

PERSONALITY HARDINESS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN RELATION TO THEIR OCCUPATIONAL SELF EFFICACY WITH RESPECT TO LOCALE

Dr. Guneet Toor* & Hardeep Singh**

ABSTRACT

In the present times, the nature of work and careers are changing continuously and at an escalating rate. Teachers are also exposed to certain unwanted factors in their milieu, which exists either within the educational institution (internal factors) or exists outside the educational institution (external factors) and hamper the normal routine life of teachers by negatively affecting their performance at work. A great number of research suggests that hardness acts as a protective factor in stressful situations, especially in work context. Thus, personality hardness of the teachers influences the effective school education to great extent. Hardiness begins to define areas of knowledge, skills and support that an individual can develop to resist and transform stresses. The present study chooses to restrict itself to occupational self efficacy because it is a personal characteristic that is malleable, i.e., it can be changed or improved with the help of organisational interventions (unlike positive personality traits, which are fixed) and can thus have significant implications for the management of people at work. Thus, the present research focuses on the study of personality hardness of secondary school teachers in relation to their occupational self efficacy.

Keywords: Personality, Hardiness, Occupation self efficacy, Locale School Teachers

Introduction

In every profession and pursuit, engagement ignites talent and skill and disengagement shuts it down. The brilliance and full potential of even the brightest emerged employee will never find expression unless he/she is engaged. It is the ratio of engaged to disengaged workers that drives the financial outcomes and impacts profitable growth (Loehr, 2005). This quote clearly highlights the importance of an engaged workforce for an organisation in the 21st century information/service economy.

Before long, the conceptualization of personality hardiness began to emerge (Kobasa 1979; Maddi and Kobasa 1984). Basically, hardiness was considered the specifics of what existentialists call existential courage (Maddi, 2004).

Hardy individuals consider the stressful situations as less dangerous and more controllable (Zakin, Solomon and Neriya (2003), additionally, hardiness attitude enhances stress resistance in

various life situations (Kobasa, Maddi and Kahn, 1982). Hardy individual, compared with no hardy individuals, have less physiologic responses in response to stressful situations due to their calmness. Thus, Hardiness (Kobasa, 1982) is one such moderator variable related to personality factors in psychological health including anxiety.

The concept of personality hardiness has its roots in Kierkegaard's existential philosophy owing to the fact that hardy characteristics are important in occupational settings that concomitantly expresses commitment, control and readiness to respond to challenge and are defined as a person's basic stance towards her or his place in the world (Boss, 1963; Heidegger, 1962; Kobasa 1979; Kobasa, Maddi and Kahn, 1982 and Sartre, 1956). To the existentialist, existence can be characterized by continual and unrelenting change so one is always in the process of becoming, striving for authenticity or self-actualization, with freedom of choice to create one's life. A person striving for authenticity will not feel threatened by change or any challenge but will

* Assistant Professor, GHG Khalsa College of Education, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana

** M.Ed. Student, GHG Khalsa College of Education, Gurusar Sadhar, Ludhiana

consider it essential and imperative for development. From this philosophical tradition, Kobasa identified a personality construct (Hardiness) that assists health maintenance (Gentry and Kobasa, 1984; Kobasa, 1979; Kobasa, 1982; Kobasa and Puccetti, 1983). The construct of hardiness was first introduced by Kobasa (1979), who defined it as a resistance resource in the encounter with stressful situations. Personality hardiness is a set of beliefs about oneself and the world one lives in. People with hardy personality take control of their lives, believe that commitment to goals will result in positive outcomes, and perceive daily stressors as challenges. Hence, an essential view regarding personality hardiness is that it acts as a stress buffer which leads to fewer strains in human life.

However, examining why employees exposed to similar work environments report different levels of engagement continues to be a compelling question. To predict performance in an occupation, the level of self efficacy assessed should be broader; that is, it should be domain rather than task specific (Schyns and Sczesny, 2010). Thus, occupational self efficacy can be defined as the perceptions of an individual about his/her abilities to effectively perform his/her work tasks (Rigotti, Schyns and Mohr, 2008).

Thus, the present study uses an occupational self efficacy measure that has an intermediate level of specificity because it has higher predictive value than generalised and task-specific measures of self efficacy (Chen, Gully and Eden, 2001; Pajares, 1996; Abele and Spurk, 2009). Occupational self efficacy reflects a person's conviction that he or she can execute behaviours relevant to his or her own work (Schyns and Sczesny, 2010). Thus, the present research focuses on the study of personality hardiness of secondary school teachers in relation to their occupational self efficacy.

