

Resiliency of Students with Parents Living in Alternative Family Arrangement

Eva Marie C. Avila¹, Marifel Q. Acena²

¹College of Teacher Education, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City

²College of Arts and Sciences, University of Northern Philippines, Vigan City

Corresponding author: emrca820@gmail.com

Abstract – This study aimed to assess students' resiliency with parents living in an alternative family arrangement. It also traced whether there is a significant relationship between the level of resiliency and the profile of the students and their protective factors. This study's respondents were the 63 college students enrolled during the second semester of SY 2015-2016. A questionnaire was used as the main data gathering tool in the study. The majority of the respondents are female, whose parents are in mutual type of living arrangement and non-professional, and with fathers who are high school graduates. Further, a great number are 17 years old, eldest, with two siblings, living with mothers who are high school graduates, and with parents whose monthly income is Php 10,000 and below. Their protective factors are moderate, and their resiliency is high. Faith in God makes the respondents resilient. No significant relationship was seen between the respondents' resiliency level and their personal-related factors and protective factors. The Office of Student Affairs may conduct intervention activities which involve the parents, caregivers, guardians, and the concerned students to help them manage the transition and develop coping strategies.

Keywords: students' resiliency, alternative family arrangement, protective factors

1. Introduction

Everyone stumbles and falls from time to time, but each person can get back up and carry on. As Ahangar (2010) stated, the ability to move on despite challenges is called resilience.

Resilient people respond to life's challenges with courage and emotional stamina, even when they are afraid. Downturns become to face head-on and overcome. However, people have no control over many events in their lives such as accidents, natural disasters, crimes, illnesses, the downfall of the economy, etc. However, they may control how they respond to these events, and may choose to do so with resilience.

Perez et al. (2009) assumed that resilience requires both the presence of risks and protective factors. Protective factors are necessary for bringing out positive outcomes intended to reduce or avoid negative outcomes. People's environment is contributory to various problems but can equally serve as protection. These include resources that are external to individuals like parental support, adult mentoring, or community organizations.

The incredible power of caring, support, and affection to protect children is a powerful predictor of resilience. The "sense of basic trust" identified by Erik Erickson appears to be the critical foundation for human development and bonding and, thus, human resiliency.

Consequently, marital separation is a risk factor that can contribute to later problem behaviors of children. Indeed, it is a stressful life event that the children have to overcome. To mitigate the effects of other risks and stressful life events, a child needs the enduring living involvement of one or more adults in care and joint activity with the child.

According to Wagnild (2012), resilience is important. It is important for a person's mental and physical health. Resilience protects a person from depression, fear, anxiety, helplessness, and other negative emotions. Resilience thus improves the quality of life.

An alternative family could be created through fostering and adoption or one where a surrogate has supported the progress. Also, there is a

growing trend of single parenting by choice as more independent people decide to start their family alone. There are also alternative families that evolve within the family, such as co-parenting following a separation/OFW, families raised by other family members such as grandparents and other relatives. The alternative family arrangements could positively or negatively affect students' development, including their resiliency, because of family dynamics changes. Wermer and Smith (1990) identified caregiving during the first year of a child's life as the most powerful predictor of resiliency in children.

Undeniably, records at the Guidance and Counseling Services of the University show several students with parents living in alternative family arrangements. The students could not handle stress well in difficult situations because of a lack of resilience. Consequently, they incur failing grades, skip classes, and even have relationship problems with their family members and friends.

It is along with this premise that this research is undertaken. Identifying the level of resiliency will assist the Guidance Counselors in designing responsive interventions to help the students. Likewise, since resilience may significantly affect life outcomes and schooling among students, parents of these students may be guided as to how they can adequately assist their children despite their marital status.

The researchers are optimistic that this study has a substantial impact not just on the researchers but also on the entire higher education institution. Theoretically, the study may enhance existing theories, principles, and concepts explaining students' resilience. It also gives a new dimension in discussing factors that may attribute to the overall functioning of students, especially those who have parents living in the alternative family arrangement.

For the college students, the results of this research may further promote approaches in developing and improving their ability to bounce back after a failure. Thus, they may be able to deal with any adversity, whatever the severity would be, leading to their success in their chosen field. Parents or guardians may also be benefited from the results of this study. They may be able to gain

approaches or mechanisms to support their children at risk. Lastly, knowledge and skills may be acquired to help their children enhance their protective factors and increase their resiliency level.

