

## **The Relationships between Motivation and Self-Efficacy**

Raphael Gomel<sup>1</sup>

Self-efficacy is perceived as a main factor that shapes motivation to perform tasks. The relationships between self-efficacy and motivation were examined in a recent experimental procedure presented here, conducted between managers and workers. The findings suggests different connections between these variables. A quantitative research was conducted in a college for adult studies (Gomel, 2016). 207 participants of courses in the college were required to estimate their ability to successfully complete an hypothetical task, Their self-efficacy, motivation and willingness to perform were measured. Their motivation was manipulated and changes in variables were measured. Pearson correlation coefficient and Spearman correlation coefficient were used to examine the relationships between variables. In addition, linear regression tests were done, to test the effect of interactions between motivation and specific self-efficacy on willingness to perform of the participants. It was found that motivation participates in determining self-efficacy and in forming the relationship between self-efficacy and willingness to perform. It was also found that motivation has a more crucial role than specific self-efficacy in predicting willingness to perform.

**Key words:** self-efficacy, motivation, willingness to perform

### **Introduction**

One of the issues that concern many researchers is how to motivate people to achieve best performances, and how current experience affects future behavior. according to Bandura's theory, one's Self-efficacy affects his motivation for completing the task and the later affect

---

<sup>1</sup> Gomel Raphael - Consulting and Development, Rishon le'zion, Israel [rafigomel@gmail.com](mailto:rafigomel@gmail.com)

performance. Self-efficacy has been defined as the level of an individual's belief in his or her own ability to succeed in performing and achieve wanted results (Bandura, 1977, 1980). A wide body of knowledge supports the claims of the theory, however, other evidence were found recently, suggesting different connections between the variables: A research recently conducted, following Bandura's theory, tested for a positive direct connection between self-efficacy and performance and between self-efficacy and motivation amongst nursing students. it was found in some cases that motivation had a central effect, and without it, the effect of self-efficacy on the level of success was not found (Hadid, 2013). These findings dispute Bandura's claim about the importance of motivation, and raise a question about the exclusiveness of self-efficacy in determining the level of success. Following these results, in the current research we examind wether motivation affect self-efficacy and the later affect willingness to perform

### **The role of Self-efficacy**

Self-efficacy refers to people's beliefs about their ability to monitor and manage events that affect their environment and their lives so they could satisfy their needs, and their ability to summon the motivation, the cognitive resources and the actions (skills) required to succeed in the tasks they chose. Self-efficacy is defined as "people's judgment of their capability to organize and execute courses of action required to achieve selected types of performance" (Bandura, 1986, p391). In other words; A person's assessment of his ability to use the necessary skills and behave in a specific way, in order to deal with different situations. Self-efficacy is what a person believes he can do with his abilities under given conditions (whether realistic or not). This belief is related to the expectations to get results: whether the individual expects his performance to produce successful results – or failure. Self-efficacy is based on the assumption that people avoid performing tasks which are perceived as too hard for their abilities and choose to complete tasks that match their perceived ability. These directions were supported in many researches (Lunenburg, 2011).

### **The relationships between Self-Efficacy and motivation**

According to Bandura, Self-efficacy influences action through motivational, cognitive and emotional processes. It affects the choice of tasks to be performed, determines the degree of effort investment and time of persistence's invested while dealing with obstacles. A person who believes he could perform a task, his self-efficacy will be high as well as his motivation to perform it. In contrast, a person who believes he could not complete the task successfully, will have lower self-efficacy, and will avoid the task (Snyder & Lopez, 2007). People are drawn to activities where they have high self-efficacy and less drawn to activities for which they have low self-efficacy (Van der Bijl & Shortridge-Baggett, 2002). Different researches that have found a positive connection between motivation and self-efficacy have presented findings supporting this claim, such as Eccles and others (Eccles, 2007, 2009), Agbarieh (2013), Steyn and Mashaba (2014). Williams and Williams (2010) reinforced this, indicating that people with high self-efficacy treat difficult tasks as challenges rather than threats they should avoid. Additional researches also found positive connections between efficacy and performance (O'Neil et al., 2013; Ramchunder & Martins, 2014). Similar findings have been reported by Lane et al. (2003).

