iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

PSYCHOLOGICAL CAPITAL AND WORK ENGAGEMENT AMONG NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL IN A STATE COLLEGE

Jerico D. Catipay
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4611-1796
ORCID ID - 0000-0003-4611-1796
Institute of Aquatic and Applied Sciences, Davao del Norte State College

Bernadeth A. Talip Ph.D.
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2886-9472
ORCID ID - 0000-0003-2886-9472
College of Development Management, University of Southeastern Philippines

ABSTRACT
This study determined the influence of psychological capital on the work engagement of non-teaching personnel in a state college. It employed a cross-sectional quantitative design involving 110 non-teaching personnel who had rendered at least one year of service. Data were gathered using the Revised Compound Psychological Capital Scale (CPC-12R) and the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), and were analyzed using mean, Pearson-r, and multiple linear regression. Results showed high psychological capital (M = 4.20, SD = .42) and high work engagement (M = 4.17, SD = .48). Psychological capital was significantly and positively related to work engagement ($r = .633$, $p < .01$). Regression analysis explained 40.2% of the variance in work engagement, with hope (B = .192, beta = .240, p = .011) and self-efficacy (B = .208, beta = .241, p = .024) emerging as significant predictors. The findings indicate that strengthening goal-directed motivation and confidence may enhance work engagement among non-teaching personnel.

Keywords:
Psychological capital, work engagement, non-teaching personnel, hope, self-efficacy

INTRODUCTION

Work engagement is an important concern in higher education institutions because engaged personnel perform their duties with energy, commitment, and meaningful involvement [6], [21], [24]. Global evidence indicates that many employees remain psychologically unattached to their work [20]. In state colleges, non-teaching personnel perform administrative, technical, maintenance, clerical, and support functions that help sustain daily institutional operations [4], [8], [55]. However, their psychological resources and engagement are often given less empirical attention than those of teaching personnel [13], [27].

Psychological capital refers to the positive psychological resources of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism [30], [31], [33]. These resources may help employees pursue goals, handle work demands, recover from setbacks, and maintain positive expectations [5], [33]. Work engagement, on the other hand, is reflected through vigor, dedication, and absorption [6], [24], [36]. Although prior studies show that psychological capital is associated with engagement and other positive work outcomes [11], [28], [44], [48], limited quantitative evidence focuses on non-teaching personnel in a state college. This study therefore examined the level of psychological capital and work engagement, the relationship between them, and the psychological capital domains that best predict work engagement.

OBJECTIVES

This study aimed to determine the influence of psychological capital on the work engagement of non-teaching personnel in a state college. Specifically, it sought to: (1) determine the level of psychological capital in terms of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism; (2) determine the level of work engagement in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption; (3) examine the significant relationship between psychological capital and work engagement; and (4) identify which domain of psychological capital best predicts work engagement.

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

METHODOLOGY

The study used a cross-sectional quantitative research design. The respondents were 110 non-teaching personnel selected through simple random sampling from a population of 150 employees in a state college. Only personnel with at least one year of service were included to ensure adequate exposure to the institutional work environment. The sample was also considered sufficient for multiple linear regression because the number of respondents exceeded the commonly recommended respondent-to-predictor ratio for regression analysis [51].

Psychological capital was measured using the Revised Compound Psychological Capital Scale (CPC-12R), which covers hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism [31], [46]. Work engagement was measured using the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES), which covers vigor, dedication, and absorption [34], [50]. Both instruments used a five-point Likert scale. Data were analyzed using mean to describe levels, Pearson-r to test relationships, and multiple linear regression to identify the psychological capital domains that best predict work engagement [51]. Institutional permission and informed consent were obtained, and the confidentiality of responses was observed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level Of Psychological Capital

Table 1 presents the level of psychological capital among non-teaching personnel in terms of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism. Overall, psychological capital was found to be high (M = 4.20, SD = .42), indicating that psychological capital of the respondents is often manifested in performing their work roles. Although all dimensions were rated high to very high, the mean scores revealed a clear hierarchical pattern, with optimism emerging as the strongest dimension, followed by self-efficacy, resilience, and hope. This hierarchical pattern is also evident in the meta-analytic study of Avey et al. [5], which showed that optimism and self-efficacy generally exhibited higher mean levels than hope and resilience across organizational samples.

