



Mental Toughness study on an Outbound Call Centre in the North West of England

Case Study – Mental Toughness & Call Centres

This study was carried out with a “cynical” call centre operator who wanted some evidence of the MT concept before making any commitments. This is the raw data and analysis for the study which demonstrated to everyone’s satisfaction that MTQ does correlate with performance in a call centre.

The Call Centre is a campaign based outbound call centre where operators carry out campaigns on behalf of clients – usually over a short period of time. The requirement to perform and deliver is very high.

Comments from the psychometricians at Hull University are shown in blue.

Correlations

		CHAL	COMMIT	CONT	CONF	MT	SALES
CHAL	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.689	.550	.699	.846	.236
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.003	.027	.003	.000	.380
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16
COMMIT	Pearson Correlation	.689	1.000	.615	.577	.793	.419
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.	.011	.019	.000	.106
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16
CONT	Pearson Correlation	.550	.615	1.000	.670	.839	.481
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.027	.011	.	.005	.000	.059
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16
CONF	Pearson Correlation	.699	.577	.670	1.000	.870	.274
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.019	.005	.	.000	.305
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16
MT	Pearson Correlation	.846	.793	.839	.870	1.000	.376
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.152
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16

SALES	Pearson Correlation	.236	.419	.481	.274	.376	1.000
	Sig. (2- tailed)	.380	.106	.059	.305	.152	.
	N	16	16	16	16	16	16

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

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

These results appear to be supportive. The bottom line of the data is the key – Commitment and Challenge correlate 0.40 with performance. Overall the correlation with MTQ48 0.38. Most personality questionnaires only achieve 0.30 – and when they do, psychometricians are very satisfied.

Basically, 9% of the variance in performance can be explained by the MTQ48. This is a significant factor.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
MT	1.00	4	8.5000	2.3805	1.1902	4.7121	12.2879	5.00	10.00
	2.00	5	7.2000	1.4832	.6633	5.3583	9.0417	5.00	9.00
	3.00	7	6.8571	1.5736	.5948	5.4018	8.3125	5.00	9.00
	Total	16	7.3750	1.7842	.4460	6.4243	8.3257	5.00	10.00
COMMIT	1.00	4	8.7500	2.5000	1.2500	4.7719	12.7281	5.00	10.00
	2.00	5	7.4000	1.6733	.7483	5.3223	9.4777	5.00	9.00
	3.00	7	6.5714	1.9024	.7190	4.8120	8.3308	4.00	9.00
	Total	16	7.3750	2.0616	.5154	6.2765	8.4735	4.00	10.00
CONT	1.00	4	7.7500	2.6300	1.3150	3.5652	11.9348	4.00	10.00
	2.00	5	7.0000	1.7321	.7746	4.8494	9.1506	6.00	10.00
	3.00	7	5.5714	1.6183	.6117	4.0747	7.0682	3.00	7.00
	Total	16	6.5625	2.0320	.5080	5.4797	7.6453	3.00	10.00
CONF	1.00	4	8.5000	1.9149	.9574	5.4530	11.5470	6.00	10.00

	2.00	5	6.6000	1.5166	.6782	4.7169	8.4831	4.00	8.00
	3.00	7	7.0000	1.4142	.5345	5.6921	8.3079	5.00	9.00
	Total	16	7.2500	1.6533	.4133	6.3690	8.1310	4.00	10.00
CHAL	1.00	4	8.2500	2.2174	1.1087	4.7217	11.7783	5.00	10.00
	2.00	5	6.6000	2.3022	1.0296	3.7415	9.4585	4.00	9.00
	3.00	7	6.7143	2.2887	.8650	4.5976	8.8310	4.00	10.00
	Total	16	7.0625	2.2351	.5588	5.8715	8.2535	4.00	10.00

This data is more compelling.

The analysts split the performances into low, medium and high. There were natural splits so the numbers in the three groups are not the same. However, the results clearly show that the high performers (grp 1) have MT scores in the above average range on all scales.

Overall the MTQ48 appears to be working very well.

The client obviously expects a 1:1 match so it needs explaining that low MT people can perform well and high MT people can underperform.

We are looking for general trends – and **they clearly show that MT is related to performance**. This is the case even though the best salesperson has an MT of 5. If we remove this individual from the data the results are very striking indeed.

In summary, this data strongly supports the usefulness of the scale. In this particular organisation, HIGH MT is associated with good performance.

There does not seem to be a difference between medium and low scores.