



ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, AND INTELLIGENCE QUOTIENT AS PREDICTORS OF PERFORMANCE IN THE ARCHITECTURE LICENSURE EXAMINATION

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.13841894

Janrae A. Sanicas

Accountant III, National Printing Office
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1039-5256>

MADELINE P. SOTOMIL, Ph.D, RGC, RPsy

STI West Negros University
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5972-9440>

Abstract:

This study aimed to determine the performance of Architecture graduates from a Catholic Higher Educational Institution in Bacolod City, which is the sole provider of the Bachelor of Science in Architecture in Western Visayas, in the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) conducted in January and June of 2017 and 2018. It also sought to identify the variables that best predict ALE performance, focusing on academic performance, emotional intelligence (EI), and intelligence quotient (IQ). Data needed for this descriptive-correlation study was collected from 142 respondents using structured questionnaires for demographic information. It likewise used the Ego Resiliency Scale to measure EI and the Culture Fair Intelligence Test to assess IQ. Meanwhile, secondary data on academic performance were sourced from the respondents' academic records. The ensuing analysis revealed a notable gender disparity among respondents, with a higher proportion of males. Most graduates preferred enrolling in review centers over self-review for ALE preparation. Economic analysis showed that more respondents came from lower-income families. The study likewise found minimal gender differences in academic performance and high resiliency traits across all groups. However, there were no significant correlations between academic performance and EI with ALE performance. Conversely, a significant positive correlation was identified between IQ and ALE performance, suggesting IQ as a reliable predictor of success. The findings call for the need to reevaluate admission criteria and relevant educational policies to encompass a broader range of competencies beyond IQ, including practical skills and problem-solving abilities, to better prepare graduates for success in the field of architecture.

Keywords: Academic performance, emotional intelligence, and intelligence quotient as predictors of performance in the architecture licensure examination

Introduction:

Nature of the Problem

Becoming a licensed Architect in the Philippines requires completing a five-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture and passing the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) administered by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). This examination evaluates technical competence, knowledge application, skill proficiency, and professional responsibility (Professional Regulation Commission, 2017). While academic performance has traditionally been seen as a key indicator of success in the ALE, recent studies suggest that academic achievement alone may not fully predict licensure exam outcomes. For instance, Kurtin et al. (2021) found that strong academic performance provides a solid foundation of knowledge but does not necessarily translate to success in professional settings, where practical application, critical thinking, and emotional resilience are crucial. This is particularly relevant in architecture, a field that demands not only technical expertise but also the ability to manage complex projects and adapt to challenges.

At a prestigious institution in Bacolod City, renowned for producing successful architects, there is a notable gap in understanding the factors contributing to success in the ALE, specifically the roles of Academic Performance, Emotional Intelligence (EI), and Intelligence Quotient (IQ). Despite its legacy as the sole provider of a Bachelor of Science in Architecture in Western Visayas for over six decades and recognition as the 3rd Best Performing Architectural School nationally (Category B) (Biazn, 2021), the institution's passing rates from 2016 to 2018 fell below the national average (Professional Regulation Commission, 2018). This disparity highlights the need for deeper exploration into the factors affecting licensure outcomes.

Moreover, the rigorous nature of architecture programs often requires students to balance high academic demands with the development of practical skills and creative problem-solving abilities. Arif et al. (2022) emphasized that students who excel academically in architecture programs may still face difficulties in the ALE if they lack the ability to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world scenarios. Research shows that high EI and resilience correlate with



better academic performance, enhanced creativity, problem-solving abilities, and effective teamwork—essential attributes for successful architects (Petrides et al., 2020; Rodríguez et al., 2021). Additionally, IQ remains a predictor of academic success, while EI fosters emotional regulation and interpersonal competence (MacCann et al., 2020).

Given these complexities, institutions should integrate strategies that enhance academic and non-academic competencies, ensuring that graduates are well-prepared in theory and equipped to meet the profession's practical demands. My motivation to investigate these factors is both personal and scholarly, deeply rooted in my family's longstanding connection to architecture. Inspired by my father, an Architecture graduate, I pursued the field for three semesters before shifting to a different path. Now, as my daughter, a Senior High School student specializing in Arts and design-architectural Drafting, continues this legacy, my passion for architecture has been renewed. In my role as a middle administrator, I am dedicated to ensuring that our students, including my daughter, receive the highest quality education and are thoroughly prepared for the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) should they choose to pursue their studies in this institution.

Current State of Knowledge

The Attribution Theory by Bernard Weiner and Thorndike's Law of Learning is the theoretical foundation for understanding these relationships. Attribution Theory is particularly relevant for examining how Emotional Intelligence and IQ influence licensure examination performance. According to Weiner (2020), how individuals interpret and attribute their successes or failures significantly impacts their motivation and future efforts. Weiner's updated work explores the impact of attribution on motivation and performance, particularly how individuals' attributions of their successes or failures affect their future efforts and motivation. For instance, individuals with high Emotional Intelligence are more likely to attribute their successes to internal, stable, and controllable factors, such as their efforts and abilities. This positive attribution can enhance their motivation and performance in high-stakes examinations like the Architecture Licensure Examination.

Similarly, individuals with high IQ can often leverage their cognitive abilities to succeed academically and professionally, reinforcing a positive cycle of attribution and performance (Graham & Williams, 2009; Weiner, 2020). Research supports the notion that individuals with high IQs can leverage their cognitive abilities to achieve academic and professional success, reinforcing a positive cycle of attribution and performance. For instance, a systematic review and meta-analysis highlighted a significant, positive relationship between intelligence and academic performance, with intelligence being a stable and highly relevant predictor of school success. This study analyzed 27 studies with a total sample of 42,061 individuals, underscoring the predictive capacity of intelligence on academic outcomes (Casnovas-López et al., 2022).

The combined effect of academic performance, EI, and IQ offers a comprehensive understanding of their impact on licensure exam success. Adeyemo and Torubelli (2020) highlighted that balancing cognitive and emotional skills provides comprehensive preparation for professional exams. Their research on Nigerian architecture students showed that those excelling in academic performance, EI, and IQ had higher Architecture Licensure Examination pass rates. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2021) found that integrating cognitive and emotional training in educational programs significantly improved students' performance in high-stakes exams, including the Architecture Licensure Examination. Lee, Kim, and Choi (2020) conducted a study showing that students who balanced high Academic Performance with strong emotional and cognitive skills were better prepared for the challenges of licensure exams.

Arifin, Idrus, and Mohamad (2020) discovered that architecture students with higher EI were more effective in teamwork and project management, skills critical in academic settings and licensure exams. Parker et al. (2021) highlighted that EI contributes to better Academic Performance and stress management, leading to higher success rates in professional exams. Laidra, Pullmann, and Allik (2020) demonstrated that IQ is a strong predictor of Academic Performance and the ability to apply complex problem-solving skills required in fields like architecture. Deary, Strand, Smith, and Fernandes (2020) found that IQ, alongside other factors, significantly predicts academic and professional success, highlighting its importance in licensure exam performance.

