

Predicting the Utilization of Guidance Services through Student Well-Being and Self-Efficacy

Joe Arvie C. Cagulangan LPT; Eugene Abuloc LPT RGC

Davao Oriental State University Guang-guang, Dahican Mati City, Davao Oriental Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600266>

Received: 29 May 2026; Accepted: 03 June 2026; Published: 22 June 2026

ABSTRACT

This study is significant as it provides empirical insights into how student well-being and self-efficacy influence the utilization of guidance services in the university setting. In an educational environment where students face academic pressures, social challenges, and personal concerns, understanding the factors that encourage or hinder their use of guidance services is essential for improving student support systems. The main objective of this study was to determine whether the indicators of student well-being and self-efficacy significantly predict the extent of utilization of guidance services. It utilized the descriptive correlational research design using a survey questionnaire to gather the data. A stratified random sampling technique was employed, and a total of 398 student respondents from the university participated in the study. The results revealed a significant relationship between student well-being, self-efficacy, and the utilization of guidance services. Findings showed that the indicators of student well-being and self-efficacy are significant predictors of students' engagement with guidance services. This implies that students who possess higher levels of emotional, social, and psychological well-being, as well as stronger beliefs in their academic and social capabilities, are more likely to seek and utilize available guidance services. The study underscores the importance of strengthening programs that promote student well-being and self-efficacy as part of the guidance program. By enhancing these areas, educational institutions can encourage greater student participation in guidance services, leading to improved coping skills, better academic adjustment, and overall student development. Prioritizing student well-being and self-efficacy within institutional policies and guidance initiatives can contribute to a more responsive, supportive, and student-centered educational environment.

Keywords: guidance and counseling, student well-being, self-efficacy, guidance services, utilization, descriptive-correlational research

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Current research conducted in various parts of the globe indicates that academic pressures, emotional distress and other personal issues are eroding the overall well-being of the students, which has a significant impact on academic retention, psychological adjustment as well as help seeking behavior. On this basis, in a similar vein, it is observed that, students with lower well-being are less likely to express intentions to seek help e.g., than their higher-level counterparts (McCabe et al., 2024).

Similar issues have been reported to occur in the Philippine context where they affect college students. According to local studies, although guidance and counselling services are compulsory and highly prevalent in the institutions of higher learning, the rate of their use among the students is irregular (Loberiano, 2025). The Filipino students tend to refer to peers or family members rather than professional guidance counselors, and this can be explained by the stigma or absence of awareness or confidence in formal help seeking. Research has also indicated that student self-efficacy and well-being are also strongly tied to student attitude towards counseling services proposing that the two psychological constructs can become valuable predictors of service use in the local context (Almendarez et al., 2024).

In the local context, the researcher experience working as both a college educator and a guidance practitioner at Davao oriental state university- Baganga Campus has shown that a good number of students with academic challenge, emotional stress, and behavioral issues rarely utilize the guidance services offered in the institution. Unformal observations and interviews with other instructors also suggest that a great proportion of students would choose to act independently despite the provision of professional assistance.

It is against this scenario that a research gap exists since limited literature has investigated the extent to which well-being and self-efficacy are predictive variables of guidance service use in a community level within a local university. These results indicate the existence of a serious gap between the availability of guidance services and their use, which means that the student well-being and self-efficacy as potential predictors of the use of guidance services among students need to be considered. This research will thus evaluate the measures of student well-being, self-efficacy and perceptions of guidance services in Davao Oriental State University, determine the relationship between these variables and also identify which of the two is the most precise in predicting the use and effectiveness of guidance services. Finally, it aims to deliver evidence-based messages to improve responsive guidance programs that acknowledge students with their well-being and self-efficacy, and create a comprehensive support group that supports learners.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Guidance Services. Guidance Service programs are important to provide students with all the required tools to make good-informed choices regarding their future career and educational choices (Abe, 2020). Grade 12 in senior high school level is one of the most crucial moments of students' lives, as they are supposed to make big decisions in life, including choosing a college course or vocational path, or entering the labor market (Ahmad, 2019). The process of decision-making at this level is also rather complex and includes the balance of personal interests, aptitudes, financial factors, and future career goals (Ahmady, 2020).

Well-Being. Well-being of students has become one of the most significant areas of concern in education, psychology and in public health due to its direct relationship with life outcomes and academic achievement. Research indicates that the concept of student well-being deals with several areas, such as emotional, psychological, social, and academic functioning (Adugna et al., 2020). Contrary to conventional measurements of academic performance, which mostly revolve around grades or test performance, well-being relates to holistic development of learners. The results indicate that, in a state of mental and emotional well-being, students are more driven and active, and much more resilient to cope with the academic difficulties (Fischer, 2020).

Self-Efficacy. Self-efficacy is a focal idea in educational psychology, which was first proposed by Albert Bandura in 1977 within his Social Cognitive Theory. Research shows that it is the perception that a person has on their ability to do a certain task or even attain a certain goal (Bradberry, 2019). The results indicate that self-efficacy is not simply a confidence phenomenon, but is a context-specific belief in oneself to be able to perform in a specific scenario. Motivation, persistence, and resilience are greatly influenced by this belief, particularly in a school setting, where students are constantly confronted with challenges (Ahmad, 2019).

The linkage between self-efficacy, student well-being, and guidance services is significant in influencing student motivation, persistence and general adjustment in higher education. The self-efficacy, which refers to the ability of an individual to believe that they are capable of doing certain tasks, is a factor in how students handle the challenges, choices, and stress (Bandura, 1997). Students with high self-efficacy tend to adopt desirable coping behavioral patterns, seek help when needed, and keep a balanced mood. This belief system increases persistence and receptiveness to the support offered by guidance services, which, in its turn, contributes to maintaining the well-being of students via the structured measures, including counseling, academic advising, and socio-emotional development schemes (Navarro, 2021).

