





# Investigating the Relationship Between Collective Teacher Efficacy and Teachers' Withdrawal Intention

Fateme Fadaeian<sup>1</sup>   
 Mohammad Aliakbari<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>M.A. Graduate, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Ilam, Ilam, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Professor in Applied Linguistics, Department of English Language and Literature, University of Ilam, Ilam, Iran

## ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 27 August 2022  
 Revised: 27 October 2022  
 Accepted: 24 December 2022  
 Published: 01 March 2023

## CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

E-mail:  
[fatemeh.fadaeeyan1998@gmail.com](mailto:fatemeh.fadaeeyan1998@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

This study aims at examining the link between collective instructor efficacy and withdrawal intention. Data was gathered through an online survey to collect information from Iranian EFL teachers using two questionnaires. One questionnaire asked them about their collective efficacy perception and another regarding their withdrawal intent or lack thereof. Participants included 208 male and female educators who were working in either public schools, private institutions or both participated in the scrutiny. Through the medium of the SPSS software, the data were scrutinized. The findings of this analysis noted that there exists a negative association between instructors' collective efficacy and withdrawal intention. As collaborative competence perceptions elevate in teachers, their withdrawal intent is likely to drop. Furthermore, another research question was whether it was possible for collective efficacy subscales to predict withdrawal intention or not. Instructional strategies and student discipline are subsets of collective efficacy. Student discipline was reported to predict to some extent variability in withdrawal intention. It was also concluded that headmasters and educational leaders need to focus on collective efficacy as an asset to diminish the unfavorable attrition of staff members.

**KEYWORDS:** Collective efficacy; Self-efficacy; Withdrawal intention; EFL teacher; Teacher efficacy; Teacher turnover

## 1. Introduction

According to Tella (2008), the educators' perceptions and conceptions affect the learners in direct and indirect ways. How educators observe, think, and act influence their instruction and their learners' attainments of teaching materials. An important issue that might occupy educators' minds is withdrawal intention. In general, intent to leave is choosing to withdraw from a professional position (Lee & Mitchell, 1994). Teachers' withdrawal intention causes complications that have special educational significance since generally, superior teachers contemplate the possibility of leaving, which endangers the quality of teaching at schools (Ingersoll, 2001). Teachers might leave their workplaces for various reasons. They might feel they are not valued or that their contribution is not meaningful. According to Kaplan et al., (2009), educators with withdrawal intention have decreased work participation. Decreased job satisfaction, increased emotional exhaustion, and reduced commitment (Da'as et al., 2020; Shin et al., 2020) all associated with enhanced withdrawal intention. The current study on teachers' withdrawal intention focuses on its relationship with Collective Teacher Efficacy (CTE). CTE is characterized as the common conviction of instructors working in the same organization that how much their cumulative efforts can impact all students' achievement inclusive of disinterested or deprived ones positively (Hattie, 2016). Therefore, CTE is closely related to how teachers working in the same organization will perceive to what extent their efforts have constructive effects on their learners. Cumulative efficacy positively influences the self-efficacy of educators, student achievement, teacher leadership, and school

improvement (Donohoo, 2018; Loughland & Ryan, 2022). Increasing educators' collective efficacy has been reported to result in lowering their burnout, boosting their job satisfaction, and advancing their perceived competence (Dixon et al., 2014).

Workers who contemplate leaving their job are inclined to decrease the quality of their work (Maertz & Campion, 1998). When employees start considering leaving their job, they start to shift their focus and energy to find alternative jobs and this in turn, affects their performance in their current profession. Qadach et al. (2020) worked on the link between instructional leadership and educators' withdrawal intention as well as mediators such as collective efficacy and joint conception. Shapira-Lishchinsky and Rosenblatt (2009) proposed an approach to the investigation of organizational ethics and teachers' withdrawal behavior. In the local context of Iran, an analysis of the influence of business ethical values on withdrawal was executed by Abzari et al. (2015).

Insight into teachers' withdrawal intention and its relationship with instructors' collective efficacy contributes to the existing area of analysis and increases communal awareness of the problems teachers encounter on a daily basis. Results from this study are beneficial to policymakers to potentially modify regulations in order to avoid the drop-out of teachers. In addition, results can assist teacher educators to fortify teachers with the kinds of skills and mindsets that would help them along the way in facing obstacles in the classroom or the organization. Moreover, teachers themselves can acknowledge different aspects of the story that they might currently live with; such as what they might be able to do in their existing workplace to enhance their circumstances.

The current study supplies explanations for the subsequent queries:

1. Is there any relationship between collective teacher efficacy and teachers' withdrawal intention among Iranian EFL teachers?
2. Do any of the subscales of collective teacher efficacy predict withdrawal intention among Iranian EFL teachers?
3. Is there a significant role of gender in teachers' collective efficacy?
4. Is there a significant role of teaching experience in EFL teachers' withdrawal intention?

