



## Self-Efficacy as Predictor of Quality of Work Life Among College of Business Administration Faculty Members

Denny Lou A. Bendejo<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Gemini M. Gabon<sup>1,3\*</sup>, and Lenilyn B. Combis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of College of Business Administration, University of the City of Muntinlupa, Philippines

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of the City of Muntinlupa, Philippines

<sup>3</sup>Associate Member, National Research Council of the Philippines

\*Corresponding author, E-mail: [geminigabon@plmuin.edu.ph](mailto:geminigabon@plmuin.edu.ph)

### Abstract

This study examines faculty members' self-efficacy and quality of work life at the University of the City of Muntinlupa's College of Business Administration (CBA). Specifically, this aims to assess their self-efficacy and quality of work life. Research indicates that educators with a strong sense of self-efficacy exhibit superior planning, greater resilience in the face of failure, and increased openness and supportiveness towards students. Easton and Van Laar (2018) propose that quality of working life (QWL) extends beyond job satisfaction or work happiness, encompassing an evaluation of their work environment. Gumber (2021) mentioned that faculty members who were new to teaching were more optimistic about the concept of QWL, which means that new employees are happier. QWL and community relations are the ones that matter the most in the lives of the employees. Employing an explanatory sequential design and convenience sampling approach, the study surveyed 21 faculty members. The findings revealed that self-efficacy accounts for 31.4% of the variance in the quality of work life. For every unit, there is an increase in self-efficacy and a corresponding increase in the quality of work life. The findings support the study of Hocwarter, Tett, & Newman (2020), who found that self-efficacy serves as a predictor of the quality of work life. Consequently, school leaders and policymakers must develop training programs and policies related to self-efficacy and quality of work life to improve well-being, productivity, and overall quality of life.

**Keywords:** *Quality of Work Life, Self-efficacy, Faculty Development, Educational Research*

### 1. Introduction

With the increasing number of students enrolled in a government-free higher education institution (HEI), faculty members must be equipped with the necessary teaching skills to provide quality and effective learning to their students. Through the self-efficacy of faculty members, they assisted their students in improving their academic performance. The level of confidence in teaching is significantly influenced by an individual's actual working environment and past experiences. It is crucial to acknowledge that not all faculty members are aware of their efficacy. While some may be effective in teaching, they may lack effective classroom management skills, and vice versa. Consequently, school management should implement strategies to enhance faculty members' self-efficacy, fostering a sense of value, empowerment, and increased engagement in their professional responsibilities.

Self-efficacy is a fundamental concept in social learning theory, and its role as a potent intervening factor between learning and subsequent performance has been established through research conducted in diverse domains, including teacher development. Furthermore, Bray-Clark and Bates (2003) argued that substantial research indicates that the self-efficacy construct can empower learning institutions and staff development specialists with the requisite tools to design effective educator training, enhance professional competence, and consequently improve student outcomes. Stevenson (2015) noted that Bandura and others showed that self-efficacy significantly impacts goal setting and task completion. High self-efficacy leads to



greater resilience and determination in facing challenges like crises, failed projects, and scandals. Bandura (1994; Stevenson, 2015) defined self-efficacy as an individual's belief in their ability to succeed in a situation, which influences thinking, behavior, and feelings. Research indicates that educators with a strong sense of self-efficacy exhibit enhanced planning abilities, demonstrate resilience in the face of setbacks, and cultivate open-mindedness and supportiveness towards their students. Teacher effectiveness has been a matter of concern not only for parents and students but also for policymakers, researchers, and educators. Bandura (1986; Stevenson, 2015) explains that self-efficacy beliefs result from a complex process of self-persuasion and deep knowledge gained from the cognitive processing of diverse efficacy information received passively, vicariously, socially, and physiologically.

However, educators are often faced with unprecedented challenges of stress, pressure, and burnout in their work life. They neglect their well-being and fail to maintain a healthy work life, which may affect their physical as well as mental health (Hobfoll, 2018). In 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) pointed out that burnout is a global challenge, with 45% of employees experiencing burnout symptoms. Though alarming, self-efficacy emerges as a critical factor in achieving a quality work-life.