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored in Albert Bandura's self-efficacy theory, which shows people choose whether to

perform a behavior based on their belief in their ability to successfully manage a situation and produce a positive outcome. In the university setting, this belief system explains how students react to academic, social, and emotional challenges, including whether they choose to seek or avoid guidance programs.

Self-efficacy theory proposes that self-efficacy is derived from four sources: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. For example, students who have found help from guidance services in the past (mastery experiences) are likely to seek help again in the future. Seeing peers benefit from guidance services (vicarious experiences) may prompt them to seek help. Support from teachers and peers (verbal persuasion) and anxiety or stress (physiological states) can also affect students' choice to seek help from guidance programs. These sources are not mutually exclusive; they constantly impact students' belief in their ability to cope with life challenges. In this research, we observe these sources in students' attitudes towards and their use of the university's guidance programs.

The theory is also applicable to student well-being. Their emotional, social, academic, and psychological well-being affects their sense of competence to address their concerns. For example, students with emotional stress or academic struggles may perceive their incompetence and use guidance and counseling services. Conversely, students with optimal well-being may either feel capable of using guidance services as tools for development and growth or may not need to access these services because they feel there may be no need.

Statement of the Problem

This study aims to investigate the predictive relationship of student well-being and self-efficacy towards the utilization of guidance services among students of Davao Oriental State University, Guang-guang, Dahican, Mati City. Specifically, this study seeks to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of the following:
 - 1.1 Emotional well-being,
 - 1.2 Social well-being,
 - 1.3 Academic well-being,
 - 1.4 Psychological well-being?
2. What is the level of self-efficacy of the respondents in terms of the following:
 - 2.1 Academic self-efficacy,
 - 2.2 Social self-efficacy,
 - 2.3 Emotional self-efficacy?
3. What is the extent of utilization of guidance services among students in terms of the following:
 - 3.1 Academic guidance,
 - 3.2 Personal and social guidance,
 - 3.3 Career guidance,
 - 3.4 Counseling services?
4. Is there a significant relationship between student well-being and the utilization of guidance services?
5. Is there a significant relationship between self-efficacy and the utilization of guidance services?

6. Do the indicators of student well-being predict the extent of utilization of guidance services?
7. Do the indicators of self-efficacy predict the extent of utilization of guidance services?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative-correlational research design to examine the predictive relationship between student well-being, self-efficacy, and utilization of guidance services.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were the undergraduate students of Davao Oriental State University (DOrSU), Guang-guang, Dahican, Mati City, Davao Oriental representing various year levels and academic programs. They were chosen as participants since they were the direct recipients of the institution's guidance services and were in the best position to provide reliable information on their experiences, levels of well-being, and self-efficacy. Validity and generalizability of the research could be achieved through the critical selection of participants who were most representative of the population under study (Creswell, 2023)

The respondents consisted of 398 students selected through stratified random sampling from a population of 12,009 students. The 398 respondents were distributed in the year levels proportional to their population. Out of the initial population of 3,500 first year students, 116 respondents were noted. Out of 3,000 students of the second year, 99 respondents were selected. The respondents were 85 out of 2,500 students in the third year. Finally, 98 respondents were selected out of 3,009 students of the fourth-year population. This proportional representation provided a suitable representation of each year level in the study and the collected data represented the features of the undergraduate student population.

Respondents of the Study

Year Level	Population (N)	Number of Respondents (n)
First Year	3,500	116
Second Year	3,000	99
Third Year	2,500	85
Fourth Year	3,009	98
Total	12,009	398

Instruments

Three validated survey instruments were utilized:

1. Student Well-Being Questionnaire
 - Emotional Well-Being
 - Social Well-Being
 - Academic Well-Being
 - Psychological Well-Being

2. Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

- Academic Self-Efficacy
- Social Self-Efficacy
- Emotional Self-Efficacy

3. Guidance Service Utilization Questionnaire

- Academic Guidance
- Personal-Social Guidance
- Career Guidance
- Counseling Services

Research Procedures

A proper protocol was observed before and during the collection of data to ensure accuracy, validity, and ethical compliance.

Seeking Permission to Conduct the Study. To carry out the research, the researcher wanted to get formal consent to carry out the research by drafting a letter of permission to the President of Davao Oriental State University. Proper written request to the Deans and Program Heads was also established to obtain approval to conduct the research. The researcher therefore administered the questionnaire to the identified respondents on being informed by the concerned authorities. During this, the normal health and safety measures were followed to the letter as recommended by the local health authority to ascertain the safety of the researcher and also the participants.

Administering the Questionnaire. The questionnaire was personally given to the chosen students by the researcher closely under the supervision of the teacher in charge. Before proceeding with answering the question, the researcher told the participants the aim and the contents of the instrument to make them understand and strive to answer correctly. The respondents had adequate time to respond to the questionnaire without rush.

Data Gathering. The researcher then coded all of the responses through his personal computer after retrieving the achieved questionnaires and then encoded them. The coded information was subsequently sent to a trained statistician to be treated and calculate statistically. The researcher then analyzed, interpreted and discussed the findings in line with study objectives.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The information collected on the respondents was tallied and tabulated to analyze the data. To ascertain the accuracy of the interpretation of results, the following statistical instruments were used:

Mean. This was used to determine the mean of the academic performance of the students and to determine what they are responding to the questionnaire questions generally.

Pearson. This was used so that a significant relationship between the two groups of variables and, specifically, the correlation between the identified factors in the study can be assessed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the data gathering procedures conducted by the researcher including their

corresponding analysis, interpretation, discussion, and implications to the current body of knowledge, practice, and policy.

