

The Impact of De La Salle University – Dasmariñas (DLSU-D) Student Wellness Center on College of Tourism and Hospitality Management (CTHM) Students

Alfonso V. Arcangel, Mario Luis Jamoralin

College of Tourism and Hospitality Management

De La Salle University – Dasmariñas, Philippines

Abstract: This research aims to know the impact of the De La Salle University-Dasmariñas (DLSU-D) Student Wellness Center on the CTHM students. Particularly, this study aims to know the behavioral changes on the students who attended any of the various activities of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center, and if they are applying what they learned from such activities in their daily lives. Overall, the survey results revealed that the DLSU-D CTHM Student Wellness Center had impact on the CTHM students in each wellness dimension – social, spiritual, intellectual, physical, and emotional.

Based on overall mean of the responses, the respondents slightly agree that the DLSU-D Wellness Center had impact on them on all dimensions of wellness. The students practice what they have learned from the teachings shared with them by the Center in their daily lives. The activities that the Wellness Center has provided facilitated a well-balanced social, spiritual, physical, intellectual and spiritual wellness among the CTHM students as revealed in the survey results.

Keywords: wellness, social wellness, physical wellness, intellectual wellness, emotional wellness, spiritual wellness.

I. INTRODUCTION

The university has a wellness unit named Student Wellness Center (SWC). It caters to all the students in the high school department and colleges, including the CTHM. The SWC takes proactive steps to ensure the wellness of the students during their stay in the university.

Wellness comprises physical, intellectual, emotional, social and spiritual dimensions, each important to a person's overall wellness (Gautam, 2021) and contribute to the holistic integration of a person's body, mind and spirit (Su-Kubricht, 2019). A person is physically well if he can go about his day without feeling exhausted or too stressed out. A person who is well socially can relate and connect with other people in various environments or settings. He can develop and maintain positive relationships with people. Emotional or mental wellness is about understanding and accepting oneself. A person who has emotional wellness can acknowledge, understand and process his emotions and channel them effectively. He can face challenges positively. Spiritual wellness and emotional wellness directly influence each other. A person who is well spiritually can establish peace and harmony in his life. His actions are anchored on his values, principles and beliefs, which give him fulfillment, purpose and direction in life. Intellectual wellness drives a person to learn and apply new ideas and skills and seek challenges. A person who is well intellectually thus keeps an open mind and engages in creative and stimulating mental activities to expand his knowledge. Formal studies, work, engaging in culture and other personal interests contribute to intellectual wellness (San Jose, 2019).

Achieving wellness is even more crucial among young people, particularly adolescents who are vulnerable in their youth. The hospitality industry which the students will be part of in the future would require unique services from management and staff. They would be encountering challenging situations in the day-to-day operations

This study provides an assessment of the impact of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center on CTHM students. It provides information useful for decision-making, such as redesigning or enhancing the program or taking steps to improve its implementation specifically for the CTHM students or DLSU-D students. The research may also serve as a reference or as a basis for further studies on the wellness needs of DLSU-D students or wellness programs that DLSU-D shall develop or enhance for its students.

According to Mc Dermott (2020), a student wellness program must translate its objectives into activities and observable behaviors. This allows the program to determine the interventions it will provide the students to promote their wellness. Particularly, this study aimed to know the behavioral changes on the students who attended any of the various activities of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center, and if they are applying what they learned from such activities in their daily lives.

Impact assessment applies to all areas of life (Bechervaise, 2018). In research, particularly in the academic field, impact study is integrated in many research rating systems to determine outcomes beyond scholarly contributions (Fryirs et. al., 2019). The behavioral changes on the CTHM students are the indicators of the impact of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center. To achieve its objectives, the study surveyed students enrolled in the DLSU-D's CTHM as of the school year 2020-2021. They included both males and females who are aged 18 to 25 years old.

The Problem Statement

This research aimed to determine the impact of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center on the CTHM students. Specifically, this research wanted to know the answer to the following inquiries:

1. What is the participants' profile in terms of Age and Gender?
2. How do participants of the study assess the impact of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center on them in terms of the Social, Spiritual, Intellectual, Physical, and Emotional variables?
3. Is there a significant difference between the means level of assessment of the respondents when they are grouped according to age and gender?
4. What will be the recommendations for the DLSU-D Wellness Center based on the findings of the study?