As defined by Agarwal (2017), quality of work life encompasses the subjective experience of individuals regarding their professional satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Individuals who derive contentment and fulfillment from their careers are generally considered to have a high quality of work life, whereas those who experience unhappiness or feel their needs are not adequately met are said to have a low quality of work life. Moreover, Easton and Van Laar (2019) argue that one's job significantly influences the quality of work life. They emphasize that it encompasses a broader context beyond mere job satisfaction or work happiness, encompassing the overall evaluation of an employee's work environment. An excellent quality of work life is associated with better retention and lower absences. It means productivity in the institution or in the organization. Balance of life between family and work is not the only issue in the life of a teacher, but the issue of quality of life at work is another issue and concern in the Academe or in school that Human Resource Managers or school leaders should take into consideration. Daniel (2019) claimed that quality work life is linked to the employee. Therefore, elements like the design of a good organizational structure must be designed well in favor of the employee. The autonomy of the employee should be observed by the management. Moreover, the ones that affect the employees include compensation, working conditions, human relations, and overall job satisfaction. Karthick & Raja (2018) believed that QWL in terms of the teacher's performance is identified and associated with compensation and rewards, the autonomy in the workplace, the organization culture, and resource availability. The bond between co-workers and personal life affects the teacher's QWL.

Astuti and Soliha (2021) report their finding that work-life quality positively impacts employees. Quality Work-Life is a positive reinforcement that can help increase productivity and commitment in the workforce. However, it is not binding, nor does it apply to all organizations; it may differ. It is still highly recommended that a positive working atmosphere be reinforced. At the same time, Gumber (2021) suggests that most of the studies on QWL were in the academic department. It showed that faculty members who were new to teaching were more optimistic about the concept of QWL, which means that new employees are happier. QWL and community relations are the ones that matter the most in the lives of the employees. Servant leadership is not relevant to QWL. Employees are engaged in working hard in an atmosphere with a leader who supports and rewards employees who exert effort in their respective jobs. The organization must possess fair and equal treatment from its employees. Thus, the compensation of the employees affects QWL. Management bias or favoritism plays a role in the employees' behavior, which organizations must avoid. (Setyaningrum and Pawar 2020). In addition, Omara, Rashid, and Majid (2013) posited that a superior quality of work life is associated with socializing through social networking sites (SNS). This engagement fosters the development of relationships and facilitates communication with friends. SNS also serves as a form of entertainment, a repository of information, and a platform for social interaction and self-discovery. By



utilizing these platforms, individuals can enhance their relationships with others while maintaining a healthy lifestyle and achieving a balanced well-being.

There's no current study on faculty members' self-efficacy and quality of work-life involving the University of the City of Muntinlupa. The faculty's potential, better performance, and quality of life inspired the researchers to assess the self-efficacy in the quality of work life of faculty members in the college. This study served as a means of knowing the participants' self-efficacy and quality of work-life that can be influenced and developed, and how it positively affects all facets of their experiences. Furthermore, Srivastava and Kanpur (2014) emphasized the importance of Quality of Work Life for employees. This refers to the extent to which individuals can meet their personal needs while employed. It is crucial in the workplace due to factors like increased work demands, loss of long-term employee guarantees, the need for enhanced skills, greater competition for talent, and the rise of women in the workforce.

Finally, this research aimed to determine if self-efficacy is a predictor of quality of work-life among faculty members in the College of Business Administration at University of the City of Muntinlupa, which by so doing supports the claim of Bandura (2008; Buchanan, 2016) as a basis of improving the education process.

## 2. Objectives

The researchers aim to

- 1) Identify the level of self-efficacy among selected faculty members.
- 2) Assess the level of quality of work life among selected faculty members.
- 3) Determine self-efficacy as a predictor of quality of work life among selected faculty members.

