



Occupational self-efficacy of women in Kashmir valley

Dr. Gulnaz

Lecturer School Education, Kashmir, Jammu and Kashmir, India

Abstract

The present study was to access the occupational efficacy among women`s. A sample of 245 women was drawn randomly from various professions from Kashmir Valley to assess their Occupational Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction. Information Blank I and Information Blank II were development to collect the year wise classified data regarding the enrolment of women in higher education and year wise information regarding the professional status of women in various professions. Occupational Self-Efficacy scale developed by Sanjaypot Pethe, Sushma Chowdari and Uppindar Dhar (OSES) (2006) consisting 19 items and measuring occupational efficacy through six, dimensions Confidence, Command Positive Attitude, Adaptability, Personal Effectiveness and Individuality was administered to assess the Occupational Efficacy. The study revealed that professional female have higher level of confidence, command, personal effectiveness and positive attitude, it shows that female lawyers have dependence on their abilities, control over the situations, have more inclination towards the continuous development and ability to evaluate optimistically.

Keywords: occupational, self-efficacy, women, Kashmir

Introduction

Women as partners in the process of development need to be empowered in terms of information update and skills in correct choice and decision making. They will also be required to take an independent stand in case of oppressive and unjust forces acting in self-interest than the benefit of the project. One more asset of women force is that they adapt to changes quite easily. They do not take long to adapt to a new role. The monitoring ought to consider fresh inputs to ensure continued role enhancement and prevention of stagnation.

The key instruments of the strategy for women's development both as beneficiaries and as participants is, therefore grass-root level organisations of women for learning and productive activity, which would help: (i) to draw them into the mainstream of development; (ii) promote self-reliance and collective action; (iii) strengthen their participation and voice in the development process; (iv) assist them to achieve economic viability as well as knowledge for their personal growth; (v) provide forums to enable women especially from the poorer sections to participate freely and fully in decisions that affect their lives and that of the community; (vi) enable them to acquire full access to development resources and services; and (vii) enable them to function as instruments of social change. One more asset of women force is that they adapt to changes quite easily. They do not take long to adapt to a new role. The monitoring ought to consider fresh inputs to ensure continued role enhancement and prevention of stagnation.

Although participation in economic production is the base to improve the lot of women, it is not enough by itself. Women must be involved as men in the struggle against poverty and injustice without such involvement, poverty may be overcome, but exploitation and oppression of women would

remain unchanged. In addition it is important for women to participate in political decision-making as it is politics which determine? the direction and pace of most development plans. A fuller participation of women in development, requires an all round transformation in the consciousness of both men and women as also in the socio-cultural norms, the mass media and pattern of education. All of which at present tend to perpetuate a passive, unequal role for women in social, economic and political affairs. Effective participation of all women in development as intellectuals, policy makers and decision-makers, planners, contributors and beneficiaries should be strengthened according to specific problems of women in different regions and the needs of different categories of women in them. That commitment on the part of policy-makers should guide the formulation and implementation of policies, plans, programmes and projects; with awareness that development prospects will be improved and society advanced through the full and effective participation of women.

Objective of the Study

1. To access the levels of occupational efficacy among women.

Hypothesis

1. Women working in various professions achieve a satisfactorily level of occupational efficacy

Sample

A sample of 245 women was drawn randomly from various professions from Kashmir Valley to assess their Occupational Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction.

Table 1: The distribution of the sample of working women is as under

S.no	Profession	No. of Sample Subjects
1	Doctor	30
2	Engineers	30
3	Administrative Service	15
4	Technical university lecturers	30
5	Lawyers	30
6	Judicial Officer	20
7	+2 Lecturers	30
8	College Lecturers	30
9	Academic university lecturers	30
Total		245

**Data Gathering Devices
Occupational Self Efficacy**

Occupational Self Efficacy Scale developed by Sanjyot Pethe, Sushma Chowdari and Uppindar Dhar. (OSSES) (2006) was administered to measure the professional efficacy of

women working in various professions. The scale consists of 19 items and measures occupational self-efficacy through six dimensions viz, Confidence, Command Positive Attitude, Adaptability, Personal Effectiveness and Individually.

Analysis and interpretation

Table 2: Showing the levels of Occupational Efficacy of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
A. Average	83 and above	5 (16.7%)	2 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	10 (33.3%)	3 (15%)	9 (30%)	5 (16.7%)	5 (16.7%)	9 (30%)
Average	65-82	17 (56.7%)	16 (53.3%)	7 (46.7%)	14 (46.7%)	11 (55%)	10 (33.3%)	19 (63.3%)	20 (66.7%)	18 (60%)
Below Average	64 and below	8 (26.7%)	12 (40%)	6 (40%)	6 (20%)	6 (30%)	11 (36.7%)	6 (20%)	5 (16.6%)	3 (10%)

The quick look of the above table shows the levels of occupational efficacy of women in different professions. The above table reveals that 33.3% lawyers, 30% +2 lecturers and 30% Technical Academic University Lecturers have above average level of occupational efficacy. While as 40% administrative officers, 40% engineers and 36.7% Technical Academic University Lecturers officers have below average

level of occupational efficacy.

