

MAGDALENA BOCZKOWSKA
Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0003-3435-8193

TEACHERS' RESILIENCE IN POLAND – THE ROLE OF SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC AND PROFESSIONAL FACTORS*

Introduction: Teachers' resilience is the dynamic interaction between personal, social, and physical resources to counteract risk factors in the school context by maximizing protective resources.

Research Aim: The present study aims to verify whether sociodemographic and professional variables significantly differentiate teachers' levels of resilience.

Method: The study included 752 teachers of different stages of education. The Teachers' Resilience Scale by Platsidou and Danilidou in the Polish adaptation by Boczkowska was used to measure resilience.

Results: The teachers in the sample obtained the highest mean scores in the *Family cohesion* dimension, while the lowest in the *Social competence and peer support* dimension. The analyses showed that sociodemographic variables (gender, age, place of residence and marital status) significantly differentiated the teachers' level of resilience (total score and/or scores on individual subscales). Also, professional variables (workplace, seniority, and professional development level) significantly differentiated teachers' resilience in the studied group.

Conclusions: The results broaden the knowledge of teachers' resilience and they can be used in the design of activities aimed at enhancing teachers' ability to adapt positively in the face of difficult, stressful, or traumatic events.

Keywords: resilience, teachers, sociodemographic factors, teachers' resilience

INTRODUCTION

The teaching profession is one of the most burdensome – the number of daily professional stressors related to the education and upbringing of children and adolescents is a challenge for positive functioning in this profession and maintaining

* Suggested citation: Boczkowska, M. (2023). Teachers' Resilience in Poland — the Role of Sociodemographic and Professional Factors. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 42(3), 53–69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2023.42.3.53-69>

a high quality of work and a strong commitment. There are groups of factors that may generate teacher stress: professional mismatch, physical working conditions, overload with the role, and social relations in the workplace (Kwiatkowski, 2022). Teachers' experience of stress may lead to symptoms of burnout expressed in emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal achievement (Maslach and Leiter, 2008). This, in turn, may contribute to negative effects on teachers' functioning in the physical, mental, family and social spheres (Kocór, 2019), and eventually result in them leaving the profession. The most common reasons for exiting the profession among teachers are considered to be low remuneration, emotional exhaustion, and professional burnout (Michniuk, 2020). Also, specific challenges for teachers emerged due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Significant changes resulting from the need to switch to remote teaching (teachers were not prepared for) contributed to, among others: a decrease in their physical and mental well-being (Ptaszek et al., 2020). Thus, there is a need to look for factors that are important for the harmonious adaptation of teachers in the face of difficulties and stressors in their profession. In this context, the concept of teachers' resilience should be explained.

TEACHERS' RESILIENCE

To understand the essence of teachers' resilience, we need to start from the concept of resilience itself, whose origin lies in the answer to the question: what makes some people, despite experiencing stressful or even traumatic events, able to function positively, sometimes even better than before, while others, faced with the same experiences, give up and are unable to act. Resilience in a broad sense refers to an individual's successful adaptation to difficult or challenging events and is conceptualized and operationalized in various ways in empirical investigations as a feature, process, or a result of this process (Masten, 2001). However, in all these approaches, the common denominator is the perception of resilience in connection with the positive adaptation of individuals, families or social groups that experience adversity or function in risk conditions. Here the interaction between individual (biological or psychological) and social factors is important as it covers both social microsystems such as family or friends and broader systems of various social groups. Although research on the resilience of various social groups has been quite common in recent decades, in the case of teachers it has been quite a neglected area (Gu, 2018). Gu emphasizes that teachers' resilience depends on the broad professional context and role-specific factors because it is closely related to the strength and belief in their professional commitment (2014, 2018; Gu and Day, 2013). Teachers' resilience is most often perceived as a process in which their personal characteristics interact with environmental factors and determine their

