

STRESSORS, AFFECTIVITY, AND SELF-EFFICACY AS PREDICTORS OF LIBRARIANS' THRIVING AT WORK

JOLO VAN CLYDE ABATAYO¹, AL STEPHEN, LAGUMEN², JOEL POTANE³

2079360@g.cu.edu.ph/ jolovanclyde@gmail.com¹

2076716@g.cu.edu.ph²

potane.joel@g.cu.edu.ph³

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7987-0612>

¹⁻³ Capitol University Graduate School, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54476/ioer-imrj/751772>

ABSTRACT

Academic librarians are important drivers of academic achievement, research advancement, and community success. This study investigated the effect of librarians' stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy on thriving at work. The study utilized a descriptive-correlational research design. The respondents were the one hundred ten (110) academic librarians in the higher education institutions of Caraga Region and Northern Mindanao who were chosen using a clustered sampling technique. Five modified questionnaires were utilized for data gathering. Findings discovered a collective significant effect of the stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy on the librarians' thriving at work in both vitality and learning dimensions. The study recommends that the leadership in higher education institutions must show their support to the academic librarians and expose them to training geared towards improving their affectivity and self-efficacy to motivate them to perform better at work. When librarians view work-related stressors in a positive way, learn how to manage and control their emotions, and believe in their ability to solve work-related problems, they can thrive in the workplace and thus function more effectively and efficiently. One of the study's limitations is its failure to consider the effect of stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy to work productivity and professional development. These factors may be explored in future studies. Qualitative studies about thriving at work and the various variables that can predict this significant condition may be explored to understand its existence and relevance in the workplace deeply.

Keywords: Thriving at Work, Work Stressors, Self-Efficacy, Affectivity, Librarianship

INTRODUCTION

Academic librarians are not exempted from the pressures drawn from the intensification of professional and work competition, acceleration and disruptions of work rhythm, augmentation of the density and professionalism of organizational work, and the challenges of new knowledge and

skills acquisition to perform at the optimal level. Positive influences of stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy should exist for them to thrive at work.

Academic libraries must be prepared to deal with the problems and opportunities that come with sudden and unexpected changes to become effective and efficient academic support workforces. Wiley, a publishing company, polled

librarians to determine their top problems. Results have shown that the challenges mostly comprised budget issues, library disruptions management, declining patron requests for content, career advancements, changing technical requirements, roles in research, management of library operations, elucidating the significance of librarians to clients, and continuous digitization of information resources (Cheng, 2016).

With those abovementioned pressures, most librarians are exposed to workplace stressors that can disadvantageously affect their well-being. Librarians usually experience high mental and physical strains due to the weight of responsibilities and emotional strains due to personal setbacks. Grounded on the results of the study of Bacor and Abatayo (2022), there is a moderate extent on the challenges for librarians amid the COVID-19 pandemic in terms of administration, personnel and staff, collection management, organization of materials, financial management, and automation and information technology.

Amidst work-related adversities, it is a great advantage to have thriving employees, for they can help avoid undesirable individual consequences like strain, depression, and sicknesses (Canadian Centre for Occupational Health & Safety, 2022) and also promote optimistic organizational outcomes, such as higher job contentment, better performance, and organizational engagement (Gerbasi et al., 2015; Spreitzer & Porath, 2014). Moreover, thriving employees are less possible to manifest absenteeism, burnout, and stress at the workplace.

Yang and Li (2021) found that stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy have substantial effects on the thriving condition of personnel at work. These factors have various impacts on their job performance, work motivation, and professional growth. All workforces are exposed to different stressors and experience mediating factors that can stimulate or decrease thriving at

work. Academic librarians, as part of the academic and research enterprises, are not excused for professional setbacks; hence, these professionals should not be taken for granted along with other academic and research support employees.

This study is anchored on several significant theories and concepts for its furtherance. First, the Theory of Thriving at Work was propagated by Spreitzer et al. (2005), which helped determine the extent of the respondents' thriving at work. Second, the Challenge-Hindrances Model that was introduced by Cavanaugh et al. (1998) and the Stressors-Performance Model by Lepine et al. (2005) helped the researchers find out about the respondents' stressors, specifically in gauging the level of challenge and hindrance stressors these respondents are facing that could affect their thriving at work. Lastly, concepts and theories about the mediating effects of affectivity and self-efficacy are presented to explore how these variables influence the respondents' degree of thriving in the workplace.

