

Adapted Adversity Quotient Program–Oxymoron or Opportunity? A Study of Special Education Teachers in Raipur, Chhattisgarh

Avichal Sharma¹, Pallavi Pandey^{1*}, Dr K Padmawati²

¹Assistant Professor, Chandigarh University, Punjab, India

²Assistant Professor, Govt. V Y T PG Autonomous College, Durg, India

DOI: [10.36347/sjahss.2022.v10i12.001](https://doi.org/10.36347/sjahss.2022.v10i12.001)

| Received: 24.10.2022 | Accepted: 05.12.2022 | Published: 10.12.2022

*Corresponding author: Pallavi Pandey

Assistant Professor, Chandigarh University, Punjab, India

Abstract

Original Research Article

It is commonly believed that some types of schools, such as those catering to special children, are difficult or problematic places to work (Pratt cited in Nguyen, 2002). Freeman (1988) made the observation that in order to properly care for children who have particular requirements, teachers need to fulfil not only the duty of an educator but also that of a nurse and a parent. Because of this, teachers of special education are more likely to experience burnout and stress (Freeman, 1988). It is necessary to improve special education teachers' capacity to persevere in the face of adversity because they are always facing new obstacles in their work. Therefore, it is essential to have an understanding of one's adversity quotient (AQ). The capacity to persevere in the face of adversity is a crucial component in determining one's quality of life. The findings showed that individuals with a high AQ fared better than those with a low AQ (Stoltz, 1997). In order to raise the adversity quotient (AQ) of the special education teachers working at a special education school in Raipur (Chhattisgarh), three industry professionals designed and tested an Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program. The post- test scores dramatically improved to a level that was considered to be reasonably high after the AQ Program that had been established was put into action. For the purpose of determining their AQ, the Adversity Response Profile Quick Take (Stoltz, 1997) was utilized. In the United States, the Maricopa School District in Arizona implemented a programme called AQ to encourage educators "to achieve more with less." The findings of this study suggest that the adversity quotient could be incorporated into faculty development programmes in order to help special education teachers become more resilient and capable members of the labor force.

Keywords: Adversity Quotient, Special Education Teachers, Program Development, Special Children, Modular Program.

Copyright © 2022 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Those who work in special education face a never-ending stream of obstacles in their daily lives. They have obligations at home as a son or daughter, brother or sister, and/or as a parent, in addition to the activities and tasks related to their personalized education programmes and the administrative work associated with those programmes. In this context, it is essential to have an understanding of one's capacity to persevere in the face of adversity. Therefore, this is the point in one's life where the adversity quotient, also known as the capacity to remain resilient in the face of adversity, plays a crucial role.

The findings showed that individuals with a high AQ fared better than those with a low AQ (Stoltz, 1997). The vast majority of research on the adversity

quotient has been carried out on athletes and salespeople (see Stoltz, 1997). This study has the potential to serve as an introductory piece of research that prepares the way for future investigations into the adversity quotient (AQ) of special education instructors. This study was carried out in order to determine the effectiveness of the program.

Special Education Teachers

There is a correlation between the sort of school a teacher works in and their level of stress, and this holds true for those who work in special education. The vast majority of this research has focused on how special education teachers affect their students (Pratt cited in Nguyen, 2002). Litt and Turk (1985) say that teacher stress is the feeling of unpleasant, negative emotions and anxiety that teachers have when the

problems they face endanger their health and go beyond their ability to deal with them. According to Freeman (1988), while working with students who have special needs, educators must assume not only the position of educator but also that of nurse and parent. It's obvious that the students' unique requirements are posing a significant difficulty for the school's faculty. These educators also struggle with communicating with other professionals and engaging parents.

According to Woods (1989), a stressful situation is created when a teacher's individual interests, commitments, or resources push against one or more of the other elements. He contended that stressed-out educators are the ones who are on the verge of a nervous breakdown because they have exhausted all of their reserves. He went on to say that stress in the classroom is caused by the tension between many different things. This is because it creates a unique challenge that is hard to solve without relying heavily on the teacher's own resources (Nguyen, 2002). Nattrass (1991) claims that stress is educators' leading health issue. There has been much research attempting to uncover the root of the problem and its symptoms, but the findings have often been contradictory. The many approaches taken to the study of teacher stress and the fact that educators' reluctance to open up about their own stress levels for fear of repercussions makes this a challenging topic to investigate (Travers & Cooper, 1996). According to Watson and Grossman (1994), faculty development is crucial to advancing the academic community because it encourages individuals to realize their full potential as learners and as agents of the academy's mission. There are many different ways to define faculty development, but they all have the goal of improving the quality of faculty teaching and research (Heppner & Johnson, 1994). According to Nathan (1994), faculty development programmes at American institutions are no longer a supplementary perk for teachers.