reaction and adaptation to the difficulties and challenges related to their profession (Mansfield et al., 2012). In this aspect, teachers' resilience includes the dynamic interaction between personal factors (e.g. perseverance, optimism, motivation), social factors (e.g. relationships with colleagues, interactions with students) and physical factors (e.g. school infrastructure) to counteract risk factors emerging in the school context by maximizing protective factors (Masten, 2014). Despite encountering difficulties or experiencing stress, the individual adapts positively and their sense of well-being is maintained (Howard and Johnson, 2004). The relational sphere plays an important role in this process – supportive personal and professional relationships can strengthen teachers' resilience, which is important for job satisfaction and commitment to work (Sammons et al., 2007). Resilient teachers have a high sense of self-efficacy, competence, and self-confidence, and draw strength from their achievements (Beltman et al., 2011). Current research indicates there is a relationship between resilience and the intention to change, organizational commitment, readiness for change, job satisfaction and commitment (Shin et al., 2012). Researchers concede that resilience can be promoted, nurtured, and strengthened (Cefai, 2004). Due to the constantly increasing rate of resignations from the teaching profession in many countries (Scheopner, 2010), there is a need to find factors that are important for maintaining the quality, motivation and commitment in teachers' work (Day and Gu, 2010). In this respect, teachers' resilience should be viewed as “a dynamic construct influenced by environmental, professional and personal contexts” (Sammons et al., 2007, p. 694). The literature on teachers' resilience is based on both quantitative and qualitative research and is diverse in terms of theoretical foundations, but most studies emphasize the multidimensionality of the phenomenon. Research into teachers' resilience has the potential to formulate practical implications – it can be used in the design of professional development programs for teachers and their employers, as well as for students of teaching courses (Beltman et al., 2011).

RESEARCH PROBLEM AND GOAL

The presented research aimed to verify whether sociodemographic and professional variables significantly differentiate the level of teachers' resilience. The following research problem was posed: do sociodemographic variables (gender, age, place of residence, marital status) and work-related variables (workplace, seniority, and professional development level) differentiate the level of resilience among the teachers in the sample, and if so, what are the differences?

In some analyses, variables such as age, gender, marital status, professional activity, educational attainment and income were not identified as factors influencing resilience (Böell et al., 2016), while other studies indicated that some of these variables

may be important for resilience (Beltman et al., 2011; Estaji and Rahimi, 2014; García, 2020; Polat and İskender, 2018). Since the existing empirical data regarding teachers' resilience is inconsistent, no hypotheses were formulated for the present study.

METHOD AND SAMPLE

The research was conducted in October 2020. All respondents gave informed and voluntary consent to participate in the anonymous study. Teachers were invited to participate in the study via e-mail. Due to the need to maintain the sanitary regime related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the study was conducted using a Google Forms survey, which respondents received access to in the invitation.

Resilience was measured using the Teachers' Resilience Scale (Platsidou and Daniilidou 2018) in the Polish adaptation by Boczkowska (2021). The Polish version of the scale contains 25 items and assesses four dimensions of teachers' resilience: *Social competence and peer support* (SCPS) (8 items, e.g. "I enjoy being with my co-workers"), *Family cohesion* (FC) (6 items, e.g. "My family is cohesive"), *Personal competencies and perseverance* (PCP) (9 items, e.g. "I can adapt to changes") and *The importance of spirituality* (IS) (2 items, e.g. "Sometimes I believe that nothing happens without a reason"). The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the entire scale in this study was 0.86 and for the individual subscales: SCPS – 0.88, FC – 0.89, PCP – 0.78, IS – 0.67.

The socio-demographic and professional variables for the surveyed teachers were measured by a questionnaire created by the authors containing questions about gender, age, place of residence, marital status, workplace, professional development level, and seniority. Detailed data are presented in Table 1.

DATA ANALYSIS

Two assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variability were confirmed before the analysis to decide whether to use parametric or nonparametric tests. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ and Kolmogorov–Smirnov statistics were analyzed to determine the distribution of data for investigating differences between the groups. Descriptive statistics (arithmetic mean, standard deviation) were presented for the studied variable of teachers' resilience and its dimensions.

For intergroup comparisons, the Student's *t*-test was used for normally distributed variables and the Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA for unequal groups. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to check correlations. Multivariate regression was used to check which sociodemographic and professional factors contribute most to explaining teachers' resilience. Calculations were performed using the PS IMA-GO 8 PRO package.

Table 1.
Sample characteristics (N = 752)

Variable	Category	N	%	
Gender	Female	670	89.10	
	Male	80	10.64	
	No data	2	0.27	
Place of residence	Countryside	167	22.21	
	Town	257	34.18	
	City	326	43.35	
	No data	2	0.27	
Marital status	Single	148	19.68	
	Married	520	69.15	
	Divorced, in separation	42	5.58	
	Widowed	42	5.59	
Workplace	Pre-school	112	14.89	
	Primary school	469	62.37	
	High school	170	22.61	
	No data	1	0.13	
Professional development level	Junior teacher	38	5.05	
	Contract teacher	157	20.88	
	Appointed teacher	150	19.95	
	Certified teacher	405	53.86	
	Min	Max	M	SD
Age (N = 736)	22.00	70.00	44.91	10.15
Seniority (N = 751)	0.01	50.00	19.50	11.32

Source: Author's own study.