## 2. Literature review

### 2.1. Theoretical background

The present-day views of personal and collective efficacy owe much to the theoretical background of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). Social cognitive theory suggests that humans' accomplishments revolve around their individual characteristics and their surrounding milieu (Bandura, 2002). Bandura (1977) worked on a theoretical framework to investigate psychological transformations accomplished by various treatments. Rotter (1966) carried out an analysis on internal opposed to external control of intensification to investigate the group differences in the behavior of subjects when they receive reinforcement. Findings on Americans taking part in this study showed that if they perceive that a particular situation is dependent on external factors such as chance, they do not intend to have high expectations for future reinforcement. In other words, since they perceived chance factors that they cannot predict, significant in that situation they most likely do not see their success happening again. Therefore, their failure shakes their confidence less than a situation they discern to be dependent upon their own behavior. Results suggested that subjects' expectancies and perceptions of the situation whether learning situations or in general, predict their behavior.

In the major study by Mobley (1977), it is suggested that when employees are discontented with their job, they search for other professional positions and their search leads to their eventual departure from or continuation of their current job. There are studies strongly supporting the association between withdrawal intention and withdrawal behavior (Bluedorn, 1982; Porter & Steers, 1973).

According to Abelson and Baysinger's (1984) study, optimal turnover is defined as the equilibrium between the expenses of employee attrition and the expenses linked with employee retention. Furthermore, if there is an imbalance between the costs of the staff members' attrition and retention, this asymmetry would be regarded as dysfunctional turnover. When the cost of keeping a job holder is too high, employers gladly receive high turnover rates. The other extreme situation is when the cost of keeping an employee is relatively low, the company can survive reduced turnover rates. Companies look forward to a balance and equilibrium between the two situations. Very high turnover rates are associated with high costs of looking for and educating recent job holders and at the same time, very low turnover rates are associated with costs of keeping employees with unsatisfactory performances which eventually trigger the turnover rate of other employees. Moreover, individual, organizational, and environmental factors impact the inclination of employees toward quitting. Therefore, the eventual turnover rates of companies are impressed by the aforementioned factors' influence on withdrawal tendency.

### 2.2. Empirical framework

In the analysis of Glassman et al. (2021), an instrument of collective efficacy was developed and validated. The data was gathered using a sample that included 634 educators. The results of the convergence validity analysis indicated that this proposed instrument had significant and moderate links to the other well-established instrument of similar constructs. The model proposed by this study points out that there is a cognitive filter at two levels: individual and group. In other words, an educator has some experience as an independent human being and some as a team member. These two levels shape actions or behaviors of educators and behavior in turn lead to feedback from the surroundings. Feedback eventually provides resources for cognitive filters. Collective efficacy is generated by the encounters people have with their surroundings both as individuals and as team members.

In an attempt made by Da'as et al. (2021), the perceived collective teacher efficacy across three nations and four cultures was explored. The sample included 4,216 Arab, Jewish, Turkish, and American instructors in total. Multigroup confirmatory factor analysis was employed for the purpose of testing configural invariance. The results of the study point out a sufficient fit of the framework over these nations with the use of configural invariance. Another emphasis of this analysis was to check whether the collaborative teacher efficacy instruments held separate meanings for people in these three countries. The differences in the collective efficacy results among the countries could be traced back to their cultural differences.

Meyer et al. (2022) make the case for the association between headmaster administration and instructor partnership. Additionally, the mediating part of collaborative instructor efficacy is investigated thoroughly. The sample for the data collection included 630 primary and secondary school educators in 29 institutions in Germany. The results from analyzing the structural equation modeling revealed that teacher collaboration is indirectly influenced by principal leadership with the mediating role of cumulative competence impression. To rephrase it, at schools in which principals are trying to promote alliance and cooperation among educators, there is a good chance that educators find this atmosphere a good place to put in effort for a common goal of enhancing student achievement. Where there is ongoing involvement of educators in such valuable endeavors, these educators are more inclined to strongly believe that they have what it takes to impact the academic performance of pupils.

Schechter et al. (2020) worked on the model of the associations among principals' cognitive complexity, school's absorptive capacity, educators' affective commitment, and withdrawal intention. A total of 1,664 elementary school teachers were surveyed and structural equation modeling was utilized. The results showed that schools' absorptive capacity and educators' affective commitment are mediators between withdrawal intent and principals' cognitive complexity. Principals' cognitive complexity reduces withdrawal intention among educators. Understanding the operations within a work environment helps establish better regulations or planning inside the school to promote a pleasing rate of intent to stay.

Qadach et al. (2020) carried out an investigation to scrutinize the association between headmasters' educational administration and withdrawal intention. The go-between roles of collaborative instructor efficacy and collaborative insight were also inquired into. A combined number of 1,830 elementary school instructors were surveyed to gather the data needed. The first result of this analysis was support for the mediation of collective instructor competence and shared vision in the association among principals' instructional leadership and withdrawal intention. There was found to be a clear correlation between instructional management and collaborative instructor competence. There was also a negative link between collective teacher efficacy and withdrawal intention. In other words, increments in instructional leadership through promoting a common foresight among educators and promoting their perceived competence to influence students' achievement will coincide with a reduction in contemplations of withdrawal and departure.

