

Technium.

44/2023

2023
A new decade for social changes

Technium
Social Sciences

Powered by

PLUS
COMMUNICATION



International
Communication & PR



Self-Efficacy, Well-Being, And Work Engagement of City Marshalls at Binan City, Laguna

Jomar E. Borce. and Antonio R. Yango

Graduate School, University of Perpetual Help System

Jomarborce0521@gmail.com, yango.antonio@uphsl.edu.ph

Abstract. Leaders are born and then made. However, leaders always look forward to their organization, they seek new experiences and being constant to self-introspection made. The objective of this study was to undermine the level of self-efficacy, well-being, and work engagement, probe the relationship between the respondents' level of self-efficacy and well-being, the level of self-efficacy and level of work engagement, and the well-being and level of work engagement, and discover the predictive ability of the level of self-efficacy, and well-being, taken singly or in combination, of level of work engagement of City Marshalls at Binan City, Laguna. The findings revealed that there was a multiple correlation between the respondents' level of self-efficacy, well-being, and level of work engagement. Further, the ANOVA showed that the independent variable intellectual well-being statistically significantly predicted the dependent variable level of work engagement with an F-value of 33.775 and a probability value of 0.000 which was less than the 0.05 significance level. This implied that the independent variables emotional and intellectual well-being were the drivers of work engagement, which further suggested that the city Marshall's genuine desire to learn and seek to be challenged in order to improve and grow as an individual determine their commitment to help the organization achieve its goals, which were demonstrated by how they think, feel, and act, as well as the emotional connection they feel towards the organization, work, and team. This study is believed to be a helpful reference for the study's respondents in carefully and critically exercising their functions and roles with impartiality, neutrality, and non-partisanship, such as mediation and arbitration.

Keywords. Cognitive, Marshall, self-efficacy, well-being, work engagement

I. Introduction

The emergence of creativity and innovations at the different local level is said to be due to many factors. Some of these factors include the people's participation and support, multi-sectoral cooperation, media and information dissemination, support from external international institutions, social well-being, work engagement and self-efficacy. Perhaps, if some citizens to prioritize according to the level of importance of these various factors, the role of self-efficacy, work engagement and social well-being of city Marshalls would play a key role in successful local governance (Brillantes 2018) [1].

In the country, Local Government Units (LGUs) established a strong system of coordination and cooperation among citizenry, local executives, and departments to ensure

effective and efficient delivery of self-efficacy, social well-being and work engagement program for city Marshalls and barangay officials as well. Good self-efficacy, well-being, and work engagement of city Marshalls, which means possession of such qualities as setting directions qualities, personal qualities, broad scanner, and primary values should be impressed upon the constituents to raise their level of awareness about what good leaders, especially city Marshalls, should be. They must be guided accordingly through monitoring to ensure that proper skills and work engagement are being imposed and exercised within the local barangay or even in the municipality (Padilla and Eguia, 2019) [2].

Wahome (2020) [3] expounded that self-efficacy is connected to well-being and focuses on an individual's belief in their ability to complete tasks and achieve success. People are more likely to engage in activities for which they have high self-efficacy, and they are less likely to engage in activities for which they have low self-efficacy. Thus, according to Wahome (2022) [4], self-efficacy has a substantial impact on sectors such as education, research, medical practice, and other labor-intensive endeavors. The advantages of self-efficacy include stress resistance. Possessing a high level of self-efficacy can assist a person in altering their viewpoint on difficult matters. Positive lifestyle choices and self-efficacy can aid in the maintenance of a healthy lifestyle.

Concurrently, well-being is a person's cognitive and affective positive evaluation of his or her life. From this perspective, well-being is considered subjective as it derives from an individual evaluation of one's sense of wellness and it is characterized by two components: the cognitive, that usually corresponds to the life satisfaction, and the affective, that corresponds to the predominance of positive affect over negative affect (Deci & Ryan, 2018) [5]. Recently, they have suggested that the cognitive component of well-being should be extended by the positivity that adds self-esteem and optimism to life satisfaction. Meanwhile, the affective component of well-being is instead considered in terms of hedonic balance, the difference between positive and negative affects experienced in various life situations, and it is often called happiness.

On the other hand, Bell (2022) [6] advocated for flexibility and work-life balance through services focusing on creating and sustaining a healthy mix of work, personal life, and personal pursuits to support each person's need for work life effectiveness. He stated that the success of a business depends on the attention, investment, and dedication of its personnel. When employees are engaged in their job, the organization as a whole functions more efficiently.

In addition, Herrity et al. (2021) [7] found that companies that promote employee engagement are more likely to have improved staff retention and productivity. Similarly, Robinson (2022) [8] claimed that employee engagement is the notion that employees' function more effectively when they have a positive relationship with their company and coworkers and when they have a sense of purpose in their job. Engaged employees enjoy greater physical and mental health, build stronger relationships with coworkers and clients, immerse themselves in their job, and take pleasure in the office's day-to-day successes. Motivated workers have a ripple effect across the business. Businesses with engaged workers report higher customer satisfaction, reduced absenteeism and overtime, fewer safety accidents, lower staff turnover, a more robust corporate culture, and a better bottom line.

Considering these aspects, the researcher decided to conduct this study to gauge the self-efficacy, well-being, and work engagement of the selected City Marshalls in Biñan City, Laguna. The respondents of this study were chosen from the mentioned locale. Finally, by the time this study was accomplished, the researcher proposed several recommendations in hopes

that it would serve as guide for the City Marshalls to formulate comprehensive policies, plans, programs and activities in the community and forum wherein the collective views of people may be crystallized or considered and fully exercise their role as the barangay police in the city considering it is the lowest political leader guided by the local government.

1.1 Objective of the Study

The overall objective of the study was to determine the self-efficacy, well-being, and work engagement of the City Marshalls in Biñan City, Laguna. Specifically, this study had the following objectives (1) examine the respondents' level of self-efficacy, well-being in terms of physical, social, emotional, spiritual, and intellectual, and level of work engagement, (2) discover the relationship between the respondents' level of self-efficacy and well-being, the level of self-efficacy and level of work engagement, and the well-being and level of work engagement, and (3) discern how predictive were the level of self-efficacy, and well-being, taken singly or in combination, of level of work engagement of City Marshalls at Binan City, Laguna.

