

Access this article online
Quick Response Code:

Website: https://journals.lww.com/pjhrd
DOI: 10.4103/PJHRD.PJHRD_37_25

Teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement among employees in a government higher education institution

Daisy N. Delos Reyes¹, Charlie C. Falguera², Ana Blesilda A. Atendido³

Abstract:

BACKGROUND: Although higher education institutions (HEIs) are expected to contribute much in the larger communities, it cannot be denied that the employees have the qualities and characteristics with genuine interest to help the institution, other individuals, and the communities surrounding them. Studying teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement is essential in determining how they affected with the organizational management, training of students, and achieving the goals of the college.

OBJECTIVES: The objective of this study was to determine the level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement and the relationship between them among faculty members, school administrators, and supporting staff in a government HEI in the Philippines.

METHODS: A cross-sectional design was employed involving 49 employees in a government HEI. Three self-report scales were used in gathering the data: TeamSTEPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire, Ethical Sensitivity Scale, and Utrecht Work Engagement Scale. Data were analyzed using Spearman's rho correlations, point biserial correlations, and eta correlations.

RESULTS: Participants reported high levels of perceived teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement. Marital status was significantly and positively correlated with moral sensitivity and work engagement, whereas employment status was significantly and positively correlated with teamwork and moral sensitivity. Moreover, moral sensitivity was significantly and positively correlated with teamwork and work engagement.

CONCLUSIONS: College employees who reported high levels of moral sensitivity are associated with high levels of teamwork and work engagement. Strategies to maintain and enhance teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement are recommended through various activities such as team-building workshops, staff development, and/or leadership trainings.

Keywords:

College employees, government university, moral sensitivity, teamwork, work engagement

Introduction

A college, university, or higher education institution (HEI) demonstrates an intricate structure such as multiple distinctiveness and subcultures composing of academic administrators, teaching and nonteaching personnel, and students. For a public HEI, the governance system

covers various sources of authority, such as academic leadership, faculty governance, student body, and alumni relations.^[1]

Government HEI is characterized as a nonprofit organization, which simply means, this institution is not intended of making money.^[2] As a matter of fact, government HEIs have been historically identified as a public good as they perform

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 License (CC BY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

How to cite this article: Reyes DN, Falguera CC, Atendido AB. Teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement among employees in a government higher education institution. *Philipp J Health Res Dev* 2025;29(4):63-71.

¹School of Health Sciences, Baler Extension Campus, University of the Philippines Manila, Baler, Aurora, Philippines,
²Department of Midwifery, School of Health Sciences, University of the Philippines Manila, Palo, Leyte, Philippines,
³College of Health Sciences, Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Candon, Ilocos Sur, Philippines

Address for correspondence:

Prof. Daisy N. Delos Reyes,
School of Health Sciences, Baler Extension Campus, University of the Philippines Manila, Baler, Aurora, Philippines.
E-mail: dndelosreyes@up.edu.ph

Received: 26-08-2025
Accepted: 02-11-2025
Published: 22-12-2025

critical roles in educating the community people. They offer educational opportunities for people across the lifespan, varying from music classes to infants and young children, summer camps to school-aged children, and advancing education to the adult ones.^[1] Moreover, government HEIs such as colleges and universities are also tapped as experts and consultants for various projects, research, and initiatives.^[2]

The HEIs must fulfill their roles and expectations to the communities. However, it cannot be denied that the employees are individuals with the qualities and characteristics who have the genuine interest to help the institution, other individuals, and the communities surrounding them.^[3] Teamwork is integral to the achievement of the organization's goals and objectives, and providing the sense of belonging among members which results to the idea that organizations' outputs were generated from the collegial decisions and collective behaviors anchored from its vision, mission, and core values^[4] and in which key factors of social sustainability, like goals and direction to teamwork and respect and genuine interest of communities, can be assessed by decision-makers to decipher the influence from their interconnectedness.^[5]

Moral sensitivity refers to the ability to acknowledge and address to certain ethical issues. It is integral in many professional contexts, especially in the realm of health care. Literature demonstrated that those professional individuals who reported a level of moral sensitivity may result to have a higher level of ethical behavior and decision-making skills, which will eventually enhance work engagement.^[6] For example, a study involving nurses showed that those who have higher levels of moral sensitivity demonstrated to have a lower turnover intention and greater commitment to the work environment, reflecting that moral sensitivity enhances a greater sense of responsibility and work engagement.^[7] Moreover, an ethical environment portraying moral sensitivity decreases moral distress, enhancing job satisfaction and work engagement.^[8] Similarly, leaders who have shown high levels of moral standards generate an ambience of ethical conduct and trust in the work environment, which promotes workers to be involved more actively and take actions at the advantage of the organization.^[9] The association of values and characteristics between leaders and workers promotes general work engagement and commitment to the organization.