## 3. Materials and Methods

The research study was conducted at the University of the City of Muntinlupa, located at University Road Poblacion, Muntinlupa City, Philippines. This study employed an explanatory sequential design and utilized convenience sampling to select participants from the population. Cresswell & Plano (2017) explain that explanatory sequential design is a mixed methods research design that involves collecting and analyzing quantitative data followed by qualitative data to provide a more comprehensive understanding of a research issue. Utilizing the Raosoft sample calculator, with a significance level of 0.05 and a 95% confidence interval, the population size of 50 was determined. Consequently, a minimum sample size of 45 was calculated. However, only 21 respondents were available to participate in the survey during data collection. Therefore, a sample of 21 respondents was selected from the 50 faculty members.

Qualified respondents were the professors and instructors of the College of Business Administration who were teaching during the second semester of the academic year 2024-2025.

This study employed the Teacher Efficacy Scale, adapted from Skaalvik and Skaalvik's "Teacher Self-efficacy and Teacher Burnout: A Study of Relations" (2009). This instrument comprises six subscales. Additionally, the Quality of Working Life scale, adapted from Simon Easton and Darren Van Laar's "A Measure of Quality of Working Life" (2018), was utilized. This scale also comprises six subscales and aims to: 1. Provide essential information for assessing employee contentment, which can be utilized for planning interventions, monitoring workforce experiences, and evaluating the impact of organizational changes. (Edwards, Webster, Van Laar, & Easton, 2008; Van Laar, Edwards, & Easton, 2007); 2. Capture the comprehensive essence of an individual's work experience.; and 3. Consider factors that influence an individual's overall well-being, including job satisfaction and other indicators of life satisfaction and general feelings of well-being. (Danna & Griffin, 1999)

The researcher wrote a letter to the College Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs to conduct a month-long survey. After approval, the survey was conducted. Before administering the questionnaire, the researchers explained its contents and procedures. The researchers administered the questionnaire to



participants in the College of Business Administration with the help of the Dean and Program Chairperson. Personal visits ensured complete questionnaire return.

Researchers used the JASP Statistical Package for quantitative data analysis, employing regression analysis to determine if self-efficacy predicts work-life quality among faculty in the College of Business Administration.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics on the self-efficacy of CBA faculty are presented in Tables 1 and 2. Assuming a normal distribution by employing mean and standard deviation to determine the level of self-efficacy of faculty members. [487]

**Table 1 Descriptive Statistics on Self-Efficacy of College of Business Administration Faculty**

Indicator	N	M	SD
Explain central themes in your subjects so that even the low-achieving students understand)	21	5.952	1.02
Provide good guidance and motivation to all students regardless of their level of ability.)	21	6.048	1.20
Answer students' questions so they understand difficult problems	21	6.238	1.00
Explain the subject matter so that most students understand the basic principles.	21	6.143	1.20
Maintain discipline in any school class or group of students.	21	6.143	1.01
Control even the most aggressive students.	21	5.857	1.20
Get students with behavioral problems to follow classroom rules.	21	5.952	1.02
Get all students to behave politely and respectfully	21	6.143	1.20
Organize schoolwork to adapt instruction and assignments to individual needs	21	6.238	1.18
Provide realistic challenges for all students even in mixed-ability classes	21	6.048	1.20
Adapt instructions to the needs of low-ability students while you also attend to the needs of other students in class.	21	5.762	1.34
Organize classroom work so that both low and high-ability students work with tasks that are adapted to their abilities.	21	6.143	1.01
Cooperate well with most parents.	21	4.810	1.08
Find adequate solutions to conflicts of interest with others.	21	6.048	1.02
Collaborate constructively with parents of students with behavioral problems.	21	5.095	1.95
Cooperate effectively and constructively with other teachers, for example, in teaching teams.	21	6.048	1.02
Get all students in class to work hard on their schoolwork.	21	5.952	1.20
Wake the desire to learn even among the lowest-achieving students.	21	6.048	1.20
Get students to do their best even when working with difficult problems	21	5.857	1.20
Motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork	21	6.048	1.20
Successfully use any instructional method that the school decides to use.	21	6.238	1.00



Manage instruction regardless of how it is organized (group composition, mixed age groups, etc.)	21	5.857	1.20
Manage instruction even if the curriculum is changed.	21	6.048	1.20
Teach well, even if you are told to use instructional methods that would not be your choice.	21	6.048	1.20

<sup>1</sup> Legend (1.00-2.50) *Not certain at all*; (2.51 - 4.00) *Quite uncertain*; (4.51 - 5.50) *Quite certain*; (5.51 - 7.00) *Absolutely certain*.

