

# From Chaos to Strength: Socio-Labor Aspects as Catalysts of Resilience in Times of University Crisis

Julio Montano<sup>1</sup>, Jeny Alcahuaman<sup>2</sup>, Santos Montano<sup>3</sup>,

## Abstract

*In Peru, the National Superintendence of Higher University Education (SUNEDU), when establishing licensing guidelines, left out several institutions, generating uncertainty and affecting administrative staff. In order to analyze the influence of socio-labor aspects on the resilience of those who work in a private, unlicensed university, a quantitative approach, a non-experimental design, and an explanatory correlational scope were used. The population, composed of 51 administrative workers, was evaluated using validated instruments, covering dimensions of bond of belonging, social integration, and solidarity, as well as the adaptive capacity, emotional support, and self-efficacy. The results show positive and significant correlations between socio-labor aspects and resilience (Rho between 0.678 and 0.822), with socio-labor aspects explaining 62.9% of the variability of resilience, and showing that management focused on strengthening the sense of community and collaboration can contribute to greater collective well-being and better organizational adaptation.*

**Keywords:** *Socio-Labor Aspects, Resilience, Social Integration, Solidarity, Adaptive Capacity.*

## Introduction

Higher education faces growing challenges worldwide, especially when state regulations demand strict levels of quality and efficiency, which has led to the strengthening of institutional supervision and evaluation processes to ensure that universities meet basic standards, generating significant changes in their structures and management approaches (Hegde & Inamdar, 2023; Pushpakumara et al., 2023; Claeys-Kulik et al., 2022). In this context, the role of workers becomes relevant as they constitute the essential support for the continuity of academic and operational activities, and resilience, understood as the ability to overcome adverse situations, is deeply influenced by the working conditions and social factors surrounding the individual (Hassan et al., 2024; Akçin, 2023). Therefore, there is a growing interest in understanding how socio-labor aspects can strengthen the attitude and performance of administrative workers in times of institutional crisis, which reflects the existence of a highly complex scenario.

In Peru, with the introduction of the National Superintendence of University Higher Education (SUNEDU), rigorous guidelines have been established to ensure educational quality in all universities in the country (Armijos et al., 2024; SUNEDU, 2020). This new scenario gave rise to a licensing process in which some universities did not meet the required standards and were ordered to cease their functions within a period of up to two years, counted from the resolution denying their licensing (Limaymanta et al., 2024; Gómez et al., 2024). Under these circumstances, the socio-labor aspects become more relevant, as they are determinant for the welfare and motivation of those who support the management of an unlicensed institution (Mopkins et al., 2024; Michulek et al., 2024). Several studies point out that job uncertainty can negatively affect the adaptive capacity of workers, while a supportive social environment would strengthen their willingness to overcome adversities (Aliane et al., 2023; Anand et al., 2023; Aybas et al., 2015; Cheng and Chan, 2008). This is why the articulation of socio-labor factors is decisive in promoting resilience in workers and, therefore, in the organization, while enhancing the ability to adapt and respond positively to the adversities inherent to a context of change and instability (Georgescu et al., 2024; Robinson et al., 2024; Tonkin et al., 2018).

---

<sup>1</sup> Universidad César Vallejo, Email: [jmontanob@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:jmontanob@ucvvirtual.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1620-5946>

<sup>2</sup> Universidad Católica Los Ángeles de Chimbote, Email: [jalcahuamanv@uladech.edu.pe](mailto:jalcahuamanv@uladech.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1033-6328>.

<sup>3</sup> Universidad César Vallejo, Email: [smontanob@ucvvirtual.edu.pe](mailto:smontanob@ucvvirtual.edu.pe), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8735-2644>.

However, there is insufficient information detailing how socio-labor factors influence the resilience of administrative workers operating in private universities without licensure (Nyakoty & Goronga, 2024; Unjai et al., 2024). Most previous research has focused on the student perspective or institutional policies, neglecting the specific role of administrative staff in crisis scenarios (Lu et al., 2024; Ran, 2024; Ye et al., 2024; Monzon et al., 2023; Nwoko et al., 2023). Despite advances in the understanding of resilience at the organizational level, there is still a gap in the understanding of the specific mechanisms that allow these collaborators to cope with the adversities derived from the progressive or definitive closure of their workplaces (Stankevičiūtė et al., 2021). Such a lack of knowledge prevents the design of targeted interventions that enhance occupational and social strengths to cope with the complex landscape of uncertainty, demonstrating that a significant theoretical gap remains so far.