Work engagement has been defined as an "affirmative and satisfying job-related state of mind that is commonly characterized by dedication, absorption, and vigor."^[10] Kahn conceptualized work engagement as "equipping team members' selves to their work roles" and claimed

that individuals are portraying engagement when "they apply and convey themselves physically, intellectually, and emotionally during work performance."^[11] Demerouti *et al.*^[12] highlighted the advantages of work engagement to employees themselves and the team, as the way they perform their tasks depends on the degree they are engaged at their work. In addition, Rich *et al.*^[13] identified that engaged workers are becoming more attentive and disciplined to their expected roles and responsibilities than those less engaged ones, as psychological related to their functions, and as more passionate employees. Other studies showed that as engaged workers were also socially active and engage in hobbies outside their work,^[14] the beneficial effects of work engagement overflow into their private life and vice versa,^[15] which eventually leads to better individual and group performance.

As engaged workers portray an energetic and affective involvement in various work activities, they see themselves as having the ability to deal with job demands and hand over their engagement to coworkers.^[12,16] They can greatly affect toward organizational development while enhancing a healthier work environment.^[16] It is integral for the organization to determine the genuine purpose of work engagement, especially in government institutions. For instance, the government in Uzbekistan perceives its workers as one of the main assets in developing various reforms for the public. Thus, government workers' attitudes are essentially significant to their administrators.^[17] They identified that the sense of ownership is the main feature among government and private institutions in Uzbekistan. At this stance, the government operates and controls the organizations in the public sector but has no stake in those of the private sector.^[17] With this, public organizations are becoming prone to political pressures which eventually, lead to frequent changes in formulating policies. As such, their goals went through political procedures instead of individual manager like what private organizations do.^[18] Government organizations also have a more formal decision-making procedures and portrays few rivals in the provision of education and health services.^[18]

While several studies have been conducted investigating teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement, few studies have been conducted the influence of teamwork and moral sensitivity to work engagement among teaching and nonteaching employees in public HEIs. Certain situations and conditions might test organizational teamwork and employees' moral sensitivity as they go along with their daily tasks and duties that may eventually affect their overall engagement with their employment and eventually their performance. The findings of this study might have significant implications for the employees

and the school administrators toward better work productivity, well-being, welfare, and the realization of the organization's vision and mission.

Research aims

This study aims to determine the level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement and the relationship between them among faculty members, school administrators, and supporting staff in a government HEI in the Philippines.

Null hypothesis

The researchers tested the following null hypothesis:

1. There is no significant relationship between college employees' personal profile and their perceived teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement
2. There is no significant relationship among the perceived level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement of college employees.

Methods

Study design

This study employed a cross-sectional study design.

Study settings and participants

The study was conducted in the University of the Philippines Manila School of Health Sciences (UPM-SHS). UPM-SHS is a distant college of UP Manila, where its main campus is in Palo, Leyte. The school offers a community-based stepladder curriculum from a 2.5-year Diploma in Midwifery, an additional 2 years to complete the BS Nursing program, and a 5-year Doctor of Medicine program. It has three extension campuses located in various parts of the Philippines. The extension campuses in Koronadal City, South Cotabato, and Baler, Aurora were established in 2010, and the third is in Tarlac City that started its operation in 2021. The three extension campuses offer the Diploma in Midwifery and the BS Nursing programs.

The participants were the college employees of the four campuses. They must be working either full-time or part-time, with permanent or temporary employment status, and have been working for at least 6 months in the said college. Those participants who were on leave or on official travel during the data gathering period were excluded from the study. The participants were selected through purposive sampling.

Sample size determination

The sample size was determined using the Raosoft online sample size calculator. Excluding the two researchers of the study who are faculty members of the said college, there are 71 college employees throughout the four

campuses. With 5% margin of error, a 95% confidence level, and 50% response distribution, 61 participants were needed.

Research instrument

A self-report questionnaire was used in gathering the data. This is composed of four parts. The first part is a checklist which determined the participant's age, sex, marital status, monthly income, employment status, work position, and years of experience in the college.

