

Examining the Mediating Effect of Adversity Quotient on Military Leadership and Performance

Andrey Satwika Yogaswara¹, Disman¹, Eeng Ahman¹, Nugraha¹, Muhammad Iqbal Nurfauzan², Arief Budiman¹

¹Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

²Management Department, BINUS Business School Doctor of Research in Management, Bina Nusantara University, Jakarta, Indonesia

miqbalnurfauzan@upi.edu

Abstract. The role of the adversity quotient as a mediating factor between military leadership and performance is examined in this study. In total, 69 commanders become respondents from POMDAM, and DENPOM department of Indonesian National Army (TNI). the method used is a quantitative approach with PLS-SEM. According to our research findings: (1) military leadership and adversity quotient have an impact on performance, (2) there is a connection between military leadership and performance, (3) adversity quotient moderates the relationship between military leadership and performance, and (4) both good leadership and adversity quotient influence organizational performance. Our results suggest that military leadership and adversity quotient are significant predictors of excellent performance. The results of this study's mediating effect contribute to a growing body of literature, particularly that on military leadership effectiveness.

Keywords: Adversity Quotient, Indonesian National Army, Military Leadership, Performance.

1. Introduction

The existing literature on the subject matter indicates a scarcity of comprehensive examination pertaining to the complexities associated with leadership and performance inside military establishments. One instance is to a scholarly investigation conducted by Šimanauskienė et al. (2021) that explores the significance of leadership within military establishments. Military organizations can consist of employees from a wide range of cultural backgrounds, hence posing issues for leadership (Di Schiena et al., 2013). Military leadership encompasses the intricate task of effectively managing paradoxical elements, such as striking a delicate equilibrium between the imperative of maintaining discipline and control, while also fostering an environment that encourages flexibility and adaptability (Kark et al., 2016). Military commanders are required to function within a very demanding environment characterized by elevated levels of stress, both physically and mentally (Šimanauskienė et al., 2021). The role of leadership is of paramount importance in influencing the performance of military troops. There exist several mechanisms via which leadership has influence on military performance, including but not limited to: providing direction and guidance, fostering motivation and morale, facilitating decision-making processes, promoting effective communication, ensuring accountability and discipline, and cultivating adaptability and resilience (Wong et al., 2003; Oh et al., 2008; Di Schiena et al., 2013; Šimanauskienė et al., 2021).

The efficacy of leaders within military organizations can be gauged by the analysis of disciplinary measures taken against their subordinates. The shown disciplined demeanor demonstrated by personnel of the Indonesian National Armed (TNI) Forces not only signifies a deviation from their primary responsibilities and obligations, but also reflects inadequate leadership efficacy. The leadership has shown significant concern on the escalating incidence of violations and illegal activities perpetrated by TNI soldiers throughout the years (Warka et al., 2018). The TNI is supposed to have organizational performance in order to accomplish this. However, according to Zaeid et al. (2015), organizational performance is a complicated and multifaceted concept rather than a simple phenomenon. According to Pearson-Goff and Herrington (2014), one of the most crucial indicators of whether an organization can run well is its leadership. The significance of effective leadership in the military cannot be overstated, since leaders frequently find themselves making critical decisions in challenging and high-pressure circumstances that have profound consequences on the lives of individuals. The capacity to exercise effective leadership has the potential to yield substantial impacts on mission outcomes and the welfare of workers. Leadership can result in diminished employee performance or have an impact on how targeted employees rate the leader's performance (Fosse et al., 2019).

It's crucial for management to comprehend and identify the different types of leadership that boost organizational performance (Uhl-Bien et al., 2014). According to Michael (2010), the effectiveness of an organization and its leadership are directly tied. In order to engage with subordinates, leaders must exhibit a variety of features, attributes, talents, and behaviors (Jeremy et al., 2011). The leading factor in an organization becomes particularly essential, according to Kristensen et al. (2022), when individuals or members exhibit high dynamics in their activities in addition to ongoing changes brought on by technology advancements. The ability to persuade team members to work hard to meet the previously defined goals is crucial to understanding this phenomenon. Military leadership and performance are essential for achieving organizational goals, making critical decisions, building and motivating teams, problem-solving, effective communication, raising morale, continuous learning, and ensuring the well-being of personnel.