According to Wilkerson and Irby (1998), it is a method for bolstering universities' educational vitality by focusing on educators' professional development and the institutional policies necessary to foster scholastic distinction. Human capital is an element of a university's total capital assets, and Daigle and Jarmon (1997) argue that faculty development is a crucial aspect of both creating and preserving this capital. Faculty development is a growing and changing idea, according to Hitchcock and Stritter (1992). At first, the term "faculty development" only meant helping teachers do better in the classroom. Now, it covers a much wider range of activities. According to the final report of the Commission on Faculty Development and Vocations, "faculty vitality, both from the perspective of professional expertise and from the perspective of enthusiasm and engagement, is a sine qua non of a successful institution."

The faculty member's role as a scholar and professional is another common theme in such initiatives. These courses help professors hone their abilities in areas including career planning, grant writing, publishing, committee work, administration, supervision, and a host of other areas where they are expected to be actively engaged. Programs designed to improve faculty members also pay attention to the individuals involved. There are a wide variety of courses that aim to improve people's health and happiness, such as courses on stress and time management, developing confidence and assertiveness, and so on (POD, 2003).

The Stoltz Adversity Quotient was used to characterize the special education instructors in Raipur, Chhattisgarh who are employed by a special education school in the city (AQ). Stoltz claims that a person's level of AQ is the deciding factor in whether or not they will be successful in their careers and in life. Stoltz (1997) observed that college and university education majors tend to fall on the bottom end of the AQ spectrum. Because of this, the researcher thought it was important to provide an AQ description of special education teachers.

CO₂RE QUOTIENT Dimensions of Adversity

The Adversity Quotient is comprised of four components: CO₂RE (control, origin and ownership, reach, and endurance). To improve one's AQ as a whole, one must focus on the areas highlighted by these dimensions. Below (1997) are definitions and interpretations of these dimensions based on the work of Stoltz. This scale assesses how much influence an individual feels they have over challenging situations (Stoltz, 1997). It's a reliable indicator of health and toughness (www.peaklearning.com). People with higher AQs have a more positive outlook on their ability to influence the outcomes of everyday situations. This leads to their being more proactive, which ultimately gives them more authority.

The History of Who Owns It There are two questions that should be asked along this dimension, as stated by Stoltz (1997). If you were to guess who or what brought about the difficulty, what would you guess? To what extent am I responsible for the consequences of my difficulties? Someone with a low origin score is more prone to placing blame on themselves in a non-productive manner. However, if one has a high origin score, they are more likely to look beyond themselves to find the root of the problem. A person's sense of ownership reflects the degree to which they believe they are responsible for making changes that will lead to better outcomes. It's an excellent predictor of responsibility and initiative (www.peaklearning.com). A higher ownership score indicates that the person feels more responsible for the outcome, even if outside factors contributed to it. The lower someone's ownership score, the more they deny

responsibility for the consequences of their actions. It's a measure of how far people think things will spread. It's an excellent indicator of perspective, weight, and tension (www.peaklearning.com). When considering this factor, one must wonder: "How far will the difficulties spread into other parts of my life?" When a person's AQ is low, the effects of hardship spread to other areas of their lives.

There is a correlation between a low R score and exaggerated reactions to negative experiences. The converse is also true; a higher R score suggests that the issue at hand can be more narrowly focused. People with a high R score are better able to keep the effects of hardship within manageable limits. This gives them a sense of agency and control instead of feeling helpless and hopeless (Stoltz, 1997). Endurance According to Stoltz (1997), this refers to the length of time one believes positive or negative events and their repercussions will continue to exist. A high level of optimism or hope (www.peaklearning.com). It poses two questions that are closely related to one another: For how long will we have to endure this difficulty? For how long do you anticipate the underlying conditions that have precipitated this difficulty will persist? Those who score highly on this factor are more likely to think of their achievements as long-lasting. It's possible; too, that he or she views difficulty and its origins as transient and unimportant. But people with a high AQ see problems as temporary, while people with a low AQ tend to see problems as permanent (Stoltz, 1997).

According to the LEAD Sequence proposed by Stoltz (1997), You can assist people to make lasting gains in their AQs by (1) listening to their adversity reaction, (2) investigating all possible causes, (3) analyzing the data, and (4) taking action. The LEAD order is based on the studies of several prominent cognitive psychology scholars. Stoltz (1997) pointed out the link to attributional retraining, a type of therapy that helps people figure out, evaluate, and argue about how they react to different things in life.

Core Concepts of Modular Programming and Program Development

Borromeo (2004, referenced in Borromeo, 2005) proposes a four-step procedure for developing a programme: (1) a situational analysis; (2) a prioritization and identification of areas of concern; (3) the construction of a programme; and (4) an evaluation of the program's effectiveness. A comprehensive situational analysis includes gathering information on the current state of the programme as well as the demands of the intended audience. By analyzing the findings of the situational analysis, it will be possible to determine which needs are most pressing and therefore must be addressed by the proposed programme. The programme can be shaped around these top concerns and needs. Program implementation and evaluation are the next steps.

Modularization, as defined by Wolff, S. J., & Copa, G. H. (2003), is the practice of breaking down course content into smaller, more manageable chunks that may be tailored to individual students' needs rather than being constrained by the constraints of a set curriculum or semester schedule.

