Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561, P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume : 02 Issue : 11 November-2026

Employee Well-Being in A Philippine Local Government Unit: A Descriptive correlational Assessment

Rhea Ann C. Loyaga
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Trecel C. Mañosa
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Mari Nicole T. Maraya
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Shemeber L. Silverio
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Danica L. Villablanca
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Christina R. Villones
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

MARILOU G. PEREZ, LPT, DM
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-8610-2379

Zosilyn M. Malate, LPT, MM
Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department, Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus, Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines

Published Date: November 16, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E11/2026-20**

ABSTRACT:
Objectives: This study assessed the well-being of employees of the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines, across six dimensions—psychological, social, workplace, subjective, work–life, and self-efficacy—and tested whether well-being differed by sex and related to age, marital status, and length of service. Methodology: A quantitative, descriptive-correlational design was used. Employing Slovin's formula at a 10% margin of error, 77 employees were surveyed through a convenience sample from a population of 343 using a questionnaire adapted from the Employee Well-being Scale (Pradhan & Hati, 2019). Data were analyzed with frequencies, means, independent-samples *t* tests, and Pearson correlations. Key findings: Respondents were predominantly female (55.8%), aged 32– 40 years (29.9%), married (49.4%), and short-tenured (84.5% had served 1–9 years). All six well-being dimensions registered high levels, with workplace well-being highest ($M = 4.18$) and work–life well-being lowest ($M = 3.53$). No significant sex differences emerged (all $p > .05$); age, marital status, and length of service showed only very weak, nonsignificant correlations (all $r \leq .151$). Significance: Wellbeing was uniformly high across demographic groups, and the work–life boundary is the most promising target for municipal wellness intervention; the study offers one of the first multidimensional baselines for employee well-being in Philippine local government.

KEYWORDS: employee well-being, local government unit, Philippines, workplace well-being, public sector employees

INTRODUCTION

Employees normally spend a substantial share of their lives at work, and how they fare during those hours increasingly matters to the organizations that depend on them. Well-being, in its broadest sense, describes how people feel about and function in their lives—an experience that spans health, happiness, purpose, and the capacity to handle stress. Far from being a private matter, employee well-being has documented consequences for organizations: workers who function well tend to be more engaged, more productive, and less likely to leave, while poor well-being carries real costs, from absenteeism to turnover (Weziak-Bialowolska et al., 2020).

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Local government is a distinctive setting for this concern. Municipal employees deliver the services that communities depend on daily— civil registration, social welfare, treasury functions, disaster response—often under austerity pressures and reform agendas that stretch their resources. Understanding what sustains or erodes the well-being of these workers is therefore not only a health matter but a governance matter (Adendorff et al., 2021; Sabharwal et al., 2019).

In the Philippines, the case is acute. Filipino workers reported the highest daily stress in Southeast Asia in 2021—50% said they experienced a lot of stress on the previous day, against a global average of 44%—even as the country recovered from the disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic (Gallup, 2022). Yet Philippine evidence on employee well-being remains thin. One of the few available studies examined a state university (Arbiol et al., 2022); local government units, which employ large numbers of workers on temporary and joborder contracts, have received far less attention. No published multidimensional assessment of LGU employee well-being in Eastern Visayas appears to exist.

The study addresses that gap by evaluating the well-being of employees of the LGU of Tanauan, Leyte, a second-class municipality in Eastern Visayas. Specifically, it asked four questions: (1) What is the profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, marital status, and length of service? (2) What is the level of employee well-being in terms of psychological, social, workplace, subjective, work–life, and self-efficacy well-being? (3) Is there a significant difference in well-being between male and female employees? and (4) Is there a significant relationship between employees' age, marital status, and length of service and their well-being?

