

The Effects of Self-Efficacy on College Life Satisfaction in College General Physical Education

Sang-II Park¹

Kyungil University, Republic of Korea, Professor

Jung-Taek Shin^{2*}

Donggeui University, Republic of Korea, Professor

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of self - efficacy on college life satisfaction in college general physical education and to provide basic data for improvement of general physical education classes in liberal arts. Therefore, through this study, it is aimed to help to connect with lifelong sports with the transition to positive perception of physical activity. Sample groups, which were supposed to represent all the 4-year college students in Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do, were selected from 3 different 4-year colleges in Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do. For the analysis of data, 401 questionnaires were used except data which didn't respond or trustlessly responded. If the questionnaires, which were answered badly or not answered, were excluded from the available data and coded. Procedures from the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 25.0 version for Window) were utilized to conduct the statistical analyses. Statistical methods of frequency analysis, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis for relationship among the variables were conducted. All tests were performed using a .05 significance level. First, when it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive impact on overall college life satisfaction. Second, When it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive impact on college education quality. Third, When it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive(+) impact on administration and welfare service

Key words: Self-Efficacy, Life Satisfaction, College General Physical Education

* Corresponding author.

Email address: sjt2001@deu.ac.kr

Introduction

During college life, students continually review their aptitudes, interests, and surroundings, and choose their careers by reviewing past, present, and future. But, college students do not have enough time or opportunity to explore their aptitudes, values, and career paths due to excessive competition for entrance exams. Even as a college student, he does not have an accurate understanding of himself, such as his personality, aptitude, interests, and abilities(Yoon, 2008).

It is necessary to develop and diversify sports events and programs in which students can participate voluntarily and joyfully. In addition, it is considered that it is necessary to develop educational programs that can actually help physical activities. Sports activities at university are to mobilize physical activities to cultivate more complete human beings by correcting and supplementing the lacking aspects as living people(Im, 2008). During college life, students continually review their aptitudes, interests, and surroundings, and choose their careers by reviewing past, present, and future.

The liberal arts sporting activity provides students with an opportunity to learn sports that they were usually interested in, and the fun of exercise makes them want to exercise, so they participate in physical classes(Park, & Seo, 2010; Jung, 2005). In this aspect, it can be said that it acts as a driving factor and personal growth factor that makes college students exercise as a lifelong education(Kim, & Ahn, 2018).

In today's knowledge-based society, as society becomes highly industrialized and the number of cultures improves, the public interest in higher education and the demand for professional workers are increasing significantly(Joo, Chung, Im, & Kim, 2010). Sports activities have been settled as the culture of people living in an imminent modern society. These phenomena are said to improve an individual's physical and mental health and psychological well-being(Kim, 2011).

Self-efficacy is a judgment of one's own ability to organize and carry out the necessary activities for an individual to reach a performance goal(Bandura, 1977). Therefore, self-efficacy is a belief in the learner's self as to whether or not he or she can achieve a performance goal well, and can be regarded as an important personal characteristic that promotes performance in a specific task or academic achievement situation. Self-efficacy is one of the representative variables of learning motivation, and the educational field treats self-efficacy as a major learner's characteristic that affects academic performance(Bong, & Skaalvik, 2003).

It is believed that people with a relatively high number of self-efficacies will spend more effort than those with low self-efficacy to overcome perceived obstacles associated with specific goals or objectives(Bandura, 1977). When self-efficacy is high, it increases the degree of adaptation to college life and has a positive effect on stable college life(Chnag, 2005). Therefore, college life satisfaction represents a general adaptation that indicates the degree of attachment to the college, overall satisfaction

with the quality of the college, and the degree of commitment to academic goals(Lee, 2002). Adaptation in the academic, social, and personal emotional domains required through college life is interdependent rather than mutually independent, so it is to be considered that the shortcomings in one area have a negative effect on the overall adaptation to college life(Chnag, 2005).

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of self - efficacy on college life satisfaction in college general physical education and to provide basic data for improvement of general physical education classes in liberal arts. Therefore, through this study, it is aimed to help to connect with lifelong sports with the transition to positive perception of physical activity.

Methods

Subjects

Sample groups, which were supposed to represent all the 4-year college students in Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do, were selected from 3 different 4-year colleges in Daegu and Gyeongsangbuk-do. For the analysis of data, 401 questionnaires were used except data which didn't respond or trustlessly responded. Descriptive statistics for the demographic variables were described in Table I.