Table 1 revealed that the level of self-efficacy among faculty members is between quite certain and absolutely certain. This means that faculty members have a prominent level of self-efficacy in providing instructions to their students, maintaining discipline in the classroom, adapting instructions to individual students' needs, coping with change, motivating students, and cooperating with colleagues. As suggested by Schunk and Zimmerman (2020), a higher level of self-efficacy leads to increased persistence when faced with challenges and the propensity to embrace new tasks, which is critical in today's changing work environments where adaptability is essential.

**Table 2 Descriptive Statistics on the Dimensions of CBA Faculty Member's Self-Efficacy**

Dimension	N	M	SD
Instruction	21	6.095	0.96
Maintain Discipline	21	6.024	0.99
Adapt Instruction to Individual Needs	21	6.048	1.02
Cooperate With Colleagues and Parents	21	5.500	0.81
Motivate students	21	5.976	1.10
Cope with change	21	6.048	1.01
<b>Self-Efficacy</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5.948</b>	<b>0.89</b>

<sup>1</sup> Legend (1.00-2.50) *Not certain at all*; (2.51 - 4.00) *Quite uncertain*; (4.51 - 5.50) *Quite certain*; (5.51 - 7.00) *Absolutely certain*.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics on the dimensions of self-efficacy among CBA faculty members. Among the six dimensions listed, faculty members have an absolutely certain level of self-efficacy on instructions (M=6.095), seconded by adapting instructions to individual needs and coping with change having the same mean score (M=6.048). Maintaining discipline also shows a quite certain level of efficacy (M=6.024) and motivates students (M=5.976). However, faculty members are quite uncertain about cooperating with colleagues and parents, having the lowest mean score (M=5.500). The results were supported by the study of Gilliland & Blanchard (2017), which pointed out that when an individual with low self-efficacy may experience difficulties in setting realistic goals, managing time, and coping with stress, that leads to a breakdown in their work-life balance. In addition, Bakker et al. (2017) listed that having low self-efficacy can result in an individual's decreased productivity, increased absenteeism, and a heightened risk of mental and physical health problems. Furthermore, self-efficacy can affect one's ability to combat stress and maintain a healthy work-life; individuals like faculty members with high self-efficacy may better manage workplace demands, which leads to an effective prioritization of tasks and personal time (Riggio, 2020).

Descriptive statistics on the level of quality of working life among CBA faculty members are displayed in Table 3, including the basis of interpretation as seen in Figure 1.

**Table 3 Descriptive Statistics on the Quality of Working Life of CBA Faculty Members**

Sub-scales	N	f	Interpretation
General Well-being	21	24	Higher Quality of Working Life
Home-Work Interface	21	13	Higher Quality of Working Life
Job-Career Satisfaction	21	25	Higher Quality of Working Life
Control at Work	21	12	Higher Quality of Working Life



Working Conditions	21	12	Higher Quality of Working Life
Stress at Work	21	6	Higher Quality of Working Life
<b>Quality of Work Life</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>Higher Quality of Working Life</b>

PERCENTILE TABLE								
UK Higher Education Norms (N = 3797)								
PERCENTILES*		GWB	HWI	JCS	CAW	WCS	SAW	Full scale WRQoL
Lower QoWL	10	6-13	3-7	6-13	3-7	3-7	2-3	1-56
	20	14-16	8-9	14-16	8	8-9		57-65
	30	17-18		17-18	9	10	4	66-71
Average QoWL	40	19-20	10	19-20	10		5	72-76
	50	21		21		11		77-80
	60	22-23	11	22	11		6	81-84
Higher QoWL	70	24	12	23		12	7	85-88
	80	25	13	24-25	12	13		89-91
	90	26-27	14	26	13	14	8	92-97
	99	28-30	15	27-36	14-15	15	9-10	98-110

Key: GWB: General Well-being; HWI: Home-Work Interface; JCS: Job-Career Satisfaction; CAW: Control at Work; WCS: Working Conditions; SAW: Stress at Work.

