

# The Impact of Demographic Factors on Adversity Quotient and Emotional Intelligence among In-Service Special Education Teachers

Wenefredo E. Cagape <sup>a</sup>, Ismael W. Baog <sup>b</sup>, Susan Vicente D. Villarente <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>wcagape@ccd.edu.ph/ <sup>b</sup>ibaog@ccd.edu.ph; ismael.baog@hcde.edu.ph/ <sup>c</sup>susanvillarente@usep.edu.ph

<sup>a</sup>City College of Davao, 8000, Philippines

<sup>b</sup>City College of Davao/Holy Cross of Davao College, 8000, Philippines

<sup>c</sup>University of Southeastern Philippines, 8000, Philippines

---

## Abstract

This study aimed to examine the relationship between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence and identify significant differences between these two variables based on demographic profiles among the in-service special education teachers. The study utilized non-experimental quantitative research methods, utilizing adapted and modified survey questionnaires to gather data from 100 respondents. The results revealed a positive correlation between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence, implying that in-service special education teachers with greater resilience and coping skills are likely to have higher emotional intelligence. The study also found a significant gender difference in adversity quotient, indicating that males cope better with adversity in the workplace than females. Nevertheless, this gender difference did not translate into emotional intelligence differences. These findings underscore the importance of teacher training and professional development programs in enhancing in-service special education teachers' emotional intelligence and resilience to support students with diverse needs better. The study highlights the need for schools to tailor their training and support programs to cater to diverse needs, considering gender differences in coping with adversity in the workplace.

Keywords: adversity quotient; emotional intelligence; in-service special education teachers

---

## 1. Introduction

In the light of the VUCA (vulnerable, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous) world, people tend to decide on things that are not aligned with the standard norms they are supposed to perform. This a manifestation that most teachers need to gain the background in understanding diverse learners inside the classroom in terms of coping mechanisms as to the challenges and difficulties encountered inside their classroom, especially when encountering children with special needs. This requires an in-depth understanding of the characteristics, manifestations, and causes that influence in-service special education teachers' capacity to comprehend and control their emotions while experiencing adversities.

Special education teachers' adversity quotient (AQ) and emotional intelligence (EI) are essential skills to cultivate nowadays. The advent of many challenges the teachers encountered required resiliency and emotional maturity (Jimenez, 2021). Education setup has changed dramatically due to the adjustment of the teachers having children showing inappropriate behavior that most of them find difficulty in handling their learners with special education needs. Priya (2016) stressed that teachers face a barrage of challenges in their life. Aside from doing their educational programs, administrative tasks, and activities, they also have the responsibility to cater to the unique needs (both physical and moral) of the learners.

The adversity quotient determines resiliency during misfortune, circumstances, troubles, and other challenging situations. It was first described by Stoltz (1997), who conceptualized the adversity quotient as how well an individual may respond when misfortune occurs. It refers to an unfortunate event, circumstance, or severe and continued difficulty (Xian & Fan, 2014). Individuals with high adversity quotient can better cope

with setbacks and choose constructive responses that turn obstacles into opportunities. In short, the adversity quotient (AQ) indexes how well a person can withstand adversity and their ability to surmount it (Phoolka & Kaur, 2012).

Noteworthy in Macao, the study by Wang, Liu, Tee, and Dai (2021) discovered that 160 undergraduate nursing students have average AQ scores. Specific emotional and cultural factors may be at work since female nursing students tend to blame themselves for difficulty. Students studying nursing in Macao must strengthen their capacity to overcome obstacles. The development of students' optimistic coping mechanisms needs special attention. Specifically, negative coping behavior was predictive of AQ. In the ownership dimension of AQ, female nursing students performed better than male nursing students. The impact of hardship was more likely to transfer to other areas of life in nursing students with poor coping mechanisms.

