DOES TEACHERS' SELF-EFFICACY INFLUENCE THEIR ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT?
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ABSTRACT

Self-efficacy has become the focus of attention in the field of teaching. Teachers with higher teaching efficacy portray more enthusiasm for teaching and have greater commitment to teaching. The purpose of this study was to investigate whether self-efficacy has an influence on teachers’ organizational commitment (OC). This study hypothesized that teachers’ self-efficacy would have no significant relationship on teachers’ organizational commitment. The study employed survey research design to establish the relationship between self-efficacy and teachers’ OC. Simple random sampling was employed to draw a study population of 480 teachers in secondary schools in Nairobi, Machakos, Kajiado, and Kiambu counties in Kenya. The method of data collection was through the use of questionnaires which were distributed randomly to respondents. The data was analyzed through descriptive, correlation and regression analysis. The study established that teachers’ self-efficacy had positive influence on their OC which indicates that teachers with high self-efficacy were more committed to their institutions. The study recommends that teachers’ employer should provide new teachers with guided mastery experiences and come up with ways of building their self-efficacy in order to improve their OC. The study suggests further research on the effect of teachers’ self-efficacy on students’ achievements.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of self-efficacy was first introduced by Bandura who defined it as the beliefs in one’s capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997). The introduction of this concept sparked many organizational researches in areas such as sport, politics, health, and academics. The reason behind this is that self-efficacy beliefs influences the course of action that people pursue and is an important construct for understanding human behavior in various contexts (Bandura 1986; Bandura 1997). It also strongly influences the choices people make, the effort they expend, and their perseverance in the face of challenge (Bandura 1986).

Recently, self-efficacy has become the focus of attention in the field of teaching since it has been found to be one of the important variables consistently related to positive teaching behavior such as commitment. This is because teachers with higher teaching efficacy find teaching meaningful and rewarding, expect students to be successful, have positive attitude about themselves and their students, have a feeling of being in control and share their goals with students (Ashton, 1985).

Adedoyin (2010) posits that efficacious teachers are more likely to stay in teaching, put more time in it and show greater effort in classroom planning and organization and greater enthusiasm for teaching. Similarly, a teacher with a high sense of efficacy portrays more enthusiasm for teaching, has greater commitment to teaching and is more likely to stay as a teacher (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998).

However some researchers found no correlation between efficacy in teachers and organization commitment. For instance, Murphy (2013) study on the relationship between teacher efficacy and organizational commitment found that teachers’ efficacy did not correlate with organizational commitment and that personal teaching efficacy did not correlate with affective commitment. In this study, personal teaching efficacy and general teaching efficacy correlated differently with the factors of organizational commitment and that general teaching efficacy did not correlate with any factors of organizational commitment. This, he suggests, warrants future investigation into the theoretical perspective of the teacher efficacy and commitment constructs. This study therefore investigated whether teachers’ self-efficacy had effect on their OC.
1.1. Objectives of the study

The objective of this study was to investigate whether self-efficacy had an influence on the organizational commitment of secondary school teachers in county governments in Kenya.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Self-efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy was introduced by Bandura (1986) in his social cognitive theory. Bandura, (1997) defined self-efficacy as the beliefs in one’s capacity to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments. These efficacious beliefs and judgments about personal capabilities and not their skills drive people to accomplishing their set goals. What people believe is more powerful than the abilities for a particular task and affects how one behaves and his/her motivation.

How a person feels (efficacy) about a circumstance will determine not only the behavior, but also the outcome, once a person evaluates what kind of outcome to expect (Murphy, 2013). This is in line with what Bandura (1997) proposed that one's behavior is determined by both outcome expectancy and efficacy expectations. Efficacy expectation is the belief that one has the ability and skills to successfully execute the behavior or actions required to produce the desired outcome. The belief that a particular course of action will result in expected outcome is referred to as outcome expectancy.

Research on teachers’ self-efficacy has attracted great attention among researchers (Guskey & Passaro, 1994; Tschannen- Moran, et al., 1998: Caprara et al., 2006). This is because teachers with a higher sense of efficacy exhibit greater enthusiasm for teaching (Allinder, 1994), are persistent when things do not go smoothly, are resilient in the face of setbacks (Milner & Hoy, 2003), and have greater commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992).