Academic Performance, commonly measured by grades or GPA, is a strong predictor of success in licensure examinations. Pisarik, Rowell, and Currie (2019) found a direct correlation between higher GPAs and an increased likelihood of passing professional licensure exams, including architecture. Their study emphasizes the importance of academic diligence as a foundation for licensure success. A study by Martínez-González, López-López, and Fernández (2021) analyzed the correlation between Academic Performance and success in professional exams. They found that students with higher GPAs and consistent academic records were more likely to pass the Architecture Licensure Examination, attributing this to their deeper understanding of architectural principles and better study habits.

Emotional Intelligence (EI), which involves the ability to understand and manage emotions, plays a significant role in academic and professional contexts. Recent research highlights its impact on licensure exam performance. Intelligence Quotient (IQ), a measure of cognitive abilities, remains a critical predictor of academic and professional success. Recent studies continue to validate its relevance in the context of licensure examinations. De Leon and



Gonzales (2021) examined the impact of IQ on the performance of Filipino architecture students in the Architecture Licensure Examination. They found that higher IQ scores were significantly correlated with higher exam scores, suggesting that cognitive abilities play a crucial role in mastering the comprehensive content of the licensure examination.

Theoretical Underpinnings

This study was anchored on the Attribution Theory (1985) of Bernard Weiner and Edward L. Thorndike's Law of Learning (1913).

Attribution Theory, as proposed by Bernard Weiner, is considered one of the most influential contemporary theories with significant implications for academic motivation (Weiner, 2010; Garcia y Garcia, 2020; Seel, 2022). This theory emphasizes that learners are strongly motivated by the pleasant outcome of feeling good about themselves, incorporating aspects of behavior modification, cognitive theory, and self-efficacy theory. According to Weiner, learners' current self-perceptions strongly influence how they interpret the success or failure of their efforts, which in turn affects their future behavior (Weiner, 2010; Garcia & Garcia, 2020; Seel, 2022). Within the context of Architecture Licensure Examinations, Attribution Theory helps us understand how candidates interpret and attribute their success or failure. The theory posits that people tend to explain success or failure based on three characteristics: locus of control, stability, and controllability. Locus of control refers to whether the cause of success or failure is internal (originating within the individual) or external (originating from the environment) (Graham & Williams, 2009; Joelson, 2020). Stability pertains to whether the cause is stable (likely to produce the same outcome if repeated) or unstable (likely to produce different outcomes (Weiner, 2012; iResearchNet, 2020; Open Textbooks for Hong Kong, 2020; SpringerLink, 2020). Controllability considers whether the cause is controllable (within the individual's power to change) or uncontrollable (beyond the individual's power to change (Weiner, 2020).

A key assumption of Attribution Theory is that people will interpret their environment to maintain a positive self-image. For instance, when learners succeed at an academic task, they are likely to attribute this success to their own efforts or abilities. Conversely, when they fail, they are more likely to attribute their failure to external, uncontrollable factors such as bad luck or poor teaching (Graham & Williams, 2009; Seel, 2020). Applied to the academic domain, when architecture graduates succeed in licensure examinations, they may attribute their success to their own efforts or abilities, reinforcing a positive self-image. Conversely, in the face of failure, graduates may lean towards attributing it to external and uncontrollable factors, such as the exam's difficulty or unforeseen circumstances. This understanding can provide valuable insights into the respondents' motivation and subsequent efforts in professional development.

Edward L. Thorndike's laws of learning offers valuable insights into the dynamics of academic preparation and performance which are directly relevant to this study (Thorndike, 1913; Swaim, 2023). Thorndike proposed three primary laws of learning: readiness, exercise, and effect. The law of readiness states that individuals who are not ready to learn will find it difficult to instill learning, whereas those who are prepared will perform better (Thorndike, 1920; Teachmint, 2023). This suggests that graduates who are well-prepared for their licensure examination are more likely to achieve favorable results. The law of exercise posits that practice increases the efficiency of learning. Thus, individuals who engage in regular practice are more likely to master the material and demonstrate better performance (Thorndike, 1920; Bjork et al., 2020). In the context of licensure examinations, examinees who participate more frequently in review sessions are likely to perform better than those who do not. The law of effect states that satisfaction resulting from learning strengthens further learning (Thorndike, 1920; Brown et al., 2021). Individuals who receive positive reinforcement and satisfactory feedback during their learning process are more motivated to continue striving for higher performance levels in their licensure examinations.

These principles align with the study's focus on the factors influencing Academic Performance, Emotional Intelligence, and Intelligence Quotient. They suggest that a positive learning experience, characterized by readiness, regular practice, and positive reinforcement, enhances motivation and performance. This underscores the intricate connection between Emotional Intelligence and academic success, as individuals with higher Emotional Intelligence may be better equipped to handle the demands of their education and professional licensure.

Objectives

Generally, this study aimed to determine the relationship between the factors that predict performance in the Architecture Licensure Exams of the graduates in one of the schools in Bacolod City during the January and June 2017 and 2018 licensure examinations. Specifically, this study purports to answer the following questions: 1) the level of Academic Performance of the respondents when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the aforementioned variables; 2) the level of Emotional Intelligence of the respondents when taken as whole and grouped according to the aforementioned variables; 3) the level of intelligence of the respondents when taken as a whole and grouped according to the aforementioned variables; 4) the Architecture Licensure Examination performance of the respondents when taken as a whole and grouped according to the aforementioned variables; 5) the significant



relationship between the respondents' level of Academic Performance and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination; 6) the significant relationship between the respondents' level of Emotional Intelligence and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination; 7) significant relationship between the respondents' level of intelligence and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination; 8) Do academic performance, emotional intelligence, and intelligence quotient predict performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination

Methodology

This chapter presents the research design, locale of the study, respondents, data gathering instrument, validity and reliability of the device, data gathering procedure, analytical schemes, and statistical tools.

Research Design

This study used a descriptive, correlational design to determine the relationship between academic performance and licensure exam performance, Emotional Intelligence and licensure exam performance, and Intelligence Quotient and licensure exam performance. In a relational study, the correlation coefficient is the descriptive statistic that, in a single number, summarizes and describes the essential characteristics of a relationship. Descriptive correlation research identifies relationships between variables without implying causation, making it ideal for exploring how different factors, such as career interests and academic tracks, relate. (Remler & Ryzin, 2021b). The correlation coefficient quantifies the pattern in a relationship, examining all x-y pairs at once. No other statistic does this. Thus, the correlation coefficient is important because it simplifies a complex relationship involving many scores into one easily interpreted statistic (Heiman, 2011). In the explanation design of a correlational method, the focus is on the extent to which two/more variables co-vary. It consists of a simple association between two or more variables. The prediction design seeks to anticipate outcomes by using certain variables as predictors. In this case, the researcher will first establish which predictor variables are significantly correlated with the licensure examination performance of the respondents; subsequently, they will be associated with each other to establish that they are independent. Once established, they will be tested for multiple regression to determine whether the observed linear relationship (variables mentioned above) could have emerged by chance or not, hence, the predicting power.

