Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education
BUEFAD Volume 15, Issue 1
306-316
dergipark.org.tr/buefad
DOI: 10.14686/buefad.1649671

Examining Various Variables as Predictors of Resilience in Special Education Teachers

İrem Topuz [a]* & *Olcan Aslan* [b]

a Res. Assist., Maltepe University, https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-7085-8470 *iremtopuz@maltepe.edu.tr
b Exp. Psych. Couns. (EPC), Ministry of National Education, https://orcid.org/ 0000-0001-9987-0425 olcanaslan95@gmail.com

Research Article
Received: 02.03.2025
Revised: 03.12.2025
Accepted: 06.01.2026

Abstract

This study explores the relationship between special education teachers' resilience and various factors, including gender, income level, professional experience, school administration support, partner compatibility, and student disability levels. The study was undertaken with 329 special education instructors stationed in Istanbul, using a relational survey model. Data were gathered through a personal information form and the Brief Resilience Scale and analyzed using Pearson Correlation and Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. The findings reveal that teachers with lower incomes tend to have lower psychological resilience, while those who receive strong administrative support and have better partner compatibility in the workplace demonstrate higher resilience. Educators engaging with learners exhibiting mild impairments manifest greater tenacity compared to those instructing pupils with moderate to profound disabilities. In contrast, gender and professional experience do not significantly influence psychological resilience. Regression analysis results indicate that the examined variables collectively explain 59 percent of the variance in resilience levels. These findings highlight the importance of enhancing administrative support, fostering collaboration among teachers, and implementing psychological support programs, particularly for educators working with students with severe disabilities. Future studies should incorporate expanded sample sizes and longitudinal research approaches to cultivate a more nuanced comprehension of this subject.

Keywords: Special education teachers, psychological resilience, occupational stress

Özel Eğitim Öğretmenlerinin Psikolojik Sağlamlıklarının Yordayıcıları Olarak Çeşitli Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi

Öz

Bu çalışma, özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyleri ile cinsiyet, gelir düzeyi, mesleki deneyim, okul idaresi desteği, iş yeri partner uyumu ve öğrenci engel durumu gibi çeşitli faktörler arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektedir. Araştırma, İstanbul'da görev yapan 329 özel eğitim öğretmeniyle ilişkisel tarama modeli kullanılarak gerçekleştirilmiştir. Veriler, kişisel bilgi formu ve Kısa Psikolojik Sağlamlık Ölçeği aracılığıyla toplanmış ve Pearson Korelasyon ile Çoklu Doğrusal Regresyon Analizi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Bulgular, düşük gelir seviyesine sahip öğretmenlerin daha düşük psikolojik sağlamlık sergilediğini, buna karşılık güçlü idari destek alan ve iş yerinde daha iyi partner uyumu gösteren öğretmenlerin daha yüksek psikolojik sağlamlık düzeyine sahip olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Hafif engeli olan öğrencilerle çalışan öğretmenlerin, orta veya ağır engelli öğrencilerle çalışanlara kıyasla daha yüksek dayanıklılık gösterdiği belirlenmiştir. Buna karşılık, cinsiyet ve mesleki deneyimin psikolojik sağlamlık üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin olmadığı saptanmıştır. Regresyon analizi sonuçları, incelenen değişkenlerin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerindeki varyansın %59'unu açıkladığını göstermektedir. Bu bulgular, özellikle ağır engelli öğrencilerle çalışan öğretmenler için idari desteğin artırılmasının, öğretmenler arasında iş birliğinin teşvik edilmesinin ve psikolojik destek programlarının uygulanmasının önemini vurgulamaktadır. Gelecekteki araştırmalarda, daha geniş örneklemler ve boylamsal araştırma yöntemleri kullanılarak bu konunun daha derinlemesine incelenmesi önerilmektedir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Özel eğitim öğretmenleri, psikolojik sağlamlık, mesleki stres

To cite this article in APA Style:

Topuz, İ., & Aslan, O. (2026). Examining various variables as predictors of resilience in special education teachers. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education, 15*(1), 306-316. https://doi.org/10.14686/buefad.1649671

© 2026 Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Individuals encounter various stressors and challenges throughout their lives, and how they cope with these situations significantly influences their psychological well-being and adaptation. While some individuals demonstrate greater resilience in the face of adversity, others may be more deeply affected by negative experiences. In this context, the concept of resilience emerges, referring to an individual's capacity to adapt to adversity and regain psychological balance following stressful events (Greene, 2002).