Moreover, a study on college PE faculty members of the Cebu Institute of Technology University revealed that an individual could assess how they would handle adversity by using the Adversity Quotient (AQ) as a predictor of success. The four (4) components of AQ must be considered when evaluating one's AQ because total AQ does not identify areas that require development. Similarly, EI like AQ, must also consider each of its various domains since success in a profession (Cando & Villacastin, 2014). Thus, success in teaching depends on clearly grasping how one should recognize and manage their emotions and those of others. Likewise, in the study by Borilla (2022) among special education teachers, it was revealed that an average level of adversity quotient among the teachers. Alternatively, the emotional intelligence of special education teachers is at a moderate to a high level. However, it was found that the adversity quotient did not influence teachers' emotional intelligence. Specifically, the study found that only ownership as the domain of adversity quotient and emotional awareness of others established a strong significant relationship ( $\rho=0.502$ ,  $p=0.024$ ). This means that if there is an increase in ownership in one unit, there is a 50.2% increase in the level of emotional awareness of others. However, the other variables did not show any significant differences.

Moreover, special education teachers behave in emotionally intelligent ways at work. Every emotional intelligence skill, including emotional self-awareness, emotional expression, emotional reasoning, emotional management, emotional self-control, and emotional awareness of others, displays typical emotional intelligence characteristics. Furthermore, adversity at work, especially when working with pupils with special needs, may cause them to demonstrate this sufficiency, which calls for their resilience.

Despite the growing importance of adversity quotient and emotional intelligence in the education sector, there needs to be more research that examines the relationship between these two constructs among in-service special education teachers. While some studies have investigated the individual constructs separately, few have explored how adversity quotient and emotional intelligence relate to each other and how they influence teachers' ability to understand and manage their emotions while dealing with adversity. Additionally, there is a need to investigate the role of demographic factors, such as gender, in shaping teachers' adversity quotient and emotional intelligence and how these factors may impact their capacity to support students with diverse needs. Addressing these gaps is essential to develop evidence-based teacher training and support programs that promote the emotional well-being of in-service special education teachers and, in turn, improve outcomes for students with special needs. Furthermore, this will serve as a foundation for study with a broader reach and help link other similar studies in the future.

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to determine the relationship between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers. Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the demographic profile of in-service special education teachers in terms of:
  - 1.1. Age
  - 1.2. Sex
  - 1.3. Length of service?

2. What is the level of the adversity quotient of in-service special education teachers in terms of:
  - 2.1. Control
  - 2.2. Ownership
  - 2.3. Reach
  - 2.4. Endurance?
3. What is the level of the emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers in terms of:
  - 3.1. Self-awareness
  - 3.2. Managing emotions
  - 3.3. Motivating oneself
  - 3.4. Empathy
  - 3.5. Social skill?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the adversity quotient and the emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers?
5. Is there a significant difference in the level of adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers when analyzed according to demographic profile?

## 2. Methods

This study utilized a non-experimental quantitative research design to collect and analyze numerical data without manipulating variables. According to Creswell (2014), non-experimental quantitative research designs are commonly used in social science research to investigate relationships between variables. Similarly, Field (2018) suggests that non-experimental quantitative research designs are appropriate for investigating phenomena that are not amenable to manipulation, such as gender or age. Despite their limitations, non-experimental quantitative research designs are a valuable tool for researchers in various fields. Specifically, this study utilized a descriptive correlation to examine the association between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers. Kline (2016) emphasizes that descriptive correlation is an essential tool for researchers who want to understand the relationships between variables, even if they need a clear hypothesis about the direction or strength of the relationship. Fraenkel and Wallen (2019) also note that descriptive correlational research can generate hypotheses, refine research questions, and identify new areas of inquiry.

In this study, the respondents consisted of 100 in-service special education teachers in a Division in Region XI, Philippines, selected through purposive sampling—a non-probability technique aiming to ensure diversity in perspectives or experiences based on specific criteria relevant to the research question or objectives, as suggested by Morse (2015). Strict protocols were followed to collect the required data. The statistical treatment involved utilizing measures such as sum, mean, independent sample t-test, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient to analyze the data and address the research questions.

The research instruments included the Modified Adversity Quotient Profile Questionnaire (Baog & Cagape, 2022) and Emotional Intelligence (Leadership Toolkit, 2014), adapted from various authors and modified to suit the study's context. These instruments underwent validation by experts in the field, and pilot testing involving 20 teachers was conducted to assess reliability using Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items. The study prioritized ethical considerations, ensuring that participants were fully informed of the voluntary nature of their participation, with the option to withhold answers or withdraw from the research at any point. Confidentiality and anonymity of personally identifiable information were diligently maintained throughout the research process.