Two null hypotheses guided the inferential tests: first, that there is no significant difference between male and female employees in their level of well-being; and second, that there is no significant relationship between employees' age, marital status, and length of service and their well-being. Answers to these questions can help the municipality identify which facets of well-being need the most attention and design interventions grounded in evidence rather than assumption.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on well-being has matured into a family of related but distinct constructs. Psychological well-being pertains to the positive functioning—self-acceptance, positive relations, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989). Social well-being captures the appraisal of one's circumstances and functioning in society, including integration, contribution, and acceptance (Keyes, 1998). Subjective well-being is the more affective and evaluative side of the concept, encompassing happiness and life satisfaction (Diener, 1984). Self-efficacy, or the trust in one's capabilities to perform certain courses of action, operates as a personal resource that shapes how employees approach challenges (Bandura, 1977). Cross-cultural work has shown that these constructs travel beyond their Western origins; Ryff's scales, for example, have been applied successfully with adolescents in mainland China (Gao & McLellan, 2018).

In organizational research, these strands converge in the broader notion of employee well-being, which also covers the workplace itself— the quality of the physical environment, job design, and the culture in which work is embedded. Pradhan and Hati (2019) developed and validated an Employee Well-being Scale that treats well-being as a composite of psychological, social, workplace, and subjective facets, providing organizations with a practical multidimensional measurement tool. Their scale anchors the present study.

Each strand has been linked to performance. Usman (2017) found that higher psychological well-being predicted higher job performance among employees of information technology firms. Kundi et al. (2021) similarly conveyed that psychological well-being was linked with stronger job performance, partly through employees' attachment to the employer, while noting that job insecurity functions as an important work-related stressor—a finding of particular relevance to public sectors that rely on contingent personnel. Well-being also interacts with personal resources in shaping workplace behavior: in a study of employees in the United Kingdom and United States, well-being and selfefficacy jointly strengthened the link between coaching leadership and knowledge sharing intention (Wang et al., 2021). At the level of the whole life, well-being at work and well-being in life feed each other over time (Weziak-Bialowolska et al., 2020).

The local government context adds its own dynamics. Adendorff et al. (2021) examined how leadership relates to the well-being of Australian local government employees working under prolonged austerity-driven reform, arguing that employee well-being is a critical yet underexamined asset in local government reform. Municipalities have also long experimented with structured responses: wellness programs in local government workplaces have been found to yield performance benefits when they are well designed, adequately funded, and monitored over time (Sabharwal et al., 2019).

Philippine evidence remains scarce and uneven. During the pandemic, employees of a Philippine state university maintained good psychological well-being despite difficult conditions (Arbiol et al., 2022), and studies elsewhere in the region documented elevated anxiety and reduced quality of life among local residents during the same period (Zhang & Ma, 2020). What is missing is a multidimensional assessment of well-being among Philippine local government employees—the population that delivers frontline public services. The present study fills this gap, extending the measurement tradition of Pradhan and Hati (2019) to a Philippine municipal workforce.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We employed a quantitative, non-experimental descriptive-correlational design. The descriptive component characterized the respondents' profile and their level of well-being across the six dimensions; the correlational component tested whether well-being differed by sex and whether it was associated with age, marital status, and length of service. Data were gathered at a single point in time through a self-administered survey, a strategy suited to respondents who may answer more candidly on paper than in an interview. Because the design is cross-sectional, it describes relationships as they stand rather than establishing causal direction.

The study was conducted in the LGU of Tanauan, Leyte, Philippines, a second-class municipality in Eastern Visayas. The sampling frame consisted of the municipality's 343 employees across its major offices, including the Human Resource Management Office, Municipal Accounting Office, Engineering Office, Municipal Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Office, Municipal Social Welfare and Development Office, Municipal Treasurer's Office, and Municipal Civil Registrar. Employees were selected regardless of position, age, or tenure. Utilizing Slovin's formula at a 10% margin of error, the minimum sample size was computed as 77. Because fieldwork had to work around the operational demands

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

of municipal offices during the pandemic period, a convenience sampling procedure was used: questionnaires were given to employees who were available during the two-week data collection window in 2021–2022. All 77 questionnaires distributed were completed and returned.

Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire adapted from the Employee Well-being Scale developed and validated by Pradhan and Hati (2019), whose parent scale demonstrates strong internal consistency across dimensions. The instrument had two parts. Part I collected the respondents' profile: age, sex, marital status, and length of service. Age was categorized into five brackets (23–31, 32–40, 41– 49, 50–58, and 59–67 years), and length of service into four (1–9, 10–18, 19–27, and 28–36 years). Part II consisted of Likert-type statements assessing the six well-being dimensions—psychological, social, workplace, subjective, work–life, and self-efficacy well-being—with ten statements per dimension. Some statements were positively worded (e.g., "I enjoy meaningful work") and others negatively worded (e.g., "People in my team don't help each other in difficult times"). All items used a five-point scale: 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. Dimension means were interpreted as follows: 4.51–5.00, very high; 3.51–4.50, high; 2.51–3.50, moderate; 1.51–2.50, low; and 1.00–1.50, very low. In interpreting negatively worded items, low agreement was read as favorable—strong disagreement with a negative statement is consistent with good well-being rather than poor.

Permission to pursue with the study was secured from the Office of the Municipal Mayor of Tanauan, with endorsement from the campus director and the head of the Business Entrepreneurship and Management Department of Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study and assured that respondents' involvement was voluntary, that they could withdraw without consequence, and that their identities and answers would remain confidential, in keeping with the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). The directions were explained in person, questions were entertained, and completed questionnaires were retrieved either on the spot or on a return visit agreed with the respondents.

Frequencies and percentages described the respondents' profile, and weighted means described each well-being dimension. To test for sex differences, independent-samples *t* tests were computed for each dimension. Relationships between the profile variables (age, marital status coded ordinally, and length of service) and each well-being dimension were tested using Pearson product-moment correlations. All tests were evaluated at $\alpha = .05$ using SPSS.

RESULTS

Results in Table 1 summarizes the profile of the 77 respondents. The age distribution was fairly even across the younger brackets: 29.9% were 32–40 years old, 28.6% were 23–31, 22.1% were 41–49, 14.3% were 50–58, and 5.2% were 59–67. More than half (55.8%) were female. Slightly fewer than half were married (49.4%), with 46.8% single, and the remainder in common-law unions (1.3%) or widowed (2.6%). Length of service was heavily skewed toward the bottom bracket: 84.5% had served 1–9 years, while 7.8% had served 28–36 years and 3.9% each fell in the 10–18 and 19–27 year brackets. This pattern is consistent with a workforce that relies heavily on recent hires and contingent personnel—a composition worth keeping in mind when reading the well-being results.

Table 1. Profile of Respondents (N = 77)

Characteristic	*n*	%
Age (years)		
23–31	22	28.6
32–40	23	29.9
41–49	17	22.1
50–58	11	14.3
59–67	4	5.2
Sex		
Male	34	44.2
Female	43	55.8
Marital status		
Single	36	46.8
Married	38	49.4
Common-law	1	1.3
Widowed	2	2.6
Length of service (years)		
1–9	65	84.5
10–18	3	3.9
19–27	3	3.9
28–36	6	7.8

Note. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 2 shows the level of employee well-being by dimension. All six dimensions fell in the high range, with no dimension dropping to moderate or lower. Workplace well-being was the strongest dimension (*M* = 4.18), followed by self-efficacy well-being (*M* = 4.00) and

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

psychological well-being (*M* = 3.86). Work–life well-being, while still high, was the weakest (*M* = 3.53), a pattern that identifies the balance between work and personal life as the aspect of well-being where employees fare least well.