Along with the researchers' workplace, results may be used to empathize with their clients, especially those facing problems, and use appropriate techniques and strategies to assist them. Moreover, the study's findings may serve as baseline information in designing activities geared towards the holistic development of the students.

1.1. Objectives of the Study

This study is an assessment of students' resiliency in the University of Northern Philippines. It determined the profile of the respondents, their level of protective factors, level of resiliency, and the relationship between profile, level of resiliency, and protective factors.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

To gain insights into the concepts and factors that have a significant bearing on this study, the researcher reviewed some pertinent literature and research related to resiliency. It is acknowledged that each one has extraordinary possibilities and strengths, and each one also can get back up and move forward.

Masten and Obradovic (2006) propose the Resilience Theory. It is a conceptual framework to understand how individuals can bounce back in life after experiencing an adverse situation in a strength-focused approach. They enhanced their theory. He explained resilience as a dynamic system's ability to withstand or recover from important changes that threaten its stability, viability, or development. He removed withstand and changed the definition to include adapt successfully. This definition is the capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten system function, viability, or development. This newer definition reflects the perspective that individuals do not withstand risk but change to accommodate risk. Masten explains resilience as ordinary magic, and that normative processes and basic human

adaptation systems account for the majority of resilience findings. Further, he specifies that to be resilient, there must be two criteria to be considered resilient. They are positive adaptation or development and the past or current conditions that threaten to disrupt positive adaptation.

VicHealth (2015) explained resilience in his theory that it is more than an individual set of characteristics. These are the structures around the individual, the services the individual receives, the way health knowledge is generated, all of which combine with characteristics of individuals that allow them to overcome the hardship they encounter. In 2008, he improved his definition and stated that in the context of exposure to significant hardship, whether psychological, environmental, or both, resilience is both the capacity of individuals to navigate their way to health-sustaining resources, including opportunities to experience feelings of wellbeing, and a condition of the individual's family, community and culture to provide these health resources and experience in culturally meaningful ways. He highlighted that it is the characteristics of both individuals and the environment that lead to resilience.

Another Resilience Theory is postulated by Benard as cited by Acena (2005), wherein everyone has their strengths. Every individual can rebound if a life catastrophe hits. This theory states that all people can overcome adversity and succeed despite their life circumstances.

Rutter (2006) presented his Resilience Theory. He defined resilience as an interactive concept that is concerned with the combination of serious risk experiences and a relatively positive psychological outcome despite those experiences. He reiterated that it is more than social competence or positive mental health. He said that competence must exist with risk to be resilient. In the year 2013, he improved his definition, stating that resilience is when some individuals have a relatively good outcome despite having experienced serious stresses or adversities – their outcome being better than that of other individuals who suffered the same experiences.

Another theorist of resilience is Garmezy (1961). According to him, resilience is not necessarily impervious to stress. It is designed to reflect the capacity for recovery and maintained

adaptive behavior that may follow an initial retreat or incapacity upon initiating a stressful event. He highlights that all individuals experience stress at some time in their life, and resilient individuals are not heroic than those who meet similar situations with retreat, despair, or disorder. For Garmezy, individuals need to show functional adequacy, the maintenance of competent functioning despite an interfering emotionality as a benchmark of resilient behavior under stress.

In Werner's Theory of Resilience (1992), she explained resilience as the capacity of individuals to cope effectively with the internal stresses of their vulnerabilities (labile patterns of autonomic reactivity, developmental imbalances, unusual sensitivities) and external stresses (illness, major losses, and dissolution of the family)". For her, resilient individuals worked well, played well, loved well, and expected well. Moreover, resilience is explained in Luthar's Theory of Resilience. She stated that resilience is a dynamic process encompassing positive adaptation with the context of significant adversity". She says that two critical conditions must be met to be resilient: exposure to significant threat or severe adversity and the achievement of positive adaptation. Like the other theorists, she contradicts that resilience is not a personal trait but a product of the environment and the interaction between the individual and the environment (VicHealth, 2015).

Further, Azlina and Jamaluddin (2010) said that resilience might imply effective coping that includes thoughts and actions intended to restore or maintain balance. As such, resilience is essential to a person's mental and physical health. Resilience protects one against depression, anxiety, fear, helplessness, and other negative emotions and thus has the potential to reduce their associated physiological effects. Being more resilient improves the quality of life.