Psychological Capital	Mean	SD	Level
HOPE	**3.87**	**.60**	**High**
When I am in a difficult situation, I can think of many ways to find a way out.	4.22	.61	High
Right now, I view myself as quite a successful person.	3.36	.90	Moderate
I can think of many ways to reach my current goals.	4.03	.73	High
SELF-EFFICACY	**4.13**	**.56**	**High**
I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	3.93	.76	High
I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	4.41	.59	High
I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	4.04	.70	High
RESILIENCE	**4.13**	**.55**	**High**
I consider myself to be able to stand a lot; I am not easily discouraged by failure.	3.95	.77	High
After serious life difficulties, I tend to move on.	4.22	.65	High
I believe that coping with stress can strengthen me.	4.24	.61	High
OPTIMISM	**4.69**	**.48**	**Very High**
I am looking forward to my future life.	4.80	.42	Very High
Many good things will happen in my future life.	4.70	.55	Very High
In general, I expect more good things to happen to me than bad things.	4.56	.70	Very High
OVERALL	**4.20**	**.42**	**High**

Table 1. Level of Psychological Capital Among Non-teaching Personnel

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

The findings indicate differential strength across psychological capital dimensions. Among the dimensions, optimism obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.69, SD = .48), which is regarded as a very high level. This indicates that respondents are always optimistic, which means they have a high positive outlook toward their future. Specifically, the indicators "I am looking forward to my future life" (M = 4.80) and "Many good things will happen in my future life" (M = 4.70) were rated very high. Self-efficacy (M = 4.13, SD = .56) and resilience (M = 4.13, SD = .55) were both rated high, suggesting that respondents are often self-efficient, which means they are confident in their ability to handle challenges and can adapt and recover from difficulties. Hope, while still rated high (M = 3.87, SD = .60), recorded the lowest mean among the four dimensions. The indicator "Right now, I view myself as quite a successful person" was rated moderate (M = 3.36), which may imply that some respondents are often hopeful but still cautious in evaluating their personal success even if they can identify ways to achieve their goals. The very high level of optimism indicates that respondents generally expect favorable outcomes in their future work and personal life. However, the relatively lower mean for hope suggests that although non-teaching personnel maintain positive expectations, some may still need stronger support in goal-setting, pathways thinking, and perceived personal accomplishment. This distinction is theoretically important because Psychological Capital Theory treats hope and optimism as related but distinct psychological resources. Optimism reflects positive future expectations, while hope emphasizes goal-directed agency and pathways toward desired outcomes [31, 33].

The result indicates that although the overall psychological capital of the non-teaching personnel is high based on the manifestation criteria, the four dimensions are not equally manifested. This demonstrates that the differentiated configuration of psychological capital among non-teaching personnel is unevenly experienced and shaped by both personal capabilities and perceived work conditions. These findings may be interpreted through Psychological Capital Theory, which explains psychological capital as a higher-order positive psychological resource composed of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism. From this perspective, the high overall psychological capital of the respondents suggests that non-teaching personnel possess developable psychological resources that may help them manage workplace demands, sustain positive expectations, recover from challenges, and pursue work-related goals [31, 33].

The consistently high levels of all four dimensions indicate that psychological capital is often manifested among the respondents. These findings support the view of Luthans and Broad [33], which conceptualizes hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism as interrelated capacities that operate collectively as one higher-order construct. This is further supported by Lorenz et al. [31], who validated the revised compound psychological capital scale and confirmed the collective operation of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism, further confirming the multidimensional structure of psychological capital. This overall pattern provides the descriptive context for subsequent analyses examining the relationships between psychological capital and work engagement.