Each module is a self-contained learning unit that is either self-paced or instructor-led and is based on the completion of a predetermined set of skills or learning outcomes. The creation of learning modules increases both accessibility and adaptability to learning, evaluation, and certification. The modules can be taken independently, with no need for students to take other modules before or after them. It's possible to study modules anywhere (e.g., at work, at home, or in school). Furthermore, modularization necessitates and enforces a higher degree of individual responsibility for learning and self-monitoring. Since modules allow for greater customization of programmes to individual requirements and schedules, they are more attractive to high-ability students who can work independently and do not social learners want a group experience. All of the people taking part in this study are special education teachers. They can work through the course at their own pace and repeat only the modules they need to if they need to.

Using the collected data, it was determined that the adversity quotient (AQ) of the educators working with students who require special education was somewhat low (77). This finding informed the creation of the Adversity Quotient Program, whose stated goal was to raise participants' Adversity Quotient. Since special education teachers sometimes have to make do with few resources, they often say they could benefit from a curriculum that helps them grow personally so they can better deal with the inevitable difficulties that arise. "Faculty vitality, both from the perspective of professional expertise and the perspective of enthusiasm and involvement, is a sine qua non of a successful university," as stated by the Ohio State University Commission on Faculty Development (1999). According to this study (<http://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/445320/index.pdf>), training and educating professors is crucial to the growth and preservation of a country's human capital. Personal growth for faculty members is a major objective of faculty development programmes (Professional and Organizational Development, 2003). Included in the realm of personal development are courses that focus on the student's overall health and happiness. Investing in faculty development can pay off well, so it's important to make programmes that work well (Hitchcock & Stritter, 1992).

There is an increasing need to fortify the resilience of special education instructors as they face ever more complex problems in the field. This highlights the need to know one's AQ, or 'adversity

quotient. One's resilience is a crucial factor in determining their quality of life. Staff at Maricopa Community College in Arizona, USA, was trained using AQ so that they could better meet the "do more with less" challenges of today's businesses. When applied, AQ can fortify a person's capacity to persist in the face of adversity (Stoltz, 1997). The AQ training programme was also employed in a rapidly expanding school system to assist educators build the fortitude necessary to impart meaningful education (Stoltz, 1997). In this action research, special education instructors' Adversity Quotients (AQs) were measured, and a subsequent AQ programme was designed and tested.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

In terms of research methodology, this study employed a descriptive developmental approach. The goal of the study was to see how well the Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program worked at a school for children with special needs in Raipur, India. Triangulation, or the use of numerous sources and techniques to gather information, was employed.

This was accomplished through the following means and references:

1. Focus group session.
2. Face to Face interaction with the school Director.
3. Adversity Response Profile Quick Take (1997).

Participants

This school for students with special needs employs four (4) special education teachers. The real names of these people who work in special education have been hidden by using pseudonyms.

Instruments

The researcher compiled a list of guide questions and used them to collect data during a focus group session. The teachers' unique areas for professional growth were pinpointed using this set of guide questions. The guide questions were pilot tested on three (3) special education teachers from different schools who were not included in the final sample for the study. During the practice test, the researcher asked the special education teachers if they understood what was being asked of them. Teachers with expertise in special education identified several questions that, in their opinion, could have benefited from some wording adjustments. Focus group facilitators reworded the list of guide questions to elicit more detailed responses from participants during the actual session. It was decided to talk to the school's director one-on-one to find out what kinds of professional and personal growth opportunities they could use. The people who took part were also given a short version of the Adversity

Response Profile (ARP) from 1997. ARAP (Adversity Response Profile) Snapshot in order to assess and understand special education instructors' AQ, the researcher had access to a wealth of data via the ARP Quick Take. The full version of the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) is a self-rating questionnaire used to assess an individual's coping strategy when faced with adversity (Stoltz, 1997). The reliability coefficient of the ARP is .88, making it extremely trustworthy, and it shows no significant differences in dependability between males and females or between different racial and cultural groups (Stoltz, 1997).

All four ARP sub scores (dimensions) were determined to have good reliability when analyzing internal consistency, which is the consistency of replies across all questions within a scale. The internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha, N =837) of the scale scores is as follows: control =.77; ownership =.78; reach =.83; endurance =.86. (www.peaklearning.com). Convergent validity and discriminant validity are the two parts that make up validity. Three validity studies provide evidence that the ARP measures several traits relevant to occupational success and financial well-being. This means that the ARP has strong convergent validity. The second aspect of validity is discriminant validity, which states that two scales on a questionnaire with different names should assess distinct characteristics. The four ARP scales each measure distinct but interrelated facets of AQ. According to Campbell (1960), as reported by www.peaklearning.com, justifying the use of four sub scores requires a lower level of correlation between them than their respective reliabilities. Control and ownership have the strongest association, at .55. The distance between Reach and Endurance is the next highest. Low correlations exist between the other possible scale score combinations. So, the four ARP scales had good discriminant validity because none of the correlations between scale scores were higher than the lowest scale reliability (www.peaklearning.com).