Table 2. Level of Employee Well-Being by Dimension (N = 77)

Well-being dimension	*M*	Interpretation
Psychological well-being	3.86	High
Social well-being	3.85	High
Workplace well-being	4.18	High
Subjective well-being	3.76	High
Work–life well-being	3.53	High
Self-efficacy well-being	4.00	High

Note. Scale: 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Interpretation ranges: 4.51–5.00 = very high; 3.51–4.50 = high; 2.51–3.50 = moderate; 1.51–2.50 = low; 1.00–1.50 = very low.

The item-level results flesh out this picture. Within psychological well-being, the highest-rated statement was "I think life is a continuous process of learning" (*M* = 4.60), while the statement "I understand the expectation from me" received the lowest rating in that dimension (*M* = 3.04, moderate)—suggesting that role clarity is the softest spot in an otherwise strong psychological profile. Within social well-being, employees agreed most strongly that they were an important part of their team and organization (*M* = 4.16). The lowest-rated social statement, "People in my team don't help each other in difficult times" (*M* = 2.43), is negatively worded; its low endorsement, correctly read, indicates that mutual support is present rather than absent. Within the other dimensions, employees rated most highly the statements "I enjoy meaningful work" (workplace), "Mostly I feel happy" (subjective), "I set priorities on both my work life and personal life" (work–life), and "I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough" (self-efficacy).

Table 3 presents the results of the independent-samples *t* tests by sex. Male respondents scored slightly higher than female respondents on every dimension, but none of the differences approached significance. The largest gaps—subjective and social well-being—corresponded to small effect sizes (*d* = 0.37 and 0.36), and the first null hypothesis was retained: male and female employees of the LGU did not differ meaningfully in their well-being.

Table 3. Independent-Samples t Tests of Well-Being Dimensions by Sex

Dimension	Male *M* (*SD*)	Female *M* (*SD*)	*t*	*p*	*d*
Psychological	3.93 (0.51)	3.80 (0.45)	1.05	.308	0.27
Social	3.96 (0.53)	3.77 (0.52)	0.14	.708	0.36
Workplace	4.23 (0.54)	4.13 (0.61)	0.31	.579	0.17
Subjective	3.87 (0.55)	3.68 (0.49)	0.13	.722	0.37
Work–life	3.62 (0.59)	3.47 (0.54)	0.40	.527	0.26
Self-efficacy	4.10 (0.56)	3.92 (0.59)	0.17	.679	0.31

Note. N = 77 (34 male, 43 female). df = 75. All tests nonsignificant at α = .05. Cohen's d computed from reported means and standard deviations.

Table 4 presents the correlations between the profile variables and the well-being dimensions. Every correlation was positive but very weak, and none reached significance. The strongest coefficient—the association between length of service and social well-being, *r* = .151, *p* = .191—still explained less than 3% of shared variance. The second null hypothesis was therefore retained: age, marital status, and length of service bore no statistically significant relationship to any dimension of employee well-being in this sample. Well-being, in other words, was not the province of any particular age group, marital status, or tenure bracket; it looked largely uniform across the workforce.

Table 4. Pearson Correlations Between Profile Variables and Well-Being Dimensions (N = 77)

Dimension	Age *r* (*p*)	Marital status *r* (*p*)	Length of service *r* (*p*)
Psychological	.081 (.481)	.071 (.541)	.085 (.463)
Social	.092 (.425)	.038 (.742)	.151 (.191)
Workplace	.038 (.740)	.023 (.842)	.066 (.569)
Subjective	.062 (.590)	.036 (.758)	.008 (.946)

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Work–life	.040 (.727)	.030 (.794)	.036 (.753)
Self-efficacy	.091 (.431)	.028 (.811)	.123 (.285)

Note. Marital status categories were coded ordinally. All correlations nonsignificant at α = .05.

DISCUSSION

Three findings stand out from this assessment. First, well-being was high across all six dimensions—no mean fell below the high range. Second, the profile variables told essentially no story at all: neither sex differences nor correlations with age, marital status, or tenure reached significance. Third, within the uniformly high profile, a clear internal ordering emerged, with workplace and self-efficacy well-being at the top and work–life well-being at the bottom.