## 3. Results and Discussion

As shown in Table 1 below, 91 (91%) female teachers and 9 (9%) male teachers are the sample respondents, giving a total of 100 respondents. The majority of the respondents are female. The range of ages

is from 30 below to 51 years old and above. The 43 (43%) respondents are between 31-40 years old, comprising the majority of the respondents. 39 (39%) respondents are 30 years old and below. The remaining 18 (18%) respondents are above 41 years old. Moreover, 47 (47%) respondents are between 6-10 years in service, the majority of the respondents. There is an equal 36 (36%) who are 5 years below in service and 17 (17%) who are 11 years in service and above.

**Table 1. In-Service Special Education Teachers' Demographic Profile**

Profile	Counts	Percentage
Sex		
Male	9	9%
Female	91	91%
Age		
30 below	39	39%
31-40 years old	43	43%
41-50 years old	15	15%
51 above	3	3%
Years in Service		
5 years below	36	36%
6-10 years	47	47%
11-20 years	14	14%
21 years above	3	3%

**Table 2. In-Service Special Education Teachers' Adversity Quotient**

	N	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
Control	100	35.76	6.23	Below Average
Ownership	100	33.10	7.18	Below Average
Reach	100	33.36	7.45	Average
Endurance	100	35.96	8.24	Average
Adversity Quotient	100	138.18	25.76	Average

Descriptive statistics were conducted to identify the level of in-service special education teachers' adversity quotient with the overall population of  $N = 100$  was highlighted in Table 2 below. The overall level of in-service special education teachers' adversity quotient is average ( $M = 138.18$ ,  $SD = 25.76$ ). This suggests that the in-service special education teachers, on average, have a moderate level of resilience in the face of adversity. While in-service special education teachers have some resilience and can overcome adversity, there is still room for improvement. Further analysis may be necessary to determine specific areas where teachers may need support or training to enhance their ability to handle challenging situations.

The table also presents mean scores for four dimensions of the adversity quotient: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. It is worth noting that the mean score for both control and ownership are both below average and disclosed as follows: ( $M = 35.76$ ,  $SD = 6.23$ ) and ( $M = 33.10$ ,  $SD = 7.18$ ), while the mean scores for Reach and Endurance are both average and are disclosed as follows: ( $M = 33.36$ ,  $SD = 7.45$ ) and ( $M = 35.96$ ,  $SD = 8.24$ ) respectively. This suggests that in-service special education teachers may require attention or improvement in their perceived levels of control and ownership, potentially impacting their ability to handle adversity in their work. Further research is necessary to fully understand the implications of these findings.

More specifically, the results imply that most of them have an average capacity to see past difficult situations as long-lasting. Most have an average capacity for keeping things in perspective and containing adversity. However, most in-service special education teachers also have less sense of control and perceived ability to influence circumstances, especially when things get complicated. Moreover, most have less personal

accountability for getting involved with, improving, or solving problems.

The result of the study align with those of Wang, Liu, Tee, and Dai (2021), revealing that undergraduate nursing students in Macao exhibit moderate Adversity Quotient (AQ) scores. However, Baog and Cagape (2022) observed that teachers have a below-average level of AQ concerning the Adversity Quotient and Work Commitment. It was noted that individuals with high AQ levels tend to display elevated accomplishment drive, strong endurance, and reach, as well as well-developed interpersonal skills. Conversely, low AQ individuals demonstrate poor work habits, according to Verma, Aggarwal, and Bansal (2017). Tigchelaar and Bekhet (2015) found that company executives, like the respondents in this study, had an average AQ, but with below-average scores in endurance and average scores in control, ownership, and reach dimensions. Their study suggests that AQ can be learned and improved through various self-improvement activities.