It seems that there is a lot of evidence reinforcing Bandura's main arguments that self-efficacy shapes motivation and motivation affects performance and achievements. However, research findings, although generally support the theory, are not uniform and there are also opposing evidence: Kendall (2006) found that self-efficacy is negatively related to motivation and performance, LaForge-MacKenzie et al., (2014)

found that self-efficacy was not a significant predictor of performance. Additionally, there are indications that motivation is not directly related to performance. Hadid, (2013) found that motivation has a role in strengthening the connection between self-efficacy and success. In some cases motivation was found to have a central influence, without which the effect of the self-efficacy on the level of success was not present (Hadid, 2013, p40). The current research, conducted following Bandura's theory (1986) and Hadid's findings (2013) tested for a positive

direct connection between motivation, self-efficacy and willingness to perform amongst 207 participants in management courses.

## **Method**

### *Objectives*

The current research attempted to examine relationships between motivation, self-efficacy and willingness to perform

### *Design and participants*

A quantitative research was conducted, including an experiment group and a control group. The data collected was gathered via questionnaires from 207 participants in management courses. 62 of them were managers and 144 workers, 32% were women and 68% men. 147 participants were young people between the ages of 21–30 and 60 participants were over the age of 30.

### *Material and procedure*

A hypothetical situation was presented to the participants in which they were required to estimate their ability to successfully walk through a long pathway of hot coals, barefoot. A hypothetical reward of a A little sum of money was promised to those that succeed in completing the task. Following Kirsch's distinction, we distinct between general perceived self-efficacy and a perceived specific self-efficacy regarding a particular task that one intend to performe (Kirsch, 1986). At the first stage The participants were asked to fill out questionnaire to measure their motivation, their specific self-efficacy and their level of willingness to complete the task. At the second stage, the participants' motivation was manipulated: The participants were presented with a change in the described situation, according to which, those who succeed in completing the task in the story win a large sum of money. The rest of this stage was identical to the first stage: the participants were asked once again to complete the questionnaires to measure motivation, specific self-efficacy and level of willingness to complete the task.

### *Tools and indicators*

*Measurements of the Independent Variables: General Self-Efficacy* was tested by a 10 item questionnaire, based on the General Self-efficacy questionnaire that was used at (Hurter,2008) with necessary adjustments for our research

*Motivation for Task Performance* was measured in two ways: Indicator A: The participants filled out a questionnaire including four items in which they were requested to rate, on Likert scales (Norman, 2010). Indicator B: The participants were asked to rate on Likert scale their level of motivation for performing the task on a five option scale.

*Measurement of the Dependent Variables: Specific Self-Efficacy:* The participants were requested to estimate the level of success they would achieve had they tried to do a hypothetical task on 5 options Likert scale.

*The willingness to perform the task:* The participants were requested to estimate the chances that they would perform the task in the hypotheticals situation described to them

The statistical data analysis was done using Pearson and Spearman tests and linear regression analysis.

## **Results**

### *The Relationship between Motivation and General Efficacy*

Significant relationships were found between motivation and general efficacy only among managers before the manipulation ( $r=0.302$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and in the younger group of participants ( $r=0.180^*$ ,  $p<0.05$ )

### *The relationships between Motivation and Specific Efficacy*

The relationship between motivation and specific efficacy was found to be positive, strong and significant. The relationships were stronger among workers than among managers. After the manipulation of motivation stronger relationships were found in both motivation indicators. Testing the relationships according to age distribution has not shown any significant differences between younger people and older people

*Table 1: The Relationship between Motivation and Specific Efficacy before and after the Manipulation, with Distribution by Role Groups*

	Specific efficacy			
	Before		after	
	worker	manager	worker	manager
Motivation indicator A	0.716**	0.487**	0.775**	0.688**
Motivation indicator B	0.576**	0.307**	0.777**	0.639**

\*\*p<0.01

*The Effect of Motivation and Specific Efficacy on the Willingness to Perform:*

In order to test the effect of motivation and specific efficacy on the willingness to perform, linear regressions were used. The results of the regression Before manipulation show effects of specific efficacy and motivation on the willingness to perform. This effects are stronger for workers than for managers.