Resilience is commonly defined as an individual's capacity to adapt to difficulties and overcome the challenges encountered throughout life (Block & Kremen, 1996). Jacelon (1997) describes resilience as the ability to develop effective adaptation mechanisms when confronted with severe stressors, whereas Ramirez (2007) defines it as the capacity to recover quickly from adverse experiences such as illness, depression, or stressful life conditions. More recently, psychological resilience has been conceptualized as the ability to maintain functioning in the face of adverse life events without experiencing long-term psychological impairment (Troy et al., 2023).

Psychological resilience is shaped by the risk factors individuals encounter and the protective factors they employ to cope with these challenges. Risk factors refer to elements in a person's life that generate stress and difficulties. Low socioeconomic status, authoritarian parenting styles, migration, parental psychological disorders, and child abuse are among the key factors that can negatively affect psychological resilience, as well as digital game addiction and problem behaviors, which have likewise been associated with reduced psychological resilience. (Aslan vd., 2025a; Garmezy, 1993; Karaırmak, 2006; Topuz vd., 2025). Protective factors, on the other hand, play a crucial role in mitigating the detrimental effects of these adversities. Research generally categorizes protective factors into three main groups: individual, familial, and environmental. Intelligence, positive personality traits, self-esteem, hope, and a sense of humor are considered individual protective factors, whereas healthy family relationships and supportive parenting styles fall under familial protective factors. Peer support, positive teacher attitudes, social solidarity, and social support are recognized as environmental protective factors, along with school belonging, which is widely regarded as a key protective factor fostering students' emotional security and well-being (Aslan et al., 2025b; Masten, 1994; Rambod et al., 2023; Werner, 2000).

Low socioeconomic status, authoritarian parenting styles, migration, parental psychological disorders, and child abuse are among the key factors that can negatively affect psychological resilience, as well as digital game addiction and problem behaviors, which have likewise been associated with reduced psychological resilience. Protective factors, on the other hand, play a crucial role in mitigating the detrimental effects of these adversities. Research generally categorizes protective factors into three main groups: individual, familial, and environmental. Intelligence, positive personality traits, self-esteem, hope, and a sense of humor are considered individual protective factors, whereas healthy family relationships and supportive parenting styles fall under familial protective factors. Peer support, positive teacher attitudes, social solidarity, and social support are recognized as environmental protective factors, along with school belonging, which is widely regarded as a key protective factor fostering students' emotional security and well-being.

Individuals with high resilience share several common characteristics. They generally maintain a positive outlook and cope effectively with the challenges they encounter (Luthar et al., 2000). Strong communication and analytical thinking skills enable them to use effective problem-solving strategies, helping them navigate difficult situations. Their high self-confidence allows them to remain calm and act in a planned manner under stressful conditions (Gürgan, 2006). A well-developed sense of humor helps them view adverse life events more lightly, while strong empathy skills support the development of positive social relationships (Şahin, 2014). These individuals also tend to recover quickly from traumatic experiences, demonstrating flexibility and psychological strength. Additionally, their ability to adapt to new circumstances and their high intrinsic motivation contribute to their effective management of life's challenges (Çapan et al., 2014).

Resilience is a critical competency that enables individuals to navigate stress, uncertainty, and change in various areas of life (Masten, 2014). One important domain is the professional work environment. In this context, workplace resilience refers to an individual's capacity to cope with challenges such as stress, job demands, setbacks, and transitions. Employees with high workplace resilience adapt more easily to uncertainty, maintain their motivation, and sustain productivity. Because they are more effective in managing stress and solving problems, they also tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction and overall well-being (Luthans et al., 2006). Among professions exposed to numerous risk factors that undermine psychological resilience, teaching stands out as among the most demanding. Globally, educators report some of the highest levels of occupational stress and burnout compared to other professions (Saloviita & Pakarinen, 2021). Teachers' stress has been

demonstrated to impair well-being, diminish self-assurance and self-worth, and adversely influence interpersonal dynamics (Uzun & Yaprakdal, 2022).