METHODS FOR COLLECTING DATA

Prior to beginning the research, approval to do so was requested from the School Director at the Special Education School. When authorization was finally obtained, the first step in the data collection process was to hold a focus group session with special education teachers using the Focus Group Sample Guide Questions as a basis for the discussion. It was decided to make the atmosphere warm and inviting rather than intimidating. The researcher made the request to be allowed to record the conversation on a tape recorder. On the other hand, the participants declined, which is why notes were taken nevertheless. The researcher made sure to modify, repeat, and clarify or explain the questions as necessary, and then followed up responses with further questions or clarifications based on the objectives of the focus group session. The individual interview with the school director was to be

conducted in the second phase, and it was to be based on the Interview Sample Guide Questions.

Once more, the school director was adamantly opposed to having the interview video-taped; yet, notes were taken. The subsequent step involved the distribution of the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) Quick Take (1997) in order to determine the Adversity Quotient (AQ) of the educators working in special education. The development of the Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program was the following phase after the results of the pre-test of the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) Quick Take (1997) were computed and it was discovered that they were somewhat low. After the development of the Adversity Quotient (AQ) self-learning modular programme was finished and its content validated, the next step was to distribute the generated AQ modular programme to the participants. Following a month's wait, the post-test was finally carried out. The researcher could tell if the intervention was helpful or not by comparing the results of the pre-test to the post-test.

Data Analysis

The special education teachers at the special school were characterized in terms of their adversity quotient through the utilization of qualitative analysis, which was performed on the data (AQ). For the purpose of calculating the adversity quotient of the educators working in special education, descriptive statistics were utilized. To be able to provide a basis for describing special education teachers in terms of (1) control, (2) origin & ownership, (3) reach, and (4) endurance, mean scores were computed for each CO₂RE dimension (control, origin & ownership, reach, and endurance) of AQ.

These dimensions are control, origin & ownership, reach, and endurance. When calculating the special education instructors' overall AQ, the average or

mean score on each CO₂RE dimension was summed up and then taken into account. For the purpose of providing a foundation for describing the AQ of special education teachers, the mean AQ of the participants was calculated. Before and after being exposed to the intervention, the special education instructors at the special school had their AQ measured or observed. This was done both before and after the intervention. The researcher was able to assess whether or not the intervention was successful by comparing the results of the pretest and posttest that were administered before and after the intervention.

The difference between the participants' pre-test and post-test average scores was used as an indicator of the participants' AQ variance before and after the development of the AQ Program. The participants' average pre-test and post-test scores were used as indicators of the participants' AQ before and after the development of the AQ Program. The test of the significance of the difference between means was utilized in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the difference's level of importance. One-way repeated measures and item analysis, also known as t-test for dependent samples, were the statistical methods that were applied (if 2 levels). A t-test of dependent and correlated means was used to determine whether or not there was a significant difference in the means of two sets of correlated scores. This allowed for the determination of whether or not such a difference exists.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS' ADVERSITY QUOTIENT (AQ)

Participants were asked to fill out the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) (1997). Table 1 shows individual and group goals: The AQ of special education teachers is how well they deal with problems.

Table 1

Participant	Control	Origin & Ownership	Reach	Endurance	Overall AQ
1	22 low end	20 low end	23 mid-range	20 low end	85 moderately low
2	15 low end	22 low end	6 low-end	20 low end	63 moderately low
3	17 low end	16 low end	9 low-end	17 low end	59 low end
4	18 low end	22 low end	26 mid-range	23 mid-range	89 moderately low
Average	18 low end	20 low end	16 low-end	20 low end	74 moderately low

According to the information gathered, the adversity quotient (AQ) of instructors working in special education is, on average, moderately low (74). According to Stoltz (1997), those who have a fairly low adversity quotient (AQ) are likely not living up to their full potential because they are not facing enough adversity in their lives. It's possible that those who take part will come away feeling despondent and helpless. If they were to improve their AQ, they would be able to escape this predicament.

To acquire a comprehensive understanding of one's AQ, it is necessary to examine the CO₂RE (Control, Origin & Ownership, Reach, and Endurance) dimensions in greater depth (Stoltz, 1997). The researcher discovered that the participants' average score on the control dimension was 18, which was considered to be on the lower end of the scale. According to Stoltz's (1997) assessment, those with low scores are more prone to believe that events are beyond

their control and that there is little, if anything, they can do to prevent them or mitigate the impact they have (external locus of control). People who have low perceived control over their environment may believe that they have very little ability to affect the course of events. Stoltz (1997) stated that people who don't believe they have a lot of control over their lives frequently feel helpless whenever something negative occurs in their lives. Because of this, it will be difficult for them to advance. In the most extreme examples, this might result in a pessimistic and resigned perspective on life.