Level Of Work Engagement

Table 2 presents the level of work engagement among non-teaching personnel in terms of vigor, dedication, and absorption. Overall, work engagement was found to be high (M = 4.17, SD = .48), indicating that the work engagement of non-teaching personnel is often manifested.

In terms of dimensions, dedication obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.48, SD = .54), indicating that respondents are often dedicated, which means they strongly perceive their work with commitment, pride, and enthusiasm. The indicators "I am proud of the work that I do" (M = 4.64) and "I find the work that I do meaningful and purposeful" (M = 4.54) were rated very high. Vigor was also rated high (M = 4.10, SD = .59), suggesting that respondents often manifest vigor, which means they generally experience energy and persistence in their work. Absorption, while still rated high (M = 3.92, SD = .61), recorded the lowest mean among the three dimensions. Although most indicators were rated high, the statement "It is difficult to detach myself from my job" was rated moderate (M = 3.48), indicating that not all non-teaching personnel experience deep immersion or difficulty disengaging from work.

When viewed alongside Psychological Capital Theory, the high level of work engagement suggests that non-teaching personnel with positive psychological resources are more likely to display energy, dedication, and involvement in their work. This supports the theoretical assumption that positive psychological capacities can contribute to favorable work attitudes and engagement-related outcomes [30, 33].

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

Work Engagement	Mean	SD	Level
VIGOR	**4.10**	**.59**	**High**
At my work, I feel like bursting with energy.	3.87	.76	High
At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	3.99	.71	High
When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	4.01	.83	High
I can continue to work for long periods of time.	4.18	.82	High
At my job, I am mentally resilient.	4.23	.69	High
At my job, I always persevere, even when things do not go right.	4.30	.69	High
DEDICATION	**4.48**	**.54**	**High**
I find the work that I do meaningful and purposeful.	4.54	.61	Very High
I am enthusiastic about my job.	4.35	.67	High
I am proud of the work that I do.	4.64	.53	Very High
My job inspires me.	4.45	.63	High
My job is challenging enough.	4.42	.74	High
ABSORPTION	**3.92**	**.61**	**High**
Time flies when I am at work.	4.56	.63	Very High
When I work, I forget everything else around me.	3.68	1.00	High
I feel happy when I work intensely.	3.99	.75	High
I am immersed in my work.	4.10	.72	High
I get carried away when I work.	3.73	.81	High
It is difficult to detach myself from my job.	3.48	1.07	Moderate
OVERALL	**4.17**	**.48**	**High**

Table 2. Level of Work Engagement Among Non-teaching Personnel

This finding is supported by Huang et al. [24], who emphasized that work engagement involves cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement at work. The high rating of dedication also agrees with the idea that meaningful and purposeful work can strengthen employee engagement.

In the context of higher education, Zhang et al. [59] showed that psychological capital remains an active research concern in higher education institutions, while Liu et al. [28] further confirmed the relevance of psychological capital and work engagement in explaining employee outcomes.

Relationship Between Psychological Capital And Work Engagement

Table 3 presents the significant relationship between psychological capital and work engagement among non-teaching personnel. The result revealed that most dimensions of psychological capital were significantly and positively correlated with the dimensions of work engagement at the 0.01 level of significance.

