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Abstract

A present study was conducted on self efficacy of teachers in relation to their organizational commitment for that purpose a sample of 500 was taken with 250 males and 250 females. Out of these 125 teachers were from schools and 125 from colleges of both the genders from Ludhiana District. Tools used for data collection was The General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE) (Jerusalem and Schwarzer, 1979) and Organizational Commitment scale (Hyde and Roy, 2005). Study concluded results as there is significant difference in the mean scores of gender differentials of organizational commitment among college teachers as well as total teachers and no significant difference among school teachers. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of organizational differentials of organizational commitment among total teachers. There is significant difference in the mean scores of gender differentials of self efficacy among college teachers and no significant difference among school teachers as well total teachers. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of organizational differentials of self efficacy among total teachers.
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Introduction-A teacher experiences in family and professional roles vary in many other ways. Like in case of motherhood and final examination in school, for example, spacing of the children, their temperaments or spousal agreement over parenting practices along with finishing of syllabus, revision of the syllabus, preparation of test papers, commanding authority’s attitude etc. all these factors affect the teaching of a teacher and the efficiency and dedication towards teaching is reduced.
Self-efficacy is the belief in one's effectiveness in performing specific tasks. "People who regard themselves as highly efficacious act, think, and feel differently from those who perceive themselves as inefficacious. They produce their own future, rather than simply foretell it." Albert Bandura. It is important here to understand the distinction between self-esteem and self-efficacy. Self-esteem relates to a person’s sense of self-worth, whereas self-efficacy relates to a person’s perception of their ability to reach a goal. For example, say a person is a terrible rock climber. They would likely have a poor self-efficacy in regard to rock climbing, but this wouldn’t need to affect their self-esteem; most people don’t invest much of their self-esteem in this activity.

Self-Efficacy also comes from direct reinforcement and encouragement from others. Finally, our sense of Self-Efficacy can emerge when we are in a relatively relaxed physiological state, which actually enhances the possibility that we will succeed. (Bandura, 1977). Perceived self-efficacy is defined as people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives. Self-efficacy beliefs determine how people feel, think, motivate themselves and behave. Such beliefs produce these diverse effects through four major processes. They include cognitive, motivational, affective and selection processes.

The Role of Self-Efficacy - Virtually all people can identify goals they want to accomplish, things they would like to change, and things they would like to achieve. However, most people also realize that putting these plans into action is not quite so simple. Bandura and others have found that an individual’s self-efficacy plays a major role in how goals, tasks, and challenges are approached.

People with a strong sense of self-efficacy:

- View challenging problems as tasks to be mastered.
- Develop deeper interest in the activities in which they participate.
- Form a stronger sense of commitment to their interests and activities.
- Recover quickly from setbacks and disappointments.

People with a weak sense of self-efficacy:

- Avoid challenging tasks.
- Believe that difficult tasks and situations are beyond their capabilities.
- Focus on personal failings and negative outcomes.
- Quickly lose confidence in personal abilities (Bandura, 1997).

**ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT** - Organizational commitment covers a range of attitudinal and behavioral responses about the organization and is sometime described as loyalty. Organizational commitment is a concept proposed by Mowday et. Al (1982) to integrate several of the personal characteristics and experience that individual being to the organizational. General Meaning organizational commitment in general sense, is the employee’s psychological attachment to the organization. Organizational commitment in words of Mowday is “the extent to which an individual identifies and is involved with his or her organization and it is unwilling to leave it. Has implications for the decision to continue membership in the organization”. Types of organizational commitment

**AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT** - Positive emotional attachment of the employees with the organization.

**CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT** - The individual commits to the organization because he/she perceives high cost of losing organizational member including economic costs and social costs.

**NORMATIVE COMMITMENT** - The individual commits to and remains with an organization because of feeling of obligation.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To study the organizational commitment of teachers.
   a) To study the organizational commitment among teachers in regard to their gender.
   b) To study the organizational commitment among teachers in regard to the dissemination of secondary and higher education (school teachers and college teachers)

2. To study the self efficacy of the teachers.
   a) To study the self efficacy among teachers in regard to their gender
   b) To study the self efficacy among teachers in regard to the dissemination of secondary and higher education (school teachers and college teachers)

**HYPOTHESES**
1.(a) There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of organizational commitment of teachers in regard to their gender.

1 (b) There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of organizational commitment of teachers in regard to their dissemination of secondary and higher education.

2(a) There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of self-efficacy of teachers in regard to their gender.

2(b) There exists no significant difference in the mean scores of self-efficacy of teachers in regard to their dissemination of secondary and higher education.

MEASURES ADOPTED
- The General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE) by Matthias Jerusalem & Ralf Schwarzer (1979)
- Organizational Commitment scale by Dr. Anukool M. Hyde and Mrs. Rishu Roy. (2005)

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS
Hypothesis 1 which states, “There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of organizational commitment of teachers in regard to their gender and dissemination of secondary and higher education” has been tested with the help of Tables 1,2,3,4.

Table 1: Gender differentials of organizational commitment among college teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114.32</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>3.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>108.42</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at 0.01 level

Table 1 represents mean differentials in organizational commitment of male and female college teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of college teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for college male teachers came to be 114.32 and for female college teachers 108.42. Their SDs was 17.07 and 10.83 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 3.26, significant at 0.01 & 0.05 level of significance.
Table 2: Gender differentials of organizational commitment among school teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114.58</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>112.70</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 represents mean differentials in organizational commitment of male and female school teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of school teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for school male teachers came to be 114.58 and for female school teachers 112.70. Their SDs were 17.36 and 28.66 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 0.63, which was not significant at any level of significance.

