



International journal of basic and applied research

www.pragatipublication.com

ISSN 2249-3352 (P) 2278-0505 (E)

Cosmos Impact Factor-5.86

Hope and self-efficacy of university students

Dr Rihunlang Rymbai

Education, Assistant Professor,
Department of Education, North-Eastern Hill University,
Shillong-793022, Meghalaya, India

Abstract

Hope and Self-Efficacy are important constructs of human beings. Snyder (2002) defined Hope as the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways. However, Self-Efficacy is the belief in one's ability to influence events that effect one's life and control over the way these events are experienced (Bandura, 1994). The present study aims to explore the relationship of Hope and Self-Efficacy, to find out if the ability to conceptualise goals, find pathways to these goals despite obstacles and have the motivation to use those pathways would influence is the belief a person has that they can reach their goals or a desired outcome. Findings of the study revealed that there is significant relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy of students. Further, there is no significant difference in Hope between male and female while there is a significant difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female nontribal university students.

Keywords: hope, nontribal, self-efficacy, university students.

Hope and Self-Efficacy are important constructs of human beings. The presence of Hope produces the ability to conceptualise goals, find pathways to these goals despite obstacles and have the motivation to use those pathways (Boniwell, 2008). It was Charles Snyder who developed the construct of Hope. Snyder (2002) defined Hope as the perceived capability to derive pathways to desired goals, and motivate oneself via agency thinking to use those pathways. However, Self-Efficacy is the belief in one's ability to influence events that effect one's life and control over the way these events are experienced (Bandura, 1994). It is the belief a person has that they can reach their goals or a desired outcome (Bandura, 1997). It is the expectation that one can master a situation, and produce a positive outcome based on beliefs about our personal competence or effectiveness in a given area (Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011).

The present study aims to explore the relationship of Hope and Self-Efficacy, to find out if the ability to conceptualise goals, find pathways to these goals despite obstacles and have the motivation to use those pathways would influence is the belief a person has that they can reach their goals or a desired outcome. Related studies reflected that Hope is positively associated with perceived competence and self-worth (Marques, Pais-Ribeiro, & Lopez, 2009). Also, high-hope students develop many life goals, and perceive themselves as being capable of solving problems that may arise (Snyder, Hoza, et al., 1997). Further, higher hope has been correlated positively with social competence (Barnum, Snyder, Rapoff, Mani, & Thompson, 1998), and interest in the goal pursuits of others (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997). Therefore, the present study aims to find out the relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy of nontribal university students. The nontribal university students are the students which do not belong to the tribal community of north eastern states or the rest of India.



Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are:

1. To find out the difference in Hope between male and female students.
2. To find out the difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female students.
3. To find out the relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy students.

Null Hypotheses

The Null hypotheses stated are:

Ho1: There is no significant difference in Hope between male and female students.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female students.

Ho3: There is no significant relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy of students.

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the study include 161 North-Eastern Hill University nontribal students, out of which 72 of them are male and 89 are female.

Method

Descriptive and inferential method is used in the study.

Tool

The tools used in the study are (i) Adult Hope Scale and (ii) General Self-Efficacy Scales. The Adult Hope Scale was developed by Snyder, Harris, Anderson, Holleran, Irving, Sigmon, et al. (1991). It contains 12 items, four items of which measure pathway thinking, four items measure agency thinking, and four items are fillers. Each item is answered using an 8-point Likert-type scale. The General Self-Efficacy (GSE) was developed by Lyubomirsky, Schwarzer and Jerusalem in 1995. It is a ten item measure of general Self-Efficacy with 4-point.

Statistical Technique

The Statistical techniques used in the study are t-test and Pearson Product Moment 'r'.

**Result**

The collected data of university students were analysed and the result is shown in the following tables:-

Table 1: Difference in Hope between male and female students

| Measure | Gender | N | Mean | SD | t | df | Sig. | Remark |
|---------|--------|----|-------|-------|-------|-----|------|----------|
| Hope | Male | 72 | 46.64 | 7.835 | 1.447 | 159 | .150 | Not Sig. |
| | Female | 89 | 44.75 | 8.526 | | | | |

The t-test in the Table 2 reflected the difference in Hope between male and female nontribal university students. The result of the study may be given below:

An independent sample t-test showed that the difference in Hope between male ($N= 72$, $M= 46.64$, $SD= 7.835$) and female ($N= 89$, $M= 44.75$, $SD= 8.526$) were statistically not significant, $t(159) = 1.447$, $p= .150$.

Table 2: Difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female students

| Measure | Gender | N | Mean | SD | t | df | Sig. | Remark |
|---------------|--------|----|-------|-------|---------|-----|------|-------------|
| Self-Efficacy | Male | 72 | 30.65 | 4.658 | 3.289** | 159 | .001 | Significant |
| | Female | 89 | 28.13 | 4.964 | | | | |

Note. ** $p < .01$

The t-test in the Table 2 reflected the difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female nontribal university students. The result of the study may be given below:

An independent sample t-test showed that the difference in Self-Efficacy between male ($N = 72$, $M = 30.65$, $SD = 4.568$) and female ($N = 89$, $M = 28.13$, $SD = 4.964$) were statistically significant, $t(159) = 3.298$, $p = .001$.