Study Respondents

The respondents in this study consist of 142 architecture graduates who underwent the licensure examination in January and June of 2017 and 2018. Out of the 162 takers, 142 willingly agreed to participate by responding to the survey questionnaire and providing informed consent. This study employed total enumeration, encompassing all individuals who participated in the examination during the specified years and schedules. The primary focus of this study centered on the academic performance, emotional intelligence, and intelligence quotient of the respondents, which served as predictor variables for their performance in the licensure examination. Those who opted not to partake in this study were not considered respondents, acknowledging that their perspectives are not included in the comprehensive exploration of the interplay between academic, emotional, and intellectual factors influencing licensure examination outcomes within this specific cohort.

Instruments

The research instrument employed in this study comprised two integral components. An Informed Consent was extended to retrieve personal and confidential information. Specifically, the General Weighted Average (GWA) from the Registrar's Office and the Culture Fare Intelligence Test (CFIT) result from the Office of the College Guidance and Services. Part I involves gathering essential demographic and contextual information from the respondents, including their names, sex, preferred review method, Average Family Monthly Income, individual Architecture Licensure Examination performance rating, and the specific examination date. Part II of the research instrument focused on determining the Emotional Intelligence of the respondents by utilizing the Ego Resiliency Scale, a standardized test recognized for its efficacy in measuring Emotional Intelligence. Each respondent's score on the Ego Resiliency Scale is calculated by summing up their ratings across all 14 items. Higher scores indicate greater ego-resiliency or Emotional Intelligence, reflecting higher emotional adaptability and resilience. To interpret the results obtained from this standardized instrument, the following guide was utilized: mean score range of 47.00-56.00 interpreted as very high resiliency trait; 35.00-46.00=high; 23.00-34.00=undetermined trait; 11.00-22.00=low resiliency trait; and 0.00-10.00= very low resiliency trait. To interpret the results obtained from the Grade Weighted Average, the following guide was utilized based on the College Student Handbook of the institution:

Grade Ranges for Grade Weighted Average

Final Term Grade Range	Verbal Interpretation	Description
96.00 – 100	Excellent	Exceptionally high as a result of aptitude, effort, and intellectual initiative.
93.00 - 95.99	Superior	
90.00 - 92.99	Very Good	
87.00 - 89.99	Good	High Achievement as a result of ability and effort
84.00 - 86.99	Satisfactory	
81.00 - 83.99	Fair	the minimum expected achievement of a college student
78.00 - 80.99	Fair	
75.00 - 77.99	Passed	passing grade
74.99 – below	Failed	failure in a course.

The CFIT, acquired through the school's college guidance office, stands as a proven measure with established validity for assessing cognitive abilities, ensuring a robust evaluation of respondents' intelligence. The intelligence level of the respondents was determined using the Culture Fair Intelligence Test (CFIT) Scale 3. Raymond B. Cattell constructed this test to produce a measure of cognitive abilities that accurately estimated intelligence devoid of sociocultural and environmental influences. Raw scores were converted to percentile ranks for descriptive interpretation to compute for the Intelligence level. The Percentile classification is as follows: 77--100 (Above Average); 23-76 (Average); 1-22 (Below Average).

The validity and reliability of the data gathering instrument was no longer necessary since the research instrument is a standardized test recognized for its efficacy in measuring emotional intelligence.

Data Gathering Procedure

To commence the research process, the researcher initiated the formalities by drafting a letter addressed to the school's President through the Dean of the School of Architecture, Fine Arts, and Interior Design. This letter, outlining the intent and parameters of the study, was also forwarded to the School Registrar and the Head of the College Guidance Office and Services for their awareness and support. Upon securing approval, collaborative efforts were undertaken with the Dean, Program Head of the Architecture program, School Registrar, and Head of the College Guidance Office and Services. This collaboration aimed to compile a comprehensive list of individuals who participated in the Architecture Licensure Examinations in January and June 2017 and 2018. They were subsequently armed with the compiled list, and the researcher initiated communication with the identified individuals, emphasizing the research's significance. Upon confirmation of their willingness to participate, the respondents were presented with an informed consent form explicitly outlining the permissions granted to the researcher. These permissions included access to personal data such as the General Weighted Average (GWA), indicating the respondent's Academic Performance, which was sourced from the Registrar's office. Additionally, the results of the Culture Fare Intelligence Test (CFIT), indicating the respondent's intelligence level, were sourced from the College Guidance Office and Services.

The instruments were distributed online to facilitate the data collection process, and respondents were provided access to the survey questionnaire through Google Forms. After the instrument was administered, the data collected was meticulously collated in Microsoft Excel. Subsequently, the researcher, in collaboration with a statistician, processed the data using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data were then collated and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Data Analysis and Statistical Treatment

Objective No. 1 also used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the respondents' academic performance when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the profile variables.

Objective no. 2 also used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the emotional intelligence of the respondents when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the profile variables.

Objective no. 3 likewise used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the intelligence quotient of the respondents when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the profile variables.

Objective No. 4 still used the descriptive analytical scheme and mean to determine the performance of the respondents in the Architecture Licensure Examination when taken as a whole and when grouped according to the profile variables.

Objective no. 5 used the relational analytical scheme and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation to determine the significant relationship between the Academic Performance of the respondents and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination.

Objective no. 6 also used the relational analytical scheme and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation to determine the significant relationship between Emotional Intelligence and the Architecture Licensure Examination performance.

Objective no. 7 likewise used the relational analytical scheme and Pearson's Product Moment Correlation to determine the significant relationship between the Intelligence Quotient of the respondents and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination.

Objective no. 8 still used the relational analytical scheme and multiple regression analysis to see if the respondents' Academic Performance, Emotional Intelligence, and intelligence predicted their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination.

Ethical Consideration

This study adhered to rigorous ethical standards to ensure the integrity of the research process and the protection of respondents' rights and well-being. Before participation, all respondents were fully informed about the purpose of the study, the procedures involved, the potential risks and benefits, and their rights as respondents. Written informed consent was obtained from all respondents, ensuring they understood that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences (Diener & Crandall, 1978; Aluko-Arowolo, Lawal, Adedeji, & Nwaobilor, 2023). The confidentiality of the respondents was strictly maintained. The questions and tests administered were standard measures that did not pose any physical or psychological risks. And the research process was conducted with transparency.

Results and Discussion

This section presents, analyzes, and interprets the data that were gathered consistent with its predetermined objectives.

Table 1

Level of Academic Performance of the Respondents When Taken as a Whole and When Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variables	Categories	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	80.86	Fair
	Female	81.05	Fair
Review Method	Review Center	80.95	Fair
	Self-Review	80.87	Fair
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	81.60	Fair
	Higher	80.06	Fair
Overall		80.94	Fair

The data presents a nearly identical evaluation for males and females, with males receiving an average score of 80.86 and females an average score of 81.05, both interpreted as "fair." The findings suggest that there is minimal difference in the average scores between males and females, both being rated as "fair." This observation aligns with a substantial body of research indicating that gender differences in performance outcomes are often negligible when controlling for various factors.

In terms of the review method, the data indicates that the average scores for students using review centers and self-Review Methods are nearly identical, with review center users scoring 80.95 and self-reviewers scoring 80.87. Both scores are interpreted as "fair." The findings suggest that there is minimal difference in the effectiveness of review center methods compared to self-Review Methods, as both yield similar average scores. This is consistent with existing literature that examines the impacts of different study methods on Academic Performance.

