

THE IMPACT OF AQ ON THE PERFORMANCE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS IN CHENNAI

Lucia Babitha. F
Research Scholar

Dr. T. Joseph
Associate and Head of the Department
PG and Research Department of Commerce,
Loyola College, Chennai, India

Abstract: This study has been undertaken to investigate the relationship between Adversity Quotient and Performance of School Teachers working in Chennai City. To test the Adversity Quotient The Adversity Response Profile set of statements were used and to test the Performance The Individual Work Performance set of statements were used. The data were collected by distributing questionnaires. The time period for data collection was from January 2019 to February 2019.

I INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In today's scenario the problems of human beings are on a rise both in their personal and professional lives. All these have an impact on their performances in their workplaces. Teaching is one of those professions which are highly stressful especially with the changing attitudes of students, changing syllabi and the testing techniques. It is no more that time to time job whether teachers walk home after giving extra classes to the weak students. Teachers now are slowly being put in the sphere of professionals working in the corporate sector. Teachers also have a personal life in which too they face problems. A teacher should be able to balance all the above to deliver the best to the students as he or she are creating valuable assets to the society. One aspect of maintaining a healthy balance between work and problems is the ability to deal with adversaries, this research tests that ability of the individual. Dealing with adversaries is a challenge for both men and women, but it is more challenging for a woman as she has to balance both work and home. Most of the women work to make their families comfortable and give them a better living, in such a case the problems might be more and handling them will be difficult which will have a direct influence on their performance in the classroom especially if they are new to teaching. When the teachers are sensitive in nature that might have an impact for a longer period of time and in turn affect their performance as teachers inside the classroom and affect the students till they have settled themselves with the matter.

To test such abilities to deal with adversaries a researchers named Dr. Paul Stoltz came up with a Quotient known as the Adversity Quotient (AQ) also known as the Science of Resilience in the year 1997 in his book *Adversity Quotient: Turning Obstacles into Opportunities*. He also developed a test to quantify Adversity Quotient which he termed it as Adversity Response Profile.

1.2 IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

1. This research will help the teachers know where they stand in respect to Adversity Quotient.
2. It will allow the teachers to evaluate their Performance.
3. It will provide a chance for the teachers to reinvestigate their attitude towards Adversity and help them improve it to perform better.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To measure the relationship between Adversity Quotient and Performance of school teachers.
2. To determine the influence of demographic profile of school teachers on their Adversity Quotient and Performance.

1.4 HYPOTHESES:

1. H_0 : There is no relationship between Adversity Quotient and Performance
2. H_0 : There is no significant association between demographic variables and Adversity Quotient
3. H_0 : There is no significant association between demographic variables and Performance

II REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Shivranjani (2014) stated that there are three building of AQ which are Cognitive Psychology, Neurophysiology and Psycho-Neuroimmunology. Cognitive Psychology is that which speaks about how people differ on a continuum in what adversity can do to them which depends on how they react to adversity. Some feel helpless and unable to react constructively to adversity while some feel that it is fleeting and limited and within their power to do something about are able to move beyond and above the adversity. Neurophysiology indicates that individual learns ways to react to adversity and overtime it becomes a habit. Psychoneuroimmunology shows that there is a direct link between one's response to adversity and health both mental and physical. One's ability to recover from severe body trauma such as surgery would not only depend upon the body's physical

health but equally upon one's perception of being able to cope with the adversity. A weak pattern of response to adversity would result in long period of recovery and depression. Shivranjani (2014) cited Paul Stoltz's description of adversities and how people respond to adversity. There are four types of people and their ways to respond to adversity: a) Climbers are the people in even in the face of severe adversity where they seem to be lost forever but have that physical and mental strength to collect themselves and make best use of their resources and move on to survive. b) Campers are those who when faced adversity will use all their resources to hold on to their current position without making any active effort to move on to a better position. c) Quitters are the ones who give up. They allow the adversity to overtake them and let the events take their own course of action without any effort to do something about it. Stoltz (2000) stated that people who successfully apply Adversity Quotient perform adequately in the face of Adversity whether the challenges are big or small encountered in our daily lives. They just do not learn from these adversities but they also respond to them better and fast. Siebert (2005) stated that resilience is the ability to cope with high levels of ongoing uncontrollable changes, to sustain good health and energy when under constant pressure, to bounce back effortlessly from setbacks, to overcome adversities, to change to a new way of working and living when an old way is not possible and to do all these without acting in abnormal or harmful ways. According to Siebert (2005) resiliency is an essential skill in every job sector especially during times of trouble. Wolin and Wolin (1993) gave a description of resilient individuals and resilient families.

