

Research Article

**Work Efficacy Of Teacher Educators**

**Mr.S.Manikandan,**

Part-Time Ph.D Scholar,

Alagappa University College of Education,

Alagappa University,

Karaikudi,

e-mail: bakkiyamsankar@gmail.com.

**Dr.C.Anbuchelvan,**

Research Guide & Assistant Professor,

Alagappa University College of Education,

Alagappa University ,

Karaikudi,

e-mail: anbueducation123@gmail.com.

**Abstract**

Work Efficacy is a recent concept that derived from corporate sector that not only confines its limitations to business area but it too extendable its applications to educational practices that form theoretical basis in which individuals or respective teachers or teacher educators with higher work self-efficacy are assumed more likely to undertake more commitment, responsibility, accountability, and to be successful in their workplace performance. In order to fulfill the conceptual and sample research gap, the investigator is very much interested to measure the work efficacy level of teacher educators thereby locating their present status and to develop suitable measures for improving their efficacy level. For that the researcher adopted **Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari, & Upinder Dhar(1999)** for measuring work efficacy level of 600 sample as teacher educators selected based on the stratified random sampling technique from 40 colleges of education in four districts of Tamilnadu such as Namakkal, Dharmapuri, Salem and Krishnagiri with simple objectives. The descriptive analysis revealed that teacher educators has average work efficacy. The normal distribution of the curve is slightly deviates from its normality. The differential analysis confirmed that age is significantly influencing work efficacy of teacher educators. So it is need to develop suitable implicative measures that are necessary for improving the work efficacy of teacher educators.

**Key words: Work Efficacy, Teacher Educators**

**WORK EFFICACY**

It is a measure of a range of job behaviour of an individual with expected and useful practices that referring to beliefs in one's command of the social requirements necessary for success in the workplace.

Since work efficacy is a malleable property, there are different methods for employees to achieve relative success in their jobs within the workplace by increasing their confidence level about performing a range of social behaviours with useful limitations and to develop their work self-efficacy along with a number of distinct dimensions like learning, problem solving, pressure, role expectations, team work, sensitivity, work politics, and general confidence in managing oneself well in the workplace. Teacher efficacy can be described as beliefs about whether teachers can make a difference with students.” (Lin, Gorrell &

**Taylor, 1998).**

### **RATIONALE OF THE STUDY**

Work efficacy is the self-belief of oneself and anxiety about one’s own ability to perform well in competition that occurs in almost every aspect of working atmosphere. Self-efficacy contributes to motivation by influencing the challenges that people pursue, the effort they spend, and their perseverance in the face of obstacles (Bandura, 1989).According to Stajkovic and Luthans (1998), a significant correlation was found between weighted self-efficacy and work-related performance. When this state occurs too frequently or when it is not overcome at the right time, problems arise in the performance of teachers which reflects deviations in individuals’ achievement outcomes. It is truly acceptable that a teacher with low self-esteem, lack of self-confidence and performance expectation in teaching is the factors that are not desirable to bring desirable achievement among its own and from their students. **Zellars et.al.(2008)** found that job-related self-efficacy contributed to the political and leadership skill of a teacher that are necessary to cope with strain relationships inside in an organization. Here the school of psychologists also stresses the need and importance of work efficacy for the school teachers, and teacher educators which helps them to produce a successful outcome in their student’s achievement. It is too challengeable for the total teaching outcomes in the case of efforts put by the teacher educators in the teacher education institutions. It is no doubt that teacher educators with high work efficacy can easily admire the active participants in their profession. **Ashton and Webb (1986)** showed that students learn much more from teachers who feel efficacious to manage educational demands than from those beset with self doubts. They work collaboratively with colleagues; they seek out and are responsive to advice about educational issues. They communicate effectively with their students, colleagues, parents/carers and community members. Therefore the teacher educators and their work efficacy is mandatory that helps them to identify, plan and evaluate their own professional learning needs that are very helpful for institutional development.

### **OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE TERMS**

- **Work Efficacy:** According to the investigator, the effectiveness and its ability to do teaching work as well as performance of teacher educators.
- **Teacher Educators:** According to the investigator, the teacher educators are one who teaches and guide student teachers at pre-service training programmes, and prospective teacher educators in teacher education training colleges.

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The followings are the important objectives of the present study.

1. To know the normality of the work efficacy score of teacher educators.
2. To know the overall level of work efficacy of teacher educators with respect to whole sample.
3. To know whether there is any significant difference among the different teaching experience groups (Below 5 Years, 5-10 Years, & Above 10 Years) of teacher educators with respect to their work efficacy.

