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ABSTRACT

This study was primarily aimed at investigating the relationship between the Student Affairs and Services administrators’ selected demographic profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience and their Adversity Quotient® profile (AQP) overall results in terms of the following CORE dimensions: control, ownership, reach and endurance. Moreover, it looked into the relationship between demographic profile and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of the respondents through Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ X5 short) based on the following factors: 1) Idealized Influence (II-Attributed); 2) Idealized Influence (II-Behavior); 3) Inspirational Motivation (IM); 4) Intellectual Stimulation (IS); 5) Individual Consideration (IC); 6) Contingent Reward(CR); 7) Management-by-Exception-Active (MBEA); 8) Management-by-Exception-Passive (MBEP); and, 9) Laissez-Faire (LF) and their demographic profile. Lastly, it sought to determine the relationship between the respondents’ Adversity Quotient® overall results and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results.

In particular, this study focused only on the Student Affairs and Services administrators of the public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region within Negros Oriental and Siquijor. The schools were identified by the Commission on Higher Education Regional Office (CHEDRO VII), Philippines. There were 36 respondents identified as former and present Student Affairs and Services administrators (deans, directors, managers, assistant directors, unit heads, coordinators, and faculty designates) working full-time in the higher education institutions (HEIs) of Central Visayas Region specifically within Negros Oriental and Siquijor. All assessment tools were answered voluntarily by the respondents.

The descriptive-correlational research design was used for data analysis of the three sets of instruments utilized for the study. The demographic profile referred to age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience. The Adversity Quotient® was measured through the Adversity Quotient® version 9.0 an online instrument provided by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz of Peak Learning, Inc. The Multifactor Leadership Questioner (5X-short) by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004) was used to assess the respondents’ leadership characteristics.
In the treatment of data, the following statistical tools were used: percentage, weighted mean, point biserial coefficient, and Pearson product moment r. Findings showed that there was no significant relationship between the respondents' Adversity Quotient® overall results and their selected demographic profile (sex, age, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience). Moreover, there was also no significant relationship between the respondents' Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results and their selected demographic profile. Lastly, there was also no significant relationship between the respondents' adversity quotient® and their multifactor leadership characteristics overall results.

The results of the study showed the need for a leadership management training design to enhance leaders who have been found to have low and below average Adversity Quotient level in CORE dimension: control, ownership, reach, and endurance. Simultaneously, the need to increase frequency on transformational behaviors and decrease the frequency of transactional and passive/avoidant behaviors among Student Affairs and Services administrators must also be addressed. Along the process, these leaders can positively influence their associate’s awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way.
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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE

Introduction

Historically, Student Affairs and Services has become a unit of the higher education enterprise. Student services have developed into complex structures which play an increasing important role in the enrollment and retention of students as well as in contributing to the overall culture of the institution.

It is vital that higher educational institutions have dedicated, energetic and highly qualified leaders who take care of student affairs. Professionals in admissions, campus life, student activities, campus ministry, scholarship aid and academic advising work side-by-side with faculty and staff to create a dynamic learning environment for all students. Through collective efforts, people on campus can make a unique mission and culture of their respective colleges or universities.

Given the importance of student affairs, the quest for effective leadership development in student affairs administration in any academic institution is a global concern in order to understand the complexities of student development and to build up and lead programs to enhance students’ learning as they face the challenges of college education. Subsequently, education today is operating in a constantly changing environment. Advances in technology, changes in educational policy, financial limitations, changes in student demographics, and the increased call for accountability are just some of the factors that have required the field of education to respond in a manner it never had to before (Del Favaro, 2005; Lucas, 2000). An article written on The Wall Street Journal states that leadership is less about
your needs, and more about the needs of the people and the organization you are leading. Thus, whether one is a teacher, tutor, or coach, leaders who provide student services need to understand how their leadership style impacts the students they serve. These and more continue to intrigue educators, researchers, and practitioners. Likewise, contemporary organizations are faced with demands and pressures of ever expanding magnitude.

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) explained “Leaders everywhere confront a set of irrevocable imperatives, changing realities driven by profound social, political, economic, and technological changes. Our world is in the midst of transformational change, calling for new leadership”. During this chaotic period, it is most important for organizational leaders to stay attuned to their own emotional reactions to pressures, as well as how those environmental pressures affect their constituents. Therefore, current research has focused on the importance of emotional intelligence (EI) in relation to leadership effectiveness (Stein & Book, 2000; Goleman et al., 2002; Higgs, 2002).

Currently, schools are facing many issues and emergent adversities with which student affair leaders must contend with because they serve as facilitators who promote the development of students through the services and educational experiences offered. Among these adversities, academic problems, addictions (alcohol, drugs), marital affairs, parental problems, bullying and discipline are the most common. In addition to this, according to Senge (1999), “Advances and changes in technology, science, values, environment, and international relationship hold a varied assortment of challenges and adversities in education. How a leader responds to these adversities affects not only the leader’s performance but also the
performance of those being led”. Learning to deal with adversity in the organization in one’s career life is an essential element of effective leadership (Wallington, 2004).

During the World Conference on Higher Education (2009), the changing landscape of higher education in the Asia-Pacific scenario is on the issues of rapidly changing university student population, changing socio-cultural patterns, rapid technological advancement, re-formulation of the university mission, dynamic drive to attract more international students into Asian institutions of higher learning, and new and revitalized student service program designs. In response to the challenge brought by globalization (ASEAN Integration 2015), member-states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) including the Philippines, envisioned an ASEAN University with proactive and strong linkages of leading universities and institutions in the region. In other words, the manner in which administrators of student services respond to the adversities of their context and position, both internal and external, will likely influence the local school culture, which in turn will likely influence student achievement. Leaders who are able to create and maintain a learning climate that is optimistic and resilient to the adversities inherent in modern education and society will provide students with increased opportunities to achieve in the global picture.

In the Philippines, there is an urgent call to act upon the need to empower the Student Affairs and Services programs through the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) Memorandum Order No.9 series of 2013 in accordance with the pertinent provision of Republic Act (RA) No. 7722, otherwise known as the “Higher Education Act of 1994.” Article I section 3 states that Higher Education institutions must provide a set of student-centered activities and services in support of academic instruction intended to facilitate holistic student development.
for active involvement in nation-building. These shall be collectively known as Student Affairs and Services. The role of administrators of student affairs in schools is not only to create an atmosphere of support to the diverse student needs but also to model how to face and overcome the challenges they meet along the road to opportunities. The said memorandum aims at improving the quality of Student Affairs and Services programs and services among higher education institutions by: (1) promoting access to quality, relevant, efficient and effective student affairs and services; (2) supporting student development and welfare; and, (3) ensuring that all higher education institutions comply with the minimum requirements and provide holistic approach for Student Affairs programs and services.

Research and studies on IQ (Intellectual Intelligence), MI (Multiple intelligence), and EQ (Emotional Quotient) have been given enough attention for several decades and have been identified to be relevant to success and excellent performance. Howard Gardner, a professor in psychology at Harvard University is one of many researchers who expanded the entire notion of intelligence. Now, Paul Stoltz (2000) has introduced a new and fascinating concept on Adversity Quotient® (AQ) and tells how well one withstands adversity and his or her ability to surmount it. Today, AQ® becomes more and more important as the daily dose of adversity rises in the life of school leaders. Most people, especially in the Philippines, describe ever-greater challenges in a relentless barrage of adversity, not only personal challenges but also challenges in the society and in the work place (Capones, 2004).

In the local scene, Negros Oriental and Siquijor Island province is one of the four islands in Central Visayas Region. Dumaguete City is strategically located as the center of the province as its capital emerging as a technological center in Central Philippines along with others with its
growing business process outsourcing (BPO) and other technology-related industries. Siquijor is considered as the third smallest province in the country and is commonly associated with mystic traditions with the island’s growing tourism industry that it capitalizes on (CHEDRO VII handbook).

Negros Oriental and Siquijor Island has a total of 28 higher education institutions (HEIs) of which six are only satellite campuses. Twenty of these are private HEIs with 7 sectarian and 13 non-sectarian, one state university with six satellite campuses within Negros Oriental Island and one state college in Siquijor Island. These HEIs were utilized in the study in order to achieve the following: (1) to examine whether there is a relationship between demographic profile and Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics of Student Affairs Services administrators towards developing a leadership management training design with the hope of filling in the research gap; (2) to provide substantial information for deans, directors, coordinators, heads, and faculty designates of Student Affairs and Services in facing adversities in life and in the workplace with optimism and resiliency; and (3) to embrace insights on transformational leadership management through a training design to enhance Adversity Quotient® level and leadership practices for administrators of Student Affairs and Services in Negros Oriental and Siquijor Island, Philippines.
Statement of the Problem

This research primarily examined the relationship between the respondents’ demographic profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, years of work experience and their Adversity Quotient® overall results in terms of the CORE dimensions: control, ownership, reach and endurance. Secondly, this study looked into the relationship between the respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results through the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ X5 short) based on the following factors: 1) Idealized Influence (II-Attributed); 2) Idealized Influence (II-Behavior); 3) Inspirational Motivation (IM); 4) Intellectual Stimulation (IS); 5) Individual Consideration (IC), 6) Contingent Reward(CR); 7) Management-by-Exception-Active (MBEA); 8) Management-by-Exception-Passive (MBEP); and, 9) Laissez-Faire (LF) and their demographic profile. Lastly, it sought to determine the relationship between the respondents AQ overall results and MLQ overall results.

In order to determine the interaction of the foregoing social and personal status of the respondents, the following research questions were investigated:

1. What is the demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators in terms of age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience?

2. What are the Adversity Quotient® overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

3. What are the Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the Adversity Quotient® overall results and the selected demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results and the selected demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the Adversity Quotient® overall results and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

**Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested:

H01

There is no significant relationship between the respondents' Adversity Quotient® overall results and their demographic profile (sex, age, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience).

H02

There is no significant relationship between the respondents' Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results and their demographic profile.

H03

There is no significant relationship between the respondents' Adversity Quotient® and their Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results.
Scope and Limitation

The study was focused only on determining the relationship between Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics and the demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators of selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region specifically in Negros Oriental and Siquijor Island Province, Philippines during the school year 2015-2016. The Adversity Quotient® was measured through AQP® 9.0 online instrument by Paul Stoltz (2009) and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics through MLQ (X5 short) by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004).

The analysis of the results was basically dependent on the responses of the respondents to the various items in the questionnaires. The Adversity Quotient® was measured through the AQP® version 9.0 online instrument provided by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz of Peak Learning, Inc. The Student Affairs and Services administrators answered the questions online using the unique Uniform Resource Locator (URL) given by PEAK learning to the researcher in order for the respondents to access the instrument within the period of May 15- July 30, 2015.

The Multifactor Leadership Questioner (5X-short) by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004) was used to assess their leadership characteristics through the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (5X-short). The MLQ instrument was secured with permission from Mindgarden Inc. For the purpose of this study, the nine leadership factors from MLQ were utilized but the results were intentionally not categorized based on leadership styles (transformational, transactional and laissez-faire) but on the following factors: 1) Idealized Influence (II-Attributed); 2) Idealized Influence (II-Behavior); 3) Inspirational Motivation (IM); 4) Intellectual Stimulation (IS); 5) Individual Consideration (IC); 6) Contingent Reward(CR); 7)
Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA); Passive/Avoidant Behavior; 8) Management-by-exception: Passive (MBEP); and, 9) Laissez-Faire (LF).

The respondents of the study were identified by the Commission on Higher Education Regional Office (CHEDRO VII Handbook) Philippines. These were the colleges and universities concerned with non-academic support experiences of students to attain holistic development (CHED CMO No. 9). The respondents were identified as former and present administrators of Student Affairs and Services (deans, directors, managers, assistant directors, unit heads, coordinators, faculty designates) working full-time in the above mentioned HEIs. Years of work experience of the respondents include the number of years in service as faculty and/or as administrator. All assessment tools were answered voluntarily by the respondents. However, Student Affairs and Services in higher education institutions in Negros Oriental and Siquijor have different structure and operation. Implementation of the services can be unique to an institution.
Significance of the Study

The result of the study would benefit the following:

*Student Affairs and Services Practitioners and administrators.* They will be encouraged to put their best efforts to maximize their performance capabilities and utilize awareness of their AQ® levels to help the institution they are serving and improve work performance. The findings of the study will provide ideas to help institutions develop potentials and leadership practices specifically on the areas related to management of student affairs and services.

*Academic institutions.* The institutions may include and consider the present studies of Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics in their institutional planning, decision-making, and developing programs for future leaders in the academe, for faculty and staff, especially those involved in student affairs and services.

*Philippine Association of Administrators of Student Affairs Inc. (PAASA).* The organization, in consonance with the organization’s direction to provide lectures, seminars and conventions that focus on student affairs administration, thrusts, concept-building, trends and developments, can learn from the findings of the study for this provides additional information specially, in the area of research and assessment and in understanding the administrators’ AQ® and MLC and how they handle adversity inherent in their jobs. Consequently, management of self and the people around them as administrators will improve and increase their capacity to pursue highest aspirations by responding effectively to any adversity in the work place.

*Human Resource and Development Managers in the Higher Education institutions.* They will be guided to take into consideration their AQ® in the performance or management of their respective organizations and will be able to lead their people to accomplish desired goals.
**College of Education- Doctor of Education Program.** A wide gap still exists in terms of research in the field of educational administration. Not much had been studied yet. It is hoped that the results of this study will inspire students who are pursuing Doctor of Education in major in Administration to initiate similar studies correlating adversity and leadership and other variables. It would be ideal if the program integrates Adversity Quotient Profile® and Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ) as psychological tools in the selection process of students pursuing graduate and post-graduate programs as institutions seek and assist future candidates to be equipped with the skills to withstand challenges despite the adversity as future school administrators.

**Commission on Higher Education.** The study will help officials of CHED who are concerned with Student Affairs and Services administrators in the Philippines. Pre-service trainings, seminar-workshops and conventions can be planned or designed to enhance the adversity quotient level and leadership characteristics of administrators in order to improve work efficiency and deliver more effective student services.

**Other Researchers.** This study is a valuable reference for scholarly purposes. The study will help in understanding issues regarding the relationship of Adversity Quotient and leadership characteristics which can be possibly considered by other researchers in future studies and research.
Definition of Terms

Profile

-refers to a description of the respondents based on demographic factors such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience.

Adversity Quotient® (AQ)

-is defined as the measure of one’s resilience and ability to persevere in the face of constant change, stress and difficulty. It is simply a measure of how one responds to adversity (Stotlz, 2000).

Adversity

-is any difficulty or hardship that an individual encounters. This may arise from any aspect of one’s life — self, society, or the workplace.

Adversity Response Profile

-is an accomplished self-rating questionnaire designed by Dr. Paul Stoltz (2009) that indicates an individual’s style of responding to unfavorable situations based on four CORE dimensions: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance.

Leadership

-is defined as the attributes, behaviors, characteristics, and actions that aid administrators in influencing others to reach stated goals and objectives. The role of the Student Affairs and Services administrators as leaders is critical in influencing adversity response, both individually and institutionally.
**Multifactor Leadership Characteristics**

- is derived from the Multifactor leadership Questioner (5x-short) developed by Bass and Avolio (2004) and categorized by three leadership components with nine conceptually distinct subscale factors: Transformational Leadership which is identified as characteristics of (1) idealized influence attributes and (2) Idealized Influence-Behavior (3) Inspirational Motivation, (4) Intellectual Stimulation, (5) Individual Consideration; Transactional leadership which is identified as characteristics of (6) Contingent Reward, (7) Management-by-Exception-Active; and, Passive/Avoidant Leadership which is identified as characteristics of (8) Management-by-Exception-Passive and (9) Laissez-Faire.

**Student Affairs and Services Administrators**

- are practitioners of Student Affairs and Services in higher educational institutions as defined by CHED Memorandum Order # 9 series of 2013 that are concerned with academic support experiences of students to attain holistic student development. Academic support services are those that relate to student welfare, student development and those that relate to institutional programs and services. Implementation of these services can be unique to an institution. The SAS administrators in this study include former and present deans, directors, managers, unit heads, and faculty designates working full-time in any of the 28 public and private higher education institutions in Central Visayas Region within Negros Oriental and Siquijor Island Province, Philippines.
Leadership Management Training Design

-is a proposed leadership management training design based on the findings of the study for Student Affairs and Services administrators to enhance their leadership qualities and for them to embrace transformational leadership approaches. These are set of training activities aim at proactive change in an individual. In the context of this research, it is the researcher’s purpose to bring about a change in the AQ® level of the identified group. Moreover, along the process, leaders can positively influence their associates’ awareness of what is important and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides an underlying framework for understanding the concepts that are central to this study: demographic profile, Adversity Quotient® and the various leadership characteristics. This portion presents a review of related literature to give a clear picture of the background of the study. This research indicates the Student Affairs and Services administrators’ demographic profile and their relationship with leadership characteristics.

Student Affairs Administration

The past roots of today’s student affairs programs of American colleges can be traced to the founding of the colonial colleges in the 1600s. Patterned on the English universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the colonial colleges were residential, religiously affiliated institutions. The doctrine of “in loco parentis” was the guiding philosophy: the system of discipline was paternalistic, strict and authoritarian (Komives, et al, 1996). In the middle of the 19th century a more relaxed view developed and the concept of the extra curriculum emerged. Extracurricular activities are a response to the traditional, strictly classical course of study, and include literary societies, debate clubs, athletic teams, and campus publications. The first Greek letter organization, Phi Beta Kappa, was founded in 1776. The period from 1850 to 1990 was a period of diversification: the creation of land grant colleges, the establishment of segregated Black colleges, the opening of women’s colleges, and the influence of the German university movement. These developments resulted in the appointments of special personnel to handle student problems. Heretofore, Individuals like Thomas Arkle Clark, appointed dean of men at the University of Illinois in 1901, and Evelyn Wright Allen, appointed dean of women at
Standford in 1901, were pioneers in the emerging profession then known as student personnel work. For these grounded-breaking professionals there was no coherent institutional philosophy or purpose to guide their work. Clark said, “I had no specific duties, no specific authority, and no precedence either to guide me or to handicap me... My only chart was that of the action of the Board of Trustees which said I was no interest myself in the individual student” (cited in Komives et al, 1996). These professionals, along with many others, helped shape the events which led to the recognition of what is today termed as student services or student affairs.

To guide them in their functions, the early deans used a pioneering document, the 1937 Student Personnel Point of View, which “gives the profession its soul” (Komives, et al, 1996).

