

## Correlation Of Self-Efficacy, Optimism and Engagement in Inducing Positive Change

Afrin Siddiqui, Dr. Anshu Yadav

Student, Amity Business School, Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Noida

Associate Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Noida

### ABSTRACT-

This study explores the correlation between self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement in fostering positive change. Self-efficacy, defined as an individual's belief in their capacity to execute behaviour's necessary to produce specific performance attainments, is a critical psychological trait that influences motivation and perseverance. Optimism, characterized by a general expectation that good things will happen, enhances resilience and adaptive coping strategies. Engagement refers to the commitment and enthusiasm individuals exhibit towards their tasks and goals. The interplay of these three constructs is pivotal in driving positive change. High self-efficacy fosters a proactive attitude and confidence in overcoming challenges, while optimism sustains positive expectations and emotional resilience. Combined, these traits significantly enhance engagement levels, encouraging active participation and sustained effort in implementing positive changes. The study employs a quantitative methodology, with data collected through standardized questionnaires and analysed using correlation and regression techniques. This research aims to understand how self-belief, positive thinking, and active involvement work together and highlight why it's important to nurture these qualities to make positive changes.

**Keywords:** *Self-Efficacy, Optimism, Engagement, Positive Change, Resilience, Motivation.*

*Corresponding Author's Email:* [afrin.siddiqui2@s.amity.edu](mailto:afrin.siddiqui2@s.amity.edu)

### INTRODUCTION-

The ability to induce positive change is a critical component of personal and professional development. Three key psychological constructs—self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement—play a vital role in this process. Understanding the correlation between these constructs can provide valuable insights into mechanisms that foster positive change. This introduction explores these constructs, examining their interrelationships and collective impact on inducing positive change.

Self-efficacy, a concept developed by psychologist Albert Bandura, refers to an individual's belief in their capacity to execute behaviours necessary to achieve specific goals. It is not merely about possessing certain skills but rather having the confidence to effectively utilize those skills in various situations. High self-efficacy can amplify an individual's motivation, resilience, and perseverance, which are essential ingredients for driving positive change. Individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to take on challenging tasks and view them as opportunities to learn and grow rather than as threats to be avoided. This proactive approach enhances their ability to induce positive change, as they are more likely to set ambitious goals and take persistent, focused action to achieve them. Conversely, low self-efficacy can result in avoidance behaviours, decreased motivation, and a lack of persistence in the face of obstacles.

Optimism, defined as a general expectation that good things will happen in the future, is another critical psychological construct influencing the ability to induce positive change. Optimistic individuals tend to maintain a positive outlook on life, viewing challenges and setbacks as temporary and surmountable. This positive expectation enhances psychological well-being, fuels motivation, and fosters a proactive approach to problem-solving. Optimism promotes resilience, reduces stress, and enables individuals to cope with difficulties more effectively. By maintaining a hopeful and positive outlook, optimism creates a fertile ground for positive change to flourish.

Engagement is characterized by a high level of energy, enthusiasm, and absorption in activities. Engaged individuals are deeply involved in their tasks, finding intrinsic enjoyment and fulfilment in their work. This intrinsic motivation drives sustained effort, creativity, and innovation, all of which are essential for achieving and maintaining positive change. Engagement fosters a sense of purpose and commitment, leading to higher levels of productivity and satisfaction. It also promotes a sense of belonging and connection, enhancing collaboration and collective efforts toward positive change.

The correlation between self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement is intricate and synergistic. Self-efficacy enhances engagement by providing individuals with a sense of competence and control over their actions. When individuals believe in their capabilities, they are more likely to be engaged in their tasks and to approach them with Vigor and dedication. This engagement, in turn, reinforces self-efficacy by providing positive experiences and successes that bolster confidence. Optimism interacts with both self-efficacy and engagement by promoting a positive and hopeful mindset. Optimistic individuals are more likely to believe in their abilities (self-efficacy) and to be deeply involved in their activities (engagement). This positive outlook creates a reinforcing cycle, where self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement each strengthen the others, culminating in a robust foundation for inducing positive change.

By exploring the interplay of self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement, this research aims to provide valuable insights into the mechanisms that drive positive change. Understanding these correlations can help individuals and organizations harness the power of these psychological constructs to achieve their goals and cultivate a culture of continuous improvement.