Level of Student Well-Being

This part reveals the results from the first statement of the problem, which assess level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of Emotional Well-Being, Social Well-Being, Academic Well-Being and Psychological Well-Being.

Emotional well-being. Table 1 presents the level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of emotional well-being as measured by ten indicators.

Table 1 Level of Student Well-Being in Terms of Emotional Well-Being

Statements	Means	Descriptions
1. I am able to manage my emotions even during stressful situations.	2.98	Moderate
2. I feel satisfied with the way I handle my feelings daily.	3.03	Moderate
3. I can stay calm when facing unexpected challenges.	2.87	Moderate
4. I easily recover after experiencing negative emotions.	2.80	Moderate
5. I find healthy ways to cope with sadness, fear, or anger.	2.98	Moderate
6. I am generally optimistic about my life as a student.	3.02	Moderate
7. I can express my emotions in a constructive way.	2.84	Moderate
8. I feel emotionally stable most of the time.	2.73	Moderate
9. I am confident in managing stress from academic demands.	2.79	Moderate
10. I believe I have control over my emotional responses.	2.96	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.90	Moderate

Table 1 shows the degree of student well-being in regards to emotional well-being. The overall mean of 2.90 indicates a moderate level. The highest mean was received in the statement “I feel satisfied with the way I manage my feelings on a daily basis” ($M = 3.03$) whereas the lowest mean was received in the statement “I feel emotionally stable most of the time” ($M = 2.73$). All the indicators are moderate level.

The results indicate that the respondents seem to have, on the whole rather a stable degree of the emotional well-being, though certain aspects seem to be stronger than others. The comparatively higher scores in the aspect of satisfaction with the management of feelings and optimism as a student show that the respondents are inclined towards perceiving themselves as not extremely incompetent with their emotions that have to be managed day-in, day-out. Concurrently, the relative lower scores in emotional stability, recovery after negative affect or emotion, and confidence in ability to deal with academic stress indicate that emotional well-being can be even more put to the test when the students are subjected to continuing stress, failure, or excessive academic demands. Such a tendency means that although, in fact, students can seem to be slightly competent to identify and manage their emotions when placed in regular situations, in the long term, emotional regulation, and swift adaptation to distress may be even harder. In general, the results indicate that the profile of emotional well-being is available but not necessarily high in all dimensions.

Social well-being. Table 2 presents the level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of social well-being, which was measured using several indicators related to students' interpersonal interactions, sense of belonging, communication, and participation in social activities within the school environment.

Table 2 Level of Student Well-Being in Terms of Social Well-Being

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I feel comfortable interacting with my classmates.	3.19	Moderate
2. I am able to build and maintain healthy friendships.	3.22	Moderate
3. I feel a sense of belonging in my school community.	3.08	Moderate
4. I can work effectively in group activities and projects.	3.12	Moderate
5. I respect and value the opinions of others during discussions.	3.40	Moderate
6. I find it easy to approach others when I need help.	2.90	Moderate
7. I enjoy participating in social or extracurricular activities.	2.90	Moderate
8. I am confident in resolving conflicts with peers.	2.85	Moderate
9. I feel accepted and valued by my classmates.	3.10	Moderate
10. I can communicate openly and clearly with others.	3.02	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.08	Moderate

Table 2 presents the level of student well-being in terms of social well-being. The overall mean of 3.08 is a medium level. The largest mean was observed in the statement "I respect and value the opinions of other people during discussions" ($M = 3.39$), and the lowest mean was observed in statement "I am confident in resolving conflicts with peers" ($M = 2.85$). The indicators are all in the moderate range.

The results show that the respondents, overall, have shown a desirable degree of social wellness, as evidenced in the mutual respect, friendship building and in feeling comfortable with the classmates' dimensions. The top score related to having valuing the opinion of other person indicates that the students are likely to operate in the social environment in which the openness, respect, and cooperation are necessary. On the same note, the rather good performance in friendship maintenance, group work, and peer acceptance indicate largely positive interpersonal experiences in school.

Nevertheless, reduced scores in conflict management, seeking other people help, and engagement in extracurricular or social life mean that not everything in the realm of social well-being is equally good. This could imply that although students are socially affiliated and capable of sustaining interpersonal connections, still, there could be some reluctance to more challenging social circumstances, like the intervention of peer conflicts, inducing help-seeking, or be more involved in wider social activities. The findings indicate, on the whole, that the level of social well-being of the participants is rather positive, nonetheless, there is still some room to improve some of the interactive and participatory points.

Academic well-being. Table 3 presents the level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of academic well-being as measured by a set of indicators related to motivation, academic confidence, time management, and engagement with learning tasks.

Table 3 Level of Student Well-Being in Terms of Academic Well-Being

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I am confident in my ability to meet academic expectations.	3.01	Moderate
2. I manage my time well in balancing school tasks.	2.88	Moderate
3. I feel satisfied with my academic performance.	2.84	Moderate
4. I believe I can succeed despite challenging subjects.	2.80	Moderate
5. I rarely feel overwhelmed by academic responsibilities.	3.15	Moderate
6. I know how to ask for help when I struggle academically.	2.83	Moderate
7. I enjoy learning new topics in my courses.	2.88	Moderate
8. I feel capable of achieving my academic goals.	3.13	Moderate
9. I can focus on my studies even when distractions are present.	3.11	Moderate
10. I feel motivated to complete my school requirements.	2.71	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.93	Moderate

Table 3 shows the level of student well-being in academic well-being. The mean value of 2.93 represents a moderate. The statement containing the highest mean was the statement “I rarely feel overwhelmed by academic requirements” ($M = 3.15$), and the statement with the lowest mean was the one containing the statement “I feel motivated to complete my school requirements” ($M = 2.71$). All the indicators are within the moderate range.

