Journal of Education and Practice
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.4, No.16, 2013

Relationship of Personal Growth Initiative with Self-Efficacy among University Postgraduate Students

Hemant Lata Sharma[1] and Ritu Rani[2]*
1. Head & Dean, Faculty of Education, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak (124001) Haryana (India)
2. Senior Research Fellow, Department of Education, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak (124001) Haryana (India)
*E-mail of corresponding author- ritu537@rediffmail.com

Abstract
The purpose of this study is to verify the relationship between Personal Growth Initiative (PGI) and Self-Efficacy. Personal growth initiative is active and intentional engagement in the process of self-change. Self-efficacy is a person's belief in his/her ability to succeed in a particular situation. In the present paper, relationship of personal growth initiative with self-efficacy was found and PGI was predicted on the basis of self-efficacy. Descriptive Survey Method with Ex-Post Facto design was used. Personal Growth Initiative was measures by using PGIS-II by Robitschek et al (2009) and Self-Efficacy was assessed by using Turkish Version of GSES by Yildrim and Ilhan(2010). Both the scales were adapted in Indian condition. The Cronbach Alphas for the PGIS-II and GSES were 0.741 and 0.714 respectively. Results of the study revealed the positive relationship between PGI and Self-Efficacy. It was also investigated that Self-Efficacy has significant impact on total PGI as well as its dimensions. The implications of the study are discussed in this paper later on.
Keywords: Personal growth initiative, Self-efficacy and University postgraduate students

1. Introduction

1.1 Theoretical Framework

The constructs of Personal Growth Initiative and Self-Efficacy have their roots in Positive Psychology. Positive psychology with its scholarly emphasis upon human strengths has grown rapidly since Martin Seligman's 1999 Presidency of the American Psychological Association. Seligman called upon psychologists to augment the previous focus upon pathology and explore human beings' strengths (Shroey, Little, Snyder, Kluck & Robitschek, 2007). It has been predicted that positive psychology will flourish in the new century and that researchers and psychologists will come to focus on the strength of individuals, communities and societies (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). In a similar vein, a new construct, Personal Growth Initiative (PGI) now has begun to attract attention among researchers.

1.2 Construct of Personal Growth Initiative (PGI)

Personal growth is a change within a person that is cognitive, behavioural or affective (Prochaska and Diclemente, 1986). Generally, this self change is thought of as positive, with movement in the direction of being "more complete and fully functioning" at least from the perspective of the person who is changing.There are three distinct ways of personal growth:

- Growth that is unintentional and out of awareness
- Growth that is unintentional but in awareness
- Growth that is intentional and fully in awareness

Personal growth can occur as a result of both intentional and unintentional processes. When a person is concerned only with intentional self change, that individual actively and intentionally engages in the self change process in any life domain, the term is generally known as Personal Growth Initiative (Robitschek, 1999).

Personal Growth Initiative is an active, intentional engagement in the process of personal growth and in changing and developing as a person (Robitschek, 1998). Personal Growth Initiative is the active seeking out of self-growth experiences. PGI is a global inclination to improve one's self. It is a developed skill set, including cognition, behavior, attitude and motivation that a person carries into each life experience (Robitschek, Ashton, Martinez, Murrey and Shotts, 2009). When a person intentionally involves himself in the growth process, he is said to be on the path of personal growth initiative. Intentional Growth has three salient features: Knowledge of and about the process of personal growth (Knowledge about the procedures to bring about personal growth, Knowledge about specific things to change, General knowledge of self improvement), Valuing the process of personal growth (Valuing process, outcomes of personal growth), and Intentional Behaviour. PGI is an acquired skill set for self-improvement across life domains. It is comprised of four components:

- Readiness for Change (ability to assess one's own psychological preparedness to engage in personal growth processes);
- Planfulness (ability to be strategic and organized in self-change efforts);

- Using Resources (ability to identify and access resources external to the self, such as other people and materials) and
- Intentional Behavior (actual follow-through, or doing of self-change plans and behaviors).

