Applied Quantitative Analysis, Vol. 6 No. 1 (2026) https://doi.org/10.31098/quant.4413

Research Paper

Adversity Quotient of the Probationary Faculty Members in Philippine State Universities (Region III)

Stefhan Angelo A. Payad[1*], Christian L. Banal[2], Jennifer Victoria N. Genato[3], Vladimir B. Villejo[4], May D. Borja[5], and Mark Jay P. Asutilla[6]

[1,3,4,5,6] National University, Philippines

[2] De La Salle University-Dasmariñas

Received : April 20, 2026	Revised : June 29, 2026	Accepted : June 30, 2026	Online : June 30, 2026

Abstract

This research investigated Paul Stoltz's Adversity Quotient (AQ) among probationary faculty members across selected state universities in the Philippines. The study aimed to assess their AQ profile across the CORE dimensions of Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance and to determine the relationship between selected demographic variables and AQ. Using a descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 100 respondents selected using Yamane's formula through employing the Adversity Quotient Profile (AQP). Pearson's product-moment correlation, point-biserial correlation, and Spearman's rank-order correlation were used according to the measurement level of the variables. Results indicated that the average respondent was 28 years old, predominantly male, held a bachelor's degree, and had three years of service. Participants generally exhibited moderate levels of control, ownership, and endurance but scored below average in reach, resulting in an overall average AQ. Correlational analyses indicated that none of the selected demographic variables, namely age, sex, length of service, and educational attainment, were significantly associated with the Adversity Quotient (AQ) of probationary faculty members. The findings suggest that probationary faculty members generally demonstrated an average level of Adversity Quotient, indicating a moderate capacity to cope with workplace challenges. Although no significant relationships were found between the selected demographic variables and AQ, the study highlights the value of fostering resilience and adaptive coping through faculty development initiatives. These findings offer practical insights for higher education institutions in designing mentoring, wellness, and professional development programs that support faculty well-being and sustained professional engagement.

Keywords: *Adversity Quotient, Probationary Faculty, Higher Education, Resilience, Human Resource Development*

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed persistent vulnerabilities in the education sector, exacerbating existing inequalities and placing unprecedented demands on higher education institutions. Among those most affected were probationary faculty, who frequently faced job insecurity, inconsistent compensation, and heavier workloads than their tenured counterparts (Ott & Cisneros, 2015; Villena, 2019). In the Philippine context, contract-based faculty represented a significant share of the academic workforce. Yet they remained vulnerable to unstable employment, limited opportunities for professional development, and inadequate institutional support (Wa-Mbaleka, 2015). These challenges underscore the importance of resilience in sustaining teachers' academic performance and professional growth.

In 1997, Paul Soltz proposed the Adversity Quotient (AQ), which provides a framework for understanding resilience and adaptability. AQ measures participants' responses to setbacks and challenges across the CORE dimensions. High levels of AQ are associated with persistence, problem-solving capacity, and a greater likelihood of overcoming obstacles in professional settings (Stoltz, 2000; Singh & Sharma, 2017). Previous studies in educational contexts have shown that AQ

Corresponding author's email: sapayad@national-u.edu.ph

influences teacher performance, stress management, and leadership effectiveness (Aquino, 2013; Sison et al., 2020; Pino & Merin, 2021). Atienza (2023) reported that participants faced considerable challenges in transitioning to the new normal. Even so, the findings highlighted their resilience and willingness to explore alternative approaches to addressing these challenges, with the goal of sustaining meaningful, high-quality learning experiences for their students. The relevance of adversity quotient (AQ) has also been examined among university students, particularly in Asian contexts. Among nursing interns, Gou et al. (2024) identified distinct AQ profiles that were significantly associated with depression, coping styles, positive psychological capital, and professional adaptability. Their findings suggest that individuals with higher AQ scores are generally better positioned to cope with the demands of clinical training and workplace transitions. Similar patterns emerged in the healthcare profession. Drawing on evidence from multiple studies, Saxena and Rathore (2024) concluded that AQ plays an important role in shaping healthcare professionals' mental health and professional quality of life, with higher AQ often associated with lower levels of burnout, stress, and emotional exhaustion. Likewise, Luo et al. (2025) found that nurses with stronger AQ reported lower occupational stress, while professional identity served as an important mechanism through which AQ influenced work-related experiences. Beyond healthcare settings, Wang et al. (2025) highlighted the academic implications of AQ by showing that it contributes to the development of self-regulated learning strategies among Chinese university students through achievement motivation. This finding suggests that students with higher AQ may be better able to navigate academic challenges and maintain engagement in their learning. Taken together, these studies point to the broad influence of AQ on individuals' capacity to adapt, persevere, and perform effectively across both educational and professional contexts.

Although research on Adversity Quotient (AQ) has expanded across educational and professional settings, existing studies have primarily focused on school administrators, educational leaders, tenured faculty, students, and healthcare professionals (Baroa, 2015; Gou et al., 2024; Saxena & Rathore, 2024; Luo et al., 2025). These studies consistently demonstrate the importance of AQ for promoting resilience, adaptability, professional effectiveness, and psychological well-being. However, probationary faculty members remain largely underexamined, particularly in Philippine state universities.

This gap is significant because probationary faculty occupy a unique position in higher education institutions. Unlike permanent faculty members, they often face employment insecurity, heightened performance pressures, limited institutional support, and uncertainty about tenure status. These conditions may shape how they respond to workplace challenges and sustain their professional effectiveness. Despite their substantial contributions to instruction, research, and extension services, little empirical evidence exists on the adversity quotient of probationary faculty in Philippine state universities.