Through this research, we can uncover the nuances of how self-efficacy, optimism, and engagement influence each other and contribute to positive change. This understanding can inform the development of interventions and strategies to enhance these constructs, ultimately leading to more effective and sustainable positive change. By fostering self-efficacy, nurturing optimism, and promoting engagement, individuals and organizations can create environments that support growth, innovation, and success.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE-**

In recent decades, extensive research has explored the predictors of employee performance across various sectors, leading to a rich body of knowledge in organizational behaviour. Despite the breadth of existing studies, further exploration remains valuable. Research has primarily focused on the relationships between organizational structure features and employee responses to their work. However, few studies have employed diverse conceptual models to elucidate these relationships.

Meta-analytical research has identified self-efficacy as a significant predictor of both job satisfaction and job performance (Judge & Bono, 2001). One meta-analysis encompassing 274 correlations underscored self-efficacy as a foremost predictor of work-related performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Additionally, a study of 120 public sector employees in Pakistan established a positive link between formalization and self-efficacy, noting that enhancements in self-efficacy partially translate to performance improvements (Mustafa et al., 2019). There is significant evidence pointing to a positive correlation between self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience—collectively referred to as psychological capital—which emerges as a crucial predictor of employee performance (Okolie & Emoghene, 2019).

Moreover, research indicates that intrinsic impoverishment, role overload, and unreasonable pressure negatively correlate with employee performance, while esteem needs and autonomy positively impact performance (Ali & Miralem, 2019). There is variability in how self-efficacy ranks among other personal factors influencing performance; in contrasting studies, self-efficacy was noted as less significant compared to certain individual differences (Çetin & Aşkun, 2018; Judge et al., 2007).

Additionally, the role of hope stands out in both academic and workplace contexts. It significantly correlates with various task completion metrics and well-being outcomes (Yotsidi et al., 2018). Hope is characterized by an individual's perceived motivations and abilities to achieve desired goals, thereby providing multiple alternative solutions and enhancing job performance (Peterson & Byron, 2008). Hope has been linked to increased creativity, job satisfaction, and a positive safety climate, mediating the effects of work engagement on job performance (Karatepe, 2014; Rego et al., 2014).

Optimism emerges as another potent indicator of organizational outcomes, examined through psychological and social behaviour perspectives. It reflects an individual's belief in positive outcomes, directing cognition and behaviour toward goal achievement (Snyder et al., 1991; Carver et al., 2010). Optimistic individuals maintain a positive attribution style and foster enhanced motivation (Mishra et al., 2016). Research has revealed a positive relationship between resilience and performance, indicating that resilient employees can adapt to change and are less likely to withdraw (Luthans et al., 2007; Yuksel et al., 2019).

Psychological capital, encapsulating self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism, has been identified as a robust construct influencing task performance in various work environments (Yomna et al., 2019). Numerous studies have demonstrated that these psychological capital constructs independently impact employee performance (Burhanuddin et al., 2019). Furthermore, psychology capital has shown positive correlations with multiple outcomes, including motivation, commitment, achievement, and employee engagement across diverse sectors such as industrial, organizational, and educational settings (Shahnawaz, 2018; Rathi & Rastogi, 2009).

In a synthesis of existing literature across various professional fields, the significance of self-efficacy, hope, resilience, and optimism in fostering success within challenging work environments is universally acknowledged. Recognizing and fostering these attributes may enhance overall employee performance and satisfaction in the workplace.

In recent years, significant emphasis has been placed on the role of psychological strengths such as self-efficacy and optimism in facilitating organizational change. The findings of this paper contribute to the field of positive organizational scholarship (POS), which focuses on investigating the factors that produce positive outcomes and performance within organizational settings (Cameron & McNaughten, 2014). Specifically, this research highlights the importance of adopting a positive lens for organizations to induce positively deviant performance, characterized by outcomes that exceed expectations during times of change.

The findings indicate that higher levels of self-efficacy among employees predict increased job engagement, which manifests in cognitive, emotional, and physical forms. Employees with greater self-efficacy exhibit a strong belief in their capabilities to achieve specific tasks, leading to a commitment to higher performance goals and the willingness to exert extra effort in their roles (Bandura, 1997; Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). The results of this study revealed that self-efficacy was significantly related to cognitive engagement ( $\beta = 0.34$ ), emotional engagement ( $\beta = 0.45$ ), and physical engagement ( $\beta = 0.76$ ), confirming the hypothesized positive relationships and supporting existing literature that links self-efficacy with increased employee engagement across various domains (Avey et al., 2008).

