



Self-Efficacy as a Predictor of Teachers' Innovative Work Behavior In Medan City

Farida Hanum Siregar*, Nurmaida Irawani Siregar, Andy Chandra

Universitas Medan Area

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/pjp.v3i2.5452>

*Correspondence: Farida Hanum Siregar

Email: farida@staff.uma.ac.id

Received: 28-12-2025

Accepted: 28-01-2026

Published: 28-02-2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract: This study aimed to examine teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of innovative work behavior (IWB) among junior and senior high school teachers in Medan City, Indonesia. A quantitative cross-sectional predictive–correlational design was employed using purposive sampling. Participants consisted of 214 teachers from public and private schools. Teacher self-efficacy was measured using an instrument adapted from the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), while IWB was assessed using a scale capturing core stages of work-related innovation, including idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. All items were rated on a five-point Likert scale. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics, reliability testing, Pearson correlation, and simple linear regression. The results showed a positive and statistically significant correlation between teacher self-efficacy and IWB ($r = 0.53, p < 0.001$). Regression analysis further indicated that teacher self-efficacy significantly predicted IWB ($\beta = 0.53, t = 9.09, p < 0.001$), accounting for 28% of the variance in innovative work behavior ($R^2 = 0.28, f^2 = 0.39$). These findings demonstrate that higher levels of teacher self-efficacy are associated with greater engagement in innovation-oriented work behaviors. The results highlight the role of personal psychological resources in supporting instructional innovation, suggesting that strengthening teacher self-efficacy through practice-based professional development and organizational support may facilitate sustained innovative behavior in school settings.

Keywords: Innovative Work Behavior, Teacher Self-Efficacy, Educational Innovation, Social Cognitive Theory, Work-Related Innovation

Introduction

The increasingly dynamic transformation of education requires teachers not only to deliver routine instruction but also to continuously update learning practices in an adaptive and sustainable manner. In the Indonesian context, the implementation of the Kurikulum Merdeka promotes instructional flexibility, emphasizes essential content, and strengthens teachers' roles in designing student-centered learning strategies, making instructional innovation a central demand in teachers' professional work. Nevertheless, strengthening instructional innovation remains a challenge due to uneven readiness across schools. The 2024 Kurikulum Merdeka implementation survey reported that approximately 66% of educational institutions were still categorized as "low" and "very low" in learning and assessment practices, indicating the need to enhance teachers' capacity to consistently improve and renew classroom practice (PSKP, 2024).

Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) refers to individual behavior that involves generating novel ideas, promoting them, and implementing them within the workplace (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Within industrial and organizational psychology, individual innovation in the workplace is conceptualized as Innovative Work Behavior (IWB), defined as behavior oriented toward generating and implementing new and useful ideas within one's job role. Janssen, (2000) describes IWB as a continuous process involving idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization/implementation, suggesting that innovation is not merely having ideas but also the ability to transform ideas into tangible changes. In line with this perspective, contemporary measurement models view IWB as a multidimensional construct encompassing opportunity exploration, idea generation, championing, and implementation, thus framing innovation as a journey from recognizing opportunities to applying new ideas within work systems (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). This framework is particularly relevant for the teaching profession, as instructional innovation often begins with identifying classroom problems, continues through experimentation with new methods, involves seeking support from colleagues or school leaders, and culminates in actual implementation within teaching and learning processes (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010)

Beyond internal psychological factors, social resources such as professional networks and peer support can play an important role in fostering innovative work behavior in the workplace (Messmann et al, 2018). In school organizations, teachers' innovative behavior is critical because it directly influences instructional quality and strengthens schools' adaptive capacity. The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation emphasizes that innovation is not determined solely by technical competence but also by individual psychological processes and supportive work environments that enable individuals to advance, develop ideas, and find meaning in their work in productive ways (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). However, despite the growing need for innovation, innovative behavior does not emerge automatically in all teachers, as the innovation process requires initiative, persistence, tolerance for uncertainty, and readiness to overcome implementation barriers. From the lens of Social Cognitive Theory, (Bandura, 1986, 1991) argues that human behavior is shaped by reciprocal interactions between personal factors, environmental influences, and behavioral actions, positioning personal psychological resources as essential for understanding variation in work behavior, including innovation.