Taken together, the research on resilient individuals has increasingly pointed toward the importance of a systemic view of resilience. First, the significance of strong relationships in cultivating resilience has been a consistent finding across studies. Second, an ecological, developmental view of resilience is necessary to mediate processes in a social context and over time. These multiple, recursive influences underscore the need for a systemic

assessment in times of crisis: Further, one can strengthen resilience by enhancing his resilience core, which is made up of the five essential characteristics: meaningful life (purpose), perseverance, self-reliance, equanimity, and coming home to yourself (existential aloneness) (Stephens, 2013).

Calaguas (2013) developed and validated a scale to measure resilience among college students, which has the following themes: faith, perseverance, self-esteem, acceptance, humor, independence, and social competence.

McLemore (2010) believed that resilience, combined with creating positive and constructive learning environments, can benefit all students regardless of their risk level and can effectively be taught in schools. The development of these skills is key to improving academic performance and enabling students to succeed in school and subsequently in life.

De la Cruz (2013) said that separation is traumatic both for parents and children. Children are most affected as they are confused between their parents. Children have to choose one parent over the other, which can be very traumatic as children are attached to both parents.

Edwards, Catling, and Parry (2016) identified two significant individual predictors of resilience in their study. They were the amount of adversity within an individual's relationship with their parents/guardians and locus of control. They found out that the lack of adversity within the relationship with parents/guardians, and an internal locus of control predicts higher resilience levels. According to the study of Yeager and Dweck (2012), psychological interventions that change the mindsets of the students are effective, and what educators can do to foster these mindsets can create resilience in educational settings.

Moving on, Cassidy (2015) sought to identify factors that contribute to academic resilience in a meaningful way and to examine how such factors influence specific and meaningful responses to academic adversity. He found out that academic self-efficacy is predictive of academic resilience. Further, lower and higher self-efficacy students respond in a differentially adaptive manner. It is suggested that self-efficacy training is already shown to be effective in an educational context

that offers one approach to building academic resilience in students.

It was also revealed in the study of Onturk, Efek, and Yildiz (2020), resilience may be differed by class, sports age, residence variables. Also, it was found out that sports age affects resilience negatively. Benard (2014) discusses adaptive systems or processes in a person's life that allows them to show competence despite the threats of risk factors. These are protective factors. The presence of these protective factors provides a better indicator of whether youth will grow up to become successful, well-adjusted adults than does the presence or absence of risk factors such as poverty, drug-use, and others. By providing youth with caring relationships, high expectations, and meaningful participation opportunities, the fundamental developmental needs that must be fulfilled if children and youth are to become happy and successful are met. As these needs are met, youth develop the strengths or developmental outcomes that will benefit them throughout their lives.

According to Bonanno, Bucciarelli, and Vlahov (2007), the family is a protective factor. This means being connected with others, such as family. Felsman and Vaillant (1987) followed the lives of 75 high-risk, inner-city males who grew up in poverty-stricken, socially disadvantaged families. Family life was often complicated by substance abuse, mental illness, crime, and violence. Many men, although indelibly marked by their experience, showed courageous lives of mastery and competence. These men took an active initiative in shaping their lives, despite occasional setbacks and multiple factors against them. As Felsman and Vaillant concluded, their resilience demonstrated that "the events that go wrong in our lives do not forever damn us." Werner (1995) states that Community is another protective factor of individuals. This is in the context of receiving support or counsel from peers.

In summary, the present study is similar to past research. They present the nature importance of resiliency and protective factors of individuals. On the other hand, they differ in some aspects, like the predictors of resiliency. They also differ in terms of their respondents.

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

This study used a descriptive-correlational design. The relationship between resiliency and profile and protective factors of respondents were looked into. Data were gathered, tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted to address the problems of the study.

2.2. Subjects of the Study

The respondents of the study were 63 students with parents living in alternative family arrangements. They are the students with separated, living, or working in other places, one or both is or are dead. Respondents were selected through Slovin's formula and stratified random sampling. They were contacted through text messages, and referrals.

2.3. Data Gathering Tool

A questionnaire was the main tool in data gathering. The questionnaire used in this study was composed of three parts: Part I gathered the personal-related factors of the respondents; Part II covered the level of protective factors of the respondents. The items used were taken from the study of Acena (2015), and Part III elicited the respondents' resiliency level. The researchers adopted the questionnaire constructed by Calaguas (2013) to look into the level of resiliency of the respondents. The researchers personally administered the questionnaire to the students.