An organization's success is influenced by how its members fulfill their jobs in addition to leadership, which is a determinant in performance success. If team members are dedicated to their work and effective at what they do, the business can accomplish its goals (Ablaa et al., 2016). The leadership styles employed within the military exhibit variability based on factors such as the specific characteristics of the tasks at hand, the individuals involved, the available resources, and the time required for job completion (Özlen & Zukic, 2013). Effective military leaders employ several leadership

styles to enhance morale, inspire their subordinates, assume accountability for errors, and establish a commendable leadership precedent (Wong et al., 2003). The leadership styles that have proven to be most effective in the military are those that possess the ability to inspire and motivate subordinates, address the requirements of the team, and engage in collaborative decision-making and problem-solving with subordinates. Military leaders that demonstrate these traits are more inclined to attain success in their positions and accomplish the objectives of the organization.

According to numerous research, performance is impacted differently by adversity quotient. Despite the fact that the adversity quotient is measured differently for each dimension, Hong (2020) demonstrated that it has a positive and significant impact on performance. However, the results of Aya et al. (2022) suggested that the adversity quotient's attribute, which creates good entrepreneurs, might not be appropriate for good military leaders. Performance can be negatively impacted by those with high adversity quotients (Atrizka & Pratama, 2022). The Adversity Quotient and the performance of Tayabas city government employees were also examined by Ablaa et al. (2016). The results revealed that neither adversity intelligence nor performance are factors that influence how well employees perform at work. Napier (2013) found no connection between leadership style and adversity quotient. The adversity quotient, according to Okorji & Epetuku (2019), is connected to leadership, though. Leadership has an impact on the adversity quotient, according to a different study by Zainudin et al. (2021). The initial remark implies a sense of expectation regarding the examination of the adversity quotient as a potential mediator. This suggests that the inquiry may focus on the possibilities of influencing or mediating specific relationships.

The earlier justification demonstrates how these two elements may be crucial in enhancing military performance. Since leaders usually take an active and dominant part in every organizational activity, it is crucial that the quality of leaders in companies is controlled appropriately. Leaders have a crucial role in the planning, execution, and determination of organizational goals (Igalla et al., 2019); hence, high-performing leaders are required (Lai, 2020). In order to increase military performance, we therefore investigate the connections between various variables. Although previous studies have investigated the correlation between military leadership styles and performance, there remains a dearth of knowledge regarding the fundamental factors that drive this relationship. An unexplored mediator that holds potential is the adversity quotient. The initial remark implies a sense of expectation regarding the examination of the adversity quotient as a potential mediator. This suggests that the inquiry may focus on the possibilities of influencing or mediating specific relationships. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the mediating effect of adversity quotient on the relationship between military leadership and performance. This study represents an initial endeavor to examine a theoretical framework aimed at enhancing the effectiveness of military organizations by focusing on military leadership. Specifically, it investigates the potential mediating role of the adversity quotient. The study's sample comprises commanders from the POMDAM and DENPOM units across Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Military Leadership and Performance

While ensuring that others have the motivation to work towards a common goal is the general definition of leadership (Danisman et al., 2015), leadership cannot be deemed successful and unimportant in an organizational context if the outcomes are not in line with the common goal (Koech & Namu Songe, 2012). The most significant catalyst for enhancing organizational performance is leadership (Gui, 2022). According to Ullah et al. (2011), leadership that is tied to employee participation and performance is crucial for organizational development. According to Ngambi (2011), leadership is the process of inspiring others to develop their full potential in order to contribute to a common cause and achieve added value.

The majority of existing research has been carried out inside non-military organizations, both in the

commercial and governmental sectors. However, there has been an increasing focus on leadership within military contexts, as evidenced by studies undertaken by Brandebo et al. (2016) and Gallus et al. (2013). The dearth of scholarly investigations within the military domain is regrettable, as empirical study conducted in this sector has the potential to elucidate essential organizational requirements. Performance improvement can be facilitated by effective leadership (Danisman et al., 2015). Additionally, leadership must be a crucial factor in the development of organizational performance in order to comprehend the impact of leadership on performance (Obiwuru et al., 2011). To demonstrate the nature of the relationship between the two variables, a comprehensive evaluation of the research on the impact of leadership on performance is crucial (Danisman et al., 2015). While working in an organizational setting, leadership assists followers in achieving their objectives. It also promotes followers to be expressive and adaptable to new and improved methods as well as environmental changes (Azka et al., 2011).