In the innovation literature, individual factors have increasingly been recognized as pivotal because innovation often depends on internal psychological readiness that motivates individuals to initiate and complete ideas through implementation. Amabile & Pratt,(2016) further highlight that psychological processes at the individual level represent a crucial component of organizational innovation, particularly when individuals must remain motivated amidst work demands and changing conditions. One psychological factor highly relevant to explaining individuals' readiness to innovate is self-efficacy, defined as an individual's belief in their capability to organize and execute the actions required to achieve desired outcomes. Bandura, (1991) emphasizes that efficacy beliefs shape behavioral

choices, effort investment, resilience in the face of obstacles, and persistence when difficulties arise, making self-efficacy an important determinant of productive behaviors that demand sustained perseverance.

In educational contexts, self-efficacy is often operationalized as teacher self-efficacy, referring to teachers' beliefs in their ability to perform core teaching tasks effectively. Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, (2001) conceptualize teacher self-efficacy as a professional belief related to enhancing student engagement, applying effective instructional strategies, and managing classroom behavior capabilities that function as psychological foundations for teachers to try new approaches and innovate in teaching. Theoretically, self-efficacy is expected to influence IWB because innovation requires confidence to initiate new ideas, persistence when early attempts fail, and the ability to advocate for ideas until they are implemented. Teachers with high self-efficacy tend to hold stronger expectations of success and display greater persistence when encountering initial setbacks, which increases the likelihood of completing the innovation process from exploration to implementation (Bandura, 1991) (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010).

Recent empirical evidence also supports the link between efficacy beliefs and teachers' innovative behavior. Chen, (2024) reported that teacher autonomy is associated with creative self-efficacy and innovative behavior among EFL teachers, suggesting that teachers' confidence in their creative and professional capacity plays an important role in fostering innovation in instructional practice. Similarly, Rahmani et al, (2025) and Sofiyan et al, (2022) found that teacher self-efficacy contributes to IWB, especially when reinforced by organizational factors such as leadership, indicating that self-efficacy remains a key internal component within broader models of teachers' innovative behavior.

From a social-cognitive and job resources perspective, self-efficacy functions as a key personal resource that enables teachers to engage in innovative work behavior by strengthening confidence, persistence, and proactive problem-solving at work. Meta-analytic evidence demonstrates that individuals with stronger self-efficacy beliefs consistently show higher levels of adaptive performance and work-related effectiveness, particularly in tasks requiring initiative and sustained effort (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998) Within the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, personal resources such as self-efficacy enhance motivational processes, allowing employees to remain engaged and proactive even under demanding work conditions (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In innovation-related tasks, self-efficacy facilitates innovative work behavior by increasing individuals' willingness to generate ideas, champion novel approaches, and persist through implementation challenges (Newman et al, 2018). Accordingly, teachers with strong efficacy beliefs are more likely to perceive instructional challenges as manageable, invest sustained effort in pedagogical experimentation, and translate ideas into practice, reinforcing the role of self-efficacy as a psychological driver of innovative work behavior in educational settings.

