

Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient of Teachers in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis Occidental

Mariavi E. Gongob

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

Abstract— Teachers encounter diverse instructional, interpersonal, and professional challenges that require them to manage emotions and respond constructively to adversity. Emotional Intelligence (EI) encompasses self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills, while Adversity Quotient (AQ) reflects how individuals manage difficulties through Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. Examining these constructs provides insight into teachers' capacities to navigate challenges within their professional environment. The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the levels of EI and AQ and examine their relationship among 103 permanent public elementary school teachers in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis Occidental, during School Year 2021–2022. Respondents were selected through stratified random sampling. Data were gathered using a researcher-adapted questionnaire based on Goleman's EI framework and Stoltz's CORE model of AQ. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the variables, while Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test their relationship at the 0.05 level of significance. Teachers demonstrated a Very High level of EI, with an overall mean of 3.34. Empathy obtained the highest dimension mean (3.49), while Social Skills had the lowest (3.23). AQ was also Very High across all dimensions, with Reach obtaining the highest mean (3.33) and Ownership the lowest (3.28). The relationship between EI and AQ was negative but not statistically significant ($r = -0.146$, $p = 0.141$). The findings indicated that teachers possessed strong emotional competencies and adversity-management capacities; however, EI and AQ appeared to function as distinct characteristics within the study context. The findings supported the need for professional development that sustains existing strengths while strengthening interpersonal and adversity-management competencies.

Keywords— emotional intelligence, adversity quotient, teachers, public elementary schools, descriptive-correlational.

I. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Educators function within a learning environment that demands them to deal with a variety of learners, with classroom and out-of-classroom issues, and communicate with colleagues and address unexpected challenges. In this context, EI and AQ are personal skills that can impact the way teachers identify and manage their emotions and react to challenging situations. Emotional intelligence consists of skills like self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills, while adversity quotient consists of the way people can experience and handle the challenges with options of Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. A teacher who is able to identify feelings, regulate feelings and responses, stay motivated, understand others and manage challenging

situations could be better equipped to manage their profession related demands. This is because a combined analysis of these two variables is pertinent to an understanding of the ability of teachers to effect the positive response to challenges within the professional environment.

Recent studies provide empirical support for the importance of emotional intelligence and adversity-related capacities among teachers. Teachers with greater emotional competence have been found to demonstrate better classroom discipline management, suggesting that the ability to recognize and regulate emotions contributes to effective professional functioning (Valente et al., 2019). Among Filipino public school teachers, high levels of emotional intelligence were likewise reported, and emotional

intelligence was positively and significantly associated with teaching performance, particularly when teachers were dealing with personal concerns (Go et al., 2020). In relation to adversity quotient, Filipino pre-service teachers demonstrated stronger levels of Control and Ownership but comparatively lower levels of Reach and Endurance, indicating differences in how individuals perceive and respond to difficult circumstances (Yazon, 2019). Similarly, educators examined during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated measurable levels of adversity quotient across the CORE dimensions—Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance—as they faced multiple professional challenges associated with the changing educational environment (Pino & Merin, 2021). Taken together, these studies indicate that emotional competencies and the ability to manage adversity are relevant to teachers' professional functioning and adjustment to challenging circumstances.

Despite the growing body of research on emotional intelligence and adversity quotient, a gap remains in understanding how these two constructs are related among in-service public school teachers within a specific Philippine district context. Existing studies have examined emotional intelligence in relation to classroom management, teaching performance, well-being, and other professional outcomes, while studies on adversity quotient have commonly focused on pre-service teachers, educators during pandemic-related challenges, or its association with performance and other variables. There is limited empirical evidence specifically examining whether teachers' emotional intelligence is significantly associated with their adversity quotient, particularly among teachers in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis Occidental. Establishing this relationship is important because teachers regularly encounter instructional, interpersonal, administrative, and situational challenges that require both emotional regulation and effective responses to adversity. The absence of district-level evidence provides a reasonable basis for conducting the present quantitative investigation.