The focus on administrative staff is particularly important because their work has a direct impact on the operational functioning and academic experience of the student community (Glasson, 2023), however, there are few approaches that explore how factors such as internal communication, organizational climate and talent management policies affect their ability to resist and adapt (Mussa, 2022). Even when the need to study resilience in the university context is recognized, few papers have delved into the specific role of the socio-occupational components that underpin worker resilience (Verma et al., 2024; Turner et al., 2016). This lack of data limits the comprehensive understanding of the problem and hinders the formulation of strategies that promote a more conducive environment for institutional sustainability in times of crisis, making it urgent to delve deeper into this issue.

The present research addresses this gap by exploring the socio-labor aspects that affect the resilience of the administrative staff of a private university that has not obtained its licensure, using an approach that offers a clear vision of the experiences and perceptions of the collaborators and that allows examining the bond of belonging, social integration and solidarity, as well as adaptive capacity, emotional support and self-efficacy and self-regulation, with the purpose of determining how these factors influence coping capacity in the face of work uncertainty and to generate empirical evidence that contributes to the formulation of concrete proposals aimed at strengthening the social and work bases that make possible adaptation and continuity of functions in adverse environments.

Likewise, the socio-labor resources that strengthen the integration, collaboration and resilience of administrative workers were identified, generating guidelines for decision-making on participation and inclusion strategies, support networks and strengthening of self-efficacy. The results are useful for initiatives that seek to safeguard the welfare of those who sustain the functioning of the university, while providing scientific evidence to enrich the debate on the construction of supportive and adaptive work communities.

## Research Method

### *Type, Approach, Level, and Research Design*

The research was of a basic type and developed under a quantitative approach, given that data collection and analysis was carried out using statistical tools with the purpose of achieving the objectives set and verifying the hypothesis formulated. It was framed at an explanatory and correlational level: on the one hand, it is correlational because it examines the degree of association between variables at a given point in time; on the other, it is explanatory, since it delves into the causes and effects underlying the phenomenon studied, going beyond a mere description of its characteristics. As for the methodological design, a non-experimental model was adopted, since no manipulation of the variables was involved, and a cross-sectional one, since the information was collected at a single point in time.

### *Population and Sample*

The study was carried out in a private university in the region of Ancash, Peru, whose population consisted of 51 administrative workers. Since the entire population was included in the analysis, the sample was composed of the 51 participants, thus configuring a census sampling. This methodology made it possible

to obtain direct and precise information on the variables analyzed, ensuring a complete representation of the group studied.

### *Instrument*

Two questionnaires of 15 questions each, using a Likert scale, were used for data collection. These questionnaires underwent an exhaustive validation process, evaluated by professional experts, thus ensuring the soundness and validity of the measurement elements used in the study. After the instruments were validated, a reliability test was performed. A pilot test was conducted on a sample with similar characteristics to that of the main research, obtaining a Cronbach's alpha of 0.969 for the questionnaire called “Socio-labor aspects” and 0.978 for the questionnaire called “Resilience”, indicating a very high reliability, so it was decided to use these instruments in the research.

### *Socio-Labor Aspects Scale*

The socio-labor aspects include working conditions, job security, stability, interpersonal relations, motivation and well-being of the worker within an organization (Cáceres-Lozano et al., 2023). These factors directly influence job satisfaction, quality of life and organizational commitment, promoting a healthy and productive environment for both personal and business development. Brower (2021) highlights the importance of socio-labor aspects in the work environment, emphasizing that collaboration, social capital and interpersonal connection strengthen productivity, well-being and job satisfaction, promoting a more effective, motivating and committed environment for organizational success.