In educational settings, teachers' innovative behavior is influenced by both individual and organizational factors, such as school climate, collegial support, and leadership practices (Thurlings et al, 2015). In the local Indonesian context, region-specific research

remains necessary because teacher innovation is strongly shaped by school dynamics and the varying challenges of policy implementation across regions. Sherly et al, (2024) highlights the relevance of strengthening teachers' IWB in North Sumatra to respond to changing educational demands and the Society 5.0 era, underscoring the importance of examining psychological predictors such as self-efficacy within local teacher populations. Based on this rationale, the research gap addressed in this study concerns the need to strengthen predictive evidence regarding the role of self-efficacy in explaining teachers' Innovative Work Behavior within a local context, particularly in Medan City, amid increasing demands for instructional innovation (Janssen, 2000) (PSKP, 2024). Evidence from meta-analytic research indicates that teacher self-efficacy is positively associated with teaching effectiveness and various indicators of teacher performance (Klassen & Tze, 2014). Therefore, this study aims to examine self-efficacy as a predictor of Innovative Work Behavior among teachers in Medan City, guided by the research question: "Does self-efficacy predict Innovative Work Behavior among teachers in Medan City?" (Bandura, 1991) (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010).

To address this objective, the study adopts a quantitative predictive-correlational design using regression analysis to test the contribution of self-efficacy in explaining variance in teachers' innovative work behavior (Janssen, 2000) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Theoretically, this research strengthens the understanding of teacher innovation from a social-cognitive perspective, while practically, the findings may inform teacher development interventions that enhance self-efficacy to promote more consistent innovative behavior in instructional practice (Amabile & Pratt, 2016) (Bandura, 1997).

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative cross-sectional predictive-correlational design to examine self-efficacy as a predictor of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) among teachers in Medan City, Indonesia. Data were collected during September-October 2025 through a survey administered to active teachers from formal secondary schools (junior high schools and senior high schools) in Medan City. Inclusion criteria consisted of teachers who were currently teaching, had a minimum of one year of teaching experience, and voluntarily agreed to participate by providing informed consent. Participants were recruited using purposive sampling, resulting in a final sample of $N = 214$, which was considered adequate for regression analysis with a single primary predictor.

Teacher self-efficacy was measured using the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES), which assesses efficacy beliefs across three dimensions: instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). IWB was assessed using an innovative behavior scale grounded in the work-related innovation process, capturing the stages of idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization/implementation (Janssen, 2000), as well as broader innovation behaviors from opportunity exploration through implementation (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Internal

consistency reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha, with $\alpha \geq 0.70$ considered acceptable (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Data analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 26). Descriptive statistics were computed, followed by regression assumption checks including normality of residuals, linearity, and homoscedasticity. A simple linear regression was then performed to test the predictive contribution of self-efficacy to IWB. Regression results were reported using the standardized coefficient (β), t-values, p-values, and the coefficient of determination (R^2) as indicators of predictive strength (Field, 2018) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). Ethical principles were applied throughout the study, including participant anonymity, confidentiality of responses, and voluntary participation, consistent with psychological research ethics guidelines (Association, 2017).

Result and Discussion

A total of 228 questionnaires were collected during the data collection period. After checking response completeness, 14 questionnaires were excluded due to missing or incomplete data. Therefore, the final dataset included $N = 214$ participants. Outliers were assessed using standardized residuals in the regression model, and no extreme residuals were detected ($|z| > 3.29$), indicating that no problematic outliers needed to be removed) (thus, all eligible responses were retained for further analysis (Field, 2018).

In total, 214 teachers from Medan City participated in this study. Most respondents were female (61.2%), and the largest age group was 30-45 years (52.8%). In terms of teaching level, participants were drawn from junior high schools (47.7%) and senior high schools (52.3%). The majority of respondents had 6-15 years of teaching experience (45.3%), suggesting that participants had sufficient teaching experience to evaluate innovative behavior in the workplace.