Tschannen-Moran, et al. (1998) found that teachers’ efficacy affects their behaviors, effort, innovation, organization, persistence, willingness to work with difficult students and commitment to the job. It would also be expected that a teacher with a strong sense of efficacy will be more willing to assist students with learning difficulties, ready to listen to parents’ concern, and more willing to adopt new strategies that are of benefit to student learning. Teachers’ sense of efficacy influences how much effort one invests in an endeavour.

Teacher self-efficacy is defined as teacher’s belief in his/her capability to organize and execute the courses of action required to successfully accomplish a specific teaching task in a particular context (Tschannen-Moran, et al., 1998). As much as believing that one has the
capability to execute necessary changes to achieve the desired outcomes, one must also believe that he/she has the skills required to be successful.

That is why Bandura (1997) asserted that these beliefs were more powerful than one’s actual abilities for the task at hand in influencing people’s level of motivation, affective states, and actions. The source of teachers’ self-efficacy includes; mastery experiences, physiological and affective states, vicarious experiences, and social persuasion. Mastery experiences which are defined as individual past successful experiences are believed to be the most powerful source of efficacy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). This is because people most likely believe they can be successful when they have been successful in the past (Cherniss & Goleman, 2001). If a teacher’s past performance was successful it raises the efficacy beliefs but failure lowers the beliefs. For instance, a teacher whose subject excelled in the national examination will have the expectations that future performance will be better.

Gutskey and Passaro (1994) postulate two facets of teachers’ self-efficacy; general efficacy and personal efficacy. They defined general efficacy as teachers’ beliefs in the ability of teachers (in general) to influence student outcome while personal efficacy is teacher’s belief that he/she personally has the skills necessary to affect positive student outcomes in the face of adversity or difficulty. This study will deal with personal efficacy as it will only consider individual teachers’ belief. As Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) found out general efficacy scale is least successful in capturing the essence of efficacy.

2.2. Organizational Commitment

Organization commitment (OC) has been associated with positive organizational behavior such as extra-role behavior, decreased employee turnover rate and absenteeism (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001; Solinger, Vanolffen & Roe, 2008; Turunen, 2011). Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002) for example, found that the correlations between the three commitment components were all negative. Various definitions on organization commitment exist.

Newstrom & Davis (1997) defines OC as the degree in which an employee identifies with the organization and wants to continue active participation in it. An individual who is committed to an organization identifies with it, is proud of being a member of the organization and is unwilling to leave it.

According to Colquitt, LePine, & Wesson (2009) OC is the desire on the part of an employee to remain a member of the organization. As such, a committed person strongly identifies with and feels a part of the organization which he/she works for and have a feeling
of loyalty towards his/her organization. Mowday (1998) posits that OC has three related factors: a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization.

Despite these many definitions, there is no agreement on the definition of OC. Hence Meyer and Allen (1991) suggest that one must specify the definition he or she uses to avoid confusion. The duo developed the most widely accepted and most dominant multidimensional commitment framework referred to as the three-component model (TCM). This model consists of three dimensions namely; affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment.

They argue that the three dimensions of commitment are distinguishable components, rather than three separate types of commitment. These three can be related to each other in different ways and that an individual can experience different levels of the three forms of commitment. These have received considerable interest from researchers and have been tested in different empirical settings (Meyer et al., 2002; Cohen, 2007; Solinger et al., 2008).

The main reason for this, Meyer et al., (2002) note is the belief that three-component model relates negatively to turnover, but relates differently to measures of other work-relevant behaviors. However, it is important to note that affective commitment was found to be the most reliable and strongly validated dimension and correlated with the widest range of behavioral criterion variables (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Affective commitment (AC) is employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization (Solinger, et al., 2008).

Continuance commitment (CC) refers to an awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Employees or teachers who perceives that the cost of leaving the organization/school is greater than the cost of staying and therefore remain with the organization because they need to. Other employees remain with the organization due to lack of alternative (Meyer et al., 2002). CC therefore involves calculation of the cost of leaving the organization or an employee’s assessment of the investment into the organization.