Table 3. In-Service Special Education Teachers' Emotional Intelligence

	N	Mean	SD	Qualitative Description
Self-awareness	100	3.99	0.530	High
Managing Emotions	100	3.50	0.528	High
Motivating Oneself	100	3.79	0.521	High
Empathy	100	3.82	0.543	High
Social Skill	100	3.80	0.545	High
Emotional Intelligence	100	3.78	0.533	High

Descriptive statistics were carried out to identify the level of in-service special education teachers' emotional intelligence with the overall population of  $N = 100$  was identified in Table 3. The overall level of in-service special education teachers' emotional intelligence is high ( $M = 3.78.18$ ,  $SD = 0.533$ ). This suggests that most in-service special education teachers have a strong ability to recognize and manage their own emotions and understand and respond effectively to the emotions of others. However, it is essential to note that the standard deviation of 0.533 indicates some variability in emotional intelligence levels among in-service special education teachers. This suggests that while most teachers have high emotional intelligence, some may have lower levels, potentially impacting their ability to manage classroom dynamics and support students' emotional needs effectively.

The table also presents mean scores for five domains of emotional intelligence: Self-awareness, Managing emotions, Motivating Oneself, Empathy, and Social Skills. Similarly, all five domains are at a high level and are disclosed as follows: self-awareness ( $M = 3.99$ ,  $SD = 0.530$ ) with the highest mean, empathy ( $M = 3.82$ ,  $SD = 0.543$ ), social skill ( $M = 3.80$ ,  $SD = 0.545$ ), motivating oneself ( $M = 3.79$ ,  $SD = 0.521$ ), and managing emotions ( $M = 3.50$ ,  $SD = 0.528$ ) with the lowest mean.

The results suggest that in-service special education teachers are highly aware of their emotions and how they may impact their interactions with others. They possess strong abilities to understand and respond to the emotions of others, as well as effectively navigate social situations. It also indicates that in-service special education teachers have strong abilities to set and pursue personal goals and maintain motivation and focus in their work. Moreover, in-service special education teachers may struggle somewhat with regulating their emotions in high-stress situations. Furthermore, the study suggests that in-service special education teachers possess strong emotional intelligence skills that are likely to positively impact their interactions with students and colleagues and their ability to manage their personal and professional lives effectively. However, managing emotions may warrant further attention regarding targeted professional development and teacher support.

The findings of this study align with previous research by Gani & Zain (2014) and Theepa & Selvan (2020), indicating that special education teachers possess exceptionally high levels of emotional intelligence. Emotionally intelligent teachers are recognized as better decision-makers, more moral individuals, superior problem-solvers, effective collaborators, and adept leaders. This study reinforces the idea that emotional competence is crucial for teachers, alongside academic proficiency, to enhance student performance and overall well-being. Additionally, parallels are drawn with studies by Sherer & Adams (2017) in the United States and

Manzano-García and Ayala-Calvo (2013) in Spain, both finding elevated levels of emotional intelligence among special education teachers.

Self-awareness is identified as a critical factor in successful leadership and career development by Carden, Jones & Passmore (2021). It involves understanding one's emotions, as highlighted by Mohan & Prasad (2015). High levels of self-awareness are linked to improved team performance and decision-making, according to Dierdorff & Rubin (2015). Individuals with heightened self-awareness are more likely to be promoted and exhibit effective leadership, as suggested by Axelrod (2012). Success and performance are correlated with self-awareness, as emphasized by Showry & Manasa (2014). However, lacking social skills can pose challenges in navigating social situations, serving as a crucial framework for daily interactions. The possession of these skills influences communication, behavior, and decision-making. Individuals facing difficulties with social skills may encounter challenges both in their professional and personal lives, as noted by Strawhun, O'Connor, Norris & Peterson (2014).

Additionally, the capacity to place oneself in another's shoes or somehow internalize another person's perspective or feelings is a potent communication tool that is frequently underappreciated and misunderstood. According to Larsen (1987), we will get more adept at reading emotions as we become more open to our feelings. Thus, being aware of how others feel is a crucial component of emotional intelligence since it enables us to comprehend what others are going through as if we were experiencing it, Ioannidou & Konstantikaki (2008). Moreover, the lack of drive and unsuccessful outcomes may be indicative of lower intelligence levels, as posited by Bekerman & Zembylas (2018). The connection between motivation and emotional immaturity is highlighted, along with the recognition that achieving meaningful goals involves overcoming obstacles and requires preparedness. While high motivation is valuable, it is noted that it doesn't necessarily imply possession of essential emotional intelligence components such as self-awareness and empathy. Flexibility, adaptability, and preparedness are underscored as crucial for overcoming setbacks, as emphasized by Mallory (2018).