These four components operate synergistically, rather than sequentially, to optimize personal growth (Robitschek et al., 2009). From the review, it was found that Personal Growth Initiative is correlated with many variables like psychological well-being, career exploration, family functioning, parental alcoholism, mental health, self-efficacy etc.

1.3 Construct of Self-Efficacy

Over the past 20 years, self-efficacy has become one of the most widely studied variables in the educational, psychological, and organizational sciences (Scherbaum, Charash & Kern, 2006). Self efficacy is a construct which describes the confidence of an individual in their own abilities. Self-Efficacy makes a difference to how people feel, think and act. People with high self-efficacy choose to perform more challenging tasks. They set themselves higher goals and stick to them. Actions are preshaped in thoughts and once an action has been taken, highly self-efficacious people invest more effort and persist longer than those low in self-efficacy. When setbacks occur, they recover more quickly and remain committed to their goals (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy is usually understood as being either task specific or domain specific. In recent years, a derivative of self-efficacy called *general* self-efficacy (GSE) has been developed (Scherbaum, Charash & Kern, 2006). Generalized self-efficacy (GSE) refers to a broad and stable sense of personal competence to deal effectively with a variety of stressful situations (Sherer et al., 1982). GSE is the overall belief in one's ability and Specific self-efficacy is task related. *General self-efficacy* (GSE) reflects a generalization across various domains of functioning in which people judge how efficacious they are. GSE is a universal construct, which means that it characterizes a basic belief that is inherent in all individuals (Luszczynska, Scholf and Schwarzer, 2005**).** GSE refers to global confidence in one's coping ability across a wide range of demanding or novel situations (Sherer at al, 1982).

GSE is a situation-independent competence belief. GSE has been conceptualized as a relatively stable generalized belief that an individual can marshal the resources needed to deal with the challenges that he or she experiences. That is, GSE is a trait-like belief in one's competence. GSE is a theoretically and practically useful construct for the educational and organizational domains (Scherbaum, Charash & Kern, 2006).

1.4 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine if there would be any relationship between Personal Growth Initiative and Self-Efficacy. It was also investigated to what extent self-efficacy predicted total PGI and its four dimensions.

1.5 Research Questions

The study was carried out to find answers to the following questions:

- What is the relationship between PGI and Self-Efficacy?
- What is the impact of self-efficacy on total PGI and its four dimensions?

1.6 Hypothesis of the study

H_1- There exist a significant relationship between Personal Growth Initiative and Self-Efficacy.
H_2- Self-efficacy has significant impact on Total Personal Growth Initiative.
H_3- Self-Efficacy has significant impact on 'Readiness for Change' dimension of Personal growth initiative.
H_4- Self-Efficacy has significant impact on 'Planfulness' dimension of Personal growth initiative.
H_5-Self-Efficacy has significant impact on 'Using Resources' dimension of Personal growth initiative.
H_6- Self-Efficacy has significant impact on 'Intentional Behaviour' dimension of Personal growth initiative.

2. Research Design and Methodology

2.1 Variables- PGI was taken as dependent and self-efficacy was taken as independent variable.

2.2 Method- Descriptive Survey Method with Ex-Post Facto research design was used.

2.3 Sample- In the present study, a sample of 960 university postgraduates of three Universities i.e. Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak and Chaudhary Devi Lal University, Sirsa from Harayana state in India was taken.

2.4 Research Instruments- In the present study following tools were used for data collection:

2.4.1 PGIS-II by Robitschek et al (2009)-The scale included both cognitive as well as behavioural components. There are four subscales on the PGIS-II: Cognitive Components (Readiness for Change, Planfulness), Behavioural Components (Using Resources and Intentional Behavior). There are 16 items in all the four subscales and statements are presented subscale wise. All items are positively worded and given a score of '0', '1', '2' , '3', '4' and '5' for Disagree Strongly, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree a Little, Agree a Little, Agree Somewhat and Agree Strongly respectively. A total score ranges from 0 to 80 showing low personal growth

initiative to moderate and high personal growth initiative. The test-retest reliability of original PGIS-II ranges from .61 to .77 for American sample. The Cronbach Alpha for the current study was 0.741.

