Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal – Vol. 9, No. 10
Publication Date: October 25, 2022
DOI:10.14738/assrj.910.13157.
Sihotang, H., Murniarti, E., & Purba, S. C. (2022). Management of Self-Efficiency Management and Work Commitment at the School of the Cooperation Agreement Unit. Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 9(10). 398-409.

Management of Self-Efficiency Management and Work Commitment at the School of the Cooperation Agreement Unit

Hotmaulina Sihotang
Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jalan Mayjen Sutoyo No.2 Cawang. Jakarta

Erni Murniarti
Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jalan Mayjen Sutoyo No.2 Cawang. Jakarta

Santri Chintia Purba
Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Jalan Mayjen Sutoyo No.2 Cawang. Jakarta

ABSTRACT

This study aims to reveal factors (1) reveal the dominant factors of self-efficacy and describe the characteristics of self-efficacy; (2) reveal the dominant factor of work commitment and describe the characteristics of work commitment; (3) reveal whether there is a teacher's self-efficacy, and work commitment based on gender; (4) reveal whether there are differences in self-efficacy and work commitment based on educational qualifications; (5) reveal whether there are differences in self-efficacy and work commitment based on work period. The study used a quantitative approach with a survey method with factor analysis using SPSS 26, and the study population was all SPK school teachers and a sample of 258 people with the purposive sampling technique. Data was obtained through a questionnaire. Data analysis used factor analysis to determine the dominant factors of self-efficacy and work commitment variables. The difference test uses the Tukey test. The results showed that the dominant factor of self-efficacy is the ability to solve problems, and the dominant factor of work commitment is working continuously. In addition, it was found that there was no difference in teacher self-efficacy and work commitment based on educational qualifications and gender. The longer the teacher works, the more self-efficacy and work commitment increase.

Keywords: self-efficacy, work commitment, gender, work period.

INTRODUCTION

The era of globalization can be seen through advances in technology and information that are very fast, making humans obtain information quickly according to their needs. People devote much energy and time to reaching the future and controlling the unwanted (Maddux, J. E., & Kleiman, E. M., 2018). Parents with a good economy desire to send their children to quality and international standard schools. The Indonesian government grants a Cooperation Agreement Unit (SPK) permit to schools that meet the standards. Schools with SPK permits use the national curriculum and the international curriculum. The Cooperation Education Unit is an academic

unit organized/managed based on collaboration between accredited and recognized Foreign Education Institutions (LPA) (Permendikbud No. 31 of 2014). Schools with SPK permits for elementary, middle, and high school levels. Teachers who teach SPK schools are generally women with a working period of 1-16 years with an age range of 25-55 years (February 2020). Good governance requires good human resources, good teachers, and education personnel. Good teachers have good self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the self-perception of self-quality in certain situations in performing tasks (Alwisol, 2009). Self-efficacy is influential in life in the family, the environment, and work. Self-efficacy is a person's belief about one's abilities to the performance of one's behavior and is shown by behavior that will lead to performance results as expected. Previous studies show that SPK teachers' work commitment is influenced by personality (Sihotang, H., Purba, S. C., & Sinambela, S., 2022). Self-efficacy has three dimensions: magnitude, generality, and strength (Kusrieni, D., 2014; Basito, M. D., Arthur, R., & Daryati, D., 2018).