The second part assessed the perceived teamwork using the TeamSTEPPS Teamwork Perceptions Questionnaire.^[19,20] The questionnaire has 35 items categorized into five subscales, namely, teamwork structure, teamwork leadership, situational monitoring, teamwork support, and communication. Participants were asked to answer every item in a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Extremely disagree to 5 = Extremely agree. Higher mean scores indicate better acknowledgement of teamwork. The internal consistency of the tool has been demonstrated from a previous study with an overall Cronbach's alpha coefficient above 0.70.^[20]

The third part assessed the participant's moral sensitivity level utilizing the Ethical Sensitivity Scale (ESS).^[21] The ESS has seven subscales: (a) reading and expressing emotions, (b) taking the perspectives of others, (c) caring by connecting to others, (d) working with interpersonal and group differences, (e) preventing social bias, (f) generating interpretations and options, and (g) identifying the consequences of actions and options. The tool has 28 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. Higher scores indicate greater ethical sensitivity. The internal consistency results of the total scale from a previous study showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.856.^[22]

The fourth part assessed work engagement of the employees utilizing the 17-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, which was developed by Schaufeli and Bakker.^[23] The tool is divided into three subscales: vigor, dedication, and absorption. In this question, participants were asked to rate how they felt about their current job. If participants report they never had this feeling, the zero option will be answered in the space. If they claim they have previously had this feeling, they are requested to answer the items on a 6-point Likert scale so that the responses best described how frequently they felt that way (1 = Almost never/a few times a year or less to 6 = Always/every day). Higher scores indicate a higher level of work engagement. A previous study demonstrated internal consistency of the tool utilizing the Cronbach's alpha in a range from 0.85 to 0.92 (median = 0.92).^[24]

Data collection process

A permission letter to conduct the study was secured from the college dean. Upon approval, coordination with the administrative officer and the human resource officer was made to determine the population. Similarly, coordination was conducted with the department chairs and the directors of the extension campuses for the selection of the target participants. Targeted participants were initially contacted personally and online as a preliminary process of recruitment for their participation of the survey. The researchers secured informed consents to all participants, indicating that they participated voluntarily, and all their questions and clarifications were answered before the actual survey. The survey was conducted face-to-face and online (i.e., Google Forms). Those who participated online were contacted through Facebook Messenger and Email. The survey can be finished in 20–30 min. Those who refused to participate were respected and were not coerced to answer the survey. The data were collected from January 2025 to March 2025. A total of 61 employees were recruited in the study. However, there were only 49 college employees who participated in the study. This equates to an 80.33% response rate.

Data analysis

After data collection, tallying and coding of the data were made in Micro soft Excel. Actual analysis was made using the IBM SPSS ver. 24. Descriptive statistics include frequency counts, percentages, mean, and standard deviation (SD). Correlations between the participants' demographic profile and their perceived levels of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement were determined using Spearman's rho correlations (between scale independent and dependent variables), point biserial correlations (between binary nominal and scale variables), and eta correlations (between multinomial and scale variables). Correlations between and among teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement were conducted using Spearman's rho correlation. The significance level will be set where $P < 0.05$.

Ethical considerations of the study

This study underwent ethical review from a local review ethics board with ethics review code: A-2024-141. Permission letter to conduct the study was secured from the Office of the Dean. Each participant signed a written informed consent. For personal surveys, signed consent was secured through a printed informed consent form, whereas those who participated online, informed consent was secured before answering the online Google form survey. Voluntary participation was observed throughout the study. Information about the study, purposes, possible benefits, risk, and harm was relayed to all participants. Participants were informed that they can withdraw from participating at any point of the

study. Possible risk in participating in the study includes breach of confidentiality and the consequences of such a breach. To prevent this, confidentiality and anonymity of the participants were maintained throughout the study. They were not paid in their participation but were given a message of appreciation after the survey. The researchers declare no conflict of interest over the participants or the study. All data were used solely for the current study. Raw data were deleted thereafter.

Results

A total of 49 college employees participated in the study. Most of them were females ($n = 28$ or 57.14%) with a mean age of 38.82 years old ($SD = 9.99$ years old) and married ($n = 35$ or 71.43%). Moreover, most of them were permanently employed ($n = 27$ or 55.11%), working as faculty members ($n = 28$ or 57.14%) with a monthly income of P30,000 – P39,999 ($n = 14$ or 28.57%). Marital status was significantly and positively correlated with moral sensitivity ($rpb = 0.400$, $P = 0.012$) and work engagement ($rpb = 0.329$, $P = 0.041$). Similarly, employment status was significantly and positively correlated with teamwork ($\eta = 0.456$, $P = 0.011$) and moral sensitivity ($\eta = 0.351$, $P = 0.035$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Table 1 summarizes the personal profiles of the participants and its correlations to teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement.