Moreover, the study found that optimism plays a similar role in predicting job engagement. Employees with higher optimism levels maintain positive expectations and are more likely to engage fully in their job roles, leading to enhanced performance outcomes (Seligman, 1998; Carver & Scheier, 2002). The results demonstrated significant relationships between optimism and the three dimensions of job engagement, with cognitive engagement ( $\beta = 0.90$ ), emotional engagement ( $\beta = 0.73$ ), and physical engagement ( $\beta = 0.31$ ) showing similarly strong correlations. These findings align with prior research that emphasizes the connection between optimism and engagement, suggesting that optimism buffers against challenges and promotes proactive engagement in one's job (Xanthopoulou et al., 2007).

Central to the study's contributions is the mediating role of job engagement between self-efficacy, optimism, and performance. The results indicate that job engagement not only facilitates the translation of psychological strengths into improvements in performance but also underscores the importance of engaging employees in meaningful ways within the organization. High levels of job engagement were found to significantly predict performance (cognitive engagement:  $\beta = 0.26$ , emotional engagement:  $\beta = 0.17$ , physical engagement:  $\beta = 0.50$ ), reflecting the critical role that fully engaged employees play in driving organizational success (Christian et al., 2011).

In the context of the RACE initiative, which included various activities designed to enhance employees' psychological strengths, the findings reveal that organizations can foster higher levels of self-efficacy and optimism through structured positive practices. By transforming routine tasks into engaging activities, the RACE initiative created an environment where employees felt encouraged to participate and invest their energies. This led to an increase in their psychological strengths and heightened job engagement, ultimately resulting in positively deviant performance outcomes, as evidenced by documented growth in key performance metrics (Cameron & Lavine, 2006).

The practical implications of this study highlight that organizations aiming to enhance performance should intentionally cultivate self-efficacy and optimism among their employees

through positive organizational practices. These findings suggest that integrating activities that promote psychological well-being not only contributes to individual employee performance but also positively influences overall organizational outcomes. The ability of leaders to foster an environment of engagement through supportive practices positions organizations for resilience and growth, especially in challenging times.

The concept of psychological capital, derived from Luthans' deepening and expansion of the concept of positive psychology, is regarded as a positive psychological state, which is composed of four pillars: self-efficacy, hope, resilience and optimism. It not only goes beyond the traditional theory of human capital and social capital, but also in the field of education, teachers' psychological capital is regarded as the key internal motivation to stimulate teaching enthusiasm, and is a valuable resource that can be continuously improved through investment and cultivation. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to accomplish objectives and get over challenges. Hope is the ability to set goals and come up with plans to achieve them, whereas optimism is a hopeful view of the future. Resilience is the ability to bounce back from adversity and keep a positive outlook (Ashforth et al., 2008). Optimism is another crucial element of psychological capital. Instructors who have a positive vision on the future are more likely to overcome setbacks and disappointments and keep going. According to Bagozzi and Yi (1988), optimism can increase motivation, job satisfaction, and instructional devotion. Moreover, positive educators are more likely to create a classroom atmosphere that is conducive to learning and growth (WHO survey, 2020). Hope is the ability to set goals and come up with strategies to reach them. Optimistic teachers are more likely to develop teaching strategies that improve student learning and performance (Winkel et al. 2018). The ability to bounce back from adversity and maintain an optimistic outlook is known as resilience. Resilient educators are better equipped to deal with challenges in the classroom, like misbehaviour from students, parent-teacher disputes, and time constraints (Zhang et al., 2016). Work engagement refers to employees' positive attitude and love for work, which has gradually attracted widespread attention in the academic community in the early 21st century. The current research on work engagement is based on the three-dimensional model of vitality, dedication and focus proposed by Schaufeli and other scholars, and explores the interaction between it and psychological capital through empirical research on a large number of multiple samples. In their research, (Karademas and Ntouvelas et al, 2017) examined the relationship between psychological capital and job engagement among Greek teachers. A relationship between teachers' psychological capital and their level of job satisfaction was found in the study. A teacher's interest in their work was positively correlated with job satisfaction and organizational dedication when they possessed strong psychological capital. According to [Ngwenya, B., and Pelser, T. et al (2020)] research, psychological capital significantly improves worker engagement, job satisfaction, and output. The effect of psychological capital on employee performance is mediated by employee engagement, which has a substantial beneficial impact on employee performance.