Addressing this gap is important for developing evidence-based human resource policies, faculty development initiatives, and institutional support mechanisms that strengthen educators' resilience and professional growth. Consequently, this study investigates the Adversity Quotient of probationary faculty members at selected State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) in Region III, Philippines. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How may the demographic profile of the probationary faculty members be described in terms of:
    1.1 Age;
    1.2 Gender;
    1.3 Length of Service; and
    1.4 Educational Attainment?

2. How may the Adversity Quotient of the probationary faculty members be described across the CORE dimensions of:
    2.1 Control;
    2.2 Ownership;
    2.3 Reach; and
    2.4 Endurance?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the demographic characteristics of probationary faculty members and their Adversity Quotient?
4. Based on the findings, what human resource development interventions may be proposed to enhance probationary faculty members' Adversity Quotient?
5. What implications do the findings have for human resource development and educational management within higher education institutions?

Significance of Study

For all state university administrators, the findings of this study may offer valuable insights into the challenges probationary faculty members face. This understanding can inform the development of policies, programs, and support mechanisms that promote faculty well-being, resilience, and professional growth. Moreover, the results may help educational leaders align institutional goals with personnel needs, thereby fostering improved faculty performance, organizational effectiveness, and overall institutional success.

For the Human Resource Department and management, the findings of this study may provide a basis for assessing faculty members' Adversity Quotient, enabling the identification of their strengths and areas for development in relation to institutional goals. The results may also support the enhancement of human resource functions, not only in performance management but also in the design and implementation of programs that promote employee well-being, health, and safety. Furthermore, the study may inform improvements in recruitment and selection processes and the strengthening of training and professional development initiatives.

For lecturers, the findings may offer meaningful insights into their Adversity Quotient and its role in managing the challenges of academic work. Greater awareness of their responses to adversity may prompt reflection on their professional practices, interpersonal relationships, and coping strategies for addressing workplace demands, thereby supporting both personal and professional growth within the institution.

For future researchers, this study may serve as a relevant reference for further investigations into Adversity Quotient, particularly among faculty members in higher education. It may also provide a basis for comparative studies across educational institutions, employment classifications, or demographic profiles.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Adversity Quotient Theory

Stoltz (1997) introduced the concept of Adversity Quotient (AQ) as a measure of an individual's capacity to respond effectively to adversity, setbacks, and challenges. Stoltz later operationalized the construct through the CORE framework, consisting of Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance (Stoltz, 2000). Individuals with high AQ demonstrate greater persistence, resilience, and productivity despite difficult circumstances.

AQ shares theoretical foundations with several psychological theories. It closely aligns with Resilience Theory (Masten, 2001), which emphasizes positive adaptation despite adversity, and with Grit Theory (Duckworth et al., 2007), which highlights sustained perseverance toward long-

term goals. Likewise, AQ reflects principles of Self-Efficacy Theory (Bandura, 1997), particularly individuals' beliefs in their ability to manage challenging situations, and of Psychological Capital Theory (Luthans et al., 2007), which integrates hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism as resources for overcoming workplace difficulties.

The multidimensional nature of AQ distinguishes it from related psychological constructs by explaining how individuals interpret and respond to adverse events through the CORE dimensions, rather than measuring resilience or perseverance alone.

The literature establishes AQ as a comprehensive psychological framework that explains how individuals perceive, manage, and overcome adversity. While AQ shares elements with resilience, grit, self-efficacy, and psychological capital, its CORE dimensions offer a more specific lens for understanding behavioral responses to workplace challenges. These theoretical foundations justify using AQ as the guiding framework for examining probationary faculty members who routinely encounter professional uncertainties and organizational demands.

AQ in Educational Work Settings

AQ has attracted growing attention in educational settings because of its links to teaching effectiveness, leadership, resilience, and workplace performance. Aquino (2013) found that AQ significantly influenced leadership effectiveness among secondary school administrators in Tarlac. Similarly, Bautista (2015) reported that higher AQ was associated with improved classroom management and instructional delivery among teachers.

In higher education, Sison et al. (2020) observed that faculty members at Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology generally exhibited moderate AQ levels, which significantly affected their job performance.

Recent international studies have reinforced these findings. Marashi and Rashidian (2018) reported that English as a Foreign Language teachers with higher AQ showed greater instructional effectiveness and professional growth. Likewise, Ghassemi-Fam and Nosratinia (2022) found that novice teachers with higher AQ developed stronger teaching self-efficacy.

Beyond teaching performance, AQ has also been linked to educational resilience. During the COVID-19 pandemic, Safi'i et al. (2021) found that AQ positively predicted academic achievement despite educational disruptions. Wang et al. (2025) further reported that AQ enhanced university students' self-regulated learning by strengthening achievement motivation and persistence amid academic challenges.

The literature consistently shows that AQ enhances effectiveness in educational settings by fostering instructional competence, leadership capacity, resilience, and sustained academic engagement. Although prior studies have extensively examined teachers, administrators, and students, research on probationary faculty members remains scarce. This gap underscores the need to investigate AQ among early-career faculty who face unique professional demands during their probationary period.

AQ among Contractual and Probationary Faculty

Employment status has been recognized as an important factor in resilience and workplace adjustment. In the Philippine context, Villagonzalo (2016) and Villena (2019) observed that contractual and job-order employees generally exhibited lower resilience, which negatively affected job satisfaction and work engagement.

Among educators, Banal and Ortega-Dela Cruz (2022) found that private school teachers developed a range of resilience strategies to cope with increased workloads during the COVID-19 pandemic. Similarly, Pino and Merin (2021) emphasized the importance of AQ in helping teachers adapt to remote teaching environments.

