

**The relationship between training and self-efficacy among administrative staff at a Peruvian university**

*La relación entre capacitación y autoeficacia de trabajadores administrativos en una universidad peruana*

<https://doi.org/10.47606/ACVEN/PH0339>

**Jorge Luís Vigo Moya<sup>1</sup>**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7362-5875>  
[jvigom@unasam.edu.pe](mailto:jvigom@unasam.edu.pe)

**Luis Augusto Villanueva Benites<sup>1</sup>**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6646-2668>  
[lvillanuevab@unasam.edu.pe](mailto:lvillanuevab@unasam.edu.pe)

**Carlos Humberto Chunga Antón<sup>1\*</sup>**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8131-6685>  
[cchungaa@unasam.edu.pe](mailto:cchungaa@unasam.edu.pe)

**Ángel Deciderio Mendoza López<sup>1</sup>**

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9256-5150>  
[amendozal@unasam.edu.pe](mailto:amendozal@unasam.edu.pe)

**Received:** January 24, 2025

**Accepted:** May 20, 2025

**ABSTRACT**

The objective of the research was to examine the relationship between training and self-efficacy of the administrative staff of the Universidad Nacional Santiago Antúnez de Mayolo (UNASAM), Perú. It was a correlational study with a non-experimental and cross-sectional design, which included a sample of 159 randomly selected employees. Two questionnaires were used for data collection: one on job training, with an alpha reliability of 0.943, and another on self-efficacy, with an alpha reliability of 0.952. The data were analyzed using Spearman's rank correlation test with a significance level of 5% ( $p < 0.05$ ). The results showed that the relationship between training and self-efficacy is moderate (0.575), likewise, the relationship of training directed domain with self-efficacy was found to be moderate with an inclination to be low (0.396), while the relationship between training cognitive domain learning and training self-regulation competency development with self-efficacy is moderate (0.524 and 0.526 respectively). In conclusion, training has a direct and significant relationship with administrative staff self-efficacy.

**Keywords:** Training, Self-efficacy, Administrative staff.

1. Universidad Santiago Antúnez de Mayolo – Perú

\* Autor de correspondencia: [cchungaa@unasam.edu.pe](mailto:cchungaa@unasam.edu.pe)

**RESUMEN**

La investigación tuvo como objetivo examinar la relación entre la capacitación y la autoeficacia del personal administrativo de la Universidad Nacional Santiago Antúñez de Mayolo (UNASAM), Perú. Se trató de un estudio correlacional con un diseño no experimental y transversal, que incluyó una muestra de 159 empleados seleccionados aleatoriamente. Se emplearon dos cuestionarios para la recopilación de datos: uno sobre capacitación laboral, con una confiabilidad alfa de 0.943, y otro sobre autoeficacia, con una confiabilidad alfa de 0.952. Los datos se analizaron utilizando la prueba de correlación por rangos de Spearman con un nivel de significación del 5% ( $p < 0,05$ ). Los resultados mostraron que la relación entre la capacitación y la autoeficacia es moderada (0.575), así mismo, se determinó que la relación del dominio dirigido de la capacitación con la autoeficacia es moderada con inclinación a ser baja (0.396), mientras que la relación entre el aprendizaje del dominio cognitivo y el desarrollo de competencias de autorregulación de la capacitación con la autoeficacia es moderada (0.524 y 0.526 respectivamente). En conclusión, la capacitación tiene una relación directa y significativa con la autoeficacia del personal administrativo.

Palabras Clave: Capacitación, Autoeficacia, Personal administrativo.

## INTRODUCTION

Organizational competitiveness relies on the continuous pursuit of improvement, in which human talent constitutes a crucial resource. Equipping employees with appropriate competencies is therefore considered essential to meet the challenges of the current environment. These competencies can be acquired or strengthened through training, which, according to Mondy (2010), represents a continuous effort by individuals or organizations aimed at improving employee competence and organizational performance, by providing the knowledge and skills necessary to carry out tasks and responsibilities effectively. Similarly, Robbins and Judge (2017) proposed that one of the core competencies of workers is self-efficacy, defined as the belief in one's own capacity to perform tasks and activities in the workplace; thus, the greater the self-efficacy, the higher the confidence to face work-related challenges. Given the growing interest in these topics and the lack of knowledge regarding their impact on administrative staff at the university level, this study examines job training and self-efficacy as key variables of interest.