II. Methods

This study employed quantitative research in gathering the needed data for the study. Babbie (2016) [9] defined qualitative research as a design which focuses on gathering numerical data and generalizing it across groups of people or to explain a particular phenomenon. The goal in utilizing quantitative research was to determine the relationship between an independent variable and another dependent variable within a population.

In like manner, the researcher utilized descriptive-correlational method of research. Descriptive correlational design is used in research studies that aim to provide static pictures of situations as well as establish the relationship between different variables (McBurney & White, 2019) [10]. The researcher discovered the (a) self-efficacy, (b) well-being, and (c) work engagement of City Marshalls through the employment of the aforementioned methodologies.

Simple random sampling technique was used in the study. Thomas (2022) [11] expounded that this method is the most straightforward of all the probability sampling methods, since it only involves a single random selection and requires little advance knowledge about the population. Because it uses randomization, any research performed on this sample should have high internal and external validity, and be at a lower risk for research biases like sampling bias and selection bias. Using the Raosoft calculator with 95% confidence level and 5 % margin of error and through the assistance of Biñan's City Mayor, Atty. Walfredo R. Dimaguila Jr., the researcher was able to obtain a sample size of 131 city Marshalls out of the 196 total population in Biñan City, Laguna. The obtained sample size also served as the respondents of the study. The selected respondents were regarded as the best representatives from the total population because they had adequate knowledge of the research topic, which warranted their selection as respondents of the study.

The researcher personally administered a self-made questionnaire while following the safety protocols which were the use of face masks, as well as the enforcing social distancing to adhere to the health protocols set by the Inter-agency Task Force (IATF) related to the COVID - 19 pandemic. The nature of the study and the instructions were laid out by the researcher for better understanding of the respondents. The questionnaire was subjected to face and content validity. It was presented to a panel of experts in educational management, statistics, and research to elicit their comments and suggestions and assure the appropriateness and relevance of each item in the questionnaire. It also underwent Cronbach's Alpha reliability test for

thorough validation of the formulated indicators. The result of the reliability test using Cronbach Alpha test were for self-efficacy- 0.939, for social well-being - 0.987, and for work engagement -0.969. The accomplished questionnaires were collected right after they answered by the respondents and the gathered data were tallied, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

In interpreting the collected and tabulated data, statistical tools such as weighted mean and ranking, Pearson r, and Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis were employed.

III. Results and Discussion

Table 1

Respondents' Level of Self-Efficacy

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problem if I try hard enough.	3.51	Very High	1
2. If someone opposes me, I can find means and ways to get what I want.	3.32	Very High	8
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	3.35	Very High	5.5
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	3.32	Very High	8
5. I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	3.27	Very High	10
6. I can solve most problems If I invest the necessary effort.	3.41	Very High	3
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	3.42	Very High	2
8. When I can confront with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	3.40	Very High	4
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of something to do.	3.35	Very High	5.5
10. No matter what comes my way, I'm usually able to handle it.	3.32	Very High	8
Average	3.37	Very High	

Table 1 presents the respondents' level of self-efficacy, as seen in the table, indicator 1 "I can always manage to solve difficult problem, If I try hard enough" had obtained a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as "very high" and was ranked 1. Indicator 7, which states, "I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities" got a weighted mean of 3.42, verbally interpreted as "very high" was ranked 2 and the indicator 6 "I can solve most problems If I invest the necessary effort" with an obtained weighted mean of 3.41, verbally interpreted as "very high" and was ranked 3. On the other hand, indicator 5 "I

know how to handle unforeseen situations” obtained a weighted mean of 3.27, verbally interpreted as “very high” and was ranked 10. Indicator 2, 4 and 10 which states “If someone opposes me, I can find means and ways to get what I want”, “I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events” and “No matter what comes my way, I’m usually able to handle it” obtained a weighted mean of 3.32, interpreted as “very high” and were ranked 8. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 3.37 revealed that the respondents’ level of self-efficacy was very high. The results implied that the city Marshalls had series of fundamental skills and the confidence to reflect over their own motivation, behavior, and social environment during the dispense of their responsibilities as public servants.

Table 2
The Respondents’ Well-being: Physical

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I maintain a desirable weight.	2.58	Good (Agree)	4
2. I engage in vigorous exercises such as brisk walking.	2.66	Good (Agree)	1
3. I do exercises designed to strengthen my muscles and joints.	2.62	Good (Agree)	2.5
4. I warm up and cool down by stretching before and after vigorous exercise.	2.62	Good (Agree)	2.5
5. I feel good about the condition of my body.	2.38	Poor (Disagree)	10
6. I get 7-8 hours of sleep each night.	2.54	Good (Agree)	6
7. My immune system is strong, and I am able to avoid most infectious diseases.	2.49	Poor (Disagree)	8
8. My body heals itself quickly when I get sick or injured.	2.40	Poor (Disagree)	9
9. I have lots of energy and can get through the day without being overly tired.	2.52	Good (Agree)	7
10. I listen to my body; when there is something wrong, I seek professional advice.	2.55	Good (Agree)	5
Average	2.54	Good (Agree)	

Table 2 shows the respondents’ physical well-being. Indicator 2 “I engage in vigorous exercises such as brisk walking” had obtained a weighted mean of 2.66, verbally interpreted as “agree” and was ranked 1. Indicators 3 and 4 that states, “I do exercises designed to strengthen my muscles and joints” and “I warm up and cool down by stretching before and after vigorous exercise” obtained a weighted mean of 2.62, verbally interpreted as “agree” and were ranked 2.5 respectively. On the other hand, indicator 5 “I feel good about the condition of my body”

acquired a weighted mean of 2.38, verbally interpreted as “disagree” and was ranked 10, indicator 8 “My body heals itself quickly when I get sick or injured” obtained a weighted mean of 2.40, verbally interpreted as “disagree” and was ranked 9 and indicator 7 “My immune system is strong and I am able to avoid most infectious diseases” had obtained a weighted mean of 2.49, verbally interpreted as “disagree” and was ranked 8. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.54 revealed that the respondents had good physical well-being. This suggested that the city Marshalls maintained good and positive physical health through adequate exercise, proper nutrition and abstaining from harmful habits.