2.4.2 General Self-Efficacy Scale by Yildrim and Ilhan(2010)- The scale was originally developed by Sherer et al (1982). In the present study, for the purpose of measuring general self-efficacy, SGSES by Yildrim and Ilhan(2010) was used as it is the most recent adaptation of SGSES. The total 17-item on a five point Likert scale represented three aspects underlying the scale: (i) Initiative (9 items)-which is the willingness to initiate the behaviour (ii) Persistence (5 items)- which is the perseverance in the face of adversity (iii) Effort (3 items)-which is the willingness to expend the effort in completing the behaviour. There were 17 items measured on a 5-point Likert Scale scores range from '1', '2', '3', '4' and '5' for Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree respectively. The total score ranges from 17 to 85 and higher scores indicate a higher level of belief in one's self-efficacy. The Cronbach Alpha for the entire scale was 0.80 and the test-retest reliability was 0.69. The Cronbach Alpha for the current study was 0.714.

2.5 Procedure for Data collection- The research instruments were administered on the subjects personally by the researcher herself. The respondents were informed that the information given by them would be kept confidential and would be used for research purpose only. They were asked to follow the instructions given on each questionnaire. They took about 30 minutes to fill the questionnaires. The sheets were collected back on the spot. The response rate of filled in questionnaires was 85%.

2.6 Statistical Techniques- Frequency, Percentages, Pearson correlation coefficient and Stepwise regression analysis was used and data was analyzed by using SPSS 18.0 version.

3. Analysis and Interpretation

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table-1.1: Demographic Characteristics

Characteristics of the sample		**Frequency**	**Percentages**
Gender	Male	295	36
	Female	523	64
Age Group	20-24 Years	732	89
	Above 24 Years	86	11
Locality	Urban	417	51
	Rural	401	49
University	KUK	266	32
	MDU	292	36
	CDLU	260	32
Faculty	Science	238	29.1
	Education	185	22.6
	Social Science	173	21.1
	Commerce & Management	222	27.1
Department	Mathematics	114	13.9
	Computer Science	125	15.3
	Education	94	11.5
	Physical Education	90	11.0
	Economics	101	12.3
	Public Administration	72	8.8
	Commerce	108	13.2
	Business Administration	114	13.9
	Total	**818**	**100.0**

3.2. Relationship of Personal Growth Initiative with Self-Efficacy

In order to find answer of the first research question, the relationship of total PGI dimensions of Personal Growth Initiative with dimensions of Self-Efficacy was computed through Pearson Correlation Coefficients.

Table- 1.2 Relationship of Personal Growth Initiative with Self-Efficacy

Dimensions of PGI/Dimensions of Self-Efficacy → ↓	**Initiative**	**Persistence**	**Effort**
Readiness for Change	-.111** .001	.138** .000	.167** .000
Planfulness	-.189** .000	.120** .001	.304** .000
Using Resources	.112** .001	.101** .004	.098** .005
Intentional Behaviour	-.196** .000	.145** .000	.335** .000
Total PGI	-.151** .000	.177** .000	.331** .000

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

From the table 1.2, it is clear that effort dimension of self-efficacy is positively correlated with intentional behaviour dimension of personal growth initiative with r=0.335 (N-818, p=0.000). The Planfulness dimension of PGI is also found to be positively correlated with effort dimension of self-efficacy (r= 0.304). Initiative dimension of self-efficacy is found to be inversely related to intentional behaviour and Planfulness dimensions of PGI with r= -0.196 and -0.189 respectively. Total PGI is found to be positively correlated with persistence and effort dimension of self-efficacy with r= 0.177 and 0.331 respectively.