Additionally, teachers are among the professional groups that require the most social support to cope with the difficulties of their profession. This support, often provided by colleagues, administrators, and parents, serves as a protective mechanism, helping teachers manage occupational stress. Studies have found that teachers who receive support from their professional colleagues and administrators face fewer challenges in their professional lives and are more successful at stress management (Leiter & Maslach, 1988). Special education teachers, however, work under even more demanding conditions due to their engagement with individuals with special needs. These challenges can negatively impact their psychological resilience, increasing their need for social support (Uçar, 2014).

Within our nation, educators engaged in the realm of special education encounter an array of vocational impediments. Heavy workloads, a lack of materials, insufficient resources, and the presence of teachers who are not specialized in the field are among the primary issues. Moreover, the lack of expertise and practical acumen in delivering special education services, coupled with an inadequate educator workforce, amplifies these challenges. Disciplinary issues among students and inadequate support from school administrators and parents are significant challenges for special education teachers.

Although the number of graduates from university-level special education programs has been increasing, this growth remains insufficient to meet current demand for special education teachers. Consequently, teachers from other disciplines who lack specialization in the field are often assigned to special education classrooms. However, educating students with special needs requires tailored methods and individualized instructional approaches that align with their specific needs. Teachers who lack adequate knowledge or experience in special education frequently struggle to meet these needs, thereby reducing the effectiveness of special education services and negatively affecting the overall educational process (Akçamete et al., 2001; Sucuoğlu & Kuloğlu, 1996).

Educators in the realm of special education bear the dual responsibility of not only instructing individuals with unique needs but also engaging in cooperative endeavors with their families, equipping them with insights into available support mechanisms. However, teachers with insufficient experience often struggle with this process and may be unable to provide adequate support. This increases their professional burden, heightens psychological pressure, and creates a greater need for social support (Sucuoğlu & Kuloğlu, 1996). The dual responsibility of supporting both students and their families further intensifies the workload of special education instructors and emphasizes their need for social support. The challenges they encounter directly impact their job satisfaction and psychological resilience. In this context, understanding the difficulties faced by special education teachers and their effects on resilience is essential. Anchored in this aim, the ensuing investigative inquiries have been devised to steer the study.

1. Does the gender of special education teachers significantly predict their psychological resilience?
2. Does the income level of special education teachers significantly predict their psychological resilience?
3. Does the professional experience of special education teachers significantly predict their psychological resilience?
4. Does the support provided by school administrations significantly predict the resilience of special education instructors?
5. Does the compatibility of special education teachers with their workplace partners significantly predict their psychological resilience?
6. Does the level of students' disabilities significantly predict the resilience of special education teachers?

METHOD

Research Design

This inquiry explores the psychological fortitude of special education instructors concerning an array of determinants. A correlational survey framework was employed in the investigation. The correlational survey model, a branch of quantitative inquiry, is structured to discern concurrent fluctuations among multiple variables

and gauge the magnitude of these variations (Karasar, 2012). The data obtained from the relational survey model were analyzed using Pearson's correlation and multiple linear regression.

The following regression models were developed to assess the predictive power of different variables on psychological resilience:

- Model 1: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV)
- Model 2: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV) + Income Level (DV)
- Model 3: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV) + Income Level (DV) + Professional Experience (DV)
- Model 4: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV) + Income Level (DV) + Professional Experience (DV) + School Administration Support (DV)
- Model 5: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV) + Income Level (DV) + Professional Experience (DV) + School Administration Support (DV) + Partner Compatibility (DV)
- Model 6: Resilience = Constant + Gender (DV) + Income Level (DV) + Professional Experience (DV) + School Administration Support (DV) + Partner Compatibility (DV) + Student Disability Level (DV)

(Dummy Variable: DV)

Study Group

The study's subjects were recruited through an accessibility-based sampling approach. This method allows researchers to administer surveys to individuals who are easily accessible (Balcı, 2001). The research cohort comprises 329 special education instructors employed across diverse specialized educational establishments in Istanbul. Details on the participants' socio-demographic attributes are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