H1a: Military Leadership affect significantly on Performance

2.2 Adversity Quotient and Military Performance

The concept of Adversity Quotient (AQ) refers to an individual's capacity to effectively confront and navigate through prevailing challenges or impediments. According to Abaña et al. (2016), the organization can successfully accomplish its objective if its members demonstrate effectiveness, efficiency, and commitment in their job. According to the research conducted by Parvathy and Praseeda (2014), it was concluded that the utilization of Adversity Quotient by leaders can aid in the assessment of the difficulties encountered by their subordinates when confronted with several hurdles in their personal and professional lives. Through gaining an understanding of employees' adaptability quotients, leaders have the ability to assist them in navigating difficult circumstances with enhanced effectiveness and efficiency. In this particular scenario, the concept of AQ can also serve as a means to enhance employees' capacity to surmount challenges and so enhance their overall efficacy inside the firm. The adversity quotient of an individual is impacted by a multitude of factors. The adversity quotient of an individual is shaped by a combination of internal and environmental factors.

Numerous empirical investigations have demonstrated that the construct of AQ can exert varying influences on performance outcomes. According to the findings of Hong (2020) and Irawan and Yulihisari (2019), it has been demonstrated that AQ has a favorable and statistically significant impact on performance, despite variations in the calculation of each dimension. Nevertheless, Angelopoulos et al. (2002) found that the attributes evaluated by the AQ, which contribute to the success of entrepreneurs, may not be applicable to effective military leaders. According to Widayat (2009), individuals with a high AQ have the potential to exert a direct influence on individual performance. In their study, Yet et al. (2016) conducted an investigation into the potential correlation between the Adversity Quotient and the job performance of city government employees in Tayabas. The results of their analysis indicated that there is no significant association between adversity intelligence and employees' work performance, suggesting that the former does not exert any influence on the latter.

H1b: Adversity quotient affect significantly on performance

2.3 Military Leadership – Adversity Quotient

When a collective of individuals selects an individual to serve as their leader with the aim of achieving a common objective within a particular context, the phenomenon of leadership emerges as an interactive process of influence (Alberto, 2016). In order for individuals to achieve optimal performance, it is imperative for leaders to prioritize their well-being and overall quality of life. The concept of adversity quotient refers to an individual's cognitive ability to effectively navigate and overcome various challenges and obstacles. The construct denoting the capacity to employ cognitive faculties for the purpose of modifying one's cognitive processes and behavioral patterns when confronted with obstacles is commonly referred to as the adversity quotient. In order to assume a leadership role, individuals must

demonstrate a willingness to express their viewpoints, take calculated risks in decision-making, effectively implement and follow through on decisions, engage in cooperative efforts, possess adept administrative and managerial abilities, exhibit minimal communication apprehension, actively participate in positive social exchanges, display elevated levels of self-regulation, achieve superior academic performance, and possess the capacity for accountability and problem-solving. This endeavor is anticipated to provide the individual with a distinctive encounter, with the aim of fostering the development of their adversity quotient (Phoolka & Kaur, 2012). Napire (2013) found that there is no significant relationship between Adversity Quotient and leadership style. However, Tonsiocco and Ibarra (2020) state that AQ has a relationship with leadership. Other research from Atrizka and Pratama (2022) shows that leadership has an effect on AQ.

H2: Military leadership affect significantly on adversity quotient

2.4 The mediating role of Adversity Quotient

The performance of an organization's members determines its success. If team members are competent, efficient, and dedicated to their work, the business can accomplish its goals (Ablaa et al., 2016). The initial concept of adversity quotient is a measure of an individual's ability to demonstrate resilience and tenacity in the face of various pressures (Stoltz, 1997). Military leaders that possess a higher adversity quotient may have greater ability to sustain higher levels of troop performance in demanding circumstances, in contrast to leaders with a lower AQ. In their findings, Parvathy & Praseeda (2014) claimed that the adversity quotient aids leaders in determining the issues that their employees experience when they encounter several hurdles in their lives and aids in overcoming these difficult circumstances. Leman (2007) defined the adversity quotient as a person's capacity to deal with challenges. The pressure points in the aforementioned descriptions are a person's physical and psychological fortitude in the face of challenges. According to the definition given above, the adversity quotient measures a person's capacity to persevere in the face of challenges until they find a method to overcome them, remove impediments in their path, or alter their perspective on them. A person's capacity to complete a workload, known as the adversity quotient, increases performance, and a high adversity quotient also produces high performance, so the adversity quotient can be used to predict someone's performance, according to Samsualam's research published in Utami & Dewanto (2011). According to Zainudin (2021) and Runtu et al. (2019), it has been observed that AQ plays a mediating role in the relationship between leadership and performance.