The Statement of Hypothesis

There is no significant difference between the means level of assessment of the respondents when they are grouped according to age and gender.

Scope and Delimitation of Study

This research focused on gathering data among respondents to serve as bases for decision-making such as redesigning or enhancing the program or taking steps to improve its implementation specifically for the CTHM students or DLSU-D students in general. The respondents were CTHM students from all levels as of the second semester of the academic year 2020-2021. The analysis was limited to the information gathered from the respondents' answers to the questionnaires or information using Google Forms.

The Review of Related Literature

Various factors affect a person's wellness or well-being. All dimensions of wellness - emotional, physical, social, intellectual, spiritual - must be flourishing for a person to be well. It is therefore important for a person to be conscious of his wellness in terms of each aspect so he can provide more attention or support where needed and maintain his overall wellness (Liria, 2020). Indeed, all dimensions are important to wellness, contributing to the quality of one's life (Petkov, 2019). They are interconnected thus, it is not enough that one is simply not sick as the other components are just as important (Melnyk, 2018). Wellness is not just being free from sickness or distress, but a continuing process involving decisions and choices towards a well-balanced life in all aspects of well-being (Halim, 2019). Of course, physical wellness is primarily important so a person's body can properly function. It will enable a person to live an active life (Gopal, 2018).

In a study that examined levels of holistic wellness among students, differences were found in physical activity levels and the need to belong due in part to gender effects (Baldwin et. al., 2017). Another study examining student wellness also found differences between gender and social, emotional and physical wellness. The findings show that there is a need for programs to address the needs of students based on gender and age in school health and wellness programs (Franzidis & Zinder, 2019). Daud et. al. (2017) in their study examining wellness among Malaysian students found that the highest mean score of wellness among university students was “essential self” or constructs that build self-esteem such as spirituality and cultural identity. Education whether formal or informal is the most important element that shapes the students’ identity (Daud et. al., 2017). Further, school-based wellness programs must be promoted as it is relatively easier to provide students wellness interventions in the place where they spend most of their time (Stiefel, et. al., 2017). Schools do play an important role in promoting students’ well-being. Their well-being interventions provide positive impact not only on the well-being of the students but also on their academic achievement. Demonstrating evidence of this impact is important in improving the program quality and so limited funding can be channeled on ways that prove most beneficial to the students (Dix et. al., 2020).

As past studies have shown, wellness needs of students can differ with gender or age, and interventions may need to be specifically targeted for these needs. With the Wellness Center, the DLSU-D had acted proactively on its important role in promoting its students’ wellness. This study explored the impact of the Wellness Center on the five wellness dimensions of the CTHM students.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive method of research to determine the impact of the DLSU-D Student Wellness Center on the five wellness dimensions of CTHM students.

The Respondents

The qualifications of the participants in the study were as follows:

1. BS Hotel Management students of DLSU- D as of school year 2020-2021 second semester.
2. Ages range from 18 to 25 years

The study was conducted within the CTHM of the DLSU-D in the city of Dasmarinas, Cavite.

Research Sampling

The researcher used convenience sampling to select the respondents. The study assumed that the CTHM student population is homogenous, thus the researcher selected respondents from the group based on accessibility (I. Etikan et. al, 2016).

The Instrument

This study used a questionnaire designed by the researcher and uploaded through Google Forms as the primary instrument to gather data from the participants of the study. The questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part I was on the demographic profile of the participants specifically age and gender. Part II was for determining the awareness of the respondents on the Wellness Program of the DLSU-D, their level of participation in program activities, and the impact of the program activities on them.

Sampling Method and Formula Used

The study used the Sampling Size Formula to identify the required number of respondents. The resulting number of respondents was 250 out of the total 712 student population of CTHM at a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error.