*Table 2: The Results of the Linear Regression to Predict the Willingness to Perform by Motivation A and the Specific Efficacy before the Manipulation among workers and managers*

	variable	B	$\beta$	T	p
worker	constant	0.099		0.784	0.434
	Specific efficacy	0.158	0.165	2.372	0.019
	Motivation indicator A	0.630	0.698	10.008	0.000
manager	constant	0.480		2.364	0.021
	Specific efficacy	0.148	0.204	1.809	.0075
	Motivation indicator A	0.376	0.498	4.418	0.000

Segmenting the participants according to role after the manipulation shows that the effect of specific efficacy on the willingness to perform is stronger for workers than for managers.

However, the effect of motivation on the willingness to perform is stronger for managers than for workers.

*Table 3: The Results of the Linear Regression to Predict the Willingness to Perform by Motivation A and the Specific Efficacy after the Manipulation among workers and managers*

	variable	B	$\beta$	T	p
worker	constant	0.235		1.470	0.144
	Specific efficacy	0.306	0.285	4.075	0.000
	Motivation indicator A	0.605	0.625	8.937	0.000
manager	constant	0.407		1.531	0.131
	Specific efficacy	0.214	0.211	2.156	0.035
	Motivation indicator A	0.654	0.666	6.806	0.00

The segmentation of participants according to age groups before the manipulation shows that the effect of specific efficacy on the willingness to perform is only significant for younger people. However, the effect of motivation on the willingness to perform is stronger for older people than it is for younger people. Moreover, after the manipulation, the effect of specific efficacy on the willingness to perform was found to be stronger among the older group of people in comparison to the younger group, while the effect of motivation on the willingness to perform is much stronger among younger people.

## Conclusions

In the current research, we have attempted to examine whether motivation participate in forming the self-efficacy. The examination of these relationship was done on two levels: first, we tested for a relationship between the research participants' motivation and their specific and general self-efficacy. This kind of relationship has indeed been found. Second, we tested the question whether increasing motivation by an experimental manipulation affects the strength of the relationship. Evidence was found to the strength of the relationship changing with the manipulation of the motivation of the research participants; With the increased



average level of motivation, there was also an increase in the level of self-efficacy of the participants. That is, in certain situations, the motivation can affect one's perceived self-efficacy, contrary to the perception that it is the efficacy that determines the level of motivation.

The findings of the research shows that the relationship between general efficacy and motivation does not always exist. there might be other factors causing the relationship between self-efficacy and motivation to be different between different groups of people. The relationships may differ for different ages or among workers as opposed to managers; and also for the same people in different situations. These findings fit the social learning theory, which claims that a person's motivation is affected by behavioral factors, personal factors and environmental factors that participate in forming it (Wood & Bandura, 1989). The findings of the research shows that the workers' willingness to perform is mainly affected by motivation, while the role of self-efficacy is significantly smaller. The manipulation has moderated this trend in a way that after the manipulation, self-efficacy had a slightly greater effect on performance while motivation had a slightly lower effect. Among younger people as well, the willingness to perform is affected much more clearly by motivation than self-efficacy, however, the effect of the manipulation on younger people is stronger and causes a significant increase in the effect of motivation on the willingness to perform and a decrease in the effect of self-efficacy on willingness to perform. It seems that older workers respond differently than younger workers to the promised rewards for a successful performance, and give different importance to their perceived self-efficacy: older people have higher regard to their self-efficacy than younger people. One possible explanation to this trend may be that it may have been caused by the younger people's tendency to take more risks than older people, and maybe they were more tempted by the high reward that was promised to the people who succeed in the task in this experiment.