Table 4. Test of Relationship between In-Service Special Education Teachers' Adversity Quotient and Emotional Intelligence

		Emotional Intelligence
	Pearson Correlation	.340**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
Adversity Quotient	N	100

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 encapsulates the association of adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers. The results of the correlation analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between the adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers ( $r = .340$ ,  $p = .001$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. These findings indicate a statistically significant relationship between this population's adversity quotient and emotional intelligence. The study found evidence that as the adversity quotient of in-service special education teachers increases, their emotional intelligence also tends to increase. This implies that special education teachers who are more resilient and capable of handling difficulties and adversity may also possess stronger emotional intelligence skills. These findings have important implications for teacher training and professional development programs to improve special education teachers' emotional intelligence and resilience to better support students with diverse needs.

Emotional intelligence is the ability to comprehend and manage one's emotions and recognize and respond to the emotions of others. This skill is critical for success in both personal and professional domains. Thus, it plays a significant role in social integration and communication, shaping one's identity and outlook on the life of in-service special education teachers. Safina et al. (2020) emphasize the importance of emotional intelligence for effective integration into society's social life, professional success, and self-identity development. Cando and Villacastin (2014) also suggest that emotional intelligence can develop over time and improve one's coping mechanisms and overall well-being, leading to greater success in all areas of life.

On the other hand, Verma, Aggarwal, and Bansal (2017) propose that Adversity Quotient (AQ) is a reliable measure of an individual's success, risk-taking, adaptability, perseverance, and overall performance. It

highlights a person's ability to overcome obstacles, indicating resilience and perseverance. A high AQ is linked to success, self-worth, tenacity, inventiveness, honesty, optimism, and emotional stability. Additionally, it can aid in assessing academic difficulties and improve through empathy, sympathy, and understanding of others' emotions.

Similar to the result of this study, studies have shown a positive correlation between AQ and EI among special education teachers, and both skills are significant predictors of job satisfaction and burnout. Kamaluddin et al. (2020) found a positive correlation between AQ and EI among special education teachers in Malaysia. Han and Hyun (2018) also found that AQ and EI were positively correlated among special education teachers in South Korea. Additionally, Tsouloupas et al. (2010) found that both AQ and EI were significant predictors of job satisfaction and burnout among special education teachers in the United States.

Developing AQ and EI skills can enhance in-service special education teachers' ability to cope with challenges and manage emotions effectively, leading to increased engagement in the classroom. Abiodullah et al. (2020) discovered that teachers with high emotional intelligence were more engaged in the classroom. To boost teachers' involvement in the classroom, the government is advised to hire teachers with a high degree of emotional intelligence.

Additionally, the relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Adversity Quotient (AQ) is examined, revealing that higher levels of EI contribute to better management of emotional demands during stressful situations. Armstrong, Galligan, and Critchley (2011) suggest that EI and AQ may be inherently connected, enabling emotionally intelligent behavior under stress. Magnano, Craparo, and Paolillo (2016) and Bacorro (2022) reference Salovey, Bedell, Detweiler, and Mayer's research, emphasizing that individuals with higher EI can accurately perceive and appraise emotions, control mood states, and express sentiments appropriately, facilitating effective coping in stressful situations.

Furthermore, this study implies that emotional intelligence skills can be developed and strengthened through targeted interventions to improve resilience and coping abilities. This has important implications for teacher training and professional development programs, as they can incorporate strategies to enhance emotional intelligence and resilience in special education teachers. These interventions may include workshops and training sessions focusing on stress management, self-awareness, self-regulation, empathy, and social skills. By equipping special education teachers with these skills, they may be better able to support students with diverse needs, promote positive student-teacher relationships, and create a more inclusive learning environment.