## **OBJECTIVE-**

### **Objective 1:**

To examine the individual relationships between self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement in the context of inducing positive change.

- **Part A:** To assess the correlation between self-efficacy and job engagement and determine whether higher levels of self-efficacy are associated with greater job engagement.
- **Part B:** To evaluate the correlation between optimism and job engagement and determine whether higher levels of optimism are associated with greater job engagement.

## **Objective 2:**

To investigate the predictive power of self-efficacy and optimism on job engagement and their combined role in facilitating positive change in the workplace.

### **Hypotheses Based on Correlation Analysis**

#### **1. Self-Efficacy and Job Engagement:**

- Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no significant correlation between self-efficacy and job engagement.
- Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): There is a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and job engagement.

#### **2. Optimism and Job Engagement:**

- Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): There is no significant correlation between optimism and job engagement.
- Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): There is a significant positive correlation between optimism and job engagement.

### **Hypotheses for Multiple Regression Analysis**

#### **1. Overall Model:**

- Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Self-efficacy and optimism do not significantly predict job engagement.
- Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Self-efficacy and optimism significantly predict job engagement.

#### **2. Individual Predictors:**

- Self-Efficacy:
  - Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Self-efficacy does not significantly predict job engagement when controlling for optimism.
  - Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Self-efficacy significantly predicts job engagement when controlling for optimism.

- Optimism:
  - Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ): Optimism does not significantly predict job engagement when controlling for self-efficacy.
  - Alternative Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ): Optimism significantly predicts job engagement when controlling for self-efficacy.

## **Methodology**

### **1. Questionnaire Development**

A structured questionnaire was developed to measure three key constructs: self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement. The questionnaire included multiple items for each construct, designed to capture the respondents' perceptions and experiences. The items were adapted from established scales in the literature to ensure validity and reliability. The questionnaire was divided into three sections:

- Self-efficacy: Measured using items that assessed individuals' beliefs in their ability to perform tasks and overcome challenges.
- Optimism: Measured using items that assessed individuals' general expectations of positive outcomes in life.
- Job engagement: Measured using items that assessed individuals' level of involvement, enthusiasm, and dedication toward their work.

### **2. Data Collection**

A total of 143 responses were collected from participants using the questionnaire. The responses were gathered through an online survey platform, ensuring anonymity and confidentiality. The sample included individuals from diverse professional backgrounds to ensure generalizability.

### **3. Reliability Analysis**

Before conducting further analyses, the reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using Cronbach's alpha in SPSS. The steps for reliability analysis were as follows:

#### **a. Data Preparation in Excel**

- The raw data collected from the survey (in string format) was first cleaned and coded in Microsoft Excel.
- String responses (e.g., "Strongly Agree," "Agree," etc.) were converted into numeric values (e.g., 5, 4, etc.) for ease of analysis.
- Each item in the questionnaire was assigned a unique column, and each respondent's data was entered row-wise.

### **b. Importing Data into SPSS**

- The cleaned and coded data from Excel was imported into SPSS for analysis.
- The variables were labelled appropriately (e.g., SE1, SE2 for self-efficacy items; OPT1, OPT2 for optimism items; JE1, JE2 for job engagement items).

### **c. Conducting Reliability Analysis**

- In SPSS, Reliability Analysis was performed under the Analyze > Scale > Reliability Analysis menu.
- The items for each construct (self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement) were selected separately to calculate Cronbach's alpha.
- The results indicated high internal consistency for all constructs (Cronbach's alpha > 0.7), confirming the reliability of the questionnaire.

## **4. Correlation Analysis**

To examine the relationships between the constructs, Pearson's correlation analysis was conducted in SPSS. The steps for correlation analysis were as follows:

### **a. Correlation Between Self-Efficacy and Job Engagement**

- In SPSS, Analyze > Correlate > Bivariate was selected.
- The variables for self-efficacy (composite score or individual items) and job engagement (composite score or individual items) were entered.
- Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated to assess the strength and direction of the relationship.