In terms of the Average Family Monthly Income, the data indicates that families with lower monthly incomes have an average score of 81.60, while families with higher monthly incomes have an average score of 80.06. Both scores are interpreted as "fair." The findings suggest that students from lower-income families perform slightly better on average than those from higher-income families, though both groups' performance is interpreted as "fair." This outcome is intriguing and somewhat counterintuitive given the extensive literature linking higher family income with better academic performance. Extensive research generally finds a positive correlation between higher socio-economic status (SES) and academic performance. Higher-income families can afford more educational resources, extracurricular activities, and better schooling environments, all of which contribute positively to academic success (Magnuson et al., 2022; Sirin & Sin, 2023). However, the data presented contradicts this general trend, showing slightly better performance for students from lower-income families.

The finding that the overall average score is 80.94, interpreted as "fair," reflects a moderate level of performance among the respondents. This level of performance is consistent with various studies on educational outcomes, indicating a range of factors that contribute to moderate achievement levels. Several studies highlight that Academic Performance is influenced by a myriad of factors including socio-economic status, access to quality education, parental involvement, and individual student characteristics such as motivation and learning strategies (Eccles & Wigfield, 2020). Socio-economic status is a significant determinant of Academic Performance. Students from higher SES backgrounds generally have access to better educational resources, which can enhance performance (Sirin & Sin, 2023). However, as seen in the provided data, the difference between lower and higher-income groups' performance is minimal, suggesting that other factors might be at play. The quality of instruction and the learning environment significantly impact student performance. Schools with well-trained teachers, adequate resources, and supportive learning environments tend to have students with better academic outcomes (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2023). The "fair" interpretation of the overall score suggests that while students are performing adequately, there is room for improvement. This interpretation aligns with literature indicating that many educational systems struggle with achieving high levels of performance across the board due to various systemic and individual challenges (Chrispeels & González, 2023).

Table 2

Level of Emotional Intelligence of the Respondents When Taken as a Whole and Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variables				Categories	Mean	Interpretation
Sex				Male	43.17	High Resiliency Trait
				Female	41.93	High Resiliency Trait
Review Method				Review Center	42.17	High Resiliency Trait
				Self-Review	46.44	High Resiliency Trait
Average Family Monthly Income				Lower	42.59	High Resiliency Trait
				Higher	42.72	High Resiliency Trait
Overall					42.65	High Resiliency Trait

Analyzing the results, the data shows that the average resiliency trait score for males is 43.17 and for females is 41.93, with both scores interpreted as indicating a high resiliency trait. The findings suggest that both males and females exhibit high resiliency traits, with males showing a slightly higher average score. This result aligns with existing research on resilience, which often highlights that resilience is a multifaceted trait influenced by various factors, including gender. Research indicates that resilience, defined as the ability to adapt positively in the face of adversity, is crucial for mental health and well-being (Suh & Luthar, 2020). Studies have shown that while there are some differences in how males and females develop and exhibit resilience, both genders are capable of high resilience. Differences in resilience between males and females can often be attributed to socialization processes. Males might exhibit resilience through behaviors that are outwardly more assertive or risk-taking, while females might display resilience through strong interpersonal relationships and emotional regulation (Flykt et al., 2021).

In terms of preferred Review Methods, the data shows that students using Self-Review Methods have a High Resiliency Trait score of 46.44, while those using review centers have a slightly lower score of 42.17. Both scores



are interpreted as indicating a high resiliency trait. The findings indicate that students who engage in self-review exhibit slightly higher resiliency traits compared to those who attend review centers. Both groups, however, display high levels of resilience. This observation aligns with existing literature on the relationship between study methods and resilience. Research indicates that self-directed learning can enhance resilience, as it requires students to manage their own learning process, set goals, and independently overcome challenges, all of which are key aspects of resilience (Hariri et al., 2021). Although students attending review centers also exhibit high resilience traits, their slightly lower average scores compared to self-reviewers might reflect differences in learning environments. Review centers provide social support through interactions with peers and instructors, which can strengthen resilience by offering a network of encouragement and assistance (Maulidia & Usman, 2019). However, this supportive environment may also reduce the necessity for students to develop independent coping strategies

In terms of the Average Family Monthly Income, the data reveals that students from lower Average Family Monthly Incomes have an average resiliency trait score of 42.59, while those from higher Average Family Monthly Incomes have a slightly higher average score of 42.72. Both scores are interpreted as indicating a high resiliency trait. The findings suggest that there is little difference in the resiliency traits between students from lower and higher Average Family Monthly Incomes. This observation aligns with existing literature on resilience, which often highlights the complex and multifaceted nature of this trait. Research on resilience has demonstrated that while socio-economic status (SES) can influence the development of resilience, it is not the sole determinant (Luthar et al., 2020). Although individuals from higher-income families may have access to more resources and support systems, those from lower-income families can also exhibit high levels of resilience due to various factors. While higher-income families may have financial resources, lower-income families often rely on strong social networks and community support to navigate difficulties. These support systems can contribute significantly to the development of resilience (Ungar & Theron, 2020). The interpretation of both lower and higher Average Family Monthly Incomes as indicating a "high resiliency trait" suggests that regardless of socio-economic background, students exhibit resilience. This finding underscores the importance of recognizing and fostering resilience in all students, irrespective of their economic circumstances.

The overall mean resiliency score for all respondents was 42.65, falling within the high resiliency trait category. This suggests a collectively resilient nature among Architecture graduates, regardless of gender or preferred review method. These results underscore the importance of understanding the role of resiliency in academic pursuits and suggest that cultivating this trait may be an essential aspect of success in the challenging field of Architecture. Furthermore, it implies a collective resilience among Architecture graduates, transcending sex and review method preferences. These results emphasize the significance of fostering Emotional Intelligence, particularly resilience, as an integral component of success in the demanding field of Architecture

Table 3

Level of Intelligence Quotient of the Respondents When Taken as a Whole and Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variables	Categories	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	69.93	Average
	Female	65.25	Average
Review Method	Review Center	67.97	Average
	Self-Review	67.81	Average
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	68.90	Average
	Higher	66.67	Average
Overall		67.95	Average

The study examined the level of Intelligence Quotient (IQ) of the respondents, analyzing them across different variables such as sex, review method, and Average Family Monthly Income According to the findings, the overall IQ of the respondents was 67.95 which is interpreted as "Average". When grouped by sex, males had a slightly higher IQ of 69.93 compared to females with 65.25, both scores fall within the "Average" range for IQ. The gender neutrality observed in IQ scores implies that both male and female architects possess similar cognitive skills and intellectual capacities, emphasizing the importance of equal opportunities and recognition for both genders within the profession. The gender-neutral findings align with previous research on cognitive abilities among various professions, which often reports minimal gender-based differences in intelligence. Recent studies across various fields have consistently demonstrated that men and women tend to exhibit similar cognitive performance (Chan & Torgler, 2020). While the

study's findings do not explicitly discuss gender differences in intelligence, existing literature has shown mixed results on this topic. Some studies suggest minimal or no significant gender differences in overall intelligence (Begeny et al., 2020).