The scale used to measure this variable is composed of three dimensions: bond of belonging, social integration and solidarity. Each of these dimensions included 5 questions, totaling 15 items in the instrument. When Cronbach's alpha was applied to evaluate internal consistency, an overall reliability index of 0.969 was obtained. In addition, the results showed a maximum value of 0.974 in question 2 and a minimum value of 0.965 in several questions.

As for the scales for the variable “Socio-labor aspects”, a score between 15 and 30 indicates an inadequate level, while a score between 31 and 45 corresponds to a fair level. Finally, a score is considered adequate when the score is in the range of 46 to 60. As for the dimensions, for “Bond of belonging”, a score of 5 to 10 is classified as inadequate, 11 to 15 as regular, and 16 to 20 as adequate. These same scales are applied to the dimensions of “Social integration” and “Solidarity”, thus establishing a uniform criterion for evaluating each aspect of the socio-labor aspects.

### *Resilience Scale*

Although in the work context, resilience is still a concept under debate, especially in its measurement, development and impact (Hartmann et al., 2019), it is recognized as the ability of a person to decide between retaining or modifying their ideas, emotions and actions when faced with difficulties and adverse moments, allowing them to acquire new learning that strengthens their growth and evolution throughout life (Dillon, 2022). In this sense, resilience not only implies adaptation and change, but also the ability to face and recover from adverse, challenging or stressful situations both in daily life and in the workplace (Becona, 2006).

The scale used to measure this variable is composed of three dimensions: Adaptive capacity, with 4 questions, Emotional support, with 7 questions, and Self-efficacy and self-regulation, with 4 questions, making a total of 15 items in the instrument. When Cronbach's alpha was applied to evaluate internal consistency, an overall reliability index of 0.978 was obtained. In addition, the results showed a maximum value of 0.980 in question 11 and a minimum value of 0.974 in several questions.

Regarding the scales for the variable “Resilience”, a score between 15 and 30 indicates a low level, while a score between 31 and 45 corresponds to a medium level. Finally, a score is considered high when the score is in the range of 46 to 60. As for the dimensions, for “Adaptive capacity” and for “Self-efficacy and self-

regulation”, a score from 4 to 8 is classified as low, from 9 to 12 as medium, and from 13 to 16 as high. For the dimension “Emotional support”, a score of 7 to 14 is classified as low, 15 to 21 as medium, and 22 to 28 as high.

### Data Analysis

For data analysis, the SPSS v29 statistical software was used, which facilitated both the descriptive and inferential approaches. First, tables were drawn up that reflected the levels of each variable and dimension, showing frequencies and percentages. Subsequently, an inferential analysis was carried out to test the hypothesis formulated, using the relevant statistical tests in order to identify the relationships between the variables studied.

The normality of the data was verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, which indicated that the data did not follow a normal distribution. Consequently, it was decided to use the Spearman correlation coefficient. Finally, to validate the hypothesis, the Nagelkerke coefficient was used, which allowed determining the degree of influence of one variable on the other.

## Results

### Descriptive Results

**Table 1. Levels of Variables and Their Dimensions**

Variables / Dimensions	Inadequate		Regular		Adequate	
Socio-labor aspects	0	0.0%	23	45.1%	28	54.9%
Bond of belonging	0	0.0%	23	45.1%	28	54.9%
Social integration	0	0.0%	26	51.0%	25	49.0%
Solidarity	0	0.0%	24	47.1%	27	52.9%
	Low		Medium		High	
Resilience	0	0.0%	23	45.1%	28	54.9%
Adaptive capacity	0	0.0%	26	51.0%	25	49.0%
Emotional support	0	0.0%	32	62.7%	19	37.3%
Self-efficacy and self-regulation	0	0.0%	28	54.9%	23	45.1%

Table 1 shows that for the Socio-labor aspects variable, 54.9% of respondents consider it to be at an adequate level, while 45.1% consider it to be fair. For the Bonds of belonging dimension, which measures the degree to which workers feel part of the organization, 54.9% consider it to be at an adequate level, while 45.1% consider it to be fair. For the Social Integration dimension, which reflects the way in which individuals relate to their colleagues and the work environment, 51.0% of respondents consider it to be at a fair level, while 49.0% consider it to be adequate. Finally, for the Solidarity dimension, which analyzes the willingness of workers to cooperate and support each other, 52.9% of respondents consider it to be at an adequate level, while 47.1% consider it to be fair. The absence of inadequate levels suggests that, although the majority perceives these aspects positively, there is still a considerable proportion that evaluates them in an intermediate way, which could indicate opportunities for improvement in cohesion and the sense of community within the workplace.