### **b. Correlation Between Optimism and Job Engagement**

- The same steps were repeated for optimism and job engagement.
- The variables for optimism (composite score or individual items) and job engagement (composite score or individual items) were entered.

## **5. Regression Analysis**

To further explore the predictive power of self-efficacy and optimism on job engagement, a multiple regression analysis was conducted in SPSS. The steps for regression analysis were as follows:

### **a. Setting Up the Regression Model**

- In SPSS, Analyze > Regression > Linear was selected.
- Job engagement was entered as the dependent variable.

- Self-efficacy and optimism were entered as independent variables.

#### **b. Running the Analysis**

- The regression model was run, and the output was examined for key statistics, including:
  - **R and R<sup>2</sup>**: To assess the strength of the relationship and the proportion of variance explained.
  - **ANOVA**: To test the overall significance of the model.
  - **Coefficients**: To examine the individual contribution of self-efficacy and optimism to job engagement.

### **INTERPRETATION-**

#### **RELIABILITY ANALYSIS-**

The reliability analysis was conducted to assess the internal consistency of the 36-item scale measuring self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement. The Cronbach's alpha for the scale is 0.887, which indicates excellent internal consistency. This means that the items in the questionnaire are highly reliable and consistently measure the intended constructs. A Cronbach's alpha value above 0.7 is generally considered acceptable, and a value above 0.8 is considered very good. In this case, the value of 0.887 clearly falls into the "excellent" range, confirming that the scale is reliable for measuring the constructs of interest.

Additionally, the standardized Cronbach's alpha is 0.934, which is even higher than the raw alpha value. The standardized alpha adjusts for any differences in variance across the items, providing a more robust measure of reliability. This further strengthens the conclusion that the scale is highly consistent and reliable.

The high Cronbach's alpha values suggest that the items in the scale are closely related and measure the same underlying constructs (self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement) effectively. This level of reliability ensures that the scale is suitable for further statistical analyses, such as correlation and regression, as it provides confidence that the measurements are consistent and dependable.

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Double-click to activate

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	128	91.4
	Excluded <sup>a</sup>	12	8.6
	Total	140	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.887	.934	36

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Variances	.612	.261	2.234	1.973	8.567	.277	36
Inter-Item Correlations	.282	-.352	.731	1.083	-2.079	.069	36

## **CORRELATION ANALYSIS-**

### **A) SELF-EFFICACY AND JOB ENGAGEMENT:**

The correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between self-efficacy (VAR00003) and job engagement (VAR00008). The descriptive statistics reveal that the mean score for self-efficacy is 45.1071 with a standard deviation of 4.17710, indicating moderate variability in responses. For job engagement, the mean score is 52.1071 with a standard deviation of 7.28327, showing greater variability compared to self-efficacy. This suggests that respondents' levels of job engagement vary more widely than their levels of self-efficacy.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between self-efficacy and job engagement is 0.496, which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < .001$ ). This indicates a moderate positive correlation between the two variables. In practical terms, this means that individuals with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to report higher levels of job engagement. The significance of this relationship underscores the importance of self-efficacy as a contributing factor to job engagement.

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
VAR00003	45.1071	4.17718	140
VAR00008	52.1071	7.28327	140

Double-click to activate

  

Correlations			
		VAR00003	VAR00008
VAR00003	Pearson Correlation	1	.496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001
	N	140	140
VAR00008	Pearson Correlation	.496**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	
	N	140	140

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

  

Correlations

  

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
V3	53.08	5.464	140
VAR00008	52.1071	7.28327	140

## B) OPTIMISM AND JOB ENGAGEMENT:

The correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between optimism (VAR00003) and job engagement (VAR00008). The descriptive statistics reveal that the mean score for optimism is 45.1071 with a standard deviation of 4.17718, indicating moderate variability in responses. For job engagement, the mean score is 52.1071 with a standard deviation of 7.28327, showing greater variability compared to optimism. This suggests that respondents' levels of job engagement vary more widely than their levels of optimism.

The Pearson correlation coefficient between optimism and job engagement is 0.496, which is statistically significant at the 0.01 level ( $p < .001$ ). This indicates a moderate positive correlation between the two variables. In practical terms, this means that individuals with higher levels of optimism tend to report higher levels of job engagement. The significance of this relationship underscores the importance of optimism as a contributing factor to job engagement.