Table 1. Participant characteristics (N = 214)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	83	38.8
	Female	131	61.2
Age	< 30 years	46	21.5
	30-45 years	113	52.8
	> 45 years	55	25.7
Teaching level	Junior high school	102	47.7
	Senior high school	112	52.3
Teaching experience	1-5 years	62	29.0
	6-15 years	97	45.3
	> 15 years	55	25.7

Descriptive Statistics and Instrument Reliability

Descriptively, teachers' self-efficacy and IWB scores were in the moderate-to-high range. Internal consistency reliability indicated good scale consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding the recommended minimum threshold ($\alpha \geq 0.70$) (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and reliability (total scales)

Variable	Items	Scale	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α
Teacher self-efficacy (Total)	12	1-5	3.84	0.49	0.88
Innovative Work Behavior (Total)	9	1-5	3.67	0.55	0.90

To provide a more detailed picture, reliability was also examined at the dimensional level. Self-efficacy comprised three dimensions (instructional strategies, classroom management, student engagement), whereas IWB included idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. All dimensions demonstrated satisfactory reliability.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics and reliability

Variable (Dimension)	Mean	SD	Cronbach's α
Self-efficacy - Instructional strategies	3.86	0.54	0.86
Self-efficacy - Classroom management	3.78	0.57	0.83
Self-efficacy - Student engagement	3.88	0.52	0.85
IWB - Idea generation	3.71	0.60	0.84
IWB - Idea promotion	3.62	0.62	0.82
IWB - Idea implementation	3.69	0.58	0.85

Overall, these results suggest that teachers tended to report strong confidence in their professional capabilities, alongside relatively high tendencies to engage in innovative behavior at work.

Correlation Between Self-Efficacy and Innovative Work Behavior

Pearson correlation analysis revealed a positive and significant relationship between self-efficacy and IWB, indicating that higher levels of teacher self-efficacy were associated with greater engagement in innovative behavior in teaching.

Table 4. Pearson correlation between key variables

Variable	1	2
1. Self-efficacy	-	
2. IWB	0.53***	-

Note: *** $p < 0.001$

The correlation coefficient ($r = 0.53$) reflects a moderate-to-strong association, supporting the theoretical proposition that self-efficacy is an important psychological resource in promoting work-related innovation.

Regression Assumption Testing

Prior to regression analysis, key assumptions were evaluated. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that residuals were approximately normally distributed ($W = 0.99, p = 0.12$). Visual inspection of scatterplots and partial regression plots suggested a largely linear association between self-efficacy and IWB. Homoscedasticity was supported by a relatively constant spread of residual variance. Residual autocorrelation was assessed using the Durbin Watson statistic, and the value ($DW = 1.98$) indicated no problematic autocorrelation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019).

Simple Linear Regression Analysis

To test the study hypothesis, a simple linear regression was conducted with self-efficacy as the predictor and IWB as the outcome. The results showed that self-efficacy significantly predicted IWB.

Table 5. Model summary (Self-efficacy → IWB)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	F	p
1	0.53	0.28	0.27	82.64	< 0.001

The model indicated that self-efficacy explained 28% of the variance in IWB ($R^2 = 0.28$), representing a moderate contribution within organizational and educational research contexts.

Table 6. Regression coefficients (Self-efficacy predicting IWB)

Predictor	B	SE B	β	t	p	95% CI (LL -UL)
Constant	1.34	0.23	-	5.83	< 0.001	0.89 -1.79
Self-efficacy	0.61	0.07	0.53	9.09	< 0.001	0.48 - 0.74

The regression coefficient indicates that self-efficacy contributed positively to IWB ($\beta = 0.53, p < 0.001$). Practically, a one-unit increase in self-efficacy was associated with an estimated 0.61-point increase in IWB scores, with a stable coefficient estimate within the 95% confidence interval (0.48-0.74). In addition, effect size was computed using Cohen’s f^2 : [$f^2 = \frac{R^2}{1-R^2} = \frac{0.28}{0.72} = 0.39$] The value $f^2 = 0.39$ suggests a moderate-to-large effect size, supporting the substantive and statistical importance of self-efficacy as a predictor of teachers’ innovative work behavior (Cohen, 1988).