Table 2 presents the perceived level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement among college employees. The overall teamwork mean score was 3.86 ($SD = 0.72$), indicating a high level. In terms of its subscales, the highest mean score was on teamwork structure (mean = 4.03, $SD = 0.69$), whereas the lowest was on situational monitoring (mean = 3.63, $SD = 0.77$). Nevertheless, the mean scores of all subscales indicated high levels.

The overall moral sensitivity mean score was high (4.14 [$SD = 0.38$]). In its subscales, the lowest was on "Identifying the consequences of actions and options," a mean score of 3.82 ($SD = 0.72$), but still indicates a high mean score, whereas the highest was on "Caring by connecting others" with a mean score of 4.43 ($SD = 0.47$).

In terms of work engagement, the mean scores were 4.99 ($SD = 0.84$) for vigor, 5.19 ($SD = 0.82$) for dedication, 4.53 ($SD = 0.97$) for absorption, and 4.90 ($SD = 0.78$) for the composite mean of work engagement. These indicated that college employees experienced a high level (i.e., "at least once a week") to very high level (i.e., "a couple of times per week or daily") of vigor, dedication, absorption, and overall work engagement.

Table 3 shows that correlations on the perceived level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement

Table 1: Personal profile of the participants and its correlations to teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement (n=49)

Characteristic	Frequency, n (%)	Teamwork	Moral sensitivity	Work engagement
Age (years old)				
Mean	38.82	-0.183 ^a	0.181 ^a	0.107 ^a
SD	9.99	0.264	0.270	0.516
Sex				
Male	21 (42.86)	-0.199 ^b	-0.058 ^b	0.269 ^b
Female	28 (57.14)	0.224	0.726	0.098
Marital status				
Single	14 (28.57)	0.116 ^b	0.400 ^{*,b}	0.329 ^{*,b}
Married	35 (71.43)	0.480	0.012	0.041
Employment status				
Temporary/job order	16 (32.65)	0.456 ^{*,c}	0.351 ^{*,c}	0.295 ^c
Casual	6 (12.24)	0.011	0.035	0.373
Permanent	27 (55.11)			
Work position				
Administrative staff	19 (38.77)	0.531 ^c	0.283 ^c	0.077 ^c
Faculty members	28 (57.14)	0.059	0.300	0.848
School administrator/manager/head	2 (4.09)			
Monthly income				
P10,000 – P19,999	3 (6.12)	0.645 ^c	0.540 ^c	0.368 ^c
P20,000 – P29,999	6 (12.24)	0.835	0.217	0.852
P30,000 – P39,999	14 (28.57)			
P40,000 – P49,999	11 (22.45)			
P50,000 – P59,999	7 (14.29)			
P60,000 – P69,999	1 (2.04)			
P70,000 – P79,999	2 (4.09)			
P80,000 – P89,999	1 (2.04)			
P90,000 – P99,999	1 (2.04)			
P100,000 and more	3 (6.12)			

*Significant at 0.05 level, ^aSpearman's rho correlation, ^bPoint biserial correlations, ^cEta correlations. SD: Standard deviation

Table 2: Participant's perceived level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement

Variables	Minimum score	Maximum score	Mean (SD)
Teamwork (overall)	1.00	5.00	3.86 (0.72)
Teamwork structure	2.00	5.00	4.03 (0.69)
Teamwork leadership	1.00	5.00	3.69 (1.09)
Situational monitoring	1.00	5.00	3.63 (0.77)
Teamwork support	1.00	5.00	3.78 (0.84)
Communication	2.00	5.00	4.13 (0.64)
Moral sensitivity (overall)	1.00	5.00	4.14 (0.38)
Reading and expressing emotions	2.00	5.00	4.07 (0.64)
Taking the perspectives of others	2.00	5.00	4.09 (0.66)
Caring by connecting to others	3.00	5.00	4.43 (0.47)
Working with interpersonal and group differences	3.00	5.00	4.26 (0.51)
Preventing social bias	1.00	5.00	3.99 (0.76)
Generating interpretations and options	3.00	5.00	4.34 (0.49)
Identifying the consequences of actions and options	1.00	5.00	3.82 (0.72)
Work engagement (overall)	1.00	6.00	4.90 (0.78)
Vigor	1.00	6.00	4.99 (0.84)
Dedication	2.00	6.00	5.19 (0.82)
Absorption	2.00	6.00	4.53 (0.97)

SD: Standard deviation

of college employees. Moral sensitivity was positively correlated with teamwork ($r_s = 0.355$, $P = 0.027$), vigor ($r_s = 0.448$, $P = 0.004$), dedication ($r_s = 0.460$, $P = 0.003$),

and overall work engagement ($r_s = 0.398$, $P = 0.012$). The overall work engagement and its subscales are significantly and positively correlated with each other.