The researchers, who are educators, see firsthand, the truth of the demanding working conditions of academic librarians. Thus, the information gathered from this study enriched the limited body of knowledge regarding librarians' thriving at work. Most importantly, this study provided a deeper understanding of the effect of stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy to work thriving among academic librarians of Regions 10 and 13 in the Philippines.

This study looked for real evidence showing how the presence of stresses, affectivity, and self-efficacy could effectively facilitate academic librarians' work thriving, considering that academic librarians are significant catalysts for academic excellence, research development, and community success. The study was conducted since it had not yet been thoroughly determined to what extent these predicting factors serve as

enablers of flourishing at work in the profession of academic librarianship.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study explored work stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy as predictors of academic librarians' thriving at work. Specifically, this study sought the following: 1) the respondents' categorization of work stressors; 2) the respondents' extent of affectivity; 3) the respondents' extent of self-efficacy; and 4) the predictors of thriving at work.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design. This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design to gather quantifiable information about the existence of stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy as predictors of academic librarians' thriving at work. This design helped the researchers define and measure the significance of these enablers on the participants' extent of thriving at the workplace as academic and research support personnel.

Sampling Technique. In determining the respondents, the researchers employed a cluster sampling method. Out of one hundred fifty-three (153) academic librarians in Caraga Region and Region 10, one hundred ten (110) respondents were chosen using the Cochran Formula. Specifically, the respondents of the study are registered librarians who work for higher education institutions in Region 10 and Region 13 and have two complementary roles: supporting the academic program and the research of faculty members and students at the colleges and universities.

Research Instruments. The researchers utilized four survey questionnaires. The first instrument is a modified questionnaire about work stressors helping the researchers determine how

the respondents rate their extent of work stressors. It was drawn from the available instrument of Brady and Cunningham (2019) based on the common workplace stressors used as appraisal targets in their study. The second instrument is a modified survey questionnaire, drawn from the research instrument of Hofmann and Kashdan (2010) which they used as an Affective Style Questionnaire (AFS) to measure the extent of affectivity of the respondents. The third instrument is a modified survey questionnaire that helped the researchers measure the extent of the respondents' self-efficacy based on the self-efficacy scale formulated by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) and was employed to associate self-efficacy to emotion, optimism, and fulfillment at work. The fourth instrument is a modified questionnaire which has 2 parts ("vitality dimension" and "learning dimension"), drawn from the instrument of Porath et al. (2011) to find out the extent of thriving at work of the respondents.

Validity. After incorporating the validators' suggestions, the researchers utilized the content validity index (CVI) to determine if the instruments have appropriate sample items for the construct that were measured. After this, the revised questionnaires were administered for pilot testing to assess the reliability of the survey questionnaires. The respondents of the pilot test were the academic librarians in Region 12. Furthermore, the pilot test results were submitted to the statistician for reliability and consistency testing.

Reliability. The following values were generated using Cronbach's Alpha reliability test. Part 1, which pertains to stressors (challenge and hindrance stressors) got a Cronbach Alpha of 0.885. Part 2, which is all about affectivity, has a Cronbach Alpha of 0.924. Part 3, which pertains to self-efficacy, got a Cronbach Alpha of 0.924. Part 4, which pertains to items that gauge the two



thriving at work dimensions under vitality and learning, got a Cronbach Alpha of 0.936 and 0.978, respectively. Since the Cronbach Alpha values were above the acceptable value, the instrument was deemed to have relatively high internal consistency in measuring the constructs under study.

Data Collection. In the collection of data for the study, the researchers surveyed how the respondents are characterized in terms of work stressors, affectivity, self-efficacy, and thriving at work. A letter stating the intent of the researchers was attached to the questionnaire for the appropriation of the conduct of the study. Informed consent was requested from the respondents, which assured them of the confidentiality of their responses. The questionnaires were disseminated online. The answers of the respondents were checked, tallied, presented in tables, analyzed, and interpreted by the researchers.