In the Philippines, this picture looks familiar largely because of the heavy influence of the American educational system on the Philippine higher education. The basic functions of tertiary institutions are still teaching and research and student affairs usually falls under support services. In other words, student affairs, along with other things that are not academic, support teaching research. And more often than not, the heads of student affairs offices are also faculty members and being in student affairs is an additional assignment. On the contrary, the bulk of student affairs practitioners are non-faculty in many universities abroad. In fact, in the Hong Kong University of Sciences and Technology, the Director of Student Affairs as well as the other staff is non-faculty. Only the wardens of residences are faculty members (Lacdo-o, 2005).

Traditionally, student affairs practitioners function as managers. The manager functions, are essentially planning, organizing, delegating, staffing, coordinating, budgeting, and the like. In other words, student affairs administrators oversee people and resources to ensure that they
are directed toward achieving the goals of both the administrative unit and the institution. (Miller, 2000).

Recently, the American College Personnel Association (ACPA 1996) published the Student Learning Imperative (SLI). These documents reiterated the importance of student affairs administrators functioning as educators, this time focusing specially on the outcomes of campus programs and services on student learning and personal development. More importantly, the student learning imperative is for the student affairs to be principally educational in nature and is devoted precisely toward the same goals as those of academic faculty to promote student learning and self-development using educationally instructive strategies.

At present, the Student Affairs divisions offer a variety of continuous learning opportunities and maintain a healthy campus environment. Community service learning and leadership development programs complement students’ academic pursuits while clubs and recreation activities promote student involvement. Residence halls and dining services meet students’ basic needs. Resource centers offer information on various topics (e.g. disability services, multicultural programs) and health and counseling centers provide care for physical and mental health. Across this spectrum of responsibilities, a clear mission for student affairs can instil a unified sense of purpose in staff at all levels. Leaders of Student Affairs and Services Division can use its organizational structure to help realize this mission (The Advisory Board Company 2011).

The Student Affairs sector of the Catholic Education Association of the Philippines (CEAP) of the National Capital Region considered it important to identify the competencies which
student affairs workers should possess. While the reporters come from different areas of work related to student affairs, they cited more or less the same competencies that the student affairs workers assigned to the job should possess. Among the competencies commonly cited were the following: understanding of the vision of the school; understanding of the nature of the students; knowledge of the laws concerning students; and, understanding of legal procedures. They are expected to possess the following management skills: planning, organizing, coordinating, evaluating, team-building, problem solving, interpersonal skills, research, facilitating group discussions and activities; communication skills, staff development, decision-making, conflict-management, use of information technology, and crises management. Aside from these competencies, student affairs workers are expected to manifest desirable values (values that the school where they come from stand for) and follow a decorum acceptable in the Filipino society (Songco, 2000).

Recently, CHED Memorandum Order No. 9 Series of 2013 on Enhanced Policies and Guidelines on Student Affairs and Services states that in accordance with the pertinent provisions of Repbulic Act (RA) No. 7722, otherwise known as the “Higher Education Act of 1994”, Batas Pambansa 232, and Resolution No. 321-2013 of the Commission en banc dated April 8, 2013, the Commission on Higher Education, pursuant to its commitment to the utmost achievement of quality, relevant and efficient higher education in the country, hereby adopted and promulgated the following enhanced policies and guidelines on Student Affairs and Services, which define the scope, procedures, the extent of regulations as well as the mechanics of evaluating student welfare and activities for students enrolled in Higher Education (HEIs).
Article VI Section 11 states that higher education institution must ensure that there is an office to manage the student affairs and services: the HEI must ensure an adequate number of student services personnel to serve the student population and that the student services personnel are qualified, and competent.

**Student Affairs and Services**

Student Affairs and Services are the services and programs in higher education institutions concerned with the academic support experiences of students to attain holistic development. Academic support services are those that are related to institutional programs and services. Implementation of the services can be unique to an institution (CHED CMO N0.9 Series of 2013). Student welfare services are basic services and programs needed to ensure and promote the well-being of students. Student development services refer to the services and programs designed for the exploration, enhancement and development of the student’s full potential for personal development, leadership, and social responsibility through various institutional and/or student-initiated activities while institutional student programs and services refer to the services and programs designed to pro-actively respond to the basic health, food, shelter, and safety concerns of students including students with special needs and disabilities and the school.

**Adversity Quotient®**

This discussion is grounded on the three main foundations which are psychoneuroimmunology, neurophysiology, and cognitive psychology. Psychoneuroimmunology is a field of investigation on how emotions and thoughts might affect body and health while neurophysiology is all about studies on how the brain functions and
learns during formation of habits. Lastly, cognitive psychology is a big aspect of psychology which focuses on relationships between thoughts and feelings associated with healthiness of the mind. This field can be further divided into several subjects, for instance, learned helplessness theory, hardiness, resilience, attribution, self-efficacy and many more (Stoltz, 1997).

Adversity Quotient® predicts how well one withstands adversity, overcomes it, and foresees who will be crushed, who will exceed and fall short of their expectations in performance and potential, and who gives up and prevails. Stotlz (1997) found out that AQ® has three forms. First, AQ® is a new conceptual framework for understanding and enhancing all facets of success. It is built upon a substantial base of familiar research which offers a practical, new combination of knowledge that redefines what it takes to succeed. Second, AQ® is a measure of how one responds to adversity which can be understood and changed and can be calculated and interpreted. Third, AQ® is a scientifically grounded set of tools for improving on how to respond to adversity resulting to an overall personal and professional effectiveness.

As indicated by Stoltz (2000), Adversity Quotient® is the science of human resilience. Resilience is most commonly understood as a process and not a trait of an individual. It is sometimes referred to as ‘posttraumatic growth’ or ‘steeling effects’ where the adversity leads to better functioning much like an inoculation that gives the capacity to cope well with future exposure to disease (Ruffer, 2008).
Adversity Quotient® and Demographic Profile

The findings of Cura and Gozum’s study (2011) that focused on the relationship between the Adversity Quotient® and the mathematics achievement of the sophomore students in Pamantasan Ng Lungosod Ng Maynila- College of Engineering and Technology for school year 2010-2011 with respondents who were mostly male and from the public high schools showed that the Adversity Quotient® of the respondents was not influenced by sex, course, academic status, scholastic status, scholarship grant and the type of high school they graduated from. Another study of Ferrer (2009) showed that majority of the academic head respondents belong to middle range on Adversity Quotient® dimensions: control, ownership, reach and endurance. In terms of overall adversity quotient® level, the respondents belong to average range. In terms of leadership styles, majority of the respondents possess a participative style. In terms of job satisfaction, respondents are satisfied with their present job conditions. On the assessment of significant relationship between personal characteristics such as age, gender, civil status, educational attainment and number of years of service and overall Adversity Quotient® level (control, ownership, endurance dimensions), the study showed that no significant relationship existed, except for educational attainment and AQ® reach dimension. The study also revealed that there was no relationship between leadership styles and overall adversity quotient® level except for leadership style and AQ® control dimension. Moreover, the study also found out that job satisfaction and overall adversity quotient® (control, ownership, reach and endurance dimensions) were not significantly related.

A study of Napire (2013) on Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Style in relation to the demographic profile of Elementary School principals revealed the following results: the
Adversity Quotient® (control, ownership, reach, and endurance dimensions) scores of the elementary school principals were within the “below average” range with mean score lower than the standard mean scores for each dimension sex, age, civil status, length of service as principal, highest educational attainment; and position was also not significantly related to the Adversity Quotient® (control, ownership, reach, and endurance) scores of elementary school principals.

Villaver (2005) focused her study on the Adversity Quotient levels of female grade school teachers of a public and a private school in the Rizal Province. She applied the Adversity Response Profile 7.0 of Dr. Paul Stoltz (1997). Her respondents were female grade school teachers (105) of public and private schools (31) in the province of Rizal. The z-test statistical method was used to determine the significant difference between Adversity Quotient levels of the teacher respondents. The findings on AQ® and demographic profile indicated that early adulthood stage category possessed moderate AQ® while older counterparts, moderately low AQ®. Respondents with single status were found to have moderate and moderately low AQ®s compared with the married respondents. Respondents with a teaching experience of ten years or lower had moderate AQ® while those with higher than eleven years have moderately low AQ®. In terms of socioeconomic status, the lower class had moderate AQ® while the middle class had moderately low AQ®. She discovered that there were no significant differences in AQ® between public and private school teachers since both had moderate AQ® levels.

Moreover, Lazaro-Capones (2004) in her study entitled “Adversity Quotient and the Performance Level of Selected Middle Managers of the Different Departments of the City of Manila” revealed based on the 360 degree feedback system that establishes the relationship
between AQ and job performance that there was no significant relationship between Adversity Quotient and age, gender, civil status or length service. However, results showed a significant positive correlation between Adversity Quotient and Performance level of the sample. This means that the higher the AQ the better the performance which supports the belief that training is necessary to enhance AQ and that enhanced AQ will benefit the recipient of the training.

Consequently, Olila (2012) in her study, “Adversity Quotient and Personal Characteristics” showed no correlation between the personality-temperament traits of in-school principals, school heads, academic heads and classroom teachers of selected private and public educational institutions in the Province of Aurora and their gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service.

On the other hand, Wu’s (2009) study looked into the situations, differences and related situations of adversity quotient and campus crisis management for the educators in elementary schools. To complete the study, it started with literature analysis, questionnaire survey, and collection and analysis of data.

The questionnaire was performed on 400 elementary school educators in 39 elementary schools in Kaohsiung Country. The software SPSS v. 12 was used to statistically analyze data using t-test, one-way ANOVA, product-moment correlation and multiple regression analysis. The results of analyzed data revealed that the adversity quotient of elementary school educators in Kaohsiung Country was in the medium high range. However, it was easily affected by other factors of life due to the distress. The elementary school educators in Kaohsiung Country needed to establish the conceptions of guidance and assistance for campus crisis
management. The elementary school educators in Kaohsiung Country who are males and who have already been serving over 11 years, graduated from graduate school, administrative staffs, home-room teachers and had experience for handling crisis have higher adversity quotient. The elementary school educators in Kaohsiung Country who are males, serve over 6 years, graduated from graduate school and administrative staffs, home-room teachers and had experience for handling crisis perform much better in campus crisis management. There is a close relation between the level of adversity quotient and campus crisis management. Adversity quotient can be the reference for projecting the ability of campus crisis management.

Schoon, Parsons and Sacker (2004), in their article on “Socio-Economic Adversity, Educational Resilience, and Subsequent Levels of Adult Adaptation” which is a longitudinal study on adolescents coming from different socio-economic backgrounds, studies adaptation patterns and resilience from adolescence to mid-adulthood found that socio-economic adversity may be overcome by positive teacher expectations, parental involvement and high personal motivation and that resilience can be understood only by considering the dynamic interactions between the individual and the context. They found that people with lower socio-economic background with the right environment support are better able to overcome adversities.

Furthermore, Huijuan (2009) in her study, “The Adversity Quotient and Academic Performance Among College Students at St. Joseph’s College, Quezon City” conducted on 280 undergraduate students found no significant difference in the AQ of males and females but found a significant difference in AQ of students from different courses and year levels and a significant correlation between AQ and academic performance of respondents.
In addition, O’Connell et al (2008) compared several groups on their adaptability. Among the personal variables, it was found out that age and race did not influence adaptability. However, females were found to be more adaptable than males. Among the human capital factors, employability and education are significantly correlated to adaptability, and among the different factors, the most significant is management support. This encourages individuals to pursue their own professional development, and for managers in organizations to facilitate, support and motivate workers to learn to adapt to change.

Lin (2001), in her study, selected the managers of business operations of branches of chain stores as samples and used gender as a variable and found that the AQ score of male managers was significantly higher than that of female managers. Chen (2003) elected enterprise employees as research subjects and found that gender did not have a significant effect on their AQ. However, some of the demographic variables (e.g. age, level of education, seniority, and job title) had significant effects on AQ. Wei (2008) selected life insurance agents as samples and found that demographic variables (e.g. age, level of education, seniority of service, job title, and marital status) had significant effect on AQ. Lee (2008) investigated the mentors of elementary schools, and found that gender, age, seniority of service, and level of education of teachers have a significant effect on their EQ, AQ, and class management performance. Shen and Chan (2003) also found in their study on employees of traditional industries that origin and ownership, reach, and endurance in AQ were the main factors affecting work pressure; however, control had no effect. This result showed that the control ability of employees to control in traditional industries did not have a significant effect on work pressure. However, origin and ownership had significant
positive effect on work pressure while endurance had a negative effect on work pressure (http://www.hraljournal.com/Page/3%20Shen%20Chao%20Ying.pdf).

Given these points, Lazarо’s, Curа and Gozum’s, Villаver, Canivel’s and Ferrer’s studies had some similarities with the present research since the aforementioned studies had similar findings that Adversity Quotient® do not have significant relationship with selected demographic profile.

**Leadership Concepts**

The study of leadership has been plagued with an overabundance of theories with little common direction (Chemers, 1993; Northhouse, 1997; Day, 2001). Chemers (1993) called for integration among leadership theories and approaches to provide a unified and clear direction for leadership research. However, this integration of leadership studies has managed to elude researchers. Chemers (2000) conducted a historical view and analysis of leadership theories and concluded that common findings in leadership studies have led to the following three tasks that leaders must achieve in order to be effective: (a) establish the legitimacy of their authority, (b) coach, guide and support their constituents in ways that allow for both group and individual goal attainment, and (c) identify and employ the strengths and abilities found in themselves as well as their constituents to accomplish the organizational mission (p. 40). There is little doubt that researchers in the area of leadership studies would question Chemer’s conclusion and state that they are missing other important aspects of leadership effectiveness. However, his findings are a step in the right direction. In summary, leadership and effective leadership are still obscure, ambiguous and controversial constructs in the literature. Many researchers have
focused on a leader’s ability to effectively navigate and successfully lead in the chaotic and
turbulent world of society (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Massey, 2002).

Today, leaders face the challenge of recruiting and holding on to competent employees
in organizations. A leader’s ability to inspire, motivate and create commitment to a common
goal is crucial (Bass, 1997). Traditional leadership theories focused mainly on rational process.
But theories of transformational and charismatic leadership emphasize emotions and values
(Yukl, 1994) and imply that leader and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality
elevating the interest of followers, generating awareness and acceptance among followers, and
motivating followers to go beyond self-interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1997). The
main components of transformational leadership are idealized influence and inspirational
motivation which serve as a charismatic role model in articulating a vision of the future that can
be shared. Individualized consideration involves the leader paying attention to individual
differences. Intellectual stimulation is defined as questioning old assumptions and the status
quo (Avolio & Bass, 1995).

The study of Dalisay (2007) determined administrative practices in the public secondary
schools in the National Capital Region. Administrative practices in the school were examined
from two perspectives: that of the science teachers and that of the administrators. Science
teachers and administrators perceived the implementation of mandated sciences as the
primary concern in schools. Effective practices were also noted to be frequently observed in
students’ development. Teachers perceived administrative practices in instruction and
curriculum development. Administrators worked at promoting teamwork and collaboration
among teachers. They showed polite and thoughtful behavior towards everyone in the
community. Both science teachers and administrators perceived that improvisation, innovations, creativity and the extensive and optimum use of science equipment and facilities were encouraged in the schools. Additional interesting finding of the study was that many administrators were formerly outstanding teachers. Criteria for promotion of teachers to administrative position allowed public school teacher to become principal or administrator in the public schools.

For ages, people have been looking for direction, purpose and meaning to guide their collective activities. Leadership is needed to foster purposes, direction, imagination, and passion, especially in times of crisis or rapid change. At such times, people look to leaders for hope, inspiration and a pathway which will lead them somewhere more desirable (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Endriga (2008) emphasized that current and future leaders must recognize that the major trends in globalization, technology, trade and geopolitical alignments have caused profound changes in economic activity, consumer behavior and lifestyles, industry structures, the nature of management and relationships among nations. The mindset of change, transparency, reform and transformation must replace out-dated thinking that leaders can survive with patronage, dependency and apathy. Ciulla (2004) emphasized that leadership is a distinct kind of moral relationship. According to him, leaders cannot empower people unless they have the moral courage to be honest with themselves. On the other hand, people want leaders who are honest, forward looking, competent and inspiring (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). All reviews of leadership definitions agree that leadership process is a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational variable. Corrales (2007) stressed that the ability to build strong
relationships is the universal prerequisite for becoming a great leader. Without that ability, no personal trait would consistently lead to great leadership. Not one trait can explain great leadership, not even empathy. A trait is a personal quality; while leadership is an interpersonal ability. It includes the personal, but transcends it.

Effective leadership requires influence. To have influence, one needs to have a strong relationship. Therefore, the relationship component of leadership is its core feature. Leaders who see relationship building as the “soft” stuff of organizational building will neglect the most important ingredient of their craft. They will relegate the relationship to the level of a “necessary nuisance.” These leaders will always encounter leadership puzzles they cannot understand. They are so goal focused that they will miss the “water” in which they live. Like fish, they will not realize that people require healthy water to draw life giving oxygen. The relationship is the water. This relationship is the most single important factor in promoting productivity.

According to Stewart (2006), the fundamental question for educational leaders remains: “How will educational leaders navigate others within a culture that fully embraces systematic change?” The efforts previously mentioned and other philosophical approaches are part of an ongoing normative approach and are attempts to understand leadership by suggesting concepts of leadership, emphasizing how leaders and followers should behave. A normative approach to leadership attempts to give answers to would-be leaders who are confronted with different situations and asks, what should be done?

There are a number of different approaches or “styles” to leadership and management that are based on different assumptions and theories. The style that individuals use will be
based on a combination of their beliefs, values and preferences, as well as the organizational culture and norms which will encourage some styles and discourage others. Recent approaches to leadership focus on vision and charisma, a term used by sociologist Max Weber to describe leaders who can lead, but who do not hold “a sanctioned office” (English, 1992). In the late 1970s, the concepts of transactional and transformational leadership emerged. Transactional leadership claims that the relationship between managers and employees is based on bargaining whereas transformational leadership supposes that the relationship between the manager and the employee is of mutual trust and characterized by four factors: charisma, inspiration, individual consideration and intellectual stimulation. If one attempts to examine transformational leadership theory, it can be clearly seen that it is epistemologically based on positivist/empiricist foundation on which traditional conceptualizations of leadership have been formulated (Allix, 2000). Burns (cited in Deluga, 1995) holds that leadership cannot be separated from follower’s needs and goals. Its essence lies in the interaction between the follower and the leader. This interaction takes fundamentally two different forms: transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership occurs when there is an exchange between people which can be economic, political or psychological in nature. The relationship between the leader and the follower is purely on bargaining and it does not go beyond this. However, transformational leadership occurs when the leader and the follower elevate one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Carlson (1996) points out that Burns felt that leadership theories developed up to the mid-seventies were lacking ethical/moral dimensions, so he elaborated on his exchange theory which maintains that
followers play a crucial role in the definition of leadership. This theory is made up of power relations and entails bargaining, trading and compromise among leadership and followers.