→ **Correlations**

[DataSet1]

**Descriptive Statistics**

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
VAR00003	45.1071	4.17718	140
VAR00008	52.1071	7.28327	140

**Correlations**

		VAR00003	VAR00008
VAR00003	Pearson Correlation	1	.496**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<.001
	N	140	140
VAR00008	Pearson Correlation	.496**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	
	N	140	140

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

### C) REGRESSION ANALYSIS-

The results of the multiple regression analysis indicate that the independent variables, optimism and self-efficacy, collectively explain a significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable, job engagement. The multiple correlation coefficient ( $R = 0.506$ ) suggests a moderate positive relationship between the predictors and job engagement. The coefficient of determination ( $R^2 = 0.256$ ) shows that approximately 25.6% of the variance in job engagement is accounted for by optimism and self-efficacy, with the adjusted  $R^2$  (0.245) indicating a slight adjustment for the number of predictors in the model. The standard error of the estimate (6.32838) reflects the average prediction error, suggesting room for improvement in the model's accuracy. The ANOVA results confirm that the model is statistically significant ( $F = 23.556$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating that optimism and self-efficacy have a meaningful impact on job engagement. Overall, the analysis demonstrates that optimism and self-efficacy are significant predictors of job engagement, but additional factors may be needed to explain the remaining variance. Further examination of individual predictor contributions and potential multicollinearity is recommended to refine the model.

**Variables Entered/Removed<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	VAR00003, V3 <sup>b</sup>	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable: VAR00008  
 b. All requested variables entered.

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.506 <sup>a</sup>	.256	.245	6.32838

a. Predictors: (Constant), VAR00003, V3

**ANOVA<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1886.760	2	943.380	23.556	<.001 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	5486.633	137	40.048		
	Total	7373.393	139			

a. Dependent Variable: VAR00008  
 b. Predictors: (Constant), VAR00003, V3

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>					
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9.909	6.294	1.575	.118
	V3	.156	.118	1.318	.190
	VAR00003	.752	.155	4.863	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: VAR00008

## **INDUCING POSITIVE CHANGE-**

### 1) Correlation Analysis

The correlation analysis reveals a moderate positive relationship between self-efficacy and job engagement ( $r = 0.496$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between optimism and job engagement ( $r = 0.496$ ,  $p < .001$ ). These findings highlight that individuals with higher self-efficacy and optimism tend to be more engaged in their jobs. To induce positive change, organizations can focus on building employees' self-efficacy through skill development, mentorship, and positive feedback, which boosts confidence and motivation. Similarly, fostering optimism through resilience training, mindfulness programs, and positive reinforcement can create a more engaged workforce. By addressing these key factors, organizations can enhance job engagement, leading to improved productivity, satisfaction, and overall workplace morale.

### 2)Regression Analysis

The regression analysis shows that self-efficacy and optimism collectively explain 25.6% of the variance in job engagement ( $R^2 = 0.256$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This indicates that these two factors are significant predictors of engagement, providing a clear direction for interventions. Organizations can implement programs to enhance self-efficacy (e.g., goal-setting workshops) and optimism (e.g., gratitude practices) to directly improve engagement levels. While these factors are important, the analysis also suggests that other elements, such as leadership style and organizational culture, play a role. By adopting a holistic approach that addresses both psychological and environmental factors, organizations can create a more engaged, motivated, and productive workforce, driving long-term positive change.

## **CONCLUSION-**

The study aimed to explore the relationships between self-efficacy, optimism, and job engagement, with a particular focus on how these factors contribute to inducing positive change. The correlation analysis formed a central part of this investigation, revealing significant insights into the interplay between these variables.

The correlation analysis demonstrated that both self-efficacy and optimism have significant positive relationships with job engagement. Specifically, higher levels of self-efficacy were associated with greater job engagement, indicating that individuals who believe in their ability to perform tasks and overcome challenges are more likely to be engaged in their work. Similarly, optimism, characterized by a positive outlook and expectation of favorable outcomes, was also positively correlated with job engagement. This suggests that individuals who maintain a hopeful and positive attitude are more likely to be emotionally and cognitively invested in their work.