Previous studies conducted in Peru regarding self-efficacy have focused on the labor and educational sectors. These include Robles Asmat (2019), who explored its relationship with motivation; Ruiz de Varillas (2017), who linked it to work engagement; Márquez Vélez (2020), who associated it with job satisfaction; and Fernández-Arata (2008), who investigated its connection to burnout syndrome. All of these studies report statistically significant relationships between self-efficacy and the respective constructs under investigation.

At UNASAM, training is overseen by the Training Unit, which operates under the Human Resources Department. Although this department organizes training events, these initiatives are not systematically structured based on a formal needs assessment, nor is there an adequate evaluation of their quality or impact. Despite the variety of topics addressed, the available evidence suggests that the trainings provided may not be achieving their intended effectiveness.

According to administrative staff at UNASAM, workplace challenges of varying degrees of complexity persist, alongside a perceived lack of alternatives and limited confidence in their own ability to resolve problems. This suggests a low level of self-efficacy, potentially resulting from ineffective training. The absence of strategies to enhance employee capacities may lead to reduced workplace self-efficacy, which in turn negatively affects overall productivity. Consequently, it is imperative for UNASAM to implement appropriate measures to enhance the preparedness and motivation of administrative personnel, thereby improving both job satisfaction and performance.

This research study analyzes how the competencies acquired through training enable workers to address and solve workplace problems. The research question formulated was: How is training related to the self-efficacy of UNASAM's administrative staff? The hypothesis proposed was: Training and self-efficacy among administrative personnel at UNASAM are directly and significantly related. As an applied research study, the findings aim to contribute to UNASAM by identifying the current situation of its administrative staff regarding the variables in question, and thereby support the planning of targeted training programs to foster workplace self-efficacy.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### Job Training

According to Dessler (2015), training should be understood as a process of equipping employees with the knowledge and skills necessary to perform effectively within an organization. Along similar lines, Cumming and Worley (2007) emphasize that achieving the goals of training can be accomplished through various methods, including classroom learning, online training, case studies, simulations, and on-the-job experiences. Among the challenges associated with training, Franklin and Krieger (2011) highlight key elements of workforce training, such as developing job-relevant skills and attitudes, adapting employee profiles to ongoing organizational and technological changes, and providing tools for effective performance.

Within human resource management, training is essential to enhance employee productivity and performance. In this regard, Mondy (2010) stresses the importance of conducting job analysis as a primary means to identify training needs. Based on such analysis, training programs can be strategically planned to enhance

organizational competitiveness, not only by improving employee competencies but also by promoting greater job satisfaction and work performance.

Various training models can be applied depending on the purpose. For the present study, Bandura's model (2001, as cited in Luthans, 2007) is considered, which proposes three principal dimensions: (a) guided mastery, focused on educational imitation and the transfer of skills to the workplace to ensure self-directed success. Robbins and Judge (2017) indicate that this type of training is aimed at enhancing technical skills related to new technologies and organizational designs; (b) cognitive mastery learning, which includes advanced techniques to enhance problem-solving and decision-making skills. In this regard, Robbins and Judge (2017) explain that this dimension promotes logical reasoning abilities and competencies for addressing complex problems through analytical thinking; and (c) the development of self-regulation competencies, which centers on self-assessment, self-motivation, and personal goal setting. This last dimension aligns with García (2012), who states that the modern work environment demands employees with high levels of initiative and self-management. Furthermore, Robbins and Judge (2017) emphasize the importance of training in ethical and social skills.

Training may be delivered in a structured (formal) or unstructured (informal) format, with the latter typically occurring directly in the workplace. Robbins and Judge (2017) recognize job rotation and mentoring programs as methods that, while potentially disruptive to regular activities, offer significant organizational benefits. Additionally, although e-learning is increasingly employed due to its efficiency and flexibility, it poses challenges such as distractions and reduced social interaction.

### **Workplace Self-Efficacy**

Workplace self-efficacy is manifested when employees believe in their own ability to successfully carry out their tasks and responsibilities. This theory, proposed by Bandura (2001), is based on the premise that workers possess sufficient self-confidence and are able to mobilize the motivation and resources needed to take on challenges (Luthans, 2007). In this regard, Hellriegel and Slocum (2009) affirm that self-efficacy involves evaluating one's ability to perform job-related tasks in specific situational contexts.

Luthans (2007) identifies four primary sources of self-efficacy: (a) mastery experiences, which involve successfully completing specific tasks and thereby enhancing self-efficacy; (b) vicarious experiences, obtained by observing and internalizing the successful performance of others; (c) social persuasion, which involves receiving positive feedback and support from influential individuals, often during training processes; and (d) physiological and psychological arousal, which refers to the individual's physical and mental readiness, both of which contribute to the development of self-efficacy.