Table 3: Correlations between variable of interest

Variables	Teamwork	Moral sensitivity	Vigor	Dedication	Absorption
Teamwork	1.000				
Moral sensitivity	0.355*	1.000			
	0.027				
Vigor	0.077	0.448**	1.000		
	0.643	0.004			
Dedication	0.100	0.460**	0.793**	1.000	
	0.547	0.003	<0.001		
Absorption	0.093	0.264	0.722**	0.600**	1.000
	0.575	0.104	<0.001	<0.001	
Overall work engagement	0.107	0.398*	0.893**	0.846**	0.896**
	0.515	0.012	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

*Significant at 0.05 level, **Significant at 0.01 level

Overall work engagement is positively correlated with vigor ($r_s = 0.893$, $P \leq 0.001$), dedication ($r_s = 0.846$, $P \leq 0.001$), and absorption ($r_s = 0.896$, $P \leq 0.001$). Vigor was positively correlated with dedication ($r_s = 0.793$, $P \leq 0.001$), and absorption ($r_s = 0.722$, $P \leq 0.001$), whereas dedication was positively correlated with absorption ($r_s = 0.600$, $P \leq 0.001$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

The purpose of the study was to determine the level of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement and the relationship between them among faculty members, school administrators, and supporting staff in a government HEI.

The current study showed that the perceived levels of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement were high. Teamwork is necessary toward achieving success in work. In perceived teamwork, the dimension with the highest score was “communication,” followed by “teamwork structure.” College employees, especially professors, are strongly recommended to establish a structured cooperation to be able to ascertain achievement on effective teamwork. Moreover, communication is an integral element in teamwork. Structured cooperation is strengthened on trust, and trust necessitates the establishment of two-way communication.^[25] Mean scores of teamwork and its subscales of the current study were higher than previous studies involving hospital nurses.^[26,27] The current study showed also that situational monitoring has the lowest score among teamwork subscales, similar to previous studies.^[25,26] Situation monitoring is the individual’s awareness in their work environment and being part of the organizational performance and functioning.^[28] As such, in situation monitoring, employees have a clear understanding of the job roles of all members of the team to be able to determine actual or potential performance errors. In addition, employment status was positively

correlated with teamwork. Most of our participants were permanent employees of the college, regardless of their work position. Permanent employees have better opportunities to grow and enhance their skills over time within the team. While they continuously enrich their work experiences, they are able to gain a clearer and deeper understanding of their functions and roles and the organization’s mission, vision, and goals. They are more apt to develop teamwork, promote team cohesions, loyalty, and skills development.^[29]

The current study also showed that college employees have high levels of moral sensitivity and its dimensions. This finding was similar to previous studies involving barangay health workers,^[6] and hospital nurses.^[30] Moral actions and ethical orientations among college employees influence their professional conduct. However, professional conduct of college employees depends on the culture and their level of perception between what is wrong and right. The right action will eventually result in desirable consequences.^[31] The findings of the current study suggest that college employees may have a keen awareness of the ethical and moral considerations in their work environment, to their coworkers, and to the students. Moreover, they might have a strong sense of duty toward the development and achievement of the goals of the college, and the university. As such, they have a high regard and sense of responsibility in upholding moral standards on their roles as educators and supporting staff to the students who are expected to be morally upright in serving the people of the unserved and underserved communities. In addition, marital status and employment status were positively correlated with moral sensitivity. A previous study among nurses also showed a positive correlation between marital status,^[32,33] and employment status,^[33] with moral sensitivity. The influence of marital status or employment to moral sensitivity can be affected according to one’s profession, the study context, other demographic characteristics involved, or challenging situations.^[33]

The perceived level of work engagement of the participants also showed a high mean score. This may indicate that employees were imbued in their work and the college where they were working. Previous studies showed a high level of work engagement among hospital nurses,^[34] primary health care physicians,^[35] and public employees.^[36] However, the result of the current study showed higher work engagement level compared to previous studies among university employees from foreign settings.^[37,38] Being a university or college employee poses a high risk of job stress. The stressors may range from heavy workload, the nature of work,^[38] and even the utilization of available technology.^[39] Stress is a triggering factor that may lead the employee to build up job burnout. However, literature showed that engaged employees are less likely to experience burnout and may even lead to better work performance.^[40,41] Work engagement is a positive predictor of work environment well-being characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption.^[16,24] As such, work engagement promotes positive work outcomes^[41] among college employees, wherein it might also positively affect the academic performance^[42] and psychological well-being^[43] of the students.