Resilient Individuals (Those who survived childhood adversities):

- (i) Insight: Awareness of abnormality
- (ii) Independence: distancing oneself from problems
- (iii) Relationships: Supportive associations with others
- (iv) Initiative: Self help or helping others actions
- (v) Creativity: Self expression and transformation

Resilient Families (Families that cope well under stress): Commitment, Solidarity, Adaptability, Communication, Spirituality, Conceitedness (being extremely proud of oneself), Effective Resource Management and Consistency. All these together create optimism, resourcefulness and nurturing which are aligned along the traits of resilient individuals.

III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

Government, Government Aided and Private Schools from Chennai were selected for the study. From these 10 schools were selected using simple random sampling technique. In these 10 schools 5 teachers were selected through stratified sampling technique.

3.2 DATA AND SOURCES OF DATA

For this study primary data has been collected. Questionnaires were distributed to teachers in 10 schools. 60 questionnaires were distributed out of which 50 questionnaires were found valid.

3.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study contains both independent and dependent variables. The study used pre specified variables from Adversity Response Profile by Paul. G. Stoltz and Individual Work Performance by Linda Koopmans.

Demographic variables and Adversity Quotient are the independent variables and Individual Work Performance is the only dependent variable.

Adversity Quotient measures the ability of individuals to deal with adversities and to come out successfully. According to Dr. Paul Stoltz Adversity Quotient is an extremely powerful tool to predict performance, effectiveness, learning, innovation, promotability, wealth and health. Dr. Stoltz laid the thumb of rule which states that the stronger is the AQ of the individual, the more effectively the individual will respond to adversity, and the less life's events will take a toll on the individual's energy, performance, health, and outlook. The weaker the AQ, the more difficult it can be for the person to maintain the energy, optimism, and courage required to make the best use of talents and life. Dr. Stoltz states that AQ has four CORE dimensions that describes a person's pattern of response to adversity.

THE CORE OF AQ

DIMENSION	WHAT IT IS	WHAT IT DETERMINES
Control	The extent to which someone discerns that they can influence whatever happens next	Resilience, health, and persistence
Ownership	The probability that someone will actually do anything to improve the situation, regardless of their formal responsibilities	Accountability, responsibility, action and engagement
Reach	The extent to which someone thinks an adversity will reach into and affect other aspects of the situation or beyond	Burden, stress, energy, and effort; it tends to have collective effect
Endurance	The length of time the individual perceives the situation or the adversity will last or endure	Hope, optimism, and willingness to persevere

Source: <http://www.peaklearning.com/aq-you_basics.php>

Demographic variables consist of Age, Gender, Marital Status, Educational Qualification, Designation, Experience, Grade and Income.

Individual Work Performance consists of three scales which are: Task Performance, Contextual Performance and Counter Productive Work Behaviour. Task Performance Scale is the proficiency or competency with which one performs his or her central job tasks that includes work quality, planning and organising work, being result-oriented, prioritising, and working efficiently. Contextual Performance Scale measures an individual's behaviour that supports organisational, social and psychological environment in which the technical core should function. It includes taking initiative, accepting and learning from feedback, cooperating with others, communicating effectively, showing responsibility, being student-oriented, being creative and taking on challenging work tasks. Counter Productive Work Behaviour Scale which defines the behaviour of an individual which will harm the well being of an organisation. It includes behaviours such as displaying excessive negativity, doing things that harm your organisation, doing things that harm co-workers and purposely making mistakes.