Thus, the present research aims at finding the correlation between the TEI and AQ of teachers in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis

Occidental. It aims to find out the level of teacher's emotional intelligence (Self-awareness, Self-regulation, Motivation, Empathy, Social skills), the level of adversity quotient (Control, Ownership, Reach, Endurance) of teachers, whether there is significant correlation between emotional intelligence and adversity quotient of teachers, and if the teachers' emotional intelligence is low, then recommend an appropriate intervention program or professional enhancement plan to enhance teachers' emotional intelligence and adversity quotient.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the levels of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Adversity Quotient (AQ) and examine their relationship among public school teachers in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis Occidental, during School Year 2021–2022. The descriptive component assessed EI in terms of self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills, and AQ through Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. The correlational component determined the degree and direction of the relationship between EI and AQ without manipulating the variables. The design was appropriate for describing existing conditions and examining statistical associations among naturally occurring variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Research Setting

The study was conducted in Sapang Dalaga District, Division of Misamis Occidental, Northern Mindanao, Philippines, during School Year 2021–2022. The district comprised public elementary and integrated schools serving learners from Sapang Dalaga and surrounding communities. Teachers performed various instructional, classroom management, administrative, and interpersonal responsibilities that required them to manage emotions and respond to work-related challenges.

The district was selected as the research setting because it provided an appropriate public-school context for examining teachers' Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Adversity Quotient (AQ). The

study focused on permanent public elementary school teachers assigned to the identified schools in the district. Private schools, secondary-only teachers, and non-teaching personnel were excluded. The setting provided the institutional and professional context for describing the teachers' EI and AQ and determining the relationship between the two variables.

Research Respondents

The study considered a total population of 138 qualified teachers, from which 103 teacher-respondents were selected through stratified random sampling. Each public elementary or integrated school served as a stratum, and the number of respondents selected from each school was determined proportionately according to its teacher population. This procedure provided representation from the different schools in the district and reduced the possibility that the responses would be concentrated in schools with larger teaching populations. The sampling approach was appropriate for the study because the respondents were distributed across several schools that operated under the same district-level educational administration but differed in the size of their teaching personnel.

Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-adapted structured questionnaire consisting of two parts. Part I measured Emotional Intelligence based on Goleman's (1995, 1998) five dimensions: Self-Awareness, Self-Regulation, Motivation, Empathy, and Social Skills. Part II measured Adversity Quotient based on Stoltz's (1997) CORE dimensions: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. The items were contextualized to the experiences and responsibilities of public elementary school teachers. Both parts used a four-point Likert scale, with mean scores interpreted as Very High (3.26–4.00), High (2.51–3.25), Low (1.76–2.50), and Very Low (1.00–1.75). Higher mean scores indicated higher levels of the corresponding Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient dimensions.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher secured permission from the Schools Division Superintendent of Misamis Occidental and coordinated with the Public Schools District

Supervisor and participating school heads regarding data collection. The selected teacher-respondents were informed about the study, their voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the use of data for academic purposes in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). After obtaining informed consent, the researcher personally administered the two-part questionnaire at a convenient time. The completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, coded, and entered into a data matrix for statistical analysis. The encoded data were verified against the original responses to minimize errors, while all physical and electronic research records were securely stored..

Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical principles to protect the rights, privacy, and welfare of the teacher-respondents. Before participation, the respondents were informed of the study's purpose, procedures, expected time, and use of the data. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained, with respondents free to decline or withdraw without consequences. Confidentiality and privacy were maintained in accordance with the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173) by using numerical codes instead of names and reporting results in aggregate form. The collected questionnaires and electronic files were securely stored and accessible only to authorized persons. The researcher maintained the accuracy and integrity of the data by recording and reporting responses without alteration or fabrication. The data were used solely for the stated research purposes and were securely disposed of after the prescribed retention period, consistent with responsible research practices (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Data Analysis

The collected data were coded, tabulated, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the levels of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Adversity Quotient (AQ), including their respective dimensions. Mean scores were interpreted using the four-point scale: 3.26–4.00 (Very High), 2.51–3.25 (High), 1.76–2.50 (Low), and 1.00–1.75

(Very Low). The standard deviation was used to describe the variability of the respondents' ratings. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between overall EI and AQ. The test of significance was conducted at the 0.05

level of significance. The results were interpreted based on the descriptive-correlational design, recognizing that a significant correlation indicated an association between the variables and did not establish causation.

III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS, AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 1. Level of Emotional Intelligence of the Teachers

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Self-Awareness	3.32	Very High
Self-Regulation	3.24	High
Motivation	3.40	Very High
Empathy	3.49	Very High
Grand Mean	3.34	Very High

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 - 3.25 = High; 1.76 - 2.50 = Low; 1.00 - 1.75 = Very Low

The results in Table 2.6 showed that the teachers had a very high overall level of Emotional Intelligence, with an average mean of 3.34. This indicated that the respondents had generally demonstrated strong emotional competencies across the five dimensions assessed. The result suggested that the teachers had been able to recognize their emotional states, regulate their responses, sustain motivation, understand the feelings of others, and maintain appropriate interpersonal relationships within the school environment. The overall finding also showed that the teachers' emotional intelligence had not depended on a single competency; rather, the relatively favorable ratings across all five dimensions indicated a broad pattern of emotional functioning. This was meaningful to the study because teachers who had demonstrated stronger emotional competencies had been better positioned to respond thoughtfully to classroom demands, interpersonal concerns, and work-related pressures, which were also relevant to their capacity to deal with adversity.