Psychological Capital	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption	Overall Work Engagement
Hope	.529** (.000)	.480** (.000)	.287** (.002)	.517** (.000)
Self-Efficacy	.593** (.000)	.380** (.000)	.349** (.000)	.532** (.000)
Resilience	.619** (.000)	.541** (.000)	.172 (.067)	.527** (.000)
Optimism	.346** (.000)	.438** (.000)	.148 (.116)	.386** (.000)

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

Overall Psychological Capital	**.681** (.000)**	**.594** (.000)**	**.314** (.000)**	**.633** (.000)**

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

Table 3. Significant Relationship Between Psychological Capital and Work Engagement Among Non-teaching Personnel

Specifically, hope showed significant positive relationships with vigor ($r = .529$, $p < .01$), dedication ($r = .480$, $p < .01$), absorption ($r = .287$, $p < .01$), and overall work engagement ($r = .517$, $p < .01$). Similarly, self-efficacy was significantly related to vigor ($r = .593$, $p < .01$), dedication ($r = .380$, $p < .01$), absorption ($r = .349$, $p < .01$), and overall work engagement ($r = .532$, $p < .01$). Resilience demonstrated significant positive relationships with vigor ($r = .619$, $p < .01$), dedication ($r = .541$, $p < .01$), and overall work engagement ($r = .527$, $p < .01$), but its relationship with absorption ($r = .172$, $p = .067$) was not significant. Likewise, optimism showed significant relationships with vigor ($r = .346$, $p < .01$), dedication ($r = .438$, $p < .01$), and overall work engagement ($r = .386$, $p < .01$), but not with absorption ($r = .148$, $p = .116$). Furthermore, overall psychological capital was found to have strong and significant relationships with vigor ($r = .681$, $p < .01$), dedication ($r = .594$, $p < .01$), absorption ($r = .314$, $p < .01$), and overall work engagement ($r = .633$, $p < .01$).

The significant positive relationship between overall psychological capital and overall work engagement provides empirical support for Psychological Capital Theory. The theory assumes that non-teaching personnel who possess stronger positive psychological resources are better able to cope with challenges, remain motivated, and invest energy in their work roles. Thus, the observed relationship suggests that hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism may function collectively as psychological resources that support the work engagement of non-teaching personnel [31, 33].

These results suggest that non-teaching personnel with stronger psychological capital tend to report greater work engagement, especially in the areas of energy, persistence, and meaningful involvement in work. This result is consistent with the literature reviewed earlier, which emphasizes that psychological capital serves as a positive psychological resource that supports favorable work attitudes and engagement-related outcomes. For instance, Rozkwitalska et al. [48] found that psychological capital contributes to higher work engagement, while Pandey et al. [44] reported positive relationships between psychological capital and employee engagement. Similarly, Park and Ha [45] found that positive psychological capital was significantly associated with work engagement. These studies support the present finding that non-teaching personnel with stronger hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism are more likely to manifest higher energy, dedication, and involvement in their work.

The significant relationships of hope and self-efficacy with work engagement may be explained through Psychological Capital Theory. Hope represents goal-directed motivation and pathways thinking, which may help non-teaching personnel identify ways to accomplish work tasks and remain committed to institutional goals. Self-efficacy reflects confidence in one's capability to perform tasks and overcome work-related challenges. These two resources are action-oriented because they directly involve non-teaching personnel's perceived ability to act, persist, and accomplish goals. This may explain why hope and self-efficacy showed significant links with work engagement dimensions such as vigor, dedication, absorption, and overall work engagement [31, 33].

However, the non-significant relationship of resilience and optimism with absorption may suggest that being resilient and optimistic does not automatically mean that non-teaching personnel will become fully absorbed in their work. This may be because absorption is influenced not only by personal resources but also by the nature of tasks, workload, and work environment. This finding is supported by Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Theory [7], which states that absorption is most strongly activated when job resources and task characteristics foster deep concentration and flow rather than solely through the presence of positive personal traits among non-teaching personnel. This result does not contradict Psychological Capital Theory; rather, it suggests that some dimensions of work engagement, particularly absorption, may require not only personal psychological resources but also job resources, task characteristics, and work conditions that allow non-teaching personnel to become deeply immersed in their tasks. Thus, while resilience and optimism remain important psychological resources, their influence on absorption may depend on whether the work environment provides opportunities for sustained focus, autonomy, and meaningful task involvement. Correlation analysis only examines the bivariate relationships and does not account for the shared variance among the psychological capital dimensions. To further determine the unique

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

contribution of each domain of psychological capital to work engagement, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted.