3.3 Impact of Self-Efficacy on Total PGI

In order to study the impact of independent variable (Self-Efficacy) on dependent variable (PGI) Stepwise Method of regression was used. The stepwise method adds predictor variables to the regression that best correlate with the dependent variable and subtracts predictor variable that least correlate.

Table- 1.3 Regression Model for studying the impact of Dimensions of Self-Efficacy on Total PGI

Model	**R**	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**Std. Error of the Estimate**	**Durbin-Watson**
1	.331[a]	.110	.109	10.10617	1.533
2	.353[b]	.125	.123	10.02721	
3	.375[c]	.141	.138	9.94127	

a. Predictors: (constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent variable: Total PGI Score

In the table 1.3, R value indicates the multiple correlation coefficients between all the independent (predictor) variables and dependent variable. The R^2 value indicates how well a set of variables explains variation in the dependent variable and is an accurate value for sample drawn. The Adjusted R^2 adjusts for a bias in R^2 and is considered a better population estimate (George and Mallery, 2008). From the table, it can be analyzed that effort is the determinant factor which has a significant impact on the variation in overall personal growth initiative scores and 10.9% of variance in the scores of PGI is explained by Effort dimension of self-efficacy. It was also analyzed that the three dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. Effort, initiative and persistence together accounted for 13.8% of variance in the scores of personal growth initiative. The Standard Error of Estimate is a measure of variability of the multiple correlations. The Durbin-Watson test is applied to show that there is an independence of errors in the model and its value should lie between1 to 3. In the table, the Durbin-Watson value is 1.533 which lies in the acceptable limit showing independence of errors in the model.

Table-1.4 ANOVA Summary of Regression Model for Predicting Total PGI on the basis of Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Model	**Sum of Squares**	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
1. Regression	10286.576	1	10286.576	100.716	.000[a]
Residual	83341.973	816	102.135		
Total	93628.549	817			
2. Regression	11684.370	2	5842.185	58.105	.000[b]
Residual	81944.179	815	100.545		
Total	93628.549	817			
3. Regression	13181.838	3	4393.946	44.460	.000[c]
Residual	80446.711	814	98.8829		
Total	93628.549	817			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Total PGI Score

The ANOVA tests the significance of each regression model to see if the regression predicted by the independent variables explains a significant amount of the variance in the dependent variable (Hinton, Brownlow, McMurray and Cozens, 2004). From the ANOVA table 1.4, it is analyzed that F-values for all the three models are significant(F=100.716, 58.105, 44.460, p=.000) which states that variance in the dependent variable (PGI) due to independent variable (Dimensions of self-efficacy) is not due to chance factor but it really exists. Hence from this we can say that there exists a significant relationship between the dimensions of Self-Efficacy and PGI.

TABLE- 1.5 Coefficients Summary for Predicting Total PGI on the basis of Dimensions of Self-Efficacy

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	38.113	1.980		19.251	.000		
	Effort	1.698	.169	.331	10.036	.000	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	43.364	2.417		17.942	.000		
	Effort	1.642	.169	.321	9.741	.000	.992	1.008
	Initiative	-.205	.055	-.123	-3.729	.000	.992	1.008
3	(Constant)	39.107	2.634		14.848	.000		
	Effort	1.444	.175	.282	8.269	.000	.908	1.101
	Initiative	-.258	.056	-.155	-4.598	.000	.933	1.072
	Persistence	.461	.118	.135	3.893	.000	.875	1.143