2.4. Data Analysis

Frequency count and percentage, mean, and Simple Correlational Analysis were the statistical tools used in analyzing the data.

2.5. Ethical Considerations

There was no conflict of interest in the conduct of the research. The privacy of the respondents was respected by keeping their information private and not mentioning their names. All gathered

information from the respondents were treated with the utmost confidentiality. Data were stored with a password. Only the researchers have access to the files. After two years, the data were deleted from the laptop. Before the start of the data-gathering, consent was secured from the respondents. The researchers explained the nature and objectives of the study, methodology, and expected participation from the respondents. The participation of the respondents were voluntary. Any respondent may withdraw from the study, without repercussions, at any time, whether before the data-gathering starts or while the data-gathering is on-going. All the respondents are adults. In the general population (persons of diverse SOGIE), these respondents included students and women. Voluntary participation was solicited from them. Social and psychological risks were controlled by providing the respondents with essential information on the conduct of the study. Debriefing was conducted after the interview. With the result of the study, administrators will be reminded of the importance of resiliency and protective factors of the students, especially those who have parents living in an alternative family arrangement.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Profile of the Respondents

Twenty-five (39.7%) respondents are 17 years old. The majority of the respondents are female (60.3%). A great number (28.6%) of them have two siblings. Twenty-nine (46%) respondents are the eldest children in the family. A great percentage (39.7%) of the respondents are living with their mother, the majority (82.54%) of them have parents who live under the mutual type of living arrangement. A majority (87.3%) of the respondents have fathers who are non-professional and have mothers who are non-professional. Out of 63 respondents, 50.8% claimed that their fathers are high school graduates. Twenty-one (33.3%) respondents mentioned that their mother is in high school. A majority (74.6%) of the respondents said their fathers' monthly income is Php 10,000 & below. While 68.3% of the respondents mentioned

that their mothers receive Php 10,000 & below as their monthly income.

3.2. Level of Protective Factors

3.2.1. Family

Notably, the overall mean rating (3.43) for the family as a protective factor is 'High. Please refer to Table 1. This shows that the members of the family of the respondents, even if they live in an alternative family arrangement, are very supportive of their welfare and development. Having a loving family gives strength and courage in life. According to Bonanno, Bucciarelli, and Vlahov (2007), family as a protective factor means connecting with others, such as family.

As found by Felsman and Vaillant (1987) in their study, the events that go wrong in the family do not forever damn the children. However, Berman (1991) said that individuals who have been raised in families where parents are separated tend to have difficulty in handling challenges. Parents need to be aware of their children's activities and interactions through every age, and stage of growth and development. Monitoring children's activities is an important way to lower their chances of getting involved in situations parents do not approve of, especially those that can be harmful.

3.2.2. Community

As a protective factor, community garnered a 'Moderate' descriptive rating. The respondents perceived the community as moderately

Table 1. Summary of Mean Ratings on Protective Factors

Protective Factors	\bar{x}	DR
Family	3.43	High
Community	3.39	Moderate
School	3.34	Moderate
Overall	3.39	Moderate

Norm:

4.21 – 5.00	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	High
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate
1.81 – 2.60	Low
1.00 – 1.80	Very Low

sponsoring positive action strategies that build resilience in them. Having everyday experiences and participating with the people and places of a community enables children to observe, engage, understand, and actively contribute to their expanding world. Werner (1995) explains that Community as a protective factor of individuals in receiving support or counsel from peers. Worthy to mention that friends, family members, neighbors, and other community members provide emotional support and concrete assistance to parents. Social connections help parents build networks of support that serve multiple purposes: they can help parents develop and reinforce community norms around childrearing, provide assistance in times of need, and serve as a resource for parenting information or help solving problems. Spending time with positive friends changes one's outlook for the better. Meanwhile, the respondents feel that some people in their community are not worthy of being emulated. Having positive role models is very important as they influence people's actions and motivate them to uncover their true potentials and overcome their weaknesses.