Studies have also linked AQ to teachers' well-being. Prasad and John (2021) found that educators with higher AQ experienced less burnout and greater job satisfaction. Alam et al. (2020) similarly concluded that resilient faculty members maintained stronger intrinsic motivation and consistent teaching performance despite workplace stress.

Despite these findings, empirical studies specifically examining AQ among probationary faculty in higher education remain scarce, particularly in Philippine state universities, where probationary employment often entails heightened performance expectations, limited job security, and multiple institutional responsibilities.

Existing literature suggests that employment conditions influence employees' ability to cope with workplace adversity. However, most previous studies have examined contractual employees broadly or teachers in general, without specifically investigating probationary faculty in higher education. This limitation highlights an important research gap, as probationary faculty experience distinct organizational pressures that may shape their adversity quotient and professional adjustment.

AQ as a Human Resource Development Framework

AQ has become increasingly recognized as a valuable framework in organizational development and human resource management. In organizational settings, employees with higher AQ demonstrate stronger job performance, adaptability, resilience, and problem-solving under stress (Phoolka & Kaur, 2012).

Research from Malaysia similarly reports that AQ promotes emotional regulation, workplace engagement, and effective coping with organizational change (Matore & Khairani, 2015). Indonesian studies likewise find that AQ positively influences innovation, adaptability, and persistence during workplace transformation (Anwar et al., 2024).

Leadership research conducted in China and Singapore further demonstrates that AQ contributes to stronger decision-making, emotional stability, and adaptive leadership during organizational crises (Shen, 2014).

Within healthcare organizations, AQ has consistently been associated with resilience and occupational well-being. Nurses with higher AQ report lower stress, reduced burnout, and improved job satisfaction (Shen, 2014; Suroso et al., 2025). More recent studies likewise find that AQ enhances psychological capital, professional adaptability, and quality of professional life while reducing depression and emotional exhaustion (Gou et al., 2024; Saxena & Rathore, 2024; Luo et al., 2025).

The body of evidence consistently positions AQ as an important human resource development construct that enhances employee resilience, adaptability, leadership effectiveness, and organizational performance across multiple professions. These findings suggest that AQ extends beyond an individual psychological trait and functions as a strategic organizational resource that can inform professional development, mentoring, employee retention, and resilience-building initiatives. In higher education, this perspective provides a strong rationale for integrating AQ into faculty development programs, particularly for probationary faculty members who must successfully adapt to the demands of academic employment.

Theoretical Framework

This study is grounded in the Adversity Quotient (AQ) Theory proposed by Paul Stoltz (1997), which explains how individuals perceive, respond to, and overcome life challenges. Stoltz emphasized that individual success is not determined solely by cognitive intelligence (IQ) or emotional intelligence (EQ), but also by the capacity to manage and persist through adversity. This capacity is conceptualized as the Adversity Quotient.

At the core of the theory is the CORE model, which comprises four interconnected dimensions: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. Control refers to the extent to which an individual believes they can influence adverse situations. Ownership reflects the willingness to take responsibility for addressing and improving challenging circumstances. Reach pertains to the extent to which difficulties extend into other areas of one's life, while Endurance refers to the perceived duration of adversity. Individuals with higher AQ are generally better able to maintain motivation, demonstrate resilience, and sustain productivity despite obstacles.

This theoretical framework is particularly applicable to probationary faculty members, who commonly encounter professional challenges such as job insecurity, high performance expectations, workload pressures, and adjustment to academic responsibilities. Guided by the AQ framework, this study examines how probationary faculty members cope with these challenges and sustain their professional engagement.

In this study, selected demographic variables, namely age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service, serve as the independent variables, while Adversity Quotient, operationalized through the CORE dimensions of Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance, serves as the dependent variable. These demographic characteristics may influence how faculty members perceive and respond to workplace adversity, as differences in experience, academic preparation, and personal background can shape coping strategies and resilience..

This study was guided by the following null hypothesis:

H_0: There is no significant relationship between the demographic characteristics of probationary faculty members (age, sex, length of service, and educational attainment) and their Adversity Quotient.

Alternatively, the hypothesis may be expressed as separate null hypotheses for each independent variable:

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between the age of probationary faculty members and their Adversity Quotient.
H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between the sex of probationary faculty members and their Adversity Quotient.
H_{03}: There is no significant relationship between the length of service of probationary faculty members and their Adversity Quotient.
H_{04}: There is no significant relationship between the educational attainment of probationary faculty members and their Adversity Quotient.

Using Stoltz's Adversity Quotient Theory, this study contributes to the growing literature on resilience, adaptability, and professional endurance among educators in Philippine higher education institutions. It offers deeper insight into how probationary faculty members navigate institutional demands and sustain professional effectiveness in a demanding academic environment, and it provides evidence to inform faculty development, mentoring initiatives, resilience-building programs, and human resource policies in higher education.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component described the demographic characteristics of probationary faculty members and determined their Adversity Quotient (AQ) levels across the four CORE dimensions:

Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. The correlational component examined relationships between respondents' demographic characteristics (age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service) and their AQ scores.

A descriptive-correlational design was appropriate because the study sought to examine naturally occurring relationships among variables without manipulating the research environment. Although the design does not establish causality, it enables the identification of statistically significant associations that may explain variations in faculty members' capacity to cope with workplace adversity. The findings are expected to provide empirical evidence to inform the development of faculty development initiatives, mentoring programs, resilience-building interventions, and institutional support mechanisms for probationary faculty members in higher education.

Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The respondents were 100 probationary faculty members employed at five state universities in Region III, Philippines: Central Luzon State University, Don Honorio Ventura State University, Pampanga State Agricultural University, Tarlac Agricultural University, and Tarlac State University.