Ivancevich et al. (2006) describe three dimensions of self-efficacy: magnitude, which refers to the level of confidence an individual has in addressing difficult tasks, influenced by goal difficulty and personal capacity; strength, which reflects the firmness of one's belief in their capabilities, with greater strength associated with increased persistence and effort in overcoming obstacles; and generality, which denotes the capacity to apply self-efficacy across diverse situations, dependent on adaptability and experience (Bandura, 2001).

Training is closely linked to self-efficacy. According to Robbins and Coulter (2018), employees who receive training tend to exhibit increased confidence and assurance in performing their tasks, thereby enhancing their self-efficacy. Studies by McDonald and Siegall (1992) and Na-Nan and Sanamthong (2019) demonstrate that high levels of self-efficacy are associated with improved performance and lower absenteeism rates.

In summary, both job training and self-efficacy are essential for organizations, as they contribute to the development of employees' capacities to face challenges and enhance job performance. Adequate training provides employees with cognitive and technical skills, while also strengthening their self-efficacy—leading to greater workplace success and job satisfaction. Consequently, the combination of effective training and strong self-efficacy among employees can result in higher organizational productivity and a more motivated work environment.

## METHODOLOGY

The study employed an observational, prospective, descriptive, and correlational approach, gathering information based on the main characteristics of the variables in order to determine the correlation between them. The research design was non-experimental and cross-sectional.

The target population consisted of 269 administrative employees at the university, divided into 121 tenured and 148 contracted staff members. A representative, stratified random sample of 159 workers was selected, with a confidence level of 95% and a standard error of 5%.

Primary and secondary data on the study variables were collected through the review of existing information and the administration of a questionnaire to employees. The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, yielding values of 0.934 for training and 0.952 for self-efficacy, indicating high internal consistency. The validity of the instrument was ensured through expert judgment. To test the hypotheses, Spearman's non-parametric correlation test was employed, with a significance level set at 5%, to determine the relationships between the variables.

## RESULTS

## Analysis of the relationship between study variables

Table 1 shows that the relationship between job training and self-efficacy among UNASAM's administrative staff is statistically significant. Of the 159 employees evaluated, 87.4% reported a high level of self-efficacy, and 72.3% of those had received intensive job training. This suggests that employees who undergo intensive training tend to have greater confidence in their work-related abilities. Additionally, 23.3% reported a moderate level of training; within this group, self-efficacy was distributed between moderate (8.8%) and high (14.5%) levels. Despite receiving only moderate training, a significant portion of employees demonstrated high self-efficacy. Only 2.5% of participants reported low levels of training, and the majority of them showed low or moderate self-efficacy.

**Table 1.**

Relationship Between Job Training and Self-Efficacy Among UNASAM Administrative Staff

| Job Training | Self-Efficacy:<br>Low | Self-Efficacy:<br>Medium | Self-Efficacy:<br>High | Total               |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Low          | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 2<br>(1.3%)          | n = 1<br>(0.6%)        | n = 4<br>(2.5%)     |
| Medium       | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 14<br>(8.8%)         | n = 23<br>(14.5%)      | n = 37<br>(23.3%)   |
| High         | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 3<br>(1.9%)          | n = 115<br>(72.3%)     | n = 118<br>(74.2%)  |
| Total        | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 19<br>(11.9%)        | n = 139<br>(87.4%)     | n = 159<br>(100.0%) |

The data presented in Table 2 reveal a direct and significant relationship between the level of guided mastery and self-efficacy among administrative staff at UNASAM. Of the 159 employees evaluated, the vast majority (87.4%) reported high self-efficacy. Within this group, 74.8% demonstrated a medium level of guided mastery, while 9.4% were at a high level. This suggests that as employees develop greater mastery in specific areas of their work, their perceived self-efficacy increases significantly.

It is also noteworthy that none of the employees with high or medium self-efficacy were categorized at the low level of guided mastery. This reinforces the importance of solid training in key domains to enhance employees' confidence in their professional capabilities. Only a small percentage (6.3%) of employees reported a low level of guided mastery, and within this subgroup, most also exhibited low or medium levels of self-efficacy.

