

Assessing the Crisis Self-Efficacy in Relation to Work Commitment of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

Rolando N. Sioting Jr.
rolando.siotingjr@deped.gov.ph
Apokon Elementary School, Division of Tagum City, Davao del Norte, Region XI
Philippines

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 outbreak significantly impacted public education in terms of teacher instruction, school operations, and policy changes. A paradigm shift was on the horizon, and teachers' crisis self-efficacy and commitment to their work were investigated. The study examined the impact of crisis self-efficacy on the commitment of teachers to work in the era of the COVID-19 pandemic. A questionnaire adapted for this study was retrieved from google forms online and was distributed to 61 elementary school teachers in the Division of Tagum City, Davao del Norte, Philippines. Data analysis was done using the mean, standard deviation, Pearson r, and regression analysis. Findings indicated that the commitment of teachers was significantly influenced by crisis self-efficacy. Throughout the time of crisis, commitment to work was best predicted by teachers' preventive, achievement, and uncertainty management skills. Further, a high degree of self-efficacy was observed in the aspect of action and prevention. Also noted was a high level of work commitment to teaching and learning. Correlation analysis revealed a link between crisis self-efficacy and the commitment of the teachers. The researcher recommended conducting a comparative study using a greater number of respondents in a different area to validate the finding of this study.

Keywords: crisis self-efficacy, work commitment, teachers, COVID-19 pandemic

INTRODUCTION

Students in the Philippines had a strong reaction to COVID-19 pandemic, while a high level of anxiety was observed among teachers. However, the positive view of Filipino teachers during psychological stress or anxiety was evident, and teachers had to deal with work and life adjustments throughout the pandemic crisis. While embracing the new normal set-up in education, educators must also deal with the problems of an online-blended learning approach (Baloran & Hernan, 2000).

During the Philippines' battle against the COVID-19 pandemic, DepEd began to prepare for a new normal in education and held a statewide consultation with stakeholders and education professionals to establish a Learning Continuity Plan in the delivery of education to students. For now, teachers must adapt to this approaching shift in the teaching paradigm and the increasing demands of their workloads before classes begin in a new typical pedagogical environment. As a result, their

crisis self-efficacy and commitment to their work and profession as educators are developed in this situation.

It is for this reason that the researcher was interested in determining the domain of crisis self-efficacy that strongly predicts the work commitment of all teachers in a school in Tagum City Division. Concerns raised by this study could lead to action plans that could help teachers enhance their self-efficacy and increase their commitment to work in the event of a pandemic. The following research objectives guided this study: identify the level of crisis self-efficacy and work commitment among teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic in terms of action, preventive, achievement, and uncertainty management; determine the significance of the relationship between the crisis self-efficacy and the work commitment of teachers during COVID-19 pandemic; and, finally, determine the domain of crisis self-efficacy which best predicts teachers' work commitment.

METHODS

Research Design

Quantitative, non-experimental design of research using the correlational technique was used in this study since it was aimed to determine the significant relationship between the crisis self-efficacy and work commitment of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic. This approach was ideal since it allowed for a systematic investigation of the nature of links, or associations, between and among the variables in this study. Non-experimental research is defined as research that does not involve modifying an independent variable, allocating participants to conditions or orders of conditions at random, or a combination of the two (O'Dwyer & Bernauer, 2013).

Respondents of the Study

The study's respondents were all teachers at a school in the Division of Tagum City. They were the appropriate representatives for the study and offered useful information to evaluate the hypothesis. Parents, students, school administrators, and DepEd officials were excluded since this study concentrated on teachers' work commitment. The area covered in this study were elementary school teachers in the Division of Tagum City.

Data Gathering Procedure

An online survey developed through Google forms with an appended consent form was conducted. Google form is an online survey platform that provides the service of creating survey forms, receiving responses, and analyzing data at no charge. We used this platform to demonstrate how a physical questionnaire could be converted to an online form (Mondal, et al., 2018). The Survey link was disseminated to teachers coming from the different grade levels from Kinder to Grade IV levels. Adapted survey questionnaires were used for crisis self-efficacy and work commitment. They were modified to suit the purpose of the study, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic period. A total of 61 teachers responded in the online survey.