Data Gathering

The researcher first designed the questionnaire to collect necessary information from the respondents, then uploaded the same via Google Forms. The data underwent statistical treatment and tabulation for efficient analysis and interpretation. The relationship among the variables were obtained and sound recommendations for decision-making, such as redesigning or enhancing the program or taking steps to improve its implementation specifically for the CTHM students or DLSU-D students in general, were formulated.

Data Treatment and Analysis

To analyze the research problem, the researcher employed the quantitative research method and provided the respondents with a questionnaire via Google Forms. The study used One-way ANOVA, to know if there was a significant relationship between the respondents’ gender or age and their assessment on the impact of DLSU-D Wellness Center. Percentage was used to translate the frequency distribution of different variables in the study into percent. The study also used the 4-point Likert scale for the survey questionnaire. Under this, the respondents rated their perception or judgment of a particular situation. This is on their awareness level about the university’s wellness program, their level of participation in the program, the effects of the program on their well-being, and coming up with sound recommendations for decision-making.

III. RESULTS

The study received a total of 157 responses. It excluded data from eighteen (18) respondents who signified that they were unaware of DLSU-D Wellness Center. Following are the summaries of the demographic profile of the 139 respondents:

TABLE I – Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18 & below	12	8.6	8.6	8.6
	19-22yrs old	120	86.3	86.3	95
	23-25yrs old	7	5	5	100
	Total	139	100	100	

One hundred twenty or 86.3% of the respondents are 19 to 22 years old. Twelve or 8.6% are 18 years old or below while seven or 5.1% are between 23 to 25 years old.

TABLE II - Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Female	100	71.9	71.9	71.9
	Male	37	26.6	26.6	98.6
	Prefer not to say	2	1.4	1.4	100
	Total	139	100	100	

The survey results show that 100 out of 139 respondents are female (71.9%), 37 (26.6%) are male and 2 or 1.4% did not disclose their gender.

For each of the 5 dimensions, the respondent was asked to assess a set of 7 statements (indicators) descriptive of how the Center programs may have impacted him. Each question was answerable by one of four choices – strongly disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, strongly agree. The answers were assigned corresponding numerical values from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree) as shown in Table III below:

TABLE III – Level of Agreement/Disagreement

Interval	Level of agreement/disagreement
1.0-1.49	Strongly disagree
1.5-2.49	Slightly disagree
2.5-3.49	Slightly agree
3.5-4.00	Strongly agree

TABLE IV - Major Activities Conducted by the DLSU-D Wellness Center for the University Students.

Counseling Service	76.3%
Psycho-Education Services	12.2%
Career Services	33.8%
Academic Development	23.7%

Of the respondents, 76.3% participated in counselling services. About a third or 33.8% availed career services. Academic development activities were participated in by 23.7%. and psycho-education services were availed by 12.2% of the respondents.

TABLE V - Other Activities which the DLSU-D Wellness Center Offered the Students

Printed materials for bulletin board, video presentation via LCD, online posts e.g. (Self-Management, Resiliency, Mindfulness, Mental Health Prevention, Bullying and Harassment, Cyberbullying, Gender Awareness Development)	32.4%
Seminars/Activities on: Mental Health Advocacy, Drug abuse Awareness and Prevention Control, HIV-AIDS Awareness, Parents Forum: Confronting Stigma of Mental Health	79.4%
Growth Sessions on various topics such as: Boosting self-management, resiliency, overcoming bad habits, risky behavior, responsible relationship, dealing with bullying, cultivating happiness, self-empowerment, advocacy, life skills and interest enhancement.	41.9%
Mindfulness Program: TEACH and EQUIP students with basic coping tools in handling and maintaining the self in relation to staying healthy and mentally functional.	22.1%

Table V presents other activities which the DLSU-D Wellness Center offered the students. Seminars on mental health advocacy and drug abuse awareness and prevention were the most attended where 79.4% of the respondents answered they participated in the activity. On the other hand, 41.9% of the respondents participated in growth sessions on various topics such as boosting self-confidence, resiliency, etc. while 32.4% read printed materials provided by the DLSU-D Wellness Center on various topics. About a fifth of the participants or 22.1% signified that they participated in the Mindfulness Program, which teaches and equips students with basic tools in handling and maintaining the self in relation to staying healthy and mentally functional.