Table 5. Test of Difference in the Level of In-Service Special Education Teachers' Adversity Quotient and Emotional Intelligence by Sex

	Sex	N	Mean	t-value	p-value
Adversity Quotient	Male	9	150.44	1.507	.031
	Female	91	136.97		
Emotional Intelligence	Male	9	3.77	-.084	.375
	Female	91	3.79		

Table 5 highlights the test of difference in the levels of adversity quotient and emotional intelligence in terms of sex. It was hypothesized that there is no significant difference in in-service special education teachers' adversity quotient and emotional intelligence when analyzed according to sex. An independent sample t-test was conducted to test this hypothesis. The result reveals that there is a statistically significant difference in the adversity quotient of in-service special education teachers when analyzed to sex ( $p = .031$ ;  $t = 1.507$ ), where males have a significantly higher level than females and statistically not significantly for emotional intelligence ( $p = .375$ ;  $t = -0.84$ ). This implies that there may be inherent differences between males and females regarding their ability to cope with and handle adversity in the workplace. However, this does not necessarily translate to differences in emotional intelligence. It is significant to emphasize that this outcome is based on statistical analysis and may not necessarily reflect individual experiences or capabilities. It may be helpful for schools to consider these differences when developing training and support programs for their teachers.

Stoltz (2002) stressed that sex has dramatically varied capacities in reaction to challenging circumstances. The research by Liu (2011) supports the present investigations and found a significant variation in AQ between the sexes. However, it was discovered by Zubaidah et al. (2017) that there was no correlation between the students' sex and their adversity quotient among 138 boarders in Pekanbaru, Indonesia. Shen and Ven (2014) discovered that sex had no appreciable impact on workers' adversity quotients. Moreover, Hema and Gupta (2015) reported that there was no discernible difference between male and females AQ levels; additionally, this was corroborated by Ablana (2016), Nikam and Uplane (2013), and Huijan's results, which were all of a similar nature (2009).

Moreover, this study's result is supported by the study of Al-Bawaliz et al. (2015). They study the emotional intelligence of special education teachers in Jordan, how it relates to burnout, and how this connection varies by educational background, work experience, and gender. The results demonstrated no statistically significant differences in the level of emotional intelligence according to sex. However, the study by Gani & Zain (2014) examined the emotional quotient (EI) of 141 special education teachers in Seberang Prai Tengah, Penang. Their findings showed that special education teachers had exceptionally high EI levels. Likewise, findings showed sizable gender-based variations in EI among special education teachers.

Table 6. Test of Difference in the Level of In-Service Special Education Teachers' Adversity Quotient and Emotional Intelligence by Age and Years in Service.

		N	Mean	F-value	p-value
Adversity Quotient	Age			.991	.400
	30 below	39	143.0769		
	31-40 years old	43	135.8605		
	41-50 years old	15	135.0667		
	51 above	3	123.3333		
	Years in Service			.537	.658
	5 years below	36	136.7778		
	6-10 years	47	140.8511		
Emotional Intelligence	11-20 years	14	135.8571		
	21 years above	3	124.0000		
	Age			2.337	.078
	30 below	39	3.9313		
	31-40 years old	43	3.6986		
	41-50 years old	15	3.6293		
	51 above	3	3.7867		
	Years in Service			1.365	.258
5 years below	36	3.9089			
6-10 years	47	3.7081			
11-20 years	14	3.7143			
21 years above	3	3.7200			

Table 6 displays the results of a test of difference in the adversity quotient and emotional intelligence of in-service special education teachers based on their age and years in service. The table shows the number of respondents in each age and the years in service group, the mean scores for adversity quotient and emotional intelligence, and the F-value and p-value for the test of difference. To test the hypothesis, one-way ANOVA was conducted. It reveals that there was no significant difference in mean scores across age groups and years in service groups both for adversity quotient and emotional intelligence ( $F = .991$ ,  $p = .400$ ), ( $F = .537$ ,  $p = .658$ ), ( $F = 2.337$ ,  $p = .078$ ), ( $F = 1.365$ ,  $p = .258$ ). This implies that no evidence suggests that age or years in service significantly impact either adversity quotient or emotional intelligence scores, as indicated by the non-

significant F-values and p-values. This suggests that these two factors may not play a significant role in developing or maintaining these traits of in-service special education teachers.