In this study, it can be interpreted that a teacher who has self-efficacy has confidence in the ability to organize and carry out learning tasks to achieve the goal of producing students who are competent in the affective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains. Self-efficacy refers to the level of work difficulty that each member of the organization believes will be able to overcome on their own (Penn, L. T., & Lent, R. W., 2019). In Jiang and Wang's research, it was found that someone with solid self-efficacy will be diligent and eager to try to do a difficult job even though the obstacles are heavy (Jiang, Z., Hu, X., & Wang, Z., 2018). Also, Alessandra et al. stated that individuals are not easily hit by adversity and can even overcome difficulties or negative things they experience (Alessandri, G., Perinelli, E., De Longis, E., Schaufeli, W. B., Theodorou, A., Borgogni, L., & Cinque, L., 2018). Teachers who have self-efficacy will work with enthusiasm and loyalty to the school. The results of research in Brunei, female teachers are humble and realistic, while male teachers stand out in terms of knowledge (Mundia, L., 2020). Someone who works passionately and loyally is also called a person who is committed to the organization. Teachers who are committed to their work will show behavior and emotion towards their work and always show the best performance, which impacts organizational effectiveness (Pane, Elpi Parida: 2018). Self-efficacy is directly and positively correlated with work commitment (Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S., 2017; Liu, E., 2019).

Organizational commitment is the trust level of each organization member towards the goals of the organization and the desire to work for the organization (Andriana, G. P., 2018). It is similar to Lutans' (2011), stating that organizational commitment is the desire of every member of the organization to work hard to follow the values and goals of the organization. In this case, teachers who commit will be loyal and will not move to work elsewhere. However, in reality, some teachers who teach at the Cooperation Agreement Unit schools every year move to another place within the same area as their original teaching place. It is important to investigate why there is a turnover every year. It follows the results of research by Sihotang et al. (2022) in cooperative agreement schools in general. Female teachers have a strong self-efficacy personality, and work commitment is also high, but some still resign and move to other schools every year. Therefore, studying self-efficacy based on gender and years of service is necessary. If there is a transfer of teachers, the school is overwhelmed to find a replacement because new teachers need time to adjust. Students also need time to adjust to the new teacher. It results in the achievement of school targets being hampered. Based on the description above,

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157

it becomes exciting, and it is necessary to examine the management of self-efficacy and work commitment of teachers in the cooperative agreement unit school.

METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach with a survey method (Cresswell, J., 2018). The research population is all SPK school teachers in DKI Jakarta, with a minimum accreditation rating of B. The sampling technique is purposive sampling, and the number of samples is 258 teachers—data analysis using SPSS 26. The data of this study consisted of variables of self-efficacy, work commitment, length of teaching, and gender. Data on the variables of self-efficacy and work commitment were obtained through a questionnaire with a Likert scale—research data obtained through a questionnaire. Self-efficacy indicators: (1) able to solve problems; (2) belief in being able to solve complex problems; (3) able to learn from experience; (4) positive thinking; (5) confidence; (6) have a responsible attitude; (7) Do not give up easily. Indicators of work commitment: (1) affective commitment, (2) ongoing commitment, (3) normative commitment.

Research data analysis using factor analysis reveals the dominant factor of self-efficacy and work commitment. Factor analysis can be carried out if it meets the requirements that the data are regular and homogeneous using the Kolmogorov-Smirnova test (Quraisy, A., 2020). At the same time, the difference test uses the Tukey test (Martin & Bridgmon, 2012; Kim, 2014). In addition, factor analysis if (1) the value of Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO MSA) is more significant than 0.05 and the value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Sig.) is less than 0.05; (2) There is a strong relationship or correlation between the indicators to be analyzed on the variables of self-efficacy and work commitment. It is indicated by the value of the Anti-Image Correlation between analyzed indicators greater than 0.05. Data analysis with descriptive statistics ANOVA (Santoso, S., 2019).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dominant Factors of Self-Efficacy

Based on data processing using SPSS 26 to determine the dominant factor of self-efficacy, several conditions must be met. Factor analysis requirements are (1) KMO MSA value > 0.05 with Sig. < 0.05, KMO MSA value > 0.05 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Sig.) value is smaller of 0.05. It was found that the KMO MSA was 0.828, and the value of Sig = 0.00, which means that the KMO value was > 0.05 and Sig. > 0.05 so that it can be concluded that the factor test conditions were met; (2) There is a strong relationship or correlation between the indicators to be analyzed on the self-efficacy variable. The Anti-Image correlation value indicates it between analyzed indicators > 0.05. The anti-image correlation value is above 0.05, so it meets the requirements of factor analysis. Furthermore, to find out the various dominations of each indicator on self-efficacy, it can be seen using the results of commonalities in the SPPS output as follows:

Table 1 . Communalities Self Efficacy

	Initial	Extraction
Problem_Solver	1.000	.492
Confidence_Difficult_Task	1.000	.639
Experience	1.000	.619
Positive_Thinking	1.000	.568
Self_Confidence	1.000	.600
Responsibility	1.000	.395
No_Frustration	1.000	.474

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Based on table 1, it is found that the Communalities value of self-efficacy in the problem-solver aspect is 0.492 (49.2%), confidence difficult task is 0.639 (63.9%), the experience is 0.619 (61.9%), the positive thinking is 0.568 (56.8%), self-confidence is 0.60 (60%), the responsibility is 0.395 (39.5%) and no frustration is 0.474 (47.4%).

Table 2 Total Variance Explained Self-efficacy

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	3.786	54.085	54.085	3.786	54.085	54.085
2	.888	12.684	66.770			
3	.684	9.768	76.538			
4	.567	8.099	84.636			
5	.514	7.341	91.978			
6	.326	4.655	96.633			
7	.236	3.367	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Based on the results of table 3, it is found that the total factors formed are only one factor, where all existing indicators can be combined and interrelated. The Extraction sum of squared loadings value is 3.786, and only one component has an extraction value. Therefore, it is concluded that only one factor can be used with initial eigenvalues greater than one, namely 3.786. This factor can explain 55.085% of the data variance for self-efficacy. So to see the most dominant indicators that affect self-efficacy can be seen in the following matrix component table.

Table 3 Component Matrix Self-efficacy

	Component 1
Problem_Solver	.701
Confidence_Difficult_Task	.800
Experience	.787
Positive_Thinking	.753
Self_Confidence	.774
Responsibility	.629
No_Frustration	.688

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
a. one component extracted.

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157

From the seven self-efficacy indicators measured, it can be concluded that the most dominant one in measuring self-efficacy is the belief in solving problems, which is 0.8. It means that 80% of confidence in solving problems affects the self-efficacy of an SPK teacher. Furthermore, the second indicator is that work experience affects the self-efficacy of an SPK teacher by 0.787 (78.7%). In addition to work experience, a person's self-confidence affects a teacher's self-efficacy, 0.774 (77.4%). A teacher's self-confidence affects his self-efficacy. The ability to think positively also has an influence that is not far less than the previous three indicators. One's thinking ability also affects self-efficacy, 0.753 (75.3%). Positive thinking ability affects teacher self-efficacy. The ability to solve problems has a value of 0.701 (70.1%) of a person's ability to solve problems can affect his or her efficacy at work. The work no frustration has a value of 0.688 (68.8%). It is followed by the next indicator, which is responsible for 0.629 (62.9%).

Dominant Factor of Work Commitment

Based on the data processing results using SPSS 26, several conditions must be met to determine the dominant factor of work commitment. The value of KMO MSA is > 0.05, and the value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Sig.) is less than 0.05. Based on data processing, it was found that KMO MSA = 0.634 with Sig. <0.05, the first-factor analysis requirements were met. There is a strong correlation between indicators of work commitment variables. It is indicated by the value of the Anti-Image Correlation between analyzed indicators > 0.05. The results of data processing obtained anti-image covariance affective 0.758; sustainability 0.588; normality 0.681. All anti-image correlation values are above 0.05, so they meet the requirements for factor analysis.

Table 4. Total variance Explained work commitment

Compo	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
nent	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1	1.929	64.291	64.291	1.929	64.291	64.291
2	.666	22.206	86.498			
3	.405	13.502	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Based on table 4, the total factors formed are only one factor, where all existing indicators can be combined and interrelated. The Extraction sum of squared loadings value is 1,929, and only one component has an extraction value. Therefore, it is concluded that only one factor can be used, namely the initial eigenvalues more significant than one, namely 1.929, meaning that this factor can explain 64.291% of the data variance for Work Commitment. The most dominant indicators that affect self-efficacy can be seen in the following matrix component table.