Data Gathering Procedure

A systematic approach was used to collect the essential data. First, the researcher obtained authorization to perform the study from the school principal through a letter. Following approval, survey questionnaires were distributed to teachers using Google Form. The researcher sent the google form questionnaires to the respondents online. The researcher conducted the survey online and explained the study's goal to the respondents throughout the administration and retrieval of the questionnaire. In the questionnaires, instructions were provided on how to respond to the statement. The respondents were given ample time to complete the surveys. The retrieval of the research instruments was done after the administration. After getting all the responses in the questionnaire, collation and tabulation of data were followed. Collation was done by the researcher, encoded, and submitted to the statistician for the appropriate statistical treatment. The tabulated data was subjected to analysis and interpretation according to the problem raised in the first chapter. Ethics were thoroughly observed in the conduct of this study.

Statistical Tools

Data were analyzed using mean, standard deviation, Pearson r , and regression analysis as statistical tools. For the research variables, a five-point Likert scale was used. According to Santos (2007), the Likert Scale requires respondents to check a box or leave a blank in response to many items about an attitude, object, or stimulus.

Ethical Considerations

Respondents of the survey conducted voluntarily filled-out the questionnaires and were assured that their rights and privacy were protected, and responses were strictly used for the study. This was to confirm that ethical considerations were being considered in this research. Research papers may even be doomed to failure if this part is missing. Research ethics is primarily concerned with the investigation of ethical issues that arise

when people participate in research (Walton, 2017). To ensure integrity, quality and transparency, this study was reviewed and undertaken in accordance with commonly agreed standards of good research practices.

RESULTS

Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in Terms of Action

Teacher action efficacy is depicted in Table 1 with a mean of 4.34, indicating that they are highly effective, and a standard deviation of 0.46. In addition, the SD of 0.46 shows that the measurements of variability index on crisis self-efficacy in terms of action were relatively small and most likely grouped closer to the mean.

Table 1
Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in Terms of Action

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I am certain I have the ability to take necessary action to protect myself during a crisis.	4.41	0.56	Very High
2. I know that I have the ability to do things to protect myself in case of a crisis.	4.36	0.68	Very High
3. Given enough time and effort, I believe I can solve most problems during a crisis.	4.25	0.60	Very High
Overall	4.34	0.46	Very High

Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in Terms of Preventive

The level of preventative efficacy of teachers is presented in Table 2, with a mean of 4.27, indicating that it is very high and a standard deviation of 0.50. Moreover, the SD value of 0.50, which corresponds to the category mean, showed that the measures of variability index on crisis self-efficacy in terms of prevention were likely grouped closer to the mean.

Table 2
Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in Terms of Preventive

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. What I do with the knowledge I have about a crisis will keep me safe.	4.34	0.54	Very High
2. I am able to use resources effectively during a crisis.	4.31	0.56	Very High
3. I can help others decide what actions to take during a crisis.	4.16	0.58	High
Overall	4.27	0.50	Very High

Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in terms of Achievement

Table 3 shows the level of achievement efficacy of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a mean of 4.11 or high and a standard deviation of 0.46. Furthermore, the SD value of 0.46 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on crisis self-efficacy in terms of achievement was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 3
Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in terms of Achievement

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. During a crisis, I can stick to my goals.	4.18	0.53	High
2. During a crisis, I can accomplish my goals.	4.08	0.56	High
3. During a crisis, I can achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.	4.07	0.51	High
Overall	4.11	0.46	High

Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in terms of Uncertainty Management

In Table 4, teachers' level of uncertainty management efficacy is presented with a mean of 4.05 or high and a standard deviation of 0.50, respectively. Furthermore, the SD value of 0.50 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on crisis self-efficacy in terms of uncertainty management was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 4
Level of Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy in terms of Uncertainty Management

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I am confident that I can deal efficiently with unexpected crisis situations.	4.00	0.61	High
2. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations during a crisis.	4.10	0.57	High
3. During a crisis, I can usually	4.05	0.56	High

handle whatever comes my way.

Overall	4.05	0.50	High
----------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Level of Crisis Self-Efficacy of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

The action efficacy variable received the highest mean rating of 4.34, indicating a very high result. In contrast, the mean of uncertainty management efficacy is 4.05, which is still relatively high. The SD value of 0.40 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on crisis self-efficacy during COVID-19 pandemic is relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 5
Level of Crisis Self-Efficacy of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Action Efficacy	4.34	0.46	Very High
Preventive Efficacy	4.27	0.50	Very High
Achievement Efficacy	4.11	0.46	High
Uncertainty Management Efficacy	4.05	0.50	High
Overall	4.19	0.40	High

Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to School

The level of commitment to school of teachers during the COVID-19 pandemic is depicted in Table 6, with a mean of 3.94, indicating a high level of commitment and a standard deviation of 0.56. Furthermore, the SD value of 0.56 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on crisis self-efficacy in terms of uncertainty management was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 6
Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to School

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. Often, I find it is difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employee.	3.48	1.03	High
2. I talk up this school to my friend as a great school to work for.	4.18	0.67	High
3. I find that my values and my school's values are very similar.	4.16	0.61	High
Overall	3.94	0.56	High

Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to Students

Table 7 shows the level of teachers' commitment to students during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a mean of 4.39 or extremely high and a standard deviation of 0.47. Furthermore, the SD value of 0.47 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on work commitment in terms of commitment to students was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 7
Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to Students

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. All students can succeed and it is my mission to ensure their success.	4.39	0.53	Very High
2. It is my responsibility to ensure good social relations among my	4.56	0.53	Very High

students.
3. I feel obliged to mediate among the rival groups of the students.

Overall	4.39	0.47	Very High
----------------	-------------	-------------	------------------

Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to Teaching

The level of teachers' commitment to teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic is depicted in Table 2.3, with a mean of 4.20 (very high) and a standard deviation of 0.46. Moreover, the SD value of 0.46 corresponding to the category mean indicates that the measures of variability index on work commitment in terms of commitment to teaching was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 8
Level of Teachers' Work Commitment in terms of Commitment to Teaching

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. I used to be more ambitious about my work than I am now.	4.00	0.63	High
2. Sometimes I lie awake at night thinking ahead to the next day's work.	4.13	0.69	High
3. I enjoy teaching.	4.46	0.70	Very High
Overall	4.20	0.46	Very High

Level of Teachers' Commitment in terms of Commitment to Profession

Table 9 depicts the level of commitment that teachers had to their profession during the COVID-19 pandemic, with a mean of 3.09, indicating moderate commitment, and a standard deviation of 0.72. Furthermore, the SD value of 0.72 corresponding to the category mean

indicates that the measures of variability index on work commitment in terms of commitment to teaching was relatively small, most likely clustered nearer to the mean.

Table 9
Level of Teachers' Commitment in terms of Commitment to Profession

Items	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
1. If I could get a job different from being a teacher and paying the same amount, I would take it.	3.18	1.20	High
2. If I could do it all over again, I would not choose to work in the teaching profession.	2.61	1.10	Moderate
3. I am disappointed that I ever entered the teaching profession.	2.21	1.13	Low
4. The best decision that I have ever made was to become a teacher.	4.36	0.73	Very High
Overall	3.09	0.72	Moderate

Level of Work Commitment of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

The four indicators of crisis self-efficacy combined to produce an overall mean value of 3.90, which is high. Commitment to students and teaching demonstrated itself in the top two highest scores, with 4.39 and 4.20, respectively, for the two categories.

Table 10
Level of Work Commitment of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

Indicators	Mean	SD	Descriptive Equivalent
Commitment to School	3.94	0.56	High
Commitment to Students	4.39	0.47	Very High
Commitment to Teaching	4.20	0.46	Very High
Commitment to Profession	3.09	0.72	Moderate
Overall	3.90	0.40	High

Significance on the Relationship Between the Crisis Self-Efficacy and Work Commitment of Teachers Amidst COVID-19

As shown in table 11, action efficacy did not have any significant relationship with any of the work commitment indicators since p-values 0.2152, 0.2308, 0.0653, and 0.3650 > 0.05 thus accept Ho.

Table 11
Correlation Matrix Between Level of Crisis Self-Efficacy and Work Commitment of Teachers

Variables	r-value	r ²	p-value	Decision @ $\alpha=0.05$
Action Efficacy and Commitment to School	0.16	0.025	0.2153	Accept Ho
Action Efficacy and Commitment to Students	0.16	0.025	0.2308	Accept Ho
Action Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching	0.24	0.057	0.0653	Accept Ho
Action Efficacy and Commitment to Profession	0.12	0.014	0.3650	Accept Ho
Preventive Efficacy and Commitment to School	0.47	0.220	0.0001	Reject Ho
Preventive Efficacy and Commitment to Students	0.41	0.168	0.0011	Reject Ho