Scores at the bottom of the scale may indicate a perilous vulnerability to adversity, making it more probable that a person's performance, energy, and spirit may be negatively affected by it. The lower a person's score is on this dimension, the greater the likelihood that the everyday highs and lows of life will wear them down more than they should. The information that was gathered from the interview with the school director as well as the focus group that was conducted with the special education teachers revealed that they do feel the stress of their work as well as the financial troubles that come along with it. In addition, those who teach special education have the impression that they are unable to change the circumstances that cause them stress. A person can believe they have little ability to affect the issue if they have a low perceived level of control over it (Stoltz, 1997). The participants' average score on the second section of the Adversity Quotient (AQ), which assessed their understanding of where something originated and who was responsible for it, was 20. This was on the lower end of the spectrum. According to Stoltz (1997), those who scored low are more likely to blame themselves for negative outcomes and attribute positive outcomes to random acts of luck or to factors that are external to themselves. Stoltz (1997) mentioned that if you assume that negative things happen to you because of you, it might be detrimental to your level of stress, your ego, and your motivation. They may also attempt to deflect responsibility away from themselves in order to avoid the obligation of working to find a solution to the issue. The individuals who took part in the interview as well as the focus group all concurred that these findings are accurate. The individuals who took part in the study stated that they are in an emotionally depleted state, and as a result, they are in need of personal development programmes that will motivate them and remind them why they chose to become teachers.

This is consistent with what Stoltz discovered in 1997, which was that a low score on this dimension might have a negative impact on a person's level of stress as well as their ego and their motivation. This lends credence to Freeman's (1988) assertion that educators of children who have special needs must not only play the role of a teacher but also that of a nurse and a mother, which is why they frequently become

exhausted by their work. When it came to the reach portion of the AQ exam, the average score (16) of the people who took it was on the lower end of the scale. According to the way that Stoltz's (1997) research is understood, a low score indicates that the individuals who took the exam believe that their difficulties are affecting other aspects of their lives. According to Stoltz (1997), allowing one's troubles to spread to other aspects of their lives can make them feel like much more of a burden and require much more effort to fix than they would otherwise. It is noteworthy to note that two people scored in the middle and two people scored in the bottom tier of the results. Both of the individuals who received low marks are parents, which make it challenging for them to find a balance between their professional and personal responsibilities.

This is consistent with what Woods (1989) says about how a potentially stressful situation can be created when a teacher's personal interests, commitments, or resources are not only out of sync with one or more of the other factors, but also work against them. Woods describes how this can lead to a situation in which the teacher feels pressured to choose between their students and their own needs. The final two people are located smack dab in the middle of the group. Arnold and Feldman's research, which was cited in Bautista's study in 1998, found that how one reacts to stress determines whether it will be perceived as a source of distress or a source of satisfaction (eustress). The average score on the reach dimension among special education instructors is low, which indicates that they allow their personal difficulties to affect their work and/or vice versa. This is the case since the overall score is low. This is supported by Woods's (1989) finding that teacher stress occurs when things rub against each other and create a unique kind of problem that puts too much pressure on a teacher's personal resources. Woods's (1989) finding that teacher stress occurs when things rub against each other and create a special kind of problem that puts too much pressure on a (cited in Nguyen, 2002).

A score of 20 was determined to be the norm for the fourth criterion, which was endurance. This was on the lower end of the spectrum. According to Stoltz (1997), a low score indicates that the participants who took the exam believe that adversity is something that continues over time. This may sometimes prevent individuals from doing something that might be beneficial.

The narrative of the individual who received the highest score (26 in the mid-range) demonstrated that he probably does an excellent job of maintaining his faith and persevering in spite of mild to moderate obstacles, as shown by the score he received. In the interview, he stated that there were times when he felt incredibly depressed and wanted to quit, but that he couldn't because he couldn't let his friends or co-

teachers down. He claimed that he couldn't let them down because he couldn't let them down. This provided him with the drive to carry on nonetheless. This is consistent with what Brown and Ralph (1994) said, which is that everyone experiences stress in their own unique way. They claimed each person experiences stress differently. It's possible that something (like a problem) that's challenging for one instructor could not be challenging for another, or vice versa. The overall score for this criterion is at the lower end of the scale. The responses of the special education instructors in the focus group indicate that they believe their financial difficulties have existed for a considerable amount of time and appear to be an ongoing issue.

The finding by Stoltz (1977) that individuals who have poor scores on the endurance dimension believe that problems continue for a long period is consistent with this. According to the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) Quick Take (1997), those who work in special education have a level of resilience that falls somewhere between moderate and poor (AQ). Consequently, this indicates that the individuals are not realising their full potential in any way. The researcher believes that this is intriguing because it supports what Stoltz discovered, which is that education majors in colleges and universities had the lowest AQ scores (www.executiveforum.net). On the Adversity Response Profile, Stoltz mentioned at the Executive Forum Series that took place in 2000 that the AQ scores of those actively participating in the labour field can range anywhere from 40 to 200. The typical AQ score for a person living anywhere in the world is 144. The self-learning Adversity Quotient (AQ) modular programme was developed and put through its paces after the findings of the Adversity Response Profile Quick Take (1997) were analysed. The majority of individuals who work in special education are under the impression that the programmes that foster their professional development should also foster their personal development. They believe that the school's faculty development initiatives focus more on professional than personal growth. In addition, based on the findings of the focus group session with the teachers of special education and the interview with the director of the school, the participants have proposed a personal development programme that would make them feel more motivated and would strengthen their sense of purpose in teaching. This school for students who have special needs has a limited budget, so the school director is continuously encouraging the faculty and staff to "do more with less."

