



# RESILIENCE AND INTERPERSONAL TOLERANCE AMONG TEACHING PROFESSIONALS

\*K.S.Sneka, \*\*Dr.R.Ramasamy

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13057>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra13057

## ABSTRACT

**OBJECTIVE:** The goal of the study was to understand resilience and interpersonal tolerance among teaching professionals. **TOOLS:** Bharathiar University Resilience Scale [Cronbach Alpha 8.74, Validity 0.8], Interpersonal tolerance scale (IPTS) [Cronbach's alpha 0.88, 0.90 and cross-cultural validation and a personal information form were used. **SAMPLE:** The study was conducted on teaching professionals in Namakkal District. Among them, 60 were female, and 40 were male. **METHOD:** A survey method was used to collect the data. **ANALYSIS:** Independent Sample t-test, one-way ANOVA, and cross tabs were applied to analyze the data. **RESULT:** The findings revealed that there is a significant difference between resilience and interpersonal tolerance based on demographic data. According to the study, female teaching professionals have more resilience and interpersonal tolerance than male teaching professionals.

**KEYWORDS:** Resilience, Interpersonal tolerance, teaching professionals.

## INTRODUCTION

**RESILIENCE:** The capacity of individuals to recognized as resilience. The construct of resilience includes various dimensions including time taken to get back to normalcy after a set-back, reaction to negative events, perception of the effect of past negative events, response to risk factors in life, confidence in coping with future, defining problems, being open to experience and being flexible<sup>(1)</sup> and resilience has been defined by psychology as an account for success over tasks, activities, etc during adversity such as the transition of the educational system.<sup>(2)</sup> The effective regulation of ego control, people will be characterized as tending toward either over control or under control. Resilient persons are relatively well adjusted, whereas under-controlled persons tend toward a variety of externalizing problems and over-controlled persons toward internalizing problems<sup>(3)(4)</sup>. However, subsequent applications of resilience, especially to social systems, recognized the complex adaptive nature of systems. This recognition prompted a view of resilience as involving the adaptation and transformation of systems through the emergence of new structures such as policies, processes, and organizational culture that enable organizations to continue to perform their functions in the face of challenges<sup>(5)(6)</sup> and the psychological capacity to be productive when dealing with challenges, changes, and adversity in an academic setting. It is vital to measure faculty's resilience during adversities that can be a basis of professional development plans, training, and seminars conducted by the concerned authority, ensuring that not just the knowledge, skills, and pedagogies of teachers are developing but also their psychological capacity like their academic resilience.<sup>(7)</sup>

## INTERPERSONAL TOLERANCE

The word tolerance is derived from the Latin word tolerance, which means to bear or sustain<sup>(8)</sup>, and at the interpersonal level, tolerance is an ability to accept, understand, recognize, and respect the social, political, and religious views of another person.<sup>(9)</sup> Tolerance as the personal value of an individual is determined by the globalization of the economy, quick development of communications, the interaction of cultures and their integration into a single whole social space, large-scale migration of population, and changes in social structures<sup>(10)</sup>. Theory of tolerance, Allport (1954) conceptualized tolerance and broke it down into warm tolerance (being approving of others), cold tolerance (e.g., putting up with things we do not like), and limits of tolerance (being intolerant of intolerance in others). According to Allport, tolerance is a personal value that influences an open and accepting attitude, the ability to empathize with others, self-insight, resistance to ambiguity, and values in individuals. Butrus and Wittenberg (2013) have referred to tolerance as a moral virtue equivalent to respect, equality, and freedom. According to UNESCO, tolerance is to show respect for 'others', that is to say, 'the different ones' right to be themselves and to avoid harming others, knowing that harming 'the others' means harming everyone and also respect the rights of other people who have ideas and values that do not match with a person's ideas and values<sup>(11)</sup> Faculty's interpersonal abilities are vital to organizations. Collaborative work is achievable when professors interact with one another in a spirit of tolerance, openness, and empathy. The ultimate goal of an organization's faculty is the organization's success. Workplace contentment, a sense of belonging to