Table 3
The Respondents’ Well-being: Social

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. When I meet people, I feel good about the impression I make on them.	2.46	Good (Agree)	7
2. I am open, honest, and get along well with other people.	2.45	Poor (Disagree)	8
3. I participate in a wide variety of social activities and enjoy being with people who are different than me.	2.61	Good (Agree)	2
4. I try to be a "better person" and work on behaviours that have caused problems in my interactions with others.	2.67	Good (Agree)	1
5. I get along well with the members of my family.	2.53	Good (Agree)	5
6. I am a good listener.	2.59	Good (Agree)	3
7. I am open and accessible to a loving and responsible relationship.	2.48	Poor (Disagree)	6
8. I have someone I can talk to about my private feelings.	2.54	Good (Agree)	4
9. I consider the feelings of others and do not act in hurtful or selfish ways.	2.36	Poor (Disagree)	10
10. I consider how what I say, might be perceived by others before I speak.	2.42	Poor (Disagree)	9
Average	2.51	Good (Agree)	

Table 3 displays the respondents’ social well-being. Indicator “I try to be a "better person" and work on behaviours that have caused problems in my interactions with others” had obtained a weighted mean of 2.67, verbally interpreted as “agree” and was ranked 1, indicator

3 “I participate in a wide variety of social activities and enjoy being with people who are different than me” obtained a weighted average mean of 2.61, verbally interpreted as “agree” and was ranked 2 and indicator 6 that states, “I am a good listener” got a weighted mean of 2.59, verbally interpreted as “agree” and was ranked 3. On the other hand, indicator 9 “I consider the feelings of others and do not act in hurtful or selfish ways” had obtained a weighted average mean of 2.36, verbally interpreted as “disagree” and was ranked 10, indicator 10 “I consider how what I say, might be perceived by others before I speak” got a weighted average mean of 2.42, verbally interpreted as “disagree” and was ranked 9. And indicator 2 “I am open, honest, and get along well with other people” obtained a weighted average mean of 2.45, verbally interpreted as “disagree low” and was ranked 8. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.51 revealed that the respondents had good social well-being. This implied that the city Marshalls had enough capacity to share, develop, and sustain meaningful relationships with others and allow them to feel authentic and valued, and provides a sense of connectedness and belonging.

Table 4
The Respondents' Well-being: Emotional

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I find it easy to laugh about things that happen in my life.	2.49	Poor (Disagree)	6
2. I avoid using alcohol as a means of helping me forget my problems.	2.52	Good (Agree)	4
3. I can express my feelings without feeling silly.	2.50	Good (Agree)	5
4. When I am angry, I try to let others know in non-confrontational and non-hurtful ways.	2.59	Good (Agree)	1
5. I am a chronic worrier.	2.55	Good (Agree)	2.5
6. I recognize when I am stressed and take steps to relax through exercise, quiet time, or other activities.	2.55	Good (Agree)	2.5
7. I feel good about myself and believe others like me for who I am.	2.46	Poor (Disagree)	9
8. When I am upset, I talk to others and actively try to work through my problems.	2.47	Poor (Disagree)	7.5
9. I am flexible and adapt or adjust to change in a positive way.	2.45	Poor (Disagree)	10

10. My friends regard me as a stable, emotionally well-adjusted person.	2.47	Poor (Disagree)	7.5
Average	2.51	Good (Agree)	

Table 4 shows the respondents' emotional well-being. Indicator 4 "When I am angry, I try to let others know in non-confrontational and non-hurtful ways" had obtained a weighted mean of 2.59 verbally interpreted as "agree" and ranked 1. Indicators 5 and 6 that state "I am a chronic worrier" and "I recognize when I am stressed and take steps to relax through exercise, quiet time, or other activities" obtained a weighted mean of 2.55, verbally interpreted as "agree" and were ranked 2.5 respectively. On the other hand, indicator 9 "I am flexible and adapt or adjust to change in a positive way" obtained a weighted mean of 2.45, verbally interpreted as "disagree" and was ranked 10. Indicator 7 "I feel good about myself and believe others like me for who I am" acquired a weighted mean of 2.46, verbally interpreted as "disagree" and was ranked 9. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.51 unveiled that the respondents had good emotional well-being. This implied that the city Marshalls could effectively manage and understand their emotions, ability empathize with others, and adapt when confronted with adversity and stressful situations.

Table 5
The Respondents' Well-being: Spiritual

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I find it easy to laugh about things that happen in my life.	2.42	Poor (Disagree)	7.5
2. I take time to enjoy nature and the beauty around me.	2.38	Poor (Disagree)	9.5
3. I take time alone to think about what's important in life - who I am, what I value, where I fit in, and where I'm going.	2.46	Poor (Disagree)	5
4. I have belief in the importance of things beyond myself.	2.42	Poor (Disagree)	7.5
5. I engage in acts of caring and good will without expecting something in return.	2.47	Poor (Disagree)	3.5
6. I feel sorrow for those who are suffering and try to help them through difficult times.	2.58	Good (Agree)	1
7. I feel confident that I have touched the lives of others in a positive way.	2.50	Good (Agree)	2
8. I work for peace in my interpersonal relationships, in my community, and in the world at large.	2.44	Poor (Disagree)	6

9. I am content with who I am.	2.38	Poor (Disagree)	9.5
10. I go for the gusto and experience life to the fullest.	2.47	Poor (Disagree)	3.5
Average	2.45	Poor (Disagree)	

Table 5 highlights the respondents' spiritual well-being. Indicator 6 "I feel sorrow for those who are suffering and try to help them through difficult times" had obtained a weighted mean of 2.58, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 1, indicator 7 "I feel confident that I have touched the lives of others in a positive way" obtained a weighted mean of 2.50, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 2 and indicators 5 and 10 that state "I engage in acts of caring and good will without expecting something in return" and "I go for the gusto and experience life to the fullest" obtained a weighted mean of 2.47, verbally interpreted as "disagree" and were ranked 3.5 respectively. On the other hand, indicators 2 and 9 "I take time to enjoy nature and the beauty around me" and "I am content with who I am" obtained a weighted mean of 2.38, verbally interpreted as "disagree" and were ranked 9.5 respectively. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.45 disclosed that the respondents had poor spiritual well-being. This implied that the city Marshalls had moderate sense of life-meaning, self-fulfillment, and purpose.