The required sample size was computed using Yamane's (1967) formula at a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error, based on the estimated population of probationary faculty members across the participating institutions. To ensure adequate representation, proportional allocation sampling was used. The number of respondents selected from each university corresponded to its share of the total probationary faculty population, thereby minimizing sampling bias and enhancing the representativeness of the sample.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents and Sample Sizes per University

University	Probationary Faculty	Percentage	Sample Size
Central Luzon State University	120	12%	12
Don Honorio Ventura State University	377	37%	37
Pampanga State Agricultural University	134	13%	13
Tarlac Agricultural University	108	11%	11
Tarlac State University	267	27%	27
Total	**1,006**	**100%**	**100**

Research Instrument

Data were collected using the Adversity Quotient Profile® (AQP®), formerly known as the Adversity Response Profile (ARP), a standardized psychometric instrument developed by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz, founder and Chief Executive Officer of PEAK Learning, Inc. The instrument was designed to measure an individual's pattern of responding to adversity and challenging situations, based on Stoltz's Adversity Quotient Theory (Stoltz, 1997). The AQP® has been widely used in educational, organizational, leadership, and human resource development research to assess an individual's capacity to cope with obstacles, remain resilient, and sustain performance despite adversity.

Before data collection, authorization to administer the AQP® was obtained from the appropriate source in accordance with the instrument's licensing requirements. The original English version of the instrument was used without modification because English is the primary language of instruction and professional communication at the participating state universities. Consequently, no linguistic adaptation or translation was necessary.

The AQP® comprises 14 hypothetical workplace and life scenarios that reflect situations commonly associated with adversity. Each scenario asks respondents to indicate their most likely

response on a 10-point bipolar (semantic differential) scale. The instrument measures four interrelated dimensions, collectively known as the CORE model:

- Control (C) – the extent to which individuals perceive they can influence or manage adverse situations.
- Ownership (O) – the extent to which individuals assume responsibility for improving or resolving difficult circumstances;
- Reach (R) – the extent to which adversity is perceived to affect other aspects of one's personal or professional life; and
- Endurance (E) – the perceived duration of adverse situations and their consequences.

Responses to the 14 scenarios produce an overall response pattern from which scores are computed for each CORE dimension and for the overall Adversity Quotient. According to the AQ Profile® Technical Overview, 10 of the 14 scenarios directly contribute to the overall AQ score, while all responses are used to establish an individual's adversity response pattern. Scores for each CORE dimension are obtained by summing the corresponding items, and the overall AQ score is then derived using the standardized scoring procedure developed by Stoltz.

Table 2. AQ Profile Descriptors

Descriptions	C	O	R	E	Overall AQ
High	46–50	50	40–50	43–50	167–200
Above Average	41–45	46–49	33–39	37–42	148–166
Average	34–40	38–45	25–32	30–36	125–147
Below Average	29–33	28–37	20–24	25–29	112–124
Low	10–28	10–27	10–19	10–24	40–111

For interpretation, AQ scores were classified using the standardized descriptive categories prescribed in the AQP ® manual. Overall AQ scores were interpreted as High (167–200), Above Average (148–166), Average (125–147), Below Average (112–124), and Low (40–111). The same descriptive ranges were applied to each CORE dimension (Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance). These classifications reflect the respondent' s capacity to manage adversity, with higher scores indicating greater resilience, persistence, adaptability, and the ability to maintain performance under challenging conditions.

Specifically, individuals with High AQ are generally able to overcome substantial challenges while maintaining motivation and productivity. Those with Above Average AQ typically demonstrate effective coping strategies and persistence during adversity. Respondents with Average AQ generally manage routine difficulties successfully but may experience reduced effectiveness when confronted with prolonged or cumulative stressors. Individuals with Below Average AQ are more likely to experience discouragement and diminished persistence during adversity, whereas those with Low AQ may have difficulty coping with challenging situations and may benefit from interventions aimed at strengthening resilience and adaptive coping.

The AQ Profile ® Technical Overview reports an overall reliability coefficient of. .91, indicating excellent internal consistency and psychometric stability for the instrument. This published reliability exceeds that of many commonly used psychological and educational assessments and supports the suitability of the AQP ® for measuring adversity response patterns across diverse educational and organizational settings. Because the present study employed the standardized AQP ® without modification, the instrument' s established psychometric properties provide additional support for its use in assessing the Adversity Quotient of probationary faculty

members.

In addition to the AQP ®, a researcher- developed demographic questionnaire was administered to collect information on respondents' age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service. These variables served as the independent variables in examining their relationship with respondents' Adversity Quotient.

Data Collection Procedure

Prior to data collection, approval to conduct the study was obtained from the administrators of the participating state universities. Ethical clearance was also obtained from the National University Philippines Ethics Committee. Eligible probationary faculty members were invited to participate voluntarily through institutional communication channels.

The questionnaire package included an informed consent form, a demographic information sheet, and the Adversity Quotient Profile®. Data were collected electronically via Google Forms, allowing respondents to complete the survey at their convenience while ensuring accessibility across participating institutions. The online format also facilitated efficient data management and minimized administrative burden during the post-pandemic academic period.