the organization, and improving organizational performance are all aspects of well-being. And then Well-being refers to work satisfaction, and belongingness to the organization <sup>(12)</sup>.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Hartley, M. T. (2011) inters and intrapersonal resilience variables were statistically significantly correlated with mental health. Success will be based on a mutually acceptable degree of risk tolerance and support for compensation policies, corporate culture, performance reviews, and early risk management planning [Kwak, Y. H., & LaPlace, K. S. (2005)]. Mallak, L. (1998) established an organizational resilience paradigm in an attempt to give a synthesise of the contradictory literature on resilience. He characterized organizational resilience as perceptual posture, contextual integrity, strategic ability, and strategic action. Organizational resolvability is the product of organizational resilience. Brendel, W., Hankerson, et al., (2016) Participants in the mindfulness practice condition showed a significant increase in promotional regulatory focus and a reduction in trait anxiety and stress, No significant changes were seen for resilience or tolerance for ambiguity. Resilience controls the loss by maximizing the recovery point and minimizing recovery time objectives. Sahebjamia, N., Torabi, et al., (2015) examined to evaluate the applicability of the plans. We also develop a novel interactive augmented  $\epsilon$ -constraint method to find the final preferred compromise solution. The proposed model and solution method are finally validated through a real case study

## OBJECTIVE

- To examine the difference between resilience and interpersonal tolerance based on demographic data.
- To assess the job satisfaction level of the participants.

## METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to learn more about teaching professional's resilience and interpersonal tolerance. It was based on teaching professionals' perspectives and experiences. The information was gathered from teaching professionals in Namakkal District. 100 teaching professionals provided the information, out of them 40 were male and 60 were Female.

**Tools:** Personal data were collected, which includes gender, stream, experience, marital status, birth order, and area of living.

**Bharathiar University Resilience Scale:** Resilience was defined to construct the scale, as the capacity of people to cope with stress and catastrophe, and also used to indicate a characteristic of resistance to future negative events. All of the items are assessed on five – a point Likert scale, with responses ranging from not at all appropriate to most appropriate. Reliability Co-efficient for Form A - 0.812 and Form B - 0.852 (Guttman Split-Half).

**Interpersonal tolerance scale (IPTS):** All port (1954) conceptualizes tolerance as a personal value and distinguishes between Warm Tolerance (13), Cold Tolerance (12), and Limits of tolerance (9) items. All of the items are assessed on a seven-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly disagree and strongly agree. [Reliability Cronbach's alpha =.88, .90 and cross-cultural validation (August 2016)]

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

**Objective 1:** To examine the difference between resilience and interpersonal tolerance based on demographic data.



**Table 1**

*Warm tolerance, Cold tolerance, Limits of tolerance and Resilience based on Gender, Stream, Marital Status, Area of living*

Personal variables		Mean [SD]	T - value
<b>WARM TOLERANCE</b>	Gender	Male	64.48(20.55)
		Female	65.30(18.50)
	Stream	Arts	62.95(18.47)
		Science	66.90(19.97)
	Marital Status	Married	66.99(16.93)
		Unmarried	60.88(23.01)
	Area of Living	Rural	63.13(20.20)
		Urban	68.70(16.84)
<b>COLD TOLERANCE</b>	Gender	Male	54.85(18.71)
		Female	45.20(18.42)
	Stream	Arts	48.71(19.02)
		Science	49.39(19.26)
	Marital Status	Married	50.03(19.00)
		Unmarried	47.09(19.29)
	Area of Living	Rural	51.03(19.32)
		Urban	45.06(18.11)
<b>LIMITS OF TOLERANCE</b>	Gender	Male	40.75(13.74)
		Female	42.33(12.09)
	Stream	Arts	41.42(12.39)
		Science	41.96(13.16)
	Marital Status	Married	43.34(12.79)
		Unmarried	38.36(12.12)
	Area of Living	Rural	41.59(12.51)
		Urban	41.90(13.35)
<b>RESILIENCE</b>	Gender	Male	103.20(15.307)
		Female	99.86(15.86)
	Stream	Arts	100.55(15.18)
		Science	101.80(16.78)
	Marital Status	Married	100.15(16.78)
		Unmarried	103.30(13.03)
	Area of Living	Rural	101.06(16.72)
		Urban	101.45(13.45)

*Note:* Male =40, Female=60, Arts=49, Science=51, Married=67, Unmarried=33, Rural =67, Urban=33. \*P<0.05, NS=Not significant.