Table 6

The Respondents' Well-being: Intellectual

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I tend to act impulsively without thinking about the consequences.	2.80	Good (Agree)	1
2. I learn from my mistakes and try to act differently the next time.	2.62	Good (Agree)	7
3. I follow directions or recommended guidelines and act in ways likely to keep others and myself safe.	2.57	Good (Agree)	10
4. I consider the alternatives before making decisions.	2.65	Good (Agree)	5
5. I am alert and ready to respond to life's challenges in ways that reflect thought and sound judgment.	2.69	Good (Agree)	3
6. I tend to let my emotions get the better of me and I act without thinking.	2.78	Good (Agree)	2
7. I actively try to learn all I reasonably can about an issue before making decisions.	2.67	Good (Agree)	4

8. I manage my time well, rather than time managing me.	2.58	Good (Agree)	9
9. My friends and family trust my judgment.	2.64	Good (Agree)	6
10. I think about my self-talk (the things I tell myself) and then examine the real evidence for my perceptions and feelings.	2.61	Good (Agree)	8
Average	2.66	Good (Agree)	

Table 6 shows the respondents' intellectual well-being. Indicator 1 "I tend to act impulsively without thinking about the consequences" had obtained a weighted mean of 2.80, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 1, indicator 6 "I tend to let my emotions get the better of me and I act without thinking" obtained a weighted mean of 2.78, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 2 and indicator 5 "I am alert and ready to respond to life's challenges in ways that reflect thought and sound judgment" got a weighted mean of 2.69, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 3. On the other hand, indicator 3

"I follow directions or recommended guidelines and act in ways likely to keep others and myself safe" obtained a weighted mean of 2.57, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 10, indicator 8 "I manage my time well, rather than time managing me" had obtained a weighted mean of 2.58, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 9 and indicator 10 "I think about my self-talk (the things I tell myself) and then examine the real evidence for my perceptions and feelings" obtained a weighted mean of 2.61, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 8. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.66 revealed that the respondents had good intellectual well-being. This suggested that the city Marshalls had creative abilities, an open mind and motivation to find ways to expand their knowledge and skills that can be applied to personal decisions, group interaction, and community betterment.

Table 7
Composite Table of the Respondents' Well-Being

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. Physical	2.54	Agree (Good)	2
2. Social	2.51	Agree (Good)	3.5
3. Emotional	2.51	Agree (Good)	3.5
4. Spiritual	2.45	Disagree (Poor)	5
5. Intellectual	2.66	Agree (Good)	1
Overall Weighted Mean	2.53	Agree (Good)	

Table 7 exhibits the composite table of the respondents' well-being. Indicator 5 "Intellectual" obtained a weighted mean of 2.66, verbally interpreted as "agree" and was ranked 1, indicator 1 "Physical" obtained a weighted mean of 2.54, verbally interpreted as "agree" and

was ranked 2 and indicators 2 and 3 “Social” and “Emotional” obtained a weighted mean of 2.51, verbally interpreted as “agree” and were respectively ranked 3.5. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 2.53 revealed that the respondents’ well-being was good. This suggested that the city Marshalls could build healthy, nurturing, and supportive relationships as well as fostering a genuine connection with the people around them.

Table 8
The Respondents’ Level of Work Engagement

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation	Rank
1. I can easily see how my work contributes to the company’s overall objectives.	3.34	Very High	8.5
2. I am proud to work as city Marshall of Biñan, Laguna.	3.51	Very High	1
3. My work environment motivates me to do my job to the best of my abilities.	3.39	Very High	5
4. My work provides me with meaning and purpose.	3.39	Very High	5
5. Most of the time, I can easily see how my role yields positive results for the City Marshalls’ Office.	3.37	Very High	7
6. I feel supported by my superiors when unforeseen situations arise in my private life.	3.44	Very High	3
7. I have access to education and training that I need to develop my professional skills.	3.45	Very High	2
8. Most of the time, I feel that I am fairly compensated for the work that I do.	3.34	Very High	8.5
9. Relevant and important information is shared liberally and quickly across teams and departments.	3.28	Very High	10
10. I feel that top-level management at City Marshalls’ Office cares about employee health and wellbeing.	3.39	Very High	5
Average	3.39	Very High	

Table 8 shows the respondents’ level of work engagement. Indicator 2 “I am proud to work as city Marshall of Biñan, Laguna” obtained a weighted mean of 3.51, verbally interpreted as “very high” and was ranked 1, indicator 7 “I have access to education and training that I need to develop my professional skills” had obtained a weighted mean of 3.45 and was ranked 2 and

indicator 6 “I feel supported by my superiors when unforeseen situations arise in my private life” got a weighted mean of 3.44 and was ranked 3. On the other hand, indicator 9 “Relevant and important information is shared liberally and quickly across teams and departments” had obtained a weighted mean of 3.28, verbally interpreted as “very high” and was ranked 10, indicators 1 and 8 “I can easily see how my work contributes to the company’s overall objectives” and “Most of the time, I feel that I am fairly compensated for the work that I do” obtained a weighted mean of 3.34, verbally interpreted as “very high” and were ranked 8.5 respectively. To sum up, an average weighted mean of 3.39 revealed that the respondents’ level of work engagement was very high. This suggested that the city Marshalls was highly engaged on their commitment to help the organization achieve its goals. It showed how they think, feel, and act, as well as the emotional connection they felt towards their organization, work, and team.