RESULTS

Table 2 contains descriptive statistics for the resilience of the surveyed teachers. The results indicate that the surveyed teachers obtained the highest average scores in the *Family Cohesion* dimension and the lowest in the *Social competence and peer support* dimension.

Table 2.
Descriptive statistics for the resilience variable (N = 752)

Category	M	SD
Social competence and peer support	3.59	0.62
Family cohesion	4.10	0.62
Personal competencies and perseverance	3.73	0.49
Importance of spirituality	3.73	0.90
Teacher resilience – total score	3.77	0.39

Note: Responses were given on a 5-point Likert scale

Source: Author's own study.

The obtained scores were compared with the sten norms developed for the Teachers' Resilience Scale by Boczkowska (2021). Scores in the 5–6 sten are treated as average, 1–4 as low, and 7–10 as high (Brzeziński, 2005). The largest group of the surveyed teachers obtained an average resilience score (41.22%), followed by a low score (32.05%) and a high score (26.73%).

The following part of the presented study analyzes the role of sociodemographic and profession-related variables for resilience among the surveyed teachers.

Resilience and gender

The obtained data were analyzed to check whether gender differentiates the resilience of the surveyed teachers in terms of the total score and its individual dimensions (Table 3).

Table 3.

Resilience and gender of the surveyed teachers – Student's t-test (N = 752)

Category	Gender	N	M	SD	t	p
Teacher resilience – total score	Female	670	3.77	0.39	-0.55	0.580
	Male	80	3.79	0.41		
Social competence and peer support	Female	670	3.61	0.62	1.63	0.103
	Male	80	3.49	0.55		
Family cohesion	Female	670	4.10	0.62	-0.18	0.858
	Male	80	4.11	0.64		
Personal competencies and perseverance	Female	670	3.72	0.49	-2.41	0.016*
	Male	80	3.86	0.50		
Importance of spirituality	Female	670	3.64	0.88	-1.20	0.229
	Male	80	3.77	1.04		

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Author's own study.

The obtained results suggest that gender significantly differentiates one of the dimensions of teachers' resilience: *Personal competencies and perseverance*. Men obtained a significantly higher average score in this dimension than women. It can therefore be assumed that the surveyed male teachers are better able to adapt to the changes they experience and are more willing to take the initiative in the problem-solving process than female teachers. This group of respondents also has a stronger belief that they have the skills necessary to deal with emotions described as unpleasant.

Resilience and age

The relationship between the resilience of the surveyed teachers and their age was examined. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.

Resilience and age of the surveyed teachers – Pearson correlation coefficient (N = 752)

Category	Age
Resilience – total score	0.15**
Social competence and peer support	0.09*
Family cohesion	0.11**
Personal competencies and perseverance	0.15**
Importance of spirituality	-0.02

 $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Source: Author's own study.

Data showed a positive correlation between resilience (total score) and its three dimensions: *Social competence and peer support*, *Family cohesion*, and *Personal competencies and perseverance*, and the age of the surveyed teachers. The strength of these relationships was weak. The increase in the age variable was accompanied by an increase in resilience: the older the surveyed teachers were, the higher the level of their resilience and its selected dimensions. Therefore, over time, the surveyed teachers' ability to cope and positively adapt to everyday school reality and the challenges associated with it strengthened.

Resilience and place of residence

The place of residence of the surveyed teachers was analyzed to see if it statistically significantly differentiated levels of their resilience. Due to the unequal size of the groups, Kruskal–Wallis one-way ANOVA was performed. Detailed data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5.

Resilience and place of residence of the surveyed teachers – Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA (N = 750)

Category	Place of residence	N	M	SD	p
Resilience – total score	countryside	167	3.83	0.39	0.020*
	town	257	3.72	0.39	
	city	326	3.78	0.39	
Social competence and peer support	countryside	167	3.65	0.61	0.021*
	town	257	3.51	0.62	
	city	326	3.63	0.62	
Family cohesion	countryside	167	4.21	0.58	0.083
	town	257	4.08	0.61	
	city	326	4.07	0.65	
Personal competencies and perseverance	countryside	167	3.75	0.48	0.630
	town	257	3.70	0.50	
	city	326	3.75	0.49	
Importance of spirituality	countryside	167	3.77	0.87	0.150
	town	257	3.61	0.88	
	city	326	3.65	0.93	

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Author's own study.