3.2.3. School

The overall mean rating for school as a protective factor is 3.34, with 'Moderate' as a descriptive rating. It is to be noted that students hold the belief that teachers and peers in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals. However, the respondents sometimes feel connected to their school. Subsequently, student Services Program fosters relationships among educators and students, thereby increasing students' attachment to school, and serves as an essential link between students and their families and school resources and community-based health and social services. Meanwhile, they feel that sometimes the teachers inspire and encourage them to strive for greatness, live to their fullest potential, and see the best in themselves. A role model is an individual who acts as a guide. They help direct the life of another in a positive direction, which the respondents sometimes cannot observe from their teachers.

3.2.4. Overall

The overall mean rating of 3.39, which explains the level of *Protective Factors* of students, is Moderate. This implies that students are somewhat armed with characteristics that may improve their overall functioning development. According to Benard (2014), adaptive systems or processes in a person's life allow them to show competence despite the threats of risk factors. The presence of these protective factors provides a better indicator of whether youth will grow up to become successful, well-adjusted adults than does the presence or absence of risk factors such as poverty, drug-use, and others. By providing youth with caring relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation, the fundamental developmental needs that must be fulfilled if children and youth are to become happy and successful are met. As these needs are met, youth develop the strengths or developmental outcomes that will benefit them throughout their lives. Benard (2014) also suggests that adaptive systems or processes in a person's life allow them to show competence despite the threats of risk factors.

3.3. Level of Resiliency

3.3.1. Faith

Overall, faith is 'Very High' as a component of resilience in the respondents. This is backed-up by the mean rating of 3.64. It is hard to trust God when everything seems to be going wrong. However, the respondents believe in the existence of God. They hold on to God despite the challenges they face in life. They believe that God will not give them problems one cannot handle, and that one is loved by God. Their experiences also help them become wiser and stronger.

3.3.2. Perseverance

The table presents that the overall mean rating for this resiliency component is 3.46 describing the respondents to have a 'Very High' level of perseverance. They continue living despite problems, focusing more, telling themselves not to

Table 2. Level of Resiliency of the Students

Components of Resilience	\bar{x}	DR
Faith	3.64	Very High
Perseverance	3.46	Very High
Self-Esteem	3.20	High
Acceptance	3.48	Very High
Humor	3.15	High
Independence	3.09	High
Social Competence	2.94	High
Over-all	3.25	High
Norm:		
3.26 - 4.00		Very High
2.51 - 3.25		High
1.76 - 2.50		Low
1.00 - 1.75		Very Low

give up, and not letting the same problems happen again. Here, the respondents refuse to give up the pursuit of a goal despite their condition. They seem not to make excuses or blame their parents for the challenges they experience. The respondents still stay focus on their studies. They seem to understand that without good focus, all aspects of their ability to think will suffer.

3.3.3. Self-Esteem

Overall, the respondents assessed the self-esteem component of their resiliency as 'High.' This is supported by the mean rating of 3.20. The respondents believed that one is not supposed to put one's self down, and if others can, one can also can. The result means that they feel good about themselves, feel accepted, are proud of what they do, and believe in themselves. This reflects the respondents' confidence in their ability to exert control over their motivation, behavior, and social environment. It points out that they are confident that a hypothesis or prediction is correct or that a chosen course of action is the best or most effective.

3.3.4. Acceptance

The overall rating of 3.48 describes the respondents as having a 'Very High' acceptance level of resiliency. This means they accept that there are things beyond one's control, that life can be difficult at times, and one cannot have

everything in life. They also accept the fact that they cannot have everything. This implies that the respondents embrace what life is without resistance.

3.3.5. Humor

Overall, humor is of 'High' level in the respondents as backed-up by the mean rating of 3.15. This goes to show that the respondents do not take problems too seriously. They joke around, laugh at one's problems, and smile as if nothing happens. As Mangubat (2018) pointed out, Filipinos are happy because they always see the bright side of life no matter what situation God gave them. This emphasizes that the respondents are aware that jokes play a very important role to ease their lives and work as a good medicine to relieve their stress. The respondents believe that healthy laughing helps them release the tension brought about by the problems they have with their parents. Laughter is a universally desired part of existence.

3.3.6. Independence

The overall mean describes the respondents having a 'High' level of independence as a component of resiliency. This means the respondents believe that one is responsible for everything that happens in one's life, and problems must be faced independently. The respondents take absolute responsibility for the condition and situation of their lives. They acknowledge their role in their own life rather than looking around for someone or something else to blame. They accept that they are in charge of what is going on in their lives.