Overall, these findings indicate that teachers in Medan City reported moderate-to-high levels of self-efficacy and IWB, with good instrument reliability. Self-efficacy was positively correlated with IWB and emerged as a significant predictor of IWB in simple linear regression, explaining 28% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.28$) ($\beta = 0.53$) ($p < 0.001$). This suggests that

teachers' beliefs in their professional capabilities represent a key psychological factor underlying innovative behavior in the teaching context.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that self-efficacy is a significant predictor of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) among teachers in Medan City. Self-efficacy showed a meaningful positive association with IWB ($r = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$) and explained 28% of the variance in IWB in a predictive model ($R^2 = 0.28$) ($\beta = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$). These results suggest that the stronger teachers' beliefs in their professional capabilities, the more likely they are to generate new ideas, promote instructional initiatives, and translate those ideas into tangible classroom practices. The predictive contribution can be considered moderate to strong, indicating that self-efficacy represents a substantive psychological factor for understanding teachers' innovative behavior, although other factors beyond self-efficacy may also contribute to IWB.

This finding aligns with Social Cognitive Theory, which positions self-efficacy as a central mechanism shaping human behavior through cognitive, motivational, and affective processes (Bandura, 1986, 1991). From Bandura's perspective, individuals with higher self-efficacy tend to set more challenging goals, invest greater effort, and demonstrate stronger persistence when facing obstacles (Bandura, 1997). This mechanism is highly relevant to workplace innovation because IWB is not always socially or operationally "safe": innovation requires the courage to try new approaches, tolerance for early failure, and sustained perseverance until implementation succeeds.

More specifically, the relationship between self-efficacy and IWB can be understood through the innovation stages proposed by Janssen (2000). At the idea generation stage, self-efficacy enables teachers to feel capable of exploring alternative instructional strategies and proposing new ways to address classroom problems. At the idea promotion stage, confidence strengthens teachers' willingness to communicate ideas, persuade others, and seek social support for the proposed initiatives. At the idea realization/implementation stage, self-efficacy functions as a psychological resource that supports persistence in adapting ideas into practice, particularly when teachers encounter technical constraints, environmental resistance, or limited resources (Janssen, 2000). Therefore, self-efficacy not only facilitates creativity, but also sustains the innovation process through implementation, which constitutes the core of IWB.

The framework by De Jong & Den Hartog, (2010) further supports this interpretation by emphasizing that IWB includes opportunity exploration, idea generation, championing, and implementation. Teachers with higher self-efficacy are more likely to proactively identify opportunities for improvement (e.g., diverse student needs), develop new instructional ideas, champion these ideas through support from colleagues or school leaders, and implement them in a sustained manner. In this sense, self-efficacy operates as an "internal drive" that helps teachers navigate the complex and often non-linear innovation

process, which frequently requires additional effort beyond routine teaching responsibilities.

Comparison with Recent Empirical Evidence

The present findings are consistent with recent empirical evidence in educational contexts indicating that psychological resources and confidence contribute to teachers' innovative behavior. For instance, Chen, (2024) reported that teacher autonomy was associated with creative self-efficacy and innovative behavior, suggesting that confidence in one's creative and professional capacity is an important psychological foundation for instructional innovation. Similarly, other studies have found that teacher self-efficacy contributes to IWB, particularly in work environments that demand adaptation and continuous improvement (Rahmani et al, 2025) (Sofiyan et al, 2022). The consistency in direction across studies reinforces the conclusion that self-efficacy is a robust predictor across contexts, although its magnitude may vary depending on organizational conditions and structural support.

Moreover, the finding that self-efficacy explained 28% of the variance in IWB suggests that personal factors play a strong role, but they do not operate in isolation. Innovation literature emphasizes that innovative behavior emerges from the interaction between individual characteristics and work context (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Thus, the predictive contribution of self-efficacy in this study can be interpreted as evidence that teachers' internal psychological resources are important, while contextual components such as organizational support, innovation climate, and school leadership likely strengthen or weaken the translation of efficacy beliefs into innovative practice.