Factor	Variables	n	%
Gender	Female	267	81.2
	Male	62	18.8
Income Level	Low	37	11.2
	Medium	178	54.1
	High	114	34.7
Experience	0-5 years	52	15.8
	5-10 years	120	36.5
	10+ years	157	47.7
School Administration Support	Low	37	11.2
	Medium	142	43.2
	High	150	45.6
Workplace Partner Compatibility	Low	39	11.9
	Medium	127	38.6
	High	163	49.5
Student Disability Level	Mild	107	32.5
	Moderate-Severe	222	67.5

Instruments for Data Acquisition

Personal Background Questionnaire

The personal information form, created by the researchers, includes various questions aimed at gathering information about special education teachers' gender, income levels, professional experience, fields of graduation, support received from school administration, compatibility with workplace partners, and the level of students' disabilities.

Brief Resilience Scale

The instrument, initially formulated by Smith et al. (2008) and culturally tailored for Turkish culture by Doğan (2015), follows a five-tier Likert scale comprising six statements, rated from 1 (Entirely Inappropriate) to 5 (Wholly Appropriate). Items 2, 4, and 6 are inversely scored. An elevated aggregate score on the scale indicates greater psychological fortitude. As a unidimensional scale, its validity was initially assessed through an exploratory factor analysis, which showed that it accounted for 54% of the total variance in Doğan's (2015) study. In the present study, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted to examine the construct validity of the scale. The model fit indices indicated that the scale exhibited an acceptable fit to the data ($\chi^2/df = 2.61$, RMSEA

= .06, SRMR = .05, CFI = .93). Additionally, the internal consistency of the scale was confirmed with a Cronbach's alpha (α) of .95 and a McDonald's omega (ω) of .95, demonstrating excellent reliability.

Ethics Committee Decision

For this research, ethical permission was obtained from the Maltepe University Social and Humanities Research Ethics Committee (09/01/2025), Decision No: 2025/01-17.

Data Collection

Research data were collected from special education instructors employed across a range of specialized educational institutions in Istanbul. During data collection, the researchers used forms that combined two different measurement tools. These forms took approximately 15 minutes to complete. Participants were provided with instructions on completing the scales, and data collection was conducted after obtaining informed consent from those who voluntarily agreed to participate.

Data Analysis

Initially, the collected data were transferred to a computer for analysis. SPSS 25 and AMOS 27 were used for data analysis. Before conducting the analysis, the accuracy of the collected data was checked, confirming that all items were within normal ranges and that no data entry errors were detected. A univariate normality analysis was performed using the Z-test, and the resulting Z-scores were within the reference range of -4 to +4 (Mertler & Vannatta, 2016). In the subsequent normality analysis, skewness and kurtosis values were examined and found to be between -1.50 and +1.50, supporting the assumption of normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Furthermore, correlation analysis indicated no multicollinearity issues within the dataset. Given that inter-variable associations remained at a moderate magnitude and no correlation surpassed .90, it was inferred that multicollinearity posed no substantial issue (Çokluk et al., 2014). Furthermore, within the multiple linear regression model, the Durbin-Watson statistic was computed to assess residual independence, yielding a value of 1.963. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the reference range for this test should be between 1.50 and 2.50, suggesting that the obtained value falls within the acceptable range. Pearson's product-moment correlation metric and multiple linear regression were used to examine the data, with a significance threshold of .05. To determine whether various demographic characteristics of special education teachers predict their resilience levels, multiple linear regression was conducted. Demographic variables were coded as dummy variables before being included in the analysis. The coding of dummy variables involved assigning values of "0" and "1" to participant categories (Field, 2009). Büyüköztürk (2009) states that when using categorical variables as predictors in regression analysis, one category per classification should be excluded to avoid multicollinearity among independent variables. Based on this principle, dummy variables were created for gender, income level, professional experience, field of graduation, administrative support, partner compatibility, and student disability level. In the multiple linear regression analysis, one category from each variable was excluded. A second multiple linear regression analysis was conducted using the excluded dummy variables to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of all independent variable categories. The results obtained from these analyses are reported in detail in the findings section.