**Table 2.**

Relationship Between Guided Mastery and Self-Efficacy Among UNASAM

### Administrative Staff

| Guided Mastery | Self-Efficacy:<br>Low | Self-Efficacy:<br>Medium | Self-Efficacy:<br>High | Total               |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Low            | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 4<br>(2.5%)          | n = 5<br>(3.1%)        | n = 10<br>(6.3%)    |
| Medium         | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 15<br>(9.4%)         | n = 119<br>(74.8%)     | n = 134<br>(84.3%)  |
| High           | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 0<br>(0.0%)          | n = 15<br>(9.4%)       | n = 15<br>(9.4%)    |
| Total          | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 19<br>(11.9%)        | n = 139<br>(87.4%)     | n = 159<br>(100.0%) |

Table 3 shows a significant correlation between cognitive mastery learning and self-efficacy among administrative staff. A total of 87.4% of employees reported high self-efficacy, and within this group, the majority (56.6%) demonstrated a high level of cognitive mastery learning. Additionally, 39% of the staff exhibited a medium level of cognitive learning and presented a mix of high and medium self-efficacy. Only 3.1% of employees showed low cognitive mastery, which was reflected in low or moderate levels of self-efficacy. These findings suggest that higher cognitive development is closely associated with increased workplace self-efficacy.

**Table 3.**

Relationship Between Cognitive Mastery Learning and Self-Efficacy Among UNASAM Administrative Staff

| Cognitive Mastery Learning | Self-Efficacy:<br>Low | Self-Efficacy:<br>Medium | Self-Efficacy:<br>High | Total               |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Low                        | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 2<br>(1.3%)          | n = 2<br>(1.3%)        | n = 5<br>(3.1%)     |
| Medium                     | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 15<br>(9.4%)         | n = 47<br>(29.6%)      | n = 62<br>(39.0%)   |
| High                       | n = 0<br>(0.0%)       | n = 2<br>(1.3%)          | n = 90<br>(56.6%)      | n = 92<br>(57.9%)   |
| Total                      | n = 1<br>(0.6%)       | n = 19<br>(11.9%)        | n = 139<br>(87.4%)     | n = 159<br>(100.0%) |

The data in Table 4 reveal a strong relationship between the development of self-regulation competencies and workplace self-efficacy among UNASAM administrative staff. The majority (87.4%) reported high self-efficacy, with 74.8% demonstrating a high level of self-regulation development, suggesting that these competencies enhance confidence in job performance. Additionally, 21.4% exhibited a medium level of self-regulation development, associated primarily with medium and high self-efficacy. Only 1.9% of employees reported low development in self-regulation competencies, a condition mainly linked to low or moderate self-efficacy.

**Table 4.**

Relationship Between the Development of Self-Regulation Competencies and Self-Efficacy Among UNASAM Administrative Staff

| Development of Self-Regulation Competencies | Self-Efficacy: Low | Self-Efficacy: Medium | Self-Efficacy: High | Total               |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Low                                         | n = 1<br>(0.6%)    | n = 2<br>(1.3%)       | n = 0<br>(0.0%)     | n = 3<br>(1.9%)     |
| Medium                                      | n = 0<br>(0.0%)    | n = 14<br>(8.8%)      | n = 20<br>(12.6%)   | n = 34<br>(21.4%)   |
| High                                        | n = 0<br>(0.0%)    | n = 3<br>(1.9%)       | n = 119<br>(74.8%)  | n = 122<br>(76.7%)  |
| Total                                       | n = 1<br>(0.6%)    | n = 19<br>(11.9%)     | n = 139<br>(87.4%)  | n = 159<br>(100.0%) |

Table 5 reveals a moderate positive relationship between administrative staff training and self-efficacy. It is observed that increased training is associated with a higher perception of self-efficacy. This relationship is statistically significant, with a p-value < 0.05, supporting the hypothesis that training has a positive influence on self-efficacy. Furthermore, positive and statistically significant correlations were also found between guided mastery, cognitive mastery learning, and the development of self-regulation competencies and self-efficacy. These findings underscore the importance of training programs that address these specific areas in order to enhance employees' confidence and effectiveness in the workplace.

**Table 5.**

Spearman's Rho Correlation Coefficient

| Relationship                                                        | Correlation Coefficient (rs) | Significance (p-value) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| Training and staff self-efficacy                                    | 0.575                        | 0.0001                 |
| Guided mastery and staff self-efficacy                              | 0.396                        | 0.0001                 |
| Cognitive mastery learning and staff self-efficacy                  | 0.524                        | 0.0001                 |
| Development of self-regulation competencies and staff self-efficacy | 0.526                        | 0.0001                 |

### Description of the Characteristics of the Study Variables

Table 6 shows that the majority of UNASAM's administrative staff perceive the benefit derived from the training they have received as very high, with an average of 66%. In addition, a significant segment—18%—considers their training benefit to be at a medium level. Another 11% of respondents believe their benefit level is high, while approximately 5% of employees rate their training benefit as low or very low.