**Figure 1** Quality of Working Life Score (Easton & Van Laar, 2013)

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics on the quality of working life among CBA faculty members. Based on the results, all sub-scales of quality of working life present a higher quality of working life (as seen in Figure 1, the score 92 was interpreted as higher QoWL). It is also important to note that general well-being, home-work interface, job-career satisfaction, control at work, and working conditions exhibit a good indicator of a quality working life among CBA faculty members despite the challenges and demands of a day-to-day teaching commitment. The result was supported by the study of Greenhaus & Allen (2011), as cited by Pritchard (2021), which recognizes the concept of work-life balance as an integrated approach to managing commitment across life domains. In addition, employees like faculty members with a positive work-life balance exhibit lower levels of stress and burnout, which leads to increased job satisfaction (Bakker & Demerouti, 2020).

A regression analysis of self-efficacy and quality of working life among CBA faculty members is exhibited in Table 4.

Table 3 Regression Analysis Between Self-Efficacy and Quality of Working Life

Model	R <sup>2</sup>	Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	F Change	df1	df2	p
H0	0	0		0	20	
H1	0.314	0.277	8.679	1	19	0.008

Coefficients

		95% CI					
Model		Unstand ardized	Standard Error	Standardized	t	p	
H0	(Intercept)	92	2.529		36.38	< .001	Lower Upper
H1	(Intercept)	48.773	14.83		3.289	0.004	17.735 79.812




---

Self-Efficacy	7.267	2.467	0.56	2.946	0.008	2.104	12.43
---------------	-------	-------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------

---

Table 4 shows the regression analysis between self-efficacy and work-related quality of life. Using the JASP Statistical Package by employing linear regression between two variables, the self-efficacy as a predictor of a work-related quality of life among CBA faculty members. The coefficient of determination R squared is 0.314. Therefore, about 31.4% of the variation in work-related quality of life is explained by faculty members' self-efficacy. The regression equation is useful for making predictions. With  $F(1, 19) = 8.679$  with a p-value of 0.008 lower than the significance level at 0.05, there exists enough evidence to conclude that the predictor influences work-related quality of life in the College of Business Administration at University of Muntinlupa; therefore, the model is valid. At 95% confidence, the slope for self-efficacy is between 2.104 and 12.43. In other words, the researchers are 95% confident that for every 7.267 unit increase in their self-efficacy, their quality of working life will also increase between 2.104 and 12.93. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected, which is that self-efficacy is a predictor of quality of working life. The study of Liu et Al. (2021) highlights the link between self-efficacy and quality working life, which suggests that employees with high self-efficacy have a better work life balance which resulted in lower job stress and higher job satisfaction. Consequently, Zhang and Liu (2022) assert that self-efficacious individuals proactively engage in time management strategies that promote a work-life balance. Therefore, believing in an individual's capabilities enhances their ability to effectively create an equilibrium between their work and personal life.

The researchers administered a guided interview among 21 participants who participated in the survey, who were of different age groups and had years of service in teaching. The youngest participant is a millennial under the age group between 25 to 40 years old and has been teaching for more than 2 years. Consequently, the oldest participant is a baby boomer under the age group between 57 and 75 years old and has been teaching for more than 6 years.

#### *Perceived Factors on Self-efficacy Among Participants*

The abstraction of this data for participants' perception of their perceived factors on self-efficacy defines a total of 8 codes, three sub-categories, two generic categories, and one main category, as presented in Table 4.1. Participants described the two generic categories as faculty members' self-efficacy as an effective approach to teaching.