### **HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY**

The followings are the important hypotheses of the present study.

1. The distribution scores of work efficacy of teacher educators is not normal.
2. The overall level of work efficacy of teacher educators with respect to whole sample is high in nature.
3. There is no significant difference among the different age groups (Below 30 Years, 30-40 Years, & Above 40 years) of teacher educators with respect to their work efficacy.

## METHODOLOGY

The investigator preferred **normative methodology for the present study**. The population for the present study is the 1878 teacher educators who are working in the fourty self-financing college of education in four districts of Tamilnadu. The investigator has selected from which 600 teacher educators from the total target population. The tool developed by **Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari, & Upinder Dhar (1999)** was used to measure the work efficacy of the teacher educators. This research scale consisted of **sixty statements**. The **reliability of the tool was established by using split half method**. The correlation was worked out between the two halves of the scores of tests. The correlation co-efficient was found as **0.8212**. The square root of reliability gives the intrinsic validity. Therefore the intrinsic validity of the Work Efficacy Scale is 0.9062.

## ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Descriptive analysis involves calculation of the measure of central tendencies and the measures of variability. The computed values of the mean and the standard deviation are used to describe the properties of the particular sample.

### Normality and Overall Level on the Scores of Work Efficacy of Teacher Educators

In order to find out the normality on the scores of work efficacy of teacher educators, the mean, median, mode, SEM, SD, Skewness, Kurtosis, and Range values are given in the following Table .1.1 to study the deviation from the normal distribution property from the scores on collected data.

**Table 1.1 Distribution Scores of Work Efficacy of Teacher Educators**

N	Mean	Median	Mode	SEM	SD	S	K	R	Min	Max
600	232.18	232.00	230	0.212	5.19	-0.080	-0.962	19	222	241

S-Skewness, K- Kurtosis, Min-Minimum, Max-Maximum, SEM- Standard Error of Mean, R-Range

It is understood from the Table.1.1, the ascending order of scores arrangement revealed that the minimum score of the work efficacy score of teacher educators was 222 and the maximum score was 241 and confirmed existence of higher score range difference(R=19). The result further indicated that the Mean (232.18), Median (232.00) and Mode (230) didn't coincide with the normal distribution of the curve. The mean value 232.18 indicates that the whole **sample have average category in the work efficacy (i.e. 226 to 237)**. The further verification was made with regard to skewness and kurtosis. The skewness value was found as -0.080 which was found against the zero normal value and kurtosis was -0.952 against the standard value of 0.263. The whole distribution was negatively skewed and tending to be platykurtic in nature.

The negative kurtosis values indicate the curve is slightly aligned on the left side of the normal distribution of the curve. Thus the investigator concluded that the scores obtained from teacher educators on work efficacy deviates slightly from the normality. The distribution scores of work efficacy of teacher educators are not normal. Therefore, the distribution of the normal probability curve is asymmetrical in nature. It is further inferred that for the whole sample the overall level of work efficacy of teacher educators is average in nature.

**DIFFERENTIAL ANALYSIS**

Differential analysis is an important procedure by which the researcher is able to make decisions or inferences involving the determination of the statistical significance of difference between sub-groups with reference to selected variables with the use of ‘t’ test and ‘F’ test. One way analysis of variance (F-test) was computed to find out whether there are significant differences among the three sub groups of teacher educators in respect of their work efficacy and it is given in the Table.1.2.

**Table 1.2**  
**F-Test Value of Teacher Educators with respect to Age**

Age in Years	N	Mean	SD	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value
Below 30 Years	317	193.20	5.23	Between Groups	3996.095	2	1998.048	84.283 S at 0.05 Level
30-40 Years	152	194.53	4.93	Within Groups	1436.023	597	23.678	
Above 40 Years	131	199.73	3.74	Total		599		

S-Significant, df(2,597), F-Table Value- 3.00

It is proven from the Table 1.2, that the ‘F’ value obtained is 84.283 and it is found to be greater than the table value of 3.00 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore the null hypothesis is rejected. It may be inferred that the teacher educators belonging to different age sub groups differ significantly among themselves in respect of their work efficacy. Therefore age has significant influencing factor on work efficacy of teacher educators.

It is inferred that there is significant difference between teacher educators whose age as below 30 years, 30-40 years, and above 40 years in their work efficacy. While comparing the mean scores of teacher educators whose age as below 30 years, 30-40 years, and above 40 years in their work efficacy, teacher educators whose age as above 40 years (mean=199.73) are better than teacher educators whose age as 30- 40 years (mean=194.53), and teacher educators whose age as below 30 years (mean=193.20) in their work efficacy. So the work efficacy increases with age group increases.