Due to the importance of instructor variables, this investigation will scrutinize the association between educators' collective efficacy and teachers' withdrawal intention among Iranian EFL educators. Qadach et al. (2020) analyzed the two variables of collective efficacy and intent to leave with a different lens than the current research. The focus was on the role of headmasters on education and the mediating role of collective efficacy on the association between instructional leadership and intent to leave. In similar studies only school teachers were scrutinized. The probability of predicting withdrawal intention by data from the collective efficacy of teachers is also examined here. It also attempts to capture the gender gap in instructors' collective efficacy and the role of experience in the withdrawal intention rate. These issues are under-researched in the EFL context. The current analysis aspires to straighten out the conclusions of previous research on teachers, hopefully, helping to explain the results of those analyses, and perhaps giving us more credible results.

### 3. Method

#### 3.1. Design

The present analysis used a quantitative approach and a single-group correlational research design. It was conducted using an online survey. Data was gathered through purposive sampling by distributing the questionnaires via the internet for Iranian EFL educators to fill out. Present work intended to measure the correlation between the aforementioned variables by calculating a correlation coefficient to show the degree of the relationship. Collective teacher efficacy and withdrawal intention are the two

variables observed to examine if there is a correlation, the direction of the correlation, and its magnitude. Iranian nationality and teaching English as a foreign language are two controlling variables in this study. Overall, gender and experience were moderators of the association between collective efficacy and withdrawal intention.

### 3.2. Participants

The sample of this investigation incorporated Iranian EFL teachers consisting of both male and female participants. Approximately 208 teachers, 96 women, and 112 men participated in the analysis. The entire sample of attendees were native speakers of Persian. They came from different cultural backgrounds and differed in their first language. Participants ranged from undergraduate (B.A.) students to Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) holders. Their age range was 18 to 63 years old, with most of the teachers aged from 25 to 31 years old. Participants of this study consisted of those who teach at schools, in private institutions, or in both.

**Table 1.** The Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

<i>Demographic Variables</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<b><u>Age groups</u></b>	N=208	100
15-25	36	17%
26-35	95	46%
36-45	50	24%
46-55	24	12%
56-65	3	1%
<b><u>Academic Degree</u></b>	N=208	100
Diploma	2	1%
Associate	1	0.5%
Bachelor	72	34.6%
Master	115	55.2%
Ph.D.	18	8.7%
<b><u>Years of Experience</u></b>	N=208	100
1-8	93	44.7%
9-16	63	30.3%
17-24	22	10.6%
25-32	27	13%
33-40	3	1.4%

As is presented in Table 1, the most frequent age range is between the ages of 26 to 35 and the least frequent age range belongs to ages 56 to 65 which is only three people. The youngest instructor taking part in this study was 18 years old and the oldest was 63 years old. The least frequent academic degree was the associate degree (0.5%) and the most frequent one was the master's degree (55.2%). The participants holding the diploma (between 18 to 25 years old) and associate degree (between 26 to 35 years old) were among the younger teachers. About 98.5 % had at least a B.A. degree. Most of the teachers (44.7%) participating in this investigation had between 1 to 8 years of teaching background.

### 3.3. Instruments

Two scales were translated into Persian and employed in this study. The first measure that was used in the current work is the 12-item Collective Teacher Beliefs scale created by Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004). This measure consists of two subscales. Six items assess Collective efficacy for instructional strategies and six other items assess Collective efficacy for student discipline. Both subscales are five-point Likert type ranging from *nothing* to *a great deal*.

The reliability of the whole measure reported by Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004) is .97 and factor loadings reported at least .58 to a maximum of .79. The six-item subscale of instructional strategies demonstrates reliability of .96 and its factor loadings range from .78 to .67. The other six items assessing collective teacher efficacy for student discipline have a reliability of .94 and factor loading range from .78 to .64 (Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004).

The present study used another survey consisting of five items developed by Shapira-Lishchinsky (2012). This measure asks teachers to rate the five-point Likert-type items from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* for the purpose of determining their withdrawal intention. Qadach et al. (2020) who used this scale reported its reliability to be .92. Using confirmatory factor analysis Qadach et al. (2020) on the survey of teachers' intent to leave developed by Shapira-Lishchinsky (2012), reported an incremental fit index of .95, confirmatory fit index .96, and Tucker-Lewis index of .94.

To avoid any ambiguity of the questions for the Iranian teachers, the two questionnaires were translated into Persian. Then, the translated questionnaires were back-translated into English by an expert in translation to ensure the clarity of the translated versions. Next, the original English versions and the back-translated versions were compared which showed a high similarity between them.

### 3.4. Procedures for data collection and analysis

In this study questionnaires were distributed via the internet among Iranian EFL teachers. Since the aim is to test whether there exists an association between collective instructor efficacy and teachers' withdrawal intention, a statistical procedure for correlation is needed. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearson  $r$ ) is a practical statistic and the direction and magnitude of the association are also demonstrated through this medium (Ary et al, 2018, p.152). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used in order to scrutinize the data and be able to generalize the results from the sample to the population. Multiple regression was used to determine whether the subscales of collective efficacy can predict withdrawal intention. Independent samples t-tests were utilized to uncover if there is a gender gap in collaborative instructor efficacy and if experience plays a significant role in the withdrawal intention of instructors.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Test of normality

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to try out the normality of data apportionment. The inspection was employed for the purpose of checking if the allocation deviates from a normal apportionment. The first possible outcome is when the  $p$ -value is not significant ( $p > .05$ ), this shows that the allocation of data in this study is not considerably dissimilar to a normal apportionment. Consequently, it can be considered a normal distribution. The second outcome is when the  $p$ -value is significant ( $p < .05$ ), this means that the allocation of data in this study is remarkably dissimilar to a normal apportionment.