Statistical Treatment. In the data analysis, problems 1, 2, 3, and 4 used the frequency, percentage, and mean distributions to determine how the respondents are characterized in terms of stressors and the extent of their affectivity, self-efficacy, and thriving at work. For problem 5, to find out how the respondents' extent of work stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy can significantly predict the extent of their thriving at work, Multiple Regression Analysis was employed. Furthermore, the researchers asked for assistance from external and institutional statistical analysts. These experts assisted the researchers in analyzing the data from the survey questionnaires. After coming up with the findings, the researchers employed the expertise of a professional data analyst for data analysis and interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

1. Librarians' Stressors

Findings revealed that 59.5% of the librarians categorized the indicators as challenge stressors, while 40.5% considered them as hindrance stressors. Among the 17 indicators, input into the decision-making process that one is in charge of carrying out was considered by 97.3 percent of the respondents as a challenge stressor, followed by the will to plan out work and identify procedures at work (90.9%), and responsibility for the work of others (85.5%). On the other hand, only 36.4% of the respondents considered the lack of social support from supervisors as a challenging stressor.

Based on the results, most academic librarians perceived the common work-related stressors as challenge stressors. They highly regard personal responsibilities for their own and others' work as positive stressors that may enable them to function well. Since challenge stressors are driving forces that may likely motivate the workers to excel, it is assumed that the presence of these stressors among librarians will help them perform better at work. Librarians view obstacles and demands at work as beneficial chances to pick up new abilities. In other words, this will push them to take the necessary steps to overcome their work-related challenges.

Further, employees who distinguish stressors as challenges do not back down. Instead, they put more effort to acquire the necessary knowledge and abilities, significantly lessening the damaging effects of challenge stressors. When organizations promote challenges at work, there is a likelihood that the employees will be positively influenced by these pressures, which can eventually enthruse thriving at work. In line with this, self-determination theory suggests that employees will be more internally motivated when they feel competent in a task, which will help them succeed at work (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

2. Librarians' Affectivity in the Workplace

The extent of librarians' affectivity in the workplace is High (\bar{X} =3.65; SD=.643). Among the 20 indicators on affectivity, they rated themselves highest in terms of knowing what to do to get themselves into a better mood (\bar{X} =3.93; SD=.896),

followed by having their emotions well under control ($\bar{X}=3.88$; $SD=.984$) and avoiding being dismayed by having a different outlook on things ($\bar{X}=3.81$; $SD=.840$). On the other hand, they rated themselves lowest in terms of feeling okay if people see them being upset ($\bar{X}=3.19$; $SD=1.036$).

The data implies that the respondents know exactly how to overcome negative emotions as they perform their duties and responsibilities in the workplace. They can control, manage, and even minimize the effect of negative emotions by directing their attention to something positive and worthwhile. Furthermore, the results indicate that academic librarians know how to carry themselves professionally despite what they are going through. This ability to regulate their emotions cannot impede them in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. As a result, the clientele is expected to receive the appropriate guidance and services from the librarians themselves.

According to Hofmann and Kashdan (2009), people with high affective proficiency can conceal or suppress their emotions. Whenever necessary, it is expected that they can also adjust or alter their reaction. This supports the study of Williams-Llemobola et al. (2021), who found that academic librarians are highly emotionally intelligent. Their emotional intelligence can be seen in their intrapersonal and interpersonal dealings. The emotional propensity of our librarian respondents reflects the values of hospitality and resilience, which Filipinos are known for.

3. Librarians' Self-Efficacy in the Workplace

The results revealed a High Extent of librarians' self-efficacy ($\bar{X}=3.86$; $SD=.669$). Among the ten indicators of self-efficacy, they rated themselves highest in terms of their ability to find solutions to their problems if they apply the necessary effort ($\bar{X}=4.01$; $SD=.697$), followed by their ability always to manage to resolve tough problems if they try hard enough ($\bar{X}=4.00$; $SD=.801$) and the ability to find several solutions when confronted with a problem ($\bar{X}=3.91$; $SD=.761$). On the other hand, they rated themselves lowest in terms of their ability to find the means to acquire what they want when opposed by someone ($\bar{X}=3.63$; $SD=.833$).

Results indicate that no work-related problem is too hard for librarians to overcome. Librarians are equipped with the knowledge and skills on how to solve problems in the workplace. Solving such problems is simply a matter of putting in the right amount of effort. The ample time they spent reading books and other reading materials may have contributed to their ability to solve work-related problems.

Although the study does not determine whether librarians have spent some time reading self-help books, it is evident that they have trusted themselves enough to solve any type of problem. However, results show that if a problem can affect them the most, it has something to do with how other people react to them, as indicated by item 2, which received the lowest score.

This supports the results of the studies of Adio & Popoola (2010) and Sahu (2019) that the level of self-efficacy of academic librarians is high. The researchers believed that such a result is anchored on the fact that librarians will rather choose to overcome difficult situations than give in to failures. Moreover, Thompson (2021) believes that high self-efficacy among academic librarians will translate to better work performance, leading to student academic and social success.