The performed analyses showed that the place of residence of the surveyed teachers significantly differentiated their level of resilience (total score) ($p < 0.05$) and one of the dimensions of resilience: *Social competence and peer support* ($p < 0.05$). To determine the nature of the obtained differences, pairwise comparisons were performed (Table 6).

Table 6.

Resilience and place of residence of the surveyed teachers – pairwise comparisons (N = 750)

Resilience	Category	Test statistics	Standard error	Standardized test statistics	Significance	Corrected significance
Total score	Town – City	-23.00	18.06	-1.27	0.20	0.61
	Town – Countryside	59.39	21.52	2.76	0.01	0.02*
	City – Countryside	36.39	20.60	1.77	0.08	0.23
Social competence and peer support	Town – City	-39.19	18.04	-2.17	0.03	0.09
	Town – Countryside	55.10	21.49	2.56	0.01	0.03*
	City – Countryside	15.91	20.57	0.77	0.44	1.00

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Author's own study.

Place of residence was found to differentiate the level of resilience – the total score and the dimension of *Social competence and peer support*, but these differences only concerned teachers living in towns and the countryside. The surveyed teachers who declared living in the countryside rated their level of resilience, their social competence and the support they received from colleagues significantly higher than teachers living in towns. This means that when faced with stressful or traumatic events, these respondents adapted to them better and engaged in the process of proactive coping to a greater extent than teachers from towns. The observed differences may also indicate that the surveyed teachers from rural areas derived greater satisfaction from being with their colleagues, it was easier for them to make friends with them, and in difficult situations, they could count on their support more often than teachers from towns.

Resilience and marital status

To determine whether marital status (not being in a relationship/being in a relationship) is a variable that statistically significantly differentiates the level of resilience of the surveyed teachers, the Student's *t*-test was used for two independent groups (Table 7).

Table 7.
Resilience and marital status of the surveyed teachers – Student's t-test (N = 752)

Category	Marital status*	N	M	SD	t	p
Resilience – total score	Not in a relationship	232	3.70	0.40	-3.50	< 0.001
	In a relationship	520	3.80	0.39		
Social competence and peer support	Not in a relationship	232	3.55	0.62	-1.32	0.190
	In a relationship	520	3.61	0.62		
Family cohesion	Not in a relationship	232	3.90	0.72	-6.05	< 0.001
	In a relationship	520	4.19	0.55		
Personal competencies and perseverance	Not in a relationship	232	3.70	0.50	-1.24	0.217
	In a relationship	520	3.75	0.49		
Importance of spirituality	Not in a relationship	232	3.65	0.90	-0.15	0.881
	In a relationship	520	3.66	0.90		

*not in a relationship (single, separated, divorced, widowed); in a relationship (married, in an informal relationship)

Source: Author's own study.

The conducted analyses showed that marital status differentiated the resilience of the surveyed teachers, with statistically significant differences noted in the total score ($p < 0.001$) and in the *Family Cohesion* dimension ($p < 0.001$). The respondents who were in a relationship (formal or informal) obtained significantly higher average scores in total resilience and its dimension of *Family Cohesion*, than the surveyed teachers who were not in a relationship (single, separated, divorced, and widowed). Teachers in a relationship rated their ability to positively adapt in the face of stressful events higher than their peers who were not in a relationship and identified more strongly with the belief that family cohesion, loyalty, and spending free time together are important elements of their coping with stressful stimuli.

Resilience and workplace

The data was analyzed to check whether the workplace (kindergarten, primary school, secondary school) differentiated the level of resilience among the respondents (Table 8).

The conducted analyses showed that the workplace statistically significantly differentiated the resilience of the surveyed teachers, but only in the dimension of *Social competence and peer support* ($p < 0.001$). To determine the nature of these differences, pairwise comparisons were performed (Table 9).

Table 8.
Resilience and workplace of the surveyed teachers – Kruskal–Wallis ANOVA (N = 751)

Category	Workplace	N	M	SD	p
Resilience – total score	kindergarten	112	3.80	0.44	0.584
	primary school	469	3.77	0.38	
	secondary school	170	3.75	0.39	
Social competence and peer support	kindergarten	112	3.74	0.64	0.008*
	primary school	469	3.59	0.61	
	secondary school	170	3.51	0.61	
Family cohesion	kindergarten	112	4.05	0.70	0.832
	primary school	469	4.12	0.60	
	secondary school	170	4.10	0.62	
Personal competences and perseverance	kindergarten	112	3.71	0.57	0.491
	primary school	469	3.72	0.47	
	secondary school	170	3.77	0.48	
Importance of spirituality	kindergarten	112	3.70	0.79	0.147
	primary school	469	3.69	0.90	
	secondary school	170	3.54	0.95	

* $p < 0.001$

Source: Author's own study.