**Table 2.** The Results of K-S Test for Withdrawal Intention and Collective Efficacy

Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>		
Statistic	Df	Sig.



<b>Withdrawal intention</b>	.075	208	.185
<b>Collective efficacy</b>	.078	208	.144

According to table 2, the value acquired from the instruments in this study (withdrawal intention and collective efficacy) is greater than .05. Thus, it can be deduced that the data is normally spread throughout the two variables.

## 4.2. Descriptive statistics

Almost in every research project, the basic descriptive statistics and the common statistics such as mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum of the tallies are provided.

**Table 3.** Descriptive Statistics of Collective Efficacy and its Comprising Factors

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
<b>Instructional strategies</b>	208	7.00	30.00	20.12	4.73
<b>Student discipline</b>	208	6.00	30.00	19.95	4.58
<b>Collective efficacy</b>	208	15.00	60.00	40.07	9.03
<b>Withdrawal intention</b>	208	5.00	25.00	13.72	5.53

Table 3 indicates descriptive statistics of teachers' collective efficacy along with its two sub-factors: instructional strategies and student discipline. The educational tactics factor has a higher mean than student discipline ( $M = 20.12$ ). The descriptive statistics of collective efficacy are as follows: ( $M = 40.07$ ,  $SD = 9.03$ ). Teachers' collective efficacy scale comprised 12 five-Likert type items so that the possible range of score could be between 12 to 60. As table 3 represents, the minimum, maximum, mean, and Std. Deviations are 5.00, 25.00, 13.72, and 5.53 respectively.

The outcomes of descriptive statistics of the two groups are represented in Table 4. As the table indicates, the mean scores of participants are different in the two groups (1: male, 2: female). The mean score of male participants ( $M = 118.03$ ) is more than the mean score of female participants ( $M = 98.22$ ).

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics of CTE and Teaching Experience in Two Groups

	degree	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
<b>CTE</b>	1	114	118.03	7.13	3.02
	2	94	98.22	7.02	2.71
<b>Teaching Experience</b>	1	115	87.14	5.27	4.32
	2	93	79.22	5.00	3.14

In addition, the mean scores of participants are different in the other two groups (1: more than 10 years of experience, 2: less than 10 years of experience) and the mean score of the first group ( $M = 87.14$ ) is more than the mean score of the second group ( $M = 79.22$ ).

## 4.3. Inferential statistics

### 4.3.1. Correlation

Correlation is a procedure in which the researcher analyses the potential association between the variables. Considering that the data gathered from these investigations are interval, the Pearson product-moment formula was adopted.

The first research inquiry of the current analysis was whether there exists a significant association between EFL instructors' collective efficacy and withdrawal intention. The null hypothesis based on the questions is:

H<sub>01</sub>: There is not any significant association between withdrawal intention and collaborative efficacy among EFL teachers.

**Table 5.** The Correlation between Teachers' Collective Efficacy and Withdrawal Intention

	1	2	3	4
<b>1. Instructional strategies</b>	1	.87**	.97**	-.39**
<b>2. Student discipline</b>	.87**	1	.96**	-.43**
<b>3. Collective efficacy</b>	.97**	.96**	1	-.42**
<b>4. Withdraw intention</b>	-.39**	-.43**	-.42**	1

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

As table 5 indicates, withdrawal intention associated moderately with both student discipline ( $r = -0.43, p < 0.01$ ) and instructional strategies ( $r = -0.39, p < 0.01$ ). Collective efficacy and withdrawal intention correlate moderately with each other. ( $r = -0.42, p < 0.01$ ).

#### 4.3.2. Multiple regression analysis

Regression is a procedure that is applied to the data in order to anticipate variability in the dependent variable in accordance with one or more independent variables. Regression was utilized for the purpose of realizing whether any of the subscales of collective efficacy could predict withdrawal intention.

The second research question is whether EFL teachers' withdrawal intention can be predicted by teachers' collective efficacy. The null hypothesis in accordance with this inquiry is:

H<sub>02</sub>: No subscales of collective efficacy can predict EFL teachers' withdrawal intention.

**Table 6.** Variability in EFL Teachers' Withdrawal Intention due to its Predictors

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1189.065	1	1189.065	47.504	.000b
Residual	5156.315	206	25.031		
Total	6345.380	207			

a. Dependent Variable: Withdrawal intention

b. Predictors: (Constant)

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) is a valuable approach in order to measure whether the regression model, with scores on student discipline as its predictor, has a linear relationship to withdrawal intention scores. Fisher statistic is used to ascertain whether the formula is significant. The F value is compared to the Fisher's table which has all the established criteria. A concept can only be included in the formula if the likelihood linked to the F tests is smaller than or equal to the level of the specified significance. Table 7 illustrates that  $F(1,206) = 47.50, p \leq .05$ . Consequently, it can be induced that there exists a significant association between the two concepts, this model is adequately proper, and student discipline is considered a fine predictor of teachers' withdrawal intention.