Domains of Psychological Capital that Predict Work Engagement

Table 4 presents the regression analysis examining the extent to which the domains of psychological capital predict work engagement. The result revealed that 40.2 percent (R2 = .402) of the variance in work engagement can be explained by the combined influence of psychological capital dimensions. Specifically, the domains of psychological capital that best predict work engagement among non-teaching personnel are self-efficacy (beta = .241, p = .024) and hope (beta = .240, p = .011), with nearly identical effects. Both variables significantly contributed to the model.

In contrast, resilience (beta = .173, p = .117) and optimism (beta = .158, p = .052) did not significantly predict work engagement among non-teaching personnel. Although resilience and optimism are significantly correlated with work engagement, they are not significant predictors in regression because regression identifies unique contributions after shared variance is controlled. Nevertheless, resilience and optimism remain important psychological resources as shown in their bivariate significant correlations with work engagement, indicating that their effects may overlap with other dimensions of psychological capital.

Psychological Capital	Work Engagement			
	B	Beta	t-value	p-value
Hope	.192	.240	2.576	.011
Self-Efficacy	.208	.241	2.288	.024
Resilience	.151	.173	1.582	.117
Optimism	.157	.158	1.961	.052
R^2 = .402 (40.2%)				
F = 18.290				
p < .000				
Regression Equation: WE = 1.204 + .192(Hope) + .208(Self-Efficacy) + .151(Resilience) + .157(Optimism)				

Table 4. Domains of Psychological Capital Predicting Work Engagement Among Non-teaching Personnel

The finding that hope and self-efficacy significantly predict work engagement is consistent with Psychological Capital Theory because these two dimensions are strongly action-oriented psychological resources. Hope enables non-teaching personnel to identify pathways toward work goals and sustain motivation in pursuing those goals, while self-efficacy strengthens confidence in performing tasks and overcoming work-related challenges. Their significant predictive value suggests that non-teaching personnel are more likely to become engaged when they believe they can perform effectively and when they can see clear pathways toward accomplishing their work goals [31, 33].

The results indicate that the respondents generally demonstrated strong psychological resources and a high degree of engagement in their work roles. The results further show that psychological capital is significantly related to work engagement and that self-efficacy and hope are the most important predictors of work engagement. These findings suggest that the psychological resources of non-teaching personnel are important in sustaining their energy, dedication, and involvement at work.

The strong association between psychological capital and work engagement indicates that non-teaching personnel who are hopeful, confident, resilient, and optimistic are more likely to show enthusiasm and persistence in their work. This confirms the importance of developing positive psychological resources among non-teaching personnel, especially in state colleges where non-teaching personnel perform support functions that contribute to institutional operations. Programs such as capability-building, recognition, mentoring, stress management, and goal-setting activities may help strengthen the psychological capital of non-teaching personnel and improve their engagement at work.

While the overall result is positive, the lower ratings in hope and absorption should also be given attention. The moderate rating on viewing oneself as successful may indicate the need for clearer career development opportunities and feedback systems. Likewise, the moderate rating on difficulty detaching from work may not necessarily be negative, since healthy detachment can also protect employee well-being. Therefore, the institution

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

may promote engagement while also maintaining work-life balance and psychological well-being among non-teaching personnel.

The findings affirm the relevance of Psychological Capital Theory in explaining work engagement among non-teaching personnel. The results show that psychological capital operates not only as a descriptive positive resource but also as a meaningful predictor of work engagement. In particular, hope and self-efficacy appear to be the most influential psychological resources in sustaining non-teaching personnel's energy, dedication, and involvement at work. These findings provide a theoretical basis for designing institutional interventions focused on goal-setting, confidence-building, mentoring, and capability development [31, 33].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researchers acknowledge the support of the state college administrators, the participating non-teaching personnel, the College of Development Management of the University of Southeastern Philippines, and all individuals who provided guidance and assistance in the completion of the study.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concludes that the level of psychological capital of non-teaching personnel in a state college is high. The level of work engagement of non-teaching personnel is also high. There is a significant relationship between psychological capital and work engagement among non-teaching personnel in a state college. Hope and self-efficacy are the domain of psychological capital that best predict the work engagement of non-teaching personnel.