On the other hand, for the Resilience variable, 54.9% of respondents consider it to be high, while 41.1% consider it to be at a medium level. For the Adaptability dimension, which reflects the flexibility and ability of workers to adjust to changes, 51.0% consider it to be at a medium level, while 49.0% consider it to be high, indicating a slight inclination towards favorable adaptation. For the Emotional Support dimension, 37.3% consider it at a high level, while 62.7% consider it at a medium level, this dimension has the lowest level in the high category and the highest proportion at a medium level, suggesting that workers may feel that they lack emotional support in their environment. Finally, for the dimension Self-efficacy and self-

regulation, which measures confidence in one's own abilities and emotional management in work situations, 54.9% consider it at a medium level and 45.1% at a high level. These results indicate that, although most workers have adequate resilience, there are areas in which emotional support and self-confidence could be strengthened.

The results reflect a mostly positive work environment, in which workers perceive favorable socio-labor conditions and show a good level of resilience. However, the fact that a significant portion of the participants are at average levels in dimensions such as social integration, emotional support and self-efficacy suggests that there are still opportunities to strengthen the sense of community, emotional support within the team and the ability of workers to face challenges more effectively. These findings can serve as a basis for designing strategies to improve human talent management and organizational well-being.

### *Inferential Results*

**Table 2. Test of normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov**

<b>Variables / Dimensions</b>	<b>Statistic</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Socio-labor aspects	0.181	51	0.000
Bond of belonging	0.139	51	0.015
Social integration	0.262	51	0.000
Solidarity	0.277	51	0.000
Resilience	0.224	51	0.000
Adaptive capacity	0.198	51	0.000
Emotional support	0.275	51	0.000
Self-efficacy and self-regulation	0.296	51	0.000

Table 2 shows the use of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic to test whether the data follow a normal distribution. This statistic was used since it is suitable for moderate to large samples, as in this case, where 51 observations were analyzed. The results show that for all variables and dimensions the significance value is less than 0.05, indicating that the data do not have a normal distribution. Because of this, Spearman's correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the correlation between the variables under study, and to measure the influence of one variable on the other, the Nagelkerke coefficient was used to estimate variability.

**Table 3. Correlation Between Variables and Dimensions**

	<b>Resilience</b>	
	<b>Rho</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
<b>Socio-labor aspects</b>	0.720	0.000
Bond of belonging	0.678	0.000
Social integration	0.822	0.000
Solidarity	0.742	0.000

Table 3 shows that all the correlations are positive, strong and significant, since the Rho values range between 0.678 and 0.822, and in all cases the significance is 0.000, which confirms the existence of correlations between the elements confronted. The Social Integration dimension presents the highest correlation with the Resilience variable (Rho = 0.822), suggesting that those who feel more integrated in their work environment tend to show greater resilience. It is followed by the Solidarity dimension (Rho = 0.742), indicating that the willingness to cooperate and support others in the work environment is also strongly related to the ability to cope with adversity and thus be more resilient.

Table 4 evaluates the degree of influence of the first variable on the second. Here it can be seen that the Nagelkerke coefficient shows a value of 0.629, suggesting that the Socio-labor aspects variable explains 62.9% of the variability in the Resilience variable, suggesting a strong influence of socio-labor conditions

on the adaptive and coping capacity of workers. This reinforces the importance of fostering a favorable work environment, since socio-labor conditions can contribute to the development of resilience in workers.