**Table 7.** Correlation Coefficient of Withdrawal Intention and the Predictor

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	24.151	1.552		15.563	.00
	Student discipline	-.522	.076	-.433	-6.892	.00

The magnitude of the coefficient for any of the independent variables exhibits the magnitude of the impact that each variable has on the dependent variable in linear regression. Furthermore, the direction of the coefficient manifests the direction of this influence. The coefficient is liable to rise if it is positive and inclined to drop if it is negative. Table 7 encompasses the regression formula. As demonstrated in column B, the magnitude of the regression coefficient is submitted. Moreover, these values offer details on the noteworthiness of each of the variables.

As shown in Table 8, the formula was: Prediction to withdrawal intention= 24.151 + (-.522) \* student discipline

**Table 8.** Model Summary of the R Square of the Correlation Coefficient between Withdrawal Intention and Predictors

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.43	.18	.18	5.00

a. Predictors: (Constant), student discipline

b. Dependent Variable: Withdrawal intention

The correlation coefficient is hereby demonstrated within this table by the R-value. The R square is the fraction of the variation that is predicted by independent variables. As Table 8 shows, that R amounts to .43 and R square is .18. R square is possible to be taken as the magnitude of the expected alteration for the purpose of informing that the student discipline marks are able to anticipate about 18% of the alteration in withdrawal intention which is not a small amount. The column denoted as adjusted R square amounts to .18. Adjusted R square is computed in order to avoid the overvaluation of R square. The final column shows the standard error of estimate equals 5.00.

**Table 9.** Residuals Statistics<sup>a</sup>

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
<b>Predicted Value</b>	8.47	21.01	13.72	2.39	208
<b>Residual</b>	-12.88	15.47	.00	4.99	208
<b>Std. Predicted Value</b>	-2.19	3.04	.00	1.00	208
<b>Std. Residual</b>	-2.57	3.09	.00	.99	208

a. Dependent Variable: Withdrawal intention

Table 9 includes the non-standardized predicted and residual magnitudes. In addition, the standardized (std.) predicted and residual magnitudes are also provided. The dissimilarity between the acquired and anticipated values is called the residual.

#### 4.4.3. T-test

With the aim of inspecting the significance of the dissimilarity between gender sets in their collective teacher efficacy, an independent samples *t*-test was employed. The outcomes are indicated in Table 10 In accordance with the chart below, the mean of the male set is more than the mean of the female set. As is illustrated, the mean of the teachers with more than 10 years of experience is more than the teachers with less than 10 years of experience.



**Table 10.** The Results of Independent Samples T-tests

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
	F	Sig.					
<b>Equal variances assumed (Gender)</b>	.052	.5	-2.14	114	.032	-3.31	.78
<b>Equal variances not assumed (Gender)</b>			-2.11	107.32	.032	-3.31	.78
<b>Equal variances assumed (Experience)</b>	.049	.5	-4.23	87	.012	-4.45	1.47
<b>Equal variances not assumed (Experience)</b>			-4.18	84.32	.012	-4.45	1.38

As Table 10 indicates, there exists a considerable dissimilarity in teachers' collective efficacy between men and women in favor of male participants: ( $t = -2.14, p < 0.05$ ). So, it is possible to state that the third null hypothesis is dismissed. For the purpose of exploring the significance of the dissimilarity among EFL teachers' withdrawal intention based on their teaching experience, an independent samples  $t$ -test was employed. Table 10 also demonstrates a considerable dissimilarity in teachers' withdrawal intentions between the two groups in favor of the first group (teachers with more than 10 years of experience): ( $t = -4.23, p < 0.05$ ). So, it is possible to state that the fourth null hypothesis is dismissed.

## 5. Discussion

It can be concluded that there was a noteworthy and reverse link between cumulative instructor efficacy and withdrawal intention among Iranian EFL teachers. Mattingly (2007) and Mawhinney et al. (2005) notified the same finding. Results indicated that student discipline as one of the subscales of collective teacher efficacy can predict withdrawal intention. However, instructional strategies which was the other subscale of collective efficacy could not predict withdrawal intention. According to Jensen et al. (2011), collective efficacy was supported to be a moderator between physical workload and withdrawal behavior. Moreover, collective efficacy has been supported to predict interpersonal behavior (Tasa et al., 2011), professional commitment (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007), and group performance (Carroll et al., 2005). Furthermore, withdrawal intention has been found to be predicted by job embeddedness (Mitchell et al., 2001), work environment (Breau & Rhéaume, 2014). And also cooperating in decision-making and sharing information in the workplace can predict intent to stay (Boyle et al., 1999).

