



Exploring the Association Between Inattention, Self-Efficacy, and Rumination in Young Adults

Vidur Yadav, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida
vidur1903@gmail.com

Abstract: This study explores the relationship between inattention, self-efficacy, and rumination among young adults. A total of 124 participants aged 16 and above completed self-report measures including the Attention Control Scale (ATTC), General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE), and a 22-item Rumination Scale. Results revealed a significant positive correlation between inattention and rumination ($r = 0.428$, $p < .001$), suggesting that difficulties in sustaining attention are associated with heightened ruminative thought patterns. However, no significant correlation was found between inattention and self-efficacy ($r = -0.082$, $p = .367$). These findings imply that while attentional control may influence maladaptive cognitive processes like rumination, it may not directly impact an individual's belief in their competence. Implications for mental health interventions and limitations of the study are discussed.

Keywords: *Inattention, Rumination, Self-Efficacy, Attentional Control, Young Adults*

1. Introduction

The ubiquity of digital technology has raised concerns about its cognitive and psychological impact, particularly on attentional regulation. Short-form content and constant notifications contribute to attentional lapses, potentially fostering maladaptive cognitive patterns such as rumination. Concurrently, young adults frequently self-diagnose psychological conditions based on online content, further complicating mental health outcomes. This study investigates how attentional control relates to rumination and self-efficacy in this context.

Theoretical frameworks such as Attention Control Theory (Eysenck et al., 2007), Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1977), and Response Styles Theory (Nolen-Hoeksema, 1991) provide a conceptual basis for understanding the interaction of these constructs. Rumination,

particularly its brooding subtype, is closely linked to attentional biases and emotional dysregulation. Self-efficacy, in contrast, is considered a protective factor against stress and psychological dysfunction

2. Method

2.1 Participants

A sample of 124 individuals aged 16 and above was recruited through convenience sampling. Participants represented a range of educational and occupational backgrounds and were categorized into age brackets: 16–20, 21–25, and 25+

2.2 Measures

- a) **Attention Control Scale (ATTC):** 20-item scale measuring attentional focus and shifting abilities.
- b) **General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE):** 10-item scale evaluating belief in one's capacity to manage challenges.
- c) **Rumination Scale:** 22-item instrument assessing tendencies toward repetitive negative thinking.

2.3 Procedure

Participants completed the survey via Google Forms. Ethical guidelines were followed, including informed consent, anonymity, and the option to withdraw. Attention-check items were included to ensure data integrity.

2.4 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, and reliability coefficients were calculated. A significance level of $p < .05$ was used for all inferential tests.

3. Results

Descriptive statistics indicated approximately normal distributions for self-efficacy ($M = 31.5$, $SD = 4.26$) and rumination ($M = 52.0$, $SD = 13.23$), but a positively skewed distribution for attention ($M = 47.6$, $SD = 6.18$). A significant positive correlation was found between inattention and rumination ($r = 0.428$, $p < .001$). However, inattention did not significantly correlate with self-efficacy ($r = -0.082$, $p = .367$)

Table 1: *Descriptive Statistics for Self-Efficacy, Rumination, and Attention*

Variable	N	Mean	Median	SD	Min.	Max.	Skewness	Standard Error
Self-Efficacy (SE)	124	31.5	31.0	4.26	19	40	-0.304	0.217
Rumination (RU)	124	52.0	51.0	13.23	25	84	0.224	0.217
Attention (AT)	124	47.6	47.0	6.18	35	80	1.451	0.217

Table 2: *Correlation Matrix between Rumination and Attention*

Variable	1	2
1. Rumination (RU)	—	
2. Attention (AT)	0.428***	—

Note. $N = 124$. ** $p < .001$.

Table 3: *Correlation Matrix between Attention and Self-Efficacy*

Variable	1	2
1. Attention (AT)	—	
2. Self-Efficacy (SE)	-0.082	—

Note. $N = 124$. $p > .05$ (not significant)

4. Discussion

These findings support the hypothesis that inattention is positively associated with rumination, suggesting a cognitive cycle where attentional lapses exacerbate negative thought patterns. The absence of a relationship between inattention and self-efficacy implies that self-belief may be influenced more by emotional and contextual factors than by cognitive control alone.

4.1 Implications

Interventions targeting attentional control, such as mindfulness and CBT, may help reduce rumination and improve psychological well-being. However, enhancing self-efficacy

may require multifaceted approaches including goal setting, resilience training, and social support.

4.2 Limitations

The study is limited by its cross-sectional design, self-report measures, and a positively skewed distribution of attention scores. Future research should use longitudinal methods and incorporate objective measures of cognitive function.

5. Conclusion

This study highlights a significant link between inattention and rumination but not self-efficacy. These findings underscore the importance of improving attentional control to mitigate maladaptive cognitive processes while acknowledging the complex determinants of self-efficacy.

References

- Beck, A. T., & Dozois, D. J. A. (2011). Cognitive therapy: Current status and future directions. *Annual Review of Medicine*, 62, 397-409. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-med-052909-112919>
- Borkovec, T. D., & Roemer, L. (1995). Perceived control and the worry process. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 19(6), 435-455. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02230393>
- Dew, M. A., & Tennen, H. (1992). Cognitive factors in chronic illness: The role of attentional control and self-efficacy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60(4), 535-541. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.60.4.535>
- Feldman, G., Greeson, J. M., & Renna, M. (2017). Mindfulness, self-compassion, and emotional regulation in the prediction of rumination and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 36(9), 828-850. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2017.36.9.828>
- Glass, C. R., & Fairburn, C. G. (2013). Rumination, self-efficacy, and attentional control: Mediating factors in mood regulation. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(8), 1190-1201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2013.09.002>
- Hollon, S. D., & Beck, A. T. (2004). Cognitive models of depression: A view of the past and future. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 28(5), 603-618. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:COTR.0000045562.75521.8a>

- Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (2000). The role of rumination in depressive disorders and mixed anxiety/depressive symptoms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 109*(3), 504-511.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.109.3.504>
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*(3), 385-401.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/014662167700100306>
- Schneider, M., & Wright, R. R. (2012). Attentional control and self-efficacy: Implications for psychological interventions. *Journal of Cognitive Enhancement, 6*(2), 134-143.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s41465-017-0032-1>
- Smith, J. R., & Watson, K. M. (2016). Cognitive distortions and emotional dysregulation in young adults. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 72*(7), 1245-1257.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.22249>