Table VI – Social Dimension Indicators Survey Results

Social Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
I have learned to recognize and manage my emotions better.	3.25	0.78	Slightly Agree
I have become less shy and am now more sociable and confident.	3.06	0.82	Slightly Agree
I now try to keep my relationships healthy; enjoy the company of others, develop friendships, care about others and letting others care about me	3.37	0.67	Slightly Agree
I share my talents and skills more.	3.07	0.84	Slightly Agree
I communicate my thoughts, feelings and ideas better.	3.17	0.82	Slightly Agree
I participate in a wide variety of social activities and enjoy all kinds of people.	3.04	0.82	Slightly Agree
I try to see the good in my friends and help them feel good about themselves more.	3.55	0.65	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.21	0.61	Slightly Agree

Table VI shows that the students slightly agreed on all statements except one indicative of the Center's impact on their social dimension wellness. On one statement, the respondents strongly agreed that they see the good in their friends and help them feel good about themselves more, with a mean score of 3.55. The responses got an overall mean of 3.21, suggesting that the respondents slightly agree that the Wellness Center had impact on their physical wellness.

Table VII – Spiritual Dimension Indicators Survey Results

Spiritual Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
My faith in God became stronger.	3.37	0.66	Slightly Agree
I find my purpose and meaning of life.	3.22	0.78	Slightly Agree
I participate in activities that are consistent with my beliefs and values.	3.18	0.81	Slightly Agree
I try to spend time alone/meditate regularly.	3.37	0.73	Slightly Agree
I listen to my heart and live by my principles.	3.37	0.71	Slightly Agree
I allow myself to be who I am and those around me the freedom to be who they are.	3.52	0.72	Strongly Agree
I respect different cultures and religions.	3.65	0.66	Strongly Agree
Overall Mean	3.38	0.6	Slightly Agree

Table VII shows the respondents’ assessment of the DLSU-D Wellness Center’s impact on their spiritual wellness. On 5 of the 7 statements, the respondents slightly agreed on the Center’s impact. The respondents strongly agreed on two indicators – they respect other culture and religions and allow themselves to be who they are and those around them the freedom to be who they are as well. The overall mean of 3.38 suggests that the respondents agree that the Center had impact on their spiritual wellness.

Table VIII – Intellectual Dimension Indicators Survey Results

Intellectual Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
I became more focused on my studies.	3.17	0.75	Slightly Agree
I am curious about all there is to learn. I am interested to keep learning.	3.22	0.69	Slightly Agree
I welcome intellectual challenges.	3.24	0.74	Slightly Agree
I like being with people who challenge me intellectually.	3.18	0.77	Slightly Agree
I apply what I learn in the classroom to real life situations.	3.35	0.63	Slightly Agree
I attend workshops/go to conferences.	2.75	0.93	Slightly Agree
I engage in creative and stimulating activities.	3.06	0.83	Slightly Agree
Overall Mean	3.14	0.59	Slightly Agree

The survey results on intellectual dimension are presented in Table VIII. Overall, the respondents slightly agreed that the DLSU-D Wellness Center has an impact on their intellectual wellness.

Table IX – Physical Dimension Indicators Results

Physical Dimension	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
I have become more conscious about my diet. I have since tried to eat a variety of healthy foods and observe the portions of my meals.	2.97	0.78	Slightly Agree
I have become more inclined to keep myself physically fit. I try to exercise daily/regularly and get enough rest and sleep.	2.9	0.82	Slightly Agree
I have learned to listen to my body and recognize if I am sick or feel unwell.	3.14	0.81	Slightly Agree
I have limited my alcohol intake and/or smoking or totally stopped smoking	3.32	0.93	Slightly Agree
I now feel good physically. I have enough energy and can get through the day without feeling overly tired.	2.89	0.77	Slightly Agree
I seek professional help when I feel something is wrong with my body	2.79	0.97	Slightly Agree
I am now more conscious about taking safety precautions as needed, like wearing seatbelt all times, avoiding secondhand smoke, etc.	3.43	0.78	Slightly Agree
Overall mean	3.06	0.62	Slightly Agree

Table IX shows that the respondents slightly agreed on all the physical dimension wellness indicators. The overall dimension mean score of 3.06 indicates that the DLSU-D Wellness Center has an impact on the respondents’ physical well-being.