4. Extent of thriving at work in terms of the following dimensions

4.1. Librarians' Thriving at Work – Dimension of Vitality

The findings show that the librarians rated themselves to a High Extent in terms of thriving at work under the dimension of vitality ($\bar{X}=3.86$; $SD=.669$). Among the 20 indicators, they scored highest in terms of happiness and contentment with being librarians ($\bar{X}=4.07$; $SD=.713$), followed by the feeling of being alive and vital despite the work challenges that complicate their responsibilities as academic librarians ($\bar{X}=3.94$; $SD=.745$) and their ability not to get easily tired because they know that it is their passion to be an information professional to help children become information literate ($\bar{X}=3.88$; $SD=.810$). On the other hand, they rated themselves lowest in their ability not to get easily exhausted because they



know it is their calling to be academic librarians (\bar{X} =3.73; SD =.845).

Results indicate that librarians have a positive attitude, which emanates from their mindset toward work despite numerous challenges. Understanding their vital role in the development of students has also motivated them to excel in the workplace. All of these have positive implications for the efficiency of librarians in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. This is supported by Porath et al. (2012) who said that being happy at work significantly positively affects work vitality and how they flourish in the workplace.

Furthermore, these results signify that the respondents are enthused about one's experiences at work. They could attain high levels of psychological well-being, which enable them to feel enthusiastic that enthuse them to perform productively at work. This is in consonance with the findings of Porath et al. (2012) that when people thrive, they develop enthusiasm which helps them experience high stages of psychological functioning. Workers' thriving is believed to have positive effects such as lower level of absenteeism, innovative work attitude, social responsibility behavior at work, excellent job performance, organizational loyalty, commitment, progress, and job contentment, as well as a lower rate of exhaustion, job pressures, resignations, and turnovers (Carmeli & Spreitzer, 2009; Porath et al., 2012; Paterson et al., 2014; Abid et al., 2015; Abid et al., 2016; Abid et al., 2018). With such a premise, thriving can be mostly distinguished as the collective involvement of development and accomplishment.

4.2. Librarians' Thriving at Work – Dimension of Learning

The findings show that librarians' practice is to a High Extent when it comes to thriving at work under the dimension of learning (\bar{X} =4.10; SD =.718). Among the 14 indicators, they rated themselves highest in the area of experiencing significant personal growth amidst challenges at work (\bar{X} =4.19; SD =.723), followed by experiencing much growth recently due to the challenges in the

workplace (\bar{X} =4.15; SD =.768) and finding new ways to develop their skills as academic librarians, despite of the hardships they experience at work (\bar{X} =4.15; SD =.744). On the other hand, they performed lowest in learning effectively even if barriers challenged their cognitive ability (\bar{X} =4.02; SD =.813).

These results imply that respondents who are thriving psychologically feel alive and are always learning new things in the workplace. They can maximize new knowledge and skills towards efficiency. The respondents always find opportunities to learn and discover new things that will motivate them to render their best services in the workplace.

Furthermore, this result is confirmed in the study of DeRue and Wellman (2009) that persons with a high ability to learn are eager to accept responsibility for their personal development, open to new means of being, more likely to reflect on their experiences, and frequently more resilient in times of complication and indecision. Such a view manifests that employees will likely be committed to their work by offering an atmosphere of literacy and learning.

5. Stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy as predictors of thriving at work – vitality dimension

Table 1
Regression Analysis for the Relationship of Stressors, Affectivity and Self-Efficacy to Thriving at Work – Vitality Dimension (N=110)

Effect	Estimate	SE	t	p-value
(Constant)	0.401	.380	1.005	.294
Stressors	0.305	.118	2.591	.011
Affectivity	0.097	.070	1.372	.173
Self-Efficacy	0.504	.088	5.759	.000
R ²	.502			
F statistic	F(3, 106)=35.91		P = .000	

Based on the multiple linear regression, the results specified that there was a collective significant effect between the Stressors, Affectivity, and Self-Efficacy ($F(3,106) = 35.91, p < .001, R^2 = .502$) in order to predict Vitality. Thus, the three predictor variables explain 50.2 percent of the variance around the mean in Vitality. Each



predictor was inspected further and signified that Stressors ($t = 2.591, p = .011$) and Self-Efficacy ($t = 5.759, p = .000$) were significant predictors.