The findings of the current study also showed a positive correlation between moral sensitivity and teamwork, and work engagement. Previous studies also showed positive correlations between moral sensitivity and teamwork among hospital nurses,^[27] and between moral sensitivity and work engagement among barangay health workers.^[6] The UPM-SHS is a government HEI and has been established with its mandate to train competent midwives, nurses, and physicians who will serve the Filipino people in unserved and underserved communities in the country.^[44] These students are expected to imbibe the core values of heroism, service excellence, and social accountability. Faculty members and supporting staff of the college are expected to uphold moral standards for them to be able to develop students with dedication and commitment to serve the people. Moreover, teamwork and engaged employees are crucial in the achievement of the vision, mission, and goals of the college.

The findings of the current study have several implications. First, university and college administrators should pay attention to maintain and enhance the construction of teamwork, upholding moral sensitivity, and work engagement. These three factors play crucial role in training competent, socially accountable, and ethically grounded midwives, nurses, and doctors according to the needs of the communities, and ultimately, in the achievement of the goals, mission, and vision of the college. Second, the findings may provide insights to the college employees with the opportunity

to reflect their work experiences in the college and training the students while demonstrating higher levels of teamwork, and moral sensitivity, which could affect their work engagement.

Limitations of the study

The researchers recognize some limitations of the study. First, the data were self-reported and may not reflect the actual teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement behaviors of the participants. Second, the data were drawn from one college of a university, as well as a low response rate in the recruitment of participants. These limit the degree of generalizability. Future studies are recommended involving a larger scope and coverage. Third, the study employed a cross-sectional design that only determines the relationships between the variables of interest and not the causality. Nevertheless, the study is an empirical evidence that provides significant insights into how teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement interplay among employees working in a government HEI toward the achievement of its vision and mission.

Conclusions

Employees in a government HEI reported high levels of teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement. Moral sensitivity was positively correlated with teamwork and work engagement. Moreover, marital status was positively correlated with moral sensitivity and work engagement, whereas employment status was positively correlated with teamwork and moral sensitivity. Therefore, strategies to maintain and enhance teamwork, moral sensitivity, and work engagement are recommended through various activities such as team-building workshops, staff development, and/or leadership trainings.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Adams SY. The Importance of Institutional Culture at a Technical College (Doctoral Dissertation, Marquette University); 2014. Available from: https://epublications.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1336&context=dissertations_mu. [Last accessed on 2024 Aug 10].
2. Dempsey SH. Study of Prosocial Behavior, Workplace Civility, and Work Engagement Among Employees in Higher Education (Doctoral Dissertation, University of South Carolina); 2021. Available from: <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2572566085?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true&sourcetype=Dissertations%20and%20Theses>. [Last accessed on 2024 Aug 10].
3. Morales-Huamán HI, Medina-Valderrama CJ, Valencia-Arias A,