The overall picture of high well-being is encouraging, and it is worth pausing over why. The data were collected in 2021–2022, while the Philippines was still absorbing the shocks of the pandemic, a period in which Filipino workers reported the highest daily stress in Southeast Asia (Gallup, 2022). Against that backdrop, high well-being among Tanauan's municipal employees suggests something protective in the setting itself—perhaps the stability of public service employment, perhaps the social fabric of a small municipality where colleagues are also neighbors. The finding aligns with Arbiol et al. (2022), who likewise found good psychological well-being among employees of a Philippine state university during the pandemic. It is a useful reminder that national stress statistics, while alarming, do not settle the question for any workplace; local assessment matters.

The internal ordering of the dimensions is equally informative. Employees rated their workplace well-being highest, anchored by a strong sense of meaningful work, and their self-efficacy well-being second, with confidence in their own problem-solving ability carrying that dimension. These are precisely the resources that Pradhan and Hati (2019) frame as the core of employee well-being, and they suggest a workforce that is engaged with the substance of its work rather than merely enduring it. At the other end, work–life well-being was the weakest dimension. This is the most actionable finding of the study. Municipal work—disaster response, social welfare delivery, frontline service—is demanding and not always confined to office hours, and a workforce in which 84.5% have served fewer than ten years may still be negotiating the boundaries between the job and the rest of life. Interventions here need not be elaborate: workload review, reasonable limits on after-hours tasks, and explicit encouragement to use leave entitlements would speak directly to the weakest link in an otherwise strong profile.

Two soft spots inside the dimensions merit attention. Role clarity— "I understand the expectation from me"—was the lowest-rated psychological item, falling to the moderate range. For a workforce dominated by newer employees, many presumably on job-order or contractual arrangements, this points to a need for structured onboarding and clearer communication of duties, especially since job insecurity is a recognized stressor for contingent workers (Kundi et al., 2021). And while social well-being was high and mutual support evidently present, the pattern of item ratings suggests that participation in team decision-making was the least endorsed aspect of employees' social experience at work. Creating genuine channels for employee voice—consultation on schedules, service innovations, and office procedures— would address both concerns at once.

The uniformly null inferential results deserve as careful a reading as significant ones would. Male employees scored slightly higher on every dimension, but the differences were small and statistically indistinguishable from noise. The correlations with age, marital status, and length of service were all very weak and nonsignificant—a pattern that contrasts with population-level findings that social well-being tends to rise with age and education (Keyes, 1998). Two explanations are plausible and not mutually exclusive. Well-being in this workforce may genuinely be a function of shared organizational climate rather than demographics—everyone drinks from the same well. Or the variables may have lacked the room to show their effects: with 84.5% of respondents clustered in the 1–9 year tenure bracket, restriction of range could easily have buried any true association.

Several limitations bound these conclusions. The sample was drawn from a single municipality through convenience sampling at a 10% margin of error, so the estimates are less precise and less generalizable than probability sampling would have produced. Data were selfreported at one point in time, and the shared-method design may have inflated the dimension means. The instrument was adapted from a scale validated in India (Pradhan & Hati, 2019) without independent validation in the Philippine local government context, and reliability estimates for the adapted version were not re-examined in this sample. Marital status was correlated with well-being after ordinal coding, a simplification that a future study could avoid by treating it as categorical. Finally, the severe skew of the tenure distribution—and, to a lesser extent, the age distribution—restricted the variance available to detect correlations.