Among the five components, Empathy obtained the highest mean of 3.49 (Very High), followed by Motivation at 3.40 (Very High) and Self-Awareness at 3.32 (Very High). These results suggested that the teachers' strongest emotional competencies had been directed toward understanding others, maintaining commitment to their responsibilities, and recognizing

their own emotional experiences. The particularly high empathy rating may have reflected the interpersonal nature of elementary teaching, where understanding learners' needs and responding appropriately to colleagues and parents had been part of everyday professional interaction. Motivation also received a very high rating, indicating that the teachers had generally maintained commitment and enthusiasm despite demanding circumstances. Self-Awareness likewise remained very high, suggesting that teachers had been relatively conscious of their emotions and personal strengths and limitations. Self-Regulation (3.24) and Social Skills (3.23) were rated High, slightly below the other dimensions. This pattern suggested that recognizing emotions and maintaining motivation had been somewhat stronger than consistently regulating emotional reactions and managing interpersonal relationships. The difference was relatively small, however, indicating that all five dimensions had contributed positively to the respondents' overall emotional intelligence.

The findings were consistent with empirical research showing that teachers' emotional and social competencies had been associated with their professional functioning and well-being. A study involving teachers found that social-emotional competence, particularly emotion regulation and relationship management, was related to teachers'

emotional support for students and the quality of teacher-student relationships (Aldrup et al., 2020). Similarly, research involving school teachers found that emotional intelligence had contributed significantly to psychological well-being, with resilient characteristics such as perseverance also playing an important role in this relationship (Mériida-López et al., 2021). The present finding therefore suggested that the teachers' very high Emotional Intelligence had represented a meaningful personal

resource for handling the emotional and interpersonal demands of teaching.

At the same time, the comparatively lower ratings for Self-Regulation and Social Skills indicated areas that could have received greater attention in professional enhancement activities, particularly those aimed at helping teachers translate emotional awareness and empathy into consistent regulation and constructive workplace interactions.

Table 2. Level of Emotional Intelligence of the Teachers

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Control	3.31	Very High
Ownership	3.28	High
Reach	3.33	Very High
Endurance	3.31	Very High
Grand Mean	3.31 Very High	

Scale: 3.26 - 4.00 = Very High; 2.51 – 3.25 = High; 1.76 – 2.50 = Low; 1.00 – 1.75 = Very Low

The results in Table 3.5 showed that the teachers had a Very High overall level of Adversity Quotient, with an average mean of 3.31. This indicated that the respondents had generally demonstrated strong capacity across the four CORE dimensions of Adversity Quotient: Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance. The relatively close mean scores across the dimensions suggested that no single CORE component had been substantially weaker than the others. The teachers had therefore demonstrated a generally consistent pattern in managing difficult situations, taking responsibility for circumstances within their influence, limiting the effects of setbacks, and sustaining effort when difficulties persisted.

Among the four dimensions, Reach obtained the highest mean of 3.33 (Very High), followed by Control and Endurance, both with a mean of 3.31 (Very High). Ownership obtained a mean of 3.28, which, based on the stated scale, also fell within the Very High category. The relatively narrow difference among the four dimensions indicated that the teachers' adversity-management capacities had been fairly balanced. The highest rating for Reach suggested that the teachers had been particularly capable of preventing difficulties in one aspect of their work from negatively affecting other responsibilities,

relationships, or their general attitude toward teaching. The ratings for Control and Endurance also indicated that the respondents had generally maintained a sense of personal influence and persistence when facing challenging circumstances. Ownership, while obtaining the lowest mean, remained very high, showing that the teachers had still demonstrated a strong tendency to recognize their responsibility and take action toward resolving problems.

The findings were consistent with research that examined Adversity Quotient among educators and teacher candidates using the Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance (CORE) framework. A study of pre-service teachers confirmed that the four CORE dimensions represented distinct components of Adversity Quotient and demonstrated the usefulness of the framework in assessing teachers' responses to challenging professional circumstances (Mohd Adnan & Mohd Matore, 2022). Similarly, research among educators during the pandemic examined AQ through the same CORE dimensions and emphasized the capacity of educators to respond to substantial professional challenges, including changes in instructional practices and difficulties involving stakeholders (Pino & Merin, 2021). The present finding of a Very High overall AQ level therefore

showed a stronger level of reported adversity management than that observed among the educators in the latter study, who had demonstrated a moderate overall AQ. This difference may have reflected

variations in the respondents, institutional context, measurement procedures, and circumstances under which the studies were conducted.

