ISSN: 2277-3665 Impact Factor : 5.3149(UIF) Volume - 6 | Issue - 8 | august - 2017

Academic Sports Scholars

LEVEL OF STRESS AND SELF-EFFICACY AMONG FEMALE PLAYERS AND NON-PLAYERS

Dr. Sanjay Kumar

ABSTRACT :

The purpose of this study was to study the stress level and self-efficacy level among female players and female non-playing School students. For the present study, eighty female students (forty female inter state level players and forty female non-playing School students)of different Schools of Himachal Pradesh state in India were randomly drawn to act as subjects. Data regarding stress was collected by using Student Life Stress Inventory (Gadzella, 1991) and used Self-Efficacy Scale developed by Sud, Schwarzer & Jerusalem (1998) for collecting data regarding self-efficacy. Mean and standard deviation used as statistical techniques and t-test is also used to find out significant difference. It was found that female players have higher level of stress due to frustration, conflicts, pressure, changes and due to self-imposed. Further female players found to be higher physiological, behavioral and cognitive reaction to stressors than female non-players. Self-efficacy level is also found to higher in female players than female non-playing School students.

KEYWORDS : *Stress. Self-Efficacy. Player. Non- Player.*

INTRODUCTION:

Although student-life stress and self-efficacy in basic and higher education has been a topic of interest for several decades. School students experience high stress at predictable times in each academic years due to academic commitments, sports pressure, financial, lack of time management and due to competitions (Ragheb & McKinney, 1993). In addition to these stresses freshman players must also meet the increased academic demands at the School level. The interaction of these multiple stressors present a unique problem for the School student players and evidence suggests that the combination of these stressors has a negative effect on their well-being. In addition to mental health concern, many players reported physical health problems, a lack of sleep, continuous tension, fatigue, headaches, and digestive problems (Humphrey, Yow, & Bowden, 2000). Some students can not handle the overload of stress. Some people are unable to deal with the physical and emotional trauma generated by the demands on their energy, emotions and time (Adler, 1985).

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief that he/she is capable of performing a task. It refers to a person's evaluation of his/her ability or competency to perform a task, reach a goal or overcome an obstacle. Self-efficacy underlies people's faith in their ability to carry out a particular behavior. The greater a person's sense of self-efficacy, the more persistent he/she will be and the more likely it is that the individual will be successful.Self-efficacy is one's capability to mobilize their motivation, cognitive resources, courses of action will be initiated, the amount of efforts expected in pursuit of that activity and the level of persistence in the face of obstacles(Bandura 1986).Female players face many challenges in the spheres of academic, athletic and at home. They often compete in the classroom with their peers. Persons high in self-efficacy believe that they are capable

of dealing effectively with the events in their lives. This gives them an outlook that is different from that of people who are low in self-efficacy and has a direct impact on their lives. Those who have high levels of self-efficacy are more confident that they will be able to accomplish goals in certain areas than those with low self-efficacy. Playing self-efficacy, like other forms of efficacy is domain specific and may not be transferable to another domain within the same sport or other sport. While physical talent and ability are always important, in situations where participants on both teams are highly skilled (Bandura, 1997).Those who have a high self-efficacy belief find an inner confidence, which allows them to perform tasks that might otherwise seem beyond their reach. A high self-efficacy makes life a little easier and our day a little brighter.

METHODOLOGY

For the present study, eighty female students of different School s of Himachal Pradesh were randomly drawn to act as subjects. Out of eighty students, there were forty female interuniversity level players and forty female non-playing School students. Stress due to frustration, conflicts, pressure, changes, self-imposed, physiological reaction to stressors, behavioral reaction to stressors, emotional reaction to stressors, cognitive reaction to stressors and self-efficacy were treated as variables. In the present investigation, two questionnaires were used as tools for gathering data. The investigator collect data regarding stress using Student Life Stress Inventory (Gadzella, 1991) and used Self-Efficacy Scale developed by Sud, Schwarzer & Jerusalem(1998) for collecting data regarding self-efficacy. The data analyzed and compared with the help of statistical procedure in which arithmetic mean, standard deviation (S.D.) and t-test used to compare the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Mean, standard deviation (S.D.), t-values and p-values of variables of female players and female non-players have been depicted in table 1.