The researcher recommends the following: Administrators of state colleges may consider implementing programs and interventions that strengthen the psychological capital of non-teaching personnel, particularly by enhancing non-teaching personnel' hope through clear goal-setting, career development opportunities, and recognition systems, as well as by improving self-efficacy through training, mentoring, and skills development activities. Human resources management offices may integrate psychological capital development initiatives into professional development and employee wellness programs to help sustain high levels of work engagement. Creating a supportive work environment and providing adequate job resources may further enhance non-teaching personnel's dedication and vigor at work. Non-teaching personnel may be encouraged to engage in continuous personal and professional development to strengthen confidence, goal clarity, and adaptive coping strategies, while maintaining a healthy balance between work and personal life. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other state or private higher education institutions to validate the findings of the present study. Further research may also explore additional variables that could influence work engagement or apply longitudinal or mixed-methods designs to examine changes in psychological capital and work engagement over time.

REFERENCES

1) Aboramadan, M., Dahleez, K., & Hamad, M. H. (2020). Servant leadership and academics outcomes in higher education: The role of job satisfaction. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 29(3), 562–584. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-11-2019-1923
2) Abrams, A. (2018, September 20). The value of a psychologically healthy workplace cannot be overstated. Verywell Mind. https://www.verywellmind.com/promoting-mental-health-at-work-4175382
3) Aikens, M. L., & Kulacki, A. R. (2023). Identifying group work experiences that increase students' self efficacy for quantitative biology tasks. CBE—Life Sciences Education, 22(2), ar19. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.22-04-0076
4) Antiado, A. D. F., Castillo, F. G., Jr., Reblando, J. R., & Tawadros, M. I. (2020). Managing professional development activities for non teaching staff: For professional growth. Universal Journal of Educational Research, 8(7), 3280–3285. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080758
5) Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta analysis of the impact of positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 22(2), 127–152. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.20070
6) Bakker, A. B., & Albrecht, S. (2018). Work engagement: Current trends. Career Development International, 23(1), 4–11. https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-11-2017-0207
7) Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz Vergel, A. I. (2023). Job demands–resources theory: Ten years later. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 10, 25–53. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-120920-053933