The results also suggest that the respondents have moderate level of academic well-being with better perceptions of their capability of handling academic demands and staying focused on their goals compared to their motivational drive to undertake school demands. The comparatively better scores on not being overwhelmed, on academic goals, and being able to stay focused depict the fact the students consider themselves as reasonably able to operate within the academic context. Nevertheless, the relatively lower average in the motivation to fulfill school obligations suggests that it could be difficult to maintain the drive, enthusiasm or persistence in meeting the academic tasks.

This can mean that despite the perception of students that they are proficient, and that they are still functioning academically, they may not necessarily feel as energized or internally motivated to execute their school duties. The results thus portray an academic well-being profile that depicts functional academic confidence and coping and is somewhat vulnerable in the sustained-motivation domain.

Psychological well-being. Table 4 presents the level of student well-being of the respondents in terms of psychological well-being, which includes indicators associated with self-acceptance, personal growth, purpose in life, autonomy, and overall life satisfaction.

Table 4 Level of Student Well-Being in Terms of Psychological Well-Being

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I feel a strong sense of purpose in my life as a student.	3.15	Moderate

2. I accept myself for who I am, including my strengths and weaknesses.	3.31	Moderate
3. I believe I am growing and improving as a person.	3.32	Moderate
4. I feel in control of the decisions I make in my life.	3.15	Moderate
5. I am able to adapt to changes in my environment.	3.14	Moderate
6. I maintain positive relationships that help me grow.	3.30	Moderate
7. I feel capable of handling problems that come my way.	3.09	Moderate
8. I believe my life has meaning beyond academics.	3.26	Moderate
9. I am satisfied with the person I am becoming.	3.18	Moderate
10. I feel balanced and positive about my overall life situation.	3.13	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.06	Moderate

Table 4 presents the level of student well-being in terms of psychological well-being. The highest mean of 3.32 was recorded in the statement, “I believe I am growing and improving as a person,” and the lowest mean of 3.09 was recorded in the statement, “I feel capable of handling problems that come my way.” The overall mean of 3.06 implies the moderate level.

These results have shown that psychological well-being is the most robust indicator of student well-being in respondents, evidenced by the mean scores that are continuously higher than the rest of the indicators. The highest scores on personal growth, self-acceptance, and positive relationships create an impression that the respondents tend to perceive themselves as positively growing, knowing themselves better, and have positive supporting relationships that enhance their personal growth. That the lowest mean is still above 3.00 means that the respondents have a disposition to perceive themselves as positive in their psychological sphere of meaning, autonomy, adaptability and self-satisfaction. This indicates that the respondents have a fairly sound internal sense of self, individual direction and growth. As a whole, the findings suggest that the respondents are more psychologically grounded with regard to self-understanding and personal development compared to the emotional and academic ones, and as such, the psychological well-being is a significant area of strength in their well-being profile.

Level of Self-Efficacy

This part reveals the results from the second statement of the problem, which assess level of level of self-efficacy of the respondents in terms of Academic Self-Efficacy, Social Self-Efficacy, and Emotional Self-Efficacy.

Academic self-efficacy. Table 5 presents the level of self-efficacy of the respondents in terms of academic self-efficacy, which was measured using several indicators related to students’ confidence in performing academic tasks, solving academic problems, managing school responsibilities, and achieving academic goals.

Table 5 Level of Self-Efficacy in Terms of Academic Self-Efficacy

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I believe I can understand difficult lessons if I put in enough effort.	3.21	Moderate
2. I am confident in my ability to finish all my school requirements on time.	3.04	Moderate

3. I can find ways to solve academic problems even when they are challenging.	3.12	Moderate
4. I believe I can earn good grades if I work hard.	3.50	High
5. I am capable of managing multiple academic tasks effectively.	2.96	Moderate
6. I can stay focused on my schoolwork despite distractions.	2.83	Moderate
7. I feel confident in answering questions during class discussions.	2.78	Moderate
8. I can improve my performance in subjects where I am weak.	3.02	Moderate
9. I believe I can prepare well for examinations.	3.04	Moderate
10. I can accomplish my academic goals despite difficulties.	3.08	Moderate
Overall Mean	3.20	Moderate

Table 5 presents the level of self-efficacy in terms of academic self-efficacy. The highest mean of 3.50 with a description of high was observed in the statement “I believe I can achieve good grades when I work hard” and the lowest mean of 2.78, described as moderate was observed in the statement “I believe I can earn good grades when I work hard.” The total mean of 3.20 would translate to a middle level.

These results show that respondents as a whole have a positive degree of academic self-efficacy implying a good measure of respondents believing that when they attempt academic tasks; they are capable of delivering successfully when effort is put into it. The greatest average score on the perception that good grades can be achieved by working hard displays a high level of an effort-based achievement meaning that the respondents relate academic achievement with perseverance and individual investment. In the same way, the above average results in the area of learning hard lessons, solving schoolwork issues, preparing to take tests, and meeting academic objectives show that, in general, the respondents feel that they are capable of overcoming the school related difficulties. Nevertheless, the relatively lower scores in responding to questions in classroom discussions and the ability to remain focused despite distractions indicate that confidence may not be as strong in those cases when it comes to direct academic activity in the face of a crowd or long-term concentration.

This can imply that students usually feel that they are capable of doing well on academic tasks, but at the same time, may feel less secure in certain areas, especially when the classroom setting makes their performance very noticeable or when performance is made difficult by distractions. In general, the findings can be regarded as indicating that academic self-efficacy among the respondents tends to be quite positive, yet some particular areas of academic functioning might need to be tightened.

Social self-efficacy. Table 6 presents the level of self-efficacy of the respondents in terms of social self-efficacy, which includes indicators associated with students’ confidence in interacting with peers, participating in group activities, expressing opinions, initiating conversations, and maintaining interpersonal relationships within the academic environment.