Normative commitment (NC) refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to the organization. Therefore, employees’ stay with the organization because they think it is the right and acceptable thing to do. Teachers with high levels of normative commitment stay with the organization/school because they feel they ought to, which may be attributed to the need to repay for the treatment they receive from their school. Many other forms of OC have been examined (Cohen, 2006; Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Cohen 1999).
For example, Cohen (2006) studied organizational and occupational commitment whereas Mathieu and Zajac, (1990) referred to attitudinal and calculative commitment. Allen and Meyer (1990) and Meyer and Allen (1997) studies found that OC is a multi-dimensional construct. Cohen (1999) studied affective organizational commitment, continuance organizational commitment, career commitment, job involvement and work ethic endorsement. Since an employee relationship with the organization can express a different degree of each of the constructs, this study will adopt Meyer and Allen (1991) TCM construct.

Numerous researches have been carried out to establish whether relationship exists between self-efficacy and organization commitment (Caprara, et al., 2006; Saleem, Saba & Adnan, 2013; Luthans, Zhu & Avolio, 2006). These studies observed a positive relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. According to Schwarzer & Hallum (2008) when setbacks occur, self-efficacious individuals recover quickly and maintain commitment to their goals.

They approach challenging situations with confidence while increasing their efforts which makes them successful. Tschannen-Moran, et al. (1998) indicated that teachers with a strong sense of efficacy exhibit greater enthusiasm for teaching, have greater commitment to the profession, and are more likely to remain in the classroom. On the contrary, low efficacious people see difficult situations as threats and quickly give up in case of failure.

2.3. Relationship between Self-efficacy and Organizational Commitment

According to Luthans, et al. (2006) employees with a high level of general self-efficacy are more likely to be committed to their organization. Tsai, Tsai and Wang (2011) study on the relationship between leadership style, emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and organizational commitment in the Banking Industry in Taiwan found that employees’ self-efficacy results in a significant positive influence on organizational commitment. At the school level, perceived self-efficacy beliefs have been powerfully related to meaningful outcomes such as teachers’ persistence, enthusiasm, commitment and instructional behavior (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Teachers’ belief about their teaching abilities will affect their teaching behavior such as perseverance in the face of obstacles and even commitment to teaching.

Murphy (2013) conducted a study to examine the relationship between teacher efficacy and organizational commitment using a sample of 168 of current special education teachers from across the state of Massachusetts. The findings indicated that no significant correlation existed between teacher efficacy and organizational commitment of special education teachers in Massachusetts. However, the data showed a positive correlation between one’s personal
teaching efficacy and one’s continuance commitment and a negative correlation between one’s personal teaching efficacy and one’s normative commitment. But he agrees that how efficacious one feels about their work environments impact one’s organizational commitment.

Coladarci (1992) study to examine the degree to which teachers' sense of efficacy predicted commitment to teaching revealed a significant relationship between self-efficacy and OC. According to the results, general and personal efficacy emerged as the two strongest predictors of teaching commitment, along with teacher-student ratio, school climate, and gender. Greater teaching commitment was expressed by those teachers who were higher in both general and personal efficacy and those who taught in schools with fewer students. The above literature supports the notion that self-efficacy is a significant predictor of organization commitment. It was therefore important to establish whether self-efficacy influences the OC of teachers in Kenya.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill (2012) posits that survey using questionnaires are popular as they allow the collection of standardized data from a sizeable population in a highly economic way, allowing easy comparison. This study employed a survey research design in order to investigate the influence of teachers’ self-efficacy on their OC.

3.2. Study Population

The population for this study was all teachers in secondary schools in Nairobi, Machakos, Kajiado, and Kiambu Counties. The study population was 480 teachers drawn using simple random sampling. The reason for the choice of this region was motivated by the fact that they are cosmopolitan counties with a population drawn from a diverse ethnic background.

3.3. Data Collection Method

Data collection method for this study was by use of questionnaire which was divided into five parts. The first part was designed to collect demographic information of the teachers. Demographic characteristics such as age, gender, education level, and tenure were used as control variables to rule out alternative explanation for the relationships between independent and dependent variables. Nominal scales were used in the first part of the questionnaire to collect demographic information. For information on age, length of service and education level, the researcher used ordinal scale.
The Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) which consists of 12 items was moderated to construct teachers’ self-efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This is because it is the most widely used and accepted measure (Fives & Buehl, 2010; Rodríguez et al., 2014). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) posits that this measure is of reasonable length and useful for exploring the construct of teacher efficacy. The TSES measure three dimensions of efficacy for instructional strategies, student engagement and classroom (student) management.