Table 9.
Resilience and workplace of the surveyed teachers – pairwise comparisons (N = 750)

Resilience	Category	Test statistics	Standard error	Standardized test statistics	Significance	Corrected significance
Social competence and peer support	Secondary school – primary school	32.87	19.38	1.70	0.09	0.27
	secondary school – kindergarten	82.04	26.35	3.11	0.00	0.01
	primary school – kindergarten	49.17	22.77	2.16	0.03	0.09

Source: Author's own study.

The surveyed teachers working in kindergarten obtained significantly higher average scores in the dimension of *Social competence and peer support* than the surveyed teachers working in primary schools (3.74 vs 3.59) and secondary schools (3.74 vs 3.51). This suggests that this group is characterized by higher satisfaction with the nature of the relationships they have with their co-workers and in difficult situations they can count on their support to a greater extent than the other respondents.

Resilience and seniority

The relationship between work experience and the resilience of the surveyed teachers was analyzed using Pearson's correlation coefficient (Table 10).

Table 10.

Resilience and seniority of the surveyed teachers – Pearson correlation coefficient (N = 752)

Category	Seniority
Resilience – total score	0.13**
Social competence and peer support	0.09*
Family cohesion	0.09*
Personal competencies and perseverance	0.12*
Importance of spirituality	-0.05

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Source: Author's own study.

The research results showed there was a positive correlation between resilience and the work experience of the surveyed teachers in the total score ($p < 0.001$) and three of the four dimensions of resilience: *Social competence and peer support* ($p < 0.01$), *Family cohesion* ($p < 0.01$), and *Personal competencies and perseverance* ($p < 0.01$). An increase in seniority was accompanied by an increase in resilience in this group of respondents. This suggests that as the surveyed teachers gain professional experience, they strengthen their adaptive potential in the face of difficult, stressful or traumatic events. This regularity occurs in the area of resilience related to the social and family functioning of the respondents, as well as their beliefs about their competencies.

Resilience and level of professional development

The Student's *t*-test was used to analyze if the level of professional development among the surveyed teachers, before certification (junior, contract, and appointed teachers) and after being certified, significantly differentiates their resilience (Table 11).

The level of professional development is a variable differentiating the overall resilience result ($p < 0.05$) and its dimension: *Personal competencies and perseverance* ($p < 0.05$). The surveyed certified teachers obtained significantly higher average scores in terms of resilience than the respondents before certification (94.90 vs. 93.54). This means that this group of respondents demonstrates stronger adaptability in the face of difficulties and adversities than junior, contract, and appointed teachers. At the same time, the surveyed certified teachers have a stronger belief than their other colleagues in their individual competencies related to the ability to adapt to changes, act under time pressure and cope with unpleasant emotions. These teachers, experiencing failures, are less likely to become discouraged than their colleagues who are not certified.

Table 11.

Resilience and professional development level of the surveyed teachers – Student's t-test (N = 750)

Category	Teacher	N	M	SD	t	p
Resilience – total score	before certification	345	3.74	0.39	-1.89	0.059*
	certified	405	3.80	0.40		
Social competence and peer support	before certification	345	3.57	0.63	-1.29	0.198
	certified	405	3.62	0.60		
Family cohesion	before certification	345	4.07	0.65	-1.36	0.174
	certified	405	4.13	0.60		
Personal competencies and perseverance	before certification	345	3.69	0.51	-2.15	0.032*
	certified	405	3.77	0.47		
Importance of spirituality	before certification	345	3.70	0.87	1.26	0.208
	certified	405	3.62	0.92		

Note: Before certification (junior, contract, appointed)

* $p < 0.05$

Source: Author's own study.

To determine which sociodemographic and professional factors of the surveyed teachers best explain their level of resilience, stepwise regression was used. Variables that correlate with total resilience were introduced into the model: age, marital status (being in a relationship/not in a relationship) and seniority. The obtained model including two explanatory variables (age, and marital status) turned out to be statistically significant ($F(4;734) = 11.95, p < 0.001$). It explains 18% of the variance of the total resilience variable, with the greatest contribution to explaining the dependent variable of the age of the respondents. Detailed data are included in Table 12.