This outcome is consistent with Scott's (1990) assertion that faculty development goes beyond instruction. According to him, the idea and practise of faculty development entails assisting educators in performing better in a variety of facets of their jobs, including intellectual, institutional, personal, social, and pedagogical responsibilities. According to this

definition, it is abundantly evident that faculty development encompasses every aspect of a person's personality and involves all of that person's components. The growth of the faculty is an essential component in the process of fostering academic excellence and innovative ideas. Steinert (2000) says that the academic strength of a school is directly linked to how interested and knowledgeable its teachers are.

Additionally, Watson and Grossman (1994) mentioned that faculty development contributes to the improvement of the academy by assisting individuals in their personal growth as well as their growth as people who contribute to the mission of the academy. Because special education teachers don't have much free time, there isn't enough money for materials, equipment, or allowances for special education teachers, and there isn't much room in the school. These factors all work together to make it difficult to provide adequate training or staff development. Because the institution does not currently have a lot of money, there is not a lot of money that can be spent on teacher training or the equipment and resources that may be required for activities of this nature. This is consistent with Gonzalez's assertion that a lack of funding results in a lack of resources for facilities, services, staff training, and teaching materials (cited in Manila Bulletin, 2002). A self-learning Adversity Quotient (AQ) modular programme was developed, tested, and reviewed after being informed by the information that was acquired and by what the respondents stated they required.

Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program Development

Stoltz's (1997) work on the Adversity Quotient served as the organizing principle for the program's structure and presentation. Content validation was performed on the programme that was produced for special education instructors by three individuals who are knowledgeable about the Adversity Quotient (AQ). Santos, (2012). The third individual is a Professor at the Government University in Durg, Chhattisgarh. He has a Doctor of Philosophy in Arts and is the Regional Head of Special Olympics Bharat, which is an organization that assists differently abled athletes. The other two individuals are graduate students at Amity University Chhattisgarh and Durg University, both located in Chhattisgarh. The validity of the Adversity Quotient programme that was designed was evaluated by these three, as was the arrangement of each module and its overall quality. The Adversity Quotient (AQ) self-learning modular programme is separated into 5 different modules, and the overall title of the programme is Adversity Quotient: Turning Struggles into Success.

The participants would study one module each week, with the exception of Modules 1 and 2, which are quite short and don't require as much reading time because of their simplicity. The five most important aspects of the programme are as follows: (1) the CORE

Human Drive; (2) the Three Adversity Levels; (3) the AQ Building Blocks; (4) the CO2RE Dimensions; and (5) the LEAD Sequence A motivational question or statement is presented at the beginning of each module, followed by reading input, a comprehension check, a personal application, a reinforcement activity, and an assignment. The resilience of those who teach special education is intended to be improved as a direct result of participation in the programme (an ability to recover from or adjust easily to change or misfortune). The goal of this project is to raise the Adversity Quotient (AQ) of special education teachers in one (1) month.

Adversity Quotient (AQ) after the Implementation of the AQ Programme Deelopment

Special education teachers were given a post-exam after implementing the newly created Adversity

Quotient (AQ) programme. As demonstrated by their performance on the post-test, teachers specializing in the instruction of students with special needs have significantly raised their overall quotients. Before the Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program was developed, the AQ of special education teachers was somewhat low (74). Results from a post-implementation test showed that the created programme was moderately effective (147). To check for statistical significance between the means of two sets of associated scores, we employed the t-test for dependent samples.

Means (both individual and group) are shown in Table 2. Adversity Quotients (AQs) of special education teachers after they used a newly made AQ Program to deal with hard times. Reference: Santos, (2012).

Table 2

Participant	Control	Origin & Ownership	Reach	Endurance	Overall AQ
1	27 mid-range	36 mid-range	41 high end	40 high end	144 moderately high
2	26 mid-range	38 mid-range	44 high end	46 high end	154 moderately high
3	29 mid-range	37 mid-range	41 high end	41 high end	148 moderately high
4	26 mid-range	33 mid-range	40 high end	43 high end	142 moderately high
Average	27 mid-range	35 mid-range	43 high end	43 high end	147 moderately high

According to the data from the post test, the average Adversity Quotient (AQ) of the educators working in special education was somewhere in the middle of the range from low to high (147). According to Stoltz (1997), when participants have an adversity quotient (AQ) that is somewhat high, it indicates that they are most likely doing a fairly excellent job of persisting through adversities and tapping a good share of their rising potential on a daily basis. Stoltz (1997) went on to say that even those with a reasonably high AQ have the potential to improve their performance by honing specific parts of their AQ. To have a comprehensive understanding of one's air quality (AQ), it is necessary to look more thoroughly at the CO₂RE dimensions, which are control, origin and ownership, reach, and endurance (Stoltz, 1997). The researcher discovered that the participants' mean score, which was 27, was within the middle range of possible values when it came to the control component. The score on the preliminary examination was near the bottom of the range (18). This dimension has gained a total of 9 points as a result of this change. According to Stoltz's (1997) assessment, a score in the middle of the range indicates that the participants might react to unfavorable occurrences as though they were at least somewhat within their control. They are likely not readily discouraged by negative experiences.