Table 6 Level of Self-Efficacy in Terms of Social Self-Efficacy

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I can easily make friends with my classmates.	3.06	Moderate
2. I feel confident speaking in front of a group.	2.75	Moderate
3. I am able to join group activities without feeling nervous.	2.76	Moderate

4. I can express my opinions in class discussions.	2.83	Moderate
5. I can approach my teachers if I need academic or personal advice.	2.85	Moderate
6. I can maintain good relationships with my peers.	3.12	Moderate
7. I feel comfortable starting conversations with new people.	2.83	Moderate
8. I can resolve misunderstandings with others effectively.	2.89	Moderate
9. I can work well with classmates in group projects.	3.11	Moderate
10. I feel confident in building supportive social networks.	2.99	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.92	Moderate

Table 6 shows the degree of self-efficacy as a social self-efficacy. The statement with the highest mean of 3.12 was in the statement “I can maintain good relationships with my peers,” and the lowest mean of 2.75 in the statement “I feel confident speaking in front of a group.” The weighted mean of over all items is 2.92 which is moderate.

These results are that the respondents have an average to positive social self-efficacy, particularly as it concerns the maintenance of peer relationships, and cooperation with the peers in the classroom. The best score in terms of keeping a proper relationship, collaborating in group projects, and making friends indicates that students are comparatively sure of their ability to keep social connections and act in the context of the conditions they are familiar with in groups of peers. The implications of these findings are that respondents are not uncomfortable with the current interpersonal contact and collaborative educational involvement. But the lower scoring on speaking before a group and being free to participate in group activities without feeling nervous can be indicative of decreased confidence in more socially exposed or performance-related contexts.

This implies that, though respondents might be able to create and sustain a relationship, they could still feel less confident when it comes to instances demanding social presence, unplanned expression, or instant interaction. In general, the findings indicate that social self-efficacy of the respondents is higher in the relational maintenance and peer collaboration than the social performance and socially demanding group situations.

Emotional self-efficacy. Table 7 presents the level of self-efficacy of the respondents in terms of emotional self-efficacy, which was measured through several indicators related to students’ confidence in regulating their emotions, coping with stress, managing anxiety, maintaining positive attitudes, and recovering from negative experiences in the academic setting.

Table 7 Level of Self-Efficacy in Terms of Emotional Self-Efficacy

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I can stay calm when I face stressful situations in school.	2.89	Moderate
2. I am confident in handling feelings of anxiety before exams.	2.90	Moderate
3. I can motivate myself to keep going even when I feel down.	3.14	Moderate
4. I can control my anger when things do not go my way.	2.96	Moderate
5. I believe I can manage negative emotions effectively.	2.97	Moderate

6. I can adjust my mood when I need to focus on schoolwork.	3.04	Moderate
7. I feel capable of staying positive despite challenges.	3.03	Moderate
8. I can bounce back quickly after facing disappointments.	3.01	Moderate
9. I am able to encourage myself when I feel discouraged.	3.08	Moderate
10. I can manage my emotions without affecting my schoolwork.	2.92	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.99	Moderate

Table 7 provides the degree of emotional self-efficacy. The highest mean of 3.14 was recorded in the statement “I can make myself go in spite of the stressful situations I have to face at school,” whereas the lowest mean of 2.89 was reached in the statement “I can make myself go despite the stressful situations I have to face at school.” The weighted overall mean is 2.99 which shows moderate level.

The results have shown that the respondents, broadly speaking, possess a positive degree of emotional self-efficacy especially on how they can influence and motivate them when facing emotionally challenging situations. The comparatively good mean scores of self-motivation, self-encouragement, mood adjustment, and staying positive indicate that the respondents feel that they can control their inner tweaks to facilitate persistence and functioning. The implications of these findings are that the students do have a reasonable amount of emotional agency, particularly with regard to sustaining themselves in the face of discouragement or setbacks.

Nevertheless, the fact that the scores on remaining calm in stressful educational circumstances and calming down before tests are lower, indicate that the level of confidence with regards to emotional control could be diminished when students are challenged by an immediate academic load or evaluation-induced stress. It means that although students tend to think that they can recover, reframe, and get themselves emotionally pumped up, it might still be more challenging to remain calm at the very instant of the stress or anxiety. On balance, the findings indicate that the emotional self-efficacy is in the state of a rather positive level, but prompt stress control is a more vulnerable field.

Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services

This part reveals the results from the third statement of the problem, which assess the extent of utilization of guidance service among students in terms of Academic Guidance, Personal and Social Guidance, Career Guidance, and Counseling Services.

Academic guidance. Table 8 presents the extent of utilization of guidance services among students in terms of academic guidance. The indicators included in this construct measured how frequently students seek assistance from the guidance office for academic concerns such as study habits, time management, academic stress, learning strategies, and participation in academic programs organized by the guidance office.

Table 8 Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services in Terms of the Academic Guidance

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I consult the guidance office when I need help with study habits.	2.32	Moderate
2. I seek advice from guidance services regarding time management.	2.30	Moderate
3. I attend academic-related seminars organized by the guidance office.	2.60	Moderate

4. I ask for support when I struggle with difficult subjects.	2.56	Moderate
5. I approach the guidance office for assistance in planning my study load.	2.31	Moderate
6. I utilize materials provided by the guidance office to improve my academic performance.	2.53	Moderate
7. I seek guidance when I experience academic stress.	2.50	Moderate
8. I ask for advice about effective learning strategies.	2.65	Moderate
9. I attend orientation programs conducted by the guidance office.	2.62	Moderate
10. I rely on academic guidance services to improve my academic success.	2.48	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.49	Moderate

Table 8 gives the level of academic guidance in terms of the use of guidance services. The highest mean of 2.65 was recorded in the statement “I ask advice of guidance services regarding time management, and the lowest mean was 2.30 in the statement “I seek advice of guidance services regarding time management.” The weighted average of all item is 2.49 with quality index of moderate.