This transactional model has a political basis and emphasizes the need to look closely at sociocultural aspects that have an impact on the leader-follower relationships. According to Stodgill (1997), these can be external factors such as the availability or scarcity of resources, changes in the society, and a competitive environment that influences an organization which also in return affects the leadership of the group as well. Transactional leaders encourage subordinates by appealing to their self-interest and offering rewards in exchange for work effort which are contingent on reward and management by exception. The former urges the leader to tell the followers what to do in order to achieve a desired reward for their efforts, whereas the latter one allows the leader to interfere with the subordinates’ work only when specifications or standards are not met (Hunt, 1991). In the 1990s, Bass and Avolio developed the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) so as to identify four distinct characteristics of transformational leaders referred to as “4Is”:

Idealized influence or charisma is based on follower reactions and leader behavior. Follower identifies with and admires these leaders. Such leaders are deeply respected, have referent power, and set high standards and challenging goals for their followers.

Inspirational motivation depends on how much followers wish to identify with the leader. The leader makes use of symbols and images to raise awareness of shared and desired goals.
Intellectual stimulation followers let go of their past. They are encouraged to question their own beliefs, values, and expectations, as well as those of the leaders and the organization itself.

Individualized consideration entails different but equal treatment of the followers. The leader delegates assignments to followers to provide learning opportunities and coaches them if they need it (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

Leithwood (1994) suggests that transformational school leaders adopt a widely shared vision for the school and clarify its meaning in terms of its practical implications and instruction. In addition to this, they make maximum use of all available resources and opportunities to communicate the school’s vision to staff, students, parents and other. They focus on teachers’ professional goals and if possible they align these goals with those of the school. Moreover, school goals are used as basis in the decision-making process. The staff are encouraged to be innovative, hardworking and professional and the leaders also search for these qualities when they recruit staff. In terms of administrative processes, they delegate responsibility and power for leadership widely throughout the school by providing teachers with autonomy in their decisions.

According to Avolio (2004), the work of Burns “...significantly marked the course of leadership research for the next twenty-five years, resulting in transactional and transformational leadership being the most widely researched constructs in leadership literature throughout the 1990’s and into the next millennium” (2004, p. 1558). However, the works of Bass (1997, 1998) and Bass and Avolio (1993, 2004) were a response to some of the
limitations and omissions which eventually became evident in Burns’ work, in particular, “the lack of empirical evidence to support his theories” (Stewart, 2006, p. 10).

Burns’ (2003) latest book entitled “Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness” offered an expansion of his earlier work. Through an examination of the work of world leaders, he suggested ways that transactional leaders can learn to become transformational. He further suggested that what was lacking in his original work was a focus on psychology. He believed that to understand leadership and change, we must examine human needs and social change. He stated that transforming leadership begins on people’s terms, driven by their wants and needs, and must culminate in expanding opportunities for happiness. Transformational leadership, according to Yukl (2002), motivates and influences followers by making them aware of important task outcomes by inducing them to put their own self-interest aside for the sake of the organization and by activating their higher-order needs. Various authors state that transformational leadership can take on various forms such as charismatic and visionary. The central focus of this kind of leadership is the commitment and capacity of leaders to create and promote desirable visions or images of their institution. Essentially, they must alter others’ perceptions, attitudes, and commitments through their symbolic actions while arousing strong follower emotion and identification with the leader (Bensimon et al., charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leadership is said to take place when leaders behave in four ways to obtain superior performance from employees (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass, 1996; Bass, 1998; Yukl, 2002; Sorenson & Goethals, 2004).
In reviewing Kouzes and Posner’s (1998) description of what it takes to be a leader in society today, it is easy to see that the modern definition of leadership is more than influencing others towards accomplishing organizational goals; it is about actively participating and developing healthy relationships that create a balance between personal and organizational success. These established relationships will help the organization, the leader, and the constituents make it through even the most challenging and chaotic of times. Leaders who are most successful at building relationships are referred to as relational leaders.

Sashkin and Rosenbach (2001) explained that there has been a paradigm shift in leadership theory and practice in recent decades. They purported that many of the contemporary models of leadership, including Kouzes and Posner’s, are rooted in Burns’ (1978) comparison between transformational and transactional views of leadership. The concept of transformational leadership was founded on the increased importance placed on followers within the leadership paradigm. Burns (1978) explained that leaders employ both traditional-transactional practices such as creating goals, delegating tasks and managing goal attainment as well as transformational practices that empower, educate, encourage, and eventually transform constituent (p.39). Burns’ view of transactional and transformational leadership placed the two concepts on a continuum, whereby a leader’s style fits some point along the continuum between transactional and transformational. Bass (1985) later identified the two leadership approaches as two separate leadership dimensions and he created the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The MLQ measured both transactional leadership and transformational leadership. The transactional aspect of the MLQ measured three subcategories: laissez-faire, contingent reward and management by exception. The
transformational leadership aspects measured by the MLQ included charisma, inspiration, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. Sashkin and Rosenbach (2001) explained that even though Bass’s theory of transformational leadership helped to expand Burn’s works, it lacked both the study of personal leadership characteristics and the impact of culture within an organization. Kouzes and Posner (1987) followed the works of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) and created a model of transformational leadership that considered personal leadership behaviors used during times of leadership effectiveness and organizational success. (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). Understanding what helps some people function well in adversity will enable incorporation of that knowledge into practical strategies for educational leadership and student achievement through the principal’s response to adversity. Kouzes and Posner (1987) expanded Bass’s theory by conducting research in the area of “personal best” leadership experiences. They developed a Personal-Best Leadership Experience questionnaire, and conducted many follow-up interviews to gather additional information. The personal-best questionnaire asked managers to pick a project, program, or event that they characterized as their “personal-best” leadership experience. After analyzing the data collected from questionnaires and interviews, Kouzes and Posner found that despite the variety in situations and types of leadership experiences, similar patterns were identified related to actions taken by the leaders during the experience. Through the analysis process, they identified five practices of exemplary leadership that contributed to getting extraordinary things done in organizations: (a) Modeling the Way, (b) Inspiring a Shared Vision, (c) Challenging the Process, (d) Enabling Others to Act, and (e) Encouraging the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 13). In their third edition of the Leadership Challenge (2002), Kouzes and Posner outlined two commitments of
leadership for each of the five leadership practices. The first practice is “Modeling the Way”, in which leaders (Ruderman et al, 2001) conducted a study that measured the emotional intelligence (Bar-On EQ-i) and leadership skills (Benchmark 360) of 302 managers who participated in a Leadership Development Program sponsored by the Center for Creative Leadership. They found that higher levels of emotional intelligence were associated with increased performance in each area of the Benchmarks 360 leadership feedback instrument: (a) participative management, (b) putting people at ease, (c) self-awareness, (d) balance, (e) straightforwardness and composure, (f) building and mending relationships, (g) doing whatever it takes, and (h) resourcefulness. Additionally, four themes stood out from their study. First, a participative management style was central to the connection between emotional intelligence (EI) and cooperation, interpersonal sensitivity, and awareness and control of personal emotions (p. 11). The second theme identified in the study had to do with self-awareness and the leader’s ability to demonstrate stress management, tolerance, and impulse control while meeting on-the-job challenges. In this area, independence, self-directedness, self-reliance and perseverance were key factors. Finally, the fourth theme of this study observed how the lack of EI can influence the work environment and explained that the lack of EI involves problems with interpersonal relationships. Ruderman et al. explained that organizations today are putting more value on interpersonal relationships (p. 12). Prior research of Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) has found that transformational leadership had an indirect impact through a layer in the hierarchy on the performance of salespeople in an Israeli military field experiment, and Howell and Avolio (1993) have found relationships between transformational leadership styles and performance outcomes. Further, the study of Avolio, Waldman, and Eistein (1998)
also suggested that the use of training programs to develop the skills of transformational and transactional leadership would enhance salespeople’s performance and organizational performance.

The earlier result of Deeter-Schmelz and Sojka’s (2003) in-depth interview has indicated that high-performing salespeople did demonstrate characteristics related to emotional intelligence and also concluded that emotional intelligence might play a significant role for salespeople to achieve high performance. Additionally, emotional intelligence has been found to positively correlate with job performance for Taiwan engineering professionals in the study of Chang (2001). Moreover, Abraham (1999) has suggested that an optimistic insurance salesman would perform better than a pessimistic Salesman, and has concluded that emotional intelligence is directly related to performance (Goleman’s, 1998).

Leadership and Demographic Profile

Social demographic factors in researches comprise sex, race, marital status and level of educational attainment. Previous researches on the influence of social demographic factors have studied the phenomenon from different perspectives on. However, this study, has provided a detailed explanation on the nature of these differences and the impact it has on organizations. Therefore, in this study one of the social demographic factors is gender.

Evidence from the literature that marital status of an individual might influence his or her leadership style is also a bit contradictory. In fact there is no sufficient research to support the assumption whether single or married individuals are perceived to display appropriate leadership styles in organizations. However, there is a unanimous agreement that the goal of transformational leadership is to influence followers to achieve organizational objective
through change of behavior therefore the issue of marital status is of little significance. Consequently, leadership is about developing people and leaders sharing their responsibility and authority with others (Russell, 2001).

The study of C. Bell, R. Ryannieker and P. Nel (2015) states that scholars have argued that demographic variables as critical factors be used together with other factors to explain the variances in the behavior of effective leaders. They are very significant to virtually all kinds of modern organizations. The current workforce is increasingly getting younger and highly educated. And an increasing proportion of female managers are also found in today’s organizations. The present study therefore, explored the relationship between some demographic variable and leadership effectiveness among local government managers in Eastern Cape Province. The data were collected from a sample of 222 local government managers using a self-designated biographical and occupational data questionnaire, and leadership effectiveness was measured as a unitary concept. The results indicated that gender, age and education have a positive and significant relationship with leadership effectiveness when assigning leadership responsibilities to managers.

(Bulach, 2001) investigated the impact of gender, experience, number of years at a school, and degree status on the culture and climate of a school. Twenty-five schools and 1163 teachers were involved in the study. Female teachers, more experienced teachers, and teachers with more years at a school were more positive about the culture and climate of their school. Degree status did not make a difference. Teachers with 2-10 years experience were the least positive about their schools culture and climate (www.westga.edu/-cbulach).
The study of Rosenbush (Journal of Leadership Education, 2014) on “The relationship of Gender and Organizational Setting to Transformational and Transactional Leadership Skills of Selected College Student Leaders has revealed that the main reason why women are underrepresented in organizational top management position has something to do with specialties in gender roles (Larocca, 2003). Research conducted over the years has revealed that women are generally expected to endorse the idea of affirmative action than their male counterpart (Eddy, 2008). The purpose was to examine the development of transformational and transactional leadership skills among Generation X collegiate student organizational officers and members. This study looked at the organizational structure of each group and members gender to determine if these variables were related to leadership style. In this correlational study 190 college students between the ages 18-22 from two different leadership organizations were given the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1995). Significant relationships were found between the transformational leadership scores and gender. It was found that female student leaders tended to be more transformational than male student leaders. Males had a tendency to portray transactional leadership skills. The type of organization did not influence what type of leader emerged. Although Generation X attributes suggest all members are more transformational, it was concluded that gender continues to have a significant impact on the development of student leader transformational leadership skills.
**Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Characteristics**

Adversity Quotient® (AQ) applies to institutions as well as individuals. The ability of individuals within an educational setting to withstand and effectively manage adversity will greatly influence success. It affects an organization’s agility, resilience, persistence, creativity, productivity, longevity, motivation, risk-taking, stamina, health, and success (Stoltz, 1997). The characteristics of an organizational setting that allow for its successful or unsuccessful response to adversity are in educational terms called school culture. As an educational leader, the principal is responsible for guiding and directing faculty and students through challenging events and times. A leader’s understanding of adversity (both current and emerging), its aspects and influences, and an effective means with which to overcome adversity (both personally and as a leader) will influence teachers and students towards success. The three levels of adversity involved societal adversity, workplace adversity, and individual adversity.

Further studies of AQ® have found out that there are three components of human capacity: *required capacity* is the amount of capacity that is demanded from a person as he/she encounters greater adversity in his/her job and life; *existing capacity* is what people have (experience, aptitudes, knowledge, talents-everything) when they begin a job; *accessed capacity* is what a person taps – actually accesses (tap and use) between 5% and 25% of his/her existing capacity (Stoltz, 2000). Studies on adversity quotient have shown that business and industry leaders scored higher on AQ® compared to education leaders (Schmidt, 1999). This indicated that business and industry leaders are honed to address adversity since they react positively and are more hardy and resilient leaders. A student affairs administrator’s adversity
response played a crucial role over his/her work environment including subordinate relationship as well as student adjustment. What shaped the leader most were not the adversities in his/her early life but how he/she views obstacles or events in his/her adult life as opportunities disguising as challenges (Haller, 2005).

The AQ® model provides a more complete and consistent framework for identifying who is empowered and who is helpless among working professionals like sales personnel who work in a very demanding environment (Johnson, 2005). Two Philippine studies on AQ® were included: AQ levels on the selected middle managers that showed high correlation between their AQ and performance level using the 360-degree feedback system (Lazaro, 2004), and AQ levels of female teachers in both public and private schools that resulted in either moderate AQ® or moderately low AQ®. No significant differences were found between public and private school female teachers’ AQ®s (Villaver, 2005).

Since AQ® is learned studies by Dweck (1997) showed that one’s response to adversity is formed through the influence of parents, teachers, peers, and other key people during childhood. Additional results of the studies reveal that response to adversity can be interrupted and permanently changed so one can rewire one’s brain for success. Thus, discovering, measuring and applying AQ® in one’s area allows one to understand how and why some people consistently exceed the predictions and expectations of those around them. Those who cannot overcome adversity will suffer on all fronts while those with sufficiently high AQ® are likely to continue until they succeed. They will acquire benefits in all areas of their lives.

A hermeneutic phenomenological study investigating the possible relationship or impact that adversity, obstacle and challenges had on shaping and developing of prominent leaders of
the nine chosen primary respondents showed that they had experienced various degrees of adversity in their youth and adult lives. The study revealed that adversity in the early lives of the participants was not the most important factor in shaping a leader but how he/she viewed obstacles or events in his/her adult life as opportunities disguised as challenges. Several qualities of a leader emerged relative to what most shaped the participants as leaders becoming successful. The adversity in the participants’ early lives was not the most important influence. Rather, they viewed the obstacles in their adult lives as disguised challenges, and overcoming these challenges strengthened them as leaders. In addition, mentors were very important in their lives and helped them become better leaders. Religious faith and families were also keys to success. Shared concepts of leadership including honesty, integrity, caring deeply about people, communicating clearly, knowing the business well and being humble servant leaders contributed to this.

A study of Schmidt (1999) compared the adversity response scores of leaders in education to leaders in business and industry. Her study transferred the concepts related to adversity responses of business leaders to the educational realm and provided the leaders with information and support to make changes in the current system. Areas of research investigated and discussed were hardiness, resiliency, learned helplessness, self-efficacy, attribution theory and the individual responses to challenges and how these areas of study relate to leadership effectiveness. A total of seventy-six education leaders and one hundred fifty eight business leaders were the respondents. She utilized the *ex post facto*, descriptive study using a quantitative approach to data collection. The Adversity Response Profile (ARP), a self-rating questionnaire developed by Stoltz in 1997, was used to measure the individual’s style of
responding to adverse situations. Findings revealed that business and industry leaders scored high on ARP and can be interpreted that the business and industry leaders responded more effectively to adverse conditions than their education leaders’ counterparts. Furthermore, it indicated that business and industry leaders were honed to address adversity for they reacted positively and were more hardy and resilient leaders.

The study of Williams (2003) examined the relationship between a principal’s response to adversity and student achievement, the relationship between principal and teacher’s response to adversity, and principal’s perceptions of adversity in education. Using an ex post facto non-experimental research design, the principal (n=17) and teachers (n=79) from the Flagstaff Unified School District of Arizona were asked to complete an Adversity Quotient (AQ) measure (Stoltz, 1997). Scores were compared to standardized student achievement data from the past two years. Additional qualitative data were gathered through five principal interviews. The results of this study showed that students attained higher achievement scores in schools with higher AQ principals. The study also found that teachers’ perceived control over their work environment may influence principal/teacher relationships and student achievements. These findings suggest that principal response to adversity may influence school climate, teach self-efficacy, and student achievement. The interview data supported the quantitative findings and adds a rich description of the manner in which the principals view educational adversity and their responses to it.

The study of Dai (2009) aimed to explore the high tech industry employees in terms of the following: (1) the relationship among adversity quotient, job stress, perceived organizational support and role performance; (2) the adversity quotient® as a mediator
between job stress and role performance; and (3) the moderating effect of perceived organizational support to job stress and role performance. For the purposes of this study, the questionnaire survey was conducted with the employees in the south high tech industry. A total of 111 supervisor questionnaires and 333 staff questionnaires were distributed to 44 high tech firms, where the role performance 47 questionnaires were designed for pairs of supervisors and employees. The primary findings of the study showed that adversity quotient® had significantly negative effect on job stress; adversity quotient® had significantly positive effect on role performance; job stress significantly had negative effect on role performance; job stress had a mediating effect on the relationship between adversity quotient® and role performance; and, perceived organizational support did not have significantly moderate effect between job stress and role performance. This study concluded by discussing the implications of major findings which would be a reference to the academy and industries, and making suggestions for further studies.

The study conducted by Law (2010) sought to determine the resilience levels of university administrators, specifically academic deans and department chairpersons, within a state university system. This quantitative study utilized the survey method to determine the resilience levels of academic deans and department chairs within a state university system. Responses were received from 35 deans and 123 chairs, each of whom completed the Personal Resilience Questionnaire, a survey developed by Conner Partners that measures individuals’ resilience and addresses how the respondent acts, feels, or thinks given various situations. Results were provided for each of the seven characteristics of resilience: Positive-The World, Positive Self, Focused, Flexible-Thoughts, Flexible-Social, Organized and Proactive. The results
of the survey illustrated the levels of resilience for both deans and chairs and compared their results against the more than 64,000 other individuals who have completed the instrument. The Partial Least Squares (PLS) regression method was then utilized in determining individual’s resilience. The findings showed that academic deans, on the average, exhibited higher levels of resilience than did department chairs, and that female administrators, on the average, were more resilient than males. It was also discovered that when compared against individuals from other industries and professions, academic administrators exhibited above-average resilience levels on almost every resilience characteristic. Furthermore, it was shown that gender, institutional type, experience, size of the college/department supervised, parental influence, formal training and incentive were influential in determining resilience levels.