Practical Implications for Schools and Teacher Development

The findings offer clear practical implications for schools and educational stakeholders. First, strengthening teachers' IWB may be achieved through interventions targeting self-efficacy, given its significant predictive role. Bandura (1997) noted that self-efficacy can be enhanced through four primary sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and the management of physiological and emotional states. In school settings, the most effective strategies may involve practice-based professional development that provides teachers with direct success experiences in applying new methods, such as lesson study, guided teaching practice, or structured classroom innovation projects. Such mastery-oriented interventions are important because real experiences of success tend to strengthen teachers' efficacy beliefs and increase their readiness to engage in innovation repeatedly (Bandura, 1997).

Second, schools should cultivate a supportive innovation climate that provides teachers with a psychologically safe space to experiment and reduces fear of negative consequences when initial innovations do not succeed. Organizational innovation perspectives stress that innovation involves trial-and-error, and overly perfectionistic or punitive environments can inhibit idea exploration and reduce motivation to adopt new

approaches. Accordingly, support from principals and school leadership teams is essential to sustain teacher innovation, for example by providing flexibility in instructional planning, time for reflection and collaboration, and recognition systems that value innovation processes, not solely final outcomes.

Third, the results indicate that teacher innovation should be understood as a staged process from idea generation to implementation. Based on Janssen's (2000) model, schools may design targeted support for each innovation phase. At the idea generation stage, schools can facilitate teacher learning communities to stimulate new instructional ideas. At the idea promotion stage, schools can strengthen collaboration and peer feedback systems to help teachers advocate for their initiatives. At the idea realization/implementation stage, schools can provide minimum resources (e.g., learning media access or scheduling support) to enable teachers to trial and refine innovations in real classrooms (Janssen, 2000). In this way, efforts to enhance IWB extend beyond fostering creativity and directly address implementation barriers, which often represent a critical bottleneck in innovation.

Fourth, strengthening teacher self-efficacy can be integrated into professional development programs to support increasingly adaptive instructional demands. Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) emphasized that teacher self-efficacy is closely linked to classroom management, instructional strategy use, and student engagement. When professional confidence increases, teachers may become more willing to try innovative instructional approaches, including differentiated learning, project-based learning, and educational technology integration as part of instructional innovation (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Therefore, teacher development initiatives should not only focus on technical skills but also strengthen professional beliefs to sustain innovation over time.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, the cross-sectional design limits causal inference because self-efficacy and IWB were measured at a single time point. Although self-efficacy statistically predicted IWB, the results cannot establish causality with certainty (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Longitudinal or experimental studies are needed to examine directional effects more rigorously.

Second, the use of self-report measures may introduce perceptual bias or social desirability. Although anonymity and confidentiality were emphasized, teachers may still provide socially favorable responses regarding innovation and professional confidence. Methodological literature notes that single-source, single-time data collection may increase the risk of common method bias (Podsakoff et al, 2003). Future studies should therefore employ multi-source assessments, such as principal or peer ratings, to strengthen measurement validity.

Third, the use of purposive sampling and the focus on teachers in Medan City may limit generalizability to other regions with different school characteristics. Organizational context, leadership, and workplace culture may differ across settings, potentially influencing the strength of the self-efficacy-IWB relationship (Amabile & Pratt,

2016)Replication in broader geographical contexts and across educational levels is needed to strengthen external validity.

Future Research Directions

Future research is recommended to adopt longitudinal designs to assess the stability of self-efficacy and IWB over time and to model changes in innovative behavior across academic periods. Quasi-experimental or experimental approaches may also be applied to evaluate the causal effectiveness of self-efficacy enhancement interventions in promoting innovative work behavior.