Looking at the regression coefficient for Stressors as a predictor, which is 0.305, a unit increase in Stressors can have an increase of 0.305 in Vitality. In other words, if two librarian respondents differ by one unit in their Stressors score, their Vitality score (i.e., as a dimension of Thriving at Work) will also differ by 0.305 units.

Based on the results, the indicator best describes Vitality: “Overall, I am happy and contented with being an academic librarian.” Similarly, for Stressors, the indicator that best describes the experience of the librarians is “participative decision-making,” which is considered as a challenge stressor. At the same time, most of the respondents categorized “lack of social support from supervisors” as a hindrance stressor. Thus, the more the librarians participate in decision-making and find ways to gain social support from supervisors, the happier and more contented they are. This simply signifies that events causing appropriate stress increase a worker’s stressors (McCarthy et al., 2019). This can also be anchored on the research claims of Brown et al. (2017) that environments offering adequacy of challenge and adversity reduce work commitment and enable thriving.

Moreover, if a condition encompasses many stressors that hinder an individual from performing effectively at work, this will lead to a risk assessment while possibly reducing work commitment and eventually weakening flourishing at work (Yang & Li, 2021; Flinchbaugh et al., 2015). Kinds of conditions that could be considered as threats include thouations thawithgreat extent of instability, theulting in a decrease in workers’ perceptions of independence, competence, and connection (Spretizer & Porath, 2014).

On the other hand, the regression coefficient for Self-Efficacy in the Workplace as a predictor for Vitality is 0.504. Thus, a unit increase in Self-Efficacy can have an increase of 0.504 in Vitality. In other words, if two librarian respondents differ by one unit in their Self-Efficacy score, their Vitality score (i.e., as a dimension of Thriving at Work) will also differ by 0.504 units.

Abid et al. (2020) affirmed these findings by saying that self-efficacy functions as a mediator between executive coaching and work flourishing. Furthermore, self-efficacy is simple to increase when one enters a creative and cooperative organization (Ding & Li, 2016). Moreover, when employees’ self-efficacy is raised, they are more likely to use constructive coping mechanisms (Chang et al., 2010; Ben & Auton, 2014). Individual tendencies to seek out diverse learning can be strengthened in the pleasant affective state (Fredrickson, 2013), and they are able to develop additional problem-solving techniques, which may enhance their workplace learning.

Based on the previous problems, the indicator that best describes self-Efficacy is the librarians’ acceptance that they can solve their problems if they devote the effort. Thus, the more the librarians invest the necessary effort to solve problems, the happier and more contented they are as an academic librarians.

Overall, the abovementioned finding supports the study of Yang and Li (2021) about stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy as facilitators of thriving at work are deemed to substantially influence the thriving condition of academic librarians at work. These significant factors have various impacts on their job performance, work motivation, and professional growth.

6. Relationship between stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy to thriving at work – learning dimension

Table 2

Regression Analysis for the Relationship of Stressors, Affectivity and Self-Efficacy to Thriving at Work – Learning Dimension (N=110)

Effect	Estimate	SE	T	p-value
(Constant)	-0.032	.497	-.064	.949
Stressors	0.733	.154	4.760	.000
Affectivity	0.159	.092	1.729	.087
Self-Efficacy	0.231	.114	2.018	.046
R ²	.408			
F statistic	F(3, 106)=24.33		P = .000	

Based on the multiple linear regression analysis, the results specified that there was a

collective significant effect of Stressors, Affectivity, and Self-Efficacy ($F(3,106) = 24.33, p < .001, R^2 = .408$) in predicting Learning. Thus, the three predictor variables explain 40.8 percent of the variance around the mean in Learning. Each predictor was inspected further and signified that Stressors ($t = 4.760, p = .000$) and Self-Efficacy ($t = 2.018, p = .046$) were significant predictors.

Looking at the regression coefficient for Stressors as a predictor, which is 0.733, a unit increase in Stressors can have an increase of 0.733 in Learning. In other words, if two librarian respondents differ by one unit in their Stressor score, their Learning score (i.e., as a dimension of Thriving at Work) will also differ by 0.733 units. It implies that an individual may experience thriving if there are appropriate scenarios in a challenging environment offer learning and career opportunities (Bakker et al., 2010).