In terms of the review method, although both scores fall within the "average" range for IQ, those who attended review centers had a marginally higher IQ of 67.97 compared to individuals who engaged in self-review, 67.81. The findings suggest minimal difference in IQ scores based on the method of review preparation. This aligns with previous research indicating that structured environments, such as review centers, can offer a slight advantage in preparing for standardized tests but may not significantly affect inherent cognitive abilities as measured by IQ (Kelly, 2023). Furthermore, the study's findings align with research that suggests external review processes may not consistently impact intelligence but could have effects on specific cognitive skills or learning outcomes (Shafait et al., 2021). Additionally, self-Review Methods, though lacking formal structure, can still yield comparable outcomes due to personalized and self-paced learning, which can cater to individual learning styles and potentially enhance understanding and retention (Rawson & Dunlosky, 2022). This supports the notion that while structured review centers might provide more resources, the effectiveness of self-Review Methods should not be underestimated. Recognizing and accommodating diverse learning and review preferences can enhance educational experiences and collaborative efforts within architectural practice. This insight could be valuable for educators, employers, and team leaders in creating inclusive and effective learning and working environments. While the study provides insight into the average intelligence level of the respondents, it is essential to consider that intelligence is a complex construct influenced by various factors, including genetics, environment, and education (Deary et al., 2021).

Finally, respondents from families with lower average monthly incomes exhibited a higher average IQ of 68.90 compared to those from families with higher incomes, who had an IQ of 66.67. To contextualize these findings, referring to existing literature on IQ variations across demographic factors is valuable. Research consistently indicates that IQ scores can vary based on socioeconomic status, education level, and access to resources (Smith & Jones, 2023). The slight variations found in this study align with broader trends observed in IQ research, where environmental and social factors can influence cognitive development and performance.

The implications of these findings suggest several points for consideration. First, even though the mean IQ in this study is scored "Average," it does not imply incompetence. Instead, individuals with an average IQ still possess the cognitive abilities necessary for analytical thinking and problem-solving, albeit by varying degrees (Johnson, 2021). This means that architects, who require critical thinking and problem-solving skills, can still excel in their profession despite varying IQ levels. For instance, architects with average IQs can effectively analyze architectural designs, understand engineering principles, and solve complex spatial problems. The finding that individuals from families with lower incomes tend to have slightly higher IQs could be attributed to resilience and adaptive cognitive abilities developed in challenging environments (Brown & Smith, 2020).

Table 4

Licensure Examination Performance of the Respondents When Taken as a Whole and Grouped According to the Aforementioned Variables

Variables	Categories	n	Rating	f	%	Mean	Interpretation
Sex	Male	82	Passed	59	71.95	71.90	PASSED
			Failed	23	28.05		
	Female	60	Passed	41	68.33	71.27	PASSED
			Failed	19	31.67		
Review Method	Review Center	126	Passed	92	73.02	71.74	PASSED
			Failed	34	26.98		
	Self-Review	16	Passed	8	50.00	70.79	PASSED
			Failed	8	50.00		
Average Family Monthly Income	Lower	81	Passed	55	67.90	70.91	PASSED
			Failed	26	32.10		
	Higher	61	Passed	45	73.77	72.60	PASSED
			Failed	16	32.23		
Overall		142	Passed	100	70.42	71.64	PASSED
			Failed	42	29.58		

The data provided on sex-based performance ratings reveals that out of 82 males, 59 (71.95%) passed, and 23 (28.05%) failed, with a mean score of 71.90, while out of 60 females, 41 (68.33%) passed, and 19 (31.67%) failed, with a mean score of 71.27. Both male and female groups had mean scores indicating a passing rate. However, a slightly higher percentage of males passed compared to females.

Research indicates varied outcomes regarding gender differences in Academic Performance. Some studies find that females generally excel in academic settings, particularly in language and arts (Wirthwein et al., 2019). However, results can vary greatly depending on the subject, context, and assessment methods (Sáinz & Malpica, 2023). For instance, Gallen and Wasserman (2021) argue that gender differences in mathematics performance are minor and have been decreasing, aligning with the current findings of similar pass rates and scores for both sexes. Additionally, Aliu et al. (2022) suggest that while slight differences in specific cognitive abilities may not lead to significant disparities in overall Academic Performance.

The analysis of the influence of Review Methods on licensure examination outcomes reveals significant differences between students who attended review centers and those who engaged in self-review. Of the 126 students who attended review centers, 92 (73.02%) passed the examination, while 34 (26.98%) failed. The mean score for these students was 71.74. In contrast, students who engaged in self-review had a pass rate of 50.00% and a mean score of 70.79. Although this mean score also indicates a passing performance, the success rate is notably lower than that of those who attended a review center.

These findings align with existing literature on the benefits of structured review environments. Studies have shown that structured environments like review centers can provide a marginal advantage in standardized test preparations by offering organized study materials, professional guidance, and a disciplined study routine (Aliu et al., 2022). Review centers often create an environment conducive to learning, which includes peer discussions and group studies that enhance understanding and retention of material (Rodríguez et al., 2021). This collaborative environment is essential as it allows students to benefit from collective knowledge and diverse perspectives. The higher pass rate among students who attended review centers supports the notion that structured preparation can enhance performance. According to Kurtin et al. (2021), review centers offer a systematic approach to test preparation, leading to better outcomes than self-study methods. This structured approach is particularly beneficial in complex fields such as architecture, where comprehensive understanding and application of knowledge are crucial.

The study also examined the performance of respondents in the licensure examination based on their Average Family Monthly Income. The findings indicate that there are notable differences in pass rates and mean scores between respondents from lower and higher income categories. Among respondents from the lower Average Family Monthly Income category ($n = 81$), 55 individuals passed the licensure examination, resulting in a pass rate of 67.90%. Conversely, 26 respondents (32.10%) failed to pass, with a mean score of 70.91. In contrast, respondents from the higher average family monthly income category ($n = 61$) demonstrated a higher pass rate, with 45 individuals (73.77%) successfully passing the examination. Sixteen respondents (26.23%) from this category did not pass, and they achieved a slightly higher mean score of 72.60.

These findings are consistent with previous research that examines the influence of socioeconomic factors, such as family income, on Academic Performance and licensure examination outcomes. Research by Smith et al. (2021) suggests that higher socioeconomic status is associated with better educational outcomes, including higher pass rates in professional examinations. The study underscores that individuals from higher income backgrounds often have access to better educational resources, which can contribute to their academic success (MacCann et al., 2020). Additionally, the higher pass rates and marginally higher mean scores observed among respondents from higher income categories align with studies on educational inequality. According to Aliu et al. (2022), socioeconomic status influences access to educational opportunities and support systems, which in turn affect performance in standardized assessments like licensure examinations. Students from higher-income families may benefit from additional tutoring, access to review courses, and less financial pressure, all of which contribute to better preparation and performance in licensure exams (Kurtin et al., 2021).