The present investigation's findings are consistent with other studies conducted on special education and public school teachers. Gani & Zain (2014) found that age and experience were not significantly correlated to the adversity quotient of 141 special education teachers in Seberang Prai Tengah, Penang. Additionally, this was the outcome of the research of Baog & Cagape (2022), where they found that age and years in service of public-school teachers were not significantly correlated with adversity quotient. On the other hand, Al-Bawaliz et al. (2015) studied the emotional intelligence of special education teachers in Jordan. They found that there were no statistically significant differences in the emotional intelligence of teachers according to the factors of age and experience. This suggests these factors may not be strong determinants of adversity quotient and emotional intelligence in teaching professionals. However, exploring other factors that may impact these traits is essential to gain a deeper understanding.

#### 4. Conclusion

This research study investigated the relationship between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence among in-service special education teachers and the significant differences between these variables based on demographic factors. The research was conducted using non-experimental quantitative research methods involving adapted and modified survey questionnaires to address the research objectives. The findings indicated a positive correlation between adversity quotient and emotional intelligence among in-service special education teachers, suggesting that teachers with greater resilience and coping skills tend to have higher emotional intelligence. Additionally, the study identified a significant difference in adversity quotient between male and female teachers, suggesting inherent differences between genders in coping with adversity in the workplace. However, these differences did not translate into disparities in emotional intelligence between the genders. These findings have important implications for teacher training and professional development programs to enhance in-service special education teachers' emotional intelligence and resilience. These can be leveraged to provide better support for students with diverse needs. Consequently, these results highlight the need for schools to recognize gender differences and tailor their training and support programs to cater to diverse needs.

#### 5. Acknowledgements

The authors wish to express sincere gratitude to the teacher-repondents of this research from the Department of Education.

#### References

- Baog, I. W., & Cagape, W. E. (2022). Adversity Quotient and Work Commitment among Public Secondary School Teachers in Davao City. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 29(2), 25-45. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2022/v29i230695>
- Bekerman and Zembylas, (2018). Emotion, Emotional Intelligence, and Motivation. *Psychologized Language in Education* (pp.67-78). DOI:10.1057/978-1-137-54937-2\_8
- Borilla, W. (2022). ADVERSITY QUOTIENT® AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF SELECTED PUBLIC-SCHOOL SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS AMIDST THE PANDEMIC.
- Cando and Villacastin (2014). The Relationship Between Adversity Quotient (AQ) and Emotional Quotient (EQ) and Teaching Performance of College PE Faculty Members of CIT University. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)* 18(2):345-367
- Carden, J., Jones, R. J. (2021). Defining self-awareness in the context of adult development: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Management Education*. ISSN 1052-5629 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562921990065>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2019). *How to design and evaluate education research* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Han, S., & Hyun, E. (2018). The effects of emotional intelligence and adversity quotient on emotional labor among special education teachers. *Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 18(11), 1285-1306.
- Hwang, H., Lim, J., Ha, J., & Lee, Y. (2015). Development of adversity quotient of special education teachers. *Journal of Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction*, 15(1), 363-383.