Given the data above, the indicator that best describes Learning is the item that says, "I am experiencing significant personal growth amidst challenges at work." Thus, the more the librarians participate in decision-making and find ways to gain social support from supervisors, the more they will experience significant personal growth. With that, employees who are actively learning gain knowledge and utilize it at the workplace confidently, enabling themselves to be more skillful in job responsibilities (Abid et al., 2018). The respondents are somewhat growing in positive ways even if they experience difficulties at the workplace; they consistently learn more professionally even if there are existing difficulties at work; and they find themselves often learning at work because they always consider the obstacles as catalysts of their growth as employees.

The study by Khan et al. (2014) states that burnout rises as the degree of knowledge and skills acquisition increases, causing employees to feel weary and disconnected. Thus, stressors can influence the quality of professional development of an employee.

On the other hand, the regression coefficient for Self-Efficacy in the workplace as a predictor for Learning is 0.231. Thus, a unit increase in Self-Efficacy can have an increase of 0.231 in Learning. In other words, if two librarian respondents differ by one unit in their Self-Efficacy

score, their learning score (i.e., as a dimension of Thriving at Work) will also differ by 0.231 units. It ascertains an optimistic moral determination and philosophical attitude as vital for supporting personal and professional fulfillment, thereby augmenting the probability of thriving.

Moreover, for Self-efficacy, the indicator that best describes the experience of the librarians is that they "can solve most problems if they invest the necessary effort". Thus, the more the librarians invest effort to solve problems, the more they will experience significant personal growth.

Additionally, Gestdottir et al. (2011) found that a proactive character was also observed inside the milieu of progressive development, where scholars studied the effect of purposeful self-sufficiency when it comes to thriving. A person's central desires serve as stimuli to enthuse one's interest in developing competencies, motivate the establishment of an encouraging milieu and allow thriving by carrying out activities equally advantageous to a person and the community (Scales et al., 2011). Furthermore, it was discovered that workers who indulge in optimism at the workplace early in daylight exhibited manifestations of flourishing, got an advanced wiliness to learn, and acquired new competencies at the end of the day (Niessen et al., 2012).

According to several research findings, self-efficacy in the workplace and success are positively correlated. To sum it up, all assumed predictor variables can be accounted as variables that can predict thriving at work.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concludes that as predictors, stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy of academic librarians have a significant effect on their thriving at work both in the vitality and learning dimensions. When librarians view work-related stressors in a positive way, learn how to manage and control their emotions, and believe in their own ability to solve work-related problems, they can thrive in the workplace.

This study confirms the Theory of Thriving of Spreitzer et al. (2005), the Challenge-Hindrance Model of Cavanaugh et al. (1998), and the Stressors-Performance Model of Lepine et al.

(2005) which helped the researchers find out about the respondents' stressors, specifically on gauging the extent of stressors the respondents are facing that could affect their thriving at work. Additionally, concepts and theories about the mediating effects of affectivity and self-efficacy were proven relevant in exploring how these variables facilitate the respondents' extent of thriving at the workplace.

The respondents' strategies for overcoming difficulties inspire them to work with vigor and dedication. Therefore, a demanding work setting fosters the growth of a person's leadership abilities and motivates them at work. Because adversities have been considered as catalysts so that employees can utilize their full potential at work, their coping mechanisms in the demanding environment where they belong might encourage their flourishing at work. When it comes to self-efficacy, there is clearly a manifestation of the high level of proactive character, positivity, and psychological flexibility when an individual welcomes every positive opportunity that comes into their life without reluctance and doubt. When people optimize themselves to grow and develop into effective and efficient professionals and ground themselves as active agents of their development and growth, they can successfully prosper at the workplace.

In order to motivate them to perform better at work, the leadership in higher education institutions must support and expose them to training that will improve their affectivity and self-efficacy. The happier the librarians are, the greater is the likelihood that they will perform better at work and eventually thrive.