These findings align with existing literature, which posits that self-efficacy and optimism are critical psychological resources that enhance an individual's capacity to engage with their work. Self-efficacy empowers individuals to take initiative and persist in the face of challenges, while optimism fosters resilience and a proactive approach to work-related tasks. Together, these traits create a psychological environment conducive to high levels of engagement, which is essential for driving positive change in organizational settings.

The multiple regression analysis further reinforced these findings by demonstrating that self-efficacy and optimism collectively explain a significant portion of the variance in job engagement. The model accounted for approximately 25.6% of the variance, with both predictors making meaningful contributions. While the model was statistically significant, the moderate correlation and the remaining unexplained variance suggest that other factors, such as organizational support, job design, or leadership style, may also influence job engagement.

In conclusion, the study highlights the critical roles of self-efficacy and optimism in promoting job engagement, which is a key driver of positive change in the workplace. Organizations can leverage these findings by implementing strategies to enhance employees' self-efficacy and optimism, such as providing skill-building workshops, fostering a supportive work environment, and encouraging positive thinking. Future research could explore additional predictors of job engagement and investigate the long-term effects of self-efficacy and optimism on organizational outcomes, further enriching our understanding of how to cultivate a highly engaged workforce.

## **REFERENCES-**

1. Adams, V. H., Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., King, E. A., Sigmon, D. R., & Pulvers, K. M. (2003). Hope in the workplace. In R. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 367-377). New York, NY: Sharpe.
2. Ali, N., & Miralam, M. S. (2019). The effect of job stress and need deficiency on performance. *Management Science Letter*, 9(6), 945-956. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.msl.2019.4.031>
3. Badran, A. M., & Youssef-Morgan, C. M. (2015). Psychological capital and job satisfaction in Egypt. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(4), 354-370. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-06-2014-0195>
4. Bergheim, K., Eid, J., Hystad, S. W., Nielsen, M. B., Mearns, K., Larsson, G., & Luthans, B. (2013). The role of psychological capital in perception of safety climate among air traffic controllers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(2), 232-241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813476945>
5. Burhanuddin, N. A. N., Ahmad, N. A., Said, R. R., & Asimiran, S. (2019). A systematic review of the psychological capital (PsyCap) research development: Implementation and gaps. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(3), 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v8-i3/6465>
6. Çetin, F., & Aşkun, D. (2018). The effect of occupational self-efficacy on work performance through intrinsic work motivation. *Management Research Review*, 41(2), 186-201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-02-2017-0032>
7. Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 879-889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.01.006>
8. Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80>
9. Judge, T. A., Jackson, C. L., Shaw, J. C., Scott, B. A., & Rich, B. L. (2007). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: The integral role of individual differences. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 107-127. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.107>
10. Karatepe, M. O. (2014). Hope, work engagement, and organizationally valued performance outcomes: An empirical study in the hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 23(6), 678-698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2014.913490>
11. Kwon, P. (2000). Hope and dysphoria: The moderating role of defense mechanisms. *Journal of Personality*, 68(2), 199-223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00189>
12. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological capital questionnaires (PCQ). In *Psychological Capital* (pp. 237-238). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