Lazaro (2004) conducted and presented her study on adversity quotient® and performance level in the 5th Asian Regional Congress of Industrial Relations Association (IIRA) held in Korea. She studied the missing factors of success and excellent performance among selected middle manager and the interesting concept of AQ® by Stoltz in 1997 was used. The capacity of each employee was the basis of organizational capacity where the manager handled the smallest unit. These managers handled multifaceted tasks being exposed to different people of various organizational levels creating demands greater speed capacity and capabilities. A multi-source assessment or 360-degree feedback process was used in determining the performance of a middle manager. This instrument viewed performance accurately by getting input from supervisors, peers or colleagues, subordinates, and clients from all angles. The study employed the descriptive, co-relational method of research to determine the relationship of Adversity Quotient® and performance level on middle managers.
using the 360-degree feedback system. The selected middle managers of the different departments of the City of Manila showed a high correlation between AQ® and performance level of the respondents.

The results of the study of Canivel (2010) on the Principal’s Adversity Quotient®: Styles, Performance and Practices showed that the generated principals’ adversity quotient® profile (AQ®P) of the private schools in Rizal had an average descriptive interpretation. Among the four dimensions of adversity quotient® ownership scored below average and the remaining dimensions: control, reach and endurance had the same average scores. With low AQ®, the tendency is to blame oneself (Stoltz, 2000) but with high AQ® the individual learns one’s behavior to become smarter, a character of a person with high self-worth. Results showed the responses of the principals were grouped into the leadership styles in which the participating leadership style ranked 1, followed by selling leadership style, delegating leadership style, and telling leadership style.

The principal respondents maximized the quantity and quality of performance and found out that participating style was an ideal approach to lead people according to Likert as cited in the study of Canivel (2010) and was used by most principals interviewed. From the interviews conducted among the principal respondents, four themes emerged with regards to performance. These were concerned with personality of the principals, association with colleagues, workplace and effectiveness. It affected their entire endeavors, plans and practices in their school. The proponents of the study likewise organized the responses of the principals on the various sharing regarding the practices applied in their respective schools. The prevailing
practices define clear directions through constant reviewing of the mission-vision statement which was the primary concern of the principals.

According to Sachdev (2009) in her study on “Effectiveness of an Intervention Programme to Develop Adversity Quotient® of Potential Leaders”, the intervention programme had been effective in increasing the AQ® level of potential leaders as compared with a control group taken from the same population. Qualitative responses revealed specific areas and strategies that participants have found more beneficial. The complete Intervention Programme had been presented along with all exercises, handouts, instructions and power point presentation. On the basis of the results of quantitative analysis and qualitative feedback, the intervention programme had been redesigned to include suggestions made by the participants. The redesigned intervention programme was presented, along with a manual for its use in the accompanying CD. The researcher recommended three different approaches to develop a person’s resilience: 1) A formal ‘programme’ approach – the proponents of the study recommended that a series of program should be done in developing Adversity Quotient® and that time between the sessions should be used to instill ideas and strategies that evolve into practices; 2) Ongoing coaching and mentoring – the proponents of the study recommended that the development of AQ® should not be a one-off intervention programme and that participants should be trained to identify their own reactions to adversity to understand the barriers that are stopping them from reacting in an appropriate manner to the adversity that they faced (with respect to the four CORE dimensions); 3) and, Use of available audio-visual resources – the proponents of the study suggested that excerpts from the film which highlighted one more other CORE dimension should be shown in isolation or in combination to
bring out the point and that film viewing should be immediately followed by an interactive discussion which would integrate the ideas viewed into the participants’ own life.

Majority of the students revealed that life challenges and difficulties determined the person’s ways of decision-making, particularly to their job perspective. Leadership means a lot in the success or failure of the school, teachers, and the administrators and its clientele. Leaders carry in their position the authority, responsibility, and accountability.

Bass, Avolio, and Atwater (1996), conducted four studies from 1986 to 1992. In all four studies they found out that women leaders attained higher scores for all four components of transformational leadership including charisma, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1998). As far as the transactional components are concerned they found that contingent reward was not statistically significant in the separate studies. Except for one group, there were no differences between males and females in the components management-by-exception and laissez-faire approaches. They discovered that women practiced more actively while management-by-exception men practiced management-by-exception passively. Komives (1991) discovered that there was no statistical difference between female and male managers who self-rated themselves except for intellectual stimulation. She found out that females were significantly higher than their male counterparts. D’Ambrosio (2000) examined gender differences in transformational and transactional leadership styles among leaders. She found no statistical significance between gender and transformational and transactional leadership styles among leaders. The raters who were male, however, tended to rate the female leaders higher in transformational leadership.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical paradigm in this study is anchored on Dr. Paul G. Stoltz Adversity Quotient theory and James Mc Gregor Burn’s transformational and transactional leadership theory.

For many years, researchers have devoted a great deal of their studies to intelligence Quotient (IQ) and Emotional Quotient (EQ) which are considered to be determinants of success and superior accomplishment. A decade ago (1997), Stoltz introduced a new yet interesting and intriguing concept – Adversity Quotient® (AQ®) which tells how well one withstands adversity and his ability to triumph over it. In fact, more researches recently have shown that measurement of AQ® is a better index in achieving success than IQ, education or even social skills.

Formerly, Stoltz (1997, 2000) provided theories on adversity quotient® (AQ®) of an individual on how to resolve such challenge and strive to overcome it so as not to affect deeply what he/she will accomplish in his/her work and towards life. Stoltz’s AQ® as the measure of one’s resilience and ability to persevere in the face of constant change, stress and difficulty or AQ® is simply a measure of how you respond to adversity.

Expanding on the work of Ellis, Aaron Beck formulated a model of cognitive psychology that emphasized the need to challenge or dispute negative beliefs about oneself, the present event or situation, and the future. Additionally, this model helps people recognize, assess, and dispute their reactions to life’s events. According to Stoltz (1997), the importance of these models in cognitive psychology is that unlike most training which loses its impact over time, one of the most powerful findings from these studies has been that the effect of cognitive disputation skills seems to take on a life of its own, expanding and growing long after the
training: AQ® alters how individuals view adversity and their response to it, both in current circumstances and in the future.

The concepts of Adversity Quotient® were discovered by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz in 1997. It is a scientific theory of human resilience. According to Stoltz, AQ® determines the ability of the person to succeed in work and in life. It tells how a person withstands adversity and his ability to surmount it. It predicts who will overcome adversity and who will crush it; predicts who will exceed expectations of their performance and potential and who will fall short; and, it predicts who will give up and who prevails. AQ® strengthens the effectiveness of leadership and enhances the effectiveness of subordinates. Diverse reactions are not unusual when faced with adversity. Adverse situations can be divided into three categories: events you have no control or influence over, situations resulting from decisions you made, and circumstances caused by someone else’s actions. Stoltz identifies three levels of adversity: societal, workplace, and individual. Societal adversity encompasses the continued shift in wealth, uncertainty about economic security, fear of violence and crime, environmental concerns, new definitions of family, and a loss of faith in institutions and leaders, including education. Workplace adversity results from the increasing demands of getting ahead in the world of work coupled with a loss of trust and control. As people work harder and harder to get ahead, they are receiving less and less in return. The accumulated burdens of societal and workplace adversities merge into individuals striving to be “all you can be.” These stressors lead to individual adversity (Stoltz, 2000). As these changes catch up to the individual, they can be overwhelming. The accumulated effects of the many levels of adversity faced by individuals can cause a loss of hope. School leaders must adjust and respond to the adversity that exists in all three levels:
from personal family to events occurring outside the community’s boundaries, or to the stress placed on education both nationally and locally for increased accountability and student achievement. AQ has four “CORE” dimensions that describe pattern of response to adversity. These are control, ownership, reach, and endurance.

*Control* describes the extent to which someone perceives they can influence whatever happens next. The more control one has, then more likely one has to take positive actions. Persons with higher AQ®s perceive they have significantly more control and influence in adverse situations than those with lower AQ®s. AQ® determines resilience, health and tenacity over changing situations.

*Ownership* is defined as the likelihood that someone will actually do anything to improve the situation, regardless of their formal responsibilities. The high AQ® worker holds himself/herself accountable for the outcome of the meeting, regardless of the reason it is going poorly; the low AQ® worker sees himself/herself as helpless victim. Person with high AQ® will enhance his/her ability to control the situation and will motivate positive actions while person with low AQ® will most likely blame others and composite a negative actions.

*Reach* is the extent to which someone perceives an adversity will “reach into” and affect other aspects of the situation or beyond. Someone with high AQ® will put setbacks in perspectives, not letting them ruin the day or the weekend. He/She resolves to learn from the mistakes. A low AQ® worker would extrapolate, turning the single failure into proof that he/she is worthless and stupid. This will affect other aspects of one’s life leading to frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and may lead to poor decision-making. This dimension will determine person’s burden, stress, energy, and effort as it tends to have cumulative effect.
Endurance is the perception of time over good or bad events and their consequences will last to endure. Seeing beyond even enormous difficulties is an essential skill for maintaining hope. Those with higher AQ® have the capability to see past the most interminable difficulties and maintain hope and optimism. Those with lower AQ® see adversity as dragging on indefinitely, if not permanently. Stotlz formulated a formula on how to improve AQ® called LEAD-Listen, Explore, Analyze, and Do something: (1) Listen-it is how a person responds to adversity; it measures the ability of the person in decision-making over adverse scenarios; (2) Explore-know the root cause of the problem and take responsibility; (3) Analyze-intelligently think of the situations in its occurrence and decide accordingly; (4) Do something-workout plan of actions and evaluate the result.

Adversity, though usually perceived as negative or harmful, is not without beneficial effect. It is often an individual’s reaction to adversity, not the adversity itself which determines whether the outcome is positive or negative. Given the understanding of the cognitive psychology underlying adversity and its potential benefits, the critical issues become the development of an effective means with which to respond to adversity, for both self and others. Adversity Quotient® (AQ), a theory developed by Stotlz, is built upon the cognitive psychology discussed earlier in this section and provides a means with which to overcome or benefit from adversity. The three elements of AQ are as follows: (1) AQ is a new conceptual framework for understanding and enhancing all facets of success; (2) AQ is a measure of how an individual responds to adversity; and, (3) AQ is a scientifically-grounded set of tools for improving response to adversity.
The concept of Adversity Quotient® discovered by Stoltlz (1997) is a science of human performance theory deeply rooted in several sciences like cognitive psychology (control and mastery of one’s life), psychoneuro-immunology (immune function), and neurophysiology (science of the brain). The cognitive psychology research has found that people respond to problems in consistent patterns that do not change unless the individual takes action to modify the behavior. This includes several essential concepts for understanding human motivation, effectiveness and performance.

AQ begins with an individual, but goes beyond as one is exposed to an organization. Stoltz (2000) advised that these skills can be applied to oneself, to others, and to organization. The theory discovered can be measured and can enhance the effectiveness of teams, relationships, families, organizations, communities, cultures, and societies. AQ will strengthen one’s effectiveness as a leader while enhancing the effectiveness of those being led.

Parallel to the discussion of AQ, the concepts of transformational and transactional leadership are among the most popular and current approaches to understanding leader effectiveness. It was developed in 1978 by Burns (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Bass (1985) built new version of transformational leadership on Burn’s work and then Bass and Avolio (1994, 1997) proposed full-range theory of leadership consists of transformational, transactional, and laissez -faire (Antonakis & Atwater, 2002).

In retrospect, Burns (1978) introduced the concept of transformational leadership which is about the ability of a leader to motivate and empower his/her followers with the goal to transform people and organizations, in a literal sense, to change them in mind and heart; enlarge vision, insight, and understanding; clarify purposes; make behavior congruent with
beliefs, principles or values; and, bring about changes that are permanent, self-perpetuating and momentum building. Leadership is meaningless without its connection to common purposes and collective needs. Burns’ concept is broad enough to include everything from great leaders to mothers, teachers, peers, and work supervisors.

According to Avolio (2004, p. 158), the work of Burns “significantly marked the course of leadership research for the next twenty-five years, resulting in transactional and transformational leadership being the most widely researched constructs in leadership literature throughout the 1990s and into the next millennium”. However, the works of Bass (1997, 1998) and Bass and Avolio (1993, 2004) were a response to some of the limitations and omissions which eventually became evident in Burns’ work, in particular, “the lack of empirical evidence to support his theories” (Stewart, 2006, p. 10).

Soon after, Burns’ (2003) latest book entitled Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness offered an expansion of his earlier work. Through an examination of the work of world leaders, he suggested ways that transactional leaders can learn to become transformational. He further confirmed that what was lacking in his original work was focus on psychology. He believed that to understand leadership and change, we must examine human needs and social change. He stated that transforming leadership begins on people’s terms, driven by their wants and needs, and must culminate in expanding opportunities for happiness. On the other hand, transformational leadership, according to Yukl (2002), motivates and influences followers by making them aware of important task outcomes, by inducing them to put their own self-interest aside for the sake of the organization, and by activating their higher-order needs. Various authors state that transformational leadership can take on various forms
such as charismatic and visionary. The central focus of this kind of leadership is the commitment and capacity of leaders to create and promote desirable visions or images of their institution. Essentially, they must alter others’ perceptions, attitudes, and commitments through their symbolic actions while arousing strong follower emotion and identification with the leader (Bensimon et al., 1989; Leithwood et al., 2000). Transformational leadership has four components: charismatic leadership, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leadership is said to take place when leaders behave in one of those four ways to obtain superior performance from employees (Avolio & Bass, 1991; Bass, 1996; Bass, 1998; Yulk, 2002; Sorenson & Goethals, 2004). Transformational leaders encourage follower to do more than required (Sosik et al, 2002), are proactive and help followers to attain unexpected goals (Antonakis et al, 2003); they move followers beyond immediate self-interest (Bass, 1999). The transformational leaders engage in a particular set of behaviors. They are models of integrity and fairness, set clear goals, have high expectations, provide support and recognition, stir the emotions and passions of people, and get people to look beyond their self-interest to reach for the improbable (Pierce & Newstorm, 2008; Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership focuses on social values and appears in times of distress and change (Bass, 1985). This type of leadership is an important antecedent to construct the collective confidence or strength required by groups to be successful when facing with difficult challenges (Bass et al, 2003).

Certainly, transformational leaders can create significant organizational change and act as change agents, foster higher level of intrinsic motivation and loyalty among followers, and introduce a new image or view of the future and create a commitment to this image among
followers (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2008; Noorshahi & Yamani Dozi Sarkhabi, 2008). Transformational leadership is comprised of five dimensions which are idealized influence (attribute and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Idealized influence describes the degree in which leaders are perceived as an inspiring role model (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). These leaders are admired, respected, and trusted; followers identify and pursue their leaders (Bass et al, 2003). Idealized influence consists of two forms: idealized influence attribute in which leaders receive trust plus respect, and idealized influence behavior in which leaders exhibit excellent behavior and might sacrifice their own needs to improve the objectives of their workgroup (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). Inspirational motivation describes the degree in which the leader states a vision that is attractive and encouraging to followers (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Leaders strengthen followers by viewing the future by optimism (Antonakis et al, 2003), and act in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers work (Bass et al, 2003).

Intellectual stimulation explains the degree in which the leaders stimulate their followers endeavors to be innovative and creative (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008), and consider old organizational problems with a new perspective (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). Individualized consideration refers to the degree in which leaders provide support, encouragement, and coaching to followers (Yukl, 2006). The leaders listen carefully to individual needs of followers and may delegate certain responsibilities to help followers grow through personal challenges (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass et al, 2003; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Northouse, 2007).
Transactional leadership is the second part of transformational leadership theory. Transactional leadership concentrates on the exchanges that occur between leaders and their followers (Northouse, 2007), in which helps followers to fulfil their own self-interests (Bass, 1999). Transactional leaders clarify followers responsibilities, their performance objectives, and their tasks that must be completed (Eptropaki & Martin, 2005). This type of leadership deals with maintaining the current situation and motivating people through contractual agreement (Bass, 1985; Jung et al, 2008). Transactional leaders direct followers to achieve established goals by explaining role and task requirements (Armandi et al, 2003). This leadership style tends to emphasize extrinsic rewards, such as monetary incentives and promotion (Jung et al, 2008). Transactional leaders prefer to avoid risk, and focus on efficiency (Levy et al, 2002). It can be concluded that transactional leaders help the followers to identify what must be done to accomplish the described results such as better quality output, more services, and reduce cost of production. Transactional leadership is comprised of three dimensions which are contingent reward, management by-exception active, and management-by-exception passive.

Contingent reward describes the degree in which the leader determines rewards in exchange with followers efforts to satisfy organizational goals. It includes clarification of the work required to obtain rewards and the use of incentives to influence motivation. Leaders must clarify the expectations and present recognition when goals are accomplished (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008; Yukl, 2006). Management-by-exception active explains the degree in which a leader watches followers closely for mistakes or role violations (Northouse, 2007). Active leaders check follower behavior, predict problems, and take corrective actions before the
behavior makes severe difficulties (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Management-by-exception passive leaders wait for deviances, mistakes, and errors to happen and then take corrective action (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1994). They do not actively seek out deviations from desired performance and only take corrective action when problems occur (Pounder, 2001). This type of leader avoids describing agreements, explaining expectations and standards to be achieved by subordinates, but will intervene after particular problems become apparent.

Laissez-faire leadership represents a type of behavior in which leaders display a passive indifference towards their followers (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). Laissez-faire leaders incline to move out from the leadership role and offer little direction or support to followers (Kirkbride, 2006), they avoid making decision, give up responsibilities, and are indifferent to the needs of their followers. It is believed that laissez-faire is the passive avoidant and ineffective type of leadership theory.
On the basis of the aforementioned theories, the following theoretical model is proposed:

**Figure 1. Theoretical Model**
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**Conceptual Framework**

Based on the review of the literature and the relevant theories considered for this investigation, the following conceptual framework is generated.

As shown in Figure 2, the first circle block represents the demographic profile (DP) of the student affairs and services administrators (age, sex, civil status, socio-economic income status, educational attainment, and years of work experience). The demographic profile (DP) is interrelated to the second circle block Adversity Quotient® (AQ), which in turn, is interrelated with the third circle block Multifactor Leadership Characteristics (MLC) of the respondents which also interrelated with their demographic profile. The resulting relationship which is represented by a big arrow pointed towards the right direction will be the basis for the development of a leadership training management design.

The bidirectional arrows pointing to the circle blocks signify whether there is a relationship between the demographic profile (age, sex, civil status, socio-economic income status, educational attainment, and years of work experience) and the Adversity Quotient® profile while the two interactive arrows pointing to the lower and upper circle blocks signify whether there is a significant relationship between demographic profile (age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience) and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics. The bidirectional arrows between the adversity quotient® and multifactor leadership characteristics represents whether there is a significant relationship between the two variables. From these interrelationships, a leadership management training design is proposed with a broken line box indicating that the proposed action is not part of the study and can be subjected to further enhancement.
Figure 2. Conceptual Framework
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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study used the descriptive-correlational design. The purpose of the study was to explore the extent of relationship between the demographic profile and Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics of the Student Affairs and Services administrators of public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas region, specifically in Negros Oriental and Siquijor, Philippines.