**Table 4. Ordinal Regression for Socio-Labor Aspects Vs Resilience**

<b>Model Fitting Information</b>				
<b>Model</b>	<b>-2 Log Likelihood</b>	<b>Chi-Square</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
Intercept Only	199.395			
Final	149.337	50.058	1	0.000
<b>Pseudo R-Square</b>				
Cox and Snell		0.625		
Nagelkerke		0.629		
McFadden		0.192		

## Discussion

The descriptive results indicate that most of the participants perceive the socio-labor aspects at an adequate level, giving prominence to the dimension bond of belonging and solidarity, this finding is consistent with what Sharma and Tiwari (2023) mentioned about the relevance of cohesion and support in the work environment. In line with this, Smith et al. (2025) and Peng et al. (2024) stress that an atmosphere of organizational support strengthens collective well-being and resilience, while Tri et al. (2023) and Chae et al. (2024) emphasize the need for working conditions that promote social integration and work enthusiasm. The fact that a significant percentage is located at medium levels of social integration and emotional support coincides with what was mentioned by Mullen (2021) and Merrien et al. (2023), who warn that the lack of solidarity and shared commitment can generate internal vulnerabilities. Likewise, Yu et al. (2024) and Mozammel (2023) suggest that organizational support and job security are determinants for the perception of well-being, partially supported by the predominance of moderate levels of emotional support. These findings reaffirm the importance of structures that promote a sense of belonging and reinforce collective cohesion.

The high correlation coefficients between socio-labor aspects and resilience corroborate that mentioned by Everly et al. (2013) on the relevance of crisis intervention in work environments, suggesting that mutual support and effective communication are linked to lower stress and greater adaptation. Similarly, Varajao et al. (2021) highlight the importance of trust and solidarity in the team, which coincides with the strong association observed in the dimensions of social integration and solidarity with resilience. This relationship goes hand in hand with that mentioned by Sharma and Tiwari (2023), according to which emotional intelligence promotes resilience through interaction and reinforcement. Likewise, the results agree with the reflections of Klimenko and Skachkova (2020) and Lapoutte (2021), who emphasize that cohesion and social resources are key factors for well-being in contexts of organizational transformation. The high correlation between solidarity and resilience coincides with that mentioned by Mullen (2021), who highlights the arts of resisting precariousness thanks to interpersonal support. Overall, this picture confirms that collective synergy is key to strengthening adaptability and robustness in adverse situations.

The finding that socio-labor aspects explain 62.9% of the variance in resilience supports the idea that organizational strength depends to a large extent on the well-being of its members. This finding is consistent with Cui et al. (2022), who point out that adequate working conditions and social support decrease fatigue and enhance professional identity, strengthening resilience in the face of crises. Similarly, IJntema et al. (2021) found that specific interventions, such as coaching programs and online modules, can increase resilience in periods of organizational change, highlighting the mediating role of a supportive culture in individual and collective adaptive capacity. Thus, the strong influence of socio-labor factors also reinforces the approaches of Peng et al. (2024) and Smith et al. (2025) regarding the importance of a management that prioritizes the integral well-being and active participation of workers. This nexus suggests that it is not enough to implement technical or structural improvements; it is necessary to foster bonds of belonging, social integration and solidarity that favor self-efficacy and personal growth. Consequently, the results

emphasize the convenience of organizational policies focused on mutual support and emotional strengthening.

The analysis of the findings corroborates the close interaction between socio-labor aspects and resilience, highlighting the sense of belonging, solidarity and social integration as fundamental elements. The capacity to adapt and emotional support also emerge as key elements to face uncertainty and change in the work environment. These results reaffirm the relevance of fostering working conditions that strengthen collective cohesion and the well-being of employees, while simultaneously promoting institutional stability and personal growth. Thus, they underscore the need to implement strategies focused on collaboration and self-regulation to foster a robust and resilient environment.

## Conclusion

The research reveals the significant influence of socio-labor aspects on the resilience of the administrative staff of a private non-licensed university. The emphasis on the sense of belonging, solidarity and social integration, together with self-confidence and emotional support, favors individual and collective coping and adaptation capacity. It is confirmed that the articulation of labor and social factors fosters an environment conducive to continuity of functions and institutional wellbeing. The correlations found evidence a scenario in which cooperation and cohesion strengthen self-regulation and learning skills in the face of adversity. The analysis indicates that the strong relationship between these variables contributes to sustainability, reinforcing the importance of interventions aimed at strengthening union and mutual assistance, providing valuable foundations for university management.