Among managers, the manipulation had a different effect: it appears that the higher the motivation, the more tempted the managers are to strive and receive the reward promised to those who succeed in the task, even despite their lack of faith in their ability to complete the task.



### Summary

The claim that motivation can have an important role in forming self-efficacy and in affecting willingness to perform through self-efficacy does not have much empirical evidence as found at the current research according to which motivation participates in determining self-efficacy and in forming the relationship between self-efficacy and willingness to perform. It appears from the findings of the current research that motivation has a more crucial role than specific self-efficacy in predicting willingness to perform. The practical significance is that managers can influence the level of workers' motivation and so affect their perceived self-efficacy and improve workers' performance. In addition, the fact that different relationships were found between motivation, efficacy and performance among different groups of participants has meaning regarding differences necessary to the ways of motivating different workers of an organization. thus a greater chance of success is promised rather than an attempt to motivate all workers with an identical program.

\* Gomel, Raphael. *The relationships between motivation, specific self-efficacy and performance amongst adults - managers and workers*. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment on the requirements of Varna Free University for the degree of Doctor of Psychology 2016. A dissertation that has not been approved yet.

### References

- Agbarieh, K. (2013). Self-efficacy and degree of involvement in choosing the teaching profession as related to academic motivation among education students at Al-Qasemi. Qasemi College. Al- Qasemi College (Hebrew).
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. et al. (1980). Tests of the generality of self-efficacy theory. Cognitive therapy and research, 4.1: 39-66.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. NY. Prentice-Hall.

- Eccles, J. A. (2007). Motivational perspective on school achievement: Taking responsibility for learning and teaching. In R. J. Sternberg and R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *Optimizing student success in schools with the new three Rs*, Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 199–202.
- Eccles, J. A. (2009). *Expectancy Value Motivational Theory*. The Gale Group, Inc.
- Gomel, R. (2016). The relationships between motivation, specific self-efficacy and performance amongst adults- managers and workers. A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment on the requirements of Varna Free University for the degree of Doctor of Psychology.
- Hadid, S. (2013). The effect of self-efficacy and motivation on academic achievement and task performance in nursing. Thesis for the degree "Doctor of Philosophy", Haifa, University (Hebrew).
- Kendall, L.N. (2006). When self-efficacy negatively relates to motivation and performance in a learning context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2006, 91(5):1146-53.
- Kirsch, I. (1986). Self-efficacy and expectancy: Old wine with new labels. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49.3: 824.
- LaForge-MacKenzie, K. & Sullivan, P.J.(2014) The relationship between self-efficacy and performance within a continuous educational gymnastics routine, *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 12(3), 206-217,
- Lane, A., M., Devonport, T. J., Milton, K. E., & Williams, L. C. (2003). Self- efficacy and dissertation performance among sport students. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 2 (2), 59-66.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-efficacy in the workplace: implications for motivation and performance. *International journal of management, business, and administration*, 14.1: 1-6.
- Mordecai, N. (2001). Recognition as a basis for Motivation in school. *Hinuch Hach'asiva*, 20.1-25. (Hebrew)
- O'Neil, A., Berk, M., Davis, J. and Stafford, L. (2013). Cardiac-self efficacy predicts adverse outcomes in coronary artery disease (CAD) patients. *Health*, 5, 6-14

- Ramchunder, Y., & Martins, N. (2014). The role of self-efficacy, emotional intelligence and leadership style as attributes of leadership effectiveness. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), Art.
- Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. J. (2007). *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical explorations of human strengths*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications
- Stein, G. M. and Mashaba, S. W. (2014). Cognitive factors that influence principal motivation in Mpumalanga province. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5.16: 381.
- Van der Bijl, J. J., & Shortridge-Baggett, L. M. (2002). The theory and measurement of the self-efficacy construct. In E. A. Lentz & L. M. Shortridge-Baggett (Eds.), *Self-efficacy in nursing: Research and measurement perspectives*, New York: Springer, 9-28
- Williams, T., & Williams, K. (2010). Self-efficacy and performance in mathematics: Reciprocal determinism in 33 nations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(2), 453-466.