Dependent Variable: Total PGI Score

In the table 1.5, the Unstandardized Coefficients B column gives the coefficients of the independent variables in the regression equation for each model. The Standardized Beta Coefficients provide a measure of the contribution of each variable to the model. These values represent the contribution of each independent variable to the dependent variable. The t and p values provide an indication of the impact of each independent variable on dependent variable. A large absolute t- value and small p value suggests that a predictor variable is having a large impact on the criterion variable. Table 1.5 reveals the coefficient summary of stepwise regression. During the stepwise regression analysis, it is found that effort dimension of self-efficacy is the major contributor in the variation in PGI as it is clear from the value of standardized Beta Coefficient. The Tolerance value and VIF (Variation Inflation Factor) are the ways to check the problem of Multicollinearity among variables. From the table, it can be seen that the Tolerance value lies between 0.875 to 0.933, which is above 0.1 and VIF lies between 1.072 to 1.143 which is below 10 which show that there is not any multi-collinearity in the data. Thus from this table it can be analyzed that in self-efficacy, effort comes out be major contributor and is being followed by initiative and persistence.

3.4 Impact of Self-Efficacy on 'Readiness for Change' Dimension of Personal Growth Initiative

Table-1.6 Regression Model for Predicting 'Readiness for Change' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	St. Error of Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.167[a]	.028	.027	3.37704	1.503
2	.193[b]	.037	.035	3.36274	
3	.230[c]	.053	.049	3.33775	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Readiness for Change

From the table 1.6, it can be examined that the three dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. effort, initiative and persistence explain 4.9 % of variation in readiness for change dimension of personal growth initiative.

Table-1.7 ANOVA for Predicting 'Readiness for Change' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	268.101	1	268.101	23.509	.000[a]
Residual	9305.973	816	11.404		
Total	9574.073	817			
2. Regression	358.032	2	179.016	15.831	.000[b]
Residual	9216.042	815	11.308		
Total	9574.073	817			
3. Regression	505.658	3	168.553	15.130	.000[c]
Residual	9068.415	814	11.141		
Total	9574.073	817			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Readiness for Change

From the ANOVA table 1.7, it is analyzed that F-value is significant which states that the explained variance in the Readiness for change dimension of PGI due to dimensions of self-efficacy is not due to chance factor but it really occurs.

Table-1.8 Coefficient Summary for Predicting 'Readiness for Change' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1(Constant)	11.086	.662		16.757	.000		
Effort	.274	.057	.167	4.849	.000	1.000	1.000
2 (Constant)	12.418	.811		15.320	.000		
Effort	.260	.057	.159	4.598	.000	.992	1.008
Initiative	-.052	.018	-.097	-2.820	.005	.992	1.008
3(Constant)	11.081	.884		12.531	.000		
Effort	.198	.059	.121	3.374	.001	.908	1.101
Initiative	-.069	.019	-.129	-3.644	.000	.933	1.072
Persistence	.145	.040	.133	3.640	.000	.875	1.143

Dependent Variable: Readiness for Change

From the table 1.8, it was investigated that persistence and initiative dimensions of self-efficacy had significant positive impact on the total score of readiness for change dimension of PGI as t-value of Beta coefficient is significant for all the three models.

3.5 Impact of Self-Efficacy on 'Planfulness' Dimension of Personal Growth Initiative

Table-1.9 Regression Model for Predicting 'Planfulness' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.304[a]	.093	.091	4.41780	
2	.345[b]	.119	.117	4.35576	1.609
3	.355[c]	.126	.123	4.34112	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Planfulness

From the table 1.9, it was examined that the three dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. effort, initiative and persistence explained 12.3% of variation in 'Planfulness' dimension of personal growth initiative. It was also found that effort dimension is the strongest predictor of Planfulness domain of PGI and is followed by initiative and persistence.

Table-1.10 ANOVA Statistics of Regression Model for Predicting 'Planfulness' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1. Regression	1624.392	1	1624.392	83.230	.000[a]
Residual	15925.867	816	19.517		
Total	17550.259	817			
2. Regression	2087.527	2	1043.764	55.014	.000[b]
Residual	15462.732	815	18.973		
Total	17550.259	817			
3. Regression	2210.136	3	736.712	39.092	.000[c]
Residual	15340.123	814	18.845		
Total	17550.259	817			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Planfulness

From the ANOVA table 1.10, it is analyzed that F-value for regression model is significant which states that the explained variance in 'Planfulness' dimension of PGI due to dimensions of self-efficacy is not due to chance factor but it really happens.

