United International Journal for Research & Technology

Volume 05, Issue 03, 2023 | Open Access | ISSN: 2582-6832

Beyond Burnout: Teacher Commitment Forged in Fire

Joana Paula B. Biñas[1], Marsha B. Bacutoc[2], and Christine M. Deocampo[3]

[1]Faculty Member, Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology, Philippines

[2]Faculty Member, Banate National High School, Philippines

[3]Faculty Member, Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology, Philippines

***Abstract*—** This study investigated the crisis self-efficacy and commitment profile of teachers in the Banate School District, Iloilo, Philippines, during the COVID-19 pandemic. Using descriptive and correlational methods, the study examined the teachers' crisis self-efficacy levels, commitment profiles, and the relationship between these two variables. The survey results revealed that teachers displayed an "Average Commitment" level, with slight variations across categories like educational attainment and grade level taught. No significant differences in commitment levels were found based on age or length of service. Interestingly, although a weak positive correlation was observed between commitment level and crisis self-efficacy, this association was not statistically significant. This suggests that a higher commitment level might not directly translate to increased confidence in handling crises, and other factors may play a larger role in crisis self-efficacy. The study highlights the need for further research to explore the complex relationship between commitment, self-efficacy, and crisis management in educational settings. Understanding these dynamics can inform interventions and training programs to better equip teachers for navigating future crises while maintaining their dedication to their students and profession.

***Keywords*—** Teachers' burnout, Self-efficacy, commitment, crisis.

INTRODUCTION

Even though before COVID-19, school systems were already being questioned, the COVID crisis forced the Department of Education to rethink and reinvent their systems in the field of education. Many education systems in developed and developing economies alike still rely heavily on passive forms of learning that do not foster the critical and independent thinking required in today's innovation-driven economy (Azurin, 2020). During the pandemic, teaching and learning are challenged. It takes resiliency and creativity to develop methods not just to solve the current conditions but to at least prevent undesirable outcomes when crises like the COVID-19 occur in schools. The shift of learning from in-person to online and hybrid delivery modes is one new reality brought on by the global health crisis. There have been a lot of issues between teachers and students as a result of the abrupt change in the techniques of education.

The Department of Education in the Philippines has developed a number of approaches to deal with problems brought on by the epidemic. In spite of the dangers and challenges, schools reopened in October 2020 thanks to the creation of a Learning Continuity Plan (LCP). To help with teaching and learning, DepEd developed self-learning modules, TV programs, and radio broadcast programs. It is required of school administrators, who take the lead in managing schools, to develop successful plans even when a crisis is present.

On the other hand, teachers have a direct impact on how well a school runs. The success of the students is what determines if a school teacher is effective given the difficult demands and the complexity of obligations in these tough times. In order to successfully navigate their classes throughout the pandemic, they must be able to assess risks, employ critical thinking, develop recovery strategies, and communicate effectively with their peers, learners, and stakeholders. Studies on the COVID-19 pandemic's effects were carried out in the Philippines, and they not only amply demonstrated the strong reactions of students but also uncovered the high levels of tension or worry among teachers (Baloran & Hernan, 2020). There were other challenges for teachers throughout the pandemic as well. With the deployment of online blended classrooms, the new norm in education has also given rise to difficult problems with professors. On the other hand, schools found it challenging to meet the needs of both students and instructors in terms of information and communications technology. The pandemic's effects on teachers go beyond only interfering with their regular routines; they also include a long-lasting fear of financial ruin (Baloran & Hernan, 2020). Because they are required to rapidly shift their classes from face-to-face instruction to the new modes of teaching like online and modular platforms, their work commitment during a crisis is deemed crucial. They should continue to be committed to comprehending their students' emotions, social, physical, and even spiritual well-being even as they fight

to provide high-quality education in spite of occasional obstacles with their personal issues. They should be mindful of their mental health while accommodating the academic worries of their students. Teachers are expected to maintain their dedication to their jobs during the pandemic and even unexpected events

This study is anchored to several specific theories such as the Attribution Theory, and Work Commitment Theory. The primary objective of attribution theory is on how people make sense of events and how those events influence their perceptions and actions. It is assumed that people look for reasons behind behavior and assign causes to actions (Weiner, 1986). It assumes that people want to know why things happen, especially sudden and harmful occurrences like crises.