Research Environment

Negros Oriental is one of the provinces that make-up the Central Visayas region. It occupies the south-eastern half of the island of Negros, with Negros Occidental occupying the north-western half. Negros Oriental is bounded by the Tañon Strait and the island of Cebu in the east and the province of Siquijor in the south east. A chain of rugged mountains separates Negros Oriental from Negros Occidental while the Sulu Sea is located south of the province (Your Guide to Negros Oriental and Siquijor, Philippines, 2010).

Dumaguete City is strategically located as the center of the province as its capital emerging as a technological center in Central Philippines and other technological centers in the Philippines with growing business process outsourcing (BPO) among other technology-related industries. Siquijor is considered as the third smallest province in the country and is commonly associated with mystic traditions that the island’s growing tourism industry capitalized on (CHEDRO VII Handbook).

As shown in Table 1 below, Negros Oriental and Siquijor have a total of 28 higher education institutions, six of which are satellite campuses. Of the 28 campuses eight are public
HEIs and 20 are private with seven sectarian and 13 non-sectarian. The public HEIs consist of Negros Oriental State University (NORSU) Dumaguete (main) with 6 satellite campuses namely, NORSU Bais I & II, NORSU Guihulngan, NORSU Bayawan, NORSU Mabinay, and NORSU Siaton and Siquijor State College (SCC).

Table 1. Distribution of HEIs in Negros Oriental and Siquijor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Negros Oriental</th>
<th>Siquijor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total HEIs (Including SUCs Satellite Campuses)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HEIs (Excluding SUCs Satellite Campuses)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public HEIs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Universities and Colleges (SUCs)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCs Satellite Campuses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Colleges (LCs)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private HEIs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectarian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sectarian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maps of Negros Oriental and Siquijor showing the locations of public and private higher education institutions where the respondents of the study are employed are shown in Appendix E.

Research Respondents

The respondents of this study were former and present Student Affairs and Services administrators (deans, directors, unit heads, coordinators, and faculty designates) of public and private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region, particularly Negros Oriental and Siquijor. The respondents were from various public and private colleges and universities that offer student services and/or programs in their institutions.
As shown in Table 2 above, there were a total of 36 former and present Student Affairs and Services administrators who participated in this study coming from one public state university, one public college, and nine private colleges with the corresponding number of respondents and their job title: Negros Oriental State University-Dumaguete (Student Affairs Office dean, Guidance Director, Former Student Affairs Office Dean-3) with five satellite university campuses which participated in the study: Negros Oriental State University Bais I & II (SAO Assistant Director, Assistant Director CARE-2), NORSU-Bayawan (SAO Assistant Director-1), NORSU-Mabinay (SAO Assistant Director-1); NORSU-Siaton (SAO Assistant Director-1). There were three private universities that participated in the study: Silliman University-Dumaguete (Student Services Dean, Head-Student Housing and Residence Division, Head-Student...
Scholarship Division, Head- Student Activities Division, and Adviser-International Students Office- 5); Foundation University-Dumaguete (Student Life Dean, Guidance Coordinator, Health Officer, Cultural Affairs Officer-4); and St. Paul University-Dumaguete (Student Affairs Office Manager, Guidance Coordinator, Former Guidance Coordinator- 3). The private Colleges that participated were: AMA Computer College-Dumaguete (Student Affairs Office Director-(1); Asian College of Science and Technology Dumaguete (Guidance Coordinator-1); Colegio de Sta. Catalina de Alejandro-Dumaguete (Student Affairs Dean, Alumni Director, Library Director, Guidance Coordinator, Campus Ministry Coordinator, Clinic Coordinator- 6); La Consolacion College-Bais (Guidance/Faculty Designate-1); Diaz College-Bais (Guidance Coordinator-1); Metro Dumaguete College-Dumaguete (Vice-president for Student Affairs-1); Negros Maritime College Foundation-Sibulan (Student Affairs Office Director and Guidance Coordinator-2); Negros College- Ayongon (Student Affairs Office Director-1); and Carmelite College-Siquijor (Vice-President for Student Services-1). The only public college that participated was Siquijor State College- Larena Siquijor (Student Affairs Director-1). The participants were requested formally to participate in the study. All respondents who were willing to participate were asked to complete the Respondent’s Profile, Adversity Response Profile (ARP®) online, and the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ-5x short). Each participant was given a code that corresponded to his/her Respondent’s Profile, Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics results.
Research Instruments

The two primary instruments used to collect the data in this study were Dr. Paul G. Stoltz (2009) Adversity Quotient Profile (AQP) AQP® 9.0, an online instrument, and Multifactor Leadership Questioner-5x short (MLQ, 2004 by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio’s). The reason for selecting these two instruments was their similarity in their methodological approaches. Both instruments employed self-report measures that assess the participants’ perceptions of their own abilities within each construct. Letter of permission was sent to the authors and agreement was made between PEAK learning and Mindgarden Inc. and the researcher in order to utilize the instruments in this particular study.

Paul Stoltz Adversity Quotient Profile® (AQP)

The AQP questionnaire is a standardized questionnaire that measures individual response to adversity. It is a self-report questionnaire consisting of 14 questions to 30 scenarios with a five-point Likert scale response (Stoltz, 1997). It was developed, tested and validated by Peak Learning with over 7,500 participants from diverse organizations such as Kaibab National Forest, W.L. Gore & Associates (makers of Gore-Tex), Minnesota Power, ADC Telecommunications, and US West. A numerical score calculated from the respondent’s answers is referred to as a person’s Adversity Quotient® (AQ). AQ is a composed of four subsections: Control (the control one has over a given situation); Ownership (the origin and/or ownership of the situation); Reach (the measure of reach that a particular event has into other areas of life); and Endurance (the measure of endurance, which assesses length of time that any given adversity will last) A resulting numerical score called Adversity Quotient® (AQ) is given to each respondent based upon reported answers. Scores are generated for each of the four
subcomponents. These four scales are inter-correlated but also stand on their own as separate measures within AQ®. Scores can range from 10 to 50 on the four sub-scales and can range from 40 to 200 in AQ®. The higher the overall score, the more effective an individual is in response to adverse conditions.

The score range and its corresponding interpretation are presented in Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176-200</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158-175</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-157</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-135</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-118</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of the score range and equivalents is as follows:

**Low:** The person probably suffers unnecessarily in a number of ways. The motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ®.

**Below Average:** The person is likely to be under-utilizing his potential. Adversity can take a significant and unnecessary toll, making it difficult to continue the ascent. The person may battle against a sense of helplessness and despair. Escape is possible by raising the AQ®.

**Average:** The person usually does descent job of navigating life as long as everything is going relatively smooth. However, the person may suffer unnecessarily from the larger setbacks, or may be disheartened by the accumulated burden of life’s challenges.

**Above Average:** The person has probably done a fairly good job in persisting through challenges and in tapping a good portion of growing potential on a daily basis.
High: The person probably has the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life.

The AQP® is composed of the following four CORE dimensions namely: control, ownership, reach and endurance. The CORE equivalents were provided by Stoltz (2009). The CORE score range and the corresponding verbal interpretation are presented in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE Dimensions</th>
<th>Score Range and Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>48-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>43-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>44-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multifactor Leadership Questioner by Bernard M. Bass & Bruce J. Avolio**

Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004) developed an instrument called the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ), also known as MLQ x5 short. The MLQ has undergone several revisions in attempts to better gauge the component factors while addressing concerns about its psychometric properties (Avolio et al., 1995). The current version of MLQ (Form 5X) was developed based on the results of previous research using earlier versions of the MLQ, the expert judgment of six leadership scholars who recommended additions or deletions of items, and confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs). There are 36 items that represent the nine leadership factors described above (i.e., each leadership scale is comprised of four items), and 9 items that assess three leadership outcome scales. This study focused on the 36 items that correspond to the nine leadership factors.

It MLQ 5X-Short, is widely used for measuring leadership styles (transformational, transactional or laissez-faire). Further, it was utilized in several empirical researches, particularly those concerned with the relationship between leadership styles and other factors. It consists of 45 items answered by the leaders using a five-point Likert scale. The scale
points are 0= not at all, 1= once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often and 4= frequently, if not always. The original version of it consists of three parts: the first part describes the information of the respondents; the second part measures the three styles of leadership; and, the third part measured leadership outcomes. For the purposes of the present study, the focus is on the second part that reflects three styles of leadership.

Transformational leadership scale consists of 20 items grouped in 5 subscales Intellectual Stimulation, Behavioral Idealized Influence, Attributed Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation and Individual Consideration. Transactional leadership scale consists of 12 items, categorized in 3 subscales Contingent Reward, Passive Management-by-Exception, and Active Management-by-Exception). Laissez-faire leadership is one scale. Every subscale consists of 4 items. Sample items of MLQ-5x Short: The person I am rating …; “Provides me with assistance in exchange for my effort”, “Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate”, “Fails to interfere until problems become serious”, and “Is absent when I need him/her.”

Research Procedure

As with any data collection process, formal permission was asked through a letter for the approval of the respondents from various public and private universities and colleges within Negros Oriental and Siquijor. Prior discussion about the research idea was done through appointment and phone call with the selected student affairs administrators. When permission was already granted, guidelines and procedure on conducting research in respective institutions were followed. In terms of approval to use the data collection instruments, a written request through electronic mail was sent for both the AQP® Questioner (Adversity Response Profile, P.
Stoltz) and the MLQ (Bass and Avolio). School visitation was done to further assist some of the respondents when the instruments were administered to them. The respondents were informed that all information shared in the study would be kept and observed strict confidential and would only be used for this study. Availability and willingness to participate in this research were the determining factors in the selection of these respondents from public and private universities and college or higher education institutions within Negros Oriental and Siquijor.

A researcher designed instrument to determine the Respondent’s Profile, an electronic AQP® 9.0 questionnaire to get their Adversity Quotient Profile®; and , a one paper copy questioner to get their response on Multifactor Leadership Characteristics through MLQ (X5 short) were utilized. The MLQ being utilized were composed of the following factors: 1) Idealized Influence (II-Attributed), 2) Idealized Influence (II-Behavior), 3) Inspirational Motivation (IM), 4) Intellectual Stimulation (IS), 5) Individual Consideration (IC), 6) Contingent Reward (CR), 7) Management-by-Exception-Active (MBEA), 8) Management-by-Exception-Passive (MBEP), and 9) Laissez-Faire (LF).

Part 1, the respondent’s or the student affairs and services administrator’s profile, is consist of his/her name (optional), administrative position, sex, age, civil status, socio-economic income, highest educational attainment, years in service as faculty and as administrator of student affairs and services.

Part 2, (Dr. Paul G. Stoltz (2009) latest AQP® online version 9.0, is a self-rating instrument that measures an individual’s style of responding to adverse situation and his/her adversity level. It takes about 7-10 minutes to answer the questions online. The AQP® presents 14
scenarios or events, each of which is followed by four questions to be responded based on a 5-point Likert scale. The respondents answered the AQP® version 9.0 through online and results of the respondents on excel spreadsheet and updated descriptive interpretations of AQP® scores were sent through email by PEAK Learning, Inc. Each of the four questions was represented and was scored on a distinct dimension of adversity quotient® as Control, Ownership, Reach and Endurance (CORE). The CORE equivalents were also sent by PEAK Learning, Inc. to interpret student affairs and service administrators’ AQ® dimensions and overall AQ® score equivalents.

Part 3, the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ x5 short), was answered on paper copy with proper instructions given to respondents. The interpretation of the results was guided through the MLQ manual provided by Mindgarden Inc. The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score is derived by summing the items and dividing the sum by the number of items that make up the scale. If an item is left blank, the total for that was only divided scale by the number of items answered. All of the leadership characteristics scales have four items each.

Statistical Treatment of Data

In the treatment data, the following statistical tools were used: percentage and weighted mean to determine the extent of relationship between nominal variables of sex, age, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience; chi square for educational attainment and MLQ and AQ®; point biserial coefficient for sex, age, civil status and MLQ and AQ; and, person product moment r for years of work experience and MLQ and AQ®; Pearson correlation coefficient r, for numbers 4, 5, and 6 questions to test the degree
of relationship between profile and the adversity quotient overall equivalent The Pearson’s $r$
correlation coefficient was also used to explore the relationship between variables expressed in
continuous interval data, such as numerical test scores (Mertler & Charles, 2005, p. 301). The
results of the Pearson’s $r$ indicated the degree of association shared by the various subscale
variables collected through the Profile, AQ® and the MLQ. The point biserial coefficient of
correlation was used among the variables for profile (sex, educational attainment, and civil
status).
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data collected based on the responses of the Student Affairs and Services administrators from public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region specifically in Negros Oriental and Siquijor. The Student Affairs and Services administrators were from the public institutions were particularly from Negros Oriental State University (NORSU) Main campus and satellite campuses Bais(I & II), Bayawan, Mabinay, and Siaton and Siquijor State College. Those from private institutions were particularly from AMA Computer College-Dumaguete, Asian College of Science and Technology-Dumaguete, Colegio de Sta. Catalina de Alejandrea, Foundation University, La Consolacion College-Bais, Diaz College-Bais, Metro Dumaguete College-Dumaguete, Negros College-Ayongon, Negros Maritime College Foundation- Sibulan, St. Paul University-Dumaguete, Silliman University-Dumaguete, and Carmelite College Siquijor.

Out of the forty one (41) questionnaires distributed to the public and private universities and colleges within Negros Oriental and Siquijor, only thirty six (36) questionnaires were retrieved. From the thirty six (36) respondents, nine (9) failed to register online before the expiry date set by PEAKlearning Inc. (July 30, 2015) for the Adversity Quotient Profile® 9.0 tool. Only a total of twenty seven (27) respondents answered the Adversity Quotient Profile® 9.0 online but 36 answered the Respondents’ Profile. Thirty five (35) answered the Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ X5 short). For correlating the Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics, those who answered the MLQ but did not answer the AQP® 9.0 online and visi-versa were eliminated for correlation when getting the significance of their AQ®
and MLQ overall results. A total of thirty six (36) returned questionnaires were scored and interpreted for this study.

Profile of the Respondents

The profile of the respondents includes the following: age, sex, civil- status, socio-economic income per month, educational attainment, and years of work experience.

Table 4. Profile of Respondents in Terms of Sex and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Approximate</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-40 (Young Adult)</td>
<td>3 (8.33)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>14 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 (Middle Adult)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>14 (39)</td>
<td>20 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and up (Late Adult)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
<td>2 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (25)</td>
<td>27 (75)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36

Table 4 shows the distribution of respondents profile number and percentage of Student Affairs and Services administrators in terms of sex and age. It is evident that the highest number of respondents is within the age bracket of 40-60 (Middle Adult) with 20 respondents (56%), followed by 14 respondents (39%) within the age bracket of 20-40 (Young Adult), and only two respondents (5%) within the age bracket of 60 and up (Late Adult).

This means that most of the respondents are in their middle adulthood. This is the seventh stage of Eric Erickson’s stages of development when an individual becomes a mature adult dealing with the challenge of generativity versus stagnation. The mature adult wants to be useful and effective, contributing to the world. Adults feel a need to impart their own knowledge and teach younger generations (E. Erickson, 1964).
The total number of respondents is 36, of which 27 are female (75%), while only 9 are male (25%). The total female respondents are practically three times the number of male respondents which indicates that there are more females than males working as practitioners/administrators of student affairs and services in Central Visayas Region particularly in Negros Oriental and Siquijor. Educational roles, according to Law and Glover (2001), are mostly inclined towards people and relationship that are valued by women to fit family life into their careers, whereas men prefer task orientation working for money and always looking up for career development. One of the striking findings, according to Helgesen (1990), is that women tend to lead from the center of an organization whereas men are more hierarchical and lead from the top. Men place emphasis on vision while many women connect more closely to the principles of voice.

Table 5. Profile of Respondents in Terms of Civil Status and Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civil Status</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree (%)</th>
<th>Master’s Degree (%)</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>3 (9)</td>
<td>14 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>10 (27)</td>
<td>5 (14)</td>
<td>20 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>12 (33)</td>
<td>16 (44)</td>
<td>8 (22)</td>
<td>36 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36

In relation to civil status and educational attainment, married respondents lead with 20 (55%) and with the most number of bachelor’s degree 5 (14%), master’s degree 10 (27%) and 5 (14%) doctorate degree. The profile shows that married respondents tend to pursue graduate
and post graduate degrees. Updating knowledge leads one to be motivated and accept change (Bennis, 1990; Covey, 1989).

Meanwhile, majority of married respondents are in the middle adulthood (ages 40 to 60 years), a stage of establishing careers, settling down within a relationship, beginning to own families and developing a sense of being a part of the bigger picture. This is the time to give back to society through raising children, being productive at work, and becoming involved in community activities and organizations (Gross R.D. & Humphreys P., 1992). Moreover, there are only two married respondents within the age bracket of 60 and up (Late Adult) as shown in Tables 3 and 4. In his article titled “Erik Erikson”, McLeod (2013) discusses that “as we grow older (60 and up) and become senior citizens, we tend to slow down on productivity, and explore life as a retired person. It is during this time when we contemplate our accomplishments and are able to develop integrity if we see ourselves as leading a successful life.

On the other hand, eight of the respondents, 3 (9%) single and 5 (14%) married have accomplished doctorate degrees. Indeed, updating knowledge leads one to be motivated and accept change. In the same way, administrators/principals are faced with constant change that calls to upgrade knowledge and skills (Stoltz, 2000).
Table 6. Profile of Respondents in Terms of Socio-Economic Status (Monthly Income) and Years of Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Economic Monthly Income</th>
<th>Work-Experience</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Answer</td>
<td>1-8 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20,000.00</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,000.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (%)</td>
<td>3 (8)</td>
<td>13 (36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=36.

Table 6 shows the distribution of socio-economic status or income per month according to years of work experience among student affairs and services administrators. As shown in the Table 6 above, 13 (36%) respondents have 1-8 years of experience in the higher education institutions as faculty and/or administrators. Following this are those between 12-24 years of work experience with 8 respondents (22%) leaving only 1 (3%) respondent in the 34-40 years bracket. However, 3 (8%) of the respondents opted not to answer this category.