3.3.7. Social Competence

The respondents are 'High' along with this component of resiliency, as shown by the mean rating of 2.94. This reflects that the respondents can take another's perspective concerning a situation, learn from past experiences, and apply that learning to social interaction changes. This goes to show that the respondents have friends who can help them deal with dilemmas. Talking

about their problems with their friends can help shed light on how to get through a problem.

3.3.8. Overall Resiliency

The overall mean rating of 3.25 shows that the respondents have a High level of resilience. This means that they can stand up after encountering experiencing several challenges in their lives. This is what we call the Resilience Theory. As cited by VicHealth (2015), Masten (2006) explains resilience as a capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully from significant changes that threaten its stability, viability, or development. Further, Benard (2014) says that every individual can rebound if a life catastrophe hits. He also states that all people can overcome adversity and succeed despite their life circumstances. Ungar (VicHealth, 2015) explained resilience is more than an individual set of characteristics. It is the structures around the individual, the services the individual receives, the way health knowledge is generated, all of which combine with characteristics of individuals that allow them to overcome the hardship they encounter. Rutter added that resilience is an interactive concept concerned with the combination of serious risk experiences and a relatively positive psychological outcome despite those experiences. He reiterated that it is more than social competence or positive mental health (VicHealth, 2015).

According to Garmezy, resilience is not necessarily impervious to stress. It is designed to reflect the capacity for recovery and maintained adaptive behavior that may follow an initial retreat or incapacity upon initiating a stressful event. He highlights that all individuals experience stress at some time in their life, and resilient individuals are not heroic than those who meet similar situations with retreat, despair, or disorder. Werner (VicHealth, 2015) explained resilience as the capacity of individuals to cope effectively with the internal stresses of their vulnerabilities and external. She said that resilient individuals worked well, played well, loved well, and expected well.

Luthar's Theory of Resilience states that it is a dynamic process encompassing positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity.

She contradicts that resilience is not a personal trait but a product of the environment and the interaction between the individual and the environment. Furthermore, Azlina and Jamaluddin (2010) said that resilience might imply effective coping that includes thoughts and actions intended to restore or maintain balance. As such, resilience is essential to a person's mental and physical health. Resilience protects one against depression, anxiety, fear, helplessness, and other negative emotions, and thus has the potential to reduce their associated physiological effects. Being more resilient improves the quality of life.

3.3.1. Relationship Between Level of Resiliency, Profile and Protective Factors

Notably, there is no significant relationship between the respondents' resiliency level and their personal-related attributes.

Results of bivariate correlation analysis reveal that age is positively correlated to faith ($r = .287$), sex and humor ($r = .295$), and living arrangement and humor ($r = .259$). This means that the older the respondents, the greater is their faith; female respondents and those whose parents are in 'mutual type of living arrangement' tend to have a better sense of humor. Older people may be wiser because of life experiences and skills to understand people. Consequently, older people who can center on unchanging core beliefs about God are more prepared to thrive. Females can generate comic relief and find alternative ways of looking at things and the ability to laugh at themselves and ridiculous situations. According to Bonanno, Bucciarelli, and Vlahov (2007), demographic information like gender predicts resilience.

Meanwhile, the number of siblings is negatively correlated to independence ($r = -.273$),

Table 6. Correlation Coefficients Between the Level of Resiliency of the Respondents and their Personal-Related Factors

Variables	Level of Resiliency							Overall
	Faith	Perseverance	Self-Esteem	Acceptance	Humor	Independence	Social Competence	
Age	.287*	.162	.046	.180	.113	.072	-.243	.103
Sex	.021	-.057	.095	.141	.295*	.220	.208	.243
Number of Siblings	-.109	.085	-.163	-.154	-.174	-.273*	-.164	-.224
Ordinal Position	-.029	.087	-.041	-.115	-.180	-.319*	-.095	-.176
Religious Affiliation	-.263*	-.424**	-.099	-.108	.144	.141	-.180	-.192
Type of Living Arrangement	-.070	.090	-.150	.209	.259*	.212	.009	.104
Guardianship	-.156	-.044	-.148	-.040	-.172	.020	-.125	-.159
Parents Occupation								
Father	.011	-.048	-.115	-.049	-.193	-.005	-.058	-.131
Mother	.103	-.103	-.203	.044	.002	.210	.001	-.015
Parents Educ Attainment								
Father	.134	.007	-.023	.170	.115	.096	.097	.129
Mother	.020	-.076	-.163	.034	-.109	-.074	.006	-.112
Parents Monthly Income								
Father	-.018	-.021	-.034	.105	.084	.106	.121	.097
Mother	-.112	-.100	-.149	-.207	-.218	-.206	.079	-.240