Additionally, subsequent studies may develop more comprehensive models by incorporating organizational variables such as perceived organizational support, leadership style, innovation climate, and job autonomy as potential mediators or moderators. Innovation research emphasizes the interplay between individual and contextual factors, and examining these mechanisms may provide deeper insights into how self-efficacy translates into teachers' innovative practices (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Finally, multi-source assessments and more objective behavioral indicators (e.g., documentation of instructional innovations, teaching portfolios, or classroom observation) could strengthen empirical evidence and reduce measurement bias (Podsakoff et al, 2003). Overall, this study highlights that self-efficacy is a meaningful predictor of teachers' Innovative Work Behavior in Medan City. Consistent with Social Cognitive Theory, teachers' beliefs in their professional capabilities support persistence, initiative, and the courage needed to complete the innovation process from idea generation to implementation. These findings underscore the importance of enhancing teacher self-efficacy alongside organizational support to promote sustained instructional innovation (Amabile & Pratt, 2016) (Bandura, 1997).

Conclusion

This study provides empirical evidence that teacher self-efficacy is a significant predictor of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) among teachers in Medan City. Statistical analysis demonstrated a moderate-to-strong positive relationship between self-efficacy and IWB ($r = 0.53$, $p < 0.001$), with regression results indicating that self-efficacy explained 28% of the variance in teachers' innovative work behavior ($R^2 = 0.28$) ($\beta = 0.53$) ($t = 9.09$) ($p < 0.001$) ($f^2 = 0.39$). These findings indicate that teachers with higher confidence in their instructional strategies, classroom management, and student engagement are more likely to generate, promote, and implement innovative instructional ideas. Practically, the results suggest that strengthening teacher self-efficacy through practice-based professional development, mastery-oriented training, and sustained organizational support may serve as an effective strategy to enhance continuous instructional innovation in schools. Programs that provide opportunities for successful teaching experiences, peer modeling, and constructive feedback are particularly recommended. For future research, longitudinal and experimental designs are needed to establish causal relationships, while incorporating organizational variables such as leadership style, innovation climate, and job autonomy

may offer a more comprehensive explanation of teachers' innovative work behavior across different educational contexts

References

- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. (2016). The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157–183.
- Association, A. P. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. American Psychological Association.
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 248–287.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.
- Chen, Y. (2024). Teacher autonomy, creative self-efficacy, and innovative behavior: Perspectives from Chinese university EFL teachers. *Arab World English Journal*, 15(2), 73–86. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no2.5>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5 ed.). Sage Publications.
- De Jong, J. P. J., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23–36.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287–302.
- Klassen, R. M., & Tze, V. M. C. (2014). Teachers' self-efficacy, personality, and teaching effectiveness: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 12, 59–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2014.06.001>
- Messmann, G., Mulder, R. H., & Palonen, T. (2018). Vocational education teachers' personal network at school as a resource for innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 30(3), 174–185. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-08-2017-0069>
- Newman, A., Herman, H. M., Schwarz, G., & Nielsen, I. (2018). The effects of employees' creative self-efficacy on innovative behavior: The role of entrepreneurial leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 89, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.04.001>
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

-
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903.
- PSKP. (2024). *Survei implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka tahun 2024*. Pusat Standar dan Kebijakan Pendidikan.
- Rahmani, A., Aslamiah, & Ngadimun. (2025). Principal transformational leadership, self-efficacy, and OCB on teachers' innovative work behavior. *Curricula: Journal of Curriculum Development, 4*(2), 1123–1138.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 580–607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256701>
- Sherly, E. E., Sihombing, H. B. M., Romy, E., & Sudirman, A. (2024). Model for strengthening teachers' innovative work behavior in facing the challenges of the Society 5.0 era in Indonesia. *Cardiovascular Therapy and Prevention, 23*(4S), 4292. <https://doi.org/10.15829/1728-8800-2024-4292>
- Sofiyani, S., Sembiring, R., Danilwan, Y., Anggriani, R., & Sudirman, A. (2022). Innovative work behavior and its impact on teacher performance: The role of organizational culture and self-efficacy as predictors. *Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation, 6*(1), 44–52. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jere.v6i1.38255>
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 124*(2), 240–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Thurlings, M., Evers, A. T., & Vermeulen, M. (2015). Toward a model of explaining teachers' innovative behavior: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research, 85*(3), 430–471. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314557949>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*(7), 783–805.