Table 4.1 Abstraction result of participants on perceived factors on self-efficacy

Codes (frequency of statements)	Sub-categories	Generic Categories	Main Category
Effective instruction (21)	Classroom management	Effective Teaching Strategies	Faculty members' Self-efficacy as an Effective Approach to Teaching
Organize classroom (21)			
Maintains discipline in the classroom (15)			
Provide different teaching styles (10)	Adaptive teaching styles		
Easily adapt to changes (10)			
Advise and mentor students (12)			



Motivate students (18)	Collaborative learning environment	Shared teaching and learning responsibility	
Cooperate with peers and other stakeholders (8)			

Participants recognized that effective teaching strategies enhance instruction, classroom discipline, and organization. They acknowledged that self-efficacy in improving teaching involves adopting holistic approaches to motivate students, stimulate their interests, and foster understanding in their studies. This validation not only supports teachers but also reflects their motivation to transfer their knowledge to their students. Adaptability is paramount for teachers, who must remain informed about current trends and issues in teaching styles and modalities. As teaching evolves, teachers must adapt their approaches to meet the diverse needs of their students, tailoring their teaching methods to influence their learning trajectories and overall development.

Furthermore, faculty members' shared teaching and learning responsibilities must be implemented to guide students in their learning journey, fostering enrichment and motivation. Collaborative efforts are crucial in engaging students actively in class and providing academic and holistic advice and mentorship. Teachers play a pivotal role in shaping students' attitudes and behaviors, making their ability to act as peer counselors, advisers, and mentors essential in institutions that adopt a holistic approach to quality education.

When participants were asked about their perception of self-efficacy, the interview results revealed a correlation between the abstraction results and the survey question on their level of self-efficacy. Faculty members exhibited a high level of self-efficacy in managing instructions, adapting to changes, following discipline, and motivating themselves. They also demonstrated a high level of self-efficacy in collaborating with peers and parents. Based on these findings, faculty members concluded that self-efficacy is an effective teaching approach. By meeting the needs of their students, they believe that the learning process will become more manageable and successful.

#### *Perceived Challenges in the Quality of Work-Life*

The abstraction of this data for participants' perception of their challenges in their quality of work-life defines a total of 9 codes, five sub-categories, two generic categories, and one main category as presented in Table 4.2. Participants described the two generic categories as faculty members' motivation for a quality work-life.

Table 4.2 Abstraction result of participants on challenges in their quality of work-life

Codes (frequency of statements)	Sub-categories	Generic Categories	Main Category
Fatigue from work demand (16)	Stress at Work	Job Performance and Productivity	Faculty Members' Motivation for a Quality of Work-Life
Limited time to complete task (12)			
Difficulty disconnecting from the online platform (18)	Work-Life Balance		
Limited opportunities for training and development (21)	Professional Development Opportunities		
Student behavior during online class (21)	Work Dilemma		
Different teaching load (10)			
Late announcement on school policies (15)			



Relationship with colleagues(16)	Safe working environment		
Conducive Classroom (12)			

Job performance and productivity emerged as a prominent category from three sub-categories: stress at work, work-life balance, and professional development. Participants indicated that improving job performance and productivity can contribute to an individual's overall well-being, even amidst the challenges associated with achieving a healthy quality of work life. These challenges include demanding work requirements, inadequate time management skills, excessive reliance on online platforms, and limited opportunities for professional development. Despite these obstacles, faculty members expressed confidence in their ability to effectively manage and overcome these challenges that may impact their job productivity and performance. They emphasized the significance of proactive planning to meet deadlines and mitigate burnout. Additionally, they recognized the value of training and development programs that align with emerging teaching methodologies as a means of enhancing their confidence and effectiveness in their teaching roles. Furthermore, they acknowledged the benefits of disconnecting from online platforms to facilitate rest and conserve energy for both work and personal pursuits.

Furthermore, the workplace atmosphere is influenced by two distinct categories: work dilemmas and a safe working environment. Participants acknowledged that they faced challenges due to the student's behavior during online classes and the overwhelming class preparation caused by varying teaching loads. Additionally, they encountered challenges related to the late school policy announcement, their relationships with colleagues, and the conducive classroom environment during face-to-face classes. These perceived challenges directly impact creating a safe and supportive work environment for faculty members, fostering a sense of value and respect that contributes to their overall well-being and job satisfaction.