Participants were informed of the study's objectives, the voluntary nature of participation, their right to withdraw at any time without penalty, and the confidentiality of their responses. No personally identifiable information was collected. Completed questionnaires were screened for completeness before coding and statistical analysis.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations, were used to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and describe their Adversity Quotient levels across the four CORE dimensions. Before inferential analysis, AQ scores were assessed for normality using skewness, kurtosis, and normality tests. Because the AQ scores approximated a normal distribution, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was used to examine relationships between AQ and continuous variables, namely age and length of service. Because sex is a dichotomous variable, a point-biserial correlation was used to assess its association with AQ scores. Educational attainment, being ordinal, was analyzed using Spearman's rank-order correlation. These statistical procedures were selected according to the measurement level of each variable to ensure appropriate estimation of the relationships under investigation. All statistical analyses were conducted at the 0.05 level of significance.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the Respondents

The study included 100 probationary faculty members from five state universities in Region III. The participants had a mean age of 28 years, with ages ranging from 22 to 39 years. Regarding sex distribution, 56% of respondents were male, while 44% were female. Regarding educational background, 68% held bachelor’s degrees, 30% had completed master’s degrees, and 2% were currently enrolled in doctoral programs. On average, respondents had about three years of experience as probationary faculty members.

These findings reflected the demographic realities of contractual teaching staff in Philippine state universities, who often consisted of younger, less experienced educators still pursuing advanced studies (Villena, 2019; Wa-Mbaleka, 2015).

Adversity Quotient of Respondents

Table 3 presents the Adversity Quotient (AQ) for the participants in this study. The mean scores indicate that respondents had an average AQ. They scored within the average range on the dimensions of control, ownership, and endurance, while their reach score was below average. This suggests that probationary faculty members were generally capable of managing immediate challenges and taking responsibility for their roles. However, they struggled to prevent adversity from spilling over into other aspects of their work or personal lives. These findings echo earlier studies indicating that employees with lower job security often have difficulty separating professional and personal stressors (Spector, 2019; Singh & Sharma, 2017). In the context of education, Bautista (2015) and Sison et al. (2020) also found that AQ influenced performance, but vulnerabilities in specific dimensions could hinder consistent productivity.

Table 3. Adversity Quotient of the Respondents

Adversity Quotient	Frequency	Percentage	Mode
High	3	3%	
Above Average	15	15%	
Average	46	46%	**Average**
Below Average	27	27%	
Low	9	9%	

Relationship Between Demographic Variables and AQ

To assess whether selected demographic variables were associated with the Adversity Quotient (AQ) among probationary faculty members, Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted. Table 4 presents the correlation coefficients, p-values, sample size, degrees of freedom, statistical decisions, and interpretations for each demographic variable.

Age and Adversity Quotient

Age was not significantly associated with Adversity Quotient ($r = -.001$, $p = 0.234$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. The absence of a significant relationship suggests that chronological age alone does not explain differences in probationary faculty members' ability to manage workplace adversity. Because the respondents were relatively homogeneous in age (mean = 28 years; range = 22–39 years), they were likely exposed to comparable institutional expectations, teaching responsibilities, and employment conditions. Consequently, opportunities to develop resilience may have been influenced more by workplace experiences, organizational support, and professional development than by age itself.

This finding contrasts with Daloos (2015) and Adame (2026), who reported that older professionals exhibited stronger coping abilities and decision-making skills when confronted with workplace challenges. However, it is consistent with Stoltz's (1997) conceptualization of Adversity Quotient as a developable capability rather than a trait determined by chronological age. The present findings therefore suggest that resilience among probationary faculty members may be cultivated through institutional experiences and developmental opportunities rather than by age alone.

Sex and Adversity Quotient

Sex was likewise not significantly associated with Adversity Quotient ($r = .120$, $p = 0.053$). Accordingly, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This finding indicates that male and female probationary faculty members demonstrated comparable capacity to respond to workplace adversity. Both groups perform similar instructional, research, and extension responsibilities and are subject to comparable institutional expectations, probationary evaluation systems, and

employment uncertainties. These shared professional experiences may contribute to the development of similar capabilities for managing adversity, regardless of sex.

The result aligns with previous studies showing that resilience and adaptive coping are shaped primarily by environmental, organizational, and experiential factors rather than by biological characteristics. Stoltz's (1997) theory likewise emphasizes that Adversity Quotient develops through individuals' responses to challenging experiences, suggesting that opportunities for learning, mentoring, and professional growth are likely to have greater influence on AQ than demographic characteristics such as sex.

Length of Service and Adversity Quotient

No significant relationship was found between length of service and Adversity Quotient, $r(98) = -.229$, $p = .42$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This finding indicates that length of service is not significantly associated with the Adversity Quotient (AQ) among probationary faculty members.

Although the correlation coefficient indicated a weak negative association between length of service and Adversity Quotient, the relationship was not statistically significant. This finding suggests that the number of years served as a probationary faculty member does not appear to influence an individual's capacity to respond to workplace adversity. It is possible that factors other than length of service, such as personal resilience, institutional support, mentoring, or professional development opportunities, play a more substantial role in shaping Adversity Quotient. This finding is consistent with Aquino (2013), who likewise reported no significant relationship between years of service and Adversity Quotient among school administrators. However, it differs from Bautista (2015), who found that educators with longer years of service demonstrated higher AQ levels. These differing findings suggest that the relationship between work experience and Adversity Quotient may vary across educational settings, institutional contexts, and participant characteristics.

Educational Attainment and Adversity Quotient

Educational attainment was not significantly associated with Adversity Quotient, $r(98) = .249$, $p = .27$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Although the correlation coefficient indicated a weak positive relationship, the association was not statistically significant. This finding suggests that differences in educational attainment do not appear to influence the Adversity Quotient of probationary faculty members.