Rodríguez, et al. (2014) in their study on teachers’ self-efficacy and its relation with students’ affective and motivation found this scale’s reliability was high ($\alpha=.92$), while the reliability of the efficacy for instructional strategies was 0.81, efficacy in classroom management was 0.86 and efficacy in student engagement was 0.81.

The Meyer, Allen, and Smith, (1993) TCM Employee Commitment Survey designed to measure the three dimensions of organizational commitment (AC, CC and NC) was moderated to construct teachers’ OC questionnaire. To avoid confusion, the term organization was replaced by school and in some instance with the term job. The participants responded to items on a 5-point likert scale (strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”) since as Meyer, & Allen, (2004) posits that although a 7-point disagree-agree scale is used, a 5-point scale also works quite well. In this study, each of the OC dimension (AC, CC, and NC) composed of five items. Some of the items in the questionnaire were negatively keyed items in order to control the tendency of respondents responding affirmatively to items regardless of their content.

3.4. Pilot Study

The questionnaire was pilot tested with a sample of 48 teachers from schools in Githunguri sub-county in Kiambu County. This pilot test comprised 10% of the sampled schools which is in line with Fink (2009) suggestion that the minimum number for a pilot should be 10% of the sample. Pilot testing enabled the researcher to correct ambiguous questions and assess the question validity and reliability of the instruments. The results of the pilot test are as shown in Table 1.

| Variable Name                | Cronbach Alpha’s coefficient | Number of items |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Self-efficacy                | 0.734                        | 9               |
| Organizational commitment    | 0.826                        | 12              |

Since the computed alpha coefficient was greater than 0.7, this was considered sufficient and therefore an acceptable level of internal reliability (Saunders et al., 2012). The pilot assisted the researcher to identify confusing questions where three OC questions were paraphrased before going to the field.
Reliability was measured using internal consistency approach which measures consistency of responses across all questions and to test how well a set of items measure a particular characteristic or behavior. Coefficient alpha popularly known as Cronbach’s alpha measure was used to measure reliability and since all values were higher than 0.7 they were considered to be sufficient level of internal reliability (Saunders et al., 2012).

3.5. Data Analysis and Presentation

This study utilized both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. For qualitative analysis, data was obtained from the respondents using open-ended questions. With open-ended questions, respondents are free to respond in their own words. The importance of qualitative research approach is that it views human thought and behavior in social context and covers a wide range of phenomena in order to understand and appreciate them thoroughly (Daniel, 2016).

For quantitative data analysis, the researcher applied descriptive statistics and multiple regression method. Descriptive statistics was employed to get general information of the respondents where means, frequencies, percentages and standard deviation were used. Multiple regression was used to analyze the influence of self-efficacy on teachers’ OC. Multiple regression examines how independent variables are related to a dependent variable. It allows the researcher to identify how independent variables relate to dependent variables as it analyzes the relationship between independent variable and a single dependent variable.

4. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

4.1. Respondents’ Profile

The results in table 2 show that among the teachers 52% were female and 48% were male which indicates that female teachers were more than the male. The findings are consistent with Nzomo (2012) who found that the number of female teachers was higher than that of males in Nairobi County. The respondents who were between the ages of 20-34 years were 33.3% which is a youthful workforce in Kenya. The teachers who were between the ages of 35 and 49 years were 54.1% whereas those who were ages 50 and above were only 12.5%.

