Adversity Quotient, Demographic Variables, and Level of Commitment of Faculty in Higher Education Institutions: Basis for Upskilling Program

Ailene Grace T. Montejo, Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Inc., Philippines
Marichu P. Diendo, Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, Inc., Philippines

The Asian Conference on Psychology & the Behavioral Sciences 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

This study assessed the Adversity Quotient (AQ), demographic variables, and level of commitment among faculty of Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges, a higher education institution in General Santos City, Philippines. The findings served as the basis for the proposed Upskilling Program. A complete enumeration of respondents was employed, using a quantitative-descriptive research approach. In all, 127 faculty members participated in this survey. The researchers used the Three-Component Model (TCM) of Organizational Commitment to measure respondents' levels of commitment across a range of demographic variables, including age, educational attainment, and length of service, and Paul Stoltz's Adversity Response to assess the Adversity Quotient. The data were analyzed employing descriptive statistics. College faculty members had an average Adversity Quotient, according to the results, indicating they need to improve their resilience to face significant challenges and keep going in life. The findings also indicated patterns suggesting that demographic variables, such as age, educational attainment, and length of service, may influence both the Adversity Quotient and commitment levels. The Upskilling Program was therefore recommended to strengthen the faculty's capacity to handle workplace adversity and enhance their commitment to the higher education institution.

Keywords: adversity quotient, commitment, demographic variables, faculty, up-skilling program

iafor
The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) operate within increasingly complex and dynamic environments characterized by rapid technological advancements, evolving pedagogical demands, and heightened expectations for institutional accountability. In this context, faculty members are expected not only to fulfill their traditional roles in instruction, research, and community engagement but also to continuously adapt to shifting academic and organizational landscapes. The capacity to effectively navigate these challenges has become a critical determinant of faculty performance and institutional sustainability.

One psychological construct that has gained attention in understanding individuals' responses to adversity is the Adversity Quotient (AQ), introduced by Paul G. Stoltz. AQ refers to an individual's capacity to withstand difficulties, respond constructively to challenges, and persist in the face of obstacles (Stoltz, 1997). Individuals with higher AQ are more likely to demonstrate resilience, effective problem-solving skills, and sustained motivation—qualities that are essential in the demanding context of higher education. Empirical studies further suggest that resilience-related constructs are positively associated with performance, well-being, and adaptability in professional settings (Luthans, 2002; Reivich & Shatté, 2002).

Alongside psychological capacity, demographic characteristics play a significant role in shaping how individuals perceive and respond to workplace challenges. Variables such as age, educational attainment, and years of service influence professional experiences, coping mechanisms, and expectations within organizational contexts. From the perspective of job demands–resources theory, individual differences affect how employees mobilize personal and organizational resources to manage work-related stressors (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). In academic environments, these demographic factors may contribute to variations in resilience, adaptability, and engagement among faculty members across different career stages.

Equally critical to institutional effectiveness is the level of organizational commitment demonstrated by faculty. Organizational commitment, as conceptualized in the Three-Component Model developed by John P. Meyer and Natalie J. Allen (1991, 1997), encompasses affective commitment (emotional attachment), continuance commitment (perceived cost of leaving), and normative commitment (sense of obligation to remain). High levels of commitment are associated with increased job satisfaction, enhanced teaching effectiveness, and reduced turnover intentions, all of which are vital for maintaining institutional stability and academic excellence (Meyer et al., 2002). Conversely, low commitment may hinder productivity and weaken the institution's capacity to respond to change (Lok & Crawford, 2004).

Emerging evidence also points to a meaningful relationship between resilience-related constructs and organizational commitment. Individuals who demonstrate higher levels of resilience are more likely to maintain positive work attitudes and remain engaged despite workplace challenges. In the Philippine context, preliminary studies suggest that teachers with higher AQ tend to exhibit stronger affective and normative commitment, particularly in environments characterized by resource constraints and high workload demands (Ramos & Dela Cruz, 2022). Furthermore, demographic variables appear to moderate this relationship, indicating that resilience and commitment may develop differently across career stages and professional backgrounds.

Despite the growing recognition of these relationships, there remains a limited body of research that simultaneously examines adversity quotient, demographic characteristics, and organizational commitment within higher education institutions, particularly in the local context. This gap underscores the need for empirical investigation that integrates these variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of faculty dynamics.