Table 9
Relationship between the Respondents’ Level of Self-efficacy and Well-being

Well-being	Pearson value	r	p-value	Interpretation
1. Physical	0.168 Low correlation		0.054	Not Significant
2. Social	0.162 Low correlation		0.064	Not Significant
3. Emotional	0.182* Low correlation		0.037	Significant
4. Spiritual	0.197* Low correlation		0.024	Significant
5. Intellectual	0.221* Low correlation		0.011	Significant

**Significant @ 0.05*

For the relationship between the respondents’ level of self-efficacy and well-being, table 9 reflected that the obtained p- values for physical =0.054 and social =0.064 were all greater than the level of significance @ 0.05, therefore, no significant relationship was noted. The result implied that the respondents’ level of self-efficacy has nothing to do with their physical and social and well-being may be due to the fact that their job requires physical agility and creditable ability to socialize with people from all walks of life. On the other hand, the obtained p- values for emotional =0.037, spiritual= 0.024 and intellectual =0.011 were all less than the level of significance @ 0.05, therefore, significant relationship was observed. The findings revealed that

the higher the respondents' level of self-efficacy, the better their emotional, spiritual, and intellectual well-being.

Table 10
Relationship between the Respondents' Level of Self-efficacy and Level of Work Engagement

	Pearson value	r	p-value	Interpretation
1. Respondents' Level of Self-efficacy and Level of Work Engagement	0.178* Low correlation		0.041	Not Significant

*Significant @ 0.05

As shown in Table 10, there was no significant relationship between the respondents' level of self-efficacy and level of work engagement. The probability value of 0.041 was obtained which was greater than 0.05 level of significance; this showed that the respondents' level of self-efficacy is not determined by their level of work engagement due to the fact that self-efficacy is mostly derived from personal experiences and work engagement undoubtedly might have no effect on their capability and tenacity to accomplish different tasks.

Table 11
Relationship between the Respondents' Well-being and Level of Work Engagement

Social Well-being	Pearson value	r	p-value	Interpretation
Physical	0.219* Low correlation		0.012	Significant
Social	0.298** Low correlation		0.001	Significant
Emotional	0.353** Low correlation		0.000	Significant
Spiritual	0.405** Low correlation		0.000	Significant
Intellectual	0.454** Low correlation		0.000	Significant

*Significant @ 0.01, **Significant @ 0.05

As table 11 shows the relationship between the respondents' well-being and level of work engagement, a p-values of 0.012 (physical), 0.001 (social), 0.000 (emotional), 0.000

(spiritual) and 0.000 (intellectual) were less than the 0.01 and 0.05 significance levels respectively. This implied that the better the respondents' physical, social, emotional, spiritual and intellectual well-being, the higher their level of work engagement.

Table 12

Stepwise Regression between the Level of Self-efficacy, Well-being taken Singly or in Combination of Level of Work Engagement

Predictor	Dependent Variable	R ²	F	p-value	β	t	p-value
Self-efficacy					-	-	-
Physical well-being					-	-	-
Social well-being					-	-	-
Emotional well-being	Work engagement	0.206	33.775	0.000*	-	-	-
Spiritual well-being					0.344	5.812	0.000*
Intellectual well-being					-	-	-
Overall Well-being							

*Significant @ 0.05

As presented in Table 12, there was a multiple correlation between the respondents' level of self-efficacy, well-being, and level of work engagement. A value of 0.000 indicates a high level of prediction of the dependent variable (level of work engagement). The obtained R square of 0.206 shows that independent variables (level of self-efficacy and well-being) explain the variability of the dependent variable (level of work engagement). Further, the ANOVA showed that the independent variable intellectual well-being statistically significantly predicted the dependent variable level of work engagement with an F-value of 33.775 and a probability value of 0.000 which was less than the 0.05 significance level. This implied that the independent variables emotional and intellectual well-being were the drivers of work engagement, which further suggested that the city Marshall's genuine desire to learn and seek to be challenged in order to improve and grow as an individual determine their commitment to help the organization achieve its goals, which were demonstrated by how they think, feel, and act, as well as the emotional connection they feel towards the organization, work, and team.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendation

In terms of the respondents' level of self-efficacy it implied that the city Marshalls had series of fundamental skills and the confidence to reflect over their own motivation, behavior, and social environment during the dispense of their responsibilities as public servants.

Taking into account the respondents' well-being specifically physical, it suggested that the city Marshalls maintained good and positive physical health through adequate exercise, proper nutrition and abstaining from harmful habits.

When it came to the respondents' well-being in terms of social, it implied that the city Marshalls had enough capacity to share, develop, and sustain meaningful relationships with others and allow them to feel authentic and valued, and provides a sense of connectedness and belonging.

Talking about the respondents' well-being specifically emotional, it suggested that the city Marshalls could effectively manage and understand their emotions, ability empathize with others, and adapt when confronted with adversity and stressful situations.

In terms of the respondents' well-being in terms of spiritual, this implied that the city Marshalls had moderate sense of life-meaning, self-fulfillment, and purpose.

When it came to the respondents' well-being in terms of intellectual, it suggested that the city Marshalls had creative abilities, an open mind and motivation to find ways to expand their knowledge and skills that can be applied to personal decisions, group interaction, and community betterment.

The results of the composite table of the respondents' well-being showed that the city Marshalls could build healthy, nurturing, and supportive relationships as well as fostering a genuine connection with the people around them.

The respondents' level of work engagement suggested that the city Marshalls were highly engaged in their commitment to help the organization achieve its goals. It showed how they think, feel, and act, as well as the emotional connection they felt towards their organization, work, and team.

For the relationship between the respondents' level of self-efficacy and well-being, no significant relationship was noted. The result implied that the respondents' level of self-efficacy has nothing to do with their physical and social and well-being may be due to the fact that their job requires physical agility and creditable ability to socialize with people from all walks of life. On the other hand, the obtained p- values for emotional, spiritual, and intellectual unveiled a significant relationship. The findings revealed that the higher the respondents' level of self-efficacy, the better their emotional, spiritual, and intellectual well-being.