Although the correlation coefficient indicated a weak positive association between educational attainment and Adversity Quotient, the relationship was not statistically significant. This finding suggests that differences in educational attainment do not appear to influence the Adversity Quotient of probationary faculty members. Resilience and the capacity to cope with workplace adversity may be shaped more by individual characteristics, workplace experiences, organizational support, and professional development opportunities than by formal academic qualifications alone. This finding is consistent with Aquino (2013), who likewise reported no significant relationship between educational attainment and Adversity Quotient among school principals. However, it differs from studies by Marashi and Rashidian (2018) and Ghassemi-Fam and Nosratinia (2022), which suggested that continuous learning and professional development contribute to stronger resilience and adaptive capabilities. These differing findings indicate that the relationship between educational attainment and Adversity Quotient may vary across educational contexts, occupational roles, and participant characteristics.

Overall, the results indicate that none of the selected demographic variables, namely age, sex, length of service, and educational attainment, were significantly associated with the Adversity

Quotient of probationary faculty members. These findings suggest that Adversity Quotient may not be explained by demographic characteristics alone. Instead, AQ may be influenced by other personal, organizational, or environmental factors not examined in this study, such as institutional support, mentoring, workplace climate, coping strategies, and individual resilience. Future research may explore these variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors that contribute to Adversity Quotient among probationary faculty members.

Table 4. Correlation of Adversity Quotient Profile and Years of Service

Variable	N	df	r	p-values	Decision	Interpretation
Age	100	98	-0.001	0.234	Fail to Reject H_0	No Significant Relationship
Sex	100	98	0.120	0.053	Fail to Reject H_0	No Significant Relationship
Length of Service	100	98	-0.229	0.42	Fail to Reject H_0	No Significant Relationship
Educational Attainment	100	98	0.249	0.27	Fail to Reject H_0	No Significant Relationship

The findings suggest that demographic characteristics, including length of service and educational attainment, are not significant determinants of probationary faculty members' Adversity Quotient. This implies that the capacity to cope with workplace adversity may be influenced by factors beyond demographic and professional characteristics. Individual differences in resilience, organizational support, mentoring, workplace climate, and access to professional development opportunities may play a more substantial role in shaping faculty members' responses to workplace challenges. Consequently, human resource development initiatives should continue to promote resilience, socio-emotional competencies, and supportive professional environments through mentoring programs, faculty wellness initiatives, and collaborative academic communities. Such initiatives may benefit probationary faculty members regardless of their length of service or educational attainment.

Implications for Human Resource Development

The findings underscored the importance of institutional support in strengthening probationary faculty resilience. The lower score on the reach dimension indicated that these faculty members were particularly vulnerable to stress spillover, which could affect teaching quality and personal well-being. Universities could address this through resilience-building programs, mentoring, and professional development tailored to contractual faculty. Furthermore, although educational attainment and length of service were not significantly associated with Adversity Quotient, higher education institutions may still consider providing scholarships, graduate study support, mentoring, faculty wellness programs, and continuing professional development opportunities to promote faculty growth and well-being. These initiatives may help strengthen resilience, enhance professional competence, and contribute to the long-term sustainability of higher education institutions (Ott & Cisneros, 2015). Adversity Quotient (AQ) offers a useful lens for Human Resource practitioners in higher education to better understand how employees respond to institutional demands, job insecurity, and performance-related pressures. In state universities, probationary faculty members often face less stable employment arrangements, substantial workloads, and high-performance expectations. These conditions may contribute to ongoing occupational stress, which can affect both well-being and work performance.

Recent studies in higher education further highlight these concerns. Saxena and Rathore (2024) and Wontorczyk & Rożnowski (2022) note that job insecurity, role overload, and workload

intensity are key factors that negatively affect academic well-being and professional functioning. From an HR perspective, the Adversity Quotient (AQ) may serve as a useful lens for understanding how faculty members respond to workplace adversity, particularly in terms of resilience and adaptability. Those with higher AQ, especially in the dimensions of Control and Ownership, tend to demonstrate greater engagement, sustained productivity, and a more solution-oriented approach when facing institutional constraints.

Empirical evidence from higher education settings suggests a positive relationship between AQ and faculty performance, adaptability, and persistence under pressure (Pino & Merin, 2021; Widodo et al., 2022). In this regard, AQ may help HR units better understand patterns of faculty effectiveness in environments characterized by changing demands and organizational uncertainty, particularly regarding workforce development and support strategies.

Human resource units in State Universities and Colleges (SUCs) may use the findings as a diagnostic tool to identify faculty members who may benefit from resilience-building programs. Regular monitoring of AQ can serve as an early indicator of burnout risk or declining motivation, enabling administrators to design timely interventions such as workload balancing, mentorship, or peer support systems. Because the present study found no significant relationship between AQ and demographic variables, resilience-building initiatives should not be designed solely on the basis of age, sex, educational attainment, or length of service. Instead, institutions may adopt a more focused approach by using AQ assessment results to identify faculty members who require additional support. Embedding AQ assessments within performance appraisals could also align faculty development with institutional sustainability goals, ensuring that well-being and productivity are addressed simultaneously. This is supported by Bouadel et al. (2026), who recommend that training programs incorporate modules on transformational leadership, stress and crisis management, decision-making under uncertainty, and emotional intelligence and emotion regulation. These components are considered essential for strengthening individuals' capacity to respond effectively to workplace challenges. Similarly, Yazon et al. (2021) proposed that universities, particularly through the Office of Student Affairs and Services, may develop structured student development programs to enhance students' skills, abilities, and self-awareness through targeted activities.

CONCLUSIONS

The results underscore the critical role of institutional mechanisms in strengthening probationary faculty members' resilience. The relatively lower score in the reach dimension indicates that these faculty members are more susceptible to stress spillover, which may affect both their professional responsibilities and personal well-being, potentially influencing instructional quality. In response, higher education institutions may consider implementing targeted interventions, such as structured resilience-enhancement programs, mentoring systems, and continuous professional development initiatives specifically designed for non-regular academic personnel.