This indicates that the workforce in the teaching sector is an aging population. The reason for this could be due to the freezing of employment for teachers by the government of Kenya and the adoption of demand driven policy by teachers’ employer Teachers Service Commission (TSC). The policy set recruitment on demand and availability of vacancies rather than on supply of teachers (TSC, 2002).
Table 2: Respondents’ Profile

| Gender          | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| Male            | 196       | 48.0    |
| Female          | 212       | 52.0    |

| Age             | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| 20-24 years     | 1         | 0.2     |
| 25-29 years     | 66        | 16.2    |
| 30-34 years     | 69        | 16.9    |
| 35-39 years     | 69        | 16.9    |
| 40-44 years     | 60        | 14.7    |
| 45-49 years     | 92        | 22.5    |
| 50 years and above | 51      | 12.5    |

| Marital Status  | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| Married         | 304       | 74.5    |
| Single          | 92        | 22.5    |
| Widowed         | 8         | 2.0     |
| Separated       | 4         | 1.0     |

| Job Group       | Frequency | Percent |
|-----------------|-----------|---------|
| K               | 89        | 21.9    |
| L               | 150       | 36.9    |
| M               | 102       | 25.1    |
| N               | 63        | 15.5    |
| P               | 2         | 0.5     |
| Q               | 1         | 0.2     |

| Level of Education | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| Diploma            | 37        | 9.1     |
| Higher National Diploma | 5 | 1.2 |
| Degree             | 299       | 73.3    |
| Masters            | 64        | 15.7    |
| Doctorate          | 3         | 0.7     |
| Total              | 408       | 100.0   |

4.2. Independent Samples T-Test for the relationship between Gender and Study Variables

Independent sample t-test was used to test whether there were differences between teachers’ self-efficacy and OC with respect to gender (Table 3). In terms of teachers’ self-efficacy the study revealed that the mean difference is significant (mean difference = 0.08, \( t = -2.622, df = 406, p\text{-value} = 0.009 \)). Though self-efficacy mean score for female teachers was higher \( (m = 3.03) \) than that of male \( (m = 2.95) \). For teachers’ OC, the mean difference is not significant (mean difference = -0.06, \( t = -1.613, df = 406, p\text{-value} = 0.107 \)). This is consistent to Turunen (2011) study on employment and OC among employees in Finland, Germany, Great Britain, Spain and Sweden that found that women displayed strong commitment than men in all the comparison countries.

Table 3: Independent Samples T-Test for the relationship between Gender and Study Variables
Variables

| Group Statistics            | Gender | N   | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Err | or Mean |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----|-------|----------------|----------|---------|
| Self Efficacy:Teacher       | Male   | 196 | 2.9524| 2.7308         | .01951   |         |
|                             | Female | 212 | 3.0326| 3.3855         | .02325   |         |
| Organizational Commitment of Teacher | Male   | 196 | 2.8262| 3.6511         | .02608   |         |
|                             | Female | 212 | 2.8866| 3.8899         | .02672   |         |

Independent Samples Test

|                  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | t-test for Equality of Means |
|------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                  | F                 | Sig. | t     | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |
| Self Efficacy:Teacher | 3.140            | .077 | -2.622 | 406 | .009 | -0.08024 | .03060 | -.14041 | -.02008 |
|                   | Equal variances assumed |      |       |    |^
|                   | Equal variances not assumed | -2.644 | 398.777 | .009 | -0.08024 | .03035 | -1.3991 | -0.02058 |
| Organizational Commitment of Teacher | 308            | .579 | -1.613 | 406 | .107 | -0.06038 | .03743 | -1.3395 | .01320 |
|                   | Equal variances assumed |      |       |    |                             |                |                   |                   |
|                   | Equal variances not assumed | -1.617 | 405.905 | .107 | -0.06038 | .03733 | -1.3377 | .01302 |

4.3. Correlation Analysis for the linear relationship between the study variables

To establish whether there exists a relationship between the study variables a correlation matrix was run. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient designated $r$, is used for correlation analysis. Pearson correlation $r$ usually measures the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, while the significance is shown by the $p$-value (where $p= 0.05$ or $0.01$). According to Obilor, & Amadi (2018), the larger the $p$-value the stronger the relationship.