Another objective of the present investigation was to examine the difference between collective efficacy in male and female educators. It was disclosed that male instructors are expected to have a higher perception of their potential to influence student achievement than female instructors. The results are similar to that of Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007), supporting, that men had higher teacher efficacy than their female associates. However, Brennen et al. (1996) and Fives and Looney (2009) concluded that women have higher teacher efficacy than men. The reason for the opposing results could be the difference between the aspect of efficacy dealt with in each study and the occupational context of the studies. It could be speculated that female teachers can better identify with the role of teachers and perceive their potential to impose advancements (Fives & Looney, 2009). On the other hand, it seems that male educators are more equipped with team perceptions of potential enhancement. Another explanation could be that female educators feel more able to influence their environments in some contexts than others (Blau et al., 1998; Haydel, 1997; Wittmann, 1992).

In addition, the results showed that instructors who have spent more than 10 years instructing their students have higher withdrawal intentions than those instructors who have spent less time in this profession. The outcomes of this analysis did not corroborate those of Hill and Hirshberg (2013) and Ost and Schiman (2015), which reported that the turnover rate was greater among instructors who have taught for less than 3 years and more than 20 years in comparison to their coworkers. Another study by Nogueras (2006) on the withdrawal intention of nurses found that experience is a strong predictor of withdrawal intention. Additionally, more experienced employees exhibited lower withdrawal intent rates. In a study by Knani and Fournier (2013), it was reported that work experience positively influences withdrawal intention. The dissimilarity among

the findings could have several reasons such as the difference between the concepts of withdrawal determination and eventual physical withdrawal, the groupings of years of experience not being identical, and the behavior of the employees in those contexts. It can be assumed that there are contexts in which as the staff members gain experience, they become less inclined to leave their position as a result of various factors. There are also contexts in which more experienced job holders are more inclined toward leaving their position than staying at their job. Some of the factors that could come together to form a pattern of behavior of the staff members with regard to their added experience are decision latitude (Knani & Fournier, 2013), secondary traumatic stress (Christian-Brandt et al., 2020), and coping strategies (Wunnenberg, 2020).

According to Goddard et al. (2015), instructors are more inclined to involve in group work interactions with their peers provided that their leaders have some expertise in classroom practice. Several analyses have emphasized the part executed by communication and the involvement of teachers in constructing the prospective agenda of the school (Lambersky, 2014; Yahaya and Ebrahim, 2016). Since teachers with scarce group work experience tend to only conjecture on the cumulative competencies of themselves and their coworkers (Parker et al., 2006), individualistic contexts are more inclined to have discrepancies in collective efficacy estimates. Instruction is facilitated in an environment where instructors believe and behave in such a way that they can influence their students' achievement. Developing a culture of participation and cooperation among teachers would set a satisfying example for students' tendency toward teamwork. Teachers who are more inclined towards leaving the school are unlikely to try their best at educating students or enhancing their ambition. Other faculty members are also influenced by teachers. Working alongside colleagues who have their minds occupied with intentions to leave may not be uplifting or inspirational.

This present investigation achieves development of some compelling issues; however, a few limitations are essential to be mentioned with respect to the current analysis. The corona virus pandemic prevented feasible and face-to-face access to teachers. Another limitation of the researcher was the restricted available time. Moreover, the skill, knowledge, and experience of the researcher were limited as well. Conducting a mixed-method, or cross-national study would demand resources unavailable to the researcher. To obtain more precise results on the issue and also to extend our knowledge of teacher-related variables a qualitative approach would benefit the researcher in collecting additional data. Further research could also look into the same relationship with university professors and investigate the difference between their perceptions and their academic rank, annual income, or related and unrelated academic backgrounds.

## 6. Conclusion

This study made an effort to test the hypothesis that collective teacher efficacy subscales could predict variability in withdrawal intention and the relationship between CTE and WI. It has come to light through multiple regression analysis that student discipline which is one of the two subscales of collective teacher efficacy is able to predict withdrawal intention. The findings clearly indicate that the aggregate mentality of teachers regarding their power to make changes in the classroom for the benefit of the pupils would be in accordance with the determination of educators to commit to their profession.

This analysis has provided deeper insight into the factors leading instructors to decide to stay put rather than depart from their organization. In general, therefore, it seems that there exist both personal and organizational components involved in the issue. As it was reviewed in the literature of the field, organizational elements such as principals' organizational leadership, organizational justice, workplace ethics, and workplace environment influence the withdrawal intention of teachers. On the other hand, individual elements such as self-efficacy and burnout are associated with alterations in withdrawal intent. This fresh awareness enhances the chance of making proper predictions of the association between other organizational or individual components with the voluntary turnover of instructors.

The present study has supplied additional endorsement for the reverse association between withdrawal intention and withdrawal intention. This research has several practical applications. Firstly, it points to the importance of teacher mentality. How teachers perceive their capacity to ameliorate student performance will eventually give rise to that improved performance. Another closely related issue in regard to the job holders at the same company. Colleagues can mirror each other and the teacher mentality is able to be reshaped through the interactions among teachers and their reciprocation of wisdom gained from experience.

## 7. References

- Abelson, M. A., & Baysinger, B. D. (1984). Optimal and dysfunctional turnover: Toward an organizational level model. *Academy of Management review*, 9(2), 331-341.