According to Meyer and Allen's (1991) "Three Component Model of Commitment," loyalty to an organization is a psychological state with three unique components that influence how employees feel about the company they work for. The approach emphasizes that to attain stability and save costs, businesses frequently work to foster commitment, and commitment is required to stick with a course of action. According to the three emotional components, employees with strong affective commitment remain with the company because they want to, while those with strong normative and continuity commitments do so out of obligation (Meyer & Allen, 2004). In the framework of a school, organizational commitment is valued highly, pandemic or not. Teachers struggle to address the developmental needs of the students while taking into account their emotional, social, physical, cognitive, and even spiritual well-being as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic changes in the educational setup.

This study is based on the concept that there is a need to assess the status of teachers' crisis self-efficacy level, commitment, and stakeholders' collaboration among the teachers of the municipality of Banate during the new normal and to come up with a contingency plan for teachers' development even during the trying times.

This study aimed to describe the crisis self-efficacy levels of the teachers and their relationship to the commitment profile. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the teachers' crisis self-efficacy level, and commitment profile as an entire group and when grouped according to: a) age; b) length of service; c) educational attainment; d) grade level taught?
2. Are there significant differences in the crisis self-efficacy levels, and commitment profile of teachers when grouped according to: a) age; b) length of service; c)educational attainment; d) grade level taught?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the crisis self-efficacy levels, and the commitment profile of teachers?
4. What enhancement could be done in the learning continuity plan in relation to crisis self-efficacy, commitment, and collaboration?

Hypothesis

1. There are no significant differences in the crisis self-efficacy levels, and commitment profile of teachers when grouped according to a) age; b) length of service; c) educational attainment; and d) grade level taught.
2. There is no significant relationship between the crisis self-efficacy levels, and the commitment profile of the teachers.

METHODS

This study utilized a descriptive-correlational method of research wherein a survey method will be used to describe the characteristics of a population and a correlation wherein a there is an association of two or more variables which are paired to see their relationships. A descriptive-correlational method refers to a type of study in which information is collected without making any changes to the study subject (Ask Media Group, LLC, 2020). This design was used to describe the teachers' crisis self-efficacy level and commitment profiles of teachers.

The participants of the study are teachers from the Schools District of Banate, Province of Iloilo. Of the 345 total population of teachers in the municipality, Slovin's formula was used to come up with a sample size of 186. Once the sample size was identified, a random sampling technique was used to identify teachers from the different schools in the municipality. It was used to come up with a subgroup of interest that makes up a relatively small proportion of the overall sample (Explorable, 2020).

The data-gathering instruments were taken from published instruments. In getting the crisis self-efficacy

level of teachers, a crisis self-efficacy scale was developed by Sejin Park (2016). The teachers' work commitment level was gathered using the Revised Three-Component Model Employee Commitment Survey by J. P. Meyer and N. Allen. The survey includes three well-validated scales, the Affective Commitment Scale (ACS), the Normative Commitment Scale (NCS), and the Continuance Commitment Scale (CCS). Each is scored separately and can be used to identify the "commitment profile" of employees within an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

- The procedures of the study was done in three phases, namely: (a) profiling of teachers and measuring of their crisis self-efficacy level and commitment.
- The data that gathered from the survey was analyzed using the following statistical tool:
- Frequency distribution and percentage. These were used to arrange the data by categories and to determine the corresponding frequencies and percentages.
- Mean. This was used to determine the level of teachers' crisis self-efficacy, and work commitment profile.

t-test for independent samples. The independent samples t-test was utilized for inferential statistics analyzed at .05 level of significance to test the difference between the teachers' crisis self-efficacy level and work commitment profile when grouped according to sex, age, length of service and educational attainment.