Table 1 shows that there is no significant difference between warm tolerance, limits of tolerance, and resilience among teaching professionals, implying that there is no significant difference between male and female teaching professionals, as well as between stream, marital status, and area of residence among teaching professionals. To compare resilience and interpersonal tolerance among teaching professionals, an independent sample t-test was used. Because the test statistic's absolute value is more than 1.96, the difference in cold tolerance between men (mean=54.85, SD=18.71) and women (mean=45.20, SD=18.42) is significant. As a result, male teaching professionals have a higher tolerance for cold than female teaching professionals.[cold tolerance (e.g., putting up with things we do not like)] Intolerant masculine teachers may dismiss others' views, beliefs, and values if they do not understand them, and they typically judge people based on first impressions. There is no statistically significant difference in resilience and interpersonal tolerance towards teaching professionals.

**TABLE: 2 Warm tolerance, Cold tolerance, Limits of tolerance and Resilience based on Experience and order of Birth**

	Personal Variables	Category	Mean (SD)	T- Value
<b>WARM TOLERANCE</b>	Experience	1 to 5 Years	65.53(19.5)	.13 <sup>NS</sup>
		6 to 10 Years	65.50(18.92)	
		Above 10 Years	63.13(19.84)	
	Order of Birth	First Child	64.26(19.21)	2.59 <sup>NS</sup>
		Middle Child	59.32(21.09)	
		Last Child	70.97(16.42)	
<b>COLD TOLERANCE</b>	Experience	1 to 5 Years	50.38(19.19)	1.37 <sup>NS</sup>
		6 to 10 Years	44.66(19.16)	
		Above 10 Years	52.61(18.28)	
	Order of Birth	First Child	46.11(18.72)	1.38 <sup>NS</sup>
		Middle Child	49.24(17.20)	
		Last Child	53.39(20.74)	
<b>LIMITS OF TOLERANCE</b>	Experience	1 to 5 Years	115.91(30.82)	.46 <sup>NS</sup>
		6 to 10 Years	110.16(31.03)	
		Above 10 Years	115.74(33.48)	
	Order of Birth	First Child	110.37(29.57)	.05 <sup>NS</sup>
		Middle Child	108.56(31.79)	
		Last Child	124.55(32.10)	
<b>RESILIENCE</b>	Experience	1 to 5 Years	102.04(12.91)	1.55 <sup>NS</sup>
		6 to 10 Years	103.50(16.68)	
		Above 10 Years	96.30(18.49)	
	Order of Birth	First Child	98.98(13.99)	.99 <sup>NS</sup>
		Middle Child	101.84(18.38)	
		Last Child	104.14(15.63)	

**Note:** First child=46, Middle child=25, Last child=29, 1to5 years=45, 6to10year =32, Above10 years=33.

The result of the one-way ANOVA between groups of variance was resilience and interpersonal tolerance among teaching professionals. Subjects were divided into three groups according to their experience and birth order. [Experience Group 1=1 to 5 years, Group2=5 to 10 years and Group3 = above 10 years; Birth order Group1= first child, Group2 = middle child and Group3 = last child]. In warm tolerance mean(SD) for Experience, 1to5 years= 65.53(19.5); 6to10 years=65.50(18.92); Above10 years= 63.13(19.84); Order of birth, First child = 64.26(19.21) ; Middle child =59.32(21.09) ; Last child = 59.32(21.09).so, there are no statistically significant differences between group means as determined by one-way ANOVA in table 2. There is no statistically significant difference in resilience and interpersonal tolerance towards teaching professionals based on their experience and order of birth. Both new and veteran teachers receive the same salary; there is no difference in their income, and the incentives offered by private institutions do not satisfy them. The lack of space for one's personal development and pursuit of personal growth all have an impact on male teaching professionals at private institutions.