Table-1.11Coefficient Summary for Predicting 'Readiness for Change' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	10.351	.865		11.960	.000
Effort	.675	.074	.304	9.123	.000
2 (Constant)	13.373	1.050		12.737	.000
Effort	.642	.073	.290	8.775	.000
Initiative	-.118	.024	-.163	-4.941	.000
3 (Constant)	12.155	1.150		10.568	.000
Effort	.586	.076	.264	7.682	.000
Initiative	-.133	.025	-.184	-5.430	.000
Persistence	.132	.052	.089	2.551	.011

Dependent Variable: Planfulness

From the table 1.11, it is clear from the Beta coefficients that Effort (.264) dimension of self-efficacy has positive and linear relationship with Planfulness dimension of PGI followed by initiative(-.184) , having inverse relation) and persistence(.089). The t-value of Beta coefficient is significant for all the models which show that contribution made by these dimensions of self-efficacy is significant. It was also analyzed that effort domain of self-efficacy is the strongest predictor of 'Planfulness' dimension of PGI.

3.6 Impact of Self-Efficacy on 'Using Resources' Dimension of Personal Growth Initiative

Table-1.12 Regression Model for Predicting Using Resources Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.112[a]	.012	.011	3.25823	1.698
2	.156[b]	.024	.022	3.24073	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Initiative
b. Predictors: (Constant), Initiative, Effort
c. Dependent Variable: Using Resources

From the table 1.12, it was revealed that two dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. initiative and effort contribute to 2.2% of variance in 'Using Resources' dimension scores of PGI. The persistence dimension was excluded by stepwise regression analysis as it was not found to influence significantly Using Resources dimension of PGI.

Table- 1.13 ANOVA for Regression Model for predicting 'Using Resources' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	109.324	1	109.324	10.298	.001[a]
Residual	8662.725	816	10.616		
Total	8772.049	817			
2 Regression	212.646	2	106.323	10.124	.000[b]
Residual	8559.403	815	10.502		
Total	8772.049	817			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Initiative
b. Predictors: (Constant), Initiative, Effort
c. Dependent Variable: Using Resources

From the ANOVA table 1.13, it is found F-values of both regression models are significant which meant that the explained variance in 'Using Resources' dimension of PGI due to initiative and effort is not by chance but it really happens.

Table-1.14 Coefficient Summary for predicting 'Using Resources' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1.(Constant)	8.554	.416		20.585	.000		
Initiative	.057	.018	.112	3.209	.001	1.000	1.000
2. (Constant)	6.475	.781		8.289	.000		
Initiative	.062	.018	.121	3.494	.001	.992	1.008
Effort	.171	.054	.109	3.137	.002	.992	1.008

Dependent Variable: Using Resources

From the above table 1.14, it is found that initiative domain of self-efficacy is the greater contributor with beta coefficient .121 and is followed by effort with beta coefficient .109. The t-value is significant which means the variance explained by these two dimensions of self-efficacy is significant.

3.7 Impact of Self-Efficacy on 'Intentional Behaviour' Dimension of Personal Growth Initiative

Table-1.15 Regression Model for Predicting 'Intentional Behaviour' dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.335[a]	.112	.111	3.50094	
2	.374[b]	.140	.138	3.44775	1.750
3	.388[c]	.151	.147	3.42881	

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Intentional Behaviour

From the table 1.15, it is revealed that 14.7 % of variance in intentional behaviour dimension of PGI is accounted for by three dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. Effort, initiative and persistence. It can also be said that effort is the major factor that has a significant impact on the variation in scores of intentional behaviour dimension of PGI. The Durbin-Watson Value (1.750) lies in acceptable limits showing that there is an independence of errors in the table.