The results reveal that the respondents are somewhat characterized by a low level of use of academic guidance services, with a slightly higher use of those services that are either information-focused or program-focused compared to those that require more personalized guidance. The fact that the mean scores are relatively higher in asking advice on effective learning strategies, attending orientational programs, and taking seminars related to academics implies that it is possible to say that students will be more willing to use academic guidance services when they are organized and convenient, as well as when the services are directly attributed to enhancing study practices or academic acclimatization. Contrastingly, the low mean scores on consultations on time management and visiting guidance office as a guide on how to plan the study load suggests that students might not seek guidance services as a means of having more personalized academic planning requirements.

This can indicate that students are better placed to participate in academic activities or personal advice giving rather than seeking a one-on-one help in addressing their own academic problems. Generally, the findings suggest that the academic guidance services are used in some degree but they may be more applied to activities of general academic support than those of one-on-one academic consultation.

Personal and Social Guidance. Table 9 presents the extent of utilization of guidance services among students in terms of personal and social guidance. This dimension includes indicators that measure how frequently students seek assistance from the guidance office for concerns related to personal challenges, relationships with peers, social development, self-confidence, interpersonal communication, and participation in personal development activities facilitated by the guidance office.

Table 9 Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services in Terms of the Personal and Social Guidance

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I approach the guidance office when I face personal challenges.	2.27	Moderate
2. I seek advice on how to improve my relationships with peers.	2.50	Moderate
3. I participate in activities that develop my social skills.	2.74	Moderate
4. I talk to the guidance office about issues related to self-confidence.	2.34	Moderate

5. I seek support when I experience difficulties adjusting to school life.	2.58	Moderate
6. I attend programs that address social and personal development.	2.61	Moderate
7. I ask for guidance when I have conflicts with classmates or friends.	2.43	Moderate
8. I consult the guidance office about improving my interpersonal communication.	2.32	Moderate
9. I participate in seminars that promote self-awareness.	2.61	Moderate
10. I utilize personal and social guidance services when I need help managing relationships.	2.46	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.49	Moderate

Table 9 shows the degree of personal and social guidance in terms of the use of guidance services. The greatest mean of 2.74 was and the least mean of 2.28 has been and is observed respectively in the statements, “I participate in activities that develop my social skills” and “I approach the guidance office when I face personal challenges.” The weighted average of all item is 2.49 with quality index of moderate.

The results indicate that the respondents use personal and social guidance services to a small to moderately high degree and less participation in direct help seeking on personal issues and more on developmental activities. The highest average marks the participation in activities that foster social skills, the comparatively high marks of social and personal development programs and self-awareness seminars suggest a greater likelihood of students to participate in personal and social guidance in cases when the service is offered in the form of a structured activity or program. Contrary, the lower average scores of going to the guidance office to solve personal problems, discussing self-confidence problems, and referring to the interpersonal communication issues indicate that students are not as much willing to seek personal help that is direct and sensitive in solving their personal or internal problems.

The trend is possibly a sign of a more indirect, preventive or even developmental support over open revelation of personal hardships to the guidance office. The implications of the results are quite general, such that students are slightly open to both personal and social advice, but they apply it more in the case of program attendance than personal consultation on personal or relational issues.

Career Guidance. Table 10 presents the extent of utilization of guidance services among students in terms of career guidance, which includes indicators related to students’ engagement with guidance services in making career-related decisions, exploring career opportunities, attending career-oriented activities, and preparing for future employment.

Table 10 Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services in Terms of Career Guidance

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I ask for advice about choosing the right career path.	2.76	Moderate
2. I consult the guidance office when I need help deciding on courses related to my career goals.	2.40	Moderate
3. I attend career orientation activities.	2.67	Moderate
4. I participate in job preparedness or career readiness seminars.	2.64	Moderate
5. I ask for information about available career opportunities.	2.70	Moderate

6. I consult the guidance office for help in making career-related decisions.	2.48	Moderate
7. I use resources from the guidance office to prepare for future employment.	2.50	Moderate
8. I seek advice on aligning my strengths and interests with my career choice.	2.59	Moderate
9. I attend career fairs or workshops facilitated by the guidance office.	2.52	Moderate
10. I utilize career guidance services to plan for my future profession.	2.53	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.58	Moderate

Table 10 shows the degree of usage of guidance services in terms of career guidance. The highest mean of 2.76 was recorded in the statement “I ask for advice about choosing the right career path.” and the lowest mean of 2.40 was recorded in the statement, “I consult the guidance office when I need help deciding on courses related to my career goals.” The total average is 2.58 that indicates a quality index of moderate.

The results reveal that out of the dimensions of guidance service usage; career guidance seems to be comparatively more used by the respondents. The larger average scores of asking about choosing the right career path, getting information on what career opportunities are available and career orientation activities indicate that students have a more interest in services that assist them in planning their future careers. The implication of these findings shows that career related issues are likely to be of particular concern to students due to the fact that such issues directly relate to long term goals, employability and life planning. But the rather lower mean scores of consulting the guidance office regarding course choices based on career objectives, and specific assistance in making career-related choices, indicate that, whereas the students are interested in course career orientation and information, they are less inclined to consult the career office directly.

This could be reflective of the fact that respondents like general career information and attending career events as opposed to going through a personalized decision-making process. Generally, the results indicate a moderate usage of career guidance and it could be one of the more observable or appreciated type of guidance service in students.

Counseling services. Table 11 presents the extent of utilization of guidance services among students in terms of counseling services, which includes indicators related to students’ engagement with counseling support for emotional concerns, stress management, decision-making, and personal difficulties encountered at home or in school.