Table 5

Relationship between the Respondents' Academic Performance and their Performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination

Variable	r	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Level of Academic Performance				
Level of Architecture Licensure Examination Performance	0.135	0.110	0.05	Not Significant



In Table 5, percentages were calculated by dividing the number of respondents in specific categories of Academic Performance or ALE scores by the total number of respondents and multiplying by 100. The mean was determined by summing all individual scores and dividing by the number of respondents. The correlation coefficient (r) of 0.135 indicated a weak positive relationship between Academic Performance and ALE performance, but the p -value of 0.110, which exceeded the significance level of 0.05, showed that this relationship was not statistically significant.

A correlation coefficient close to zero (0.135 in this case) indicates a weak or negligible linear relationship between the two variables being studied—Academic Performance and licensure examination performance. The p -value of 0.110 further supports the conclusion that this observed correlation is not statistically significant. In other words, the data do not provide sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which posits that there is no relationship between Academic Performance and licensure examination performance in the population.

These findings are consistent with recent literature that highlights the limitations of using Academic Performance alone as a predictor of success in professional licensure examinations. Research by MacCann et al. (2020) underscores that while academic grades reflect knowledge acquisition and understanding of theoretical concepts, licensure exams often require practical application, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills that extend beyond academic coursework. Moreover, studies by Kurtin et al. (2021) emphasize the multifaceted nature of licensure examinations, which assess a combination of knowledge, skills, and competencies specific to the profession. Academic Performance, while foundational, may not directly translate into the ability to navigate these multifaceted demands effectively.

The lack of a significant relationship between Academic Performance and licensure examination outcomes carries several implications for educational practices and policies: Educational institutions should adopt holistic approaches to exam preparation that include targeted training in exam-specific skills, such as problem-solving and application of knowledge. Integrating mock exams, case studies, and practical exercises into the curriculum can better prepare students for the challenges posed by licensure exams (Rodríguez et al., 2021). Developing non-cognitive skills such as Emotional Intelligence, resilience, and effective stress management should be prioritized alongside academic coursework. These skills are critical in managing exam stress, maintaining focus, and adapting to challenging exam scenarios (Aliu et al., 2022). Ensuring all students have access to comprehensive exam preparation resources, including review courses, study materials, and mentorship opportunities, can mitigate disparities in exam performance attributed to academic backgrounds (Smith, 2021).

Graduates preparing for licensure examinations should not rely solely on their academic performance as an indicator of readiness. Instead, they should adopt comprehensive preparation strategies that include a targeted review of licensure examination content and practice assessments to ensure a thorough understanding of the material and exam format.

Table 6

Relationship between the Respondents' Emotional Intelligence and their Performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination

Variable	r	p -value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Level of Emotional Intelligence				
Level of Architecture Licensure Examination Performance	0.073	0.385	0.05	Not Significant

The analysis of the data revealed a Pearson correlation coefficient (r) of 0.073 between respondents' Emotional Intelligence and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination. Additionally, the associated p -value was found to be 0.385, which exceeds the conventional significance level of 0.05. Thus, based on this analysis, the correlation between respondents' Emotional Intelligence and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination is considered Not Significant, as shown in Table 11 above.

The findings suggest that Emotional Intelligence, as measured in this study, does not significantly predict performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination. This is consistent with recent literature that has explored the influence of EI on academic and professional outcomes. For example, Aliu et al. (2022) discuss that while EI skills such as self-regulation, empathy, and stress management are crucial for overall personal and professional development, their direct impact on exam performance may vary.

Studies by MacCann et al. (2020) emphasize that while EI contributes to adaptive behaviors and interpersonal skills, its predictive power on academic or professional achievement can be nuanced. Factors such as specific exam preparation strategies, domain-specific knowledge, and problem-solving abilities often have a more direct influence on licensure exam outcomes in fields like architecture.

The implication is that while Emotional Intelligence might contribute positively to overall well-being and interpersonal skills, it may not be the primary factor influencing success in licensure exams. Licensure exams, such as those for architecture, assess a wide range of technical knowledge, practical skills, and professional competencies. While EI contributes to interpersonal skills, adaptability, and stress management, these qualities may not directly align with the specific knowledge and skills required to pass the exam (MacCann et al., 2020). Success in licensure examinations often hinges more on domain-specific knowledge, including architectural principles, building codes, design methodologies, and construction practices. Candidates must demonstrate mastery of these specific areas through rigorous testing formats that prioritize practical application and problem-solving (Kurtin et al., 2021). Effective preparation for licensure exams typically involves targeted study of exam content, exposure to practice questions, and simulation of exam conditions. While EI skills like resilience and self-regulation can enhance overall preparation effectiveness, they may not directly influence mastery of the technical content required for exam success (Smith, 2021).

Other factors, such as academic preparation, access to resources, socioeconomic background, and personal motivation, may exert stronger influences on exam outcomes than EI alone. These factors contribute to a holistic understanding of exam success and should be considered alongside EI in future research and educational strategies (Rodríguez et al., 2021). Students and educators should consider a holistic approach to exam preparation, encompassing technical knowledge, problem-solving skills, and effective study strategies in addition to Emotional Intelligence. This comprehensive approach can better equip students for the multifaceted challenges of the Architecture Licensure Examination and their future professional practice.

Table 7

Relationship between the respondents' Intelligence Quotient and their Performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination

Variable	r	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Level of Intelligence Quotient				
Level of Architecture Licensure Examination Performance	0.334	0.000	0.01	Significant

The results reveal a significant result, with a positive weak correlation coefficient (r) of 0.334 and a p -value of 0.000. The p -value is less than the chosen significance level (0.01), leading to the decision to reject the null hypothesis (H_0), indicating that there is a statistically significant correlation between IQ and Architecture Licensure Examination performance.

The positive correlation coefficient suggests a direct relationship between IQ and Architecture Licensure Examination performance. As the IQ increases, the Architecture Licensure Examination performance tends to increase. This means that takers with higher IQs tend to pass the Architecture Licensure Examination. While correlation does not imply causation, this significant finding prompts further exploration into the specific aspects of intelligence measured by IQ that may influence Architecture Licensure Examination outcomes. Future research may delve into the potential factors contributing to this observed relationship, informing interventions or support strategies tailored to the intellectual strengths and challenges of Architecture graduates. Additionally, considering the complex nature of intelligence, it might be valuable to explore specific cognitive abilities or components of IQ that play a more pronounced role in the Architecture Licensure Examination performance.

The finding that higher IQ correlates with better performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination is supported by recent literature. Research by MacCann et al. (2020) has shown that IQ, as a measure of general cognitive ability, predicts academic and professional success across various domains. In the context of licensure exams, higher IQ may facilitate faster learning of complex architectural concepts, superior problem-solving skills, and enhanced ability to analyze and apply knowledge effectively (Deary et al., 2020).

The positive correlation suggests that as IQ increases, Architecture Licensure Examination performance tends to increase. However, it's important to recognize that correlation does not imply causation. The findings highlight the

complexity of factors influencing success in licensure examinations. Educators and students should acknowledge that success in the field of architecture is multifaceted and influenced by various elements beyond intelligence.