Preventive Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching	0.47	0.220	0.0001	Reject Ho
Preventive Efficacy and Commitment to Profession	0.29	0.084	0.0260	Reject Ho
Achievement Efficacy and Commitment to School	0.40	0.16	0.0013	Reject Ho
Achievement Efficacy and Commitment to Students	0.36	0.129	0.0045	Reject Ho
Achievement Efficacy and Commitment to Teaching	0.46	0.211	0.0002	Reject Ho
Achievement Efficacy and Commitment to Profession	0.24	0.057	0.0622	Accept Ho
Uncertainty Management and Commitment to School	0.42	0.176	0.0006	Reject Ho
Uncertainty Management and Commitment to Students	0.45	0.202	0.0003	Reject Ho
Uncertainty Management and Commitment to Teaching	0.60	0.36	0.0000	Reject Ho
Uncertainty Management and Commitment to Profession	0.18	0.032	0.1557	Accept Ho

Preventive self-efficacy has the corresponding correlation coefficient values of 0.47, 0.41, 0.47 and 0.29 with p-values of $0.0001 < 0.05$, $0.0011 < 0.05$, $0.0001 < 0.05$ and $0.0260 < 0.05$ respectively. As a result, this indicates that there is a statistically significant association between all measures of work commitment, namely commitment to school, commitment to students, commitment to teaching, and commitment to profession, and thus rejecting the Ho. In addition to this, all correlation coefficients showed positive values indicating that as

teachers increased their preventive self-efficacy, their work commitment for all indicators also increased. Commitments to school ($0.0001 < 0.05$), commitment to students ($0.0011 < 0.05$) and commitment to teaching ($0.0001 < 0.05$) had a defined but small relationship to preventive self-efficacy. Commitment to profession ($0.0260 < 0.05$) showing almost negligible relationship to the said self-efficacy indicator. Although the strength of the relationship was most likely low, this relationship was deemed to be significant at all.

Achievement self-efficacy has the corresponding p-values of $0.0013 < 0.05$, $0.0045 < 0.05$, and $0.0002 < 0.05$ respectively which indicate that there is significant relationship to commitment to school, commitment to students and commitment to teaching thus rejecting Ho. Also, all correlation coefficient values of 0.40, 0.36, and 0.46 showed a positive value. This only explains that as teachers increased their achievement self-efficacy, their work commitment for all indicators of crises self-efficacy also increased. Achievement self-efficacy and commitment to profession has a p-value of $0.0622 > 0.05$ which indicates that there was no significant relationship thus accepting Ho.

Uncertainty management efficacy is significantly relative to all indicators of work commitment except for commitment to profession which has a p-value of $0.1557 > 0.05$.

Crisis Self-Efficacy and the Overall Level of Work Commitment

Presented in Table 12 is the correlation matrix between the level of crisis self-efficacy and the overall level of work commitment of teachers. The action efficacy and its overall work commitment showed a 0.23 correlation, which means that there is slight correlation. The p-value of $0.0808 > 0.05$ indicates that their relationship is not significant thus accepting Ho.

Table 12
Crisis Self-Efficacy and the Overall Level of Work Commitment

Variables	r-value	r ²	p-value	Decision @ $\alpha = .05$
Overall Work Commitment				
Action Efficacy	0.23	0.0529	0.081	Accept Ho
Preventive	0.55	0.3025	0.000	Reject Ho
Achievement	0.49	0.2401	0.000	Reject Ho
Uncertainty Management	0.54	0.2916	0.000	Reject Ho

For preventive efficacy and its overall work commitment resulted in 0.55 which means that preventive efficacy has a moderate correlation with the work commitment of teachers. The p-value of $0.0000 < 0.05$ signifies that the relationship is substantial and significant, thus rejecting Ho.

For achievement efficacy, compared to its overall work commitment has an r-value of 0.49 which shows that there is low correlation between them. The p-value of $0.0000 < 0.05$ explains that there is a small but significant relationship between achievement and the overall work commitment of teachers thus rejecting Ho.

Lastly, uncertainty management efficacy and the overall work commitment, results revealed a 0.54 which means that there is moderate correlation. The p-value of $0.0000 < 0.50$ explains that their relationship is substantial and significant thus rejecting Ho.

DISCUSSION

Crisis Self-Efficacy and Work Commitment of Teachers

Given the circumstances, it was reasonable to believe that teachers realize that learning about the pandemic problem would help them stay safe. According to Bandura (1977), knowledge and motivation to accomplish a task are directly tied to one's feeling of efficacy, which refers to self-assessment of his or her capacity to do a certain activity. That is, self-efficacy influences decisions regarding what behaviors to pursue; hence, it is known as a powerful predictor of a wide range of

behaviors (Bandura, 1990; Compeau & Higgins, 1995; Rimal & Adkins, 2003; Verroen, Gutteling, & DeVries, 2012). Teachers believed that having enough information and learning to use resources efficiently would be more productive during a crisis. Teachers can also choose what steps to take in a crisis to carry out their tasks efficiently. Teachers' commitment to the school was evident by their involvement in school events and their loyalty to the institution. In terms of school effectiveness, teacher satisfaction, and teacher retention, teacher commitment is scientifically substantiated (Fresko, Kfir, and Nasser, 1997; Singh & Billingsley, 1998; Nir, 2002).