Equally important, are the respondents distribution in terms of income per month vis-à-vis the salary monthly grade of professional workers in the Philippines. The structure of wages
and other pecuniary incentives in the government is prescribed by Republic Act 6758, or the Salary Standardization Law (SSL) of 1987, as well as by Joint Resolution No. 01, s. 1994 of the Senate and the House of Representative and the National Economic Development Authority (NEDA 2014). Nineteen (53%) of the respondents are with a salary grade of 20,000+ per month followed by seven respondents (20%) with a salary grade of 40,000+. Three (8%) with a salary grade of 60,000+ and one (3%) with a salary grade of 140,000 per month.

As a result of the findings in Tables 3, 4 and 5, the student services administrators can be described as mostly female, within the range of 40-60 years old (Middle Adult) and married. They have pursued graduate and post-graduate studies and majority have around 1-8 years of work experience in higher education institutions as faculty and/or administrators. Also, most of the respondents’ socio-economic income is within the 20,000-40,000 pesos per month salary grade. The upshot of all this data suggests that society considers experience, knowledge, talents and everything one acquired as one grows in a career are important attributes in determining the capacity of a person to perform his/her social role as administrator.
As reflected in Table 7, the overall AQ® scores of most of the Student Affairs and Services administrator respondents with frequency of eleven (41%) range from 40-133 and are within the “Low” descriptive equivalents. Low means the person probably suffers unnecessarily in a number of ways. The motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ®.

The “Below Average” AQ® overall scores of the respondents are recorded with frequency eight (30%) that range from 119-135. Below Average means the person has the tendency to likely be under-utilizing his/her potential. Adversity can take a significant and unnecessary toll,
making it difficult to continue the ascent. The person may battle against a sense of helplessness and despair. Escape is possible by raising the AQ®.

A frequency of seven (26%) of the respondents obtain scores within an “Average” that range from 136-157 descriptive rating. Average means the person usually tends to do descent job of navigating life as long as everything is going relatively smooth. However, the person may suffer unnecessarily from larger setbacks or may be disheartened by the accumulated burden of life’s challenges. A frequency of one (4%) scored “High” that range from 176-200 in his/her overall AQ® results. High means the person probably has the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life.

The computed mean score of the overall AQ® of the Student Affairs and Services administrators is equal to 115 which is below the standard mean of 146. This indicates an overall “Low” AQ® of the respondents. Low means that most of the respondents probably suffer unnecessarily in a number of ways. The motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ® (Stoltz, 2009).

Equally important are the findings as shown in Table 6 which are the respondents’ scores in the CORE dimensions (control, ownership, reach, and endurance). The data show consistency of results on the four dimensions and on their AQ® overall equivalent results.

As shown in Table 7, in terms of Control Dimension, three (11%) of the respondents score “Above Average” and five (18%) score “Average”. However, the larger distribution of the respondents score “Low” with eleven (41%) of them. A considerable eight (30%) score “Below Average” in this dimension. The mean score of the respondents is 30 which is way below the
standard mean of 38. Control describes the extent to which he/she can influence whatever happens next. They may respond to adverse events partially with their control depending on the magnitude of the event. They probably are not easily disheartened. But, it may be more difficult to maintain a sense of control when faced with more serious setbacks or challenges (Stoltz, 1997). The more control one has, the more likely one has to take positive actions. Persons with higher AQ®s perceive they have significantly more control and influence in adverse situations than those with lower AQ®s. High AQ® determines resilience, health and tenacity over challenging situations.

As to Ownership dimension, the above shows that one (4%) of the respondents scored “High”; two (7%) score “Above Average”; six (22%) score “Average”, nine (33%) score “Below Average” and nine (33%) scored Low”. The mean score of the respondents is 34 which is way below the standard mean of 41. Ownership is defined as the likelihood that someone will actually do anything to improve the situation regardless of their formal responsibilities. The respondents’ mean score is in the mid-range which means they respond to adverse events as sometimes originating from without and sometimes from themselves. They may, on occasion, blame themselves unnecessarily for bad outcomes. They probably hold themselves somewhat accountable for the outcomes of the adversity, but may limit themselves accountability to only those things for which they are the direct cause, being unwilling to contribute in a larger way (Stotlz, 1997). The high AQ® worker holds himself/herself accountable for the outcome of the meeting, regardless of the reason it is going poorly; the low AQ® worker sees himself/herself as a helpless victim. Person with high AQ® will enhance his/her accountability to control the
situation and motivates positive action while person with low AQ® will most likely blame others and manifest negative actions.

The results of the study show that in **Reach dimension**, one (4%) of the respondents score “High”; seven (26%) score “Above Average” and five (18%) score “Average”. On the other hand, the majority of the respondents ten (37%) scored “Below Average” and four (15%) score “Low”.

The mean score of the respondents is 31 and this is below the standard mean of 33. This tells us that **Reach** is the extent to which someone perceives an adversity will “reach into” and affect other aspects of the situation or beyond. The respondents’ mean score is in the mid-range which means they may respond to adverse events as somewhat specific. However, they may occasionally let them reach unnecessarily into other areas of their life. When they are feeling down, they might catastrophize, making bad events much more far reaching. In weaker moments, they may succumb to the temptation to turn setbacks into disasters, relaying on others to pull them out of the emotional pit (Stotlz, 1997). Someone with high AQ® will put setbacks in perspectives, not letting them ruin the day or the weekend. He/she resolves to learn from the mistakes. A low AQ® worker would extrapolate, turning the single failure into proof that he/she is worthless and stupid. This will affect other aspects of one’s life leading to frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and may lead to poor decision making. This dimension will determine a person’s burden, stress, energy, and effort as it tends to have cumulative effect.

In **Endurance dimension**, five (18%) of the respondents have “Above Average” descriptive rating. Seven (26%) of them score “Average” and seven (3%) score “Below Average” in this dimension.
On the other hand, this tells us that majority of the respondents eight or 30% score “Below Average” in the endurance dimension. The computed mean score of 30 is below the standard mean of 34. Endurance is the perception of time over good or bad events and their consequences will last or endure. Seeing beyond even enormous difficulties is an essential skill for maintaining hope. The mean score of the respondents is in the mid-range which means they may respond to adverse events and their causes as somewhat enduring. This may, on occasion, delay from taking constructive action. With life’s small to moderate challenges, they probably do a reasonably good job of keeping faith and forging ahead. However, there may be moments when they are weakened and their hope dwindles, especially when experiencing a fairly severe setback (Stoltz, 1997). Those with higher AQ® have the capability to see past the most interminable difficulties and maintain hope and optimism. Those with lower AQ® see adversity as dragging on indefinitely, if not permanently.
Tables 8 to 12 discuss the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Idealized Influence (Attributed); Idealized Influence (Behavior); Inspirational Motivation; Intellectual Stimulation; and Individualized Consideration that form transformational leadership style.

Idealized Influence (Attributed) factor refers to the socialized charisma of the leaders, whether the leader is perceived as being confident and powerful and whether the leaders is viewed as focusing on higher-order ideals and ethics (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). The results show that the Student Affairs and Services administrators have the highest respondents mean on idealized influence (attributed) characteristics of 2.62 of item 25 which means they have the tendency to fairly often display a sense of power. However, they sometimes instill pride in others for being associated with them. And then, they sometimes go beyond self-interest for the good of the group. Likewise, sometimes they also act in ways that build other’s respect for them. The respondents overall mean is 2.05 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators sometimes exhibits personal sacrifices dealing with crises and obstacles and self-confidence as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).
Transformational leadership, according to Yukl (2002), motivates and influences followers by making them aware of important task outcomes, by inducing them to put their own self-interest aside for the sake of the organization, and by activating their higher-order needs. Various authors state that transformational leadership can take on various forms such as being charismatic and visionary. The central focus of this kind of leadership is the commitment and capacity of leaders to create and promote desirable visions or images of their institution.

Table 9. Distribution of Respondents’ by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Idealized Influence-Behavior Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall 3.24 Fairly often

Table 9 above presents the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Idealized Influence-Behavior Factor Results. Idealized Influence (Behavior) Factor refers to the charismatic actions of a leader that is centered on values, beliefs, and sense of mission (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). The results show that the Student Affairs and Services administrators have the highest respondents mean on idealized influence (behavior) characteristics of 3.44 of items 14 and 23 which means that they have the tendency to fairly often specify the importance of having a sense of purpose. Hence, they fairly often consider the moral and ethical consequences of their decisions as administrators of Student Affairs and Services. Idealized influenced characterized by charismatic way of leading is categorized into
two: behavior and attributed. The computed overall mean of the behavior category is 3.24. This means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators are fairly often engendering trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect amongst followers through application of charismatic vision and behavior when leading their subordinates. They articulate fairly often a vision and explain how to attain the vision in an appealing manner, lead by examples, act confidently and optimistically, share risks with followers, emphasize values and reinforce them by symbolic action, and display an above average level of ethical and moral conduct (Hoerr, 2006).

Table 10. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Inspirational Motivation Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspirational Motivation</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>n=35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the third factor on Table 10 presents the distribution of respondents by Inspirational Motivation factor results. Inspirational Motivation factor refers to the leaders capacity to energize their followers by viewing the future with optimism, stressing ambitious goals protecting an idealize vision, and communicating to followers that the vision is achievable (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). The results show in a Table 10 above that the Student Affairs and Services administrators get the highest mean of 3.39 on item 36 under inspirational motivational characteristics which means that the respondents tend to fairly often express confidence that the goals they set will be achieved. Also, fairly often they talk enthusiastically.
about what needs to be accomplished with co-workers. They are optimistic about the future and fairly often they articulate a compelling vision of the future. Inspirational motivation describes the degree in which the leader states a vision that is attractive and encouraging to followers (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Leaders strengthen followers by viewing the future with optimism (Antonakis et al, 2003), and act in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work (Bass et al, 2003). The respondents overall mean is 3.13 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often set high standard and orientation about the future as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Table 11. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Intellectual Stimulation Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=35

Subsequently, Table 11 above presents the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Intellectual Stimulation Factor Results. Intellectual Stimulation factor refers to the leader’s actions that appeal to followers’ sense of logic and analysis by challenging followers to think creatively and find solutions to difficult problems (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). Table 11 above shows that the respondents get the highest mean of 3.17 on item 30 under Intellectual Stimulation factor which means that the respondents fairly often tend to get others to look at problems from different angles. Moreover, fairly often they practice to re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate and
suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments to fellow co-workers. Intellectual stimulation explains the degree in which the leaders stimulate their followers’ endeavors to be innovative and creative (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008), and consider old organizational problems with a new perspective (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). The respondents’ overall mean is 3.02 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often accept followers ideas and encourage them to challenge the status quo by re-examining critical assumptions as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Table 12. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Individual Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=35

The fifth factor of transformational leadership style is the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Individual Consideration factor results. Individual Consideration refers to leader behavior that contributes to follower satisfaction by advising, supporting, and paying attention to the individual needs of followers, and thus allowing them to develop and self-actualize (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003).

Results reveal that the respondents get the highest mean of 3.57 on item 29 under intellectual Stimulation factor which means that frequently if not always they have the tendency to consider individuals in the workplace as having different needs, abilities, and
aspirations. It follows that, fairly often they manifest characteristics of helping others to
develop their potentials, treat others as individuals rather than just as member of a group, and
fairly often they spend time teaching and coaching fellow colleagues in the student affairs and
services unit in their respective institutions. Individualized consideration refers to the degree in
which leaders provide support, encouragement, and coaching to followers (Yukl, 2006). The
leaders listen carefully to individual needs of followers and may delegate certain responsibilities
to help followers grow through personal challenges (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Bass et al, 2003;
Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Northouse, 2007). The upshot of all of this is that the respondents
overall mean is 3.31 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly
often treat their subordinates as individuals rather than as part of the group and invest in their
learning process as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Table 13 to 15 that follow presents the distribution of respondents by Multifactor
Leadership Characteristics with three sub-factors: Contingent Reward, Management by
Exception-Active, and Management by Exception-Passive that form transactional leadership
style.

Transactional leadership style, in its more constructive form, is supplemented by working
with individuals and/or groups, setting up and defining agreements or contracts to achieve
specific work objectives, discovering individuals’ capabilities, and specifying the compensation
and rewards that can be expected upon successful completion of the tasks. In its corrective
form, it focuses on actively setting standards. In its passive form, it involves waiting for mistakes
to occur before taking action. In its active form, there is close monitoring for the occurrence of
mistakes. In either passive or active form, it focuses on identifying mistakes. Many consultants
using the MLQ have found it useful to label Contingent Reward (CR) and Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA) as Transactional Leadership and Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP) and Laissez Faire as Passive/Avoidant Leadership (Bass and Avolio 2004).

Table 13. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Contingent Reward Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contingent Reward</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[n=35\]

Table 13 above shows the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Contingent Reward Factor which refers to leader behaviors focused on clarifying role and task requirements and providing followers with material or psychological rewards contingent on the fulfilment of contractual obligations (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). The results above show that the Student Affairs and Services administrators get the highest mean of 3.36 on item 35 under contingent reward factor which means that sometimes they tend to express satisfaction when others meet their expectations. In like manner, fairly often they make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved, and fairly often they discuss in specific terms that is responsible for achieving performance target. Contingent reward describes the degree in which the leader determines rewards in exchange with followers efforts to satisfy organizational goals. It includes clarification of the work required to obtain rewards and the use of incentives to influence motivation. Leaders must clarify the expectations and present recognition when goals are accomplished (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008; Yukl, 2006). The respondents overall mean of 2.91 implies that the Student
Affairs and Services administrators *fairly often* exchange related behavior, in which reward are contingent upon the subordinates’ agreement to task performance as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Table 14. *Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Management-by-Exception-Active Factor Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=35*

Subsequently, Table 14 above presents the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Management-by-Exception-Active factor Results. Management-by-Exception-Active Factor refers to active vigilance of a leader whose goal is to ensure that standards are met (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). Table 14 above reveals that the respondents get the highest mean of 2.17 on item 24 which means that the respondents tend to *sometimes* focus their attention on keeping track of all mistakes. Management-by-exception active explains the degree in which a leader watches followers closely for mistakes or role violations (Northouse, 2007). Active leaders check follower behavior, predict problems, and take corrective actions before the behavior makes severe difficulties (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). To summarize, the respondents overall mean is 2.03 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators *sometimes* tend to actively searches for subordinates’ mistakes as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).
Table 15. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Management-by-Exception-Passive Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=35.

Table 15 above presents the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Management-by-Exception-Passive Factor Results. Management-by-Exception-Passive Factor refers to leaders only intervening only after noncompliance has occurred or when mistakes have already happened (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003). Table 15 above shows that the respondents get the highest mean of 1.83 on item 17 which means that the respondents tend to sometimes show that they are firm believer in “If aren’t broke, don’t fix it”. Certainly, once in a while they tend to fail to interfere until problems become serious and not at all demonstrate that problems must not become chronic before they take action as administrators and not to wait for things to go wrong before taking action. Management-by-exception passive leaders wait for deviances, mistakes, and errors to happen and then take corrective action (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Bass & Avolio, 1994). They do not actively seek out deviations from desired performance and only take corrective action when problems occur (Pounder, 2001). In short, the respondents overall mean is 1.11 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators, once in a while, tend not to get involved with subordinates problems unless the problems attract the leader’s attention as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).
Table 16. Distribution of Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Laissez-Faire Factor Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>No Ans</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>F %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td>f %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last and the ninth factor is the distribution of respondents by Multifactor Leadership Characteristics: Laissez-faire factor results. Laissez-faire represents the absence of a transaction of sorts with respect to leadership in which the leader avoids making decisions, abdicates responsibility, and does not use their authority. It is considered active to the extent that the leader “chooses” to avoid taking action. This component is generally considered the most passive and ineffective form of leadership (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al. 2003). Results reveal that the respondents get the highest mean of 1.34 on item 33 which means that once in a while they tend to delay responding to urgent questions. Thus, once in a while, they tend to be absent when needed, avoid getting involved when important issues arise, and avoid making decisions. Laissez-faire leadership represents a type of behavior in which leaders display a passive indifference towards their followers (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). Laissez-faire leaders incline to move out from the leadership role and offer little direction or support to followers (Kirkbride, 2006), they avoid making decision, give up responsibilities, and are indifferent to the needs of their followers. It is believed that laissez-faire is the passive avoidant and ineffective type of leadership theory.

n=35.
The respondents’ overall mean is 1.04 which mean that the Student Affairs and Services administrators once in a while manifest “non-leadership”, in other words, the perception of leadership in action as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Table 17. Test of Independence Between the Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® Overall Results and Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Sex</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Age</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Civil Status</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Educational Attainment</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Socio-Economic Status</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQ and Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 describes the relationship between the Adversity Quotient® overall results and the demographic profile of the respondents such as age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience. As shown, it can be noted that the said variables are not significantly related to the Adversity Quotient® of the Student Affairs and Services administrators.

It is ascertained by the computed $x^2$ value of 3.51 of the extent of relationship between AQ and Sex. This extent of relationship is found to be not significant as shown by the p value of 0.319 which is greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance and with 3 degrees of freedom. Thus, the $H_0$ that there is no significant relationship between sex and adversity quotient is accepted. This indicates that sex is not a determinant of Adversity Quotient. This relates to Huijuan (2009), in her study, “The Adversity Quotient and Academic Performance among College Students at St. Joseph’s College, Quezon City” conducted on 280 undergraduate students that found no significant difference in the AQ® of males and females. However, in the
Amongst the human capital factors, employability and education are significantly correlated to adaptability. Work environment factors are all positively related to adaptability, and among these, the most significant is management support. This calls for the individuals to pursue their own further development, and for managers in organizations to facilitate support and motivate workers to learn to adapt to change.

The set of data also shows that there is no significant relationship between adversity quotient overall results and age. This is supported by the computed $x^2$ value of 3.38 of the extent of relationship between AQ and age. This extent of relationship is found to be not significant as shown by the $p$ value of 0.692 (df=6) which is greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Again, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between age and adversity quotient is accepted. This indicates that age is not a determinant of adversity quotient.

Moreover, the data above also shows that there is no significant relationship between adversity quotient overall results and civil status. This is supported by the computed $x^2$ value of 4.84 with the $p$ value 0.848 (df=9) which is greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Again, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between civil status and adversity quotient is accepted. This indicates that civil status is not a determinant of adversity quotient.

R. Olila (2012) in her study, “Adversity Quotient and Personal Characteristics as Correlates of the Personality-Temperament Traits of Educators” conducted on 139 college deans, school principals, school heads, academic heads and classroom teachers of selected private and public educational institutions in the Province of Aurora found out that gender, age, civil status,
Consequently, educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience are not also determinants of respondents’ adversity quotient. The computed $x^2$ value for educational attainment variable of 5.12 (df=6) with the p value 0.528 and socio-economic status of 12.70 (df=12) and years of work experience 8.45 with a p value of 0.490 (df=9) are greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience and their adversity quotient is accepted.