Table 12.

Stepwise regression analysis: teachers' resilience (explained variable), age and marital status of respondents (explanatory variables)

Category	unstandardized coefficients		standardized coefficients	t	p	semi-partial correlations
	B	standard error	β			
constant	84.87	1.95	–	43.57	< 0.001	–
Age	0.13	0.04	0.14	3.74	< 0.001	0.14
Marital status	1.99	0.78	0.09	2.55	0.011	0.09

Source: Author's own study.

DISCUSSION

The presented research aimed to determine the role of selected sociodemographic and professional factors for teachers' resilience. So far, to the best of the author's knowledge, the role of factors such as age, gender, marital status, work experience and level of professional development for teachers' resilience has not been explored in Polish literature.

The obtained data indicates that men demonstrate more positive beliefs about their own competencies and perseverance. The perspective of analyzing resilience in terms of gender seems to be important primarily since the teaching profession, especially at the earliest stages, is particularly hyper-feminized (Corrall, 2016). Although some studies have shown that gender does not differentiate resilience, some reports suggest that gender may be important for resilience (Estaji and Rahimi, 2014). This is consistent with the results obtained by Polat and İskender (2018) in a study on resilience with 581 teachers (Friborg et al., 2005). Similarly to the present study, no gender differences were confirmed in terms of the total resilience score, but in the perception of the "self" subscale, men had statistically significantly higher averages than women. Negative self-beliefs may be a risk factor for teachers' resilience (Kitching et al., 2009). However, research in this area is not clear (see Beltman et al., 2011), which may call for future research exploration in this area.

Teachers living in the countryside demonstrate higher social competence and support from colleagues living in the city, which may mean that they feel more joy in being with their colleagues and have stronger bonds with them – thanks to a solid network of peer relationships, they have stronger protective resources. Day and Gu (2010) indicated that teachers consider relationships at work to be the most important factor in helping them maintain resilience. Research conducted among teachers often emphasizes that inappropriate relationships within the teaching staff constitute a significant burden and cause stress (Pyżalski, 2010). In terms of resilience, data obtained by Brunetti show that co-workers can be a valuable source of support, hope and inspiration, especially in the face of difficult events (2006).

Teachers in relationships (formal and informal) present a higher level of resilience and family cohesion, which is consistent with previous analyzes (García, 2020) indicating that teachers who are married or live with a partner show a much higher level of resilience than those who are single. Social support, especially from colleagues and family, is an important protective factor for resilience (Sęk and Cieślak, 2004; Walsh, 2007). This finding is not consistent with previous research, which did not confirm the relationship between marital status and resilience (Stavraki and Karagianni, 2020).

Teachers working in kindergarten obtained higher results in terms of social competence than teachers working in other stages of education. Most research

on resilience focuses on individual characteristics, but the broader context should be taken into account - including the teacher's workplace. Resilience can be developed by providing support in the workplace (King et al., 2016). Strong and caring leadership is particularly important, as it can be a source of personal support for teachers in difficult situations (Howard and Johnson, 2004), but relationships with mentors can be equally valuable, especially in the first stages of a professional career (Olsen and Anderson, 2007). Seniority is important for resilience – the more work experience, the greater the intensity of this variable, which is also related to another result showing that certified teachers have a stronger belief in their own competencies and perseverance than teachers who are not certified. In fact, an increase in age and work experience is associated with greater professional experience, which in turn favors the development of personal abilities and skills for coping with challenging and stressful situations. As teachers progress through subsequent levels of professional development, their sense of self-efficacy increases, which may contribute to learning and using various coping strategies that can facilitate their adaptation and provide them with the ability to act effectively and more resiliently in such situations (Beltman et al., 2011).

To sum up, the role of sociodemographic factors in experiencing resilience is not entirely clear, and research results from various authors are ambiguous or even contradictory. Therefore, it is important to conduct further research into teachers' resilience. Increasing rates of teachers leaving the profession suggest the need to seek and strengthen protective factors in this professional group. Empirical evidence suggests that resilience is a psychological factor that influences teachers' decisions to leave the profession: teachers with lower levels of resilience show stronger intentions to leave (Arnup and Bowles, 2016; Beltman et al., 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

From the perspective of positive psychology, this research helps to determine how certain groups of teachers can adapt positively in the face of difficulties and adversities. This will help in designing practical intervention programs aimed at supporting teachers' positive results: motivation, quality of work, and commitment to it. Teacher education programs should encompass protective and risk factors for teachers' resilience. Junior teachers, in particular, should be provided with extensive support to help them pursue a positive career path. Such interventions should include higher-level structural action to tailor school-wide demands to the capabilities of each teacher and those most at risk of stress.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The conducted research was cross-sectional. It is extremely important to conduct longitudinal research that would deepen our understanding of dynamic resilience processes at various levels of analysis – related to individual experiences and the social determinants of resilience.