Table 5. Component Matrix work commitment

	Component 1
Affective	.742
Sustainability	.866
Normativity	.793

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Based on table 5, the indicator that has the most significant influence on a teacher's work commitment is a continuous commitment, which is 0.866 or 86.6%. Continuing work commitment affects the work commitment of a teacher in the School of Work Agreement (SPK). It is followed by normative and work commitments, worth 0.793 and 0.742, respectively. 79.3% of normative commitment affects work commitment, and 74.2% of practical commitment affects a teacher's work commitment.

Differences in self-efficacy and work commitment by gender

Self-efficacy by Gender

Prerequisite tests were first carried out, namely normality tests and homogeneity tests from grouped self-efficacy data, to determine the differences in teacher self-efficacy based on gender. From the self-efficacy data using the normality test, it was found that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov sig. <0.05 and the Shapiro-Wilk Statistic Sig. <0.05 means the data is not normally distributed. Furthermore, the second prerequisite test is the homogeneity test. Based on the homogeneity test of the variance of the data, it was obtained that the value of Sig.> 0.05 means that the existing data is homogeneous.

Table 6 Test Statistics

	Self_Efficacy
Mann-Whitney U	6965.000
Wilcoxon W	10535.000
Z	-.611
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.541

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

The value of asymp Sig. (2-tailed) from the Mann-Whitney U test is sig.=0.541, which means the result is sig>0.05. With a value of Sig.> 0.05, it is concluded that there is no difference in a teacher's self-efficacy, both male and female. Alternatively, it can be simplified that the self-efficacy of male and female teachers is the same.

Work Commitment Based on Gender

A prerequisite test was first carried out, namely the normality test and homogeneity test from the work commitment data grouped by gender to find out the difference in the work commitment of teachers based on gender. The normality test found that the Kolmogorov and Shapiro-Wilk scores and the homogeneity test of work commitment data based on gender were homogeneous.

Table 7 Test Statistics Mann Whitney U

	Work_Commitment
Mann-Whitney U	6512.500
Wilcoxon W	10082.500
Z	-1.418
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.156

a. Grouping Variable: Gender

The value of asymp Sig. (2-tailed) from the Mann-Whitney U test sig.=0.156, the result is sig>0.05. With a value of Sig.> 0.05, it is concluded that there is no difference in a teacher's commitment, both male and female. It shows that a teacher's work commitment is not

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157

influenced by gender. Alternatively, it can be simplified that the work commitment of a male and female teacher is the same.

Test the Differences in Self-Efficacy and Work Commitment Based on Educational Qualifications

Self-Efficacy Based on Education

The self-efficacy analyzed was grouped into three data groups, namely D3, S1, and S2. A prerequisite test was carried out first, namely the normality and homogeneity test, to see the difference in the self-efficacy of the three groups. The Kruskal Wallis test was used to see the difference between the three groups of data, and Kruskal Wallis obtained 0.526, meaning that there was no difference in teacher self-efficacy grouped by educational qualifications. Furthermore, it is necessary to compare the combination of the combination between the 2 data groups formed, namely D3 and S1, D3 and S2, and S1 and S2. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to find the difference because the data were not normally distributed. The results of data processing with Mann Whitney U look like the following table:

Table 8 Test Statistics

	Self_Efficacy		
	D3 and S1	D3 and S2	S1 and S2
Mann-Whitney U	213.500	33.000	3225.000
Wilcoxon W	219.500	39.000	3690.000
Z	-1.094	-.753	-.396
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.274	.452	.692
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]		.491[b]	

a. Grouping Variable: Education

Based on the table above, it is obtained that the value of asymp Sig. Between two groups of teachers with different education is Sig>0. Then obtained:
a. There is no difference in self-efficacy in the D3 and S2.
b. There is no difference in self-efficacy in the D3 and S2.
c. There is no difference in self-efficacy in the S1 and S2.