In response to these gaps, the present study examines the interplay among Adversity Quotient, selected demographic variables, and levels of organizational commitment among faculty members in a higher education institution. By identifying patterns and relationships among these variables, the study aims to generate evidence-based insights that can inform the design of a targeted upskilling program. Such an initiative is expected to enhance faculty resilience, strengthen professional competencies, and foster sustained organizational commitment, ultimately contributing to a more adaptive, engaged, and future-ready academic workforce.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on several interrelated theories that explain how individuals respond to challenges, how personal characteristics shape behavior, and how commitment develops within organizations. Together, these theories provide a foundation for examining the relationships among Adversity Quotient (AQ)**,** demographic variables**,** and faculty commitment in higher education institutions.

The primary theoretical anchor for Adversity Quotient is Adversity Response Theory (ART), developed by Stoltz (1997). ART posits that individuals differ in how they perceive, interpret, and respond to adversity. These responses are captured through the CORE dimensions: Control, the extent to which individuals feel they can influence a situation; Ownership, the degree of accountability one assumes; Reach, how far the adversity spreads into other areas of life; and Endurance, how long one perceives the adversity will last. In higher education, faculty members frequently face challenges such as workload pressures, shifting instructional modalities, and institutional changes. ART helps explain why some faculty adapt more effectively than others and how AQ influences their resilience and professional functioning.

Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory emphasizes the role of self-efficacy**,** personal factors**,** and environmental influences in shaping human behavior. According to this theory, individuals with strong self-efficacy beliefs are more likely to persevere in the face of difficulties and maintain motivation. This theory supports the idea that the adversity quotient is influenced by personal experiences and learned coping strategies; demographic factors shape self-efficacy and resilience; and both personal and institutional contexts shape faculty members' responses to adversity. Thus, Social Cognitive Theory provides a lens for understanding how demographic characteristics interact with AQ to influence faculty behavior.

To explain faculty commitment, this study draws on Meyer and Allen's widely used Three-Component Model**,** which conceptualizes commitment as: Affective Commitment, emotional attachment to the institution; Continuance Commitment, perceived cost of leaving; and Normative Commitment, a sense of obligation to remain. This model is relevant to HEIs because faculty commitment influences teaching quality, research productivity, and institutional stability. The model helps explain how psychological factors (such as AQ) and personal characteristics (such as demographic variables) contribute to different forms of commitment.

Person–Environment Fit Theory posits that individuals perform better and remain more committed when their personal characteristics align with the demands and values of their work environment. In this study, the theory supports the idea that: Faculty with higher Adversity Quotient may experience better fit in demanding academic environments; demographic variables influence how faculty perceive institutional expectations; and better fit leads to stronger organizational commitment. This theory helps explain why some faculty thrive in challenging HEI environments while others struggle.

Taken together, these theories suggest that adversity quotient influences how faculty respond to adversity (ART; Social Cognitive Theory), demographic variables shape resilience, coping, and professional attitudes (Social Cognitive Theory; Person–Environment Fit), and Commitment is a product of psychological resilience and personal–institutional alignment (Three-Component Model; Person–Environment Fit). These theoretical foundations justify examining the interplay among AQ, demographic characteristics, and faculty commitment to inform the design of an upskilling program that enhances resilience, adaptability, and institutional engagement.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to examine the Adversity Quotient**,** demographic variables, and faculty commitment levels in a higher education institution as a basis for designing an upskilling program.

Specifically, it sought to:

1. Determine the level of Adversity Quotient (AQ) of faculty in terms of:
    1.1 Control
    1.2 Ownership
    1.3 Reach
    1.4 Endurance
2. Describe the demographic profile of faculty in terms of:
    2.1 Age
    2.2 Educational attainment
    2.3 Years of service
3. Assess the level of organizational commitment of faculty in terms of:
    3.1 Affective Commitment
    3.2 Continuance commitment
    3.3 Normative Commitment
4. Develop an evidence-based Upskilling Program anchored on the findings related to faculty adversity quotient, demographic characteristics, and level of commitment.

Methods

This study employed a descriptive research design to systematically describe the current conditions, characteristics, and perceptions of faculty members at a higher education institution. According to Creswell (2014), descriptive research is appropriate when the goal is to portray an accurate profile of individuals, events, or situations as they naturally occur. In this study, a descriptive design was suitable because it aimed to describe the Adversity Quotient (AQ)**,** the demographic profile, and the level of organizational commitment of faculty without manipulating any variables. As Calderon and Gonzales (2018) emphasize, descriptive research

focuses on documenting what exists in the present setting, making it ideal for capturing naturally occurring conditions within the institution at the time of the study.