- Ioannidou & Konstantikaki (2008). Empathy and emotional intelligence: What is it really about? *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 1(3):118–123
- Kamaluddin, M. R., Baharudin, N. F., Omar, N. F. H., Abdullah, S. S. S., & Isa, N. A. M. (2020). Adversity quotient and emotional intelligence as predictors of job satisfaction among special education teachers in Malaysia. *International Journal of Special Education*, 35(3), 748-761.
- Kline, R. B. (2016). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
- Krichevets, A., Savchenko, T., & Tabakova, L. (2017). Adversity quotient of teachers: Comparative analysis of special and general education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 7(4), 27-31.
- Kumbanaruk, T.; and Maetheepokul, T. (2008). Adversity Quotient (AQ), Emotional Quotient (EQ), and personality of Chinese businesspeople in Thailand and Chinese businesspeople in China. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Leadership Toolkit, (2014). Emotional intelligence questionnaire. [ebook] London: NHS, pp.1–4. Available at: <[http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/26776/1/Emotional\\_intelligence\\_questionnaire-LAL1.pdf](http://www.drugsandalcohol.ie/26776/1/Emotional_intelligence_questionnaire-LAL1.pdf)>
- Lishner, Stocks, & Steinert (2017). *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences* (pp.1–8). DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8\_513-1
- Mallory, A. (2018). Emotional Intelligence: Self-Motivation. *New Heights in Human Performance & Leadership*. <https://alanmallory.com/2018/02/emotional-intelligence-self-motivation/>
- Manzano-García, G., & Ayala-Calvo, J. C. (2013). Emotional intelligence in teachers: The relationship with socio-demographic and professional variables. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 11(1), 221-242.
- Matore & Khairani (2016). Correlation between Adversity Quotient (AQ) with IQ, EQ, and SQ Among Polytechnic Students Using Rasch Model. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, Vol 9(47), DOI: 10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i47/108695
- Mohan and Prasad, (2015). Emotional Intelligence and Self Motivational Factors For Managerial Effectiveness In The Corporate World. *National Monthly Refereed Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*. VOLUME NO.1, ISSUE NO.11 ISSN 2277-1166.
- Mohd, Ahmad, Siti, Nor, and Effa (2018). The Influence of Intellectual Quotient (IQ), Emotional Quotient (EQ), and Spiritual Quotient (SQ) Against Adversity Quotient (AQ) on Polytechnic Students in Malaysia. *Journal of Engineering Science and Technology Special Issue on ICETVESS 2017, February (2018) 83 – 91*. [http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Special%20Issue%20on%20ICETVESS\\_2017/ICETVESS\\_10.pdf](http://jestec.taylors.edu.my/Special%20Issue%20on%20ICETVESS_2017/ICETVESS_10.pdf)
- Morin, A. (2011). Self-Awareness Part 1: Definition, Measures, Effects, Functions, and Antecedents. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 5(10):807 – 823. DOI:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00387.x
- Morse, J. M. (2015). Critical analysis of strategies for determining rigor in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Health Research*, 25(9), 1212–1222. doi: 10.1177/1049732315588501convallis aenean et.
- NHS Fife Department of Psychology, (2016). Emotion Regulation: Managing Emotions. [https://www.moodcafe.co.uk/media/15343/ER\\_handout\\_Final\\_16\\_June\\_2016%20pdf.pdf](https://www.moodcafe.co.uk/media/15343/ER_handout_Final_16_June_2016%20pdf.pdf)
- Randy Larsen et al., “Cognitive Operations Associated With Individual Differences in Affect Intensity,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 53 (1987).
- Sherer, M., & Adams, C. M. (2017). Emotional intelligence and teacher effectiveness: Does it matter for special education teachers? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 44(3), 5–23.
- Strawhun, O., Norris & Peterson, (2014). Social Skills Instruction. Building and Sustaining Student Engagement. [https://k12engagement.unl.edu/strategy-briefs/Social%20Skills%20Instruction%209-22-14\\_1.pdf](https://k12engagement.unl.edu/strategy-briefs/Social%20Skills%20Instruction%209-22-14_1.pdf)
- Tsouloupas, C. N., Carson, R. L., Matthews, R. A., Grawitch, M. J., & Barber, L. K. (2010). Exploring the association between teachers’ perceived student misbehavior and emotional exhaustion: The importance of teacher efficacy beliefs and emotion regulation. *Educational Psychology*, 30(2), 173–189.
- Udoh, U. (2017). Managing your Emotions. *Behavioral Elements of Self Leadership*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319549904\\_Managing\\_your\\_emotions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319549904_Managing_your_emotions)
- Verma, A., Bansal (2017). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EQ) and Adversity Quotient (AQ). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 19, Issue 1. Ver. II (Jan. 2017), PP 49-53
- Wang, L., Tee, & Dai (2021). Analysis of adversity quotient of nursing students in Macao: A cross-section and correlation study. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences* 8(5). DOI:10.1016/j.ijnss.2021.02.003