Table 1:Comparison of Stress and Self-Efficacy between Femaleplayers and Female Non-Playing School Students.

S.No.	Variables	Female Players		Female Non-Players		t-value	p-value
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
1.	Frustration	21.98	4.99	16.22	4.07	-5.63	0.00
2.	Conflicts	9.80	2.34	8.32	1.89	-3.09	0.00
3.	Pressure	12.83	2.99	9.50	2.22	-6.60	0.00
4.	Changes	9.75	1.93	7.40	1.94	-5.42	0.00
5.	Self-imposed	24.56	3.99	21.73	4.61	-2.94	0.00
6.	Reaction to stressors Physiological	32.65	7.24	20.33	4.23	-9.29	0.00
7.	Emotional	11.05	3.92	11.95	3.32	1.10	0.27
8.	Behavioral	16.03	3.91	11.03	3.70	-5.86	0.00
9.	Cognitive	6.40	1.98	8.35	1.83	4.56	0.00
10.	Self-efficacy	34.42	4.44	32.66	3.21	2.06	0.04

Level of significance, p<.01 and p <.05

The perusal of the Table 1 shows that female players have, 21.98 (S.D.= 4.99) and female non-playing School students have 16.22 (S.D. = 4.07) mean levels of stress due to frustration. Significant difference found

between female players and female non-players in the perception of stress due to frustration, (p< .01). It is clear that female players have higher level of stress perception due to frustration. Female players have, 9.80 (S.D. = 2.34) and female non-players have, 8.32 (S.D.) = 1.89) means levels of stress due to conflicts. It shows that there is significant difference in the perception of stress due to conflicts. Female players have higher level of life stress as comparison to female non-playing School students due to conflicts. Female players have 12.83 (S.D.=2.99) and female non-playing School students have 9.50 (S.D.=2.22) mean levels of stress due to pressure. There is significant difference regarding stress due to pressure,(p < .01). Female players perceive high stress than female non-playing School students due to pressure. Female players have 9.75 (S.D. = 1.93) and female non-players have 7.40 (S.D. = 1.94), mean levels of stress perception due to changes. It shows that there is significant difference,(p < .01). Female players perceive high level of stress due to changes than female non-playing School . Female players have 24.56 (S.D. = 3.99) and female non-playing School students have 21.73 (S.D. = 4.61), mean levels of stress perception due to self-imposed. It reveals that there is significant difference regarding stress perception due to self-imposed, (p < .01). It is also analyzed that female players have higher level of stress perception due to self-imposed than female non-playing School students. Female players have 32.65 (S.D. = 7.24) and female non-players have 20.33 (S.D. = 4.23), mean level of stress due to physiological reaction to stressors. It reveals that there is significant difference, (p < .01). It is analyzed that female players have high stress perception due to physiological reaction to stressors as comparison to female non-playing School students. Female players and female non-players have 11.05 (S.D. = 3.92) and 11.95 (S.D. = 3.32) mean levels of emotional reaction to stressors. It shows that there is insignificant difference, (p > .05). It is further analyzed that there is no significant difference in the perception of stress due to emotional reactors to stressors between female players and female non-playing School students. It is evident from Table 1 that female players and female non-players have 16.03 (S.D. = 3.91) and 11.03 (S.D. = 3.70) mean levels of behavioral reaction to stressors respectively. It shows that there is significant difference, (p < .01). It is analyzed that female players percept high level of behavioral reaction to stressors than female non-players. It is quite shown in Table 1 that female players and female non-players have 6.40 (S.D. = 1.98) and 8.35 (S.D. = 1.83) mean levels of cognitive reaction to stressors. It shows that there is significant difference, (p < .01). It is further analyzed that female players have high level of cognitive reaction to stressors than female non-players. Female players and female non-players have 34.42 (S.D. = 4.44) and 32.65 (S.D. = 3.21) mean levels of scores regarding self-efficacy respectively. It shows that there is significant difference between female players and female non-players regarding self-efficacy,(p<.05). It is analyzed that female players have high level of self-efficacy as comparison to female non-playing School students.