Table 1. *Demographic Profiles of Subjects*

Variable	Category	Respondents	%
Gender	Male	238	59.4
	Female	163	40.6
	Total	401	100.0
Major	Social Science	89	22.2
	Natural Science	98	24.4
	Health Science	107	26.7
	Arts, and Physical Science	107	26.7
	Total	401	100.0
Number of Participation	First	190	47.4
	Second	51	12.7
	Third or more	160	39.9
	Total	401	100.0

measurement tool

In this study, the questionnaire factors consisted of self-efficacy and college life satisfaction. The self-efficacy measurement tool was revised and supplemented based on the scale developed by Cho(2016). The question consists of a total of 23 questions, consisting of three sub-factors: self-confidence, self-control efficacy, and task difficulty preference. The tools for measuring college life satisfaction were revised and revised based on the scale developed by Hwang(2013). The question consists of 14 questions, which are the three sub-factors of overall college life satisfaction, college education quality, and administrative and welfare services.

Reliability Analysis

As shown in <Table 2>, the questionnaire questions of this study consisted of questions about the self-efficacy, college life satisfaction and questions about the general characteristics of the survey subjects.

Reliability analysis is defined as the analytical method to evaluate how the researcher did what he/she wanted to know. To measure reliability for the self-efficacy factor and college life satisfaction factor, this used Cronbach's α . This research had each Cronbach's α value for the reliability analyses of self-confidence, self-control efficacy, task difficulty preferences, college life satisfaction, college education quality and administration and welfare service.

The result for the Cronbach's α is following: the value of the self-confidence is .879, self-control efficacy is .849, task difficulty preferences .754, overall college life satisfaction is .679, college education quality is .767, administration and welfare service is .873. It means that the internal consistency among the questions is high and reliable<Table 3>.

Table 2. *Questionnaire*

Configuration	Measurement scale	Questionnaire questions
Demographic Profiles of Subjects		3
Self-Efficacy	self-confidence	7
	self-control efficacy	12
	task difficulty preferences	4
College Life Satisfaction	overall college life satisfaction	5
	college education quality	4
	administration and welfare service	5
total		40

Table 3. *Reliability of Variables*

Composition	Cronbach's α
self-confidence	.879
self-control efficacy	.849
task difficulty preferences	.754
overall college life satisfaction	.679
college education quality	.767
administration and welfare service	.873

Procedures and Test of Measurement

The intent, purpose, and content of the research as well as the matters to be attended to were explained to every respondent. The questionnaires were filled with by self-administration way and then collected. To increase the reliability of questionnaires, pre-surveys were conducted with 70 college students and every alpha value of Cronbach was yielded. And the items with significantly low reliability were excluded from the final questionnaires.

If the questionnaires, which were answered badly or not answered, were excluded from the available data and coded. Procedures from the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 25.0 version for Window) were utilized to conduct the statistical analyses. Statistical methods of frequency analysis, reliability analysis, correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis for relationship among the variables were conducted. All tests were performed using a .05 significance level.

Results

correlation analyses

In this study, the results of calculating the correlation coefficient of Pearson's probability to analyze the relationship between self-efficacy and college life satisfaction are shown in <Table 4>.

Table 4 shows the results of multi-collinearity analysis for the variables used in this study. As a result, the tolerance limit was found in the range between .031 ~.521. Therefore, there was found no multi-collinearity problem in this analysis.

Table 4. *Correlation Analysis*

factors	1	2	3	4	5	6
self-confidence	1.000					
self-control efficacy	.386**	1.000				
task difficulty preferences	.146**	.347**	1.000			
overall college life satisfaction	.160**	.297**	.120*	1.000		
college education quality	.055	.260**	.059	.508**	1.000	
administration and welfare service	.031	.191**	.106*	.378**	.521**	1.000

*p<.05, **p<.001

Multiple Regression analyses

Table 5 shows the results of multiple regression analysis of the self-efficacy and overall college life satisfaction. Regression analysis showed that the value of R^2 was .091, indicating 9.1% explanatory power. Also, the F value was 13.046($p<.001$). The influence self-efficacy and overall college life satisfaction is as follows. Self-control efficacy Beta value is .271($t=4.911$, $p<.001$). When it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive(+) impact on overall college life satisfaction.

Table 5. *The Result of Multiple Regression Analysis 1*

Satisfaction factors	Factors	B	Std E	Beta	t
overall college life satisfaction	Constant	2.165	.225		9.603***
	Self-confidence	.052	.051	.054	1.025
	Self-control efficacy	.304	.062	.271	4.911***
	Task difficulty preferences	.011	.045	.012	.241
$R^2=.091$, $F=13.046$ ***					

Table 6 shows the results of multiple regression analysis of the self-efficacy and college education quality. Regression analysis showed that the value of R^2 was .068, indicating 6.8% explanatory power. Also, the F value was 9.500($p<.001$). The influence self-efficacy and college education quality is as follows. Self-control efficacy Beta value is .284($t=5.105$, $p<.001$). When it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive(+) impact on college education quality.