Legend: ** - significant at 0.01 prob level

* - significant at 0.05 level

Table 7. Correlation Coefficients of Level of Resiliency and Protective Factors

Variables	Resiliency							Overall
	Faith	Perse- verance	Self- esteem	Accep- tance	Humor	Inde- pendence	Social Com- petence	
Family	.243	.450**	.347**	-.088	-.145	-.142	.207	.227
Community	.113	.406**	.301	-.002	-.110	-.079	.143	.223
School	.122	-.084	-.041	.183	-.068	.186	-.159	-.009

Legend: ** - significant at 0.01 prob level

* - significant at 0.05 level

ordinal position and independence ($r=-.319$), and religious affiliation and faith ($r=-.263$), and perseverance ($r=-.424$). This implies that those with fewer siblings and higher ordinal positions tend to be more independent. Since there are fewer siblings, they are free from the influence or control of another. Respondents occupying higher ordinal positions tend to have no problem navigating the world on their own. With younger siblings' presence, the parents are focused on them, leaving the older children to do more activities independently. Catholic respondents tend to be persevering and have stronger faith. Moreover, the other personal-related factors were found not to be related to their level of resiliency.

3.3.2. Relationship Between the Level of Resiliency and Protective Factors

Table 7 presents that the respondents' overall level of resiliency is not significantly related to their protective factors. In particular, the family is significantly related to perseverance ($r=.450$) and self-esteem ($r=.347$); and community and perseverance ($r=.406$). Perseverance is a valuable character quality for children to learn more about. The family is profoundly important to the development of a child. A child will learn about relationships, manners, self-esteem, worth, and loyalty, all by watching and participating in the family and the community. Bonanno, Bucciarelli, and Vlahov (2007) revealed that resources like social support are also used to predict resilience.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

This study focused on the students' resiliency in the University of Northern Philippines with parents living in alternative family arrangements during the second semester, the School Year 2015-2016. The majority of the respondents are female, whose parents are in mutual type of living arrangement and non-professional, and with fathers who are high school graduates. Further, a great number of the respondents are 17 years old, the eldest, with two siblings, living with mothers who are high school graduates, and with parents whose monthly income is Php 10,000 and below.

The students are armed with characteristics that may improve their overall functioning development. The presence of these protective factors provides a better indicator of whether youth will grow to become successful, well-adjusted adults than does the presence or absence of risk factors such as poverty, drug-use, and others. By providing youth with caring relationships, high expectations, and opportunities for meaningful participation, the fundamental developmental needs that must be fulfilled if children and youth are to become happy and successful are met. As these needs are met, youth develop the strengths or developmental outcomes that will benefit them throughout their lives.

In addition, the students can stand up after encountering experiencing several challenges in their lives. The structures around the individual, the services the individual receives, the way health knowledge is generated, all of which combine with characteristics of individuals that allow them to overcome the hardship they encounter. Resilience

is not necessarily impervious to stress. It is designed to reflect the capacity for recovery and maintained adaptive behavior that may follow an initial retreat or incapacity upon initiating a stressful event. He highlights that all individuals experience stress at some time in their life, and resilient individuals are not heroic than those who meet similar situations with retreat, despair, or disorder. Luthar's Theory of Resilience states that it is a dynamic process encompassing positive adaptation in the context of significant adversity. She contradicts that resilience is not a personal trait but a product of the environment and the interaction between the individual and the environment. As such, resilience is essential to a person's mental and physical health. Resilience protects one against depression, anxiety, fear, helplessness, and other negative emotions and thus has the potential to reduce their associated physiological effects. Being more resilient improves the quality of life.

Age is positively correlated to faith, sex and humor, and living arrangement and humor. This means that the older the respondents, the greater is their faith; female respondents and those whose parents are in 'mutual type of living arrangement' tend to have a sense of humor. Older people may be wiser because of life experiences and skills to understand people. Consequently, older people who can center on unchanging core beliefs about God are more prepared to thrive. Females can generate comic relief and find alternative ways of looking at things and the ability to laugh at themselves and ridiculous situations. On the other hand, the family is significantly related to perseverance and self-esteem, and community. Perseverance is a valuable character quality for children to learn more about. The family is profoundly important to the development of a child. A child will learn about relationships, manners, self-esteem, worth, and loyalty, all by watching and participating in the family and the community.