3.4 STATISTICAL TOOLS

Since all the data were collected as ordinal scale, non parametric tests were used.

3.4.1 Reliability Statistics:

Cronbach Alpha was conducted to test the reliability of the questionnaire.

3.4.2 Cross Tabulation:

Cross Tabulation was used to find the number of respondents according to the demographic profile and Adversity Score and Individual Work Performance Score respectively.

3.4.3 Chi - Square:

Pearson's Chi-Square test was used to find out the influence between demographic profile and Adversity Quotient Score and Individual Work Performance respectively.

3.4.5 Kruskal Wallis and Post Hoc Test:

Kruskal Wallis Test was conducted to find out whether the distributions between the categories of Demographic Profile and a) Adversity Quotient and b) Individual Work Performance are the same. Post Hoc Test was conducted to identify the groups which significantly differ.

3.4.6 Mann Whitney U Test:

Mann Whitney U Test was carried out for those demographic variables which has only two groups.

3.4.6 Spearman's Rank Correlation:

It was conducted to find out the relationship between Adversity Quotient Score and Individual Work Performance Score.

IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Reliability Statistics:

Table 4.1: Reliability Statistics

CRONBACH'S ALPA	No.OF ITEMS
0.714	46

Table 4.1 shows that Cronbach's Alpha is 0.714 which means that 71.4% the questionnaire is reliable.

4.2 Cross Tabulation:

Table 4.2.1: Age and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	AGE	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Less tha 25 yrs	3	5
2	26-35 yrs	8	5
S.NO	AGE	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
3	36-45 yrs	8	4
4	46-55 yrs	10	3
5	56 & more than 56 yrs	3	1

Table 4.2.1 shows the number of respondents according to age in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each age category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the age category of less than 25 years, 3 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the age category of 26-35 years, 8 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the age category of 36-45 years, 8 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 4 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the age category of 46-55 years,

10 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 3 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the age category of 56 and more than 56 years, 3 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 1 teacher to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.2: Gender and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	GENDER	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Male	3	1
2	Female	29	17

Table 4.2.2 shows the number of respondents according to gender in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each gender category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the gender category of male, 3 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 1 teacher to high adversity quotient. Under the gender category of female, 29 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 17 teachers to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.3: Marital Status and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	MARITAL STATUS	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Single	6	4
2	Married	26	14

Table 4.2.3 shows the number of respondents according to marital status in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each marital status category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the marital status category of single, 6 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 4 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the marital status category of married, 26 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 14 teachers to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.4: Educational Qualification and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	DTE	16	5
2	B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed	6	7
3	M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed	10	6

Table 4.2.4 shows the number of respondents according to educational qualification in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each educational qualification category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the educational qualification category of DTE, 16 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the educational qualification category of B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed, 6 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 7 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the educational qualification category of M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed, 10 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 6 teachers to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.5: Designation and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	DESIGNATION	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	TGT	1	0
2	MGT	17	8
3	BT	5	3
4	PGT	9	6
5	NUR	0	1

Table 4.2.5 shows the number of respondents according to designation in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each designation category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the designation category

of TGT, 1 teacher belong to moderate adversity quotient and no teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the designation category of MGT, 17 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 8 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the designation category of BT, 5 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 3 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the designation category of PGT, 9 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 6 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the designation category of Nursery, no teacher belongs to moderate adversity quotient and 1 teacher to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.6: Experience and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	EXPERIENCE	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	1-5 yrs	4	7
2	6-10 yrs	5	2
3	11-20 yrs	17	8
4	21 & more than 21 yrs	6	1

Table 4.2.6 shows the number of respondents according to experience in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each experience category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the experience category of 1-5 years, 4 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 7 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the experience category of 6-10 years, 5 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 2 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the experience category of 11-20 years, 17 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 8 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the experience category of 21 & more than 21 yrs, 6 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 1 teacher to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.7: Employment Type and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	EMPLOYMENT TYPE	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Government	4	3
2	Aided	19	5
3	Private	9	10