H3: Adversity Quotient Mediates the Influence of Military Leadership on Organizational Performance

3. Research Methods

To evaluate the earlier theory, we conducted quantitative study using PLS Structural Equating Model (PLS-SEM) analysis. The study encompassed a total population of 69 commanders within the Military Police Department of the Indonesian Army. Consequently, the sampling approach employed was a census or saturation sample. Because the amount of samples we could utilize was constrained by the questionnaire we gave out, the PLS-SEM was employed. The PLS-SEM was used to test the construct once 69 commandants in the Indonesian Army became respondents at the Military Police Leader level. The questionnaire was used to collect answers from respondents using a Likert scale of “1 (strongly disagree) and “5 (strongly agree). In this instance, the endogenous factors are military leadership, while the exogenous variables are military performance and adversity quotient. In order to evaluate the hypotheses, we conducted an analysis to determine the statistical significance of the path coefficient, indirect effect, and total effect. The statistical tests employed in this study involved the utilization of t-test statistics with a significance level of $p < 0.05$. Additionally, bootstrap confidence intervals and/or bootstrap bias-corrected confidence intervals, as described by Garson (2016), were also utilized.

Table 1: Operationalization of Construct

VARIABLE	DIMENSIONS	INDICATORS
Kepemimpinan Militer Yukl (2012)	Task-oriented	Planning
		Clarifying
		Monitoring Operation
		Problem-Solving
	Relations-oriented	Supporting
		Developing
		Recognizing
		Empowering
	Change-oriented	Advocating change
		Envisioning change
		Encouraging innovation
		Facilitating collective learning
	External	Networking
		External monitoring
Adversity Quotient (Stolz, 2002)	Control	Representing
		Difficulty
	Origin of Ownership	Change
		Awareness
		Confession
	Reach	Search
		Predictive
	Endurance	Preventive
		Response
		Reason
Kinerja Pimpinan Militer Peraturan Panglima TNI No. Perpang/93/XI/2011 Tahun 2011	Quantity	Completion
		Implementation
	Quality	Satisfaction
		Teaching materials
	Creativity	Procedure
		Preparation
	Cooperativeness	Vertical
		Horizontal
	Initiative	Personality
		Inspirational
	Personal Quality	Honesty
		Sincerity

4. Results And Discussion

The detailed socio-democratic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Appendix. Table 2 below shows the reliability and validity test result for each variables.

Table 2: Reliability and Validity Analysis

Variable	Dimensions	Cronbach's alpha	Composite reliability	AVE
ML	Task-oriented	0.859	0.873	0.891
	Relations-oriented	0.768	0.863	0.826
	Change-oriented	0.899	0.905	0.92
	External	0.912	0.915	0.934

AQ	Control	0.855	0.872	0.897
	Origin of Ownership	0.722	0.766	0.84
	Reach	0.906	0.918	0.934
	Endurance	0.846	0.851	0.909
MP	Quantity	0.920	0.925	0.944
	Quality	0.879	0.893	0.918
	Creativity	0.909	0.94	0.938
	Cooperation	0.894	0.919	0.927
	Initiative	0.955	0.955	0.964
	Personal Qualities	0.908	0.908	0.956

The results that presented in Table 2 shows the reliability of the measurement items was examined using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability, where the results for all constructs exceeded a threshold value of 0.70 (see Table 2), indicating strong reliability between measures. In addition, convergent validity is achieved when the AVE value is above 0.50, which is set. All co-variances between factors fall under the square root of the individual factor AVE, supporting sufficient discriminant validity.

Table 3: Statistical Result Of The Structural Model

Hypothesized Path	B	P	R ²	Result
Direct Effect				
KM -> AQ	0.689	0.000	0.475	Accepted
KM -> KIN	0.803	0.000	0.738	Accepted
AQ -> KIN	0.421	0.004		Accepted
Mediation Effect				
KM -> AQ -> KIN	0,290	0.022		Accepted

The R2 of the construct predictor adversity quotient is 47.5 percent, and the predictor Performance is 73.8 percent based on the SEM-PLS results, with all validated direct associations leading to a thorough model specification (see Table 3). Military leadership's adversity quotient and performance responsibility (1=0.689 and 2=0.803, respectively) are significantly positively correlated. H1 and H2 are approved as a result. H3 is also accepted because the adversity quotient shows a substantial and positive association to performance (3=0.421). Furthermore, the association between military leadership and performance is mediated by the adversity quotient, suggesting that H4 is taken to be accurate.