Table 6. *The Result of Multiple Regression Analysis 2*

Satisfaction factors	Factors	B	Std E	Beta	t
college education quality	Constant	2.603	.246		10.576***
	Self-confidence	-.051	.055	-.049	-.928
	Self-control efficacy	.340	.067	.284	5.105***
	Task difficulty preferences	-.028	.048	-.030	-.564
R ² =.068, F=9.500***					

Table 7 shows the results of multiple regression analysis of the self-efficacy and administration and welfare service. Regression analysis showed that the value of R² was .039, indicating 3.9% explanatory power. Also, the F value was 5.344(p<.001). The influence self-efficacy and administration and welfare service is as follows. Self-control efficacy Beta value is .193(t=3.422, p<.001). When it comes to relative influence, it showed that the self-control efficacy factor has significantly positive(+) impact on administration and welfare service.

Table 7. *The Result of Multiple Regression Analysis 3*

Satisfaction factors	Factors	B	Std E	Beta	t
administration and welfare service	Constant	2.598	.284		9.144***
	Self-confidence	-.057	.064	-.048	-.895
	Self-control efficacy	.264	.077	.193	3.422***
	Task difficulty preferences	.044	.056	.041	.780
R ² =.039, F=5.344***					

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of self - efficacy on college life satisfaction in college general physical education and to provide basic data for improvement of general physical education in liberal arts. Therefore, through this study, it is aimed to help to connect with lifelong sports with the transition to positive perception of physical activity.

This result showed that the self-control efficacy factor had significantly positive effect on overall college life satisfaction, college education quality, and administration and welfare service . However, self confidence and task difficulty preferences had not significantly positive effect on subfactor of life satisfaction. These results suggested that self-efficacy affected quality of life in a single factor, but

it was appropriate to interpret that this was due to self-regulating efficacy. This results partly supported previous studies(Burger & Samuel, 2017; O’Sullivan, 2011; Zhang, 2016) which self efficacy had significantly effect on life satisfaction.

Self-efficacy is beliefs about the capability to master new or challenging tasks, to perform a given behavior(Bandura, 1997). Young people including university student who reported high levels of academic self-efficacy not only displayed less test anxiety at school (Nie, Lau, & Liao, 2011) and better achievement outcomes (Burger & Samuel, 2017), but also evaluated their lives more positively than their peers with lower levels of self-efficacy (Suldo & Huebner, 2006). These previous studies suggested that self-efficacy is important psychological skill for student students.

Life satisfaction is particularly worthy of attention because during their transition to adulthood young people face many developmental and adjustment challenges, including in the self, in the family, and at school (Hampel & Petermann, 2006). Previous studies have examined life satisfaction and its correlates in adults, to such an extent that by now it is widely recognized as an important indicator of adults’ well-being and successful development (Diener & Chan, 2011). High levels of self-efficacy was associated with goal setting, persistence, and a constructive way of dealing with failures (Schwarzer, 2000). Furthermore, self-efficacy enabled individuals to trust their capabilities and to face stressful demands with confidence (Jerusalem & Mittag, 1995). Hence, higher levels of self-efficacy are likely to weaken negative effects of stress on life satisfaction. Ahn and Jo(2015) examined that general physical class improved self-efficacy and university life satisfaction of university student. In this regard, universities should try to provide classes and leisure programs that can improve self-efficacy, which is positively related to quality of life.

By the way, self-efficacy may be a prime resource in this regard as it facilitates coping (Bandura, 1997). However, compared to perceived stress, self-efficacy might be a somewhat less important predictor of life satisfaction in young adults (Hamarat, Thompson, Zabucky, Steele, Matheny & Aysan, 2001). More generally, this also supports the finding that “bad is stronger than good” (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer & Vohs, 2001), in that the experience of negative school-related stress has a stronger impact on young people’s life satisfaction than self-efficacy. In this point, future studies need to study self-efficacy, stress, and quality of life through structural equation model. In addition, it is considered necessary to study the relationship between self-efficacy and quality of life through longitudinal research design. Also, it is necessary to investigate the structural relationship between physical activity, self-efficacy, and quality of life, and to study changes in self-efficacy and quality of life in the process of exercise participation. Lastly, research is also needed on intervention programs that can increase physical activity of university student based on physical activity program for children with disabilities(Kwon, 2020), Korean PE class(Kim, So, &

Cha, 2019). Also, Teacher education is important to improve students' physical activity. In the follow-up study, an intervention program for teachers who guide college students' physical activities based on previous researches on teacher education (Kwon, 2017; Kwon, Kulinna, 2017; Yi & Lee, 2017) is also needed.