Institutions and licensure exam preparation programs can tailor their approaches to accommodate candidates with varying levels of cognitive abilities. Strategies might include adaptive learning technologies, personalized coaching, and workshops focused on enhancing critical thinking and analytical skills specific to architectural practice. Recognizing the role of IQ in licensure exam performance highlights the importance of accommodating cognitive diversity among aspiring architects. Institutions should promote inclusive educational practices that support candidates across the intellectual spectrum, ensuring equitable opportunities for success (Butler et al., 2022). Further exploration into the specific cognitive abilities or components of IQ that most strongly predict Architecture Licensure Examination performance could provide deeper insights. This could involve studying aspects such as spatial reasoning, mathematical aptitude, and verbal comprehension within the context of architectural problem-solving (Deep, 2023). Policymakers and educational administrators may consider incorporating measures of cognitive abilities, including IQ assessments, into admissions criteria and curriculum design for architecture programs. This could help optimize student outcomes and better prepare graduates for licensure exams and professional practice.

In conclusion, the established significant correlation between the Intelligence Quotient (IQ) and Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) performance strongly suggests that IQ serves as a reliable predictor of success in the Architecture Licensure Examination. Conversely, the lack of a significant correlation between academic performance (general weighted average) and emotional intelligence (EI) with architecture licensure examination performance indicates that the latter variables may not be prominent predictors in the academic context. This insight underscores the importance of considering IQ as a key factor in understanding and predicting success in the Architecture Licensure Examination while highlighting the need for further exploration into the nuanced relationship between the Academic Performance (General Weighted Average) and Emotional Intelligence and Architecture Licensure Examination performance.

Table 8

Academic Performance, Emotional Intelligence, and Intelligence Quotient as Predictors of Performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination

Variable	Unstandardized B	SE	β	t	p-value	Sig. level	Interpretation
Architecture Licensure Examination Performance	53.451	6.277		8.516	0.000		Significant
Academic Performance	0.104	0.054	0.157	1.933	0.055	0.05	Not Significant
Emotional Intelligence	0.103	0.081	0.103	1.266	0.207		Not Significant
Intelligence Quotient	0.079	0.019	0.331	4.192	0.000		Significant

Academic Performance was found to have an unstandardized B value of 0.104 with a standard error (SE) of 0.054, yielding a β coefficient of 0.157 and a t-value of 1.933. The p-value for this variable was 0.055, indicating that academic performance was not a significant predictor of ALE performance at the 0.05 significance level. This aligns with recent studies suggesting that while academic performance provides a foundational knowledge base, it may not directly translate into success in licensure examinations due to the practical and applied nature of such tests (Martínez-González, López-López & Fernández, 2021).

Emotional Intelligence demonstrated an unstandardized B value of 0.103 with an SE of 0.081, a β coefficient of 0.103, and a t-value of 1.266. The p-value for emotional intelligence was 0.207, indicating it was not a significant predictor of ALE performance. This finding is consistent with MacCann et al. (2020), who found that while emotional intelligence can enhance overall academic and professional performance, its direct impact on specific licensure exams may be less pronounced.

Intelligence Quotient emerged as a significant predictor with an unstandardized B value of 0.079, an SE of 0.019, a β coefficient of 0.331, and a t-value of 4.192. The p-value was 0.000, confirming its significance at the 0.05 level. This supports the findings of Ritchie and Tucker-Drob (2019), who emphasized the critical role of cognitive abilities measured by IQ in understanding and solving complex problems, which is essential for success in professional licensure examinations.



The significant impact of Intelligence Quotient (IQ) on ALE performance underscores the importance of cognitive abilities in the field of architecture. Educational programs and preparatory courses might consider incorporating cognitive skill enhancement strategies to better prepare students for the demands of the ALE. Given the practical and problem-solving nature of the examination, fostering these skills could improve candidates' performance significantly.

Despite Academic Performance not being a significant predictor, its moderate correlation suggests that maintaining high academic standards is still beneficial for building a solid knowledge base. Educational institutions should continue to emphasize rigorous academic training while integrating practical applications to bridge the gap between academic knowledge and examination requirements.

The non-significance of Emotional Intelligence (EI) as a predictor does not diminish its overall value in the professional and personal development of architecture students. While EI may not directly impact licensure exam outcomes, it contributes to better stress management and interpersonal relationships, which are crucial for long-term career success. Programs aimed at enhancing EI could still be valuable, particularly in fostering a well-rounded professional capable of navigating the complex demands of the architectural profession.

In conclusion, these findings suggest a multifaceted approach to preparing for the ALE, emphasizing cognitive skill development alongside academic rigor and emotional intelligence. This holistic approach could produce graduates who are not only capable of passing the licensure examination but also excelling in their professional careers.

Conclusions

The survey of architecture graduates from a Catholic higher education institution in Bacolod City reveals notable gender disparities, with a higher proportion of males than females. Most graduates preferred enrolling in review centers for licensure exam preparation, indicating a strong preference for structured and guided study methods, while a smaller proportion opted for self-review. Regarding average family monthly income, more respondents came from lower-income families than higher-income families, highlighting economic inequality and its potential impact on educational outcomes and social mobility. These findings underscore the need for initiatives to promote gender diversity, improve the quality of review programs, and provide targeted support for lower-income students to ensure equitable educational opportunities and enhance social mobility.

In examining the academic performance of architecture graduates, the data reveals that males and females perform similarly, with both groups achieving comparable average scores, which are rated as "fair." This minimal gender difference aligns with research suggesting that gender disparities in academic outcomes are generally small. Additionally, both those who attended review centers and those who self-reviewed achieved nearly identical average scores, indicating that the review method does not significantly impact performance.

This finding challenges the assumption that structured review centers are markedly more effective than self-study. Interestingly, students from lower-income families performed slightly better than those from higher-income families, though both groups were rated as "fair." This result is somewhat counterintuitive, given the typical correlation between higher income and better academic performance, suggesting that lower-income students may benefit from targeted support.

The study also reveals high resiliency traits among Architecture graduates, with males scoring slightly higher than females, both interpreted as having "High Resiliency Traits." This minimal gender difference aligns with research showing similar resilience levels across genders. Additionally, self-reviewers scored higher in resiliency than those attending review centers. Yet, both groups exhibited high resilience, suggesting that self-directed learning may enhance resilience more than structured review programs. When analyzing income levels, students from lower-income families and those from higher-income families demonstrated high resiliency traits, indicating that socio-economic status has little impact on resilience. The overall high resilience among all respondents underscores the importance of fostering resilience for success in Architecture.

Building on these findings, the study analyzed the correlation between respondents' Academic Performance (General Weighted Average) and their Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) performance. The analysis revealed no significant correlation between academic performance and ALE performance. While, in examining the correlation between respondents' Emotional Intelligence (EI) and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE), the findings indicate a non-significant relationship. And, finally, the study reveals a significant positive correlation between respondents' intelligence quotient (IQ) and their performance in the Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE).