Depending on the variables the researcher utilized, different leadership philosophies may have a good or negative association with performance (Fu-Jin et al., 2010). As was already mentioned, effective management requires the capacity to motivate a team of individuals toward a single objective (Ojokuku et al., 2012). The style of leadership used has a big impact on the relationship between leaders and followers as well as the caliber of employee performance (Ngambi, 2011). Development of management and leadership is necessary for improved performance. To demonstrate the nature of the relationship between the two variables, research on the impact of leadership on performance is crucial (Danisman et al., 2015). According to Karamat (2013), the most significant factor in enhancing organizational performance is leadership. However, it is vital to keep in mind that in an organizational setting, leadership can only be deemed successful and unimportant if the outcomes do not satisfy shared objectives (Koech & Namusonge, 2012).

Some of the earlier research in this study was conducted on businesses in Indonesia (Fitriasari & Mauludin, 2018; Paais, 2020) and Kenya (Koech & Namusonge, 2012), on manufacturing businesses in Congo (Jeremy et al., 2011), on oil and gas businesses in Jordan (Rawashdeh, 2018), on banks

(Ojokuku et al., 2012), and even on SMEs (Obiwuru et al. It should be highlighted, nonetheless, that military organizations face distinct issues or contradictions from non-military groups. These are the different types of paradox: (a) shared leadership versus hierarchical leadership; (b) flexibility and creativity versus conformity and discipline; (c) complexity and chaos versus simplicity and linearity; (d) hegemonic and prototypical leadership versus dual identity leadership; and (e) distant leadership and exchange relationships versus close leadership and collaborative relationships (Kark et al., 2016)

According to the study's findings, organizational performance is positively impacted by the adversity quotient. Performance of an individual increases with their organizational degree of adversity quotient. The study's findings corroborate those of Hong (2020) and Irawan & Yulihisari (2019), who discovered evidence that, even when each dimension is measured differently, the adversity quotient has a positive and significant impact on performance. This study, which focuses on individual performance, counters the findings of Angelopoulos et al. (2002), who suggested that the quality measured by the adversity quotient may not be appropriate for military leaders. The findings of Yet et al. (2016), which demonstrate that the adversity quotient does not dictate how employees perform at work and does not effect performance, cannot be compared to TNI personnel as a civil servant.

The effect of the adversity quotient on the troops' military performance in Ecuador was confirmed by Carrasquero et al. (2017). These findings corroborate what Brannon (2013) reported and Carrasquero et al. (2017) cited, who found that behavioral characteristics, specifically the attribute of behavior in dealing with internally caused negative events, are a predictor of performance. As a result, control has a very powerful causal influence on the locus of control, and many causal factors have their roots in the soldier's internal self, which acts as both a catalyst and amplification for the illusion of control over conduct in the face of difficulty. When examining the data, the dispersion of these reactions on the locus of control can reveal details about the particular acts taken by soldiers in the face of hardship. On the other hand, this level enables troops to believe that even if they feel in control while handling exterior circumstances, their internal feeling of control over their lives must be sound. These results are in line with those suggested by Carrasquero et al. (2017) for a sample of Venezuelan naval troops who experienced a variety of challenges on board. These researchers also found that feelings of gregariousness and solitude appeared to have an impact on the soldiers' performance. These results support Stoltz's (2002) assertion that individuals with sufficiently strong resilience ownership build teams that exhibit a high willingness to accept responsibility and can favorably influence trust, interdependence, and team agility, in this example, a platoon. The results differ from those published by Carrasquero et al. (2012) for marine personnel having a greater adversity quotient resistance than administrative troops or at military schools in the indicator of the value of the influence of this adversity quotient. The results of this investigation are consistent with those of Carrasquero et al. (2017).

Additional studies revealed that leadership will raise troops' adversity quotient levels. These findings corroborate Atrizka and Pratama's research findings from 2022, which indicate that leadership has an impact on the adversity quotient. Napire (2013) discovered no connection between leadership and adversity quotient. But according to Tonsiocco and Ibarra (2020), leadership and the adversity quotient are associated. The results of other studies that used leadership as a factor influencing the adversity quotient were not cited by researchers.