Table X – Emotional Dimension Indicators Results

Emotional Dimension	Mean	Deviation	Interpretation
I have gained a positive outlook in life.	3.25	0.75	Slightly Agree
I have been enlightened about my problem(s).	3.18	0.79	Slightly Agree
I appreciate how others feel.	3.5	0.68	Strongly Agree
I manage my emotions in a constructive way.	3.21	0.79	Slightly Agree
I manage stress	2.97	0.86	Slightly Agree
I accept my fault and forgive myself when I feel I have done something wrong.	3.27	0.79	Slightly Agree
I seek support when needed.	3.26	0.82	Slightly Agree
Overall Mean	3.23	0.63	Slightly Agree

Table X presents the results on the emotional dimension wellness indicators. With an overall mean score of 3.23, the participants slightly agreed on the impact of the Center on their emotional wellness. On appreciating how others feel however, the responses registered a mean of 3.5, indicating the respondents strongly agreed on the indicator.

Table XI – Results on the Relationship Between the Impact of the DLSU-D and Gender

	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-comp	Sig	Decision	Interpretation
Female	3.1934	0.50221	0.769	0.465	Not significant	Failed to reject null hypothesis
Male	3.2625	0.53115				
Prefer not to say	2.8429	0.22223				
Total	3.2068	0.50772				

The mean perception of the male respondents on their assessment as to the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the students is higher (mean = 3.2625) as compared to the mean of the female (mean = 3.1924) and those who opted not to indicate their gender (mean = 2.8429). Thus, there are differences among the three groups on the impact of the center on the wellness of students. To determine whether these differences are significant, the one-way analysis of variance (F test) is computed. Results showed that the computed F of 0.769 yielded a significance level of .465. Since this value is greater than the critical value (significance level) of .05, the null hypothesis of no significant difference is accepted. The result implies that the level of perception of the respondents in terms of the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the students is the same for all the respondents regardless of their gender. There is no significant relationship between respondents' gender and their assessment on the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the health of the students.

Table XII – Results on the Relationship Between the Impact of the DLSU-D and Age

	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-comp	Sig.	Decision	Interpretation
18 & below	3.019	0.51303	1.025	0.362	Not significant	Failed to reject null hypothesis
19-22 yrs old	3.23	0.50086				
23-25 yrs old	3.1306	0.61872				
Total	3.2068	0.50772				

The mean perception of the respondents with age group 19 – 22 years old on their assessment as to the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the students is higher (mean = 3.2300) as compared to the mean of the age group 18 years and below (mean = 3.0190) and the age group 23 – 25 years old (mean = 3.1306). Thus, there are differences of the three groups on the impact of the center on the wellness of students. To determine whether these differences are significant, the one-way analysis of variance (F test) is computed. Results showed that the computed F of 1.025 yielded a significance level of .362. Since this value is greater than the critical value (significance level) of .05, the null hypothesis of no significant difference is accepted. The result implies that the level of perception of the respondents' assessment in terms of the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the students is the same for all the respondents regardless of their age group. There is no significant relationship between respondents' age and their assessment on the impact of DLSU Wellness Center on the health of the students.