Table-1.16 ANOVA for Regression Model for predicting 'Intentional Behaviour' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	1264.178	1	1264.178	103.143	.000[a]
Residual	10001.363	816	12.257		
Total	11265.542	817			
2 Regression	1577.660	2	788.830	66.361	.000[b]
Residual	9687.881	815	11.887		
Total	11265.542	817			
3 Regression	1695.531	3	565.177	48.072	.000[c]
Residual	9570.010	814	11.757		
Total	11265.542	817			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Effort
b. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative
c. Predictors: (Constant), Effort, Initiative, Persistence
d. Dependent Variable: Intentional Behaviour

From the above table 1.16, it is interpreted that F-values for all regression models are (F=103.143, 66.361, 48.072, p=0.000) significant. It means that the variance explained by the three dimensions of self-efficacy is not due to chance factor but it really exists.

Table- 1.17 Coefficient Summary for predicting 'Intentional Behaviour' Dimension of PGI on the basis of Self-Efficacy

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1. (Constant)	8.612	.686		12.557	.000		
Effort	.595	.059	.335	10.156	.000	1.000	1.000
2. (Constant)	11.098	.831		13.355	.000		
Effort	.569	.058	.320	9.813	.000	.992	1.008
Initiative	-.097	.019	-.167	-5.135	.000	.992	1.008
3. (Constant)	9.904	.908		10.902	.000		
Effort	.513	.060	.289	8.520	.000	.908	1.101
Initiative	-.112	.019	-.193	-5.781	.000	.933	1.072
Persistence	.129	.041	.109	3.166	.002	.875	1.143

Dependent Variable: Intentional Behaviour

From the table 1.17, it was analyzed that effort domain of self-efficacy is the greater contributor with beta coefficient .289 and is followed by initiative with beta coefficient .193 and persistence with beta coefficient .109. The t-value is significant which means that the variance explained by these dimensions of self-efficacy is significant. The tolerance value and VIF lie in acceptable limits which mean that there is no Multicollinearity.

4. Hypotheses Testing

From the analysis, it was found that H_1, H_2, H_3, H_4 and H_5 were supported as self-efficacy was found to have significant impact on 'total PGI', 'Readiness for Change', 'Planfulness', 'Using Resources' and 'Intentional Behaviour' dimensions of Personal growth initiative. H_1, H_3 and H_5 were strongly supported.

5. Findings of the Study

The main findings of the study were

1) Persistence and Effort dimensions of self-efficacy were significantly and positively correlated with total PGI and its four dimensions.
2) Initiative dimension of self-efficacy showed unexpectedly inverse relationship with total PGI and its three dimensions i.e. Readiness for change, Planfulness and Intentional Behaviour.
3) The results of the study indicated that 13.8% of variance in total PGI scores is accounted for by self-Efficacy and major contribution towards variance in total PGI was 'Effort' dimension of Self-Efficacy.
4) The findings revealed that 4.9% of the variance in 'Readiness for Change' is caused by dimensions of self-efficacy.
5) The three dimensions of Self-Efficacy i.e. Effort, Initiative and Persistence caused 12.3% of the variance in 'Planfulness' dimension of Personal Growth Initiative.
6) It was found that 2.2% of variance in 'Using resources' dimension of PGI is accounted for by two dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. Initiative and Effort.

7) The results also showed that three dimensions of self-efficacy i.e. Effort, Initiative and Persistence caused 14.7% of variance in 'Intentional Behaviour' dimension of Personal growth Initiative.