Table 4.2.7 shows the number of respondents according to employment type in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each employment type category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the employment type category of government, 4 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 3 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the employment type category of aided, 19 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the employment type category of private, 9 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 10 teachers to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.8: Grade and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	GRADE	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Permanent	31	13
2	Temporary	1	5

Table 4.2.8 shows the number of respondents according to grade in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each experience category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the grade category of permanent, 31 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 13 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the grade category of temporary, 1 teacher belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.9: Income and Adversity Quotient Score

S.NO	INCOME	MODERATE AQ	HIGH AQ
1	Less than Rs.20,000	2	5

2	Rs. 21,000-Rs.40,000	8	5
3	Rs.41,000-Rs.60,000	19	7
4	Rs.1,01,000 & more than Rs.1,01,000	3	1

Table 4.2.9 shows the number of respondents according to income in relation to Adversity Quotient Score. Teachers under each experience category into Moderate Adversity Quotient Score and High Adversity Quotient. Under the income category of less than Rs.20,000, 2 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the income category of Rs.21,000-Rs.40,000, 8 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 5 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the income category of Rs.41,000-Rs.60,000, 19 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 7 teachers to high adversity quotient. Under the income category of Rs.1,01,000 & more than Rs.1,01,000, 3 teachers belong to moderate adversity quotient and 1 teacher to high adversity quotient.

Table 4.2.10: Age and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	AGE	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Less tha 25 yrs	3	5
2	26-35 yrs	3	10
3	36-45 yrs	4	8
4	46-55 yrs	1	12
5	56 & more than 56 yrs	2	2

Table 4.2.10 shows the number of respondents according to age in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each age category into Moderate Individual Work Performance Score and High Individual Work Performance Score. Under the age category of less than 25 years, 3 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 5 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the age category of 26-35 years, 3 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 10 teachers to individual work performance. Under the age category of 36-45 years, 4 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 8 teachers to individual work performance. Under the age category of 46-55 years, 1 teacher belong to moderate individual work performance and 12 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the age category of 56 and more than 56 years, 2 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 2 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.11: Gender and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	GENDER	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Male	1	3
2	Female	12	34

Table 4.2.11 shows the number of respondents according to gender in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each gender category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the gender category of male, 1 teacher belong to moderate individual work performance and 3 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the gender category of female, 12 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 34 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.12: Marital Status and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	MARITAL STATUS	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Single	5	5
2	Married	8	32

Table 4.2.12 shows the number of respondents according to marital status in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each marital status category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the marital status category of single, 5 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 5 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the gender category of female, 12 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 34 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.13: Educational Qualification and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	DTE	5	16
2	B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed	3	10
3	M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed	5	11

Table 4.2.13 shows the number of respondents according to educational qualification in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each educational qualification category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the educational qualification category of DTE, 5 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 16 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the educational qualification category of B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed, 3 teachers belong to individual work performance and 10 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the educational qualification category of M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed, 5 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 11 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.14: Designation and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	DESIGNATION	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	TGT	0	1
2	MGT	5	20
3	BT	3	5
4	PGT	5	10
5	NUR	0	1

Table 4.2.14 shows the number of respondents according to designation in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each designation category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the designation category of TGT, no teacher belongs to moderate individual work performance and 1 teacher to high individual work performance. Under the designation category of MGT, 5 teachers belong to individual work performance and 20 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the designation category of BT, 3 teachers belong to individual work performance and 3 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the designation category of PGT, 5 teachers belong to individual work performance and 10 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the designation category of Nursery, no teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 1 teacher to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.15: Experience and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	EXPERIENCE	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	1-5 yrs	4	7
2	6-10 yrs	2	5
3	11-20 yrs	5	20
4	21 & more than 21 yrs	2	5