University authorities are encouraged to implement policies to strengthen social and labor relations that include spaces for dialogue, mentoring programs, and recognition systems. These measures, focused on collaboration and well-being, would favor the consolidation of a resilient institutional environment.

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to all the Peruvian university staff who provided support to complete the research.

## Declaration of Conflicts of Interests

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## References

- Akçin, K. (2023). The mediating effect of psychological resilience in the impact of increasing job insecurity with the pandemic, on organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Kybernetes*, 52(7), 2416-2430. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-08-2022-1126>
- Aliane, N., Al-Romeedy, B., Agina, M., Salah, P., Abdallah, R., Fatah, M., Khababa, N., & Khairy, H. (2023). How Job Insecurity Affects Innovative Work Behavior in the Hospitality and Tourism Industry? The Roles of Knowledge Hiding Behavior and Team Anti-Citizenship Behavior. *Sustainability*, 15(18), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151813956>
- Anand, A., Dalmasso, A., Rezaee, S., Parameswar, N., Rajasekar, J., Dhal, M. (2023). The effect of job security, insecurity, and burnout on employee organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Research*, 162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.113843>
- Armijos, J., Molina, M., & Soler, C. (2024). Dissolution of Higher Education Institutions: Between aspirations and social commitment. *Revista Ibérica De Sistemas e Tecnologias De Informação*, E71, 153-168. <https://www.risti.xyz/issues/ristie71.pdf>
- Aybas, M., Elmas, S., & Dündar, G. (2015). Job insecurity and burnout: The moderating role of employability. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(9), 195-203. <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/view/21200>
- Becoña, E. (2006). Resiliencia: definición, características y utilidad del concepto. *Revista de Psicopatología y Psicología Clínica*, 11(3), 125-146. <https://revistas.uned.es/index.php/RPPC/article/view/4024>
- Brower, T. (2021, March 21). 7 ways social matters for the future of work. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/tracybrower/2021/03/21/socializing-is-surprisingly-significant-7-ways-social-matters-for-the-future-of-work/>