Conclusion

In general, teachers are expected to be more involved in their jobs during times of crisis. Moreover, it was evident that teachers are very committed to work throughout the COVID-19 crisis. Education professionals are dedicated to completing their work tasks at school, particularly in the education of their students, and believe in their efficacy. During the COVID-19 outbreak, teachers' crisis self-efficacy influenced their professional dedication. Throughout this crisis, teachers' dedication to their work is affected by the domains of action, prevention, achievement, and uncertainty management. Throughout the epidemic, the study revealed a link between teachers' professional dedication and crisis self-efficacy. During the COVID-19 pandemic, teachers' commitment to their profession was predicted by their crisis self-efficacy in preventive, achievement, and uncertainty management.

Recommendations

The researcher strongly recommends that programs be established to help teachers recognize emergencies so they can be safe while performing school activities and continue teaching and learning. Teachers should be trained how to be flexible and adaptive in the face of unexpected job changes and difficult students. It is also proposed that the Department of Education provide teachers with new modalities for school operations and instruction due to teachers' structural

uncertainties in the face of pandemics or other future events, such as teaching and technology change.

When faced with potentially detrimental social settings, school personnel must boost motivation to lessen work uncertainty. Every school leader should help teachers renew their professional commitment by providing emotional and psychological support. However, school-level activities can be developed to increase teachers' commitment to the teaching profession and sustain pride and involvement in achieving the aim of their job.

Based on the findings of this study, teachers should take proactive measures at work to prevent COVID-19 outbreaks by increasing their knowledge, personal and professional resources, and job motivation. Using remote and blended learning in the classroom can assist teachers meet the Department's educational goals even if their jobs are in danger due to the COVID-19 situation. Also, future researchers should do a comparative study with a larger size in a different area to corroborate the findings.

REFERENCES

- Baloran, E., & Hernan, J. (2020). *Crisis self-efficacy and work commitment of education workers among public schools during COVID-19 pandemic*. <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202007.0599.v1>
- Bandura, A. (1990). *Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of control over AIDS infection*. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 13(1), 9–17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189\(90\)90004-G](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-7189(90)90004-G)
- Compeau, D. R., & Higgins, C. A. (1995). *Computer self-efficacy: Development of a measure and initial test*. *MIS Quarterly*, 19, 189-211.
- Fresko, B., Kfir, D., & Nasser, F. (1997). *Predicting teacher commitment*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 429-438.
- Mondal H, Mondal S, Ghosal T, Mondal S. (2018). *Using Google Forms for Medical Survey: A Technical Note*. *Int J Clin Exp Physiol*.5(4):216-8
- Nir, A. E. (2002). *School-based management and its effect on teacher commitment*. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5,323-341.
- O'Dwyer, L. M., & Bernard, J. A. (2013). *Quantitative research for the qualitative researcher*. Sage Publications. Park, E., Scherer, C. W., & Glynn, C. J. (2001). Community involvement and risk perception at personal and societal-levels. *Health, Risk & Society*, 3(3), 281- 292.
- Rimal, R. N., & Adkins, A. (2003). *Using computers to narrowcast health messages: The role of audience, segmentation, targeting, and tailoring in health promotion*. In T. L. Thompson, A. M. Dorsey, K. I. Miller, & R. Parrott (Eds.), *Handbook of health communication* (pp. 473-495). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Santos, D. (2007). *Motivation and work: A survey on motivational aspects of industries*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318180085_Motivation_and_Work_A_Survey_of_the_Motivational_Aspects_in_Industries.
- Singh, K., & Billingsley, B. S. (1998). *Professional support and its effects on teachers' commitment*. *Journal of Educational Research*, 91, 229-239.
- Verroen, S., Gutteling, J., & DeVries, P. (2012). *Enhancing self-protective behavior: Efficacy beliefs and peer feedback in risk communication*. *Risk Analysis*, 33, 1252-1264
- Walton, L. (2017). *Motivation to change in eating disorder patients: a conceptual clarification on the basis of self-determination theory*. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 37, 207–219