IV. DISCUSSION

While other studies examined wellness considering certain variables, this study examined the impact of the DLSU-D Wellness Center on five wellness dimensions as assessed by the CTHM students. The results of this study reveal how the respondents assess the impact of the Center's programs on their wellness. A study by T. Young, S. Maccines, J. Aaron, R. Colla (2020) examined the impact of a wellbeing program imbedded in university classes with emphasis on valuing happiness, baseline wellbeing and practice frequency. The results of the study, which show that imbedded wellbeing programs can improve the wellbeing of students, were encouraging. Similarly, the results of this study indicate that the CTHM students slightly agree on the impact of the DLSU-D Wellness Center on their wellness. While the former study used baseline wellbeing among others, this study focused on the students' perception on the Center's impact on their wellbeing. A greater number of the respondents in this study belongs in the 19-22 age group, the regular age for college students in the country. Similarly, majority of the respondents in a study by Cleofas, J.V (2019) involving mental health and quality of life of college students in a selected university in Manila are 19 years of age. The same study by Cleofas, J.V (2019) had mostly female respondents. The reason is that the university was originally exclusive to female students and only accepted males more recently. Similarly, in this study, majority of the respondents are female. This is expected given that the DLSU-D CTHM has more female than male students. Based on the results of the study, the respondents agreed that the DLSU-D Wellness Center programs have impact on their physical, emotional, social, spiritual and intellectual wellness. There was not one indicator in any of the five dimensions where the respondents disagreed with the stated impact. Their responses only varied between the degree of their agreement, either slightly agree or strongly agree. The respondents strongly agree on 4 out of 35 impact statements – one in social, two in spiritual and one in emotional.

Whereas other studies found a relationship between gender or age and wellness, this study did not find a significant relationship between these variables and the respondents' assessment of the Center's impact on their wellness. Specific to gender, the results of the study are similar to the findings of a study by Franzidis & Zinder (2019) examining student wellness, which found differences between gender and social, emotional, and physical wellness. However, the differences per the results of this study were not found significant. Since most of the respondents in this study are female, there may not be sufficient data to find a significant relationship between gender and the respondent's assessment of the impact. Whereas the study by Franzidis & Zinder examined the social, emotional, and physical wellness of students in relation to their gender, this study examined the impact of the DLSU-D Wellness Center on the students' wellness dimensions as perceived or assessed by the CTHM students.

Regarding age, a study by Liu, W., Mei, J., Tian, L. et al. (2016) found that younger age students reported higher levels of subjective well-being in school than older students. This contrasts with the results of this study where the 19-22 age group had a higher mean perception on the impact of the Center's wellness program compared to the 18 years old and below group and lower mean perception compared to the 23-25 years age group. However, the differences in the perceived impact in relation to age per results of this study were not found significant.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The DLSU-D Wellness Center has contributed to the balanced wellness of CTHM Students. The Wellness Center's activities impacted the well-being of the CTHM students in all five dimensions as revealed in the survey results. Further studies may be done to examine the factors that affect the impact of the Center's Wellness programs on the students. Based on the survey results and conclusions, the researcher recommends the following:

1. To strengthen the impact of the DLSU-D Wellness Center on the students' wellness, the Center must ensure that the Center's program and activities are implemented, and the students' participation is high. This can be done through partnering with different university student organizations throughout the different stages of implementation from identifying the most suitable programs and activities to evaluation after implementation. Such activities can also be integrated in the academic and extra-curricular programs of the university.
2. The DLSU-D Wellness Center can continue offering programs without particular attention to gender differences. The results of this study suggest that the programs had created essentially the same impact on the wellness of the CTHM students regardless of their gender. However, further studies may be done to determine if there is a significant relationship between the students' gender and the perceived impact of the Center or the students' wellness measurement across the University and not in the CTHM alone.
3. The DLSU-D Wellness Center can continue offering programs without particular attention to age differences. The results of this study suggest that per assessment of the CTHM students, the Center had essentially the same impact on their wellness regardless of their age. Further studies may be done to determine if there are significant differences in the perceived impact or wellness measurement based on smaller age groups (e. g., 17-18; 19-20; 21-22; 23-24).
4. Conduct regular evaluation activity among students towards each semester to determine the outcome/impact of the Wellness Center to the CTHM Students.
5. For the University to allot resources (budget, manpower, etc.) to the Wellness Center to focus on providing services to students needing special interventions such as counselling, and to expand at the same time specialize its wellness programs and activities.
6. For the Wellness Center to create a support system composed of students who will be a peer influence among students.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aggarwal, R. & Ranganathan, P. (2019). *Study designs: Part 2 – Descriptive studies*. *Perspect Clin Res* Vol. 10, pp.34-36.,
- [2] Baldwin, D.B., Towler, K., Oliver, M., Datta. (2017). *An examination of college students' wellness: A research and liberal arts perspective*. *Sage Journal* Vol. 4.
- [3] BECHERVAISE. (2018). *What Is an Impact Assessment and Why Is It Important?* CHANTAL BECHERVAISE.
- [4] Cleofas. (2019, September 26). *Student involvement, mental health and quality of life of college students in a selected university in Manila, Philippines*.
- [5] Corte, R. (2020). *What Is Wellness and Why Is It Important?*