The correlation matrix (Table 4) displays the correlation between the independent variable (teachers’ self-efficacy) and the dependent variable (organizational commitment). The results revealed that there was positive though weak correlation between teachers’ self-efficacy and organization commitment ($r=0.280$, $p$-value<0.001). This means that an improved teachers’ self-efficacy would lead to 28.0% increase in their OC.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix for the Study

|                  | Self Efficacy:Teacher | Organizational Commitment of teacher |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Self Efficacy:Teacher | Pearson Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) | N  |  |  |  |
|                   |                      |                        | 408 | 1 |   |
| Organizational Commitment of teacher | Pearson Correlation | Sig. (2-tailed) | N  | .280** | .000 | 408 | 1 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
4.4. Regression Results for the Relationship between Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

In this section regression analysis was run to establish the extent to which teachers’ self-efficacy influences their organizational commitment in county governments in Kenya. The study hypothesized that:

H0: There was no significant influence of teachers’ self-efficacy on their organizational commitment in county governments in Kenya.

To test the hypothesis the following model $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X + \epsilon$ was fitted. Table 5 shows that the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and organizational commitment was statistically significant ($F (1, 406) = 34.461, p\text{-value}<0.001$). With $R^2 = 0.078$, the model implies that about 7.8% of the variations of organizational commitment can be explained by the self-efficacy. The adjusted $R^2$ explained 0.076 or 7.6%, while the rest can be explained by other factors not explained in the model.

The standard coefficient for self-efficacy is statistically significant ($H_0: \beta \neq 0$), since $\beta = 0.280, t = 5.878, p\text{-value}<0.001$). This implies that for one unit increase in teachers’ self-efficacy organizational commitment increases by 0.280. We reject the null hypothesis and conclude that teachers’ self-efficacy ($X$) has significant influence on their organizational commitment.

Table 5: Regression Results for the Relationship between Teachers’ Self-Efficacy and Organizational Commitment

| a) Model Summary |
|------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 1     | .280 | .078 | .076 | .36379 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self-Efficacy: Teacher

| b) ANOVA^{b} |
|---------------|
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|----------------|----|-------------|---|-----|
| 1     | Regression | 4.561 | 1 | 4.561 | 34.461 | .000^{a} |
|       | Residual    | 53.732 | 406 | .132 |          |       |
|       | Total       | 58.293 | 407 |           |          |       |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self-Efficacy: Teacher

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment of teacher
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

The study confirmed that self-efficacy among the teachers positively influences their commitment to teaching. Teachers’ efficacy or belief in one’s capability to execute a task affects their behavior, effort and in the long run their commitment to the job. This corroborates with Agarwal and Mishra (2016) study among revenue personnel who found a statistically significant relationship between self-efficacy and organizational commitment. Self-efficacy also correlated positively with affective, continuance and normative commitment. Rath and Rastogi (2009) found a weak relationship between self-efficacy and OC. This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge on self-efficacy by providing additional empirical evidence of the relationship between teachers’ self-efficacy and their OC.

5.1. Practical Implication of the Study

This study provided valuable information regarding teachers’ self-efficacy and its influence on their organizational commitment. Educational policy makers may consider this information for reflection on practice. Self-efficacy training may be a powerful tool that organizations can employ to enhance OC of their employees. Of importance, is that teacher self-efficacy in relation to student management, classroom management and instructional strategies should be strengthened through skill training among the teachers.

5.2. Recommendation of the Study

The results show that teachers’ self-efficacy is high and the main source of their efficacy was mastery experience. Efficacy beliefs influence self-motivation of workers and determine how much effort they invest in a task (Bandura, 1997). The study recommends that teachers’ employer should provide new teachers with guided mastery experiences and come up with ways of building their self-efficacy such as job enrichment. Job enrichment helps to provide immediate evaluation of their work hence making people work harder as they find their work more exciting. The school principals should be encouraged to give frequent verbal encouragement to the teachers which will help them overcome self-doubt and improve their self-efficacy.

c) Coefficients*

| Model            | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| 1 (Constant)     | 1.839                       | .175                      | 10.537| .000 |
| Self Efficacy:Teacher | .340                       | .058                      | .280  | 5.870| .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Commitment of teacher
5.3. Limitation of the study

The sample of this study was not adequately representative of all the teachers as it was only limited to four counties in Kenya. In future, studies should incorporate a more representative sample. Another limitation was the use of self-report in the collection of data which presented the presence of social desirability bias. According to Andersen and Mayerl, (2019) social desirability bias is a tendency where respondents present themselves in a more positive way than is accurate in self-reported surveys. Future studies should include multi-method approach in collection of data.
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