From the findings, the researchers forward the following recommendation: the Office of Student Affairs and Services in cooperation with the different colleges may conduct intervention activities to enhance the students' protective factors and resiliency, like Continuous

consultation and counseling services with the student, his/her parents/caregiver/guardian, and every person that the student feels important in his/her life, family day to facilitate communication between parents/caregiver/guardian and students, seminar-workshop for parents/caregiver/guardian to equip them with cooperative parenting skills characterized by joint planning, flexibility, and sufficient communication as well as how to maintain a working partnership, seminar-workshop for students may be conducted to help them manage the transition and develop coping strategies. Further, assistance may be provided to students to join organizations of his/her interest to facilitate the students' networks for support and periodic consultation with stakeholders to improve school and community links to provide positive climate. Moreover, the University may form partnerships with institutions offering religious/spiritual activities to deepen the students' faith with parents living in alternative arrangements. As an offshoot to this study, researches along predictors of resilience may be conducted. Impact of resilience to students' lives may be also be conducted.

REFERENCES

- Acena, M. (2005). Resiliency of students of higher education institutions in Ilocos Sur. (Doctoral Dissertation).
- Ahangar, R. (2010). A study of resilience in relation to personality, cognitive styles and decision-making style of management students. *Africa Journal of Business Management*.
- Azlina, A., & Jamaluddin S. (2010). Assessing reliability of Resiliency Belief Scale (RBS) in the Malaysian context. *International Journal for Cross-Disciplinary Subjects in Education*
- Berman, C. (1991). *A whole heart. Adult children of divorce speak out*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucchiarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2007). What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources, and life stress. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75(5), 671–682. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.5.671>
- Calaguas, G. (2013). A measure of resilience for college students: Scale development and initial validation. *The Guidance Journal*

- Cassidy, S. (2015). *Resilience Building in Students: The Role of Academic Self-Efficacy*. *Front. Psychol.* 6:1781. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01781
- De la Cruz, R. (2013). Attitude and academic performance of Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College first year students living in alternative family arrangement. (Master's Thesis)
- Edwards, T.; Catling, J. C.; Parry, E., Identifying Predictors of Resilience in Students, *Psychology Teaching Review*, v22 n1 p26-34 Spr 2016
- Erickson, Erik. *Childhood and Society*, 2nd edition. New York: W.W. Norton, 1963.
- Felsman, J. K., & Vaillant, G. E. (1987). *Resilient children as adults: A 40-year study*. In E. J. Anthony & B. J. Cohler (Eds.), *The Guilford psychiatry series. The invulnerable child* (p. 289–314). Guilford Press.
- Masten, A.S., & Obradovic, J. (2006). Competence and Resilience in Development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. doi:10.1196/annals.1376.003
- McLemore, C. (2010). Resiliency and academic performance. ScholarCentric. Retrieved from www.ScholarCentric.com
- Onturk, Y., Efek, E., & Yildiz, M. (2020). Investigating the Psychological Resilience of Students in Sports Sciences Faculty. *International Journal of Educational Methodology*, 6(2), 393–403.
- Osorio, B. R., (2019). *So here's what really makes Filipinos happy*. <https://www.philstar.com/lifestyle/sunday-life/2019/08/11/1942234/so-heres-what-really-makes-filipinos-happy>
- Perez, W. et. Al (2009). Academic resilience among undocumented Latino students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*.
- Rutter, M. (2006). *The promotion of resilience in the face of adversity. Families Count: Effects on Child and Adolescent Development*. 26-52. 10.1017/CBO9780511616259.003.
- Wagnild, G.M. (2010). Discovering your resilience core. Retrieved from www.resiliencescale.com
- Werner, E. E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(3), 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.ep10772327>
- Werner, E. E., & Smith, R. S. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood. Zero to three. Bulletin of the National Center for Clinical Infant Programs*
- VicHealth 2015, *Current theories relating to resilience and young people: a literature review*, Victorian HealthPromotion Foundation, Melbourne.
- Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). *Mindsets That Promote Resilience: When Students Believe That Personal Characteristics Can Be Developed*, *Educational Psychologist*, 47:4, 302-314, DOI: 10.1080/00461520.2012.722805