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the personality hardiness among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.
2. To compare the personality hardiness of secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district with respect to locale.
4. To study occupational self efficacy among

secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

5. To compare the occupational self efficacy of secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district with respect to locale.
6. To find out relationship between personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.
8. To find out relationship between personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among urban secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.
9. To find out relationship between personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Method

In the present study descriptive method of research was employed to study personality hardiness of secondary schools teachers in relation to their occupational self efficacy.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

Keeping in mind limited resource of time and money, only 120 secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district were randomly selected. Out of 120 secondary school teachers selected, 60 secondary school teachers were selected who were teaching in secondary schools belonging to urban area. Similarly, 60 secondary school teachers were selected from schools belonging to rural area.

Measures

- Hardiness scale by Nowack (1990)
- Occupational self efficacy scale by Chadha and Kaur (2013)

Procedure

Tools used for collecting data in the present study were Hardiness scale by Nowack (1990) and Occupational self efficacy scale by Chadha and Kaur (2013). To insure the best possible condition for administrating the scale, principals and teachers of those institutions from where the samples were drawn, were approached and their cooperation was sought by emphasizing and explaining to them the purpose and utility of the research project. They

were cooperative and gave necessary facilities within their powers. Teachers were urged to answer the questions truthfully. They were ensured that the record would be kept confidential. Necessary instructions were read out to them. Whenever the teachers had any difficulty in understanding any item, the investigator readily explained the meaning to them without brazening their response. After administering the tools, the response sheets of each subject were scaled according to the directions given in the manual.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Mean scores of Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

Variable	N	Mean	SD
Personality Hardiness	120	98.55	13.91
Occupational Self Efficacy	120	196.33	21.87

Above table shows the mean scores of Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The mean scores of Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy are 98.55 and 196.33 respectively. SD for Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy are 13.91 and 21.87 respectively.

Table 2: Mean scores of Personality Hardiness among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

N	Locale	Mean	SD	S.E. _d	t-ratio
60	Urban	97.27	10.89	2.58	0.99*
60	Rural	99.83	16.38		

*Not significant at 0.05 & 0.01 level

Above table shows mean scores of Personality Hardiness among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The mean scores of Personality Hardiness among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district are 97.27 and 99.83 respectively. SD for urban and rural secondary school teachers are 10.89 and 16.38 respectively and t-ratio value is 0.99 which is less than the table value at both levels of confidence i.e. 0.05 and 0.01. This indicates that no significant difference exists in the mean scores of Personality

Hardiness among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Hence hypothesis (1) stating, "There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Personality Hardiness among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district with respect to locale" stands accepted. Further it is observed that the mean scores of Personality Hardiness of rural secondary school teachers are more than that of urban secondary schools teachers of Ludhiana district.

Table 3: Mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

N	Locale	Mean	SD	S.E. _d	t-ratio
60	Urban	191.58	24.95	3.909	2.45
60	Rural	201.13	17.17		

*Significant at 0.05 & not significant 0.01 level

Above table shows mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district are 191.58 and 201.13 respectively. SD for urban and rural secondary school teachers are 24.95 and 17.17 respectively and t-ratio value is 2.45 which is more than the table value at 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that significant difference exists in the mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among urban and rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Hence hypothesis (2) stating, "There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district with respect to locale" stands partially rejected. Further it is observed that the mean scores of Occupational Self Efficacy among rural secondary school teachers are more than that of urban secondary schools teachers of Ludhiana district.

Table 4: Coefficient of correlation between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

N	r
120	0.295

*Significant at 0.05 & 0.01 levels of confidence

Above table represents the coefficient of correlation between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The value of coefficient of correlation is 0.29 which is significant at both levels of confidence. This indicates that there exists significant and positive relationship between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Hence hypothesis (3) stating, "There exists no significant relationship in the mean scores of personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among secondary schools teachers of Ludhiana district" stands rejected.

Table 5: Coefficient of correlation between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among urban secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

N	r
60	0.48

Above table represents the coefficient of correlation between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among urban secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The value of coefficient of correlation is 0.48 which is significant at both levels of confidence that is 0.05 and 0.01. This indicates that there exists significant and positive relationship between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Hence hypothesis (4) stating, "There exists no significant relationship in the mean scores of personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among urban secondary schools teachers of Ludhiana district" stands rejected.