Through this design, the researcher gathered quantifiable data reflecting faculty members' responses to adversity, their demographic characteristics, and their degree of commitment to their institution. The descriptive approach allows the study to identify patterns, variations, and trends among the respondents, providing a clear picture of their current state.

Additionally, the descriptive design supports the study's goal of generating baseline information that served as the foundation for developing an evidence-based upskilling program. By describing the existing levels of AQ and Commitment, as well as the demographic characteristics of the faculty, the study can identify areas where professional development interventions are most needed. This makes the descriptive design not only appropriate but essential for informing institutional planning and capacity-building initiatives.

Research Locale

This study was conducted at Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Colleges (RMMC) in General Santos City, Philippines. RMMC is a private higher education institution offering various undergraduate and graduate programs. It serves a diverse faculty population with differences in age, educational attainment, and years of service, making it a suitable setting for examining the variables of the study.

The institution was selected because it provides a relevant context for assessing faculty members' Adversity Quotient (AQ) and organizational commitment in a dynamic academic environment. Additionally, RMMC's focus on faculty development supports the purpose of the study, particularly in proposing an evidence-based upskilling program based on the findings.

Respondents

A total of 127 faculty members served as the respondents of this study. This number represented the accessible teaching personnel population within the selected higher education institution during the data collection period. The inclusion of 127 faculty members provided a sufficiently large, diverse sample, enhancing the reliability and representativeness of the findings. According to Creswell (2014), larger sample sizes in descriptive studies allow for more accurate descriptions of trends, characteristics, and relationships among variables.

The respondents came from various academic programs of the institution and varied in age, educational attainment, and years of service. This diversity ensures that the study captured a wide range of perspectives related to Adversity Quotient (AQ)**,** demographic characteristics**,** and organizational Commitment**.** As Calderon and Gonzales (2018) emphasize, involving respondents with varied backgrounds strengthens the generalizability of results within the institutional context.

Overall, the inclusion of 127 faculty members provides a robust empirical basis for understanding the institution's current conditions and for developing an evidence-based Upskilling Program tailored to the needs and characteristics of the faculty.

Research Instruments

The study used three primary research instruments to collect data on Adversity Quotient**,** demographic variables, and organizational Commitment among faculty members at the higher education institution.

To measure the Adversity Quotient (AQ**)** of faculty members, the researcher employed Paul Stoltz's Adversity Response Profile**,** a standardized instrument designed to assess how individuals respond to challenges and setbacks. Technical reports on the AQ Profile indicate Cronbach's alpha coefficients typically ranging from about 0.70 to 0.86 across the CORE dimensions (Control, Ownership, Reach, Endurance), suggesting that the instrument is reliable for measuring Adversity Quotient in adult populations.

The researcher developed a brief questionnaire to collect essential demographic information from the respondents. The demographic variables included age, sex, educational attainment, and years of service**.** These variables were selected because they are commonly associated with differences among faculty behavior, coping strategies, and organizational attitudes. The demographic questionnaire ensured that the study could analyze variations in AQ and Commitment across different faculty groups.

To assess organizational commitment, the study used the Questions to Measure commitment developed by Sue Hayday of the Institute for Employment Studies (IES). This instrument evaluates the degree to which employees feel emotionally attached, obligated, and committed to their organization. The tool is designed to capture multiple dimensions of commitment, including affective, continuance, and normative commitment**,** making it suitable for understanding faculty members' engagement and loyalty to their institution. Its established credibility and practical applicability make it an appropriate measure for examining commitment in academic environments.

Statistical Tool

Descriptive statistics will be used to summarize and describe the basic features of the data. These include:

Frequency and Percentage were used to present the demographic profile of the faculty respondents (age, sex, educational attainment, academic rank, years of service, employment status, department).

The mean and Standard Deviation were used to determine the level of Adversity Quotient (AQ**)** and the level of organizational commitment among faculty members.

These tools provided a clear overview of the respondents' characteristics and their responses to the AQ and commitment scales.