As a matter of fact, Schoon, Parsons and Sacker (2004), in their article, “Socioeconomic Adversity, Educational Resilience, and Subsequent Levels of Adult Adaptation” which is a longitudinal study on adolescents coming from different socio-economic backgrounds, studies adaptation patterns and resilience form adolescence to mid-adulthood, found that socio-economic adversity may be overcome by positive teacher expectations, paternal involvement and high personal motivation and that resilience can be understood only by considering the dynamic interactions between the individual and the context. It was found out that people with lower socio-economic background with the right environmental support are better able to overcome adversities.

As shown above, it can be noted that the said demographic profile variables are not significantly related to the adversity quotient of the Student Affairs and Services administrators. This supports the studies conducted by Cura and Gozum (2011), Ferrer (2009), Napire (2013), Villaver (2005), and Lazro-Capones (2004).
Gozum’s study (2011) showed that the adversity quotient® of the respondents was not influenced by their sex, course, academic status, scholastic status, scholarship grant and the type of high school they graduated from. Ferrer’s (2009) study showed that majority of the academic head respondents belong to middle range on adversity quotient® dimensions: control, ownership, reach and endurance. In terms of overall adversity quotient® level, respondents belonged to average range. In terms of leadership styles, majority of the respondents possess a participative style. In terms of job satisfaction, respondents were satisfied with their present job conditions. On the assessment of significant relationship between personal characteristics such as age, gender, civil status, educational attainment, and number of years of service and overall adversity quotient® level of control, ownership and endurance dimensions, the study showed that there was no significant relationship except for educational attainment and AQ® Reach dimension of the respondents which were significantly related. Napire’s (2013) study on Adversity Quotient® and Leadership Style in Relation to the Demographic Profile of the Elementary School Principals revealed the following results: The Adversity Quotient® dimensions scores of the elementary school principals were within the “Below Average” range with mean score lower than the standard mean scores for each dimension: sex, age, civil status, length of service as principal, highest educational attainment, and position and were not significantly related to the same.

Furthermore, Villaver’s (2005) study on the adversity quotient levels of female grade school teachers of a public and a private school in the Rizal Province found that the respondents in early adulthood stage possessed moderate AQ® while older counterparts possessed moderately low AQ®. Respondents with single status were found to have moderate and
moderately low AQ®s compared with the married respondents. Respondents with a teaching experience of ten years or lower had moderate AQ® while those with higher than eleven years had moderately low AQ®. In terms of socioeconomic status, the lower class had moderate AQ® while the middle class had moderately low AQ®. It was found out that there were no significant differences in AQ® between public and private school teachers since both had moderate AQ® levels.

Lastly, Lazaro-Capones’ (2004) study on selected middle managers from the City of Manila called entitled, “Adversity Quotient and the Performance Level of Selected Middle Managers of the Different Departments of the City of Manila, found no significant relationship between Adversity Quotient and Age, Gender, Civil Status or Length of service. However, results showed a significant positive correlation between Adversity Quotient and Performance level of the sample. It can be concluded that the higher ones AQ, the better his/her performance. This supports the belief that training to enhance AQ will benefit the recipient of the training.

Given these points, Olila’s, Lazaro’s, Gozum’s Villaver’s, Canivel’s and Ferrer’s studies have some similarities with the present research since the aforementioned studies have similar findings that Adversity Quotient® does not have significant relationship with the selected demographic profile.

Table 18. Test of Independence Between Respondents’ MLQ Overall results and Demographic Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Coefficient correlation</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Age</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.251</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Years of Work Experience</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Sex</td>
<td>rpb</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Civil Status</td>
<td>rpb</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLQ and Educational Attainment</td>
<td>χ²</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data presented in Table 18 contains the measures for determining the relationship between the respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Questioner (MLQ) results and demographic profile (age, socio-economic status, and years of work experience, sex, civil status, and educational attainment). It is delineated in the above Table using coefficient correlation at 0.05 level of significance.

The extent of relationship with the computed $x^2$ value of 0.251 is found to be not significant as shown by the $p$ value of 0.146 which is lower than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance with 33 degrees of freedom. Thus, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between age and MLQ is rejected. This indicates that age is not a determinant of multifactor leadership characteristics. The above Table also shows that there is no significant relationship between MLQ overall results and socio-economic status. This is supported by the computed $x^2$ value of 0.107 which is lower than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance with 31 degrees of freedom. This extent of relationship is found to be not significant being less than the $p$ value of 0.553 (df=31) at 0.05 level of significance. Again, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between socio-economic status and MLQ overall result is accepted. This indicates that socio-economic status is not a determinant of multifactor leadership characteristics.

Moreover, the data show that there is no significant relationship between MLQ overall results and years of work experience. This is supported by the computed $x^2$ value of 0.279 with the $p$ value of 0.104 (df=33) which is greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Again, the $H_0$ that there is no significant relationship between years of work experience and multifactor leadership characteristics is accepted. This indicates that years of work experience is not a determinant of multifactor leadership characteristics.
Consequently, sex, civil status, and educational attainment are not also determinants of the respondents’ multifactor leadership characteristics. The computed $x^2$ value for sex of 0.13 (df=33) with the p value of 0.441, the computed civil status correlation coefficient of 0.07 with p value of 0.670 (df=33), and the computed educational attainment $x^2$ value of 5.31 with p value of 0.257 (df=4) are greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Thus, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between sex, civil status, and educational attainment and multifactor leadership characteristics are accepted. This indicates that sex, civil status, and educational attainment are not determinant of multifactor leadership characteristics.

This supports the study of D’Ambrosio (2000) that examined gender differences in transformational and transactional leadership styles among leaders. She found no statistical significance between gender and transformational and transactional leadership styles among leaders. However, the raters who were male tended to rate the female leaders higher in transformational leadership.

In the study of Helgesen (1990), women seemed to lead from the center of an organization whereas men were more hierarchical and led from the top. Men placed emphasis on vision while many women connected more closely to the principles of voice.

On the contrary, the study of Rosenbush showed a significant relationship between the transformational leadership scores and gender. It was found that female student leaders tend to be more transformational than male student leaders and that males had a tendency to portray transactional leadership skills (Journal of Leadership in Education 2014).

Findings of the present study, when viewed with individual factors and demographic profile shows that there is a significant relationship between age and Idealized Influence (Behavior)
factor and age and Individual Consideration factor (see appendix Q page. 199). This indicates that as the individuals’ age, manifestations of their characteristics on Idealized influence-Behavior and Individual Consideration both forming transformational leadership become more evident. Idealized Influence (Behavior) refers to leaders who are deeply respected, have referent power, and set high standards and challenging goals for their followers. Individualized Consideration factor means that the leader delegates assignments to followers to provide learning opportunities and coaches them if they need it (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This supports the study of Rosenbush (2014) with results indicating that age has a positive and significant relationship with leadership effectiveness.

Moreover, Leithwood (1994) suggests that transformational school leaders adopt a widely shared vision for the school and clarify its meaning in terms of its practical implications and instruction. Use of all available resources and opportunities to communicate the school’s vision to staff, students, parents and others must be examined. Teachers’ professional goals must be given focus and must be aligned with those of the school. Moreover, the school goals must be considered in the decision making process. The staff must be encouraged to be innovative, hardworking and professional and schools must also search for these qualities when they recruit staff. In terms of administrative processes, responsibility and power for leadership must be delegated widely throughout the school by providing teachers with autonomy in their decisions.
Table 19. Test of Independence Between Respondents’ Adversity Quotient® and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversity Quotient and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics (MLQ)</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Accept Ho</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 presents the test of independence using correlation coefficient of adversity quotient and multifactor leadership characteristics overall results. The findings indicate based on the computed $\chi^2$ value of 0.285, no significant relationship as shown by the p value of 0.146 which is greater than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance with 22 degrees of freedom. Thus, the $H_0$ of no significant relationship between AQ® and MLQ is accepted. This indicates that the Student Affairs and Services administrators’ Adversity Quotient® overall results are not a determinant of their Multifactor Leadership Characteristic overall results. This study suggests that adversity quotient of the respondents are independent of their leadership characteristics.

From the study of Haller (2005), adversity in the early lives of the prominent leader respondent was not the most important factor in shaping a leader but how he/she viewed obstacles or events in adult life as opportunities disguised as challenges. Therefore, adversity quotient® is a scientifically grounded set of tools for improving how to respond to adversity resulting to an overall personal and professional effectiveness (Stoltz, 1997). When used properly, individual AQ® can be a vital piece of effort to strengthen leaders and their ability to prosper in this demanding work environment (Canivel, 2010).

The leaders developed styles over a period of time from experience, education and training (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). This style is not how the leaders think they behave in this
situation but how others (followers) perceive their behavior. The result of the study shows that leaders in Student Affairs and Services fairly often show themselves the following leadership characteristics: idealized influence (attributed and behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration forming transformational leadership. It is important to remember that the transactional – transformational model of leadership is based on a continuum. In this continuum, leaders may reward followers when they achieve objectives. Motivation and inspiration of followers lead to work for transcendental goals where rewards are internal. While research has shown that transformational leadership is related to organizational effectiveness, both approaches are needed. Transactional and transformational styles can represent both active and passive forms of leadership. Transactional leadership behavior is needed for effective department management, identifying performance standards, and classification of job expectation. Transformational behavior provides a vision to motivate and inspire followers during this era of environmental and professional change (J. Rukmani, M. Ramesh, & J. Jayakishnan, 2010).

With regards to the test of finding relationship between the respondents adversity quotient dimensions: control, ownership, reach, endurance and multifactor leadership characteristics: 1) Idealized Influence (II-Attributed), 2) Idealized Influence (II-Behavior), 3) Inspirational motivation (IM), 4) Intellectual Stimulation (IS), 5) Individual Consideration (IC), 6) Contingent Reward (CR), 7) Management-by-exception-Active (MBEA), 8) Management-by-exception- Passive (MBEP), and 9) Laissez-Faire (LF), the results showed that there is a significant relationship between Control Dimension and Intellectual Stimulation (F4). This is supported by the computed $\chi^2$ value of 0.40 with the $p$ value of 0.041 (df=24) which is lower
than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Respondents with high Control perceive that they can influence whatever happens next for the more control one has, the more likely he/she takes positive actions. Person with higher AQ® perceive they have significantly more control and influence in adverse situations than those with lower AQ®. Adversity Quotient determines resilience, health and tenacity over changing situations (Stoltz, 2009). This relates to Intellectual Stimulation factor in which the respondents fairly often manifest leader actions that appeal to followers’ sense of logic and analysis by challenging followers to think creatively and find solutions to difficult problems (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al. 2003).

In terms of Control and Contingent Reward (F6), the results shows that there is also a significant relationship. This is supported by the computed $x^2$ value of 0.44 with the $p$ value of 0.025 (df=24) which is lower than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Student Affairs and Services administrators exhibit some degree of control to overcome difficult events in life. This also relates to their Contingent Reward factor in which they often fairly exhibit leader behaviors focused on clarifying role and task requirements and providing followers with material or psychological rewards contingent on the fulfilment of contractual obligations (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al. 2003).

Moreover, in terms of Ownership and Inspirational Motivation (F3), the results show a significant relationship with the computed $x^2$ value of 0.40 with the $p$ value of 0.042 (df=24) which is lower than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Ownership is defined as the likelihood that someone will actually do anything to improve the situation, regardless of his/her formal responsibilities. A worker with high AQ® holds himself/herself accountable for the outcome of the meeting, regardless of the reason it is going poorly; the low AQ® worker sees
himself/herself as a helpless victim. A person with high AQ® will enhance his/her ability to control the situation and motivates positive actions while a person with low AQ® will most likely blame others and composite a negative actions (Stoltz, 2009). It follows then, that their Inspirational Motivation factor fairly often manifests characteristics of leaders who energize their followers by viewing the future with optimism, stressing ambitious goals, protecting an idealize vision, and communicating to followers that the vision is achievable (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003) which also relate with their adversity quotient ownership dimension.

Lastly, in terms of Reach and Contingent Reward (F6), the results show a significant relationship with the computed $x^2$ value of 0.47 with the $p$ value of 0.015 (df=24) which is lower than the margin of error at 0.05 level of significance. Reach is the extent to which someone perceives an adversity will “reach into” and affect other aspects of the situation or beyond. Someone with high AQ® will put setbacks in perspectives, not letting them ruin the day or the weekend. He/She resolves to learn from the mistakes. A low AQ® worker, on the other hand, will extrapolate, turning the single failure into proof that he/she is worthless and stupid. This will affect other aspects of one’s life leading to frustration, bitterness, failure, misfortune and may lead to poor decision-making. This dimension will determine the person’s burden, stress, energy, and effort as it tends to have cummulative effect. It follows that their Contingent Reward factor fairly often manifests leader behaviors focused on clarifying role and task requirements and providing followers with material or psychological rewards contingent on the fulfillment of contractual obligations (J. Antonakis, J. Avolio et al 2003).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations formulated on the basis of the research findings. More so, a leadership management training design is proposed for all the Student Affairs and Services administrators of public and private Higher Education Institutions in Central Visayas specifically within Negros Oriental and Siquijor.

Summary of the Study

This study sought to determine the relationship between the selected demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience and their adversity quotient® overall results based on the following dimensions: control, ownership, reach and endurance. This also looked into the Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators through the following characteristics: Transformational Leadership: Idealized Influence (II) (Attributed), Idealized Influence (II) (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC); Transactional Leadership: Contingent Reward(CR), Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA), Passive/Avoidant Behavior and Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP); and, Laissez-Faire (LF).

In order to determine the interaction of the foregoing social and personal status of the respondents, the study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators in terms of age, sex, civil status, socio-economic status, educational attainment, and years of work experience?
2. What are the Adversity Quotient® overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

3. What are the Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

4. Is there a significant relationship between the Adversity Quotient® overall Results and the selected demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

5. Is there a significant relationship between the Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results and the selected demographic profile of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

6. Is there a significant relationship between the Adversity Quotient® overall results and Multifactor Leadership Characteristics overall results of Student Affairs and Services administrators?

The study was focused on determining the adversity quotient and multifactor leadership characteristics of Student Affairs and Services administrators of selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region specifically in Negros Oriental and Siquijor, Philippines for school year 2015-2016.

The analysis of the results was basically dependent on the responses of the respondents to the various items in the questionnaire. The Adversity Quotient® was measured through the AQP® version 9.0 instrument provided by Dr. Paul G. Stoltz of Peak Learning, Inc. The Student Affairs and Services administrators or the respondents answered online using the URL provided by the Peak Learning, Inc. to the researcher during the period May 15- July 30, 2015.
The Multifactor Leadership Characteristics Questioner (5X-short) by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004) was used to assess the respondents leadership characteristics whether transformational leadership factor: Idealized Influence-Attributed (II-Attributed)), Idealized Influence-Behavior (II-Behavior), Inspirational motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS) and Individual Consideration (IC); transactional: Contingent Reward(CR), Management-by-exception: Active (MBEA), Management-by-exception: Passive (MBEP); or, laissez-faire (LF).

In particular, the study focused only on the Student Affairs and Services administrators of the public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region within Negros Oriental and Siquijor who expressed their willingness to participate in this research. The respondents were identified as former and present administrators of student affairs and services (deans, directors, assistant directors, unit heads, coordinators, faculty designates) working full-time for school year 2015-2016. All assessment tools were answered voluntarily by the respondents.

In terms of treatment of data, the following statistical tools were used:

1. Percentage and weighted mean to establish part of the respondents’ demographic profile;
2. Chi square to determine the extent of relationship between nominal variables (sex, age, civil status, socio-economic income, educational attainment, and years of work experience) and their adversity quotient overall results and multifactor leadership characteristics overall results;
3. Point biserial coefficient to establish part of the respondents’ demographic profile, particularly, sex, educational attainment, and civil status; and,
4. Pearson Product Moment r to test the degree of relationship between demographic profile and adversity quotient overall results and demographic profile and MLQ overall results.

The test of independence between the respondents’ demographic profile and adversity quotient® presented that there was no significant relationship between the following: (a) adversity quotient® and age; (b) adversity quotient® and sex; (c) adversity quotient® and civil status; (d) adversity quotient® and educational attainment; (e) adversity quotient® and socio-economic status; and, (f) adversity quotient® and years of work experience. Also, the test of independence between the respondents’ demographic profile and multifactor leadership characteristics presented that there was no significant relationship between the following: (a) MLQ and age; (b) MLQ and sex; (c) MLQ and civil status; (d) MLQ and educational attainment; (e) MLQ and socio-economic income status; (f) MLQ and years of work experience. Lastly, the test of independence between the respondents’ adversity quotient® and multifactor leadership characteristics presented that there was no significant relationship between them.

Findings of the Study

The following were the significant findings of the study:

Demographic Profile

Age and Sex

The highest number of respondents was within the age bracket of 40-60 (Middle Adult) with 20 (56%), followed by 14 (39%) within the age bracket of 20-40 (Young Adult); then 2 respondents (5%) within the age bracket of 60 and up (Late Adult).
The total respondents’ population was 36, of which 27 were female (75%) while only 9 were male (30%). The total female respondents were practically two times the number of male respondents which indicated that there were more females than males working as practitioners of Student Affairs and Services in Central Visayas Region, particularly in Negros Oriental and Siquijor.

Civil Status and Educational Attainment

In relation to civil status and educational attainment, married respondents led with 20 (55%) and with the most number of bachelor’s degree 5 (14%), master’s degree 10 (27%) and 5 (14%) doctoral degree. The profile showed that married respondents tended to pursue graduate and post graduate degrees.

On the other hand, eight (23%) of the respondents, 3 (9%) were single and 5 (14%) were married have attained doctoral degrees.

Socio-economic Status and years of work experience

Thirteen (36%) of the respondents had 1-8 years of experience in the higher education institutions as faculty and/or administrators. Following this were those between 12-24 years of work experience with 8 respondents (22%) while only 1 (3%) respondent was in the 34-40 years bracket. However, 3 (8%) of the respondents opted not to answer this category.

In terms of monthly income, 19 respondents (53%) were in the 20,000+ per month salary grade, followed by 7 respondents (20%) who were in the 40,000+ salary grade. Then two (8%) were in the 60,000+ salary grade and only one (3%) was in the 140,000 per month salary grade.
Respondents Adversity Quotient® Overall Results

Eleven (41%) of the Student Affairs and Services administrator respondents’ AQ overall scores ranged from 40-133 and were within the “low” descriptive equivalents. Eight (3%) had the “below average” AQ® overall scores that ranged from 119-135 which means that they had the tendency to likely be under-utilizing their potential. Adversity can take a significant and unnecessary toll on them, making it difficult for them to continue the ascent. They may need to battle against a sense of helplessness and despair but escape is possible for them by raising their AQ®.