Faculty members were surveyed to identify the challenges they encountered that may impact their quality of work-life. The responses were categorized based on the emerging codes collected. The majority of respondents cited challenges related to student behavior during online classes, work-related fatigue, limited opportunities for professional development, difficulties disconnecting from the online platform, workplace bullying, and late school policy announcements. These challenges are often associated with constructs of work-life balance, including general well-being, the work-home interface, job satisfaction, control at work, working conditions, and stress levels. The findings of the interview revealed that despite the challenges experienced by faculty members, they still maintain a high level of quality of work-life as they are able to manage and address these issues that may lower their overall satisfaction.

## 5. Conclusion

School leaders should consider self-efficacy as a key factor in quality education. John Hattie (2012) found that teacher self-efficacy has the greatest impact on student achievement, surpassing factors like teacher-student relationships, home environment, and parental involvement. Teachers with high self-efficacy and action are more likely to foster learning. Self-efficacy can also be a teacher-retention strategy, as caring for teachers' well-being is essential for their career growth. Empowering teachers as stakeholders is crucial. They should be involved in decision-making processes and have a say in the school's improvement. When efficacious teachers and leaders collaborate, shared values and beliefs align with the school's vision and mission, leading to cultural change. Faculty members' quality of work life is influenced by six factors: general well-being, home-work interface, job and career satisfaction, control at work, working conditions, and stress. A positive work environment is essential for organizational success by boosting employee morale and engagement. Initiatives include employee recognition programs, training, mental health support, and safe working conditions. Self-efficacy significantly improves faculty members' quality of work life. Organizations should prioritize quality of work life and foster self-efficacy by implementing policies promoting positive work environments, skill enhancement, and well-being. This cycle of improved self-efficacy and quality of



working life leads to enhanced organizational performance. Vohra and Chanda. (2021) also suggests that a supportive leadership style significantly increases employee self-efficacy when improving the quality of work life. As for future researchers, the study may be their guide for future studies related to the topic of self-efficacy and quality of work life. They may replicate the study considering other variables not mentioned in the study

## 6. Acknowledgements

The researchers are grateful to all of those with whom we have had the pleasure of working during this study. The management committee headed by Dr. Raymundo P. Arcega, CESE, University President of the University of the City of Muntinlupa, for allowing us to produce a relevant research study and for continuously empowering us to author good research that will be beneficial for the stakeholders of the institution. The REQALIA office for equipping us to author relevant research. The Dean, faculty, and staff of the College of Business Administration for their usual support and for actively participating in the survey and data gathering for this study's completeness. Our families and friends for their love and support. And to God Almighty for giving us the wisdom and strength to finish this study.

## 7. References

- Agarwal, S. (2017, May 5). <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jbm/papers/Vol16-issue3/Version-1/H016315459.pdf>. Retrieved December 10, 2019
- Astuti, J.P. & Soliha, E. (2021). The effect of quality of work life and organizational commitment on performance with moderation of organizational culture (study on Public Health Center Puskesmas in Gabus District) Vol. 02 No. 06 (2021) e-ISSN: 2775-0809
- Bakker et al. (2017). A systematic review of the impact of work-life balance on mental health and well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 30(2), 147-164.
- Bakker, A.B., & Demerouti, E. (2020). Work engagement: A resource-based perspective. In *Handbook of Employee Engagement* (pp. 95-111). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology*, 4, 359-373.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior*, 4. New York: Academic Press, pp. 71-81.
- Bandura, A. (2008). An agentic perspective on positive psychology. *Positive psychology: Exploring the best in people*, 1, 167 – 196.
- Bray-Clark, N., & Bates, R. (2003). Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Teacher Effectiveness: Implications for Professional Development, Volume XXVI, Number 1, Fall 2003.
- Buchanan, J. (2016). Albert Bandura: Self efficacy for agentic positive psychology. Retrieved January 28, 2019, from <https://positivepsychologyprogram.com/bandura-self-efficacy/>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications
- Daniel, O. (2019). Analysis of quality work-life on employees' performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*. ISSN (Online): 2319 – 8028, ISSN (Print): 2319 – 801X. [www.ijbmi.org](http://www.ijbmi.org) || Volume 8 Issue 02 Series. IV || February 2019 || PP 60-65.
- Danna, K. & Griffin, R.W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and synthesis of literature. *Journal of Management*, 25, 357 – 384.
- Easton, S. & Van Laar, D. (2018). *A Measure of Quality of Working Life Second Edition*. Quality of Working Life Research, Department of Psychology, University of Portsmouth, ISBN:978-1-86137-622-6.