**IMPLICATIONS**

The findings have shown that the teacher educators have average work efficacy with respect to whole sample and teacher educators with more age groups have higher work efficacy than their counterparts. A teacher educator in the teacher training institutions is the entire role model for development and sedimentation of all necessary behavioural internship, inservice and preservice training programmes pertaining to work efficacy in terms of teaching and research among the school teachers, prospective student teachers and prospective teacher educators. So newly recruited teacher educators have just get lessons and ideas from the senior teacher educators to increase their work efficacy culture by keeping out the ego classes. Therefore, he/she should discharge their professional responsibilities and their work efficacy according to the existing rules and adhere to procedures and methods consistent with their own institutional bodies and professional organizations with utmost care and professional interest. Then only teacher educators’ effectiveness and their ability to do with different teaching tasks as well as performance get improved well. Further this research outcomes recommends, a in-depth study on work efficacy with different dimensions of teacher educators have studied with their performance with respect to their collaborative team work, learning higher degrees, teaching, and research experience, accountability, work commitment and work achievement in given tasks. Influence of other such factors

like management, peer group support and social relationship with junior staff and subordinates are to be studied.

### CONCLUSION

Today the multiskilled role of teacher educator increases with diversified need of learners, and work environment. Their role as trainers with respect to teacher education gets very much important in pre-service, inservice and internship practices. A teacher educator should concentrate on developing their own work efficacy within them to a maximum level thereby integrating all stakeholders of teacher education and availing all conducive work environment for their best performance. Teaching profession is a noblest of all profession which simple requires careful observation and interaction with all the stakeholders of education like policy makers, school heads, management, parents, trainees, students, and colleagues, etc. Teacher educators should take the liability of teaching profession seriously and perform their duties efficiently.

### REFERENCES

1. Ashton, P. T. (1986). Teacher efficacy: A motivational paradigm for effective teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, 28-32.
2. Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a Difference: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy and Student Achievement*. New York: Longman.
3. Bandura, A. (1989). Human agency in social cognitive theory. *The American Psychologist*, 44, 1175–1184.
4. Brownell, M. T., & Pajares, F. (1999). Teacher efficacy and perceived success in mainstreaming students with learning and behavior problems. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 22(3), 154-164.
5. effects of political skill, perceived control, and job-related self-efficacy on the relationship between negative affectivity and physiological strain. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29, 549–571.
6. Lin, H., Gorrell, J., & Taylor (1998). Pre-service teachers' efficacy beliefs in Taiwan. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 32(1), 17-25
7. Occupational Self Efficacy Scale, National Psychological Corporation, Agra
8. Richter, E., Brunner, M., & Richter, D. (2021). Teacher educators' task perception and its relationship to professional identity and teaching practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 101, 103303.
9. Sanjyot Pethe, Sushama Chaudhari, & Upinder Dhar. (1999). *Psychological Test: Manual for*
10. Sharma, U., Loreman, T., & Forlin, C. (2012). Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices. *Journal of research in special educational needs*, 12(1), 12-21.
11. Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta
12. analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240–261.
13. Stetz, T. A., Stetz, M. C., & Bliese, P. D. (2006). The importance of self-efficacy in the moderating effects of social support on stressor-strain relationships. *Work and Stress*, 20, 49–59.
14. Tahseen, N. (2015). Work-related stress among teacher-educators: Evidence from Punjab. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 357-375.
15. Wheatley, K. F. (2002). The potential benefits of teacher efficacy doubts for educational reform. *Teaching and teacher education*, 18(1), 5-22.
16. Wheatley, K. F. (2005). The case for reconceptualizing teacher efficacy research. *Teaching and teacher education*, 21(7), 747-766.
17. Wyatt, M., & Dikilitaş, K. (2021). English language teachers' self-efficacy beliefs for grammar instruction: implications for teacher educators. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(5), 541-553.
18. Yin, H., Xie, C., Hu, H., & Wang, M. (2020). Demystifying and sustaining the resilience of teacher educators: the perspectives of Teaching–Research Officers in China. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 21(2), 311-323.

Mr.S.Manikandan, Dr.C.Anbuchelvan,

19.Zellars, K. L., Perrewe, P. L., Rossi, A. M., Tepper, B. J., & Ferris, G. R. (2008). Moderating