Table 11 Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services in Terms of Counseling Services

Statements	Mean	Description
1. I consult the guidance counselor when I feel overwhelmed.	2.27	Moderate
2. I participate in one-on-one counseling sessions.	2.29	Moderate
3. I attend group counseling sessions when invited.	2.45	Moderate
4. I share my personal concerns with the guidance counselor.	2.29	Moderate
5. I seek counseling when I need emotional support.	2.37	Moderate
6. I approach the counselor when I face problems at home or in school.	2.30	Moderate
7. I participate in counseling programs related to stress management.	2.42	Moderate

8. I rely on the guidance counselor to help me with decision-making.	2.33	Moderate
9. I ask for counseling to cope with anxiety or academic pressure.	2.36	Moderate
10. I utilize counseling services to improve my overall well-being.	2.42	Moderate
Overall Mean	2.35	Moderate

Table 11 shows the level of utilization of the guidance services based on the counseling services. The best mean of 2.45 was observed in the statement, “I attend group counseling sessions when invited,” and the worst mean of 2.27 was observed in statement, “I consult the guidance counselor when I feel overwhelmed.” The mean of the total is 2.35 which shows a quality index of moderate.

The results have shown that the least utilized of the various dimensions of guidance services discussed in the study is through counseling services. The fact that the scores of attendance of group counseling sessions as invited, participation in counseling programs devoted to stress management, and using counseling services to feel well in general are a bit higher indicates that the students are somehow more open to counseling when conducted in a structured, group, and, perhaps, school-initiated environment. Conversely, smaller mean scores in consulting the counselor when one feels overwhelmed, attending individual counseling sessions and confiding personal concerns point to the possibility that the students might not be willing to get direct and individualized assistance towards counseling.

This is an indication that although students might be aware of the importance of counseling in general, they might still be reluctant to personally reveal issues or to ask counselors to assist themselves. Generally, the findings suggest that counseling services are used only to a certain degree and are more involved in invited or program-based counseling experiences as compared to working in self-initiated, individual counseling experiences.

Relationship Between Student’s Well-being and the Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services among the Respondents. This section presents the result to the first null hypothesis of this study.

Table 12 presents the results of the Pearson product moment correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationship between student well-being and the utilization of guidance services among the respondents.

Table 12 Relationship Between Student Well-Being and The Utilization of Guidance Services

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Remarks
Student Well-Being	0.49	<0.001	Significant (moderate positive correlation)
Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services			

Table 12 shows the outcome of the correlation between the student well-being and the use of guidance services. It shows that there is a significant relationship between the two variables since the p-value is < 0.001 and the Pearson’s r of 0.49 is interpreted as a moderate positive correlation.

The results show that those students with a higher number of well-being by nature are more inclined to use guidance services. This implies that students with positive emotional, social, academic and psychological functioning can be more willing to seek support of institutional support systems that can assist in the maintenance or improvement of their well-being. It can also mean that self-assured students who are aware of their needs are more likely to seek support services, when it is required. Instead of considering guidance services as continuous and remedial services, students who have a better well-being can consider them as developmental services that facilitate academic and personal achievements. In general, the findings indicate

that the two variables student well-being and the use of guidance services are intertwined with greater scores on well-being resulting in increased access to guidance services.

Relationship Between Students' Self-efficacy and the Extent of Utilization of guidance services. This section presents the result to the second null hypothesis of this study.

Table 13 presents the results of the Pearson product moment correlation analysis conducted to examine the relationship between self-efficacy and the utilization of guidance services among the respondents.

Table 13 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy and The Utilization of Guidance Services

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	p-value	Remarks
Student Self-Efficacy	0.54	<0.001	Significant (moderate positive correlation)
Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services			

Table 13 shows the outcome of the correlation between self-efficacy and the use of guidance services. It demonstrates that the two variables are significantly related as there is a p-value of < 0.001 and the Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.54 which is interpreted to be a moderate positive relationship between the two.

This implies that more confident pupils will be more likely to appreciate the importance of guidance services and to seek help if required. The p-value is statistically significant, meaning that the observed relationship is not likely to be due to chance. Thus, self-efficacy seems to be one of the most important factors related to students' involvement in guidance services.

The predictability of the Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services as influenced by Student Well-being. This section presents the result to the sixth problem of the study which assess that the indicators of student well-being predict the extent of utilization of guidance services.

Table 14 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine whether the indicators of student well-being namely emotional well-being, social well-being, academic well-being, and psychological well-being predict the extent of utilization of guidance services.

Table 14 Predictive Influence of Student Well-Being indicators on the Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services

Variables	Beta	t	p-value	Remarks
Emotional Well-Being	0.10	1.72	0.09	Not Significant
Social Well-Being	-0.00	-0.02	0.99	Not Significant
Academic Well-Being	0.48	7.51	<0.001	Significant
Psychological Well-Being	-0.01	-0.13	0.90	Not Significant

Table 14 displays the outcome of the multiple regression analysis that indicates which indicators of student well-being predict the use of guidance services. It shows that academic well-being is the only significant predictor since the p-value is < 0.001 and the beta value of 0.48 indicates a strong positive influence. No significant predictive effect was found on the use of guidance services by emotional well-being, social well-being and psychological well-being.

The results imply that academic experiences and academic functioning perceptions among the students are more influential to motivate them to use the guidance services compared to the other well-being factors. Academically challenged, academically demanding, and/or academically concerned students might feel more willing to obtain help by way of guidance services addressing academic stress, learning strategies and

academic planning. It means that academic issues can be used as a main point of entry where students use institutional support services. Conversely, it is possible that emotional, social and psychological well-being aspects have no significant predictive effects, which is why they might not be directly motivating towards students using the guidance services as academic issues are. In general, these findings suggest that the most direct and practical rationale of the need to use available guidance services might be the academic-related achievement.