Table 4.2.15 shows the number of respondents according to experience in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each experience category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the experience category of 1-5 years, 4 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 7 teachers to high

individual work performance. Under the experience category of 6-10 years, 2 teachers belong to individual work performance and 5 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the experience category of 11-20 years, 5 teachers belong to individual work performance and 20 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the experience category of 21 & more than 21 years, 2 teachers belong to individual work performance and 5 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.16: Employment Type and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	EMPLOYMENT TYPE	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Government	1	6
2	Aided	8	16
3	Private	4	15

Table 4.2.16 shows the number of respondents according to employment type in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each employment type category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the employment type category of government, 1 teacher belongs to moderate individual work performance and 6 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the employment type category of aided, 8 teachers belong to individual work performance and 16 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the employment type category of private, 4 teachers belong to individual work performance and 15 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.17: Grade and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	GRADE	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Permanent	10	34
2	Temporary	3	3

Table 4.2.17 shows the number of respondents according to grade in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each grade category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the grade category of permanent, 10 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 34 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the grade category of temporary, 3 teachers belong to individual work performance and 3 teachers to high individual work performance.

Table 4.2.18: Income and Individual Work Performance Score

S.NO	INCOME	MODERATE IWP	HIGH IWP
1	Less than Rs.20,000	3	4
2	Rs. 21,000-Rs.40,000	2	11
3	Rs.41,000-Rs.60,000	7	19
4	Rs.1,01,000 & more than Rs.1,01,000	1	3

Table 4.2.18 shows the number of respondents according to income in relation to Individual Work Performance Score. Teachers under each income category into Moderate individual work performance and High individual work performance. Under the income category of less than Rs.20,000, 3 teachers belong to moderate individual work performance and 4 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the income category of Rs. 21,000-Rs.40,000, 2 teachers belong to individual work performance and 11 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the income category of Rs.41,000-Rs.60,000, 7 teachers belong to individual work performance and 19 teachers to high individual work performance. Under the grade category of Rs.1,01,000 & more than Rs.1,01,000, 1 teacher belongs to individual work performance and 3 teachers to high individual work performance.

4.3 Pearson's Chi-Square:

Table 4.3: Pearson's Chi-Square

S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG	ACCEPT/REJECT NULL HYPOTHESES
------	-------------	-----	-------------------------------

1	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Age and Adversity Score	0.454	ACCEPT
2	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Gender and Adversity Score	0.633	ACCEPT
3	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Marital Status and Adversity Score	0.768	ACCEPT
4	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Educational Qualification and Adversity Score	0.205	ACCEPT
5	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Designation and Adversity Score	0.622	ACCEPT
6	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Experience and Adversity Score	0.143	ACCEPT
7	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Employment Type and Adversity Score	0.090	ACCEPT
8	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Grade and Adversity Score	0.010	REJECT
9	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Income and Adversity Score	0.173	ACCEPT
10	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Age and Individual Work Performance Score	0.354	ACCEPT
11	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Gender and Individual Work Performance Score	0.962	ACCEPT
12	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Marital Status and Individual Work Performance Score	0.053	ACCEPT
13	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Educational Qualification and Individual Work Performance Score	0.844	ACCEPT
S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG	ACCEPT/REJECT NULL HYPOTHESES
14	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Designation and Individual Work Performance Score	0.710	ACCEPT
15	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Experience and Individual Work Performance Score	0.770	ACCEPT
16	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Employment Type and Individual Work Performance Score	0.494	ACCEPT
17	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Grade and Individual Work Performance Score	0.153	ACCEPT
18	H ₀ :There is no significant influence of Income and Individual Work Performance Score	0.613	ACCEPT

Table 4.3 shows the significance value of the Chi-Square calculated. It shows demographic profile and adversity quotient score and individual performance score respectively. The significance value of each variable is 0.454, 0.633, 0.768, 0.205, 0.622, 0.143, 0.090, 0.010, 0.173, 0.354, 0.962, 0.053, 0.844, 0.710, 0.770, 0.494, 0.153 and 0.613 respectively.