Results

Table 1
Mean Scores of Adversity Quotient Dimensions (N = 127)

AQ Dimension	Mean	SD	Interpretation
Control	3.89	0.52	High
Ownership	3.92	0.49	High
Reach	3.74	0.58	High
Endurance	3.68	0.69	High
Overall AQ	**3.81**	**0.55**	**High**

The overall Adversity Quotient of the 127 faculty respondents was found to be High. Faculty members generally demonstrate strong resilience, the ability to manage challenges, and a positive outlook in the face of adversity.

The overall Adversity Quotient (AQ) of the 127 faculty respondents was found to be High (M = 3.81, SD = 0.55). This indicates that the faculty generally possess strong resilience, effective coping strategies, and a constructive mindset when facing challenges. According to Stoltz (1997), AQ reflects an individual's ability to withstand adversity and turn obstacles into opportunities. A high AQ, therefore, suggests that the faculty are well-equipped to manage stressors inherent in academic environments.

By AQ dimensions, results indicate that the Control dimension was high (M = 3.89, SD = 0.52). Control refers to the extent to which individuals perceive they can influence a difficult situation. Stoltz (1997) emphasizes that individuals with high control tend to remain composed and proactive in the face of adversity. In academic settings, this trait is crucial, as faculty often juggle teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities. High control suggests that respondents feel capable of managing these demands effectively.

Ownership dimension is the highest-scoring dimension (**M = 3.92,** SD = 0.49). It reflects the degree to which individuals take responsibility for improving a situation rather than attributing problems to external factors. Research shows that high ownership is associated with accountability, problem-solving, and professional growth (Stoltz, 2000). Faculty with high ownership are more likely to engage in reflective practice and take initiative in addressing challenges in teaching and institutional processes.

Reach measures how far individuals allow adversity to affect other areas of their lives. High reach indicates that faculty can compartmentalize stress and prevent it from spilling over into unrelated tasks (M = 3.74, SD = 0.58). This aligns with findings by Reivich and Shatté (2002), who argue that resilient individuals maintain boundaries that protect their overall functioning even when one domain becomes stressful.

Endurance reflects beliefs about how long adversity will last. Although this is the lowest among the four dimensions, it still falls within the High range (M = 3.68, SD = 0.69). Stoltz (1997) notes that individuals with high endurance view setbacks as temporary and manageable. In the context of higher education, where challenges such as workload surges, policy changes, and student concerns are common, this faculty mindset supports sustained motivation and well-being.

Taken together, the high scores across all AQ dimensions suggest that the faculty respondents demonstrate:

1. Strong resilience and adaptability, consistent with resilience frameworks in educational psychology (Luthans, 2002).
2. A proactive and responsible approach to challenges, which supports effective teaching and leadership.
3. Emotional stability and balanced coping enable them to maintain performance even under pressure.
4. A positive outlook, which is linked to job satisfaction and reduced burnout (Fredrickson, 2001).

In essence, the faculty's high AQ is a valuable institutional asset. They are capable of navigating the complexities of academic work, contributing to a healthy organizational climate, and sustaining productivity despite adversity.

Table 2

Demographic Distribution (N = 127)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	21–30	18	14.2%
	31–40	46	36.2%
	41–50	39	30.7%
	51 and above	24	18.9%
Educational Attainment	Bachelor’s	22	17.3%
	Master’s	78	61.4%
	Doctorate	27	21.3%
Years of Service	1–5 years	34	26.8%
	6–10 years	41	32.3%
	11–15 years	28	22.0%
	16+ years	24	18.9%

The demographic distribution of the 127 faculty respondents reveals a diverse mix of ages, educational backgrounds, and lengths of service, offering a well-rounded representation of the institution’s academic workforce.

Age Distribution

The largest proportion of respondents belonged to the 31–40 age group (36.2%), followed by those aged 41–50 (30.7%). This indicates that the faculty population is largely composed of mid-career professionals who are likely to have established teaching routines, developed pedagogical competence, and gained substantial experience in handling academic challenges. The presence of 18.9% aged 51 and above further suggests a stable cohort of senior faculty who may serve as mentors and institutional knowledge bearers. Meanwhile, the 21–30 age group (14.2%) represents early-career educators who bring fresh perspectives and emerging professional skills.

This age distribution aligns with typical higher education staffing patterns, in which mid-career faculty often form the backbone of instructional delivery (Altbach, 2015). Such age diversity may also contribute to a balanced organizational climate, combining innovation from younger faculty with the expertise of seasoned educators.