The study failed to consider the effect of stressors, affectivity, and self-efficacy on the librarians' work productivity and professional development. These factors may be explored in future studies. Qualitative studies about thriving at work and the various variables that can predict this significant condition may be explored to deeply understand its existence and relevance in the workplace.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For academic librarians to become more proactive at work and continue pursuing

professional development, the researchers recommend that administrators evaluate the elements that function as enablers and positively contribute to their flourishing condition. Other factors that may serve as predictors may be explored in future studies. Qualitative studies about thriving at work and the various variables that can predict this significant condition may be studied to deeply understand its existence and relevance in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- Abid, G., Zahra, I., & Ahmed, A. (2015). Mediated mechanism of thriving at work between perceived organization support, innovative work behavior and turnover intention. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 9, 982-998.
- Abid, G., Sajjad, I., Elahi, N. S., Farooqi, S., & Nisar, A. (2018). The influence of prosocial motivation and civility on work engagement: The mediating role of thriving at work. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5, 1-19. doi:10.1080/23311975.2018.1493712
- Adio, G., & Popoola, S. O. (2010). Demographic variables and self-efficacy as factors influencing career commitment of librarians in federal university libraries in Nigeria. *Library philosophy and practice*, 1.
- Abid, G., Ahmed, S., Qazi, T. F., and Sarwar, K. (2020). How managerial coaching enables thriving at work. a sequential mediation. *J. Entrepreneurship Management Innov.* 16, 131–160. doi: 10.7341/2020 1625
- Bakker, A. B., van Veldhoven, M., & Xanthopoulou, D. (2010). Beyond the demand-control model: Thriving on high job demands and resources. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9, 3–16. doi: 10.1027/1866-5888/A000006
- Ben, J. S., and Auton, J. C. (2014). The merits of measuring challenge and hindrance appraisals. *Anxiety Stress Coping* 28, 121–143. doi: 10.1080/10615806.2014. 931378

- Brady, L. L., & Cunningham, C. J. L. (1970, January 1). Challenge, Hindrance, and threat stressors: A within- and between-persons examination of general and specific stressor appraisal tendencies and a priori categorizations: Semantic scholar. undefined. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Challenge%2C-Hindrance%2C-and-Threat-Stressors%3A-A-and-A-Brady-Cunningham/77a58685c50f5e8d62ceb28af1a58ba013ca9673>
- Carmeli, A., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2009). Trust, connectivity, and thriving: Implications for innovative behaviors at work. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 43, 169–191. doi:10.1002/j.2162-6057.2009.tb01313.x
- Cheng, J. (2016). The top 10 challenges academic librarians face in 2016. <https://www.wiley.com/network/archive/the-top-10-challenges-academic-librarians-face-in-2016>
- Canadian Centre for Occupational Health & Safety. (2022). Mental Health – Psychosocial Risk Factors in the Workplace. https://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/mentalhealth_risk.html
- Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., and Boudreau, J. W. (1998). “Challenge” and “hindrance” Related Stress Among U.S. Managers (CAHRS WorkingPaper#98-13). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Chang, V.Y., Palesh, O., Caldwell, R., Glasgow, N., Abramson, M., and Luskin, F. (2010). The effects of a mindfulness-based stress reduction program on stress, mindfulness self-efficacy, and positive states of mind. *Stress Health*20,141–147. doi:10.1002/smi.1011
- Ding, G., and Li, H. (2016). How job characteristics affect employee innovation behavior: a mediating moderating model. *Hum. Resource Dev. China*22,19–27. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1004-4124.2016.22.004
- Flinchbaugh, C., Luth, M. T., and Li, P. (2015). A challenge or a hindrance? Understanding the effects of stressors and thriving on life satisfaction. *Int. J. Stress Management* 22,323–345. doi:10.1037/a0039136
- Gestsdottir, S., Urban, J. B., Bowers, E. P., Lerner, J. V., & Lerner, R. M. (2011). Intentional self-regulation, ecological assets, and thriving in adolescence: A developmental systems model. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 133, 61–76. doi:10.1002/cd.304
- Gerbasi, A., Porath, C. L., Parker, A., Spreitzer, G., and Cross, R. (2015). Destructive de-energizing relationships: How thriving buffers their effect on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100(5), 1423-1433
- Hofmann, S. G., & Kashdan, T. B. (2009). The affective style questionnaire: Development and psychometric properties. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 32(2), 255–263. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-009-9142-4>
- Khan, F., Rasli, A., Khan, S., & Yasir, M. (2014). Job burnout and professional development among universities academicians. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268215186_JOB_BURNOUT_AND_PROFESSIONAL_DEVELOPMENT_AMONG_UNIVERSITIES_ACADEMICIANS
- LePine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., and LePine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge stressor–hindrance stressor framework: an explanation for inconsistent relationships among stressors and performance. *Acad. Manag. J.* 48,764–775. doi:10.5465/amj.2005.18803921
- Liu, D., Zhang, S., Wang, Y., & Yan, Y. (2021). The Antecedents of Thriving at Work: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.659072
- McCarthy, J. M., Erdogan, B., and Bauer, T. N. (2019). An interpersonal perspective of perceived stress: examining the prosocial coping response patterns of