Bartone & Ender (1994) also point out that higher operational tempo for high-risk teams heightens the danger of individual and group stress, which can impair the effectiveness of the individual, the team, and the organization. Long-term stress exposure can also make people tired and have a poor impact on their performance and mental health (Bartone et al., 2022; Blatnik & Tuak, 2018). Thus, highlighting the significance of military leaders building and enhancing the resilience of their teams' individual and collective members refers to team leadership and the capacity to adapt to stress in order to deal with situations effectively before going back to their basic soldier duties. Every person aspires to success, and efforts to do so will undoubtedly encounter challenges along the way. If we relate to Stoltz's

adversity quotient theory by using the CORE principle—which stands for Control, Origin of Ownership, Reach, and Endurance—problems can be transformed into worthwhile opportunities. This idea is a different aspect of resilience that affects how someone responds to every issue, disagreement, injustice, setback, difficulty, and opportunity they face on a daily basis.

The study's findings indicate a strong association with beneficial influence. Evidence suggests that the study's findings have a favorable impact on performance when Adversity Quotient mediators are used. The conclusion is that performance will improve with any improvement in leadership. The performance of an organization's members determines its success. If team members are competent, efficient, and dedicated to their work, the business can accomplish its goals (Ablaa et al., 2016). According to their research, Parvathy & Praseeda's (2014) adversity quotient assists leaders in determining the issues that their employees experience when they encounter several hurdles in their lives and aids in overcoming these trying circumstances. Therefore, aid with overcoming hardship must go hand in hand with leadership. Because every issue can be resolved appropriately, leaders and staff will be better able to deal with disagreements and develop constructive solutions as a result of understanding and putting it into practice.

This research has some limitations. The proposed study model is unable to provide a comprehensive solution to the performance issue. Hence, for future investigation, it is advisable to incorporate additional independent variable in order to examine whether elements outside military leadership has a more substantial impact on performance. The chosen unit of analysis for this study is the commander within a specific unit in the Indonesian National Armed Forces. As a result, it is important to note that the findings of this research cannot be extrapolated to encompass all performance difficulties within the entire Indonesian National Army organization. The anticipated outcomes of this study are poised to hold significance for policymakers and officials within the Army Military Police, serving as valuable study material or references for the formulation of policies within military organizations. Specifically, this study focuses on policies pertaining to military leadership, the internalization of organizational culture, the measurement of adversity quotient, organizational military behavior, and its impact on organizational performance. The findings of research can serve as valuable input, stimulate brainstorming, and contribute to the thought process of military agencies, particularly inside educational institutions, as they strive to enhance the effectiveness of military leaders.

5. Conclusion

Prior research has examined the association between military leadership styles and performance. However, there is still a lack of understanding of the underlying components that influence this relationship. One potentially underexplored mediator that shows promise is the adversity quotient. This research endeavor represents the inaugural attempt to investigate the impact of mediation on the relationship between military leadership and organizational performance. The empirical evidence suggests that the adversity quotient plays a mediation function in the association between military leadership and performance. This demonstrates that in order to enhance the operational capabilities of military organizations, it is imperative to prioritize the enhancement of military leadership efficacy via the lenses of Adversity Quotient. According to studies employing SEM-PLS, military leadership and performance have a positive and significant link with adversity quotient. Similarly, adversity quotient and performance have a positive and substantial relationship. The findings further demonstrate that the relationship between military leadership and performance is mediated by the adversity quotient. This result is consistent with earlier studies that have demonstrated how effective leadership impacts organizational performance and how the adversity quotient also influences organizational success. Keep in mind that military organizations face different issues or contradictions than non-military ones, and that research results may vary depending on the organizational setting under study. Military organizations should focus on creating strong leadership in order to raise their personnel's resilience to hardship and boost their productivity. In this situation, adversity quotient can be raised through

leadership development programs that emphasize overcoming obstacles and stress. Further exploration of the limitations of the research findings is warranted by future research endeavors. The data collection process employed a cross-sectional approach, with a very modest sample size of 69 participants. Hence, we propose conducting additional study to examine the model's efficacy using an expanded sample size and/or employing a longitudinal data gathering approach.