- Vasquez-Coronado MH, Valencia J, Delgado-Caramutti J. Organizational culture and teamwork: A bibliometric perspective on public and private organizations. *Sustainability* 2023;15:13966.
4. Pandey R, Chitranshi J. The Impact of Organisational Culture on Employees' Behaviour in Research and Development Organisation. In: AIP Conference Proceedings. Vol. 2523. AIP Publishing; 2023.
5. Irfan M, Alaloul WS, Ghufuran M, Yaseen G, Thaheem MJ, Qureshi AH, et al. Analyzing the impact of organizational culture on social sustainability: a perspective of the construction industry. *Environ Dev Sustain*. 2024;26:1103-33.
6. Delante K, Lagura G. Moral sensitivity and work values as determinants of work engagement among barangay health workers. *Int J Sci Res Manage* 2024;12:10-18535.
7. Kim H, Kim H, Oh Y. Impact of ethical climate, moral distress, and moral sensitivity on turnover intention among haemodialysis nurses: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Nurs* 2023;22:55.
8. Jaafarpour M, Khani A. Evaluation of the nurses' job satisfaction, and its association with their moral sensitivities and well-being. *J Clin Diagn Res* 2012;6:1761-4.
9. Godbless EE. Moral leadership, shared values, employee engagement, and staff job performance in the university value chain. *Int J Organ Leadersh* 2021;10:15-38.
10. Schaufeli WB, Martinez IM, Pinto AM, Salanova M, Bakker AB. Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *J Cross Cult Psychol* 2002;33:464-81.
11. Kahn WA. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Acad Manage J* 1990;33:692-724.
12. Demerouti E, Cropanzano R, Bakker A, Leiter M. From thought to action: Employee work engagement and job performance. In: *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*. New York, USA: Psychology Press; 2010;65:147-63. Available from: https://books.google.com.ph/books?hl=en&lr=&id=IZJ5AgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA147&ots=N1QF_Nhd7V&sig=DFvCZvEQQ-3JGL03VAvcsEPyCvg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false. [Last accessed on 2024 August 10].
13. Rich BL, Lepine JA, Crawford ER. Job engagement: Antecedents and effects on job performance. *Acad Manage J* 2010;53:617-35.
14. Schaufeli WB, Taris T, Le Blanc P, Peeters M, Bakker AB, De Jonge J. Does work make work healthy? In search of the enthusiastic employee. [Does work make happy. 2001,]; 2001. p. 422-8.. Available from: <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2001-11526-001>. [Last accessed on 2024 Aug 10].
15. Grzywacz JG, Marks NF. Reconceptualizing the work-family interface: An ecological perspective on the correlates of positive and negative spillover between work and family. *J Occup Health Psychol* 2000;5:111-26.
16. Bakker AB. An evidence-based model of work engagement. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2011;20:265-9.
17. Ergashev B. Public administration reform in Uzbekistan. *Probl Econ Transit* 2006;48:32-82.
18. Zukhriddinovich ED. Analysis of the policy of the republic of Uzbekistan regarding international non-governmental organization. *J Polit Sci Int Relat* 2020;3:9-15. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dilmurod-Ernazarov/publication/340429322_Analysis_of_the_Policy_of_the_Republic_of_Uzbekistan_Regarding_International_Non-governmental_Organization/links/5e88545d299bf1307978d84f/Analysis-of-the-Policy-of-the-Republic-of-Uzbekistan-Regarding-International-Non-governmental-Organization.pdf. [Last accessed on 2025 Aug 01].
19. Khoshnoodifar M, Emadi N, Mosalanejad L, Maghsoodzadeh S, Shokrpour N. A new practical approach using TeamSTEPPS strategies and tools: An educational design. *BMC Med Educ* 2024;24:22.
20. Qu J, Zhu Y, Cui L, Yang L, Lai Y, Ye X, et al. Psychometric properties of the Chinese version of the TeamSTEPPS teamwork perceptions questionnaire to measure teamwork perceptions of Chinese residents: A cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e039566.
21. Tirri K, Nokelainen P. Measuring Multiple Intelligences and Moral Sensitivities in Education. Vol. 5. Sense Publishers: Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Springer Science and Business Media; 2012. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Petri-Nokelainen/publication/302412864_Ethical_Sensitivity_Scale/links/5c0e7a4ba6fdcc494fe9dc7e/Ethical-Sensitivity-Scale.pdf. [Last accessed on 2025 Aug 01].
22. Güneşer R, Kirmilioğlu N, Kalaycioğlu O. Validity and reliability of the Turkish version of the ethical sensitivity scale. *Ethics Behav* 2025. p. 1-14.
23. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB. Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *J Organ Behav Int J Ind Occup Organ Psychol Behav* 2004;25:293-315.
24. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Salanova M. The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. *Educ Psychol Meas* 2006;66:701-16.
25. Wijayanti TC. Influence of Interpersonal Communication and Teamwork on Organization to Enhance Employee Performance: A Case Study. In: 1st UMGESHIC International Seminar on Health, Social Science and Humanities (UMGESHIC-ISHSSH 2020). Atlantis Press; 2021. p. 425-31.
26. Kakemam E, Hajizadeh A, Azarmi M, Zahedi H, Gholizadeh M, Roh YS. Nurses' perception of teamwork and its relationship with the occurrence and reporting of adverse events: A questionnaire survey in teaching hospitals. *J Nurs Manag* 2021;29:1189-98.
27. Nobahar M, Ameri M, Goli S. The relationship between teamwork, moral sensitivity, and missed nursing care in intensive care unit nurses. *BMC Nurs* 2023;22:241.
28. Castner J. Validity and reliability of the brief TeamSTEPPS teamwork perceptions questionnaire. *J Nurs Meas* 2012;20:186-98.
29. Adecco Australia. The Power of Permanence: Exploring the Top 5 Advantages of Hiring Permanent Employees; 2023. Available from: <https://www.adecco.com/en-au/news-and-resources/the-power-of-permanence-exploring-the-top-5-advantages-of-hiring-permanent-employees>. [Last accessed on 2025 Sep 20].
30. Jia W, Chen X, Fang J, Cao H. Association of teamwork, moral sensitivity and missed nursing care in ICU nurses: A cross-sectional study. *J Clin Nurs* 2025;34:1801-7.
31. Namagembe S, Ntayi JM. Individual ethical orientations, ethical sensitivity and professional conduct of academic staff in universities in Uganda. *Int J Econ Manage Sci* 2012;6:56-64. Available from: https://d1wqtxs1xle7.cloudfront.net/112703073/individual-ethical-orientations-ethical-sensitivity-and-professional-conduct-of-academic-staff-in-universities-in-uganda-2162-6359-1-055-libre.pdf?1711284018=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DIndividual_Ethical_Orientations_Ethical.pdf&Expires=1756009032&Signature=NJAWiLMhvF84a2Pb3Ws_K0qaPm6yCsYyDz1yy0Ja59VFyc6fEDGax0n~YJFcb402kib6LvwSVB0RYOnCZYd3Fs7V0SiT2gLIFFnY8Dn689Vlm7-cbY0Mge~pHQmdcJC1WUg0Ue4oyVZif34VhIBzTIdB8e3jVyawwYvFZWibNqPzGwqb1sX4UiGyvzdpdqCNqOsbftzRVHeeXZQQfHK02uEE6xkYW7Fb62z2gU~8hmxxruV4kBT-GRG8OAwlZMrgmJTUmeOMJQ593BhRHh89XFQ-jEf0c793dfAnWeNZ~0QO6SYiOReKmg3Abx-cqpyKrCFB3un3lqM~vesRODRjvg__&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA. [Last accessed on 2025 Sep 20].
32. Darzi-Ramandi M, Sadeghi A, Tapak L, Purfarzad Z. Relationship between moral sensitivity of nurses and quality of nursing care for patients with COVID-19. *Nurs Open* 2023;10:5252-60.
33. Bordbar S, Bahmaei J, Rad HF, Yusefi AR. Investigate the state of critical thinking and its impact on moral courage and moral sensitivity; evidence from nurses' perspective. *BMC Nurs* 2024;23:825.
34. Falguera CC, Labrague LJ, De Los Santos JA, Firmo CN, Tsaras K. Predictive roles of organizational and personal factors in work