REFERENCES

- Arnup, J., Bowles, T. (2016). Should I stay or should I go? Resilience as a protective factor for teachers' intention to leave the teaching profession. *Australian Journal of Education*, 60(3), 229–244.
- Beltman, S., Mansfield, C., Price, A. (2011). Thriving not just surviving: A review of research on teachers' resilience. *Educational Research Review*, 6(3), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2011.09.001>
- Boczkowska, M. (2021). Skala Resilience Nauczycieli (SRN) – polska adaptacja Teachers' Resilience Scale (TRS) M. Platsidou, A. Danilidou. *Edukacja Elementarna w Teorii i Praktyce*, 16(4/62), 109–132.
- Böell, J.E.W., Silva, D.M.G. V. da, Hegadoren, K.M. (2016). Sociodemographic factors and health conditions associated with the resilience of people with chronic diseases: A cross-sectional study. *Revista Latino-Americana de Enfermagem*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1518-8345.1205.2786>
- Brunetti, G.J. (2006). Resilience under fire: Perspectives on the work of experienced, inner city high school teachers in the United States. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 22(7), 812–825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.04.027>
- Brzeziński, J. (2005). *Metodologia badań psychologicznych*. PWN.
- Cefai, C. (2004). Pupil resilience in the classroom. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*, 9(3), 149–170. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363275204047804>
- Corrall, G.G. (2016). *Evolución de la Incursión del Perfil Masculino Como Docente en Educación Infantil*. Universidad de la Rioja.
- Day, C., Gu, Q. (2010). *The New Lives of Teachers*. Routledge.
- Estaji, M., Rahimi, A. (2014). Examining the ESP teachers' perception of resilience. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 453–457.
- Friborg, O., Barlaug, D., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J.H., Hjemdal, O. (2005). Resilience in relation to personality and intelligence. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 14(1), 29–42.
- García, M.I.V. de V. (2020). Resilient keys to burnout prevention in high school teachers. *Journal of Biomedical Science*, 3(2), 691–699.
- Gu, Q. (2014). The role of relational resilience in teachers' career-long commitment and effectiveness. *Teachers and Teaching*, 20(5), 502–529. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.937961>

- Gu, Q. (2018). (Re)conceptualising teacher resilience: A social-ecological approach to understanding teachers' professional worlds. In M. Wosnitza, F. Peixoto, S. Beltman, C.F. Mansfield (Eds.), *Resilience in Education* (pp. 13–33). Springer.
- Gu, Q., Day, C. (2013). Challenges to teacher resilience: Conditions count. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(1), 22–44.
- Howard, S., Johnson, B. (2004). Resilient teachers: Resisting stress and burnout. *Social Psychology of Education*, 7(4), 399–420.
- King, D. D., Newman, A., Luthans, F. (2016). Not if, but when we need resilience in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(5), 782–786. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2063>
- Kitching, K., Morgan, M., O'Leary, M. (2009). It's the little things: Exploring the importance of commonplace events for early-career teachers' motivation. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600802661311>
- Kocór, M. (2019). *Wypalenie zawodowe nauczycieli: Diagnoza, wsparcie, profilaktyka*. Krakowska Akademia im. Andrzeja Frycza Modrzewskiego.
- Kwiatkowski, S.T. (2022). Stres zawodowy nauczycieli – mechanizmy, uwarunkowania, strategie przeciwdziałania. In K. Białożył-Wielonek (Ed.), *Wybrane aspekty funkcjonowania rynku pracy w czasie pandemii COVID-19* (pp. 13–48). Wyd. Scriptum.
- Mansfield, C. F., Beltman, S., Price, A., McConney, A. (2012). “Don't sweat the small stuff.” Understanding teacher resilience at the chalkface. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(3), 357–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.11.001>
- Maslach, C., Leiter, M.P. (2008). Early predictors of job burnout and engagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 498–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.3.498>
- Masten, A.S. (2001). Ordinary Magic: Resilience Processes in Development. *American psychologist*, 56(3), 227.
- Masten, A.S. (2014). *Ordinary Magic. Resilience in Development*. Guilford.
- Michniuk, A. (2020). Dlaczego współcześni nauczyciele rezygnują z pracy w szkołach państwowych? Raport z badań. *Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, 43(1), 153–165.
- Olsen, B., Anderson, L. (2007). Courses of action: A qualitative investigation into urban teacher retention and career development. *Urban Education*, 42(1), 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085906293923>
- Platsidou, M., Danilidou, A. (2018). Teachers' resilience scale: An integrated instrument for assessing protective factors of teachers' resilience. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology*, 15, 15–39.
- Polat, D.D., İskender, M. (2018). Exploring teachers' resilience in relation to job satisfaction, burnout, organizational commitment and perception of organizational climate. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 5(3), 1–13.
- Ptaszek, G., Stunża, G.D., Pyżalski, J., Dębski, M., Bigaj, M. (2020). *Edukacja zdalna: Co stało się z uczniami, ich rodzicami i nauczycielami*. GWP.
- Pyżalski, J. (2010). Stresory w środowisku pracy nauczyciela. In J. Pyżalski, D. Merecz (Eds.), *Psychospołeczne warunki pracy polskich nauczycieli. Pomędzy wypaleniem zawodowym a zaangażowaniem* (pp. 53–74). Impuls.