ANOVA. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to compare means between the groups that are being studied and determines whether any of those means are statistically significantly different from each other (Lund Research Ltd, 2018). Through this tool, the significant differences in the levels of teachers' crisis self-efficacy level and work commitment profile when grouped according to sex, age, length of service, and educational attainment of teachers will be determined.

Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) is a measure of the strength of the association between two variables. It gives information about the magnitude of the association, or correlation and direction of the relationship (Statistics Solutions, 2020).

Ethical Issues

The researcher sought permission from the public school district supervisor before the conduct of the data gathering. To uphold the confidentiality of the research data, all research input was treated anonymously. The researchers also informed the participants that a copy of the research bulletin would be sent to them after the completion of the research paper so they would be aware of the results of the study.

Participants' Crisis Self-Efficacy

Table 1
Teachers' Level of Crisis Self-Efficacy

Category		*M*	*Description*	*SD*
A. Entire Group		5.94	High Level	.43
B. Educational Attainment	Baccalaureate Degree	5.92	High Level	.42
	Post Baccalaureate Degree	5.97	High Level	.45
C. Length of Service	Short	6.00	High Level	.43
	Long	5.88	High Level	.43
D. Grade Level Taught	Elementary	5.95	High Level	.44
	Secondary	5.92	High Level	.43

Note: 1.00 – 2.50 Low Crisis Self-Efficacy Level 2.51 – 5.50 Average Crisis Self-Efficacy Level
5.51 – 7.00 High Crisis Self-Efficacy Level

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As shown in Table 1, teachers across the board, regardless of education level, experience, or grade level, displayed remarkably high self-efficacy in handling crises, according to a recent study. With consistently high scores and low variances within each group, these findings contradict previous research by Tas et al. (2021) that reported low teacher confidence in online learning. Notably, educational attainment had little impact on crisis self-efficacy, suggesting it may be fostered by experience and development efforts like those outlined in studies by Marahasi & Assgar (2019) and Lee, Watson & Watson (2020). This unexpected

result highlights the critical role of teachers' self-efficacy in navigating turbulent times like pandemics and calls for further exploration of its implications for professional development programs and broader education system preparedness.

Table 2
Teachers' Organizational Commitment Level

Category		M	Description	SD
A. Entire Group		4.34	*Average Commitment*	.70
B. Educational Attainment	Baccalaureate Degree	4.29	*Average Commitment*	.70
	Post Baccalaureate Degree	4.41	*Average Commitment*	.70
C. Length of Service	Short	4.31	*Average Commitment*	.71
	Long	4.37	*Average Commitment*	.70
D. Grade Level Taught	Elementary	4.29	*Average Commitment*	.75
	Secondary	4.41	*Average Commitment*	.61

Note: 1.00 – 2.50 Low Level of Commitment (LLC) 2.51 – 5.50 Average Level of Commitment (ALC)
5.51 – 7.00 High Level of Commitment (HLC)

In Table 2, it is shown that teachers across the board, regardless of education level, experience, or grade level, displayed an average level of organizational commitment in a recent study, subtle nuances emerged beneath the surface. Averaging around 4.34 with some variability (SD=0.70), their commitment fell within the "Average Commitment" category. Interestingly, post-baccalaureate teachers and those at secondary schools edged out their counterparts with slightly higher commitment scores (4.41 vs. 4.29 and 4.41 vs. 4.29, respectively). However, a cautionary note arises when focusing on elementary school teachers: their higher standard deviation (0.75) compared to secondary teachers (0.61) hints at wider differences in commitment within their ranks. This suggests that factors beyond the scope of this study, perhaps job satisfaction or workplace environment, might play a more prominent role in shaping their organizational dedication. While education attained, experience and grade level appear to have minimal effects on overall commitment, further research is needed to delve deeper into the intricate factors driving commitment variations within specific teacher subgroups, especially among elementary school educators.