It means that the self-efficacy of teachers with Diploma Education is the same as that of teachers with undergraduate education. Furthermore, from the average self-efficacy of each group, we can see that these data also show that they are not much different from each other. It is shown in the average between data groups: 1) Self-efficacy D3 is 117; 2) Self-efficacy S1 is 119; and 3) Self-efficacy S2 is 119.43.

Table 9. Descriptives

	Education	Statistic Mean	Std. Error
Self_Efficacy	Diploma	117.00	2.082
	Undergraduate	119.90	.742
	Master	119.43	2.171

Work Commitment Based on Education

The work commitments analyzed in this section are grouped based on three data groups: work commitments to teachers with D3 and S1, D3 and S2, and S1 and S2. The work commitment of the three data groups will be analyzed for differences using statistical analysis.

Table 10. Test Statistics

	Work_Commitment		
	D3 and S1	D3 and S2	S1 and S2
Mann-Whitney U	286.500	40.000	2973.500
Wilcoxon W	292.500	46.000	3438.500
Z	-.450	-.314	-1.059
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.653	.754	.289
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]		.791[b]	

Based on the value of Sig. in the Mann-Whitney U test in the table above, it is obtained that:

a. Asymp Value. Sig=0.653 or sig.>0.05. The point is that there is no difference in work commitment between teachers with D3 and S1.
b. Asymp Value. Sig=0.754 or sig.>0.05. The point is that there is no difference in work commitment between teachers with D3 and S2.
c. Asymp Value. Sig=0.389 or sig.>0.05. The point is that there is no difference in work commitment between teachers with S1 and S2.

So it can be concluded that the work commitment of teachers with different educational backgrounds, such as D3, S1, and S2 Masters, is the same, or there is no difference. We can also see this further based on the average score of work commitment between groups which are not much different from each other, namely 1) The work commitment of teachers with D3 is 55.67; 2) The work commitment of teachers with S1 is 46.60, and 3) The work commitment of teachers with S2 is 45.27.

Test the difference between self-efficacy and work commitment based on the work period.

Self-Efficacy Work Period

A person's self-efficacy can also be influenced by the length of work a person has worked in a particular field. In the data of this study, it was found that there was a variance in the length of work of teachers so that from various lengths of work teachers, they were grouped into four data groups, namely less than two years (df = 28), 2-5 years (df = 61), 5-10 years (df =113)) and more than ten years (df=56). Data analysis started with normality and homogeneity tests as a prerequisite test for the two-mean test to see differences in data groups. Based on the normality test, it was found that the data were not normally distributed because the Sig. in each group is below 0.05, as shown in this table.

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157

Table 11 Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Work_Period	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Self_Efficacy	Less than two years	.114	28	.200*	.960	28	.350
	2-5 years	.113	61	.049	.971	61	.165
	5-10 years	.173	113	.000	.945	113	.000
	more than ten years	.169	56	.000	.954	56	.032

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

The next test used was Mann Whitney U. Abnormal data caused this, but because there were four groups of data to be compared, Kruskal Wallis analysis was performed first. Asymp Value. Sig. in this analysis obtained by 0 means <0.05. It means that there is a difference in average self-efficacy based on the length of work

To see the difference between the two groups of data formed, the Mann-Whitney U test was carried out by comparing the existing groups, namely: 1) under two years and 2-5 years of work; 2) under two years and 5-10 years of work; 3) under two years and over ten years of work, 4) 2-5 years and 5-10 years of work; 5) 2-5 years of work and over ten years of work, 6) 5-10 years of work and more than ten years of work. The results obtained are as follows:

Table 12 Test Statistics

	Self_Efficacy					
	1)	2)	3)	4)	5)	6)
Mann-Whitney U	527.500	759.000	292.500	2942.50	1396.50	3129.000
Wilcoxon W	933.500	1165.00	698.500	4833.50	3287.50	9570.000
Z	-2.886	-4.258	-4.673	-1.592	-1.703	-.117
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.000	.111	.089	.907

a. Grouping Variable: Work_Period

Based on the results in the table above, it can be concluded that:

a. There are differences in teacher self-efficacy with working under two years and 2-5 years working.
b. There is a difference in teacher self-efficacy with working years under two years and working lengths of 5-10 years.
c. There is a difference in teachers' self-efficacy with working years below two years and working years above ten.
d. There is no difference in teacher self-efficacy with 2-5 years of work and 5-10 years of work.
e. There is no difference in teacher self-efficacy between 2-5 years of work and ten years of work.
f. There is no difference in teacher self-efficacy with 5-10 years of work and more than ten years of work.

To see and compare the average score of each group of data, namely, the average length of work under two years is 109.75, the average length of service of 2-5 years is 118.92, the average length of work is 5-10 years is 121.45 and with years of service above ten years is 122.52. So it can be concluded that the longer a person works, the higher his self-efficacy.

Table 13 Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Work_Commitment

	(I) Work_Period	(J) Work_Period	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tamhane	Less than two years	2-5 years	-3.448	1.361	.080
		5-10 years	-7.027*	1.217	.000
		more than ten years	-7.375*	1.241	.000
	2-5 years	Less than two years	3.448	1.361	.080
		5-10 years	-3.579*	1.069	.007
		more than ten years	-3.927*	1.096	.003
	5-10 years	Less than two years	7.027*	1.217	.000
		2-5 years	3.579*	1.069	.007
		more than ten years	-.348	.911	.999
	more than ten years	Less than two years	7.375*	1.241	.000
		2-5 years	3.927*	1.096	.003
		5-10 years	.348	.911	.999

Work Commitment-based work period

A teacher's work commitment is his involvement in doing work to achieve organizational goals that can be seen based on affective, ongoing, and normative commitments. Each commitment can be built through the length of time someone has worked in the field they are engaged. The data prerequisite test was first carried out by looking at the normality and homogeneity of the data to see the difference in work commitment based on the length of work. The sig value on work commitment based on length of work is above 0.05, with the Liliefors test using a sig value on the Shapiro-Wilk. Furthermore, the homogeneity test using homogeneity of variance obtained that the data is not homogeneous because of the value of Sig. <0.05. So the test used for the next is the t-test, or in the SPPS, it is written with Tamhane. The values obtained using the Tamhane test can be seen in the following table:

Based on the table above, it is found that the data significance between different data groups—the value of Sig. <0.05 indicates the difference in work commitment between data groups. So, it can be concluded several things, namely:

a. There is no difference in the work commitment of teachers with working years under two years and 2-5 years of work.
b. There is a difference in the work commitment of teachers with working years under two years and 5-10 years of work.
c. There are differences in the work commitment of teachers with working years below two years and more than ten years of work.
d. There are differences in the work commitment of teachers with 2-5 years and 5-10 years of work.
e. There are differences in the work commitment of teachers with 2-5 years and more than ten years of work.
f. There is no difference in the work commitment of teachers with 5-10 years and more than ten years of work.

This difference can also be seen by comparing the average work commitment based on length of service, namely 1) less than two years of 40.93; 2) 2-5 years of 44.38; 3) 5-10 years of 47.96,

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157

and 4) over ten years of 48.30. So it can be obtained that the longer a teacher works, the higher his work commitment. Following Luth Lutens (2011) and Pongoh, S., & Watung, S., 2018) that one's work commitment reflects an individual's identification and closeness to the organization.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

Based on the results of data analysis, it can be concluded that (1) The dominant factor of self-efficacy in influencing teacher work is the problem-solving factor, which is 80%, and (2) The dominant factor of work commitment in influencing teacher performance is a continuous commitment, which is 86.6%, (3) There is no difference in the efficacy of male and female teachers, (4) There is no difference in the work commitment of male and female teachers, (5) The more extended the teacher's tenure, the more significant the teacher's work efficacy and commitment will be.