- Abzari, M., Kabiripour, V., & Saeidi, A. (2015). The effect of business ethical values on turnover intention: Mediating role of person-organization fit dimensions. The case of Iranian teachers in public school. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies*, 1(1), 65-82.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Irvine, C. K. S., & Walker, D. (2018). *Introduction to research in education*. Cengage Learning.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of social and clinical psychology*, 4(3), 359.
- Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied psychology*, 51(2), 269-290.
- Blau, F. D., Simpson, P., & Anderson, D. (1998). Continuing progress? Trends in occupational segregation in the United States over the 1970s and 1980s. *Feminist economics*, 4(3), 29-71.
- Bluedorn, A. C. (1982). A unified model of turnover from organizations. *Human relations*, 35(2), 135-153.
- Boyle, D. K., Bott, M. J., Hansen, H. E., Woods, C. Q., & Taunton, R. L. (1999). Manager's leadership and critical care nurses' intent to stay. *American Journal of Critical Care*, 8(6), 361.
- Breau, M., & Rhéaume, A. (2014). The relationship between empowerment and work environment on job satisfaction, intent to leave, and quality of care among ICU nurses. *Dynamics*, 25(3), 16-24.
- Brennan, M. D., Robison, C. K., & Shaughnessy, M. F. (1996). Gender comparison of teachers' sense of efficacy. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 122.
- Carroll, J. M., Rosson, M. B., & Zhou, J. (2005, April). Collective efficacy as a measure of community. In Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1-10).
- Christian-Brandt, A. S., Santacrose, D. E., & Barnett, M. L. (2020). In the trauma-informed care trenches: Teacher compassion satisfaction, secondary traumatic stress, burnout, and intent to leave education within underserved elementary schools. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 110, 104437.
- Da'as, R., Qadach, M., Erdogan, U., Schwabsky, N., Schechter, C., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2021). Collective teacher efficacy beliefs: testing measurement invariance using alignment optimization among four cultures. *Journal of educational administration*, 60(2), 167-187.
- Da'as, R., Watted, A., & Barak, M. (2020). Teacher's Withdrawal Behavior: Examining the Impact of Principals' Innovative Behavior and Climate of Organizational Learning. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 34(8), 1339-1355.
- Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(2), 111-127.
- Donohoo, J. (2018). Collective teacher efficacy research: Productive patterns of behaviour and other positive consequences. *Journal of educational change*, 19(3), 323-345.
- Fives, H., & Looney, L. (2009). College Instructors' Sense of Teaching and Collective Efficacy. *International journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher education*, 20(2), 182-191.
- Glassman, M., Kuznetcova, I., Peri, J., & Kim, Y. (2021). Cohesion, collaboration and the struggle of creating online learning communities: Development and validation of an online collective efficacy scale. *Computers and Education Open*, 2, 100031.
- Goddard, R., Goddard, Y., Sook Kim, E., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American journal of education*, 121(4), 501-530.

- Hattie, J. (2016). *Third annual visible learning conference (subtitled Mindframes and Maximizers)* Washington, DC, July,
- Haydel, J. B. (1997). *The relationships between evaluative culture, teacher efficacy, and student efficacy*. University of New Orleans.
- Hill, A., & Hirshberg, D. (2013). Alaska Teacher Turnover, Supply, and Demand: 2013 Highlights.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American educational research journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Jensen, J. N., Holten, A. L., Karpatschof, B., & Albertsen, K. (2011). Does collective efficacy moderate the associations between physical work load and intention to leave or sickness absence? *Journal of advanced nursing*, 67(11), 2425-2434.
- Kaplan, S., Bradley, J. C., Luchman, J. N., & Haynes, D. (2009). On the role of positive and negative affectivity in job performance: a meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of applied psychology*, 94(1), 162.
- Knani, M., & Fournier, P.-S. (2013). Burnout, Job Characteristics, and Intent to Leave: Does Work Experience Have Any Effect. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics and Management Sciences (JETEMS)*, 4(4), 403-408.
- Lambersky, J. J. (2014). *Understanding the human side of school leadership: Improving teacher morale, efficacy, motivation, and commitment*. University of Toronto (Canada).
- Lee, T. W., & Mitchell, T. R. (1994). An alternative approach: The unfolding model of voluntary employee turnover. *Academy of Management review*, 19(1), 51-89.
- Loughland, T., & Ryan, M. (2022). Beyond the measures: the antecedents of teacher collective efficacy in professional learning. *Professional Development in Education*, 48(2), 343-352.
- Maertz Jr, C. P., & Campion, M. A. (1998). 25 years of voluntary turnover research: A Review. *Management Journal*, (35), 1036-1054.
- Mattingly, J. W. (2007). *A study of relationships of school climate, school culture, teacher efficacy, collective efficacy, teacher job satisfaction and intent to turnover in the context of year-round education calendars*. University of Louisville.
- Mawhinney, H., Haas, J., & Wood, C. (2005). Teachers' collective efficacy beliefs in professional learning communities. *Leading and Managing*, 11(2), 12-45.
- Meyer, A., Richter, D., & Hartung-Beck, V. (2022). The relationship between principal leadership and teacher collaboration: Investigating the mediating effect of teachers' collective efficacy. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 50(4), 593-612.
- Mitchell, T. R., Holtom, B. C., Lee, T. W., Sablinski, C. J., & Erez, M. (2001). Why people stay: Using job embeddedness to predict voluntary turnover. *Academy of management journal*, 44(6), 1102-1121.
- Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction and employee turnover. *Journal of applied psychology*, 62(2), 237.
- Nogueras, D. J. (2006). Occupational commitment, education, and experience as a predictor of intent to leave the nursing profession. *Nursing economics*, 24(2), 86.
- Ost, B., & Schiman, J. C. (2015). Grade-specific experience, grade reassignments, and teacher turnover. *Economics of Education Review*, 46, 112-126.
- Parker, K., Hannah, E., & Topping, K. J. (2006). Collective teacher efficacy, pupil attainment and socio-economic status in primary school®. *Improving Schools*, 9(2), 111-129.
- Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1973). Organizational, work, and personal factors in employee turnover and absenteeism. *Psychological bulletin*, 80(2), 151.

