



IWNest PUBLISHER

## International Journal of Sport Sciences

(ISSN: 2077-4532)

Journal home page: <http://www.iwnest.com/IJSS/>

### The Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Performance in Soccer Learners Aged 12 to 14

Mashayekh, A.A., Aslankhani, M.A. and Shojaei, E.

Department of physical activity, Islamic azad university, Science and Research branch, Tehran, Iran

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article history:

Received 22 February 2015

Accepted 20 March 2015

##### Keywords:

Self-efficacy, soccer, penalty performance, dribbling performance

#### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and performance. Seventy three soccer learners (age:  $12.85 \pm 0.45$ ) performed FA dribbling test penalty performance was evaluated in accordance with Ramsey, Cumming, Edwards, Williams & Brunning (2010). Participants self-efficacy was assessed by Penalty self-efficacy questionnaire (Klug, 2006) and self-efficacy questionnaire-soccer (Mills, Munroe & Hall, 2000). The results showed no significant correlation between self-efficacy and performance. These findings may be due to measurement condition, measures or participant's traits.

© 2015 IWNest Publisher All rights reserved.

**To Cite This Article:** Mashayekh, A.A., Aslankhani, M.A. and Shojaei, E., The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and Performance in Soccer Learners Aged 12 to 14. *Int. J. Sport Sci.*, 2(3), 29-31, 2015

#### INTRODUCTION

Soccer is undoubtedly one of the most popular sports in the world. Running with the ball (dribbling) may be the first technique that young players learn. Penalty kick is one of the determining factors in the outcome of football matches. The identification of factors affecting the performance of these skills can be helpful for soccer coaches.

Self-efficacy is defined as the judgments of one's capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances [2]. An individual's self-efficacy beliefs are formed through six sources that provide information pertaining to one's skill execution. Four sources explained by Bandura [3] include performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological state. Furthermore, Maddux [6] added two sources of information to the four proposed by Bandura which include imaginal experiences and emotional states. These six sources of information are combined and weighted to form efficacy beliefs about the ability to execute certain skills. These efficacy beliefs ultimately become a factor in one's behavior and thought patterns, which include task choice, effort, and persistence. People with high self-efficacy scores tend to take on more challenging assignments, spend more effort during an activity and will continue to persevere in the face of failure. Thus, it is clear that self-efficacy is a determining factor in the overall performance of the athlete.

Moritz, Feltz, Fahrback & Mack [9] in a meta-analysis found that self-efficacy affects performance. Beauchamp, Bray & Albinson, [4], examined the relationship between self-efficacy, pre-competition imagery and golf performance. Results showed that self-efficacy score was predictor of golf performance. Ortega Aurelio, Pilar, & Gómez [10] found a positive relationship between self-efficacy and basketball performance. However, Aboli, Farsi, A.R., Alikhani Rad & Malekshahi [1] didn't find significant relationship between self-efficacy and goalball performance. Previous research has generally been conducted on adults. More research is needed to generalize the findings to other age groups. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and dribbling and penalty performance in youth participants.

##### Methods:

The research sample was randomly selected from 12-14 years soccer learners Mazandaran State, north of Iran. 73 healthy boys completed all the stages.

Penalty self efficacy was evaluated by Using penalty self-efficacy scale [5]. This scale is originally specifically designed for basketball free throw. The scale began by asking the athlete to imagine that he is sent

**Corresponding Author:** Mashayekh, A.A., Department of physical activity, Islamic azad university, Science and Research branch, Tehran, Iran

to the penalty spot and his coach asked kick ten penalties. The athlete was then asked, "How certain are you that you can successfully make a free throw?" 0 out of 10, 1 out of 10, 2 out of 10, all the way up to 10 out of 10. The strength of efficacy beliefs was calculated by summing all of the scores from each level and then dividing by ten. Dribbling self-efficacy was evaluated by self-efficacy scale –soccer [7] with some changes. For example, " I am confident I can remain focused during a challenging situation." Changed to " I am confident I can remain focused during a challenging situation and dribble " .

Penalty performance was evaluated in accordance with Ramsey *et al* [11]. The goal was divided into 13 sections and a rating system employed based on where the ball ended in a similar fashion to figure 1. Points ranged in value from 0 to 5 for each attempt, with more points being rewarded for shots that were closer to the corner of the goal. This scoring system was explained to all participants prior to the test. Dribbling performance was evaluated by FA dribbling test. Participants must cover a spiral course with the ball. Lower time is better.

Chronological age was measured by subtracting date of test from birth date. Maturity status was estimated by Mirwald, Boxter-jones , Baily & Beunen [8] equation. The correlation between self-efficacy scores and performance was calculated by Pearson correlation coefficient.

#### Results:

Table 1 presents descriptive information about the variables. 73 participants completed all the tasks. Skewness and kurtosis statistics are lower than 2, then we can postulate all the measured variables have normal distribution.

Table 2 shows the results of correlation analysis. The Pearson Correlation coefficient between penalty self-efficacy and penalty performance was 0.006. This value was not significant ( $P=0.959$ ). also ,the Pearson Correlation coefficient between dribbling self-efficacy and dribbling time was 0.025 . This value was not significant, too ( $P=0.834$  ). The relationships between dribbling and penalty performance and maturity offset and chronological age wasn't significant ( $r_{\text{dribbling, maturity}}=-0.039, r_{\text{dribbling, chronological age}} = 0.004, r_{\text{penalty, maturity}} = -0.090, r_{\text{penalty, chronological age}} = -0.123$ ).