The study suggests that SPK school leaders consider self-efficacy, especially the ability of teachers to solve problems and commitment to work continuously when recruiting teachers. In addition, the leadership of the SPK strives for teachers to feel happy teaching because the longer the teaching period, the higher the self-efficacy and commitment.

References

Alessandri, G., Perinelli, E., De Longis, E., Schaufeli, W. B., Theodorou, A., Borgogni, L., ... & Cinque, L. (2018). Job burnout: The contribution of emotional stability and emotional self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, *91*(4), 823-851.

Alwisol.2020. Psikologi Kepribadian. Malang:UMM Press

Andriana, G. P. (2018). *Analysis protean career on organizational commitment Me Self Efficacy: pada TST (The Secret Team) Oriflame Surabaya Branch* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim).

Basito, M. D., Arthur, R., & Daryati, D. (2018). Hubungan Efikasi Diri terhadap Kemampuan Berpikir Tingkat Tinggi Siswa SMK Program Keahlian Teknik Bangunan pada Mata

Jiang, Z., Hu, X., & Wang, Z. (2018). Career adaptability and plateaus: The moderating effects of tenure and job self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *104*, 59-71.

Kim, H.Y. (2014). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)-exploring possible interaction between factors. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics, 39*(2), 143-147.

Kusrieni, D. (2014). Hubungan efikasi diri dengan perilaku mencontek. *PSIKOPEDAGOGIA Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*, *3*(2), 100-101.

Liu, E. (2019). Occupational self-efficacy, organizational commitment, and work engagement. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *47*(8), 1-7.

Lutans, F. (2011). Organizational Behavior Fred Luthans An Evidence-Based Approach. Twelfth Edition. McGraw Hill Irwin

Maddux, J. E., & Kleiman, E. M. (2018). *Self-efficacy*. Guilford Press

Martin, W.E., & Bridgmon, K. D. (2012). Quantitative and statistical research methods: From hypothesis to results (Vol. 42). John Wiley & Sons.

Michael Amstrong, *Human Resource Managemen Practice, A guide to people Managemen*t. *11th Edition* (London: British Library, 2009), h. 345

Mundia, L. (2020). Assessment of Skills Development in Brunei Trainee Teachers: Intervention Implications. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *9*(2), 685-698.

Pane, Elpi Parida. 2018. Persepsi Budaya Organisasi dan Proses Pembelajaran Terpadu Terhadap Komitmen Guru pada Sekolah Islam Terpadu (Perception of Organizational Culture and Integrated Learning Process Toward Commitment among Integrated Islamic School Teacher's). http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/21806

Penn, L. T., & Lent, R. W. (2019). The joint roles of career decision self-efficacy and personality traits in predicting career decidedness and decisional difficulty. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *27*(3), 457-470.

Pongoh, S., & Watung, S. (2018, December). The Effect of Headmaster Leadership and Achievement Motivation on Competency of State High School Teachers in Manado City. In *Journal of International Conference Proceedings (JICP)* (Vol. 1, No. 2).

Quraisy, A. (2020). Normalitas Data Menggunakan Uji Kolmogorov-Smirnov dan Saphiro-Wilk: Studi kasus penghasilan orang tua mahasiswa Prodi Pendidikan Matematika Unismuh Makassar. *J-HEST Journal of Health Education Economics Science and Technology*, *3*(1), 7-11.

Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 31 of 2014 concerning Cooperation in the Implementation and Management of Education by Foreign Educational Institutions with Educational Institutions in Indonesia

Sihotang, H., Purba, S. C., & Sinambela, S. (2022). Analysis of Work Culture And Personality Influence on Teacher's Commitment In School Unit Cooperation Agreement (SPK). *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *21*(1), 1-14.

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.14738/assrj.910.13157