However, according to Stoltz (1997), those who scored in the middle of the range may find it more challenging to maintain a sense of control when confronted with more significant setbacks or adversity. The data that was collected from the focus group

session with the special education teachers and the interview with the school director showed that they do genuinely feel the pressure of their job as well as the financial troubles that are brought about by the profession that they choose. An improvement in this dimension's score indicates that the individual's control orientation (internal locus) has become more robust. People who have an internal locus of control feel that they have more control over their reinforcements than people who have an external locus of control orientation, according to some research (Rotter's research was cited in Hielle and Ziegler, 1992; Ortigas, 1996), and this is emphasized in the literature. Having a shift from having an external locus of control to having an internal locus of control can be reflected in a positive way by having an increase in score on the control dimension. The perception of greater control leads to an increase in agency and a more proactive approach. The greater one's control score, the greater the likelihood that they will persevere in the face of adversity, Stoltz, 1997). A low sense of control that one has over their environment can have a profoundly negative impact on their belief in their ability to influence the current state of affairs (Stoltz, 1997). The researcher observed that the average score of the participants, which was 35, fell somewhat in the middle of the range when it came to the second component of the Adversity Quotient (AQ), which is origin and ownership. The score on the preliminary examination was near the bottom of the range (20). This dimension has had a 15-point increase since we last looked at it.

According to Stoltz (1997), a score in the middle of the range indicates that an individual is likely to attribute unfavorable occurrences to both external and internal sources of origin when responding to adversity. On occasion, a person may unnecessarily blame themselves for the negative effects of adversity; however, the person may limit their culpability to only those things for which they were the direct cause, being hesitant to contribute more significantly. The participants in the focus group session with the special education teachers and the interview with the school director revealed that they feel so stressed and emotionally exhausted. That is why they require having personal development programmes such as courses or seminars that would increase their motivation and remind them of their purpose in teaching. This was seen in the data collected from the focus group session with the special education teachers. This demonstrates that they are aware that they need to address this need and that they should take action in response to this awareness, Santos, (2012).

The average score that the participants had on the reach component of AQ was 43, which was considered to be in the upper range. The score on the preliminary examination was near the bottom of the range (16). This dimension has had a 27-point increase since we last looked at it. According to the interpretation offered by Stoltz (1997), scoring in the high range indicates that a person is more likely to respond to adversity in a manner that is specific and constrained, the higher one's overall AQ and the higher one's score in this dimension are. According to Stoltz (1997), the more effectively one is able to confine or compartmentalize the reach of the hardship, the more powerful and less overwhelmed they are likely to feel as a result. According to studies (Woods, 1989, quoted in Nguyen, 2002; Natrass, 1991), teachers experience stress when their own interests, commitments, or resources compete with or among each other. Therefore, the capacity to organize one's concerns into categories or to set limits makes it easier to deal with the obstacles and difficulties of life (Stoltz, 1997). When it came to the fourth dimension, which was endurance, the average score that the participants had (43) was on the higher end of the spectrum. The score on the preliminary examination was near the bottom of the range (20). This dimension has had a 23-point boost since we last looked at it. According to Stoltz's (1997) interpretation, scoring at the high end shows that the participants regard achievement as durable, if not permanent. This conclusion is based on the fact that higher scores indicate a greater likelihood of success. In a similar vein, one may think of adversity and the factors that led to it as being fleeting. The responses of the special education teachers that were generated from the focus group session reflect that the teachers perceive that their financial problems have been a constant problem. These responses were

generated by the special education teachers who participated in the session.

Therefore, an improvement in their score on this criterion would be beneficial in terms of the way they approach life in general. According to Stoltz (1997), having a high score in this dimension might increase a person's levels of vitality and optimism, as well as their propensity to take action. He went on to say that a high score in this dimension demonstrates a natural and healthy propensity to be able to see the light at the end of the tunnel. The results of the Adversity Response Profile (ARP) Quick Take (1997), which were compiled after the development of the Adversity Quotient (AQ) Program, suggest that the educators of special education students have an AQ score that is somewhere in the middle of the range (147). Therefore, this suggests that the participants are probably doing a rather good job of persevering through problems and tapping a good share of their rising potential on a daily basis.