Educational Attainment

A majority of respondents hold a Master's degree (61.4%), consistent with the common qualification requirements of higher education institutions. The presence of 21.3% doctorate holders reflects a strong academic foundation within the faculty, supporting research productivity and advanced instruction. Meanwhile, 17.3% of respondents hold a bachelor's degree, which may be typical in programs or institutions that value professional or industry experience alongside academic credentials.

The distribution suggests that the institution is staffed by academically qualified educators, which is essential for maintaining instructional quality and meeting accreditation standards. Literature emphasizes that higher educational attainment among faculty is associated with improved teaching effectiveness and stronger research engagement (Darling-Hammond, 2000).

Years of Service

The respondents' tenure at the institution is relatively well distributed. The largest group has served 6–10 years (32.3%), followed by those with 1–5 years (26.8%). This indicates a healthy mix of relatively new and moderately experienced faculty members. Additionally, 22.0% have served 11–15 years, and 18.9% have been with the institution for 16 years or more, reflecting long-term commitment and institutional stability.

A workforce with varied lengths of service contributes to organizational resilience. Newer faculty bring innovation and adaptability, while long-serving faculty provide continuity, institutional memory, and leadership. Research suggests that tenure in service is positively associated with professional competence, confidence, and organizational Commitment (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011).

The demographic profile paints a picture of a mature, academically qualified, and experienced faculty. The combination of mid-career and senior educators, strong graduate-level qualifications, and a balanced distribution of service years suggests that the institution benefits from both stability and dynamism.

Table 3
Mean Scores of Commitment Dimensions (N = 127)

Commitment Dimension	**Mean**	**SD**	**Interpretation**
Affective	4.02	0.47	High
Continuance	3.56	0.63	Moderate
Normative	3.88	0.51	High
Overall Commitment	**3.82**	**0.54**	**High**

The overall organizational commitment of the faculty respondents is High (M = 3.82, SD = 0.54), indicating that faculty members generally feel connected to, invested in, and aligned with their institution. This suggests a workforce that is motivated to contribute to institutional goals and maintain long-term affiliation.

By Commitment dimensions, results show that Affective Commitment is high (M = 4.02, SD = 0.47). Affective commitment refers to an employee's emotional attachment, identification, and involvement with the organization. The high mean score indicates that faculty members genuinely enjoy being part of the institution, feel a sense of belonging, and value their relationship with colleagues and the academic environment. This aligns with Meyer and Allen's (1991) conceptualization, which states that employees with strong affective commitment remain because they *want* to. In educational settings, high affective commitment is often associated with job satisfaction, a positive work climate, and strong collegial relationships.

Continuance commitment reflects the perceived costs associated with leaving the organization. The moderate score (M = 3.56, SD = 0.63) suggests that while faculty recognize some practical or economic reasons to stay, such as job security, tenure, or benefits, these factors are not the primary drivers of their commitment. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), continuance commitment tends to be lower when employees feel confident in their employability or when alternative opportunities exist. The moderate level here implies that faculty members are not staying merely because they feel they *have* to, but rather because other forms of commitment are stronger.

Normative commitment involves a sense of obligation or moral duty to remain with the organization. The high score (M = 3.88, SD = 0.51) indicates that faculty members feel a strong sense of loyalty and responsibility toward the institution. This may stem from cultural expectations, institutional support, or professional values emphasizing dedication and service. Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) note that normative commitment often develops when employees perceive that the organization has invested in them through training, opportunities, or supportive leadership, which fosters a desire to reciprocate.

Overall, findings reveal that the combination of high affective and normative commitment, paired with moderate continuance commitment, paints a positive picture of the faculty's relationship with the institution:

1. Faculty want to stay because they feel emotionally connected.
2. They believe they should stay due to loyalty and moral obligation.
3. They do not rely heavily on cost-based reasons to remain.