- engagement among nurses. *Front Nurs* 2022;9:379-87.
35. Lourenção LG, Sodré PC, Gazetta CE, Silva AG, Castro JR, Maniglia JV. Occupational stress and work engagement among primary healthcare physicians: A cross-sectional study. *Sao Paulo Med J* 2022;140:747-54.
36. Khusanova R, Kang SW, Choi SB. Work engagement among public employees: Antecedents and consequences. *Front Psychol* 2021;12:684495.
37. Jones R, Credeur DP, McCoy SM. Occupational sitting and work engagement among university employees. *J Am Coll Health* 2023;71:600-6.
38. Sarfaraz M, Sarfaraz S, Maqsood A, Ahmed N, Vohra F, Abduljabbar T, *et al.* Assessing the impact of workaholism and work engagement on medical university employee stress and satisfaction levels. *PeerJ* 2022;10:e12565.
39. Oraño JT, Falguera CC. Technostress among digital generations nurse educators in South-Central Mindanao Philippines. *J Prof Nurs* 2025;59:73-7.
40. Molero Jurado MD, Pérez-Fuentes MD, Barragán Martín AB, Gázquez Linares JJ, Oropesa Ruiz NF, Simón Márquez MD. Emotional intelligence components as predictors of engagement in nursing professionals by sex. *Healthcare (Basel)* 2020;8:42.
41. Falguera CC, Labrague LJ, Firmo CN, De Los Santos JA, Tsaras K. Relationship of work engagement with nurse work and patient outcomes among nurses in Central Philippines. *Acta Med Philipp* 2023;57:24-31.
42. Wang L. Exploring the relationship among teacher emotional intelligence, work engagement, teacher self-efficacy, and student academic achievement: A moderated mediation model. *Front Psychol* 2021;12:810559.
43. Falguera CC, Labrague LJ, De Los Santos JA. The relationship between COVID-19 anxiety and student nurses' perceived health, sleep quality, and psychological well-being. *Acta Med Philipp* 2023;57:82-9.
44. University of the Philippines Manila (UP Manila). School of Health Sciences. The UP Manila Catalogue of Information; 2014. p. 242-52.