First, the demographic profile of the probationary faculty members revealed that most respondents were young professionals in the early stages of their academic careers, predominantly female, holding graduate-level degrees, and with relatively short lengths of service. These characteristics reflect the emerging faculty workforce in the participating state universities in Region III.

Second, respondents demonstrated an overall average Adversity Quotient (AQ), indicating a moderate capacity to cope with workplace challenges and adversity. Across the four CORE dimensions, respondents obtained average scores in Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. Among these dimensions, Reach registered the lowest mean score, suggesting that workplace

difficulties may tend to influence other aspects of respondents' professional and personal lives. Nevertheless, the overall findings indicate that probationary faculty members generally possess adequate resilience and adaptability in fulfilling their academic responsibilities.

Third, with respect to the relationship between demographic variables and Adversity Quotient, age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service were not significantly associated with AQ. These findings suggest that the Adversity Quotient of probationary faculty members is not influenced by the demographic characteristics examined in this study. Rather, resilience and the capacity to manage workplace adversity may be shaped by other individual, organizational, or contextual factors beyond the scope of the present investigation.

Fourth, based on the identified AQ levels and areas for improvement, a Human Resource Development (HRD) intervention program was proposed to enhance resilience, adaptability, stress management, and professional growth among probationary faculty members. The proposed intervention focuses on mentoring, faculty wellness initiatives, resilience-building activities, and continuing professional development opportunities designed to strengthen the CORE dimensions of Adversity Quotient.

Finally, the findings provide important implications for educational management. Higher education administrators may consider integrating resilience-building initiatives into faculty development programs, particularly for probationary faculty members who are navigating the demands of teaching, research, extension, and institutional service. Such initiatives may contribute to improved well-being, professional effectiveness, and retention of early-career faculty members.

From a theoretical perspective, the study supports the applicability of Stoltz's (1997, 2000) Adversity Quotient framework in understanding resilience and adaptability among probationary faculty members in Philippine public higher education institutions. The findings suggest that the CORE dimensions of Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance remain relevant in explaining how faculty members respond to workplace challenges and professional demands.

The conclusions of this study are limited to probationary faculty members from the five participating state universities in Region III and should not be generalized to all higher education institutions in the Philippines without further investigation. Future studies involving larger and more diverse samples may provide broader insights into the factors influencing Adversity Quotient among faculty members across different institutional contexts.

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

While this study provided meaningful insights into the Adversity Quotient (AQ) of probationary faculty members at selected state universities in Region III, several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings.

First, the study used purposive sampling to include 100 probationary faculty members from five state universities in Region III. Although the sample size was sufficient for the descriptive and correlational analyses, the non-probability sampling approach may limit the sample's representativeness and the generalizability of the findings. The experiences and perceptions of probationary faculty members from other regions, private higher education institutions, or specialized universities may differ from those represented in the present study.

Second, the study used a cross-sectional descriptive-correlational design, with data collected at a single point in time. While this design was appropriate for examining existing relationships among variables, it does not permit causal inferences about the factors associated with Adversity Quotient. Furthermore, the design does not capture possible changes in AQ as faculty members gain professional experience, pursue advanced academic qualifications, or transition from probationary to permanent employment status.

Third, the study relied exclusively on self-reported data collected via the Adversity Quotient

Profile® (AQP) and demographic questionnaires. As in most survey-based research, responses may have been influenced by social desirability bias, acquiescence bias, or differences in how respondents interpreted questionnaire items. Consequently, participants may have overestimated or underestimated their actual levels of resilience, adaptability, and capacity to cope with adversity.

Fourth, the study examined only selected demographic variables, namely age, sex, educational attainment, and length of service. Other potentially influential personal, professional, and organizational factors were excluded from the analysis. Variables such as workload, job satisfaction, psychological safety, organizational commitment, mentoring experiences, leadership support, work-life balance, institutional climate, and access to professional development opportunities may also contribute to the development of AQ and warrant further investigation.

Finally, the study adopted a purely quantitative approach. Although the findings provided a useful overview of AQ levels and their relationships with selected demographic characteristics, the lack of qualitative data limited deeper understanding of how probationary faculty members experience, interpret, and respond to adversity in their academic work. Interviews, focus group discussions, reflective journals, or case studies could have yielded richer insights into the contextual and lived experiences underlying the observed AQ scores.

In light of these limitations, several directions for future research are recommended. Future studies may employ longitudinal designs to examine how AQ evolves across stages of academic careers and to determine whether resilience and adaptability increase as faculty members accumulate professional experience. Mixed-methods studies that combine quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews or focus group discussions are likewise recommended to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how faculty members perceive and manage workplace adversity.

Comparative investigations of probationary and tenured faculty members may also be conducted to determine whether employment status, career stage, and organizational experience influence AQ levels and coping strategies. Similarly, future studies may include larger regional or national samples from both public and private higher education institutions to enhance the external validity and generalizability of the findings.

Moreover, future research may extend the present study by examining AQ as a predictor of key organizational and psychological outcomes. These may include burnout, job performance, job satisfaction, employee retention, psychological safety, workload management, organizational commitment, faculty well-being, and perceived institutional support. Advanced analytical approaches, such as multiple regression, path analysis, and structural equation modeling, may further clarify the mechanisms through which AQ influences professional effectiveness and resilience among higher education faculty members.

Such investigations may contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of faculty resilience and inform the development of evidence-based human resource development programs, faculty wellness initiatives, and institutional policies to strengthen adaptability, well-being, and professional success in higher education settings.