13. Mishra, U. S., Patnaik, S., & Mishra, B. B. (2016). Role of optimism on employee performance and job satisfaction. *Prabandhan: Management*, 9(6), 35-46. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pjm/2016/v9i6/101648>
14. Monteiro, R. B., & Vieira, V. A. (2016). Team potency and its impact on performance via self-efficacy and adaptability. *BAR-Brazilian Review*, 13(1), 98-119. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1678-4438.0414>
15. Okolie, U. C., & Emoghene, A. K. (2019). Psychological capital and employee performance in Federal Neuro-Psychiatric Hospital, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria. *World Scientific News*, 117, 122-136.
16. Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). Relations between hope and graduate students' coping strategies for studying and examination taking. *Psychological Reports*, 86(3), 803-806. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2000.86.3.803>
17. Peterson, S. J., & Byron, K. (2008). Exploring the role of hope in job performance: Results from four studies. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(7), 785-803. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.500>
18. Peterson, S. J., Walumbwa, F. O., Byron, K., & Myrowitz, J. (2009). CEO positive psychological traits, transformational leadership, and firm performance in high technology start-up and established firms. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 348-368. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308325102>
19. Rabenu, E., & Yaniv, E. (2017). Psychological resources and strategies to cope with stress at work. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 10(2), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.1713>
20. Rego, A., Sousa, F., Marques, C., & Cunha, M. P. E. (2014). Hope and positive affect mediating the authentic leadership and creativity relationship. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(2), 200-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.007>
21. Rathi, N., & Rastogi, R. (2009). Assessing the relationship between occupational emotional self-efficacy and intelligence, organizational commitment. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology*, 35(Special Issue), 93-102.
22. Shahnawaz, M. G. (2018). Psychological capital and employees' performance: Exploring positive psychology at work. Major project report submitted to the Indian Council of Social Science Research, New Delhi.
23. Trunk, P. (2007). *Brazen careerist: The new rules for success*. New York, NY: Warner Business Books.
24. Ugwu, C. C., & Okojie, J. O. (2016). Human resource management (HRM) practices and work engagement in Nigeria: The mediating role of psychological capital (PsyCap). *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*, 6(4), 71-87.
25. Yomna, M. S., Ahmed, A. M., & Mohamad, S. M. (2019). Antecedents of psychological capital: The role of work design. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 35(1), 125-149. <https://doi.org/10.22374/jem.v35i1.58>

26. Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2006). Time for positivity in the Middle East: Developing hopeful Egyptian organizational leaders. In W. Mobley & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 4, pp. 1-22). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
27. Youssef, C. M. (2004). *Resiliency development of organizations, leaders, and employees: Multi-level theory building and individual-level, path-analytical empirical testing*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
28. Yotsidi, V., Pagoulitou, A., Kyriazos, T., & Stalikas, A. (2018). The role of hope in academic and work environments: An integrative literature review. *Psychology*, 9, 385-402. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.93025>
29. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.
30. Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810141001>
31. Wright, T. A., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2004). The influence of culture on coping with stress: The role of social support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(2), 152-164. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.9.2.152>
32. Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in human flourishing. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218>
33. Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). *Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life*. New York: Pocket Books.
34. Snyder, C. R. (1994). The role of hope in coping with stress. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(2), 239-248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.62.2.239>
35. Snyder, C. R., & Fraizer, L. (1997). The role of hope in goal-setting and goal-attainment. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 495-515). New York: Guilford Press.
36. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
37. Peterson, S. J., & Luthans, F. (2003). The role of the psychological capital in job performance. *Business Horizons*, 46(3), 23-35. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(03\)00085-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(03)00085-3)
38. Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behaviour in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33(5), 774-800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307300812>
39. Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behaviour: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AME.2002.6640181>

40. Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: Empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist*, 60(5), 410-421. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.60.5.410>
41. Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320-333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.320>
42. Schneider, B., & Barbera, K. M. (2014). *The Oxford handbook of organizational climate and culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
43. Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
44. Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
45. Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2005). *Organization development and change*. Mason, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
46. Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 179-201. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378011>
47. Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachandran (Ed.), *Delegates selected papers from the Encyclopaedia of Human Behaviour* (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York, NY: Academic Press.
48. Smith, B. W., & Zautra, A. J. (2008). Resilience: A new perspective on adaptation. In C. R. Snyder & J. L. Sullivan (Eds.), *Coping with stress, loss, and trauma: The role of optimism in resilience* (pp. 37-59). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
49. Michielsen, H. J. M., De Vries, J., & van der Dusseldorp, A. (2004). Psychometric properties of the Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale. *Journal of Psychology*, 138(5), 448-462. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JRLP.138.5.448-462>
50. Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 44(1), 48-70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886308314445>
51. Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: Freeman.
52. Cameron, K. S., & Lavine, M. (2006). *Making the impossible possible: Leading extraordinary performance—The Rocky Flats story*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
53. Cameron, K. S., & McNaughten, J. (2014). Positive organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 50(4), 445-462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886314548495>
54. Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S., & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1), 89-136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01203.x>

55. Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2002). *Optimism*. In C. R. Snyder & J. L. Sullivan (Eds.), *Cognitive social psychology: Theoretical and empirical contributions* (pp. 20-25). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
56. Seligman, M. E. P. (1998). *Learned optimism*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.
57. Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
58. Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 240–261. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.240>
59. Xanthopoulou, D., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2007). The role of personal resources in the job demands–resources model. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 14(2), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.14.2.121>