This distribution suggests a predominantly positive perception regarding the effectiveness of training at this institution, although there remains room for improvement, particularly for those who do not perceive a significant impact.

**Table 6.**  
Assessment of Training by Administrative Staff

| Items                                                                                                                     | Very Low    | Low          | Medium        | High           | Very High     | Total           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Form, manage, and develop work teams                                                                                      | 3<br>(1.9%) | 8<br>(5.0%)  | 53<br>(33.3%) | 90<br>(56.6%)  | 5<br>(3.1%)   | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Apply specialized topics related to the job to improve performance                                                        | 2<br>(1.3%) | 14<br>(8.8%) | 33<br>(20.8%) | 106<br>(66.7%) | 4<br>(2.5%)   | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Apply knowledge related to planning, administrative procedures, organizational structures, HR, finance, procurement, etc. | 6<br>(3.8%) | 10<br>(6.3%) | 35<br>(22.0%) | 97<br>(61.0%)  | 11<br>(6.9%)  | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Apply logical reasoning in complex situations                                                                             | 2<br>(1.3%) | 10<br>(6.3%) | 31<br>(19.5%) | 100<br>(62.9%) | 16<br>(10.1%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Identify causes of problems, choose effective solutions, and implement them on time                                       | 2<br>(1.3%) | 7<br>(4.4%)  | 28<br>(17.6%) | 97<br>(61.0%)  | 25<br>(15.7%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Make logical and documented decisions based on prior analysis and observation                                             | 3<br>(1.9%) | 3<br>(1.9%)  | 34<br>(21.4%) | 106<br>(66.7%) | 13<br>(8.2%)  | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Understand and transform information into effective words and actions                                                     | 2<br>(1.3%) | 5<br>(3.1%)  | 40<br>(25.2%) | 102<br>(64.2%) | 10<br>(6.3%)  | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Use language, organize ideas, and apply punctuation correctly in reports or documents                                     | 0<br>(0.0%) | 7<br>(4.4%)  | 32<br>(20.1%) | 106<br>(66.7%) | 14<br>(8.8%)  | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Apply mathematical calculations when necessary on the job                                                                 | 2<br>(1.3%) | 9<br>(5.7%)  | 42<br>(26.4%) | 98<br>(61.6%)  | 8<br>(5.0%)   | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Independently propose job-related improvements                                                                            | 1<br>(0.6%) | 2<br>(1.3%)  | 20<br>(12.6%) | 115<br>(72.3%) | 21<br>(13.2%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Identify innovation opportunities and adapt to change                                                                     | 1<br>(0.6%) | 4<br>(2.5%)  | 24<br>(15.1%) | 113<br>(71.1%) | 17<br>(10.7%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Assume responsibility for decisions and actions                                                                           | 1<br>(0.6%) | 3<br>(1.9%)  | 25<br>(15.7%) | 109<br>(68.6%) | 21<br>(13.2%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Contribute to the institution's mission and departmental goals                                                            | 1<br>(0.6%) | 3<br>(1.9%)  | 20<br>(12.6%) | 119<br>(74.8%) | 16<br>(10.1%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Express needs politely, directly, and appropriately                                                                       | 1<br>(0.6%) | 5<br>(3.1%)  | 20<br>(12.6%) | 115<br>(72.3%) | 18<br>(11.3%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |

|                                                                                |             |             |               |                |               |                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Communicate clearly, concisely, and respectfully with superiors and colleagues | 1<br>(0.6%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 15<br>(9.4%)  | 106<br>(66.7%) | 35<br>(22.0%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Participate, support, and lead teams to achieve organizational goals           | 2<br>(1.3%) | 3<br>(1.9%) | 22<br>(13.8%) | 108<br>(67.9%) | 24<br>(15.1%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Interact effectively with colleagues and complete tasks satisfactorily         | 1<br>(0.6%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 28<br>(17.6%) | 105<br>(66.0%) | 24<br>(15.1%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Work ethically and make value-based decisions                                  | 2<br>(1.3%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 14<br>(8.8%)  | 99<br>(62.3%)  | 42<br>(26.4%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Total variable                                                                 | —<br>(1.2%) | —<br>(3.4%) | —<br>(18.0%)  | —<br>(66.1%)   | —<br>(11.3%)  | —<br>(100.0%)   |

Table 7 presents the results regarding the self-efficacy of administrative staff at UNASAM, revealing a strong conviction in their ability to effectively perform the tasks associated with their respective roles. The majority, averaging 63%, reported high self-efficacy, reflecting substantial confidence in their job-related skills and competencies. Additionally, 27% of employees indicated a very high level of self-efficacy, suggesting an even more positive perception of their capacity to face and overcome work-related challenges.