Differences in Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy Levels

Table 3 indicates that teachers' crisis self-efficacy remained remarkably consistent across their educational attainment and grade levels, with no statistically significant differences found ($p > 0.05$). However, when examining length of service, a curious trend emerged: teachers with shorter tenures showed marginally higher self-efficacy ($p = 0.070$), hinting at the potential influence of factors beyond experience, inviting further investigation (Hancock & Munakata, 2009; Day & Marks, 2000). This nuanced picture underscores the need to delve deeper into the intricacies of crisis self-efficacy in educators, potentially beyond traditional demographic boundaries.

Differences in Teachers' Crisis Self-Efficacy Levels

Table 3
t-test Results for the Differences in the Crisis Self- Efficacy Levels of Teachers Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Grade Level Taught

Category		M	t-value	df	2-tail prob.
A. Highest Educational Attainment	Baccalaureate Degree	5.92	.808	184	.420
	Post Baccalaureate Degree	5.97			
B. Length of Service	Short	5.99	1.821	184	.070
	Long	5.88			
C. Grade Level Taught	Elementary Teacher	5.95	.569	184	.570
	Secondary Teacher	5.92			

Legend: 1.00 – 2.50 Low Crisis Self-Efficacy Level 2.51 – 5.50 Average Crisis Self-Efficacy Level
5.51 – 7.00 High Crisis Self-Efficacy Level

Table 4 shows the result of the t-test for the difference in the Level of Organizational Commitment of Teachers Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Grade Level Taught.

The t-value of 1.116 with 184 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.266 suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment between teachers with a Baccalaureate Degree and those with a Post Baccalaureate Degree.

The t-value of 0.529 with 184 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.266 suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment between teachers with a short length of service and those with a long length of service.

The t-value of 1.15 with 184 degrees of freedom and a p-value of 0.252 suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in organizational commitment between elementary teachers and secondary teachers.

Table 4
t-test Results for the Differences in the Level of Organizational Commitment of Teachers Grouped According to Highest Educational Attainment, Length of Service and Grade Level Taught

Category		*M*	*t*-value	df	2-tail prob.
A. Highest Educational Attainment	Baccalaureate Degree	4.29	1.116	184	.266
	Post Baccalaureate Degree	4.41			
B. Length of Service	Short	4.31	.529	184	.266
	Long	4.37			
C. Grade Level Taught	Elementary Teacher	4.29	1.15	184	.252
	Secondary Teacher	4.41			

Note: 1.00 – 2.50 Low Level of Commitment (LLC) 2.51 – 5.50 Average Level of Commitment (ALC)
5.51 – 7.00 High Level of Commitment (HLC) *p<0.05

In all three cases, the p-values are greater than the commonly used significance level of 0.05 (or 5%). This indicates that there is no strong statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that there are no significant differences in organizational commitment based on these three variables.

Data in table 5 is a result of the Pearson correlations to assess the relationship between Commitment Level and Crisis Self-Efficacy Level. For commitment level, Pearson Correlation: r(186) = .067, p = .180 (one-tailed) and for Crisis Self-Efficacy Level, Pearson Correlation: r(186) = .067, p = .180 (one-tailed).

Table 5
Correlations between Commitment Level and Crisis Self-Efficacy

	COMMITMENT LEVEL	CRISIS SELF-EFFICACY LEVEL
Commitment Level		
Pearson Correlation	1	.067
Sig. (1-tailed)		.180
N	186	186
Crisis Self-Efficacy Level		
Pearson Correlation	.067	1
Sig. (1-tailed)	.180	
N	186	186

Both Commitment Level and Crisis Self-Efficacy Level demonstrated a positive correlation of approximately .067, indicating a weak positive association. However, these correlations were not statistically significant (p > .05, one-tailed) in a sample of 186 participants. This suggests that there is no evidence to support a significant one-tailed correlation between these two variables in the given sample.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study's result of a weak positive correlation between commitment level and crisis self-efficacy suggests that

there is a tendency for individuals with higher commitment levels to have slightly higher levels of crisis self-efficacy. This finding aligns with some theoretical assumptions, as higher commitment might indicate a stronger sense of dedication and responsibility, potentially leading to increased confidence in managing crises.