Table 6: Coefficient of correlation between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district

N	r
60	0.13

*Not significant at both levels of confidence i.e. 0.05 and 0.01 levels

Above table shows that represents the coefficient of correlation between Personality

Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among rural secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district. The value of coefficient of correlation is 0.13 which is not significant at both levels of confidence that is 0.05 and 0.01 levels. This indicates that no relationship exists between Personality Hardiness and Occupational Self Efficacy among secondary school teachers of Ludhiana district.

Hence hypothesis (5) stating, "There exists no significant relationship in the mean scores of personality hardiness and occupational self efficacy among rural secondary schools teachers of Ludhiana district" stands accepted.

Educational Implications

Regarding current study's results, occupational self efficacy and personality hardiness have been found as a facilitator that affect teachers' performance in the educational field. The findings of the study supported the evidence to focus on teachers' psychological aspects, reinforce them and encourage them as human resource trainers of society. In that case, both occupational self efficacy and personality hardiness can be mentioned as moderators in the educational organizations.

Overall, our results provide some support for some aspects of the hardiness construct, but they also underscore the need for both conceptual and methodological refinements. The primary support lies in the findings concerning adaptive cognitive responses to potential stressors, a central aspect of the hardiness model. One area for conceptual refinement concerns the nature of the link between hardiness and health.

Organizations may benefit by including hardiness, self efficacy and coping concepts in training and assimilation programs for employees and supervisors. Even during the recruitment of middle level and top level management, measuring these internal resources will aid the organization to select the appropriate candidate as their work involves handling various problematic situations. Recognizing hardiness, self efficacy and coping as potential targets for intervention raises the issue of whether it is possible to change an individual's general tendencies, which are by nature difficult to change.

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 Behaviour*, 74(1), 53–62.

Boss, M. (1963). *Psychoanalysis and daseinanalysis*. New York, NY: Basic Books. Retrieved from www.oushi.upol.cz.on August 7, 2016.

Chadha, M. & Kaur, J. (2013). *Occupational self efficacy scale*, Panjab University unpublished Ph.D. Thesis.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62–83

Gentry, W. D., & Kobasa, S. C. O. (1984). Social and psychological resources mediating stress-illness relationships in humans. In W. D. Gentry (Ed.), *Handbook of Behavioural Medicine*, 87-116. Retrieved from www.rci.rutgers.in.on September 16, 2016.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper & Row. Retrieved from www.iiste.org. on September 23, 2016.

Kobasa, S.C. (1982). Commitment and coping in stress resistance among Lawyers. *J. Personality Soc. Psychol.*, 42, 702-717. Retrieved from www.mapace.umsystem.edu. on September 29, 2016.

Kobasa, S.C, Maddi, S.R., & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 168-177.

Kobasa, S.C. & Puccetti, M.C. (1983). Personality and social resources in stress resistance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45, 839-850. Retrieved from www.uir.unisa.ac.za.on August 2, 2016.

Kobasa, S.C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1-11.

Loehr, J. (2005). *Become fully engaged. Leadership Excellence*, 22(2), 14.

Maddi, S.R. (2004). Hardiness: An operationalization of existential courage. *J Humanist Psychol*, 44, 279–298. Retrieved from www.hrcek.srce. hr.on August 30, 2016.

Maddi, S. R., & Kobasa, S. C. (1984). *The hardy executive: Health under stress*. Homewood: Dow Jones-Irwin. Retrieved from digital common.org.on September 16, 2016.

Nowack, K.M. (1990). Coping, style, cognitive hardiness, and health status. *Journal of Behavioural Medicine*, 12, 145-158. Retrieved from www.dtic.mil.org.on August, 20, 2016.

Pajares, F. (1996). Self efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Measurement*, 66(4), 543–578.

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(2), 238-255. doi:10.1177/1069072707305763

Sartre, J. P. (1956). *Being and nothingness*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Schyns, B., & Sczesny, S. (2010). Leadership attributes valence in self-concept and occupational self efficacy. *Career Development International*, 15(1), 78–92.

Zakin, G. Solomon, Z., & Neriya, Y. (2003). Hardiness, attachment style, and long term psychological distress among Israeli POWs and combat veterans. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 819–829. Retrieved from www.tandfonline.org.on August 30, 2016.