There was no significant relationship between the respondents' level of self-efficacy and level of work engagement. This showed that the respondents' level of self-efficacy is not determined by their level of work engagement due to the fact that self-efficacy is mostly derived from personal experiences and work engagement undoubtedly might have no effect on their capability and tenacity to accomplish different tasks.

When it came to the relationship between the respondents' well-being and level of work engagement, it implied that the better the respondents' physical, social, emotional, spiritual, and intellectual well-being, the higher their level of work engagement.

It was concluded that there was a multiple correlation between the respondents' level of self-efficacy, well-being, and level of work engagement. Further, the ANOVA showed that the independent variable intellectual well-being statistically significantly predicted the dependent variable level of work engagement. This implied that the independent variables emotional and intellectual well-being were the drivers of work engagement, which further suggested that the

city Marshall's genuine desire to learn and seek to be challenged in order to improve and grow as an individual determine their commitment to help the organization achieve its goals, which were demonstrated by how they think, feel, and act, as well as the emotional connection they feel towards the organization, work, and team.

The following recommendations were made by the researcher based on the following findings.

To the city Marshall Office, the researcher suggests should conduct systematic self-management like crime incident investigation, stress management training, time management training and personal development training that would enhance self-efficacy expectations of the city Marshalls, and encourage them to set realistic personal goals, delineate clear priorities, be well-organized and enhance time-management skills that would really help them develop more their self-efficacy. They also need to provide Marshalls specific seminar/webinar particularly on embracing the value of well-being that would really improve their sense of life-meaning and purpose which usually include their connection to culture, community, spirituality and/or religiosity, beliefs, values, mental models, and ethics they hold which are all part and parcel of the spiritual development of the city Marshalls. On top of that, they may consider revisiting the employee manual particular matters related to improvement of work culture, reducing turnover, increasing productivity, building better work and client relationships, and others. High employee work engagement also turns workers into best advocates which have something to do with the Marshalls' work engagement.

To the head of the city Marshall, the researcher recommends that they may consider recognizing good work done by providing flexible work schedule, benefits in form of rewards /recognition. Also to boost team relationship among them ,have open communication and encourage feedback. To raise their profile and enhance their well-being, provide activities for Mental health such as meditation or yoga, physical like team buildings and joggings, social likes volunteer works, emotional activities like department values seminars, counseling, and trainings, spiritual like worship classes, prayer counseling and intellectual like recreational activities, board games and training.

The researcher recommends that future researchers duplicate the investigation considering other variables such as family management, work life balance and leadership skills.

V. References

- [1] Academy of Management, (2018) "Leadership: do traits matter? "CAD MANAGE PERSPECT February 1, 1991 vol. 5 no. 248-60 retrieved from <http://amp.aom.org/content/5/2/48.short?rss=1&ssource=mfr>
- [2] Ackerman, C. E. (2022, August 14). What is self-efficacy theory? (incl. 8 examples & scales). PositivePsychology.com. Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://positivepsychology.com/self-efficacy/>
- [3] Antony, M. R. (2018). Paradigm shift in employee engagement: A critical analysis on the drivers of employee engagement. *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, 10(2), 32-46. Retrieved from <https://ijibm.elitehall.com>
- [4] Aquino, R.S (2018) Institutional Assessment of the Philippine Barangay
- [5] Justice, ACCESS TO JUSTICE FOR THE POOR PROJECT: Towards a Citizen-Driven Justice System: An Institutional Assessment of the Philippine Barangay Justice System. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/4303456/Towards_a_CitizenDriven_Justice_System_an_Institutional_

- [6] Assessment_of_the_Barangay_Justice_System
- [7] Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Brummelhuis, L. L. ten. (2019, August 26). Work engagement, performance, and active learning: The role of conscientiousness. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879111001151#:~:text=Work%20engagement%20is%20an%20active%2C%20positive%20work-related%20state,and%20experiencing%20a%20sense%20of%20significance%20and%20enthusiasm>
- [8] Bank (2019) & Berent Jr., A. B. (2018) Innovations and Excellence: Understanding Local Governments in the Philippines retrieved from <http://localgov.up.edu.ph/innovations-andexcellence.html>
- [9] Bandura, A. (2018). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. New York, Worth Publishers.
- [10] Bell, A. (2022, August 26). 23 reasons why employee engagement is important in 2022. *Snack Nation*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://snacknation.com/blog/importance-of-employee-engagement/>
- [11] Beltran-Martin, I., Bou-Llusar, J., Roca-Puig, V., & Belen Escrig-Tena, A. (2018). The relationship between high performance work systems and employee proactive behavior: Role breadth self-efficacy and flexible role orientation as mediating mechanisms. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 27, 403- 422. doi:10.1111/174 8583.12145
- [12] Burke, M., Marlow, C., & Lento, T. (2019, April 1). Social network activity and social well-being: Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on human factors in computing systems. *ACM Conferences*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/1753326.1753613>
- [13] Binita, T., & Usha, L. (2018). Building psychological safety for employee engagement in post-recession. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 1, 19. doi:10.1108/DL 05-2015-0044
- [14] Byrne, J. M., & Canato, A. (2018). It's been a hard day's night: Work family interface and employee engagement. *Organizational Dynamics*, 46, 104-112. doi:10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.00
- [15] Caprara, G. V., Eisenberg, N., & Alessandri, G. (2018). Positivity: The dispositional basis of happiness *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 18, 353–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-016-9728-y>
- [16] Cabrilo, S., & Dahms, S. (2018). How strategic knowledge management drives intellectual capital to superior innovation and market performance. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22, 621. doi:10.1108/jkm-07-2017-0309
- [17] Chreim, S. (2018) “The (non)distribution of leadership roles: Considering leadership practices and configurations” *Human Relations* April 2015 vol. 68no. 4 517-543 retrieved From <http://hum.sagepub.com/content/68/4/517.abstract>
- [18] Creswell, J.W. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- [19] Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- [20] Criswell C. and Martin, A. (2018) A CCL Research White Paper: 10 Trends A Study of Senior Executives' Views on the Future retrieved from <http://insights.ccl.org/wp-content/uploads/2007/03/TenTrends.pdf>