REFERENCES

Adame, J. (2026). Adversity quotient, resilience and professional effectiveness among helping professionals. *International Journal of Behavioral and Social Analytics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/gwh4j269

Alam, R., Kumar, P., & Sharma, D. (2020). Resilience and motivation in teaching: The mediating role of adversity quotient. *International Journal of Educational Management, 34*(4), 567–582.

Anwar, L., Sa'dijah, C., Murtafiah, W., & Huljannah, M. (2024). Adversity quotient of Indonesian prospective mathematics teachers in solving geometry higher-order thinking skills

problems. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 15*(1), 79–98. https://doi.org/10.22342/jme.v15i1.pp79-98

Aquino, J. (2013). *Adversity quotient, leadership style, and performance of secondary school heads* (Doctoral dissertation, Tarlac State University).

Atienza, E. M. R. (2023). Leaders of collaboration, communication, and confidence behind adversity. *Advanced Qualitative Research, 1*(2), 28–39. https://doi.org/10.31098/aqr.v1i2.1672

Banal, C. L., & Ortega-Dela Cruz, R. A. (2022). Teachers' resilience in facing workload adversities. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences, 14*(1), 36–51.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman.

Baroa, E. D. (2015). *Adversity Quotient® and leadership skills of school administrators in the Division of Cadiz City* [Unpublished master's thesis]. University of St. La Salle.

Bautista, M. J. C. (2015). Adversity quotient and teaching performance of faculty members. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 5*(3).

Bouadel, S., Ahizoune, S., & Hassouni, K. (2026). The correlation between leadership style and adversity quotient among women managers in the Moroccan health sector. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences, 24*, Article 101015. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2026.101015

Daloos, M. J. O. (2015). *Emotional intelligence and adversity quotient of selected helping professionals* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Far Eastern University Manila. https://www.peaklearning.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/PEAK_GRI_daloos.pdf

Duckworth, A. L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M. D., & Kelly, D. R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92*(6), 1087–1101. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.92.6.1087

Ghassemi-Fam, M., & Nosratinia, M. (2022). Experienced and novice EFL teachers' adversity quotient. *Journal of Language and Translation, 12*(1).

Gou, Y., et al. (2024). Relationships of the adversity quotient subtypes of nursing interns with depression, coping styles, positive psychological capital, and professional adaptability. *BMC Medical Education*.

Luo, X., et al. (2025). The impact of nurses' adversity quotient on their work stress: The mediating role of professional identity. *BMC Nursing*.

Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford University Press.

Marashi, H., & Rashidian, S. (2018). EFL teachers' adversity quotient, personal growth initiative, and self-efficacy. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 37*(3).

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227

Matore, M. E. E., Khairani, A. Z., & Razak, N. A. (2015). The influence of AQ on the academic achievement among Malaysian polytechnic students. *International Education Studies*, *8*(6), 69–74. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v8n6p69

Ott, M., & Cisneros, J. (2015). Understanding the changing faculty workforce in higher education: A comparison of full-time non-tenure track and tenure line experiences. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*, 90. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1934

Phoolka, S., & Kaur, N. (2012). Adversity quotient: A new paradigm to explore. *International Journal of Contemporary Business Studies, 3*(4), 67–78.

Pino, Z. A. N., & Merin, J. A. (2021). Educators' adversity quotient: Rising above challenges in the time of pandemic. *Education Journal, 10*(4), 119–125. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20211004.12

Prasad, K., & John, S. (2021). Adversity quotient and burnout among educators. *Journal of*

Educational Psychology Research, 12(2), 45–58.

Safi'i, A., Muttaqin, I., Sukino, Hamzah, N., Chotimah, C., Junaris, I., & Rifa'i, M. K. (2021). The effect of the adversity quotient on student performance, student learning autonomy, and student achievement in the COVID-19 pandemic era: Evidence from Indonesia. *Heliyon, 7*(12), e08510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08510

Saxena, S., & Rathore, B. (2024). Adversity quotient as determining factor of mental health and professional quality of life among healthcare professionals: A systematic review. *Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine, 46*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/09727531241231055

Shen, Y. (2014). The relationship between adversity quotient and occupational stress among nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management, 22*(8), 1033–1040.

Singh, S., & Sharma, T. (2017). The effect of adversity quotient on the occupational stress of IT managers in India. *Procedia Computer Science, 122*, 86–93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.345

Sison, M. H., Constantino, J. A., Gabriel, E. C., & Vega, M. T. C. (2020). Adversity quotient of NEUST-SIC CoEd faculty. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences, 5*(6).

Spector, P. E. (2019). Do not cross me: Optimizing the use of cross-sectional designs. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*(2), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-09613-8

Stoltz, P. G. (1997). *Adversity quotient: Turning obstacles into opportunities*. John Wiley & Sons.

Stoltz, P. G. (2000). *Adversity quotient at work: Make everyday challenges the key to your success*. William Morrow.

Villena, I. F. (2019). Exploring the case of job orders and contract of service workers in the government. *Philippine Journal of Labor Studies, 1*(2).

Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2015). Factors leading to limited faculty publications in Philippine higher education institutions. *International Forum, 18*, 121–141.

Wang, Y., et al. (2025). Adversity quotient influences self-regulated learning strategies via achievement motivation among Chinese university students. *Education Sciences*.

Wontorczyk, A., & Rożnowski, B. (2022). Remote, hybrid, and on-site work during the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and the consequences for stress and work engagement. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(4), 2400. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042400

Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper & Row.

Yazon, A. D., Ang-Manaig, K., & Adrian, T. W. C. (2021). A correlational study on mindset, grit, and adversity quotient of pre-service teachers: Evidence in the Philippines and Hong Kong. *International Journal of Management, Entrepreneurship, Social Science and Humanities, 4*(2), 174–181.