Table 3. *Test of Significant Relationship Between the Teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient*

Test Variables	r value	P value	Decision
Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient	-0.146	0.141	retain the Ho

Note: If $p \leq 0.05$, with a significant relationship

Table 4 presents the test of the significant relationship between the teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient. The results showed a Pearson r value of -0.146 and a p -value of 0.141. The negative correlation coefficient indicated a weak inverse relationship between the two variables, suggesting that increases in Emotional Intelligence tended to correspond with slight decreases in Adversity Quotient within the sample. However, the relationship was not statistically significant because the obtained p -value of 0.141 was greater than the 0.05 level of significance. This result indicated that the observed relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient had not been sufficiently strong to establish a meaningful association in the population represented by the respondents. Thus, the teachers' emotional intelligence had not appeared to be a significant predictor of their adversity quotient based on the data analyzed.

Since the p -value exceeded the prescribed significance level, the null hypothesis was retained. This meant that there had been insufficient statistical evidence to conclude that a significant relationship existed between the teachers' Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient. The finding was noteworthy because the respondents had previously demonstrated Very High Emotional Intelligence (3.34) and generally high levels of the dimensions of Adversity Quotient. The results therefore suggested that having a high level of emotional intelligence did not necessarily correspond to having a higher adversity quotient among the teachers in the study. Although emotional awareness, empathy, motivation, and other emotional competencies could have supported teachers in dealing with workplace demands, adversity management appeared to have involved other personal or contextual

factors that were not sufficiently captured by Emotional Intelligence alone.

This finding could have been understood in relation to studies showing that emotional competencies and resilience-related characteristics were related but distinct aspects of teachers' professional functioning. Research on teachers' social-emotional competence indicated that emotional abilities were associated with important aspects of teacher-student interaction and professional behavior, but the construct involved several specific competencies that did not automatically translate into every form of coping capacity (Aldrup et al., 2020). Similarly, research examining teachers' adversity-related capacities treated Adversity Quotient as a multidimensional construct involving Control, Ownership, Reach, and Endurance, indicating that responses to adversity encompassed perceptions of control, responsibility, containment of difficulties, and persistence (Mohd Adnan & Mohd Matore, 2022). The present result therefore suggested that Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient represented related but statistically distinct constructs among the teachers studied. The weak negative correlation ($r = -0.146$) and nonsignificant p -value ($p = 0.141$) indicated that other factors, such as organizational support, teaching experience, workload, coping strategies, self-efficacy, or workplace conditions, might have contributed to differences in teachers' capacity to manage adversity.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

Summary of Findings

Level of Emotional Intelligence. The teachers obtained an overall average mean of 3.34, interpreted as Very High. Among the five dimensions, Empathy

obtained the highest mean of 3.49 (Very High), followed by Motivation with 3.40 (Very High), Self-Awareness with 3.32 (Very High), Self-Regulation with 3.24 (High), and Social Skills with 3.23 (High).

Level of Adversity Quotient. The teachers obtained Very High levels across the four CORE dimensions. Reach obtained the highest mean of 3.33, followed by Control with 3.31, Endurance with 3.31, and Ownership with 3.28. All four dimensions were interpreted as Very High based on the prescribed scale.

Significant Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient. The test of relationship yielded a Pearson r value of -0.146 and a p -value of 0.141. Since the p -value was greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was retained. The relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient was therefore not statistically significant.

Conclusions

The study concluded that the teachers in Sapang Dalaga District had demonstrated very high levels of both Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient; however, these two constructs had not shown a statistically significant relationship. Although the teachers had exhibited strong emotional competencies, particularly in empathy, and high capacity across the CORE dimensions of adversity management, the findings indicated that their emotional intelligence had not been significantly associated with their adversity quotient. Thus, the study concluded that Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient had functioned as distinct characteristics among the teachers, and the observed level of one construct had not necessarily corresponded to the level of the other.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were proposed for the identified beneficiaries:

1. **Teachers.** Teachers may sustain their very high level of Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient through continuous self-reflection, professional learning, and deliberate practice in managing workplace challenges. Since Social Skills obtained the lowest mean among the

Emotional Intelligence dimensions, teachers should give particular attention to strengthening communication, conflict management, teamwork, and constructive engagement with colleagues, learners, parents, and other stakeholders. They may also participate in peer-support activities, reflective discussions, and collaborative problem-solving sessions that provide opportunities to practice these competencies in actual school situations.