- [21] Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2019). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *The handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 63–73). Oxford University Press.
- [22] Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Hedonia, eudaimonia, and well-being: An introduction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9018-1>. Brief literature review retrieved from <http://research-methodology.net/leadership-styles-a-brief-literature-review/>
- [23] Escuadro, S. (2022, August 5). 10 great employee engagement articles for you to read. EdApp Microlearning Blog. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.edapp.com/blog/employee-engagement-articles/>
- [24] Fisher, E.A (2019) Motivation and Leadership in Social Work Management: A Review of Theories and Related Studies, *Administration in Social Work*, 33:4, 347-367, DOI: 10.1080/03643100902769160 retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/03643100902769160>
- [25] Fredrickson, B. L., & Joiner, T. (2018). Reflections on positive emotions and upward spirals. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(2), 194–199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617692106>
- [26] Fritscher, L. (2018). Self-efficacy. Retrieved from <http://phobias.about.com/od/glossary/g/selfefficacy.htm>
- [27] Gameda, H. K., & Lee, J. (2020, April 6). Leadership styles, work engagement and outcomes among information and Communications Technology Professionals: A cross-national study. *Heliyon*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7138911/>
- [28] Geraghty, S. (2018). How self-efficacy affects performance in the workplace. *Talkdesk*. Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://www.talkdesk.com/blog/how-self-efficacy-affects-performance-in-the-workplace/>
- [29] Gordon, J., & Berry, J. (2018). *Environmental leadership equals essential leadership*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press retrieved from <http://www.watercentre.org/education/leadership/attachments/3.pdf>
- [30] Grille, A., Schulte, E., Kauffeld, S. (2019) “Promoting Shared Leadership: A Multilevel Analysis Investigating the Role of Prototypical Team Leader Behavior, Psychological Empowerment, and Fair Rewards” *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* August 2015 vol. 22 no. 3 324-339 retrieved from <http://jlo.sagepub.com/content/22/3/324.abstract>
- [31] Heald, S. (2018). Climate silence, moral disengagement, and self-efficacy: How Albert Bandura’s theories inform our climate-change predicament. *Environment*, 59(6), 4-15. doi:10.1080/00139157.2017.1374792
- [32] Henderson, K. J. (2019, August 27). What are the duties of a city marshal? *Career Trend*. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://careertrend.com/list-6733985-duties-city-marshal-.html>
- [33] Herrity, J. (2021, April 1). 10 reasons why employee engagement is important | indeed.com. *Indeed*. Retrieved October 9, 2022, from <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/engaging-employee>
- [34] Horan, K. A., Moeller, M. T., Singh, R. S., Wasson, R., William H O’Brien, Matthews, R. A., Barratt, C. L. (2018). Supervisor support for stress management and intervention process. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 11(4), 260-272. doi:10.1108/IJWHM-12-2017-0113

- [35] IBS Center for Management Research, (2020) “the factors that inhibit change in organizations and how to manage change.” Retrieved from <http://www.icmrindia.org/free%20resources/Articles/Leadership%.htm>
- [36] Increaseo. (2022, June 30). Social Wellbeing - an area of employee health that is forgotten about. Workplace Health & Occupational Wellbeing Consultants Australia & New Zealand. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://vitalityworks.health/social-wellbeing/>
- [37] Ishii, K., Oka, K., & Shibata, A. (2018, March 19). Work engagement, productivity, and self-reported: Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. LWW. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from https://journals.lww.com/joem/Fulltext/2018/04000/Work_Engagement,_Productivity,_and_Self_Reported.15.aspx
- [38] Jiang, X., Fang, L., & Lyons, M. D. (2019). Is life satisfaction an antecedent to coping behaviors for adolescents? Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48(11), 2292–2306. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01136-6>
- [39] Kameyama, J., Hashizume, Y., Takamura, Y., Nomura, S., Gomi, T., & Yanagi, H. (2022, February 19). Work engagement, well-being, and intent to continue working based on educational support among foreign care workers in Japan. Environmental health and preventive medicine. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC9093614/>
- [40] Lopez-Garrido, G. (2020, August 9). Self-efficacy theory. Self-Efficacy: Definition & Examples. Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/self-efficacy.html>
- [41] Lynch, M. (2021, February 11). What is self-efficacy? The Advocate. Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://www.theadvocate.org/what-is-self-efficacy/>
- [42] Lyons, P. R., & Bandura, R. P. (2018). Self-efficacy measure may enhance your recruitment and placement efforts. Human Resource Management International Digest, 26(3), 35-37. doi:10.1108/HRMID-03-2018-0043
- [43] Marshall, D. R., Meek, W. R., Swab, R. G., & Markin, E. (2020, August 17). Access to resources and entrepreneurial well-being: A self-efficacy approach. Journal of Business Research. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0148296320305154>
- [44] Martin, A. (2018) "The future of leadership: where do we go from here?" Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 39 Iss: 1, pp.3 – 8 DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00197850710721345> retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/00197850710721345>
- [45] McQuaid, D. (2019, September 23). UK employees see Social Wellbeing as top priority. HRreview. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.hrreview.co.uk/hr-news/uk-employees-see-social-wellbeing-as-top-form-of-support-they-can-recvie/120654>
- [46] Meintjes, A., & Hofmeyr, K. (2018). The impact of resilience and perceived organizational support on employee engagement in a competitive sales environment. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 16, doi:10.4102/sajhrm.v16i0.953
- [47] Miller, E. (2021, August 20). Employee engagement - what is it & why is it important? Motivosity. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.motivosity.com/blog/what-is-employee-engagement/>