CONCLUSION

Employees of the LGU of Tanauan, Leyte, reported high levels of well-being across all six dimensions—psychological, social, workplace, subjective, work–life, and self-efficacy—with workplace well-being strongest and work–life well-being weakest. Well-being did not differ by sex, and age, marital status, and length of service bore no significant relationship to it. For the municipality, the practical message is to protect what is working—meaningful work, mutual support, and problem-solving confidence—while directing attention to the work– life boundary, role clarity, and employee participation, drawing on the design principles of well-funded, monitored local government wellness programs (Sabharwal et al., 2019). Future researchers should use probability samples across multiple LGUs, validate the well-being scale locally, and model well-being with multivariate designs that include organizational variables such as leadership and job security, so that wellbeing can be linked to the municipal performance it is presumed to support. The study offers one of the few multidimensional baselines of employee well-being in Philippine local government, against which future wellness interventions can be measured.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank the Office of the Municipal Mayor of Tanauan, Leyte, for permitting and facilitating the data gathering, and the officials and employees of the municipal offices who gave their time to participate. We also thank the Eastern Visayas State University Tanauan Campus administration, for allowing us to conduct the study outside the university premises.

DECLARATIONS

Funding: No funding was received for this research.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Research ethics and consent: The study was conducted with the permission of the Office of the Municipal Mayor of Tanauan, Leyte. Participation was voluntary and based on informed consent; respondents could decline or withdraw without consequence, and identities and responses were kept confidential in accordance with the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173).

Data availability: The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Author contributions: All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study, data collection, analysis, and interpretation, and to drafting and revising the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version and consent to its publication.

REFERENCES

1) Adendorff, G., Dick, T., Xerri, M., & Brunetto, Y. (2021). Does the talk match the walk for Australian local government employees: The link between leadership and employee well-being. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 80*(4), 769–789. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12467
2) Arbiol, J., Gonzales, E. S., & Cabajes, A. V. (2022). Psychological well-being of employees of a Philippine state university in times of COVID-19 pandemic. *Southeastern Philippines Journal of Research and Development, 27*(1), 75–84. https://doi.org/10.53899/spjrd.v27i1.190
3) Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
4) Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*(3), 542–575. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542
5) Gallup. (2022). *State of the global workplace: 2022 report*. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace2022report.aspx
6) Gao, J., & McLellan, R. (2018). Using Ryff's scales of psychological well-being in adolescents in mainland China. *BMC Psychology, 6*, Article 17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-018-0231-6
7) Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*(2), 121–140. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787065
8) Kundi, Y. M., Aboramadan, M., Elhamalawi, E. M. I., & Shahid, S. (2021). Employee psychological well-being and job performance: Exploring mediating and moderating mechanisms. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 29*(3), 736–754. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2020-2204
9) Pradhan, R. K., & Hati, L. (2019). The measurement of employee well-being: Development and validation of a scale. *Global Business Review, 23*(2), 385–407. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919859101
10) Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). *Data Privacy Act of 2012*. Republic of the Philippines.
11) Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069
12) Sabharwal, M., Kiel, L. D., & Hijal-Moghrabi, I. (2019). Best practices in local government wellness programs: The benefits of organizational investment and performance monitoring. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 39*(1), 24–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X16682817
13) Usman, A. (2017). The effect of psychological well-being on employee job performance: Comparison between the employees of projectized and non-projectized organizations. *Journal of Entrepreneurship & Organization Management, 6*(1), 8–12. https://doi.org/10.4172/2169-026X.1000206
14) Wang, W., Kang, S. W., & Choi, S. B. (2021). Effects of employee well-being and self-efficacy on the relationship between coaching leadership and knowledge sharing intention: A study of UK and US employees. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(20), Article 10638. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182010638
15) Weziak-Bialowolska, D., Bialowolski, P., Sacco, P. L., VanderWeele, T. J., & McNeely, E. (2020). Well-being in life and well-being at work: Which comes first? Evidence from a longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Public Health, 8*, Article 103. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00103
16) Zhang, Y., & Ma, Z. F. (2020). Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental health and quality of life among local residents in Liaoning Province, China: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(7), 2381. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17072381

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/