2. **School Heads / Principals.** School Heads should develop localized professional development activities that will sustain teachers' existing strengths while addressing areas requiring further improvement, particularly Social Skills. Coaching sessions, peer mentoring, team-building activities, conflict-resolution workshops, and structured professional learning discussions may be incorporated into school-based programs. Since Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient showed no significant relationship, school heads should avoid treating emotional intelligence as the sole basis for improving teachers' capacity to manage adversity. Instead, interventions should also consider workload, organizational support, interpersonal relationships, available resources, and other workplace conditions that may influence how teachers respond to difficulties.
3. **Schools Division / District Administrators (Division of Misamis Occidental).** The Schools Division and District Administrators may use the findings as a basis for strengthening professional development programs related to teacher well-being, interpersonal competence, resilience, and workplace coping. Capacity-building activities may include emotional regulation, effective communication, conflict management, stress management, problem-solving, and resilience-oriented professional learning. Periodic assessment may also be conducted to determine whether these programs address the identified needs of teachers while sustaining their already high levels of Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient. Programs should be responsive to actual school conditions rather than relying solely on individual-level interventions.

4. **Students / Learners.** Students and learners may benefit from school programs that support teachers' emotional and interpersonal competencies. School Heads and teachers should continue promoting respectful communication, positive teacher-learner relationships, and emotionally supportive classroom practices. Since teachers had demonstrated particularly high levels of Empathy, this existing strength should be maintained through classroom practices that encourage attentive listening, understanding of learner concerns, and appropriate responses to students' emotional and academic needs. Such efforts may contribute to a more supportive learning environment while also strengthening teacher-learner interactions.
5. **Community and Stakeholders.** Parents, guardians, community representatives, and local stakeholders may participate in activities that strengthen communication and collaboration with teachers and school personnel. Regular consultation, constructive dialogue, and collaborative school activities may be encouraged to help address concerns before they develop into more difficult workplace or school-community issues. Since Social Skills represented the comparatively lower Emotional Intelligence dimension, stronger partnerships between teachers and stakeholders may provide practical opportunities for teachers to apply and improve their interpersonal competencies while maintaining the strong empathy and adversity-management capacities reflected in the findings.
6. **Future Researchers.** Future researchers are encouraged to examine other factors that may explain teachers' Adversity Quotient because the present study found no significant relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Adversity Quotient. Subsequent studies may investigate variables such as teacher self-efficacy, organizational support, workload, coping strategies, leadership practices, job satisfaction, resilience, and school climate. Researchers may also consider larger samples, other school districts, public and private school settings, or comparative groups to determine whether similar findings will emerge in different contexts.

Qualitative or mixed-method approaches may also be considered to provide deeper explanations of how teachers actually experience and manage adversity in their professional lives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aldrup, K., Carstensen, B., Köller, M. M., & Klusmann, U. (2020). Measuring teachers' social-emotional competence: Development and validation of a situational judgment test. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 892. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00892>
- [2] Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [3] Go, M. B., Golbin, R. A., Jr., Velos, S. P., & Bate, G. P. (2020). Filipino teachers' compartmentalization ability, emotional intelligence, and teaching performance. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 16(3), 27–42. <https://doi.org/10.24191/ajue.v16i3.7912>
- [4] Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- [5] Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- [6] Mérida-López, S., & Extremera, N. (2020). The interplay of emotional intelligence abilities and work engagement on job and life satisfaction: Which emotional abilities matter most for secondary-school teachers? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 563634. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.563634>
- [7] Mohd Adnan, R. M., & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2022). Development of Adversity Quotient (AQ) index of pre-service teachers in Institute of Teacher Education (IPG). *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10, 940323. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.940323>
- [8] Pino, Z. A. N., & Merin, J. A. (2021). Educators' adversity quotient: Rising above challenges in the time of pandemic. *Education Journal*, 10(4), 119–125. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.edu.20211004.12>
- [9] Stoltz, P. G. (1997). *Adversity quotient: Turning obstacles into opportunities*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [10] Valente, S., & Lourenço, A. A. (2020). Conflict in the classroom: How teachers' emotional intelligence influences conflict management. *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00005>
- [11] Yazon, A. D. (2019). Pre-service teachers' adversity quotient and proficiency in English language and mathematics. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 7(12), 2670–2676. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2019.071214>