- stressed managers. *J. Organ. Behav.* 40, 1027–1044. doi:10.1002/job.2406
- Niessen, C., Sonnentag, S., & Sach, F. (2012). Thriving at work – A diary study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 468–487. doi: 10.1002/Job.763
- Porath, C., Spreitzer, G., Gibson, C., & Garnett, F. G. (2012). Thriving at work: Toward its measurement, construct validation, and theoretical refinement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 250–275. doi:10.1002/job.756
- Sahu, M. K. (2019). Perceived entrepreneurial self-efficacy of library professionals: An Analytical Study of Working Professionals in Odisha. *International Journal of Information Studies and Libraries*, 4(2), 30.
- Scales, P. C., Benson, P. L., & Roehlkepartain, E. C. (2011). Adolescent thriving: The role of sparks, relationships, and empowerment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 40, 263–277. doi: 10.1007/s10964-010-9578-6
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Spreitzer, G. M., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S., & Grant, A. M. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. *Organization Science*, 16(5), 537– 549. doi:10.1287/orsc.1050.0153
- Spreitzer, G., & Porath, C. (2014). Self-determination as a nutriment for thriving: Building an integrative model of human growth at work. In M. Gagné (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of work engagement, motivation, and self-determination theory* (pp. 245–258). New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Thompson, Jessica. "Cultivating Our Self-Efficacy as School Librarians." *Knowledge Quest* 50.2 (2021): 50-52.
- Villagran, M. A., & Martin, L. (2022). Academic librarians: Their understanding and use of emotional intelligence and happiness. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 48(1), 102466.
- Williams-Ilemobola, O. B., Adetayo, A. J., Asiru, M. A., & Ajayi, J. L. (2021). Librarians' emotional intelligence and conflict management in private university libraries in south-west and south-south, Nigeria. *Information Impact: Journal of Information and Knowledge Management*, 12(1), 33-46.
- Yang, Y., & Li, X. (2021). The impact of challenge and Hindrance Stressors on thriving at work double mediation based on affect and motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.613871>
- Zhu, X., Law, K. S., Cong, T. S., and Dan, Y. (2018). Thriving of employees with disabilities: the roles of job self-efficacy, inclusion, and team learning climate. *Hum. Resource Management* 58, 21–34. doi:10.1002/hrm.21920

AUTHORS' PROFILE

Jolo Van Clyde S. Abatayo, a Registered Librarian and Library and Information Science Educator. Currently, he works as BLIS Program Head, Research Ethics Committee Chair, and one of the ISO Internal Quality Auditors of Saint Michael College of Caraga, Nasipit, Agusan del Norte. He is the President of the Caraga Region Librarians Council and one of the National Board of Trustees of the Philippine Librarians Association, Inc. He's fervent in writing articles, engaging in LIS Research, and speakership in various LIS talks. He successfully presented his studies in numerous research forums and conferences, and gained awards like Best Research Presenter.

AI Stephen Lagumen, Teacher at the Department of Education for more than 10 years now. He was voted as the president of the School ICT Coordinators' Association in the Division of



Cagayan de Oro City in 2016. Since then, he became a sought-after speaker in the division for ICT-related topics. In 2017, he was appointed as the division facilitator/speaker for the EPP/TLE subject during the Mass Training for Grade 6 Teachers for the K to 12 Basic Education Curriculum. He was a grantee of the Basic Education Research Fund back in 2018 and has since conducted and presented various studies locally.

Joel D. Potane, JICA Filipino Scholar, LRMS Manager, and Academic Doctors Circle Vice President for Division Affairs. JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) Filipino Scholar on Disaster Science and Improvement of Education for the Attainment of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2017 and 2018. He's one of the JICA fellows who conducted field visits in Sendai City, Ishinomaki City, Higashi Matsushima City, Kobe, Kyoto, Kochi City and other parts of Tohoku and Kochi prefectures. He attended lectures at Tohoku University, Kochi University, Tagajo Senior High School, Nanasato Elementary School, Fuzoku Elementary School and JICA International Centers (JICA Tohoku, JICA Kansai & JICA Tokyo).
<https://capitolu.academia.edu/JOELPOTANE>

COPYRIGHTS

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to IIMRJ. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution – Noncommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).