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

8) Barreto, A. (2020). The importance of non teaching staff training and public administration in higher education institutions: A literature review. International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 7(2), 151–156.
9) Becker, G. S. (1993). Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
10) Biricik, Y. S. (2020). The relationship between psychological capital, job performance, and job satisfaction in higher education institutions offering sports education. World Journal of Education, 10(3), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v10n3p57
11) Biswal, K., Srivastava, K. B. L., & Alli, S. F. (2023). Psychological capital and work engagement: Moderating role of social relationships. Annals of Neurosciences. https://doi.org/10.1177/09727531231198964
12) Burnett, S. (2019). Employee engagement and burnout: A quantitative study of their correlations with job and organizational satisfaction (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego). https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/144/
13) Calobag, G. B. (2024). Exploring non teaching personnels' challenges on training through webinars: Administrative officers in focus. International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 6(3). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i03.22142
14) Chaw, L. Y., & Tang, C. M. (2018). What makes learning management systems effective for learning? Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 47(2), 152–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047239518795828
15) Clack, L. (2021). Employee engagement: Keys to organizational success. In The Palgrave handbook of workplace well being (pp. 1001–1028). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30025-8_77
16) Da, S., Zhu, Z., Cen, H., Gong, X., Siu, O. L., & Zhang, X. (2021). Psychological capital, positive affect, and organizational outcomes. Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology, 15, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/18344909211010514
17) Deligero, J. L., & Laguador, J. M. (2014). Work engagement among non-teaching personnel and its relationship with work units' performance of a higher education institution. LPUB Research Journal.
18) Dugyon, E. (2016). Impact of community extension programs on the residents of selected adopted barangays of Ifugao State University, Philippines. International Journal of Advanced Research, 4(6), 535–539. https://doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/848
19) Erb, M. (2024, January 14). Global employee engagement benchmark study. Great Place To Work®. https://www.greatplacetowork.com/resources/blog/global-employee-engagement-benchmark-study
20) Gallup. (2024). State of the global workplace report. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx
21) Gifford, J., & Young, J. (2021). Employee engagement: Definitions, measures and outcomes. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
22) Gupta, M., & Shaheen, M. (2017). Impact of work engagement on turnover intention: Moderation by psychological capital. Business: Theory and Practice, 18, 136–143. https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2017.014
23) Hansen, M. J., Palakal, M. J., & White, L. (2024). The importance of STEM sense of belonging and academic hope in enhancing persistence. Journal for STEM Education Research, 7, 155–180. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41979-023-00096-8
24) Huang, S. Y., Huang, C. H., & Chang, T. W. (2022). A new concept of work engagement theory in cognitive, emotional, and physical engagement. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 663440. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.663440
25) Huppert, F. (2014). The state of wellbeing science: Concepts, measures, interventions, and policies. In Handbook of well being. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell036
26) Karatepe, O. M., & Karadas, G. (2015). Do psychological capital and work engagement foster frontline non-teaching personnel' satisfaction? International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 27(6), 1254–1278. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-01-2014-0028
27) Lacsamana, R. M., Portugal, L., & Delos Reyes, E. F. (2018). Learning needs assessment of non teaching personnel as input to human resource development plan. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences, 5(3).
28) Liu, J., Xu, R., & Wang, Z. (2024). The effects of psychological capital, work engagement, and job autonomy on job performance. Scientific Reports, 14, 69484. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-69484-3