However, it's crucial to note that this correlation is not statistically significant ($p > .05$, one-tailed) in the sample of 186 participants. This implies that the observed relationship between commitment and crisis self-efficacy may have occurred due to chance and is not a reliable, generalizable finding.

To contextualize these findings, let's consider related research on commitment and self-efficacy. Commitment, often explored in the context of organizational behavior, can encompass various aspects, such as job commitment and organizational commitment. Self-efficacy, on the other hand, pertains to individuals' beliefs in their abilities to perform tasks and handle challenges effectively.

One study by Noesgaard, M. &, Jørgensen (2023) explored organizational commitment, suggesting that individuals with high levels of organizational commitment are more likely to engage in positive behaviors that benefit the organization. While this study doesn't directly assess the relationship with self-efficacy, it implies that commitment may be associated with proactive behavior, including crisis management.

In the realm of self-efficacy, Bandura's self-efficacy theory emphasizes that individuals with higher self-efficacy are more likely to engage in goal-directed behaviors. This theory suggests that people with greater self-efficacy may be more inclined to take on challenging tasks, including managing crises.

The finding of a weak, non-significant correlation between commitment and crisis self-efficacy has several implications. First, it suggests that commitment level alone may not be a strong predictor of crisis self-efficacy. Other factors, such as training, experience, and personal traits, might play a more substantial role in determining individuals' confidence in handling crises. Second, it highlights the need for further research to explore the complex relationship between commitment and self-efficacy, especially in the context of crisis management. Future studies with larger sample sizes and different participant demographics may provide more insights into this relationship.

In conclusion, the study's results indicating a weak positive correlation between commitment level and crisis self-efficacy, which is not statistically significant in the given sample, underscore the complexity of the relationship between these two variables. While commitment and self-efficacy are valuable traits in various contexts, this study suggests that they may not be strongly linked when it comes to managing crises. Further research is needed to better understand the interplay between commitment, self-efficacy, and crisis management.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to extend their deepest gratitude to all the people who helped in fulfilling this study.

- To the school heads who allowed them to conduct the study in the school.
- To all the teachers who willingly participated in the study.
- To researchers' families and friends who provides them love and support all throughout their journey.
- And most especially, to Almighty God who gives all the provision, wisdom, encouragement, strength, and endless opportunities.

REFERENCES

[1] Ask Media Group, LLC. (2020). Retrieved January 11, 2020, from https://www. Altun, M. (2017). The Effects of Teacher Commitment on Student Achievement. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 7(11). doi: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i11/3475

[2] Azurin, C. (2020, May). Beyond COVID 19 supernova. Is another education coming? Journal of Professional Capital and Community, 5, 381-390. doi:10.1108JPCC-05-2020-0019

[3] Baloran, E. T., & Hernan, J. T. (2020, July 24). 1. doi:10.20944/preprints202007.0599.v1

[4] Explorable. (2020). Retrieved 2020, from https://explorable.com/stratified-sampling

[5] Lee, D., Watson, S. & Watson, W. (2020). The Relationships Between Self-Efficacy, Task Value, and Self-Regulated Learning Strategies in Massive Open Online Courses. International Review of

Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 21(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v20i5.4389

[6] Lund Research Ltd. (2018). Retrieved January 12, 2020, from https://statistics.laerd.com/statistical-guides/one-way-anova-statistical-guide.php

[7] Meyer, J. (1991). A Three Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment.

[8] Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

[9] Noesgaard, M. &, Jørgensen, F., Building organizational commitment through cognitive and relational job crafting, European Management Journal,2023, ISSN 0263-2373, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2023.01.002.

[10] Statistics Solutions. (2020). Retrieved September 2, 2020, from https://statisticssolutions.com/pearsons-correlation-coefficient/

[11] Weiner, B. (1986). An attribution theory of motivation and emotion.