It can be concluded from the above table that female lawyers followed by +2lectueres have higher occupational efficacy and Engineers, Administrative Officers followed by Technical Academic University Lecturers have lower Occupational Efficacy.

Table 3: Showing the Confidence levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
Above Average	19 and above	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (23.33)	3 (15%)	11 (36.6%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)
Average	13-18	22 (73.3%)	13 (43.3%)	11 (73.3%)	19 (63.33)	15 (75%)	16 (53.3%)	26 (86.6%)	27 (90%)	26 (86.66%)
Below Average	12 and below	8 (26.6%)	17 (56.6%)	4 (26.6%)	4 (13.33)	2 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (10%)

The quick look of the above table shows the confidence level of working women in different professions. The above table reveals that 36.6% Technical Academic University Lecturers, 23.3% lawyers and 15% judicial officers have above average

level of confidence. While as 56.6% engineers, 26.6% administrative officers, 26.6% doctors have below average level of confidence.

Table 4: Showing the Command levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
Above Average	14 and above	13 (43.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (20%)	1 (5%)	6 (20%)	3 (10%)	2 (6.6%)	7 (23.33%)
Average	10-13	16 (53.3%)	21 (70%)	13 (86.6%)	20 (66.6%)	18 (90%)	17 (56.6%)	26 (86.6%)	27 (90%)	21 (70%)
Below Average	9 and below	1 (3.3%)	9 (30%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (13.33)	1 (5%)	7 (23.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.67%)

The quick look of the above table shows the command levels of working women in different professions. The above table reveals that 43.3% doctors, 23.33% +2Lecturers, 20% Technical Academic University Lecturers and 20% lawyers

have above average level of command. While as, 56.67% + lecturers and 30% engineers and 23% Technical Academic University Lecturers have below average level of command.

Table 5: Showing the Adaptability levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
Above Average	14 and above	7 (23.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (20%)	11 (36.6%)	1 (5%)	10 (33.3%)	2 (6.6%)	4 (13.3%)	8 (26.67%)
Average	10-13	23 (76.6%)	27 (90%)	11 (73.3%)	17 (56.6%)	18 (90%)	16 (53.3%)	23 (76.6%)	25 (83.3%)	20 (66.67%)
Below Average	9 and below	0 (0%)	3 (10%)	1 (6.6%)	2 (6.6%)	1 (5%)	4 (13.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.67%)

The quick look of the above table shows the Adaptability levels of working women in different professions. The above table reveals that 33.3% Technical Academic University Lecturers, 26.67% +2 lecturers and 23.3% doctors have above

average level of Adaptability. While as, 53.33% +2 lecturers, 13.3% Technical University Lectures and 10% engineers have below average level of Adaptability.

Table 6: Showing the Personal Effectiveness levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
A. Average	20 and above	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	0	0 (0%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (16.67%)
Average	15-19	6 (20%)	26 (86.6%)	7 (46.6%)	22 (73.3%)	4 (20%)	13 (43.3%)	27 (90%)	28 (93.3%)	21 (70%)
Below Average	14 and below	24 (80%)	4 (13.3%)	8 (53.3%)	7 (23.3%)	16 (80%)	17 (56.6%)	2 (6.6%)	2 (6.6%)	4 (13.33%)

The quick look of the above table shows the personal effectiveness level of women working in different professions. The above table reveals that 16.67% +2lecturers, 3.3% Academic University Lecturers and 3.3% lawyers have above

average level of Personal effectiveness. While as, 80% judicial officers, 80% doctors and 56.6% Technical Academic University Lecturers have below average level of Personal effectiveness.

Table 7: Showing the Positive Attitude levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
A. Average	13 and above	10 (33.3%)	2 (6.6%)	2 (13.3%)	15 (50%)	4 (20%)	17 (56.6%)	6 (20%)	8 (26.6%)	12 (40%)
Average	8-12	18 (60%)	21 (70%)	11 (73.3%)	12 (40%)	15 (75%)	12 (40%)	15 (50%)	14 (46.6%)	15 (50%)
Below Average	9 and below	2 (6.6%)	7 (23.33%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (3.3%)	9 (30%)	8 (26.6%)	3 (10%)

The quick look of the above table shows the Positive Attitude level of women working in different professions. The above

table reveals that 56.6% Technical Academic University Lecturers, 50% lawyers and 40% +2 lecturers have above

average level of Positive Attitude. While as, 36% Academic University Lecturers, 26% college lecturers and 23.33%

doctors have below average level of Positive Attitude.