Seven (26%) of the respondents obtained scores within “average” that ranged from 136-157 descriptive rating. Average means that they had the tendency to do decent job of navigating if is everything is going relatively smooth. Consequently, they may suffer unnecessarily from larger setbacks or may be disheartened by the accumulated burden of life’s challenges: However, one (4%) scored “high” that ranged from 176-200 in the overall AQ® results which means that the person demonstrated the ability to withstand significant adversity and to continue to move forward and upward in life. The computed mean score of the overall AQ® of the Student Affairs and Services administrators equaled to 115 which was below the standard mean of 146. This indicated an overall “low” AQ® of the respondents. Low means that most of the respondents probably suffer unnecessarily in a number of ways but their motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope could still be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ® (Stoltz, 2009).
Respondents’ Multifactor Leadership Characteristics Overall Results

**Idealized Influence (Attributed).** The findings of the study showed that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often display a sense of power and confidence in their obligation as leaders as manifested in the results which gave the highest mean of 2.62 on item 25. Idealized Influence (Attributed) factor in terms of the overall mean was 2.05 which means that they manifest these traits sometimes in their practice as leaders.

**Idealized Influence (Behavior).** The findings of the study showed that the Student Affairs and Services administrators had the highest mean on idealized influence (behavior) characteristics of 3.44 of items 14 and 23 which means that they have the tendency to fairly often specify the importance of having a sense of purpose. Hence, they fairly often consider the moral and ethical consequences of their decisions as administrators of Student Affairs and Services. The computed overall mean of the behavior category was 3.24. This means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often include engendering trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect among followers through application of charismatic vision and behavior when leading their subordinates as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

**Inspirational Motivation.** The findings of the study showed that the Student Affairs and Services administrators got the highest mean of 3.39 on item 36 under inspirational motivational characteristics which means that the respondents tend to fairly often express confidence that the goals they set be achieved. Also, fairly often they talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished with co-workers and are optimistic about the future and fairly often they articulate a compelling vision of the future. In fact, the respondents overall mean
was 3.13 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often have high standard and orientation about the future as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

**Intellectual Stimulation.** The findings of the study showed that the respondents got the highest mean of 3.03 on both items 2 and 32 under Intellectual Stimulation factor which means that the respondents tend to fairly often re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate or not and suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments to fellow co-workers. Moreover, fairly often, they seek differing perspectives when solving problems and get others to look at problems from many different angles. Therefore, the respondents’ overall mean of 3.02 suggested that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often accept subordinates’ ideas and encourages subordinates to challenge the status quo by re-examine critical assumptions as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

**Individual Consideration.** The results revealed that the respondents got the highest mean of 3.57 on item 29 under Intellectual Stimulation factor which means that frequently, if not always, they have the tendency to consider that individuals in the workplace as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations. It follows that, fairly often, they manifest characteristics of helping others to develop their potentials, treat others as individuals rather than just as members of a group, and fairly often they spend time teaching and coaching fellow colloquies in the student affairs and services unit in their respective institutions. The respondents overall mean was 3.31 which mean that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often treat their subordinates as individuals rather than as part of the group, and invest in their learning process as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).
Contingent Reward. The results revealed that the Student Affairs and Services administrators got the highest mean of 3.39 on item 1 under contingent reward factor which means that, sometimes, they tend to provide assistance in exchange for their effort. In like manner, fairly often, they express satisfaction when others tend to meet their expectations, they make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved, and discuss, in specific terms, who is responsible for achieving performance target. Hence, the overall mean of 2.91 means that the student affairs and services administrators fairly often exchange related behavior, in which reward are contingent upon the subordinates’ agreement to task performance as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Management by-Exception (Active). The results also revealed that the respondents got the highest mean of 2.08 on both item 4 and 22 which means that the respondents tend to sometimes focus their attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. More so, they give their full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. To summarize, the respondents’ overall mean was 2.03 which means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators sometimes tend to actively search for subordinates’ mistakes as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

Management by Exception (Passive). The data showed that the respondents got the highest mean of 1.83 on item 17 which means that the respondents tend to sometimes show that they are firm believer in “If aren’t broke. don’t fix it”. Certainly, once in a while, they tend to fail to interfere until problems becomes serious, and not at all demonstrate that problems must not become chronic before they take action as administrators and not wait for things to go wrong before taking action. In short, the respondents overall mean was 1.11 which means
that the Student Affairs and Services administrators *once in a while*, tend not to get involved with subordinates’ problems unless the problems attract the leaders attention as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

**Laissez-Faire.** Results revealed that the respondents got the highest mean of 1.34 on item 33 which means that, *once in a while*, they tend to delay responding to urgent questions. Thus, once in a while, they tend to be absent when needed, avoid getting involved when important issues arise, and avoid making decisions. It follows then, that the respondents’ overall mean of 1.04 means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators, *once in a while*, manifest “non-leadership” or in other words, the perception of leadership inaction as defined by Bass and Avolio (1993).

The test of independence between the respondents’ demographic profile and adversity quotient® found out there was no significant relationship between the following: (a) adversity quotient® and age; (b) adversity quotient® and sex; (c) adversity quotient® and civil status; (d) adversity quotient® and educational attainment; (e) adversity quotient® and socio-economic status; and, (f) adversity quotient® and years of work experience.

In terms of test of independence between the respondents’ demographic profile and multifactor leadership characteristics, it was found out that there was no significant relationship between the following: (a) MLC and age; (b) MLC and sex; (c) MLC and civil status; (d) MLC and educational attainment; (e) MLC and socio-economic status; (f) MLC and years of work experience.
In terms of independence between the respondents’ adversity quotient® and multifactor leadership characteristics, it was found out that there was no significant relationship between them.

**Conclusions**

The findings of the study therefore, supports the following conclusions.

**Demographic Profile of the Respondents**

It was evident that the highest number of respondents was within the age bracket of 40-60 implying that most of the respondents were in their middle adult stages. This is the seventh stage of Eric Erickson’s Stages of Development when an individual becomes a mature adult, dealing with the challenge of generativity versus stagnation. The mature adult wants to be useful and effective, contributing to the world. Adults feel a need to impart their own knowledge and teach younger generations (E. Erickson, 1964). The total female respondents were practically trice the number of male respondents which indicated that there were more females than males working as practitioners and administrators of Student Affairs and Services in Central Visayas Region particularly, in Negros Oriental and Siquijor. Majority of the respondents were married and were holders of either a master’s degree or a doctoral degree. Only five were single and were all doctoral degree holders. Most of the respondents were receiving 20,000+ per month as salary and only two respondents were receiving 80,000 to 140,000 per month. The most number of respondents had 1-8 years of work experience in the higher education institutions as faculty and/or administrators.

The Student Affairs and Services administrators’ overall AQ® results was equal to 115 which was below the standard mean of 146. This indicated an overall descriptive “Low” AQ® of
the respondents implying that most of the respondents probably suffer unnecessarily in a number of ways. But the motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ® (Stoltz, 2009).

Multifactor Leadership Characteristics With regards the Student Affairs and Services Administrators’, the conclusions based on the nine sub-factors are outlined below:

1. **Idealized Influence (Attributed).** An overall descriptive rating of **oftentimes** was derived implying that oftentimes the respondents make personal sacrifices, deal with obstacles, and exhibit self-confidence in their role as leaders.

2. **Idealized Influence (Behavior).** An overall descriptive rating of **fairly often** was met meaning they fairly often engender trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect among followers through application of charismatic vision and behavior when leading their subordinates.

3. **Inspirational Motivation.** An overall descriptive rating of **fairly often** was presented suggesting that they fairly often set high standard and orientation about the future.

4. **Intellectual Stimulation.** An overall descriptive rating of **fairly often** was derived from the data signifying that the Student Affairs and Services administrators fairly often accept subordinates’ ideas and encourages them to challenge the status quo by re-examining critical assumptions.

5. **Individualized Consideration.** An overall descriptive rating of **fairly often** was achieved entailing that fairly often they treat their subordinates as individuals rather than as part of the group and invest in their learning process.
6. **Contingent Reward.** An overall descriptive rating of *fairly often* was made denoting that they fairly often exchange related behavior, in which reward are contingent upon the subordinates’ agreement to task performance.

7. **Management by-Exception (Active).** An overall descriptive rating of *sometimes* was offered hinting that sometimes they tend to actively search for subordinates’ mistakes.

8. **Management by-Exception (Passive).** An overall descriptive rating of *once in a while* was shown presupposing that the Student Affairs and Services administrators once in a while, tend not to get involved with subordinates’ problems unless the problems attract the leaders attention.

9. **Laissez-Faire-** The overall descriptive rating of *once in a while* was arrived at designating that the Student Affairs and Services administrators once in a while manifest “non-leadership” in other words, the perception of leadership inaction.

To summarize, the nine subscale factors of Multifactor Leadership Characteristics that form transformational, transactional, and or laissez-faire leadership showed the respondents’ overall mean of 2.46 with a descriptive rating of *sometimes.* This means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators have the tendency to sometimes manifest the multifactor leadership characteristics in doing their role as leaders of student affairs and services. Moreover, the results demonstrated that the Student Affairs and Services administrators utilized a combination of transformational, transactional and passive/avoidant leadership. It can be inferred that the respondents relatively exhibited leadership characteristics to direct their subordinates to achieve organizational goals.
The respondents’ demographic profile in terms of age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience were found to have no significant relationship with their adversity quotient. These results proved that age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience do not affect one’s level of adversity quotient. Given these points, the findings of Lazaro’s, Cura and Gozum’s, Villaver, Canivel’s and Ferrer’s studies have been confirmed by the present research since the aforementioned studies had similar findings that Adversity Quotient® do not have significant relationship with the selected demographic profile.

The test of independence between the respondents’ selected demographic profile and multifactor leadership characteristics yielded results that which prove that age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, socio-economic status, and years of work experience do not affect one’s multifactor leadership characteristic. Findings based on individual factors showed that there was a significant relationship between age and Idealized Influence (Behavior) and age and individual consideration factor. This indicated that as the individual age, manifestations of their characteristics on Idealized influence-Behavior and Individual Consideration both forming transformational leadership, become more evident. Idealized Influence (Behavior) refers to leader characteristics that are deeply respected, have referent power, and have set high standards and challenge goals for followers. On the other hand, Individualized Consideration means that the leader delegates assignments to followers to provide them learning opportunities and coaches them, if needed (Bass & Avolio, 1997). This supports the study of Rosenbush (2014) which indicated that age has a positive and significant relationship with leadership effectiveness. On the other hand, the results also showed that there was no
significant relationship between the respondents’ adversity quotient® and multifactor leadership characteristics. This indicated that the Student Affairs and Services Administrators’ Adversity Quotient overall results were not determinant of their Multifactor Leadership Characteristic overall results. This study suggested that respondents’ adversity quotient was independent of their leadership characteristics. However, when viewed based on AQ dimensions, control and Intellectual Stimulation (F5) and control and Contingent Reward (F6) showed significant relationships. Furthermore, Ownership Dimension and Inspirational Motivation (F3) also showed a significant relationship.
Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are formulated:

1. The Student Affairs and Services administrators in Negros Oriental and Siquijor need to look into the possibility of enhancing their present level of adversity quotient through AQ® assessment and training. The ability to withstand adversities is an important aspect of their quality of life. Findings reveal that people with high AQ® outperform those with low AQ® (Stoltz, 1997). They need to be aware of adversity response and its impact to their role as administrators of Student Affairs and Services. Through collaboration among the respondents’ respective HEIs, Human Resource Development Office, the Philippine Association of Administrators of Student Services (PAASA) Inc., local and national chapters, and the Commission on Higher Education, pre-service trainings, seminar-workshops and conferences intended for student affairs and services practitioners and administrators can be designed to enhance leadership skills and the administrators’ ability to withstand adversity inherent with their jobs. These agencies can assist them to develop resiliency in the workplace.

2. Further research on adversity quotient is encouraged through the College of Education- Graduate Programs. Similar researches correlating adversity quotient, multifactor leadership characteristics and other demographic variables which were not covered in this study such as religious affiliation, job satisfaction, performance evaluation, regional background, family constellation, school background, living
location, race/ethnicity, and the like can be initiated. Also, the number of respondents can be increased and the scope can be widen to cover different regions in the country. Significant relationships can be possible among these variables when paired.

3. The Student Affairs and Services administrators in Negros Oriental and Siquijor shall regularly revisit and engage in self-introspection practice to assess their leadership characteristics through the multifactor leadership questioner (MLQ) as to the following characteristics: Idealized Influence (II-Attributed), Idealized Influence (II-Behavior), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), Individual Consideration (IC), Contingent Reward (CR), Management-by-exception-Active (MBEA), Management-by-exception- Passive (MBEP), and Laissez-Faire (LF). This is also a way of looking into their strengths and weaknesses in leadership to improve their leadership practices which can significantly impact their institution’s performance. The leaders then become aware of these negative personal developmental experiences that may be limiting effective leadership. Training or individual counseling can then address those areas where previous developmental experiences have left an individual unprepared for the challenges of leadership (Avolio, 1994; 2004).

4. The study provides appropriate information for Student Affairs and Services administrators regarding their leadership capabilities which can assist them to arrange leadership enhancement training to cultivate effective leaders. The need to increase frequency of transformational behaviors can be strengthened, particularly
on Idealized Influence (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration. The frequency of transactional behaviors and passive/avoidant behaviors, the management-byexception -passive as well as laissez-faire must also be minimized.

5. Although the results of the study indicate that the Student Affairs and Services administrators’ Adversity Quotient® overall results are not determinant of nor dependent on their Multifactor Leadership Characteristic Overall results, there is still a need to look into leaders’ AQ by conducting more studies related to adversity quotient dimension as to control, ownership, reach, and endurance and the leadership styles as to transformational, transactional and passive/avoidant leadership and the relationship between and among factors and/or dimensions.

6. A leadership management training design is proposed in order for Student Affairs and Services administrators to enhance their leadership qualities and embrace transformational leadership. It is composed of a set of training activities aim at proactive change in an individual. In the context of this research, it is the researcher’s purpose to bring about an improvement in the adversity quotient level of the identified group. Moreover, along the process, leaders can positively influence their associates’ awareness of what is important and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. It is only then that they can overcome the challenges of an ever-changing environment. It is important for school administrators to be effective in operating within such an environment and have the skills necessary to be successful despite adversities. The
educational leader’s adversity response plays a crucial role in the development of a successful school climate for an improved/ maximized student achievement (Rosenholtz, 1989; Stoltz, 2000).
A LEADERSHIP MANAGEMENT TRAINING DESIGN FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES
ADMINISTRATORS IN NEGROS ORIENTAL AND SIQUIJOR, PHILIPPINES

Rationale

A leadership management training design is proposed for Student Affairs and Services administrators in order to enhance their leadership qualities for them embrace transformational leadership approach. This is composed of a set of training activities aimed at proactive change among educational leaders or in an individual. The purpose is to bring about change in the adversity quotient® level of the identified group. Moreover, along the process leaders can positively influence their associates’ awareness of what is important and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way.

According to Daft (2008), the purpose of management is “the attainment of organizational goals in an effective and efficient manner through planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling organizational resources” (p. 4). Managers seek stability in an organized environment in order to control the organization’s bottom line. The motivation for management is power and profit. Leadership is different because it is “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes and outcomes that reflect their shared purposes” (p. 4). Leader provide a vision for the future of the organization and often questions the way things are done because they want to move the organization and its people forward instead of merely maintaining a stable environment. Then motivation for leadership is people and progress by building networks of positive relationships (Daft, 2008).

With this framework, the study investigated the relationship between the adversity quotient® and multifactor leadership characteristics and the demographic profile of Student
Affairs and Services administrators of selected public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Central Visayas Region specifically in Negros Oriental and Siquijor, Philippines for school year 2015-2016. The adversity quotient® was measured through AQP® 9.0 online instrument by Paul Stoltz (2009) and multifactor leadership characteristics through MLQ (X5 short) by Bernard M. Bass and Bruce J. Avolio (2004). Although, the study found that there is no significant relationship between demographic variables and their adversity quotient and multifactor leadership characteristics, as well as the respondents adversity quotient overall results and multifactor leadership characteristics overall results, it still suggests the need to enhance the respondents' adversity quotient level as to the four dimensions: control, ownership, reach, and endurance through AQ® assessment and training. The ability to withstand adversities is an important aspect in one’s quality of life. Findings of the studies revealed that people with high AQ® outperform those with low AQ® (Stoltz, 1997).

The study showed that Student Affairs and Services administrators’ overall AQ® results equaled to 115 which is below the standard mean of 146. This indicated an overall descriptive “Low” AQ® among the respondents. Low means that most of the respondents probably suffer unnecessarily in a number of ways. The motivation, energy, vitality, health, performance, persistence, and hope can be greatly revitalized by learning and practicing the tools in raising AQ® (Stoltz, 2009).

However, the multifactor leadership characteristics (nine subscale factors) forming transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership yielded a grand overall mean of 2.46 with a descriptive rating of sometimes. This means that the Student Affairs and Services administrators tend to sometimes manifest the multifactor leadership characteristics in doing
their role as leaders of student affairs and services. This shows that the Student Affairs and Services administrators utilize a combination of transformational: Idealized Influence- (Attributed), Idealized Influence (Behavior), Inspirational motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individual Consideration); transactional (Contingent Reward, Management-by-exception- (Active), Management by-exception(passive); and, laissez-faire leadership styles. It can be inferred that the respondents relatively exhibited leadership characteristics to direct their subordinates to achieve organizational goals. How the challenges as leaders are resolved is highly dependent upon the individual leader’s personal qualities expressed in the style of leadership and the degree of resilience and control over his/her decisions and emotions which is known as adversity quotient (IJSBAR 2015).

The training outcomes are:

1. To equip participants with a body of knowledge on Adversity Quotient® and ground – breaking approaches on effective leadership which is applicable in both personal and professional life;
2. To enable the participants to reflect on their Adversity Quotient® level results as to CORE dimensions: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance;
3. To enable the participants to reflect on their Multifactor Leadership Characteristics results;
4. To provide a range of analytical frameworks on enhancing adversity quotient and leadership practice that can be applied by the participants to their own working environments;
5. To provide opportunities for the participants to improve their skills in leadership management; and,
6. To enable participants to contribute to school or college improvement in its management of Student Affairs and Services.
Scheme of Implementation

The proposed leadership management training design will be presented to the Student Affairs and Services administrators in Negros Oriental and Siquijor, Philippines through the Philippine Association of Administrators of Student Affairs Inc. (PAASA) Local Chapter. With the help, suggestions, and feedback of the respective higher education institutions in Negros Oriental and Siquijor, and the PAASA local chapter officers, a training schedule will be set for all practitioners and administrators of Student Affairs and Services units. The target date of implementation is first semester for school year 2016-2017.
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