- [6] Curancho, E.S. (2019). *Young Filipinos are in the midst of a mental health crisis*.
- [7] Dix. (2020). *Student wellbeing programs improve academic outcomes*. Katherine Dix.
- [8] DOH website, (2020). *Your Mind Matters: DOH calls for unified response to mental health*
- [9] Dr. Li Ping Su-Kubricht, R. (2019). *The 8 Dimensions of Wellness | Rocky Mountain University*. Dr. Li Ping Su-Kubricht
- [10] Formplus Blogsite, (2020). *The 4,5-, and 7-Point Likert Scale + [Questionnaire Examples]*.
- [11] Franzidis. (2019). *Examining Student Wellness for the Development of Campus-Based Wellness Programs*. Alexia F. Franzidis.
- [12] Fryirs. (2019). *Engaging with research impact assessment for an environmental science case study*. Kirstie A. Fryirs, Gary J. Brierley & Thom Dixon.
- [13] Gautam. (2021). *HOW CAN YOU ENSURE 8 COMPONENTS OF WELLNESS IN THE WORKPLACE*. Sweta Gautam.
- [14] Halim. (2019). *Eight Dimensions of Wellness*. Tariq Halim.
- [15] Hayes. (2020). *Chi-Square (χ^2) Statistic Definition*. Adam Hayes.
- [16] Health. (2017). *School Wellness Programs: Magnitude and Distribution in New York City Public Schools*. J Sch Health.
- [17] Hopper, J. Ph.D., (2016). *Why you need a 4-point scales*
- [18] McDermonnt, D., (2020). *How to design a Wellness Program for College Students During Covid – 19*
- [19] Huebner. (2015, January 20). *Age and Gender Differences in the Relation Between School-Related Social Support and Subjective Well-Being in School Among Students*.
- [20] Liria. (2020). *SAMHSA'S EIGHT DIMENSIONS OF WELLNESS*. Jessica Liria.
- [21] Melnyk. (2018). *9 dimensions of wellness*. Bernadette Melnyk.
- [22] Montano, D., (2021). *Socioeconomic status, well-being and mortality: a comprehensive life course analysis of panel of data, Germany, 1984-2016*. Archives of Public Health. Vol 79
- [23] Nurul 'Ain Mohd Daud. (2017). *A Descriptive Study of Wellness among Undergraduate Students in a Public University in Malaysia*.
- [24] Page, L., (2016). *What is Welleness Program?*
- [25] Pundit. M. (2020). *Gender and Wellness*.
- [26] Raghuphati, V. & Raghupati, W. (2020). *The influence of education on health: an empirical assessment of OECD countries for the period of 1995-2015*. Archive of Public Health. Vol. 78.,
- [27] Roberts, S. (2018). *Mental Illness is a Global Problem: We need a Global Response*,
- [28] San Jose. (2019). *HOW TO ADDRESS THE 7 DIMENSIONS OF WELLNESS IN THE WORKPLACE*. Cecilia San Jose.
- [29] Shapiro, A. (2018). *7 Components of Wellness*
- [30] Sohail. (2018). *what are the 5 components of wellness*. Hina Sohail
- [31] Stoewen. (2017). *Dimensions of wellness: Change your habits, change your life*. Debbie L. Stoewen.
- [32] Victoria Government Website, (2021). *Gender Equality in Health and Wellbeing*.
- [33] Wang, J. & Geng, L. (2019). *Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Physical and Psychological Health: Lifestyle as a Mediator*. Int J Environ Res Public Health Vol. 16, pp. 281.,
- [34] WHO website (2020) *Special Initiative for Mental Health in the Philippines*.
- [35] Young. (2020, July). *The impact of a wellbeing program imbedded in university classes: the importance of valuing happiness, baseline wellbeing and practice frequency*. Tarli Young.