Table 3: Correlation between Hope and Self-Efficacy of (i) all students (ii) male students (iii) female students

| Measures | Students | M | SD | N | df | r | Sig | Remark |
|---------------|----------|-------|-------|-----|-----|--------|------|-------------|
| Hope | All | 45.60 | 8.253 | 161 | 159 | .597** | .000 | Significant |
| Self-Efficacy | | 29.26 | 4.976 | | | | | |
| Hope | Male | 46.64 | 7.835 | 72 | 70 | .628** | .000 | Significant |
| Self-Efficacy | | 30.65 | 4.658 | | | | | |
| Hope | Female | 44.75 | 8.526 | 89 | 87 | .565** | .000 | Significant |
| Self-Efficacy | | 28.13 | 4.964 | | | | | |

Note. ** $p < .01$ level



On observing Table 3, it may be interpreted that:

The relationship between Hope ($M = 45.60$, $SD = 8.253$) and Self-Efficacy ($M = 29.26$, $SD = 4.976$) of allnontribal university students was positively and significantly correlated, $r (159) = .597$, $p = .000$.

The relationship between Hope ($M = 46.64$, $SD = 7.835$) and Self-Efficacy ($M = 30.65$, $SD = 4.658$) of male nontribal university students was positively and significantly correlated, $r (70) = .628$, $p = .000$.

The relationship between Hope ($M = 44.75$, $SD = 8.526$) and Self-Efficacy ($M = 28.13$, $SD = 4.964$) of female nontribal university students was positively and significantly correlated, $r (87) = .565$, $p = .000$.

Based on the result of the study, the Null hypothesis H_01 stating no significant difference in Hope between male and female nontribal university students was accepted. Null hypothesis H_02 stating no significant difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female nontribal university students was rejected at .01 level of significance, since there was significant difference between the groups. Similarly, null hypotheses H_03 , H_04 and H_05 stating no significant relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy in (i) nontribal university students (ii) male nontribal university students and (iii) female nontribal university students, were rejected at .01 level of significance, since there were significant relationship between the groups.

Discussion

Findings of the study revealed that there is no significant difference in Hope between male and female nontribal university students, which is similar to the finding of Fatima (2017) showing that there exists no difference found between male and female cancer patients on hope. Also, male nontribal university students have higher Mean in Hope than female. However, there is a significant difference in Self-Efficacy between male and female nontribal university students, which is in line with the study of Chavez, Beltran, and Guerrero, Enriquez and Reyes (2014) where MANOVA results showed significant global gender differences in the self-efficacy scores for the communication, attention and excellence variables. It also shows that male have higher Self-Efficacy than femalenontribal university students. Other findings were that there exists significant relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy in(i) nontribal university students (ii) male nontribal university students and (iii) female nontribal university students. It was observed that stronger relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy exists in male as compared to female nontribal university students.

Conclusion

The findings of the study have given an insight on the status of difference in Hope and Self-Efficacy, and relationship between Hope and Self-Efficacy of Hope, Pathway-Hope, Agency-Hope and Happiness of nontribal students studying in the North-Eastern Hill University. The students in the study being university students have been exposed to many years of education. This may have contributed to their Hope and Self-efficacy. However, through the findings of the study a call is that the university education system and the other levels of education may enhance the curriculum, educational theory and practice in order to give higher hopes for students and reachable and practical success for their future. I this way their Self-Efficacy may be boosted for better



preparation for their future. In conclusion impending research in the similar field may be anticipated to be carried out.

References

- Barnum, D. D., Snyder, C. R., Rapoff, M. A., Mani, M. M., & Thompson, R. (1998). Hope and Social Support in the Psychological Adjustment of Children Who Have Survived Burn Injuries and Their Matched Controls. *Children's Health Care*, 27, 15-30.
- Fatima, S. (2017). Hope and Mental Well Being among Male and Female Cancer Patients. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4(2), 58 – 64
- Hefferon, K & Boniwell, I. (2011). *Positive Psychology Theory, Research and Applications*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Juan Francisco Aguirre Chavez, Francisco Muñoz Beltran, Alejandro Chavez Guerrero, Maria del Carmen Zueck Enriquez, Jesus Jasso Reyes. A Gender Study on College Students' Academic Self-Efficacy. *Science Journal of Education*. Vol. 2, No. 6, 2014, pp. 180-184
- Marques, S. C., Pais-Ribeiro, J. L., & Lopez, S. J. (2009). Validation of a Portuguese Version of the Children's Hope Scale. *School Psychology International*, 30, 538-551.
- Snyder, C. (2002). Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249-275. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1448867>
- Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Simpson, S. C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1, 107-118.
- Snyder, C. R., Hoza, B., Pelham, W. E., Rapoff, M., Ware, L., Danovsky, M., Highberger, L., Rubinstein, H., & Stahl, K. (1997). The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 22 (3), 399-421.