References

- Ablaña, M. V. V, Isidro, D. J., & Gino A. Cabrera, Mp. (2016). Correlation between Adversity Quotient and Job Performance of LGU Employees of Tayabas City : Input to Effective Public Personnel Management. *Journal of Research of the College of Arts and Sciences, Southern Luzon State University, Lucban, Quezon, PH*, 8(2), 109–122.
- Alberto, S. (2016). What is leadership? *Journal of Business Study Quarterly* 8(1).
- Angelopoulos, P. Houde, S., Thompson, Megan. (2002). Canadian Forces training and mental preparation for adversity: Empirical review of Stoltz Adversity Quotient (AQ) training for optimal response to adversity; a review of the A Q literature and supporting studies. *Defence Research and Development Canada*
- Atrizka, D., & Pratama, I. (2022). The Influence of Organizational Leadership and Coaches on Indonesian Athletes' Adversity Quotient (Intelligence). *Revista de Psicología del Deporte (Journal of Sport Psychology)*, 31(1), 88-97.
- Aya, M. K. F. D., Buenvinida, L. P., Tan, C. S., Bandoy, M. M., & Manaig, K. A. (2022). Leadership Practices, Adversity Quotient, And School-Based Management Practices In The New Normal: A Descriptive-Correlational Approach. *International Journal of Theory and Application in Elementary and Secondary School Education*, 4(2), 59-84.
- Azka .G, Tahir. M, Aslam. M & Syed.T (2011). Transformational leadership, employee engagement and performance: mediating effect of psychological ownership. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(17), 7391-7403.
- Bartone, P. T., & Ender, M. G. (1994). Organizational responses to death in the military. *Death Studies*, 18(1), 25-39.
- Blatnik, P., Marinšek, M. & Tušak, M. (2016). Stres, absentizem in ekonomski vidiki telesne neaktivnosti. In M. Tušak, E. Zirnstein, P. Blatnik (ed.). *Psihološki, ekonomski in pravni vidiki promocije zdravja na delovnem mestu* (46-66). Ljubljana: Faculty of sport.
- Brandebo, F., M., Nilsson, S., & Larsson, G. (2016). Leadership: Is bad stronger than good? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37, 690–710.
- Carrasquero, E. E. C., Coronel, F. J., Vaca, I. M., Pilatasi, E. F. M., & Urquizo, S. (2017). Adversity quotient in training soldier staff of the Ecuadorian Army. *Revista Cubana de Medicina Militar*, 46(1), 39-50.
- Danisman, Sahin, Tosuntas, S. B. & Karadag Engin. (2015). The Effect of Leadership on Organizational Performance. *Leadership and Organizational Outcomes*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-14908-0_9
- Di Schiena, R., Letens, G., Van Aken, E., & Farris, J. (2013). Relationship between Leadership and Characteristics of Learning Organizations in Deployed Military Units: An Exploratory Study. *Administrative Sciences*, 3(3), 143–165.
- Fitriasari, M. A., & Mauludin, H. (2018). The Influence of Leadership on Employee Performance with Organizational Culture and Work Motivation as Intervening Variables. *Scientific Research Journal*, 6(7), 42–49.

- Fosse, T. H., Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S. V., & Martinussen, M. (2019). Active and passive forms of destructive leadership in a military context: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 28(5), 708-722.
- Gallus, J. A., Walsh, B. M., van Driel, M., Gouge, M. C., & Antolic, E. (2013). Intolerable cruelty: A multilevel examination of the impact of toxic leadership on U.S. military units and service members. *Military Psychology*, 25, 588–601
- Gui, L., Lei, H., & Le, P. B. (2022). Determinants of radical and incremental innovation: the influence of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing and knowledge-centered culture. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 25(5), 1221-1241.
- Hong, Soon-Bok. (2020). An Analysis on the Relationships of Tax Official's Adversity Quotient Factor with Their Resilience and Job Performance. *World Journal of Accounting, Finance and Engineering* Vol.4, No.1 (2020), pp.35-40
- Igalla, M., Edelenbos, J., & van Meerkerk, I. (2019). Citizens in action, what do they accomplish? A systematic literature review of citizen initiatives, their main characteristics, outcomes, and factors. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 30, 1176-1194.
- Irawan, Wira & Yulihassari. (2019). Effect of Adversity Quotient, Motivation and Discipline on the Performance of Employees PT. PLN (Persero) West Sumatra Padang Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology* Volume 4, Issue 4, April – 2019
- Jeremy .M, Melinde .C & Ciller V. (2012). Perceived leadership style and employee participation in a manufacturing company in the democratic republic of Congo, *African journal of business management*, .6(15), 5389-5398.
- Kark, R., Karazi-Presier, T., & Tubi, Sarit. (2016). Paradox and Challenges in Military Leadership. *Leadership Lessons from Compelling Contexts Monographs in Leadership and Management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Khan, S., Asghar, M., & Zaheer, A. (2014). Influence of Leadership Style on Employee Job Satisfaction and Firm Financial Performance: A Study of Banking Sector in Islamabad, Pakistan. (5), 374-384.
- Koech, P. M., & Namusonge, G. S. (2012). The effect of leadership styles on organizational performance at state corporations in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 2(1), 1–12
- Kristensen, T. B., Saabye, H., & Edmondson, A. (2022). Becoming a learning organization while enhancing performance: the case of LEGO. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 42(13), 438-481.
- Lai, F. Y., Tang, H. C., Lu, S. C., Lee, Y. C., & Lin, C. C. (2020). Transformational leadership and job performance: The mediating role of work engagement. *Sage Open*, 10(1), 2158244019899085.
- Maddi, S. R., Kahn, S., & Maddi, K. L. (1998). The effectiveness of hardiness training. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 50(2), 78.
- Michael. A. (2010). Leadership style and organizational impact. Retrieved from: [http/ www.ala- apa.org](http://www.ala-apa.org)
- Napire, N. J. (2013). Adversity quotient and leadership style in relation to the demographic profile of the elementary school principals in the second Congressional District of Camarines Sur.
- Ngambi, H. C. (2011). The relationship between leadership and employee morale in higher education. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 762.

