74.

Kirkpatrick, S.A. and Locke, E.A. (1996). Direct and indirect effects of three core charismatic leadership components on performance and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81:36-51.

Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W.B., Xanthopoulou, D., and Bakker, A. (2009). The gain spiral of resources and work engagement. In A.Bakker & M, Leiter (Eds.)

Work engagement: Recent development in theory and research. New York: Psychology Press.  
Vancouver, J.B; Thomson, C.M.and Williams, A.A. (2001). The changing signs in the relationships among self-efficacy, personal goals and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 8: 605-620.

Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker; A. B, Demerouti, E.and Schaufeli, W.B. (2009). Work Engagement and financial returns: A diary study on the role of job and personal resources. *Journal of occupational & Organizational Psychology*, 82:183-200.

**How to cite this article:**

Sharma D.D and Suman Kanta (2018) 'Job Related Self - Efficacy - A Study of Technical Employees of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited Hamirpur (Himachal Pradesh)', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 07(6), pp. 13150-13156. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2018.13156.2332>

\*\*\*\*\*