Reference

- Ahn, B. W., & Jo, E. Y., (2015). The Verification of Relationship model among Self-Efficacy, Enjoyment Factor, Flow Experience, and University Life Satisfaction by General Physical Class Participants. *The Journal of Wellness*, 10(3), 97 - 107.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323-370.
- Bong, M., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2003). Academic self-concept and self-efficacy: How different are they really? *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(1), 1-40.
- Burger, K., & Samuel, R. (2017). The Role of Perceived Stress and Self-Efficacy in Young People's Life Satisfaction: A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(1), 78-90.
- Chang, K. M. (2005). The Influence of University Students' Career Decision Level and Academic Self-efficacy on Their Adjustment to University. *The Korea Journal of Counseling*. 6(1), 185-196.
- Diener, E., & Chan, M. Y. (2011). Happy people live longer: Subjective well-being contributes to health and longevity. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 3, 1-43.
- Hampel, P., & Petermann, F. (2006). Perceived stress, coping, and adjustment in adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 38(4), 409-415.
- Im, B. J. (2008). *Introduction to Social Physical Education*. Seoul : Seoul Nation University Publisher.
- Jerusalem, M., & Mittag, W. (1995). Self-efficacy in stressful life transitions. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 177-201). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Joo, Y. J., Chung, A. K., Im, Y. W., & Kim, G. Y. (2010). The structural relationship among self-efficacy, perceived usefulness and ease of use, learning flow, and satisfaction in college lecture. *15(3)*, 217-238.
- Jung, S. H. (2005). Promotive and Interruptive Sources of Enjoyment in University Field and Track Events Class. *Korean Society of Sport and Leisure Studies*. 23, 89-99.
- Kim, D. K. (2011). Verification of Relationship Model among Self-Esteem, Immersion, Psychological

- well-Being and Happiness of Sports for all Participants. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Chonnam National University, Chonnam, Korea.
- Kim, E. H., & Ahn, H. S. (2018). The study on Enjoyment factor and Intrinsic Motivation Depending on University Student's Level of Participation in Physical Education. *Journal of Korean Society for Rhythmic Exercises*, 11(2), 37-49.
- Kim, Y. J., So, H. S., & Cha, E. J. (2019). A TPACK-based personality education program for korean PE class. *Research in Dance and Physical Education*, 3(1), 31-45.
- Kwon, E. H. (2017). How to reconceptualize physical education teacher education curriculum for successful training toward inclusion. *Research in Dance and Physical Education*, 1(1), 13-28.
- Kwon, E. H. (2020). Designing the physical activity program for children with disabilities. *Research in Dance and Physical Education*, 4(1), 17-25.
- Kwon, J. Y., & Kulinna, P. H. (2017). Expanded roles of physical education teacher education in united states and Korea. *Research in Dance and Physical Education*, 1(1), 45-51.
- Lee, Y. C. (2002). The Relationship Among Narcissistic Personality, Self-Efficacy, and Adaptation to College Life. (Unpublished master dissertation). Hongik University, Seoul, Korea.
- Nie, Y., Lau, S., & Liau, A. K. (2011). Role of academic self-efficacy in moderating the relation between task importance and test anxiety. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(6), 736-741.
- O'Sullivan, G. (2011). The Relationship Between Hope, Eustress, Self-Efficacy, and Life Satisfaction Among Undergraduates. *Social Indicators Research*, 101, 155-172.
- Park, H. J., & Seo, Y. H. (2010). Analysis on the Relation among Mental Motive, Immersion Experience and Satisfaction with the Class of Participants in Dance Sports of Humanistic Physical Education. 15(2), 65-77.
- Park, M. H. (2015). The Mediating Effects of Self-Efficacy on the Relationships of Family Support and College Adjustment among College Students with Disabilities. *Korean Journal of Physical, Multiple & Health Disabilities*. 58(4), 147-168.
- Schwarzer, R. (2000). General perceived self-efficacy in 14 cultures. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin. <http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/world14.htm>. Accessed 18 August 2016.
- Suldo, S. M., Huebner, E. S., Savage, J., & Thalji, A. (2010). Promote subjective well-being. In M. A. Bray, T. J. Kehle, & P. E. Nathan (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of school psychology* (pp. 504-522). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yi, K. J., & Lee, W. I. (2017). Community-based physical and health education teacher education (PHETE). *Research in Dance and Physical Education*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Yoon, Y. R. (2008). An Effent of Career Group Counselling on the Career Decision Making Self-efficacy of the College Students. *Journal of Education & Culture*. 14(2), 125-145.

Zhang, R. (2016). Positive Affect and Self-Efficacy as Mediators Between Personality and Life Satisfaction in Chinese College Freshmen. *Journal of Happiness Study*, 17, 2007–2021.

Received: August 29, 2020

Reviewed: October 19, 2020

Accepted: October 19, 2020