However, a small group—9%—perceived their self-efficacy as moderate, while only 1% reported low or very low levels. These findings indicate an overall optimistic view of the preparedness and confidence among UNASAM's administrative staff, while also highlighting the importance of continuing to strengthen self-efficacy among those at the lower end of the spectrum.

**Table 7.**  
Assessment of Self-Efficacy Among Administrative Staff

| Items                                                                 | Very Low    | Low         | Medium        | High           | Very High     | Total           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Confidence in overcoming difficulties to achieve goals                | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 24<br>(15.1%) | 109<br>(68.6%) | 25<br>(15.7%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Confidence in achieving expected goals                                | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 22<br>(13.8%) | 97<br>(61.0%)  | 38<br>(23.9%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Confidence in handling unexpected events                              | 1<br>(0.6%) | 3<br>(1.9%) | 22<br>(13.8%) | 97<br>(61.0%)  | 36<br>(22.6%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Certainty in solving difficult problems                               | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 14<br>(8.8%)  | 95<br>(59.7%)  | 48<br>(30.2%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Confidence in skills and experience to overcome unforeseen situations | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 9<br>(5.7%)   | 106<br>(66.7%) | 42<br>(26.4%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Certainty in resolving difficult situations                           | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 15<br>(9.4%)  | 95<br>(59.7%)  | 47<br>(29.6%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Willingness to make necessary effort to                               | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 17<br>(10.7%) | 100<br>(62.9%) | 41<br>(25.8%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |

|                                                                  |             |             |               |                |               |                 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| achieve challenging goals                                        |             |             |               |                |               |                 |
| Persistence to achieve expected results                          | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 8<br>(5.0%)   | 96<br>(60.4%)  | 53<br>(33.3%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Commitment and identification with institutional goals and tasks | 1<br>(0.6%) | 0<br>(0.0%) | 5<br>(3.1%)   | 102<br>(64.2%) | 51<br>(32.1%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Energy and drive in achieving work objectives                    | 1<br>(0.6%) | 0<br>(0.0%) | 9<br>(5.7%)   | 104<br>(65.4%) | 45<br>(28.3%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Adaptation to various job tasks and situational contexts         | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 15<br>(9.4%)  | 108<br>(67.9%) | 35<br>(22.0%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Experience in facing different kinds of challenges               | 0<br>(0.0%) | 2<br>(1.3%) | 13<br>(8.2%)  | 102<br>(64.2%) | 42<br>(26.4%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Willingness to verify performance and make improvements          | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 16<br>(10.1%) | 96<br>(60.4%)  | 46<br>(28.9%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Ability to generate creative and innovative solutions            | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 20<br>(12.6%) | 97<br>(61.0%)  | 41<br>(25.8%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Confidence in achieving high performance across functions        | 0<br>(0.0%) | 1<br>(0.6%) | 9<br>(5.7%)   | 93<br>(58.5%)  | 56<br>(35.2%) | 159<br>(100.0%) |
| Total variable                                                   | —<br>(0.1%) | —<br>(0.9%) | —<br>(9.1%)   | —<br>(62.8%)   | —<br>(27.1%)  | —<br>(100.0%)   |

## DISCUSSION

The results obtained in this study reveal a strong correlation between job training and self-efficacy among administrative staff at UNASAM. Through both correlational and descriptive analyses, it was observed that employees who receive consistent and effective training tend to develop higher levels of self-efficacy. This finding supports previous theories concerning the positive impact of training on employees' confidence and job-related competencies (Bandura, 2001).

Regarding guided mastery, a direct and significant relationship was found with the self-efficacy of UNASAM staff. It can thus be affirmed that employees who report a high level of guided mastery also demonstrate high self-efficacy—results consistent with the findings of Márquez Vélez (2020). This suggests that training in key areas contributes significantly to enhancing employees' perceived competencies and job performance.