- Cáceres-Lozano, L., Acevedo-Cárdenas, J., Barrios-Martínez, V., Romero-Salinas, L., Pérez-Peña, A. & Contreras-Pacheco, F. (2023). Labor Well-Being and its Correlation with the Organizational Commitment. *Revista de Investigación en Salud, Universidad de Boyacá*, 10(1), 94-111. <https://doi.org/10.24267/23897325.742>
- Chae, U., Lee, G., Kang, A., Lee, J. & Ahn, D. (2024). Comparative analysis and model development of working conditions and sociopsychological factors influencing job satisfaction among office workers. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development*, 8(12), 1-19. <http://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i12.8437>
- Cheng, G., & Chan, D. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied psychology*, 57(2), 272-303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x>
- Claeys-Kulik, A., Bennetot, E., Estermann, T., & Jørgensen, T. (2022). The European Universities Initiative and system level reforms. Current challenges and considerations for the future. European University Association. [https://www.eua.eu/images/publications/Publication\\_PDFs/briefing\\_eui\\_impact\\_on\\_system\\_level\\_reforms.pdf](https://www.eua.eu/images/publications/Publication_PDFs/briefing_eui_impact_on_system_level_reforms.pdf)
- Cui, Q., Liu, L., Hao, Z., Li, M., Liu, Chenxin, Y., Zhang, Q. & Wu, H. (2022). Research on the influencing factors of fatigue and professional identity among CDC workers in China: an online cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*, 12(4), 1-9. <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-058762>
- Dillon, T. (2022). *Agile Resilience: The Psychology of Developing Resilience in the Workplace*. (B. Thomson, Ed.). Critical Publishing. <https://www.criticalpublishing.com/agile-resilience>
- Everly, G., Sherman, M., Stapleton, A., Barnett, D., Hiremath, G. & Links, J. (2013). Workplace Crisis Intervention: A Systematic Review of Effect Sizes. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 21(3-4), 153-170. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J490v21n03\\_09](https://doi.org/10.1300/J490v21n03_09)
- Georgescu, I., Bocean, C., Vărzaru, A., Rotea, C., Mangra, M., & Mangra, G. (2024). Enhancing Organizational Resilience: The Transformative Influence of Strategic Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Culture. *Sustainability*, 16(10), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16104315>
- Glasson, M. (2023). *Understanding Administrative Support from the Perspective of Special Educators* [Master's thesis, Illinois State University]. <https://doi.org/10.30707/ETD2023.20230711063201393052.999979>
- Gómez, J., Prado, J., Enciso, E., & Tenorio, F., & Pozo, C. (2024). The institutional licensing process and the improvement of scientific research in higher education. *Comuni@ccion: Revista de Investigación en Comunicación y Desarrollo*, 15(3), 261-271. <https://doi.org/10.33595/2226-1478.15.3.1025>
- Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A. & Hoegi, M. (2019). Resilience in the Workplace: A Multilevel Review and Synthesis. *Applied Psychology*, 69, 913-959. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12191>
- Hassan, R., Amin, H., & Ghoneim, H. (2024). Decent work and innovative work behavior of academic staff in higher education institutions: the mediating role of work engagement and job self-efficacy. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03177-0>
- Hegde, M., & Inamdar, N. (2023). State-university relations and its implication on internationalization of higher education. *Power and Education*, 15(3), 362-376. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17577438221119323>
- IJntema, R., Ybema, J., Burger, Y. & Schaufeli, W. (2021). Building resilience resources during organizational change: A longitudinal quasi-experimental field study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 73(4), 302-324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000218>
- Klimenko, L. & Skachkova, L. (2020). Subjective Well-Being of Russian Faculty: An Empirical Study. *Voprosy Obrazovaniya / Educational Studies Moscow*, 4, 37-63. <https://doi.org/10.17323/1814-9545-2020-4-37-63>
- Lapoutte, A. (2021). Résilience d'une méta-organisation : Le cas d'un commun de l'alimentation. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 92(1), 79-100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12288>
- Limaymanta, C., Quiroz-de-García, R., Beizaga, V., & Chinchilla-Rodríguez, Z. (2024). The 2014 university reform in Peru. Changes in the scientific practices of 92 licensed universities. *Información, Cultura y Sociedad*, 51, 91-120. <https://doi.org/10.34096/ics.i51.13753>
- Lu, J., Chen, J., Li, Z. & Li, X. (2024). A systematic review of teacher resilience: A perspective of the job demands and resources model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 151, 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104742>
- Merrien, A., Charbonneau, J., Jankovic, I., Novkovic, S., Duguid, F., Guillotte, C. & Fouquet, E. (2023). Social Resources and Cooperative Resilience: Findings from the Canadian Cooperative Sector During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Entrepreneurial and Organizational Diversity*, 12(2): 56-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5947/jjeod.2023.010>
- Michulek, J., Gajanova, L., Sujanska, L., & Tesarova, E. (2024). Understanding How Workplace Dynamics Affect the Psychological Well-Being of University Teachers. *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14120336>
- Monzón, L., Dávila, J., Rodríguez, E. & Pérez, A. (2023). Resilience in the university context, a mixed exploratory study. *Pensamiento Americano*, 16(31), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.21803/penamer.16.31.636>
- Mopkins, D., Lee, M., & Malecha, A. (2024). Personal, Social, and Workplace Environmental Factors Related to Psychological Well-Being of Staff in University Settings. *Workplace Health Saf*, 72(3), 108-118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21650799231214249>
- Mozammel, S. (2023). Job Performance through Job security and Organizational support: Testing the Mediation of Employee Engagement. *International Journal of Operations and Quantitative Management*, 29(1), 1-13. <https://submissions.ijqm.org/index.php/ijqm/article/view/144/48>
- Mullen, M. (2021). Holding it together: resilience and solidarity in the economies of Auckland youth performance companies. *Research in Drama Education*, 26(1), 88-104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2020.1815525>
- Mussa, A. (2022). Internal Communications and Organization Performance in Zanzibar Public Institutions. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, 22(20), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajeba/2022/v22i2030670>
- Nwoko, J., Emeto, T., Malau-Aduli, A. & Malau-Aduli, B. (2023). A Systematic Review of the Factors That Influence Teachers' Occupational Wellbeing. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(12), 1-32. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20126070>