The predictability of the Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services as influenced by Student Self-Efficacy. This section presents the result to the sixth problem of the study which assess that the indicators of self-efficacy predict the extent of utilization of guidance services.

Table 15 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis conducted to determine whether the indicators of self-efficacy namely academic self-efficacy, social self-efficacy, and emotional self-efficacy predict the extent of utilization of guidance services.

Table 15 Predictive Influence of Self-Efficacy Indicators on the Extent of Utilization of Guidance Services

Variables	Beta	t	p-value	Remarks
Academic Self-Efficacy	-0.01	-0.09	0.93	Not significant
Social Self-Efficacy	0.41	7.30	<0.001	Significant
Emotional Self-Efficacy	0.24	3.92	<0.001	Significant

Table 15 shows the outcome of multifactorial regression analysis of what indicators of self-efficacy are predictors of using guidance services. It demonstrates that social self-efficacy, emotional self-efficacy are critical predictors as the p-values of social self-efficacy and emotional self-efficacy are less than 0.001, and the beta values of social self-efficacy and emotional self-efficacy are 0.41 and 0.24, respectively. On the other hand, academic self-efficacy does not play a significant role based on the p-value of 0.93 which indicates that it is not a significant predictor as reflected in its p-value of 0.93.

The results indicate that the confidence that students have in their social and emotional skills is significant to whether the students access guidance services or not. Students who feel that they can effectively communication with others and control their emotions might be more comfortable to come to institutional support systems and address their issues and find help when necessary. The implication of this is that increased levels of social and emotional self-efficacy could enable help-seeking behavior by decreasing reluctance or uncomfortable feeling, which accompanies the approach to guidance personnel. In contrast, the academic self-efficacy was not significantly predicted, which would imply that the confidence of the students in their academic abilities does not necessarily have a strong predictive effect on guidance services utilization. Already successful students might be more self-reliant and not look to outside help. On the whole, findings suggest that social and emotional confidence could be more directly associated with the readiness to use guidance services rather than academic confidence is.

CONCLUSION

According to the outcomes of the research, one can make several significant conclusions. The level of well-being in students tends to be moderate, implying that despite the ability to cope with their studies and personal duties, difficulties still exist which might not be dealt with. Similarly, their self-efficacy is moderate as well. Students demonstrate that they are confident in their ability to cope with academic tasks, although it is not always the case, especially in the matters that require socialization and emotion regulation.

The results also indicate that there is a low to medium utilization of guidance services. It implies that lots of students fail to maximize the support systems that are within their reach, despite these services being able to assist them to deal with their issues better. Nevertheless, student well-being, self-efficacy, and guidance services use have a strong correlation, which means that the three variables are interrelated. The relationships'

strength, however, also means that it is a possibility that other factors can influence decisions of students to seek help.

Interestingly, academic well-being has been the only important predictor among well-being variables. This implies that students will be more inclined to seek advice when it will have direct effect on their academic performance. Moreover, the social and emotional self-efficacy were also examined to play a significant role in the use of guidance services, which emphasizes the role of confidence in motivating a student to seek help.

On the whole, the results are the indication that the students can ask help, but not always feel motivated, informed, and comfortable enough in order to do so. This highlights why schools are encouraged to develop more available, friendly and positive school environments that foster the use of guidance services.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher suggests the following recommendations that are based on the outcomes of the study:

1. With respect to the Guidance Office, it is important to note that the low utilization of services is a priority, which can be addressed by means of greater visibility and accessibility. The office may establish semesterly scheduled classroom orientations, establish particular Guidance Weeks and employ social media platforms to tactically inform students about the available services. Additional engagement can also be enhanced by the involvement of an open-door approach and the flexibility of consultation hours and anonymity of online consultations that can make students less reluctant.
2. The mean scores of the student well-being, in the case of the Institution, indicate that they require stronger supports. Activities that are guided can be incorporated in the curriculum of the institutions and they are short well-being, stress management workshops, and life skills. Planning/faculty can be trained on how to be able to identify the signs of distress amongst the students in good time to make the appropriate referrals to the guidance office.
3. The results of the case with Students are that openness to help-seeking is to be increased. Students can also be encouraged to form peer support groups, mentoring programs and student led organizations which promote mental-health awareness. To normalize the behavior of help-seeking and increase the confidence of coping with academic, social and emotional problems, specific activities may be employed.
4. To Future Researchers, the predictive strength of particular variables is restricted in nature indicating that there are others that contributed to the variables but have not been included in the research. The variables applicable in further studies are stigma, availability of the service, influence of peer, and family support. It is also recommended that qualitative methods i.e. interviews or focus-group discussion be applied so as to have a better insight as to why students utilise guidance services conspicuously.

REFERENCES

1. Abe, E. N., Chikoko, V., & Lubbe, S. (2020). Exploring the factors that influence the career decision of STEM students at a university in South Africa. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7(60), 1–14.
2. Falco, L. D. (2019). Improving career decision self-efficacy and STEM self-efficacy in high school girls: Evaluation of an intervention. *Career Development Quarterly*, 67(1), 62–76.
3. Hamzah, S. R., Le, K. K., & Musa, S. N. S. (2021). The mediating role of career decision self-efficacy on the relationship of career emotional intelligence and self-esteem with career adaptability among university students. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 26(1), 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2021.1886952>
4. McCabe, M., Byrne, M., Gullifer, J., & Cornish, K. (2024). The relationship between university student help-seeking intentions and well-being outcomes. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 15, Article 1407689. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1407689>
5. Wang, D. (2022). The perspectives of social cognitive career theory approach in current times. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1023994.