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

29) Lo, Y., Lu, C., Chang, Y., & Wu, S. (2024). Examining the influence of organizational commitment on service quality. Heliyon, 10(2), e24130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e24130
30) Loghman, S., Quinn, M., Dawkins, S., Woods, M., Sharma, S. O., & Scott, J. (2023). A comprehensive meta analysis of the nomological network of psychological capital. Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 30(1), 108–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/15480518221107998
31) Lorenz, T., Hagitte, L., & Prasath, P. R. (2022). Validation of the revised compound PsyCap scale (CPC 12R). Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 1075031. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1075031
32) Lupșa, D., Vîrga, D., Maricuțoiu, L. P., & Rusu, A. (2019). Increasing psychological capital: A preregistered meta analysis. Applied Psychology, 69(4), 1506–1556. https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12219
33) Luthans, F., & Broad, J. D. (2022). Positive psychological capital to help combat mental health fallout from the pandemic and VUCA environment. Organizational Dynamics, 51(2), 100817. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2020.100817
34) Mabasa, D. G. (2025). Validation of the UWES in assessing work engagement of own account informal entrepreneurs. Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management, 17(1), a963. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v17i1.963
35) Macias, E. F., & Llorente, R. B. (2014). Job satisfaction. In Springer encyclopaedia of quality of life and well being research. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_1568
36) Mazzetti, G., Robledo, E., Vignoli, M., Topa, G., Guglielmi, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2023). Work engagement: A meta analysis using the job demands–resources model. Psychological Reports, 126(3), 1069–1107. https://doi.org/10.1177/00332941211051988
37) Mendoza, R. O., Laguador, J. M., & Buenviaje, M. G. (2014). Organizational satisfaction and work engagement among non teaching personnel. Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Economics, 1(1), 12–22.
38) Motowidlo, S. J., & Kell, H. J. (2012). Handbook of psychology (2nd ed.). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/0471264385
39) Najorra, S. (2019). The work satisfaction of non teaching personnel. Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3(7).
40) Nel, J. H., & Linde, B. (2018). The emergence of the employee engagement concept. In The art of engaging unionised non-teaching personnel (pp. 11–34). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-2197-9_2
41) Nolzen, N. (2018). The concept of psychological capital: A comprehensive review. Management Review Quarterly, 68, 237–277. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-018-0138-6
42) Novotney, A. (2023, April 21). Why mental health needs to be a top priority in the workplace. American Psychological Association. https://www.apa.org/news/apa/2022/surgeon-general-workplace-well-being
43) Ohlin, B. (2020, June 22). PsyCap 101: Your guide to increasing psychological capital. PositivePsychology.com. https://positivepsychology.com/psychological-capital-psycap/
44) Pandey, J., Gupta, M., & Hassan, Y. (2021). Intrapreneurship to engage non-teaching personnel: Role of psychological capital. Management Decision, 59(6), 1525–1545. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-06-2019-0825
45) Park, S., & Ha, Y. (2025). The relationship between positive psychological capital and work engagement in clinical nurses. BMC Nursing, 24, 117. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-024-02600-w
46) Prochazka, J., Kacmar, P., Lebedova, T., Dudasova, L., & Vaculik, M. (2023). The revised compound psychological capital scale (CPC 12R). International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-023-01135-6
47) Ramirez, L. (2023, October 12). DOH, WHO launch Philippine council for mental health strategic framework 2024–2028. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/philippines/news/detail/12-10-2023-doh--who-launch-philippine-council-for-mental-health-strategic-framework-2024-2028
48) Rozkwitalska, M., Basińska, B. A., Okumus, F., & Karatepe, O. M. (2022). The effects of relational and psychological capital on work engagement. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 35(3), 616–629. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-07-2021-0222
49) Saleem, M. S., Isha, A. S., Yusop, Y. M., Awan, M. I., & Naji, G. M. (2022). The role of psychological capital and work engagement in enhancing construction workers' safety behavior. Frontiers in Public Health, 10, 810145. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.810145
50) Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2003). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 25(3), 293–315.
51) Seabrook, J. A. (2025). Powering nutrition research: Practical strategies for sample size in multiple regression. Nutrients, 17(16), 2668. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu17162668

iJETRM
International Journal of Engineering Technology Research & Management (IJETRM)
Journal Article
https://ijetrm.com/issue/

52) Song, X. (2023). Employee motivation, job satisfaction, and employee engagement. International Journal of Research Studies in Management, 11(4). https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsm.2023.1035
53) Sun, Y., & Liu, L. (2023). Structural equation modeling of students' resilience and engagement. BMC Psychology, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-023-01366-1
54) Takawira, N., Coetzee, M., & Schreuder, D. (2014). Job embeddedness, work engagement and turnover intention. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 14(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v12i1.524
55) UNESCO Institute for Statistics. (2023). Non teaching staff. https://uis.unesco.org/en/glossary-term/non-teaching-staff
56) United Nations Children's Fund. (n.d.). Sustainable development goals. https://www.unicef.org/sustainable-development-goals
57) Vella, S., & Pai, N. (2019). A theoretical review of psychological resilience. Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences, 7(2), 233. https://doi.org/10.4103/amhs.amhs_119_19
58) World Health Organization. (2022). Mental health at work. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work
59) Zhang, L., Wider, W., Fauzi, M. A., Jiang, L., Tanucan, J. C. M., & Udang, L. N. (2024). Psychological capital research in HEIs. Heliyon, 10(4), e26607. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e26607
60) Zhang, R., Shan, M., Yin, Y., Wu, Y., Gao, P., Xin, Y., & Shen, K. (2025). Psychological capital appreciation as a mediator between resilience and burnout. Frontiers in Public Health, 13, 1551725. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1551725