#### Discussion:

Unexpectedly, correlation coefficient between self-efficacy score and performance was not significant. This result is inconsistent with the findings Moritz *et al* [9], Beauchamp *et al* [4] and Ortega *et al* [10] but was consistent with Vancouver, Thompson, Casey & Putka. [12] and Abdoli *et al* [1]. Ortega *et al* [10] analyzed the relationship between the level of self-efficacy of the player with the ball in basketball, various performance indicators, and individual participation of the youth player in competition. In order to evaluate the levels of self-efficacy, a questionnaire was administered to 187 players from the under-16 age category. From a total of 22 games, the following variables related to the individual performance of the player were analyzed: a) points scored; b) shot attempts and shots made of 1, 2, and 3 points; c) efficacy percentage of 1, 2, and 3-point shots; d) rebounds made; and e) personal fouls received. With regard to participation, the following variables were analyzed: f) minutes played; g) total time of ball possession; h) number of ball possessions; i) number of passes received; and j) number of offensive phases in which the player participates. The results indicate that the performance and participation variables correctly classify 74.2% when differentiating between players with high and low levels of self-efficacy. The players with high levels of self-efficacy presented higher values in the different performance and participation variables than the players with low levels of self-efficacy. The difference between Ortega *et al*'s participation and this study was their age and level of expertise more over the measurement condition was different.

Aboli *et al* [1] studied the relationship between self-efficacy and emotional intelligence with performance in goalball players. The participants were 32 male (mean age= 26.09). Measurement tools were Sharer's self-efficacy questionnaire, Siberia Shirring Emotional Intelligence questionnaire and sheet of secretary for registration of performance. Researcher read sporadic questions for every subject and wrote their answer. The results indicated that there isn't significant correlation between self-efficacy, emotional intelligence, and performance. Abdoli *et al* [1] suggested that different task condition with that described in self-efficacy scale may be the reason.

Previous studies were performed of adult participants. Adults may have enough cognitive development to perceive self-efficacy propositions. Then they answers would have higher correlation with their performance. At the other side, the penalty test manner in this study cannot differentiate between intense shots and only transited ball from the corner of goal. Then, participant may have really low ability and self-efficacy but score highly in this test. These may be the reasons that we don't found significant correlation between self-efficacy and performance. Another study with more reliable and more valid measures could answer our question. Examining the role of expertise, reading ability, Physiological states and audience's verbal persuasion could illustrate this problem, too.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abdoli, B., A.R. Farsi, Alikhani Rad, M. Malekshahi, 2012. The Relationship between Self- efficacy and Emotional Intelligence with Performance in Goalball Men's of Premiership. Sport psychology studies, no 2. Persian.
- [2] Bandura, A., 1997. Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.
- [3] Bandura, A., 1977. Self-efficacy; Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioral change. Psych. Review, 84(2): 191-215
- [4] Beauchamp, M.R., S.R. Bray, J.G. Albinson, 2002. Pre-competition imagery, self-efficacy and performance in collegiate golfers, Journal of Sports Sciences, 20(9): 697-705.
- [5] Klug, J.J., 2006. Effect of an imagery training programe on free throw self-efficacy and performance of high school basketball players. A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Miami University In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, Department of Physical Education, Health, and Sport Studies. Miami University Oxford, OH.
- [6] Maddux, J.E., 1995. Self-efficacy theory: An introduction. In J.E. Maddux (Ed.), Self-efficacy, adaptation, and adjustment: Theory, research, and application (pp 3-27). New York: Plenum Press.
- [7] Mills, K.D., K.J. Munroe, C.R. Hall, 2000. The relationship between imagery and self-efficacy in competitive athletes. Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 20(1): 33-39.
- [8] Mirwald, R.M., A.D. Boxter-jones, D.A. Baily, G.P. Beunen, 2002. An assessment of maturity from anthropometric measurements. Medicine and science in sports and exercises, 34: 689-94.
- [9] Moritz, S.E., D.L. Feltz, K.R. Fahrbach, D.E. Mack, 2000. The relation of self-efficacy measures to sport performance: A meta-analytic review. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 71: 280-294.
- [10] Ortega, E., O. Aurelio, S. Pilar, M.A. Gómez, 2009. Relationship between the level of self-efficacy, performance indicators and participation in youth basketball. Revista de Psicología del Deporte, 18: 337-342.
- [11] Ramsey, R., J. Cumming, M.G. Edwards, S. Williams, C. Brunning, 2010. Examining the Emotion Aspect of PETTLEP-based Imagery with Penalty Taking in Soccer. Journal of Sport Behavior, 33(3): 295.
- [12] Vancouver, J.B., C.M.E. Thompson, T. Casey, D.J. Putka, 2002. Two Studies Examining the Negative Effect of Self-Efficacy on Performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3): 506-516.
- [13] [www.fasoccerstar.com/whatsavailable.phtml](http://www.fasoccerstar.com/whatsavailable.phtml).

## Appendixes:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics.

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
Dribbling	73	13.24	17.12	15.0923	.87689	-.077	-.472
Penalty	73	8.00	29.00	16.2329	5.07861	.528	-.583
PSE	73	36.00	71.00	47.0137	8.92016	1.096	.797
DSE	73	13.00	22.00	17.3836	2.07920	-.102	-.173
Chronological age	73	12.01	13.82	12.8590	.45517	.490	-.418
maturityoffset	73	-2.85	-.84	-2.0772	.50934	.540	-.635

Table 2: Correlation analysis.

		dribbling	penalty	PSE	DSE	maturityoffset	Chronological age
dribbling	Pearson Correlation	1	.220	.155	.025	-.039	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.061	.189	.834	.746	.973
Penalty	Pearson Correlation	.220	1	.006	.076	-.090	-.123
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.061		.959	.525	.446	.301

Abbreviations: PSE: penalty self-efficacy , DSE: dribbling self-efficacy