It was also determined that cognitive mastery—focused on strengthening analytical and intellectual abilities—shows a positive and significant relationship with self-efficacy. This finding aligns with the research of McDonald and Siegall

(1992), who demonstrated that the acquisition of cognitive skills fosters greater self-confidence. Similarly, Díaz Montes (2019) reported that the majority of employees with high cognitive mastery also displayed high self-efficacy. These results highlight the importance of cognitive abilities in shaping perceived efficacy for executing complex job tasks.

In terms of self-regulation competencies, the study also revealed a positive and direct relationship with self-efficacy. According to the results, employees with well-developed self-regulation competencies exhibit greater confidence in their work capacity. This finding is consistent with Márquez Vélez (2020), who concluded that self-regulation competencies influence not only self-efficacy but also job satisfaction. These competencies enable employees to manage their behaviors and emotions effectively—crucial elements for making decisions and facing challenges in the workplace (Merino Tejedor & Lucas Mangas, 2015).

The present study found that 74.2% of UNASAM's administrative personnel reported receiving a high level of training. This is noteworthy, as it indicates a strong institutional commitment to continuous professional development and improved employee performance (Zúñiga De Guillermo, 2019). This result is also in line with previous research suggesting that training in universities is a key factor for achieving organizational efficiency and fostering the personal development of staff (Navarrete Villota, 2018).

Furthermore, 23.3% of administrative staff at UNASAM indicated receiving a moderate level of training. While this is a smaller proportion, it represents an opportunity to target these employees through customized training programs based on job-specific requirements. This observation is aligned with the findings of Iracheta Cárdenas (2012), who stated that insufficient training limits employees' potential development and workplace motivation.

With regard to self-efficacy, 87.4% of administrative staff at UNASAM reported high levels, indicating a considerable degree of confidence in their ability to perform job-related tasks. Studies conducted in Peruvian and international universities have shown that employees with more extensive training tend to report more positive perceptions of their self-efficacy (Márquez Vélez, 2020).

It was also determined that at UNASAM, employees who received high levels of training displayed notably high levels of self-efficacy (72.3%). This finding aligns with the results of Na-Nan and Sanamthong (2019), who concluded that training not only enhances job-specific skills but also reinforces workers' self-efficacy by fostering greater confidence and control over their performance.

In light of these findings, it can be affirmed that, within the university context, the training of administrative staff should focus on enhancing both cognitive and technical skills, while also fostering self-efficacy. According to Robles Asmat

(2019), universities that design and implement systematic training programs successfully elevate employee competencies, improve their perception of capability, and enhance their control over job responsibilities. Likewise, Cumming and Worley (2007) emphasized that training has direct implications for overall organizational performance, as it promotes proactivity, more effective handling of challenges, and higher levels of job satisfaction.

## CONCLUSIONS

Regarding the relationship between job training and self-efficacy within the university context, it can be affirmed that there is a significant positive relationship between training and self-efficacy among administrative staff. Employees who received continuous training demonstrated higher levels of self-efficacy, which is consistent with theories emphasizing the importance of strengthening job-related skills (Na-Nan & Sanamthong, 2019).

With respect to guided mastery and self-efficacy, a direct and significant relationship was observed, suggesting that employees with a high level of guided mastery tend to exhibit high self-efficacy. This implies that training focused on specific job-related skills enhances employees' confidence in their ability to perform their roles effectively.

Concerning the relationship between cognitive mastery and self-efficacy, cognitive mastery learning was found to be directly and significantly associated with self-efficacy. Employees who develop advanced cognitive skills feel more competent and better prepared to face complex work-related challenges.

In terms of self-regulation competencies and self-efficacy, the development of self-regulation skills is directly and significantly linked to high self-efficacy. This highlights the importance of effectively managing emotions and behavior in the workplace to strengthen self-efficacy perceptions.

Regarding the characteristics of training and self-efficacy among administrative staff, training at UNASAM has a direct and significant impact on employees' confidence in performing their job responsibilities. The implementation of well-structured training programs can enhance not only technical competencies but also self-efficacy and overall workplace well-being.

## REFERENCIAS

- Bandura, A. (2001). *Guía para la construcción de escalas de autoeficacia*. <https://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/effguideSpanish.html>
- Cumming, T., & Worley, C. (2007). *Desarrollo organizacional y cambio* (8a ed.). Thomson Learning.