Table 3: Gender differentials of organizational commitment among total teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114.45</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>110.42</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level

Table 3 represents mean differentials in organizational commitment of male and female total teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of total teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for total male teachers came to be 114.45 and for total female teachers 110.42. Their SDs were 17.18 and 21.59 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 2.31, significant at 0.05 level of significance.

Table 4: Organisational differentials of organizational commitment among total teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>111.37</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>111.08</td>
<td>20.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 represents mean differentials in organizational commitment of college and school teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of total teachers in regard to their dissemination of secondary and higher education. The mean value for college teachers came to be 111.37 and for school teachers 111.08. Their SDs were 14.57 and 20.33 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 0.18, which was not significant at any level of significance.

Discussion of the Results—Entries made in tables 1 showed that t-value of organizational commitment among college male and female teachers was significant at 0.01 level of significance. This indicated that organizational commitment score of college male teachers was significantly higher than that of college female teachers. Entries made in tables 2 showed that t-value of organisational commitment among school male and female teachers was not significant at any level. This indicated that organisational commitment score of school male teachers and school female teachers were not significant at either levels. Entries made in tables 3 showed that t-value of organisational commitment among total male and female teachers was significant at 0.05 level of significance. This indicated that organisational commitment score of total male teachers was significantly higher than that of total female teachers. Entries made in tables 4 showed that t-value of organisational commitment among college and school teachers was not significant at any level. This indicated that organisational commitment score of college teachers and school teachers was the same. Hence from the above discussion, it can be concluded that teachers of colleges and schools differ significantly in their organisational commitment in regard to their gender and not significantly to the dissemination of secondary and higher education. Thus, Hypothesis 1, which states “There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of organisational commitment of teachers in regard to their gender and dissemination of secondary and higher education” stands partially accepted and partially rejected.

Hypothesis 2 which states, “There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-efficacy of teachers in regard to their gender and dissemination of secondary and higher education” has been tested with the help of Tables 5,6,7,8.
Table 5: Gender differentials of self efficacy among college teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>3.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.42</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at 0.01 level

Table 5 represents mean differentials in self-efficacy of male and female college teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of college teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for college male teachers came to be 25.83 and for female college teachers 23.42. Their SDs were 7.14 and 4.12 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 3.27, significant at 0.01 as well as 0.05 level of significance.

Table 6: Gender differentials of self efficacy among school teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.94</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 represents mean differentials in self-efficacy of male and female school teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of school teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for school male teachers came to be 26.94 and for female school teachers 27.42. Their SDs were 11.48 and 7.75 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 0.39, which was not significant at either 0.05 or 0.01 level of significance.
Table 7: Gender differentials of self-efficacy among total teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 represents mean differentials in self-efficacy of male and female total teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of total teachers in regard to their gender. The mean value for total male teachers came to be 26.38 and for total female teachers 25.74. Their SDs were 9.56 and 8.87 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 0.77, not significant at any level of significance.

Table 8: Organisational differentials of role conflict among total teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>S.E.d</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleges</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>25.41</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 represents mean differentials in self-efficacy of college and school teachers. Entries made in this Table showed means scores of total teachers in regard to their dissemination of secondary and higher education. The mean value for college teachers came to be 24.62 and for school teachers 25.41. Their SDs were 5.94 and 8.20 respectively. The t-value calculated in this respect was 1.23, which was not significant at any level of significance.

Discussion of the Results-Entries made in tables 5 showed that t-value of self-efficacy among college male and female teachers was significant at one percent level. This indicated that self-efficacy score of college male teachers was significantly higher than that of college female teachers. Entries made in tables 6 showed that t-value of self-efficacy among school male and female teachers was not significant at any level. This indicated that self-efficacy score of school
male teachers was at par with that of school female teachers. Entries made in tables 7 showed that t-value of self-efficacy among total male and female teachers was not significant at any level. This indicated that self-efficacy score of total male teachers was at par with that of total female teachers. Entries made in tables 8 showed that t-value of self-efficacy among college and school teachers was again not significant at any level. This indicated that self-efficacy score of college teachers was at par with that of school teachers. Hence from the above discussion, it can be concluded that teachers of colleges and schools do not differ much in their self-efficacy in regard to their gender and dissemination of secondary and higher education. Thus, Hypothesis 2, which states “There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-efficacy of teachers in regard to their gender and dissemination of secondary and higher education” stands majorly rejected and mildly accepted.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Teaching today is more complex and demanding role that it has ever been. Teaching is the essential profession the one that makes all other professions possible. Without well qualified, caring and committed teachers neither improved curricula and assessment nor safe schools can contribute to this noble task.

So for better prospects of the teachers the present study has multiple implications To study the demands and needs of the teachers, their experiences, not only helps them in formulating the commitment towards the organizational but as well improving their job performance and better insight in nation building. Teacher actually are the builders of the nation and it is they who contribute to the knowledge and wisdom of society. This study can help the administrators and bureaucrats in formulating rules and appraising the performance of their employees in terms of positive needs and negative experiences. This study can help in analyzing the job performance and predict avenues for individuals in various sectors.

The findings of investigation may provide help to the school and college personnel, teachers, counselors and guidance workers to develop suitable methods of improve self efficacy among the teachers.
It has been found out that the males self efficacy is easy affected by the conflicting situation as compared to females because females can cope up with the stress on conflict without it being affecting their other roles and duties.

Parents should identify the capacity and ability of the child and should accordingly impose responsibilities on them and take care that these responsibilities does not reduce self efficacy. Parent should also try to be the best facilitator to aid their self efficacy.
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