The table shows that there is significant influence of Grade on Adversity Quotient Score whose significance value is 0.010. All the other null hypotheses have been accepted that is a) There is no significant influence of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, designation, experience, employment type, income on adversity quotient score. b) There is no significant influence of age, gender, marital status, educational qualification, designation, experience, employment type, grade, income on individual work performance score.

4.4 Spearman's Rank Correlation:

Table 4.4: Spearman's Rank Correlation

			AD SCORE	IWP SCORE
Spearman's Rho	AD SCORE	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	0.160
		Significance (2-tailed)		0.268
	IWP SCORE	Correlation Coefficient	0.160	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	0.268	

Table 4.4 displayed the significance value of the Spearman's Rank correlation. It showcases adversity quotient score and individual work performance score. The significance value is 0.268 and correlation is 1.000

The hypotheses for Spearman's Rank Correlation is:

H_0 : There is no significant association between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score

H_1 : There is no significant association between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score

Table 4.4 shows the spearman's rank correlation which run to assess the relationship between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score. There is no correlation between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score, that is significance value is 0.268 which is greater than the P value 0.05 at 5% confidence level. Hence the H_0 has been accepted.

4.5 Kruskal Wallis and Post Hoc Test:

Table 4.5: Kruskal Wallis and Post Hoc Test

S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG	ACCEPT/REJECT HYPOTHESES
1	Kruskal Wallis Test: H_0 : The distribution of someone you respect ignores your attempt to discuss an important issue is the same across the categories of Age Post Hoc Test: H_0 : There is no significant difference between 36-45 yrs and 26-35 yrs	0.36 0.06	REJECT
S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG	ACCEPT/REJECT HYPOTHESES
2	Kruskal Wallis Test: H_0 : The distribution of being overlooked for promotion is the same across the categories of Educational Qualification Post Hoc Test: H_0 : There is no significant difference between DTE and B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed	0.29 0.034	REJECT
3	Kruskal Wallis Test: H_0 : The distribution of the meeting you are in is a total waste of time is the same across the categories of Educational Qualification Post Hoc Test: H_0 : There is no significant difference between DTE and M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed	0.020 0.016	REJECT
4	Kruskal Wallis Test: H_0 : The distribution of being overlooked for promotion is the same across the categories of Designation Post Hoc Test: H_0 : There is no significant difference between MGT and BT	0.021 0.046	REJECT
5	Kruskal Wallis Test: H_0 : The distribution of computer crashed for the third time in this week is the same across the categories of Experience	0.044	REJECT

6	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of workplace being understaffed is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Private	0.026 0.025	REJECT
7	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of planning lessons optimally is the same across the categories of Designation Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between PGT and BT	0.048 0.045	REJECT
8	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of computer crashed for the third time in this week is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Private	0.043 0.036	REJECT
9	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of being able to distinguish main issues from side issues is the same across the categories of Educational Qualification Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed and DTE	0.021 0.016	REJECT
10	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of planning lessons optimally is the same across the categories of Educational Qualification Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between M.A, M.Sc, M.Com, B.Ed and B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed H ₀ : There is no significant difference between DTE and B.A, B.Sc, B.Ed	0.002 0.002 0.024	REJECT
S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG	ACCEPT/REJECT HYPOTHESES
11	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of being able to carry out the lessons well with minimal time and effort is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Private	0.016 0.014	REJECT
12	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of planning lessons optimally is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Private	0.027 0.024	REJECT
13	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of complaining minor work related issues at work is the same across the categories of Employment Type	0.042	REJECT
14	Kruskal Wallis Test: H ₀ : The distribution of worked on keeping knowledge on the subjects which I teach upto date is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Government	0.005 0.005	REJECT

15	H ₀ : The distribution of continually seeking new challenges at work is the same across the categories of Employment Type Post Hoc Test: H ₀ : There is no significant difference between Aided and Private	0.031 0.030	REJECT
----	---	--------------------	--------

Table 4.5 displayed the significance value of Kruskal Wallis Test are 0.36, 0.29, 0.020, 0.021, 0.044, 0.026, 0.048, 0.043, 0.021, 0.002, 0.016, 0.027, 0.042, 0.005 and 0.031. The significance value of Post Hoc Test are 0.06, 0.034, 0.016, 0.046, 0.025, 0.045, 0.036, 0.016, 0.002, 0.024, 0.014, 0.024, 0.005 and 0.030.