- Nyakoty, C. & Goronga, P. (2024). Resilience strategies for higher education institutions. In Rebuilding higher education systems impacted by crises: Navigating traumatic events, disasters, and more (pp. 1-18). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1926-0.ch001>
- Peng, M., Chamb, T. & Gaob, Z. (2024). Quantifying employee well-being as the mediator between employee-centred CSR and organisational resilience: a model comparison approach. *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, 8(2), 1-24. [https://doi.org/10.47263/JASEM.8\(2\)03](https://doi.org/10.47263/JASEM.8(2)03)
- Pushpakumara, H., Jayaweera, P., & Wanniarachchige, M. (2023). Issues and Challenges of Quality Assurance in Higher Education Institutes: A Systematic Literature Review. *Journal of Management Matters*, 10(1), 49-65. <https://doi.org/10.4038/jmm.v10i1.47>
- Ran, N. (2024). A Study of the Relationship between Burnout and Social Support among Special Education Teachers in China. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12, 360-373. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.121024>
- Robinson, R., Yan, H., & Jiang, Y. (2024). Employee resilience during crisis: A three-tiered perspective on its 'can-do' and 'reason-to' motivational factors. *Tourism Management*, 16, 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2024.104912>
- Sharma, S. & Tiwari, V. (2023). Emotional Intelligence and Career Success: Does Resilience Matter? *Global Business and Organizational Excellence*, 42(6), 138-153. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22196>
- Smith, C., Wong, K., Dunn, S., Gregorio, M., Wong, L., Huynh, P. & Hung, L. (2025). Behind the Frontlines: Insights for Supporting Mental Health and Staff Retention in the Long-Term Care Workforce. *Healthcare*, 13(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare13010040>
- Stankevičiūtė, Ž., Sanchez-Hernandez, M. & Staniškienė, E. (2021). The Negative Effect of Job Insecurity in the Virtuous Cycle Between Trust in the Organization, Subjective Well-Being, and Task Performance in the Current Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, and Ambiguity Context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.796669>
- SUNEDU (2020). Licenciamiento Institucional. Superintendencia Nacional de Educación Superior Universitaria. <https://www.sunedu.gob.pe/licenciamiento-institucional/>
- Tonkin, K., Malinen, S., Näswall, K., & Kuntz, J. (2018). Building employee resilience through wellbeing in organizations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 29(2), 107-124. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21306>
- Tri, N., Heru, T. & Abd, M. (2023). Workplace Well-Being: The Roles of Perceived Organizational Support, Organizational Justice and Workplace Spirituality. *Quality - Access to Success*, 24(193), 257-267. <http://doi.org/10.47750/QAS/24.193.29>
- Turner, M., Holdsworth, S. & Scott-Young, C. (2016). Resilience at University: the development and testing of a new measure. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(2), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1185398>
- Unjai, S., Forster, E., Mitchell, A. & Creedy, D. (2024). Interventions to promote resilience and passion for work in health settings: A mixed-methods systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies Advances*, 7, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnsa.2024.100242>
- Varajao, J., Fernandes, G., Amaral, A. & Gonçalves, M. (2021). Team Resilience Model: An Empirical Examination of Information Systems Projects. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 206, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.res.2020.107303>
- Verma, R., Sekar, S. & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2024). Unlocking flourishing at workplace: An integrative review and framework. *Applied Psychology*, 74(1), 1-39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12591>
- Ye, W., Teig, N. & Blömeke, S. (2024). Systematic review of protective factors related to academic resilience in children and adolescents: unpacking the interplay of operationalization, data, and research method. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1405786>
- Yu, X., Lin, X., Xue, D. & Zhou, H. (2024). Impact of Work Engagement on Teachers' Workplace Well-Being: A Serial Mediation Model of Perceived Organizational Support and Psychological Empowerment. *Sage Open*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241291344>