- Obiwuru, T. C., Okwu, A. T., Akpa, V. O., & Nwankwere, I. A. (2011). Effects of leadership style on organizational performance: A survey of selected small scale enterprises in Ikosi-Ketu council development area of Lagos State, Nigeria. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(7), 100–111
- Oh, P. S., & Lewis, D. E. (2008). Management and Leadership Performance in the Defense Department: Evidence from Surveys of Federal Employees. *Armed Forces & Society*, 34(4), 639–661.
- Paais, M., & Pattiruhu, J. R. (2020). Effect of Motivation, Leadership, and Organizational Culture on Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(8), 577–588.
- Parvathy, U., & Praseeda, M. (2014). Relationship between Adversity Quotient and Academic Problems among Student Teachers. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 19(11), 23–26.
- Pearson-Goff, M., & Herrington, V. (2014). Police leadership: A systematic review of the literature. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 8(1), 14-26.
- Phoolka, S., & Kaur, N. (2012). Adversity Quotient: A new paradigm in Management to explore. *Research Journal of Social Science and Management*, 2(7), 109-117.
- Rawashdeh, A. (2018). Examining the effect of green management on firm efficiency: Evidence from Jordanian oil and gas industry. *Management Science Letters*, 8(12), 1283-1290
- Runtu, D. Y., Aldrin, N., & Merdiaty, N. (2019). Effect of work ethics on job performance with Adversity Quotient as a mediator: Work Ethics on Job Performance with Adversity Quotient. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* (2147-4478), 8(5), 98-103.
- Šimanauskienė, V., Giedraitytė, V., & Navickienė, O. (2021). The Role of Military Leadership in Shaping Innovative Personnel Behaviour: The Case of the Lithuanian Armed Forces. *Sustainability*, 13(16), 9283.
- Sutarman, S., Tjahjono, H. K., & Hamami, T. (2017). The implementation of holistic education in Muhammadiyah's Madrasah Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 17(2), 191-203.
- Uhl-Bien M, Schermerhon JR and Osborn RN. Organizational behavior: experience, grow, Contribute. John Wiley and Sons inc.: 2014
- Ullah, S., Ullah, A., & Durrani, B. (2011). Effect of leadership on employees performance in multinational pharmaceutical companies in Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2(9), 286–299.
- Wong, Leonard., Paul Bliese, Dennis McGurk. (2003). Military leadership: A context specific review. *The Leadership Quarterly* Vol. 14 Issue 6 pp:657-692
- Zaied, Ngambi H.C, Cant M.C, Van Heerden C. H. (2010). Marketing management: A South African perspective, Juta, Cape Town.
- Zainudin, B., Sutawidjaya, A. H., Saluy, A. B., Djamil, M., & Endri, E. (2021). The effect of compensation, leadership, and supervision on performance of government civil servants: Mediating role of adversity quotient. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 453-469.

APPENDIX

Table 2: Socio Demographic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	66	95,7%
Female	3	4,3%
Age		
< 50	51	73,9%
50 – 55	16	23,2%
56 <	2	2,9%
Education		
High School	27	39,1%
Diploma	1	1,4%
Bachelor	24	34,8%
Postgraduate	19	24,7%