- [48] Minna-Maaria H., & Anna-Maija L. (2019). (A)moral agents in organizations? the significance of ethical organization culture for middle managers' exercise of moral agency in ethical problems: *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(1), 147-161. doi:10.1007/s10551-017-3511-
- [49] Mind Tools Ltd, (2018). "The Leader-Member Exchange Theory" Retrieved from <https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/leader-member-exchange.htm>
- [50] Morton, L., Ferguson, M., & Baty, F. (2018, January 1). Improving wellbeing and self-efficacy by social prescription. *Public Health*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.infona.pl/resource/bwmeta1.element.elsevier-8331914c-9f38-35cd-8cf6-7c9d407be082>
- [51] Muslichah, (2018). The effect of self-efficacy and information quality on behavioral intention with perceived usefulness as intervening variable. *Journal of Accounting, Business & Management*, 25, 21-34. doi:10.31966/jabminternational.v1i25.32
- [52] Newman, A., Le, H., North-Samardzic, A., & Cohen, M. (2019). Moral disengagement at work: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-36. doi:10.1007/10551-019-04173-0
- [53] Orechwa, J. (2021, April 7). Why is employee engagement important? LinkedIn. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/why-employee-engagement-important-jennifer-orechwa>
- [54] Padilla, C.T and Eguia, R.E (2019) Leadership Scale of Barangay Legislators in Davao City: An Application of Structure Equation Model. Retrieved from http://www.nscb.gov.ph/ncs/11thNCS/papers/invited%20papers/ips-12/02_Leadership%20Scale%20of%20Barangay%20Legislators.pdf
- [55] Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., Stough, C. (2018) "Emotional intelligence and effective leadership", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 22 Iss: 1, pp.5 – 10 retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/01437730110380174>
- [56] Pearce, C.L, Wassenaar, C.L. and Manz, C.C (2018) "Is Shared Leadership the Key to Responsible Leadership?" *ACAD MANAGE PERSPECT*, August 1, 2014 vol. 28 no. 3275-288 retrieved from <http://amp.aom.org/content/28/3/275.abstract?sid=d2397ca0-09cb-412a-94e4-b2a52fd38c94>
- [57] Population of cities in Philippines (2022). Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/cities/philippines>
- [58] Ramirez-Duran, D. (2022, September 10). What is social wellbeing? 12+ activities for Social Wellness. *PositivePsychology.com*. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://positivepsychology.com/social-wellbeing/>
- [59] Robinson, A. (2022, October 9). The importance of Employee Engagement & 7 benefits. *teambuilding.com*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://teambuilding.com/blog/employee-engagement-benefits>
- [60] Sancassiani, F., Campagna, M., Tuligi, F., Machado, S., Cantone, E., & Carta, M. G. (2018, February 27). Organizational wellbeing among workers in Mental Health Services: A pilot study. *Clinical practice and epidemiology in mental health: CP & EMH*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4353129/>
- [61] Self-efficacy: Peer reviewed articles. *Open Access Journals*. (2020). Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://www.openaccessjournals.com/peer-reviewed-articles/selfefficacy-14618.html#:~:text=Psychologists%20have%20studied%20self->

- efficacy%20from%20many%20views.%20professional,with%20utilizing%20those%20innate%20skills%20to%20realize%20goals.%22
- [62] Sinclair, J. (2021, February 15). What is social well-being? definition, types, and how to achieve it. What Is Social Well-Being? Definition, Types, and How to Achieve It. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.betterup.com/blog/what-is-social-well-being-definition-types-and-how-to-achieve-it#:~:text=Social%20well-being%20can%20be%20defined%20as%20the%20sharing%2C,and%20provides%20a%20sense%20of%20connectedness%20and%20belonging>
- [63] Singh, S.K., Pradhan, R.K., Panigrahy, N.P. and Jena, L.K. (2019), "Self-efficacy and workplace well-being: moderating role of sustainability practices", *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 6, pp. 1692-1708. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0219>
- [64] Shenton, C. (2022, September 29). Workplace Wellbeing: The importance of social wellbeing and inclusivity in the Workplace. *Weekly10*. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.weekly10.com/workplace-wellbeing-part-4-social-wellbeing-at-work/>
- [65] Shukla, R. (2019) A Class notes for MBA- first year students, on principles of management in simple language,- Introduction of management, Scientific management(Taylor law). Retrieved from <http://managementlearningcenter.blogspot.in/2012/08/evolution-of-management-classical.html>
- [66] Sulistiowati, S., Komari, N., & Dhamayanti, E. (2018). The effects of person-job fit on employee engagement among lecturers in higher education institutions: Is there a difference between lecturers in public and private higher education institutions? *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 8, 75-80. Retrieved from <https://www.econjournals.com/index.php/irmm>
- [67] Qualitative Research Consultants Association, (2018) "What is Qualitative a. Research?" Retrieved from <http://www.qrca.org/?page=whatisqualresearch>
- [68] Ugwu, F. O., & Onyishi, I. E. (2018). Linking perceived organizational frustration to work engagement: The moderating roles of sense of calling and psychological 130 meaningfulness. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26, 220-239. doi:10.1177/106907271769273
- [69] University of minnesota. (2019). Why personal relationships are important. Taking Charge of Your Health & Wellbeing. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://www.takingcharge.csh.umn.edu/why-personal-relationships-are-important>
- [70] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2021, August 26). Social Wellness Toolkit. National Institutes of Health. Retrieved October 6, 2022, from <https://www.nih.gov/health-information/social-wellness-toolkit>
- [71] Wahome, C. (2022, April 28). What is self-efficacy? WebMD. Retrieved October 5, 2022, from <https://www.webmd.com/balance/what-is-self-efficacy>
- [72] Webmaster. (2022, February 15). Social ties are good for your health. Stanford BeWell. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from <https://bewell.stanford.edu/social-ties-are-good-for-your-health/>
- [73] Yango, A.R., Bermudo, P.J.V. and Quendangan, E.B. (2019) College Students' Attitude towards the Internet as Communication Medium and Level of Utilization of English Language in the Classroom. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 7, 438-452. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2019.77036>