On the whole, students who participate in intercollegiate sports have difficulty in forming well made educational plans as aspirations. The rigorous schedule of student-athletes may also impede their academic success. On average, student players, particularly those in revenue-generating sports will spend upward of 20-30 hours per week in practice, traveling, game time, training, receiving care for physical ailment, study hall, and working with tutors (Ferrante, Etzel and Lantz, 1991). Female players have higher level of stress due to frustration, conflicts, pressure, and changes and self-imposed. Further female players found to be higher stress perception due to physiological, behavioral and cognitive reaction to stressors than female non-playing. Self-efficacy level is also found to higher in female players than female non-playing School students. Papanikolaou et al. (2003) conduct a study on male athletes and female athletes which showed female athletes were stressed by factors such as: tests and examinations, preparing papers far class, missing classes because of travel, and making up missed assignments.

One could agree that student players feel stress the worst because not only do they go through the stress of a normal student, they also feel the stress from fans and coaches for whom they are performing. Sports participation itself can become an additional stressor that traditional School student do not experience but it is also proved that participation in sports can serve as buffer to stressor (Kimball & Freysinger, 2003).

Playing self-efficacy, like other forms of efficacy is domain specific and may not be transferable to another domain within the same sport or other sport. While physical talent and ability are always important, in situations where participants on both teams are highly skilled (Bandura,1997).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the results of the present study confirm that female players percepts higher stress due to frustration,conflicts, pressure, changes and self-imposed than female non-players. Female payers also precepts higher level of physiological, behavioral and cognitive reaction to stressors than female non-playing School students of Himachal Pradesh (India). But they do not differ regarding stress perception due to emotional reaction to stressors. The self-efficacy level is also high in female players.

REFERENCES

1.Adler, Peter (1985). The academic performance of School athletes. Sociology of Education. 58, 241-250.
2.Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundation of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.
3.Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W.H. Freeman.
4.Ferrante, A.P., Eztel, E.F., & Lantz, C. (1991). Councling School students athletes: The problem, the need. In E.F. Eztel, A.P. Ferrante & J.W. Pinkney (eds.), Counceling School student athletes: Issue and interventions (pp. 3-26). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
5.Gadzella, B.M. (1991). Student life stress inventory: Copyright. Department of Psychology and Special Education. East Texas State, Commerce, Texas.
6.Hood, A.B., Craig, A.F. & Ferguson, B.W. (1992). The impact of athletics, part time employment, and other activities on academic achievement. Journal of School Student Development, 33, 447-453.
7.Humphrey, J.H., Yow, D.A. & Bowden, W.W. (2000). Stress in School athletics: Causes, consequences, coping. Binghamton, New York: The Haworth Half-Court Press.
8.Kimball, A., & Freysinger, V.J. (2003). Leisure, stress, and coping: The sport participation of collegiate student.
9.McCleod, Quinton (2001). Stress levels among student athletes and non-student-athletes. School Student Journal, 35, 1-10.
10.Papanikolaou, Z., Nikalaidu, D. Patsiaouras, A., & Alexopoulos, P. (2003). The freshman experience: High stress-low grades. Athletic Insight: The One-Line Journal of Sport Psychology, 5.
11.Ragheb, K.G., & McKinney, J. (1993). Campus reaction and perceived academic stress. Journal of School students Development, 34, 5-10.
12.Sood, Anshu (2003). The role of self-efficacy and personality factors in scholastic attainment. Unpublished Dissertation, H.P., Shimla, India.
13.Sud, S., Schwarzer, R. and Jerusalem, M. (1998). Hindi version of general self-efficacy scale. HTTP://userpaze.fu-berlin.de/~health/hindi .htm.

Dr. Sanjay Kumar