**Objective: 2** To assess the job satisfaction level of the participants

**Table 3** Cross tab between Demographic variables and job satisfaction questions

SOME JOB SATISFACTION QUESTIONS	CATEGORY	GENDER		STREAM		EXPERIENCE			BIRTH OF ORDER			AREA OF LIVING		MARITAL STATUS	
		MALE	FEMALE	SCIENCE	ARTS	1 TO 5 YEARS	6 TO 10 YEARS	ABOVE 10 YEARS	FIRST CHILD	MIDDLE CHILD	LAST CHILD	RURAL	URBAN	MARRIED	UNMARRIED
1] There are few rewards for those who work here.	<b>YES</b>	30	41	39	38	36	27	14	39	19	19	51	26	52	25
	<b>NO</b>	10	13	10	13	09	04	09	07	05	11	16	07	14	09
2] Are you satisfied with the permanency of the job?	<b>YES</b>	26	51	39	38	33	27	17	32	22	23	49	25	50	27
	<b>NO</b>	14	09	10	13	12	05	06	14	03	06	18	05	19	06
3] Do you feel positive and motivated within your workplace?	<b>YES</b>	36	55	48	43	38	31	22	43	23	25	62	29	61	30
	<b>NO</b>	04	05	04	05	07	01	02	03	02	04	05	04	06	03
4] Do you have everything within your working place to feel comfortable and relaxed?	<b>YES</b>	32	49	42	39	34	30	17	37	22	22	55	26	54	27
	<b>NO</b>	09	10	08	11	11	02	05	09	02	17	12	06	27	05
5] Do you get enough time to do your job well?	<b>YES</b>	28	44	39	33	29	25	18	31	20	21	49	23	48	24
	<b>NO</b>	13	16	10	18	16	07	05	15	05	08	18	10	19	09
6] Are you regularly stressed with deadlines and the workplace?	<b>YES</b>	16	28	20	24	19	15	10	19	11	14	29	15	33	11
	<b>NO</b>	24	32	29	27	26	17	13	27	14	15	38	18	34	22
7] Do you usually take your work home?	<b>YES</b>	21	32	23	30	23	17	13	27	13	13	36	17	36	17
	<b>NO</b>	19	28	26	21	22	15	10	19	12	16	31	16	31	16

Note: Male =40, Female =60.



Descriptive and Statistical Analysis Levels across the selected Job satisfaction Questions.

The different types of opinions in table 3 (I.e.) are created to calculate degrees of satisfaction in a cross-tabulation. According to the data in this table, 23% of professors say that the incentives at private institutions are not satisfactory. In private institutions, 77% of professors reported being motivated to finish their work. Female teachers at private colleges exert more effort and enthusiasm than their male counterparts in comparison to that group. 25% of faculty members are dissatisfied with the permanence of their jobs based on their marital status.

Male faculty members are less content than female faculty members due to their heavier workloads, lack of completion time, and satisfaction with job security (75% of faculty members agree), which describes their feeling of fulfillment. Because of incentives, 9% of faculty members report feeling depressed and uninspired at work (There is no difference in pay between experienced faculty and new faculty; both receive the same compensation) To accomplish their organizational goals and plan their day, 91% of faculty members feel happy and motivated to work at private institutions. 81% of faculty members work in private institutions where they have access to everything they need to feel comfortable and at ease. 72% of faculty members report having adequate time to do their work properly, while 47% report never bringing work home. Lastly, in comparison to male professors, female professors are more content to work at private institutions since they receive more benefits, feel happier, more driven, at ease, and are less pressured by their workloads and deadlines.

## CONCLUSION

This paper develops a survey tool that organizations can use to identify their strengths and evaluate the effectiveness of their resilience strategies and investments. The present study concluded that there was a significant difference between resilience and interpersonal tolerance among college faculty, based on gender. The nature of family and area of living does not influence the resilience and interpersonal tolerance among college faculty. Then in cross tabs more female faculties are more satisfied to work in private institutions than male faculties.