Consequences of this implication include: The results of the follow-up examination revealed that the participants' AQ had increased, going from a moderately low level (74) to a fairly high level (147). Stoltz (1997, page 105) emphasized that when assessing a person's total AQ, "since AQs fall on a continuum, these cut offs are somewhat arbitrary." When comparing someone with an AQ of 134 to someone with an AQ of 135, there is no obvious difference between the two. However, there is a distinction to be made between those with low, moderate, and high AQs. According to the findings of this investigation's pre-test as well as its subsequent post-test, there was a statistically significant difference in the participants' test scores between the pre-test and the post-test (p.05). The current research suggests that special education schools should incorporate the theory and practice of AQ into their faculty development programmes. The goals of these programmes are to raise the level of individual adversity awareness among teachers and to identify the areas in which those teachers can grow in order to become more resilient and capable members of the school community.

REFERENCES

- Adversity Quotient (2001). The Adversity Response Profile. www.peaklearning.com/aq/measuringaq/adversity_response_profile.htm
- Adversity Quotient (May 2000). ARP Reliability and Validity. www.peaklearning.com/aq/measuringaq/ARP_Reliabilty_VValidity.htm
- Ardales, V. (2001). Basic Concepts and Methods in Research. Iloilo City: CONCERNS, Inc.
- Austin, M. (1995, January 20). Small and modular is beautiful. Times Higher Education Supplement. Issue 1159, p.11

- Aydin (1992). Learned helplessness and explanatory style in Turkish samples. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 132, 117 – 119
- Bautista, L. (1998). Stress and coping styles of special education teachers of children with mental retardation: their implications to guidance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. College of Education, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Betts, M., & Smith, R. (1998). Developing the credit-based modular curriculum in higher education: Challenge, choice, and change. London: Falmer Press. *International Refereed Research Journal*, 3(2-4). www.researchersworld.com
- Borromeo, R. T. (2004). Strategies for program planning and development. LECTURED DELIVERED DURING THE DOMINICAN SISTERS' ADMINISTRATORS' FORUM, ILOILO CITY.
- Bos, Candace S., & Vaughn, S. (2006). Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behavior Problems.i (6th ed)
- Byrne, B. (1994). Burnout: Testing for the validity, replication, and invariance of causal structure across elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 645-674.
- Chan, D. W. (1997). Stress, coping strategies, and psychological distress among secondary school teachers in Hong Kong. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31, 145-166.
- deBettencourt Laurie, U., & Howard Lori, A. (2007). The effective Special Education teacher, a practical guide for success. Eastern Arizona College. (1974) Modularization of courses. [report]. Author.
- Executive Forum (April 2000). Creating Sustainable Optimism. www.executiveforum.net
- Fraenkel, J., & Wallen, N. (2003). How to design and evaluate research in education, *5th edition*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education
- Freeman, A., & Gray, H. (1987). Teaching without stress. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gosling, T. (2001 January 15). Human resources move center stage. Manila Bulletin, Business Section.
- Hallahan, D. P., & Kauffman, J. M. (2006). Exceptional learners: Introduction to Special Education (10th ed). Needham Heights, MA: *Allyn & Bacon*.
- Harrop, S., & Woodcock, G. (1992, April). Issues in the construction of a modular curriculum for university professional education. *Studies in Education of Adults*, 24(1), 86.
- Heward William, L. (2003). An Introduction to Special Education. (7th ed.)
- Kyriacou, C. (1989). The nature and prevalence of teacher stress. In M. Cole & S. Walker (Ed), Teaching and stress (pp. 27-34). Milton Keynes, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Large, J. (1987). A modular curriculum in information studies. France: EDIC [ED 286 512].
- Lazaro-Capones, A. R. (2004). Adversity quotient and the performances level of selected middle managers of the different departments of the city of manila as revealed by 360-degree feedback system. www.kli.re.kr/iira2004/pro/papers/session2/10%20Antonette%20Lazaro-Capones_PhDw.pdf
- Loveland, T. (1999, May-June). Adapting modular curriculum in the classroom. *Technology Teacher*. 58 (8) pp.10-15.
- Mc Gill, M. (2001). The “Adversity Quotient” and the “Vitality Quotient” of Life. www.hao.com
- McGee, C., & Hampton, P. (1996, March). The effects of modular curriculum delivery on a New Zealand secondary school. *School Organization*, 16(1), 7-16.
- Pierangelo, R. (2003). The special educator’s book of lists. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Santos, M. C. J. (2012). Assessing the effectiveness of the adapted adversity quotient program in a special education school. *Researchers World*, 3(4), 13.
- Stoltz, P. (1997). Adversity quotient: Turning obstacles into opportunities. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Stoltz, P. (2000). Adversity quotient@work USA: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Stoltz, P. (2000). Adversity quotient@work USA: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc. P. www.fsbassociates.com/williammorrow/adversityquotient.htm
- Val Meel, R., & De Wolf, H. (1994, January). Major issues for educational innovation in higher education in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Education*. [In Educational Administration Abstracts] 30(1), 42.
- Volger, D., & Hillison, J. (1980). Developing and using performance models: Implementing competency-based education in community colleges, 6. Virginia: ERIC [ED 195 304].
- Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. *Exceptional Children*, 47, 18-23.