6. Conclusion and Discussions of the Study

The findings of the study show that self-efficacy plays an important role in predicting overall Personal Growth Initiative and its dimensions. 'Planfulness' and 'Intentional Behaviour' dimensions of PGI were found to be significantly predicted by self-efficacy. Thus to bring intentional self-change, a person should have beliefs in his/her capabilities that he/she can bring that change. The person has to make appropriate plans and strategies to bring intentional change in the behaviour. The findings of the study also state that Effort dimension of self-efficacy is the major contributor in predicting overall PGI as well as its dimensions. It is of utmost importance in taking initiative for self-change. Without intentional efforts, an individual cannot bring change in intentional growth process. The findings of the present study is a pointer to the fact that present education system need to be rejuvenated through introduction of new courses which should be creativity oriented so that it can enhance students' beliefs towards intentional growth. The policy makers, government, university teachers, educationists and counselors should work together to develop intervention programmes that could improve the self-efficacy for taking personal growth initiative among our students as PGI is a sine-qua-non for human development and survival.

References

Bandura, A.(1997), *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control.* New York: Freeman.

George, D. & Mallery, P.(2008), *SPSS for Windows Step-By-Step: A Guide and Reference, 15.0 Update(Eighth Edition).* Published by Pearson Education Inc. Indian edition published by Dorling Kindersley(India) Pvt. Ltd.

Hinton, P.R., Brownlow, C., McMurray, I. & Cozens,B.(2004), *SPSS Explained.* Routledge(Taylor & Francis Group), 27 Church Road, Hove, East Sussex BN3 2FA, Tata McGraw-Hill Education Pvt. Ltd.

Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1986). The Transtheoretical approach. In J.C. Norcross (Ed.)*, Handbook of eclectic psychotherapy* (pp. 163-200). New York:Brunner/Mazel.

Robitschek, C., & Ashton et.al. (2009), "Development of the Personal Growth Initiative Scale-II", *Poster presented at the First World Congress on Positive Psychology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*

Robitschek, C.(1998), "Personal Growth Initiative: The Construct and its Measure", *Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and Development* 31, 197-210.

Robitschek, C.(1999), "Further Validation of the Personal Growth Initiative: The Construct and its Measure", *Measurement and Evaluation in Counselling and Development* 30, 183-198.

Scherbaum,C.A., Charash, Y.C. & Kern, M.J. (2006), "Measuring General Self-Efficacy: A Comparison of Three Measures Using Item Response Theory", *Educational and Psychological Measurement 66(6)*, 1048-1063.

Seligman, M. E. P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000), "Positive psychology: An introduction", *American Psychologist 55,* 5–14.

Sherer, M. et al (1982), "The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and Validation", *Psychological Reports* 51(2), 663-671.

Shorey, H.S., Little, T.D., Snyder, C.R., Kluck, B. & Robitschek, C.(2007), "Hope and PGI: A Comparison of Positive, Future Oriented Constructs", *Personality and Individual Differences* 43, 1917-1926.

Yildirim, F. & Ilhan, I.O.(2010), "The Validity and Reliability of the General Self-Efficacy Scale-Turkish Form", *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry 21(4), 301-308.*

Luszczynska, A., Scholz, T. & Schwarzer, R. (2005), "The General Self-Efficacy Scale: Multicultural Validation Studies", *The Journal of Psychology 139*(5), 439–457.

About the Authors

Hemant Lata Sharma is working as Head and Dean, faculty of Education, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana (India). She is having an experience of more than 25 years in teaching and administration. She has published many papers in International and National Journals. She has also presented paper in International Conference in U.S.A. (Texas, SITE) and participated in International workshop organized by SITE, 2012 in Texas. She has presented many papers in National Seminars and Conferences also. She has delivered many lectures in Refresher and Orientation Courses in different universities. She has written three books also. She is the member of many Governing bodies and Councils of National importance. Her areas of interests are Educational Technology, Distance Education and Teacher Education etc.

Ritu Rani is working as Senior Research fellow in the Department of Education, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, Haryana (India). She has presented papers in national seminars. She has published papers in National and International Journals. She is presently working on the constructs of Personal Growth Initiatives and self-efficacy. Her areas of interests are Educational Psychology and Educational technology.
She can be contacted at E-mail- ritu537@rediffmail.com