## LIMITATION

The research's shortcomings are related to the qualitative methodology that was utilized to gather data for this particular study, which concentrated more on educators than on other professions or administrative personnel. The participant's financial position was also omitted. This study gives us more understanding of the mechanisms underlying the link between interpersonal tolerance and resilience.

## SUGGESTIONS

First and foremost, as an exciting potential for the future, it would be worthwhile to conduct more longitudinal studies that would enable us to evaluate the development of the investigated constructs over a longer time frame. Further details and original insights are provided by longitudinal investigations that may not be possible in other contexts. Researchers can examine changes over time using this technique. To better understand issues related to development and longevity, longitudinal approaches are very helpful. Researchers can examine how certain items could change at various stages of life and investigate some of the causes of these developmental adjustments.

## Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

## REFERENCE

1. Annalakshmi, N. (2009a). *Bharathiar University Resilience Scale*. In P. Harish & W. Ajay (Eds.) *Research Methods in Business and Management* (pp. 105-121). Sri Publishers.
2. Cassidy, S. (2016). *The Academic Resilience Scale. (ARS-30): A New Multidimensional Construct Measure*. *Front. Psychol.* 7:1787. doi 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01787.
3. Caspi, A., & Silva, P. A. (1995). *Temperament qualities at age 3 predict personality traits in young adulthood: Longitudinal evidence from a birth cohort*. *Child Development*, 66, 486-498.
4. Robins RW, John OP, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, & Stouthamer-Loeber M. (1996). *Resilient, overcontrolled, and under-controlled boys: Three replicable personality types*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70,157–171.
5. Robins RW, John OP, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, & Stouthamer-Loeber M. (1996). *Resilient, overcontrolled, and under-controlled boys: Three replicable personality types*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70,157–171.
6. Pike A, Dawley S, Tomaney J. *Resilience, adaptation, and adaptability*. *Cambridge Journal Regions Economy Society*. 2010;3(1):59–70. doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsq001.
7. Riley, J. R., and Masten, A. S. (2005). "Resilience in context," in *Resilience in Children, Families, and Communities: Linking Context to Practice & Policy*,(Eds) R. D. Peters, B. Leadbeater, and R. McMahon (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum), 13–25.
8. Laursen, J. C. (2005). *Tolerance*. *New dictionary of the history of ideas*, 6. London: Thomson Gale.



9. Maksymova, O. O. (2019). *Diagnosis of the interpersonal tolerance manifestation of senior preschool children*. Вісник.
10. Abdulkerimov, G., 2004. *Tolerance in ethnic relations in Urals Region: sociological analysis*, Ph.D. thesis, ESU, Ekaterinburg.
11. Kele B (1995). *Tolerance in Turkish Culture, the International Congress of Tolerance (the Ministry of Culture Publications, Antalya)*.
12. M. Hjerm, M.A. Eger, A. Bohman, F.F. Connolly A new approach to the study of tolerance: conceptualizing and measuring acceptance, respect, and appreciation of difference *Social Indicators Research*, 147 (2020), pp. 897-919, 10.1007/s11205-019- 02176-y.
13. Hartley, M. T. (2011). *Examining the relationships between resilience, mental health, and academic persistence in undergraduate college students*. *Journal of American College Health*, 59(7), 596-604.
14. Kwak, Y. H., & LaPlace, K. S. (2005). *Examining risk tolerance in the project-driven organization*. *Technovation*, 25(6), 691-695.
15. Mallak, L. (1998). *Putting organizational resilience to work*. *INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT-CHICAGO THEN ATLANTA-*, 8-13.
16. Brendel, W., Hankerson, S., Byun, S., & Cunningham, B. (2016). *Cultivating leadership Dharma: Measuring the impact of regular mindfulness practice on creativity, resilience, tolerance for ambiguity, anxiety, and stress*. *Journal of Management Development*.
17. Sahebjamia, N., Torabi, S. A., & Mansouri, S. A. (2015). *Integrated business continuity and disaster recovery planning: Towards organizational resilience*. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 242(1), 261-273.m.