- Sammons, P., Day, C., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Stobart, G., Smees, R. (2007). Exploring variations in teachers' work, lives and their effects on pupils: Key findings and implications from a longitudinal mixed methods study. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(5), Article 5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701582264>
- Scheopner, A. J. (2010). Irreconcilable differences: Teacher attrition in public and catholic schools. *Educational Research Review*, 5(3), 261–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2010.03.001>
- Sęk, H., Cieślak, R. (2004). *Wsparcie społeczne. Stres i zdrowie*. Wyd. Nauk. PWN.
- Shin, J., Taylor, M.S., Seo, M.-G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 727–748. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.0325>
- Stavraki, C., Karagianni, E. (2020). Exploring Greek EFL teachers' resilience. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning*, 2(1), Article 1.
- Walsh, F. (2007). Traumatic loss and major disasters: Strengthening family and community resilience. *Family Process*, 46(2), 207–227.

RESILIENCE NAUCZYCIELI W POLSCE – ROLA CZYNNIKÓW SOCJODEMOGRAFICZNYCH I ZAWODOWYCH

Wprowadzenie: *Resilience* nauczycieli to dynamiczna interakcja pomiędzy zasobami osobistymi, społecznymi i fizycznymi w celu przeciwdziałania czynnikom ryzyka pojawiającym się w kontekście szkolnym poprzez maksymalizację zasobów ochronnych.

Cel badań: Celem niniejszych badań jest zweryfikowanie czy zmienne socjodemograficzne i zawodowe istotnie różnicują poziom *resilience* nauczycieli.

Metoda badań: Badaniem objęto 752 nauczycieli różnych etapów edukacji. Do pomiaru *resilience* wykorzystano Skalę Resilience Nauczycieli (*Teachers' Resilience Scale*) autorstwa M. Platsidou i A. Danilidou w polskiej adaptacji M. Boczkowskiej.

Wyniki: Badani nauczyciele odnotowali najwyższe średnie wyniki w zakresie czynnika *Spójność rodziny*, natomiast najniższe w zakresie czynnika *Kompetencje społeczne i wsparcie współpracowników*. Z przeprowadzonych analiz wynika, że zmienne socjodemograficzne (płeć, wiek, miejsce zamieszkania i stan cywilny) istotnie różnicują poziom *resilience* badanych (wynik ogólny i/lub wyniki w poszczególnych podskalach). Również zmienne zawodowe (miejsce pracy, staż pracy, poziom awansu zawodowego) stanowią czynniki istotnie różnicujące *resilience* badanych nauczycieli.

Wnioski: Uzyskane wyniki poszerzają wiedzę na temat koncepcji *resilience* w grupie nauczycieli i mogą zostać uwzględnione w projektowaniu działań mających na celu wzmacnianie ich zdolności do pozytywnej adaptacji w obliczu doświadczania trudnych, stresujących czy traumatycznych zdarzeń.

Słowa kluczowe: *resilience*, nauczyciele, czynniki socjodemograficzne, *resilience* nauczycieli