- Edwards, J.A., Webster, S., Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. (2008). Psychometric analysis of the health & safety executive management standards work-related stress indicator tool. *Work & Stress*, 22.2.96-107.
- Gilliland, B.E., & Blanchard, A.C. (2020). The effects of self-efficacy on work-life balance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 33(2)
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Allen, T.D. (2011). Work-family balance: A review and extension of the literature. In *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 165-203). SAGE Publications.
- Gumbler, V. (2021). Quality of work-life. *CASIRJ* Volume 12 Issue 11. ISSN 2319-9202
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. ISBN-13 978-0415690157, December 17, 2012, Routledge.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2018). Conservation of resources theory: Its history, principles, and applications. In A.L Veenhoven (Ed), *The psychology of happiness* (pp.135-153). Springer.
- Hocwarter, W.A., Tett, R.P., & Newman, D.A. (2020). Self-efficacy and work-life balance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 33(1), 1-24.
- Karthick, C. & Raja, N. (2018). Quality of work-life of the employees in selected information technology companies with reference to Chennai. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities (IJIRAH)* Impact Factor: 5.225, ISSN (Online): 2456 - 3145 ([www.dvpublication.com](http://www.dvpublication.com)) Volume 3, Issue 1, 2018. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330467648>
- Liu, Y., Wang, Y., & Hu, Q (2021). The impact of self-efficacy on work-life balance: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 129, 117-126.
- Omara, A., Rashid, W., & Majid, A. (2013). Motivations using social networking sites on quality work life. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 130 (2014) 524 – 531. 1877-0428 © 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under CC BY-NC-ND license. Selection and peer-review under responsibility of the Organizing Committee of INCOMaR 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.04.061
- Pritchard, R.D. (2021). The concept of work-life balance: A managerial perspective. *Organizational Dynamics*, 50(3), 1-10.
- Riggio, R.E. (2020). The role of self-efficacy in leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(3), 48-54.
- Schunk, D.H., & Zimmerman, B.J. (2020). *Self-Regulated Learning: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Routledge.
- Setyaningrum, R.P. & Pawar, A. (2020). Quality work life and employee engagement: does servant leadership influence employee performance? *Solid State Technology* Volume: 63 Issue: 5 Publication Year: 2020. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349297062>
- Skaalvik, E.M., & Skaalvik, S. (2009). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (2010) 1059 – 1069. Elsevier
- Srivastava, S., & Kanpur, R. (2014). A study on quality of work life: key elements & its implications. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, pp 54-55.
- Stevenson, H. (2015). The role self-efficacy, confidence and resilience plays in leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.clevelandconsultinggroup.com/articles/self-efficacy.php>
- Van Laar, D., & Easton, S. (2019). Quality Of Working Life. Retrieved November 5, 2019, from [http://www.qowl.co.uk/qowl\\_about\\_us.html](http://www.qowl.co.uk/qowl_about_us.html).
- Van Laar, D.L., Edwards, J., & Easton, S. (2007). The Work-Related Quality of Life (WRQoL) Scale for Healthcare Workers. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 60 (3) 325 – 333.
- Vohra, R., & Chanda, R. (2021). Leadership styles and their impact on self-efficacy and work-life balance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 28(2), 222-236.
- World Health Organization (2020). Burn-out: An “occupational phenomenon”. Retrieved from <<https://www.who.int/news-room/q-and-a/detail/burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon>



Zhang, J., & Liu, H. (2021). Self-efficacy, work-life balance, and job satisfaction: An integrative framework in human resource management. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 32(1), 47-61.