- Qadach, M., Schechter, C., & Da'as, R. a. (2020). Instructional leadership and teachers' intent to leave: The mediating role of collective teacher efficacy and shared vision. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 48(4), 617-634.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological monographs: General and applied*, 80(1), 1.
- Schechter, C., & Qadach, M. (2020). From principal cognitive complexity to teacher intent to leave: Exploring the mediating role of school absorptive capacity and teacher commitment. *Journal of educational administration*.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O. (2012). Teachers' withdrawal behaviors: integrating theory and findings. *Journal of educational administration*.
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O., & Rosenblatt, Z. (2009). Organizational ethics and teachers' intent to leave: An integrative approach. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(5), 725-758.
- Shin, Y., Hur, W.-M., Park, K., & Hwang, H. (2020). How managers' job crafting reduces turnover intention: The mediating roles of role ambiguity and emotional exhaustion. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(11), 3972.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of educational psychology*, 99(3), 611.
- Tasa, K., Sears, G. J., & Schat, A. C. (2011). Personality and teamwork behavior in context: The cross-level moderating role of collective efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 65-85.
- Tella, A. (2008). Teacher variables as predictors of academic achievement of primary school pupils' mathematics. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 1(1), 16-33.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and policy in schools*, 3(3), 189-209.
- Ware, H., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Teacher and collective efficacy beliefs as predictors of professional commitment. *The journal of educational research*, 100(5), 303-310.
- Wittmann, L. Z. (1992). The new woman as a European phenomenon. *Neohelicon*, 19(2), 49-68.
- Wunnenberg, M. (2020). Psychosocial bullying among nurse educators: exploring coping strategies and intent to leave. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 52(5), 574-582.
- Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: literature review. *Journal of management development*.

## 8. Appendices



## Appendix A: Collective Teacher beliefs scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004)

This questionnaire has been developed to collect research data with the purpose of completing an M.A. thesis in TEFL. We ask all Iranian EFL teachers working in either: **public schools**, **private institutions**, as well as **freelancers working in teams** to fill out this questionnaire. Thank you for your time and patience.

A- How old are you? .....

B- How would you describe your gender? Male ☐ Female ☐

C- What is your latest educational degree? Diploma ☐ Associate ☐  
Bachelor's degree ☐ Master's degree ☐ Doctor of Philosophy ☐

D- How many years have you been teaching? .....

### *Sub-scale1: Instructional Strategies*

1- How much can teachers in your school do to produce meaningful student learning?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

2- How much can your school do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

3- To what extent can teachers in your school make expectations clear about appropriate student behavior?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

4- To what extent can school personnel in your school establish rules and procedures that facilitate learning?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

5- How much can teachers in your school do to help student's master complex content?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

6- How much can teachers in your school do to promote deep understanding of academic concepts?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

*Sub-scale2: Student Discipline*

7- How well can teachers in your school respond to defiant students?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

8- How much can school personnel in your school do to control disruptive behavior?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

9- How much can teachers in your school do to help students think critically?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

10- How well can adults in your school get students to follow school rules?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

11- How much can your school do to foster student creativity?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

12- How much can your school do to help students feel safe while they are at school?

Nothing ☐ very little ☐ some degree ☐ quite a bit ☐ a great deal ☐

**Appendix B: “Withdrawal Intention” developed by Shapira Lishchinsky (2012)**

**Please answer these questions with the option that best describes your response.**

1- I’m considering contacting professional bodies about other work options.

Totally disagree ☐ disagree ☐ neutral ☐ agree ☐ totally agree ☐

2- Lately I’m looking for work options in other places.

Totally disagree ☐ disagree ☐ neutral ☐ agree ☐ totally agree ☐

3- I plan on leaving school.

Totally disagree ☐ disagree ☐ neutral ☐ agree ☐ totally agree ☐

4- I’ve begun inquiring among friends/acquaintances about other work options.

Totally disagree ☐ disagree ☐ neutral ☐ agree ☐ totally agree ☐

5- I’m thinking about leaving my job.

Totally disagree ☐ disagree ☐ neutral ☐ agree ☐ totally agree ☐