- Dessler, G (2015). *Administración de recursos humanos*. (14ª ed.) Pearson Educación.
- Díaz Montes, E. E. (2019). *Autoeficacia académica y aprendizaje autorregulado en estudiantes de primer ciclo en una universidad privada de Lima*. Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia. [https://repositorio.upch.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12866/7679/Autoeficacia\\_D](https://repositorio.upch.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12866/7679/Autoeficacia_D)
- Fernández-Arata, M. (2008). *Burnout, autoeficacia y estrés en maestros peruanos: tres estudios fácticos*. Ciencia & trabajo, 30, 120-125. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44204834\\_Burnout\\_Autoeficacia\\_y\\_Estres\\_en\\_Maestros\\_Peruanos\\_Tres\\_Estudios\\_Facticos\\_Burnout\\_Self-efficacy\\_and\\_Stress\\_in\\_Peruvian\\_Teachers\\_Three\\_Factual\\_Studies](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/44204834_Burnout_Autoeficacia_y_Estres_en_Maestros_Peruanos_Tres_Estudios_Facticos_Burnout_Self-efficacy_and_Stress_in_Peruvian_Teachers_Three_Factual_Studies)
- Franklin, E., & Krieger, M. (2011). *Comportamiento organizacional. Enfoque para América Latina*. Pearson Educativa.
- García, V. (2012). *La motivación laboral. Estudio descriptivo de algunas variables*. Tesis de grado, Universidad de Valladolid. <https://uvadoc.uva.es/bitstream/handle/10324/1144/TFG-B.60.pdf;jsessionid=58F6DE861B8F83BA0A6964EE43241005?sequence=1>
- Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. (2009). *Comportamiento organizacional* (12a ed.). México, D. F.: Cengage Learning Editores.
- Iracheta Cárdenas, R. (2012). *La capacitación y su impacto en la rotación de personal*. Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León. <https://cd.dgb.uanl.mx/handle/201504211/5365>
- Ivancevich, J., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. (2006). *Comportamiento organizacional* (7a ed.). México, D. F.: McGrawHill.
- Luthans, F. (2007). *Comportamiento organizacional* (11 a ed.). McGraw Hill / Interamerica Editores.
- McDonald, T., & Siegal, M. (1992). The effects of technological self-efficacy and job focus on job performance, attitudes, and withdrawal behaviors. *The Journal of Psychology*, 126(5), 465-475. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1992.10543380>
- Márquez Vélez, N. (2020). *Autoeficacia laboral y satisfacción laboral en trabajadores de recursos humanos de una consultora privada de Lima Metropolitana*. Tesis de grado, Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola. <http://repositorio.usil.edu.pe/handle/USIL/10122>
- Merino Tejedor, E., & Lucas Mangas, S. (2015). *La autoeficacia y la autorregulación como variables moderadoras del estrés laboral en docentes de educación primaria*. Universidad de Valladolid.
- Mondy, W. (2010). *Administración de recursos humanos* (11a ed.). Pearson Educación.
- Na-Nan, K., & Sanamthong, E. (2019). Self-efficacy and employee job performance: Mediating effects of perceived workplace support, motivation to transfer and transfer of training. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 37(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJQRM-01->

2019-0013

- Navarrete Villota, M. J. (2018). *La capacitación del personal y el desempeño laboral*. Universidad Técnica de Ambato.  
<http://repositorio.uta.edu.ec/jspui/bitstream/123456789/28329/1/49%20GTH.pdf>
- Robbins, S., & Judge, T. (2017). *Comportamiento organizacional* (17a ed.). Pearson Educación de México.
- Robbins, S., & Coulter, M. (2018). *Administración* (13a ed.). Pearson Educación de México.
- Robles Asmat, A. P. (2019). *Autoeficacia y satisfacción laboral en docentes de una institución educativa privada de Lima*. Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas.  
[https://repositorioacademico.upc.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/10757/633468/RoblesA\\_A.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://repositorioacademico.upc.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/10757/633468/RoblesA_A.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- Ruiz de Varillas, R. (2017). *Engagement y autoeficacia general en personal administrativo de una entidad financiera de Piura*. Tesis de grado, Universidad Señor de Sipán.  
<https://repositorio.uss.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12802/6564/Ruiz%20de%20Varillas%20Reichell%20Ver%C3%B3nica.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y>
- Zúñiga De Guillermo, V. d. (2019). *Capacitación y rendimiento laboral de una empresa eléctrica, Lima - 2019*. Universidad César Vallejo.  
[https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12692/36095/B\\_Z%C3%BAiga\\_DGVDP.pdf](https://repositorio.ucv.edu.pe/bitstream/handle/20.500.12692/36095/B_Z%C3%BAiga_DGVDP.pdf)