Table 8: Showing the Individuality levels of Women in different Professions

Level	Score	Doctors	Engineers	Administrative Officers	Lawyers	Judicial Officers	Technical Academic University Lecturers	Academic University Lecturers	College Lecturers	+2 Lecturers
A. Average	10 and above	2 (6.6%)	4 (13.33%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	2 (10%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)	8 (26.67%)
Average	5-9	25 (83.3%)	23 (76.6%)	10 (66.6%)	21 (70%)	16 (80%)	23 (76.6%)	25 (83.3%)	25 (83.3)	21 (70%)
Below Average	4 and below	3 (10%)	3 (10%)	3 (20%)	5 (16.6%)	2 (10%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.33%)

The quick look of the above table shows individuality level of women working in different professions. The above table reveals that 26.67% +2 lecturers, 13.33% engineers, lawyers, technical Academic University Lecturers, Academic University Lecturers and college lecturers have above average level of Individuality. While as, 20% administrative officers and 16.6% lawyers have below average level of Individuality.

Conclusion

1. Female lawyers have higher level of confidence, command, personal effectiveness and positive attitude, it shows that female lawyers have dependence on their abilities, control over the situations, have more inclination towards the continuous development and ability to evaluate optimistically.
2. Female doctors have higher level of command, adaptability and positive attitude. It shows that female doctors have greater control over the situations, higher adjustability and ability to evaluate optimistically.
3. Female engineers and college lecturers have higher level of individuality which shows that female engineer have independence in making decisions and setting standards of performance.
4. Female administrative officers have over all lower level of occupational efficacy.
5. Female judicial officers have higher level of confidence which shows that female judicial officers have dependence on their abilities.
6. Female Technical Academic University Lecturers have higher level of confidence, adaptability and positive attitude; it shows that female technical Academic University Lecturers have dependence on their abilities, adjustability and ability to evaluate optimistically.
7. Female Academic University Lecturers have higher personal effectiveness; it shows that the lecturers are more inclined towards continuous development.
8. Female +2 lecturers have higher level of command, adaptability, personal effectiveness, positive attitude and individuality, which shows that female +2 lecturers have higher control over the situation, adjustability, inclination towards continuous development, ability to evaluate optimistically and independence in making decisions and setting standards of performance.

On the basis of above evidence the hypothesis which reads as, "Women working in various professions

achieve a satisfactorily level of occupational efficacy" stands partially rejected.

References

1. Bandura A. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 1982; 37(2):122-147.
2. Bandura A. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986.
3. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman, 1997.
4. Carol Burgel, Joseph A Raelin, Rachelle M Reisberl. Self-efficacy in female and male undergraduate engineering students: Comparisons among four institutions. ASEE Southeast Section Conference, 2010.
5. Federici Roger A. Principals' Self-Efficacy: Relations with Job Autonomy, Job Satisfaction, and Contextual Constraints, European Journal of Psychology of Education. 2013; 28(1):73-86.
6. Gushue GV. The relationship of ethnic identity, career decision self-efficacy, and outcome expectations among Latino/a high school students. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 2006; 68:85-95.
7. Ismail Zuraidah. The Differences of career self-efficacy in the selection of careers among Malay students at International Islamic University Malaysia. The International Journal of Educational Researchers, 2010; 3(2):17-30.
8. Llorens S, Schaufeli W, Bakker A, Salanova M. Does a positive gain spiral of resources, efficacy beliefs and engagement exist? Computers in Human Behavior, 2007; 23:825-841.
9. Luthans F. Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. Academy of Management Executive. 2002a; 16(1):57-72.
10. Luthans F, Peterson SJ. Employee engagement and manager self-efficacy: Implications for managerial effectiveness and development. Journal of Management Development. 2001; 21(5):376-387.
11. Nancy E Betz, Gail Hackett. The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 2008; 28(5):399-410.DOI:10.1037/0022-0167.28.5.399
12. Richa Chaudhary, Santosh Rangnekar, Mukesh Kumar Barua. Relationships between occupational self efficacy,

- human resource development climate, and work engagement, *Team Performance Management*, 2012; 18(7/8):370-383.
13. Rigotti T, Schyns B, Mohr G. A short version of the occupational self-efficacy scale: Structural and construct validity across five countries. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 2008; 16:238-255.
 14. Robbins SP, Odendaal A, Roodt G. *Organisational Behaviour: Global and Southern African Perspectives*. Pearson Education South Africa: Cape Town, 2001.
 15. Robert M Klassen, Ming Ming Chiu. Effects on Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Job Satisfaction: Teacher Gender, Years of Experience, and Job Stress, *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2010; 102(3):741-756.
 16. Salanova M, Peiro JM, Schaufeli WB. Self-efficacy, specificity and burnout among information technology workers: An extension of the job-demand control model. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 2010; 11(1):1-25.
 17. Stajkovic AD, Luthans F. Self-efficacy and work related performance: A metaanalysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1998; 124(2):240-261.
 18. Thompson Denise G. *Teacher Job Satisfaction and Retention in a Suburban Georgia School District*. ProQuest LLC, Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Phoenix, 2010.
 19. Barry Chung Y. *Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and Career Commitment: Gender and Ethnic Differences among College Students*, Georgia State University, 2012.