Table 4.5 shows the H₀ which are rejected and to further justify the overall rejection of null hypotheses which is less than the P value 0.05 at 5% confidence level, post hoc test for multiple comparisons were run. It is the paired comparisons of different groups under each category.

4.6 Mann Whitney U Test:

Table 4.6: Mann Whitney U Test

S.NO	PARTICULARS	SIG.	ACCEPT/REJECT NULL HYPOTHESES
1	H ₀ : The distribution of missing an important appointment is the same across categories of Marital Status	0.037	REJECT
2	H ₀ : The distribution of extensive searching of a document and not finding it is the same across categories of Grade	0.019	REJECT
3	H ₀ : The distribution of computer crashed for the third time in this week is the same across categories of Grade	0.002	REJECT
4	H ₀ : The distribution of losing something that is important is the same across categories of Grade	0.019	REJECT
5	H ₀ : The distribution of continually seeking new challenges at work is the same across categories of Marital Status	0.042	REJECT
6	H ₀ : The distribution of not finding difficulty in providing solutions to new problems is the same across categories of Grade	0.045	REJECT

Table 4.6 displayed the significance value of Mann Whitney U Test are 0.037, 0.019, 0.002, 0.019, 0.042, 0.045.

Table 4.6 shows the H₀ which are rejected as the values of significance are less than the P value 0.05 at 5% confidence level of demographic variables which has two groups which are marital status and grade.

From the above tables it is evident that there is no significant relationship exists between demographic variables and a) adversity quotient and b) individual work performance through Pearson's Chi-Square test. The cross tabulation was tabulated to find out how many respondents fall under moderate and high adversity quotient score and individual work performance score respectively. Cross tabulations conducted showed that there was no low adversity quotient score and individual work performance score. The Kruskal Wallis and Post Hoc test showed that various statements of adversity quotient had different distributions across the categories of age, educational qualification, designation, experience and employment type. The statements of individual work performance had different distributions across the categories of designation, employment type, and educational qualification. The Mann Whitney U test showed that various statements of adversity quotient had different distributions across marital status and grade. The statements of individual work performance had different distributions across the same demographic variables as of adversity quotient. Finally to find out the relationship between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score, the Spearman's Rank Correlation was run which retained the null hypothesis showing that there is no significant relationship between adversity quotient score and individual work performance score.

V CONCLUSION

This study which was conducted on school teachers to test whether adversity quotient has an effect on their performance or not, through various tests it is proved that the adversity quotient of the school teachers do not have an impact on their performance. This further clarifies that both are independent of each other and teachers have the ability to perform their best within their classrooms while facing any kind of adversity.

REFERENCES:

1. What Is AQ (Adversity Quotient)? | Validation Studies | BellSouth | Study Documenting The Effect Of AQ Training On Employee Attitude And Accountability. Retrieved February 28, 2019, from http://www.peaklearning.com/about_aq_studies_bellsouth.php
2. Shivananjani (2014). Adversity Quotient: One Stop Solution to Combat Attrition Rate of Women in Indian IT Sector, *I*(5). International Journal of Business and Administration Research Review.
3. Siebert, A. (2005). *The Resiliency Advantage: Master Change, Thrive Under Pressure, and Bounce Back from Setbacks* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
4. Stoltz, P. (2000). *Adversity Quotient @ Work: Make Everyday Challenges the Key to Your Success - Putting the Principles of AQ into Action*. New York: Harper Collins.
5. Walsh, B. (2015). *The Science Of Resilience*. Harvard Graduate School Of Education. Retrieved February 28, 2019, from <https://www.gse.harvard.edu/news/uk/15/03/science-resilience>
6. Wolin, S., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The Resilient Self: How Survivors of Troubled Families Rise Above Adversity*. U.S.A: Villard.