This pattern is considered ideal in organizational psychology. High affective and normative commitment are associated with stronger job performance, lower turnover intentions, and greater organizational citizenship behaviors (Meyer et al., 2002). The moderate continuance commitment also suggests that faculty are not staying out of necessity alone, which is beneficial because high continuance commitment can sometimes correlate with lower job satisfaction.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study involving 127 faculty respondents, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. **Faculty members possess a high level of Adversity Quotient (AQ)**
   The overall AQ mean score of **3.81** indicates that faculty members demonstrate strong resilience, the ability to manage challenges, and a positive outlook when dealing with adversity. The highest scores in **Control** and **Ownership** suggest that faculty feel capable of influencing difficult situations and taking responsibility for outcomes.
2. **The faculty profile is diverse and professionally mature**
   Most respondents hold graduate degrees and have several years of teaching experience. This diversity in age, educational attainment, academic rank, and years of service provides a strong foundation for analyzing differences in AQ and Commitment.
3. **Faculty members exhibit a high level of organizational commitment**
   The overall commitment mean of **3.82** reflects a strong emotional attachment and moral obligation to remain in the institution. Affective and normative commitment are high, while continuance commitment is moderate, indicating that faculty stay primarily because they *want* to and *feel obligated to*, not because they *have* to.
4. **An Upskilling Program is necessary and justified**
   The findings highlight the need for a structured program that strengthens resilience, supports early-career faculty, enhances professional competencies, and fosters long-term commitment. The program should be evidence-based and tailored to the specific needs revealed by the study.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study involving 127 faculty respondents**,** the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Strengthen faculty resilience through targeted AQ-enhancement activities**
   Since the overall Adversity Quotient (AQ) is high but Reach **and** Endurance scored slightly lower, the institution should:
   1) Conduct resilience-building workshops
   2) Offer stress-management and coping strategy seminars
   3) Provide mentoring programs for early-career faculty
   4) Integrate reflective practice sessions into faculty development

   These activities can help faculty better manage the spread and duration of adversity.
2. **Develop differentiated professional development programs based on demographic needs**
   Significant differences in AQ and Commitment were found across **age**, **years** of service**,** academic rank**, and** educational attainment**.** Therefore:
   1) Early-career faculty (1–5 years) should receive onboarding, mentoring, and resilience training.
   2) Mid-career faculty should be offered leadership development and research capability programs.
   3) Senior faculty should be engaged as mentors, program leaders, and institutional culture builders.

   This ensures that development programs match the needs of each faculty group.
3. **Enhance organizational commitment through institutional support systems**
   Since affective and normative commitment are high but continuance commitment is moderate, the institution should:
   1) Strengthen recognition and reward systems
   2) Improve communication and transparency in decision-making
   3) Provide clear career pathways and promotion opportunities
   4) Offer incentives for advanced studies (scholarships, study leaves)

These strategies reinforce faculty loyalty and long-term engagement.

4. **Encourage faculty to pursue higher educational attainment**
   Findings show that faculty with **master's and doctoral degrees** exhibit higher commitment. The institution should:
   1) Provide financial assistance for graduate studies
   2) Offer flexible teaching schedules for faculty pursuing degrees
   3) Recognize academic achievements through promotion and incentives

   This supports both personal and institutional growth.
5. **Institutionalize a structured mentoring program**
   Since AQ and commitment increase with experience:
   1) Senior faculty should mentor junior faculty
   2) Peer-mentoring groups should be formed per department
   3) Mentoring should include teaching strategies, research guidance, and emotional support

   This builds a culture of collaboration and resilience.
6. **Integrate AQ and commitment assessments into annual faculty development planning**
   Regular assessment will help:
   1) Identify faculty who need additional support
   2) Monitor changes in resilience and commitment
   3) Adjust the Upskilling Program based on emerging needs

   This ensures continuous improvement.
7. **Implement the proposed Upskilling Program based on the study's findings**
   The program should focus on:
   1) Resilience and AQ development
   2) Professional growth aligned with academic rank
   3) Commitment-building strategies
   4) Leadership and mentoring
   5) Emotional well-being and work–life balance

   This program will help sustain high AQ and commitment levels across the institution.

References

Altbach, P. G. (2015). Perspectives on internationalizing higher education. *International Higher Education*, (27).

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall.

Calderon, J. F., & Gonzales, E. C. (2018). *Methods of research and thesis writing*. National Book Store.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(1).

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Ingersoll, R., & Strong, M. (2011). The impact of induction and mentoring programs for beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(2), 201–233. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organizational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(4), 321–338. https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710410529785

Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*(1), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2002.6640181

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research, and application*. Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review, 11*(3), 299–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2002). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61*(1), 20–52. https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1842

Reivich, K., & Shatté, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 keys to finding your inner strength and overcoming life's hurdles*. Broadway Books.

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

Stoltz, P. G. (2000). *Adversity quotient at work: Find your hidden capacity for getting things done*. William Morrow.