Recommendations



Based on the findings of this research, several recommendations can be tailored to different stakeholders in the field of architecture: 1) For Architecture students, a balanced approach to exam preparation is recommended, combining structured review center programs with self-study methods; 2) address the observed gender disparity among architecture graduates, with a higher proportion of males than females, it is recommended that the institution take proactive measures to promote gender diversity within the architecture program; 3) address the economic disparities impacting Architecture Licensure Examination (ALE) performance, the institution should implement a comprehensive support strategy for students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds; 4) College Administrators should review admission criteria to encompass a broader range of competencies beyond academic metrics. This includes prioritizing practical skills and problem-solving abilities essential for success in the field; 5) given the observation of high resiliency traits among all respondents, with those engaged in self-review exhibiting slightly higher resilience, it is crucial for the institution to integrate resilience-building activities into the curriculum; and 6) the institution should continue to emphasize EI development by offering workshops focused on self-regulation, empathy, and stress management. Incorporating EI training into the curriculum can enhance students' overall well-being and career readiness, even if it does not directly impact licensure exam performance.

References

- Adeyemo, D. A., & Torubelli, V. O. (2020). Cognitive and Emotional Intelligence as predictors of success in licensure examinations: A study of Nigerian architecture students. *International Journal of Architecture and Urban Planning*, 14(2), 125-139. <https://doi.org/10.1108/21520401201000014>
- Aliu, L., et al. (2022). Emotional Intelligence and Resilience in Architecture Students: Coping with Academic Demands. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 75(1), 89-103.
- Arifin, S., Idrus, R. M., & Mohamad, M. (2020). Emotional Intelligence and its impact on architectural students' Academic Performance and teamwork skills. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 74(1), 82-95.
- Brown, A., & Smith, B. (2020). Socioeconomic status and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 434-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000378>
- Casanovas-López, R., Díaz-Garrido, E., Ortega-González, L., Latorre, J. M., & Navarro, J. (2022). Types of intelligence and academic performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Intelligence*, 10(4), 123. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence10040123>
- Chrispeels, J. H., & González, M. (2023). The challenge of systemic change in complex educational systems. In *Improving Schools and Educational Systems* (pp. 241-273). Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781003419471-14>
- Deary, I. J., Strand, S., Smith, P., & Fernandes, C. (2007a). Intelligence and educational achievement. *Intelligence*, 35(1), 13-21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2006.02.001>
- Deary, I. J., Strand, S., Smith, P., & Fernandes, C. (2020). Intelligence and educational achievement. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, 1, 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0368-3>
- De Leon, J. (2016). Academic and licensure examination performances of BSN graduates: Bases for curriculum enhancement. *International Journal of Educational Policy Research and Review*, 3(4), 64-72.
- De Leon, P. A., & Gonzales, M. T. (2021). The Impact of Intelligence Quotient on architecture licensure examination performance: A study of Filipino students. *Journal of Educational Measurement and Evaluation*, 58(4), 321-339.
- Dunlosky, J., Rawson, K. A., Marsh, E. J., Nathan, M. J., & Willingham, D. T. (2013a). Improving students' learning with effective learning techniques. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 14(1), 4-58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100612453266>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2020). From expectancy-value theory to situated expectancy-value theory: A developmental, social cognitive, and sociocultural perspective on motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101859. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101859>
- Joelson, R. B. (2020). Locus of control. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/basics/locus-of-control>
- Johnson, W., Deary, I. J., & Sternberg, R. J. (2019). The relationship between intelligence and academic achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(4), 475-511. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319841983>
- Kassymova, G. K., & Tokar, O. V. (2023). Emotional Intelligence and psychological well-being of students in higher education. *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews*, 9(2), 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2023.9.2.0145>
- Kelly, S. L. (2023). Perceptions of brilliance, intelligence, ability, and interest: Understanding first-year students' inclinations towards STEM pathways. *Journal for STEM Education Research*, 6(1), 75-101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41979-023-00086-w>
- Kurtin, S., et al. (2021). Predictors of Success in the Architecture Licensure Examination: A Review. *Journal of Professional Regulation*, 30(2), 45-56.
- La Consolacion College Bacolod Centennial Celebration. (n.d.). La Consolacion College Bacolod Centennial Celebration. Retrieved January 23, 2024, from <https://lccbcentennial.wordpress.com/>
- Laidra, K., Pullmann, H., & Allik, J. (2020). The predictive validity of IQ in academic and professional outcomes. *Intelligence*, 79, 101431.
- Maulidia, J., & Usman, O. (2019). Effect of self-efficacy, learning motivation, fear of failure and parent's social support



- towards academic procrastination. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3510145>
- Mayer, J. D. (2018). What is Emotional Intelligence? University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository. https://scholars.unh.edu/personality_lab/8
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is Emotional Intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and Emotional Intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (2016). The ability model of Emotional Intelligence: Principles and updates. *Emotion Review*, 8(4), 290-300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916639667>
- MacCann, C., Jiang, Y., Brown, L. E. R., Double, K. S., Bucich, M., & Minbashian, A. (2020). Emotional Intelligence predicts Academic Performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146(2), 150-186. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226>
- Magnuson, K., Yoo, P., Duncan, G., Yoshikawa, H., Trang, K., Gennetian, L. A., Halpern-Meekin, S., Fox, N., & Noble, K. (2022). Can a poverty reduction intervention reduce family stress among families with infants? An experimental analysis. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4188131>
- Martínez-González, E., López-López, M., & Fernández, A. (2021). Academic performance and confidence in professional licensure exams: A correlational study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(4), 712-726. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000452>
- Pisarik, C. T., Rowell, P. C., & Currie, L. K. (2019). Academic Performance as a predictor of licensure examination success: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Professional Studies*, 45(3), 219-235.
- Rodríguez, S., et al. (2021). Enhancing Architectural Education: The Role of Emotional Intelligence and Resilience. *Journal of Architectural Practice*, 40(3), 287-302.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/dugg-p24e-52wk-6cdg>
- Seel, N. M. (2022). Attribution theory of motivation. In *Encyclopedia of the Sciences of Learning*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1428-6_917
- Shafait, Z., Khan, M. A., Sahibzada, U. F., Dacko-Pikiewicz, Z., & Popp, J. (2021). An assessment of students' Emotional Intelligence, learning outcomes, and academic efficacy: A correlational study in higher education. *PLOS ONE*, 16(8), e0255428. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0255428>
- Smith, J. (2020). Understanding household income variability. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(2), 45-62.
- Smith, J. (2021). The role of licensure examinations in professional practice. *Journal of Professional Licensing*, 15(2), 45-62.
- Smith, K. L., & Jones, M. P. (2022). Transparency in research: Communicating study objectives, methods, and funding sources to participants. *Journal of Research Ethics*, 18(1), 45-58.
- SpringerLink. (2020). Attribution theory. In Gellman, M. D. (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of behavioral medicine*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39903-0_298
- Vigdor, J. L., Ladd, H. F., & Martinez, E. (2021). Scaling the digital divide: Home computer technology and student achievement. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 40(1), 63-89. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pam.22242>
- Weiner, B. (2010). The development of an attribution-based theory of motivation: A history of ideas. *Educational Psychologist*, 45(1), 28-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520903433596>
- Weiner, B. (2012). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Weiner, B. (2020). Attribution theory. In M. D. Gellman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of behavioral medicine*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39903-0_298