FINDINGS

First, the relationships between variables were evaluated using correlation analysis. The correlation coefficients for the variables are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Inter-Variable Correlation Coefficients

Variables	n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1.Resilience	327	1										
2.Female	327	.050	1									
3.Low income	327	-.287**	.073	1								
4.High income	327	.203**	-.204**	-.259**	1							
5.0-5 years of experience	327	-.068	.081	.030	.105	1						
6.10+ years of experience	327	.097	-.193**	-.032	.046	-.414**	1					
7.Low school administration support	327	-.582**	.024	-.127*	.084	-.022	-.032	1				
8.High school administration support	327	.495**	-.011	.157**	-.166**	-.012	.078	-.326**	1			
9.Low workplace partner compatibility	327	-.606**	.008	-.131*	.148**	.073	-.219**	.494**	-.336**	1		
10.High workplace partner compatibility	327	.512**	.073	.205**	-.185**	-.096	.137*	-.276**	.753**	-.363**	1	
11.Mild disability level	327	.256**	.052	.164**	.108	-.087	.077	-.083	.029	-.194**	.065	1

**p <.05

An examination of the correlation findings outlined in Table 2 indicates a noteworthy inverse association between psychological resilience and limited financial means (r = -.287, p < .05), while a statistically significant direct linkage was observed between resilience and elevated income levels (r = .203, p < .05). In terms of professional experience, a positive but non-significant relationship was observed between 10+ years of experience and resilience (r = .097, p > .05). The level of support received from school administration was found to have a significant impact on psychological resilience, as there was a strong negative correlation between low school administration support and resilience (r = -.582, p < .05). In contrast, a positive and significant relationship was detected between high school administration support and resilience (r = .495, p < .05). Workplace partner compatibility was also found to be associated with psychological resilience. A significant negative correlation was identified between limited workplace partner compatibility and psychological resilience (r = -.606, p < .05), whereas a substantial direct association was noted between elevated workplace partner alignment and resilience (r = .512, p < .05). Furthermore, a notable linkage emerged between a mild disability level and resilience (r = .256, p < .05), indicating that special education instructors engaging with students exhibiting mild impairments demonstrate greater resilience. These findings highlight that variables such as school administration support, partner compatibility, and professional background are strongly associated with psychological resilience. To determine the extent to which gender, low- and high-income levels, 0-5 years and 10+ years of experience, low and high school administration support predict the resilience levels of special education teachers, a regression model was established and analyzed. The results of the multiple linear regression analysis are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Findings of the Multiple Regression Analysis Between Resilience and Gender, Income Level, Professional Experience, School Administration Support, Workplace Partner Compatibility, and Student Disability Level

	R	R^2	*F*	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	p	VIF
Constant				21.118	.722		29.256	.000	
Female				.204	.576	.013	.354	.724	1.119
Low income				2.081	.725	.110	2.870	.004	1.157
High income				.857	.498	-.068	-1.722	.086	1.224
0-5 years of experience				-.371	.658	-.023	-.563	.574	1.272
10+ years of experience				-.220	.492	-.018	-.448	.655	1.326
Low school administration support	.77	.59	46.897	-5.799	.807	-.307	-7.191	.000	1.432
High school administration support				1.614	.669	.134	2.413	.016	2.439
Low workplace partner compability				-5.521	.843	-.292	-6.546	.000	1.566
High workplace partner compability				2.117	.675	.177	3.135	.002	2.502
Mild disability level				1.914	.481	.150	3.975	.000	1.120

**p <.05

Based on the multiple linear regression analysis results depicted in Table 3, the comprehensive model has been determined to hold statistical significance (F = 46.897, p < .05). Examining the regression coefficients, it is observed that the independent variables explain 59 percent of the variance in resilience (R^2 = .59). The results indicate that low-income level (B = 2.081, β = .110, p = .004) has a significant and positive effect on psychological resilience, meaning that teachers with lower income levels exhibit higher psychological resilience. On the other hand, high income level (B = 0.857, β = -0.068, p = .086) does not significantly predict psychological resilience. The variable of professional experience (0-5 years and 10+ years of experience) does not have a significant effect on resilience (p > .05). The support provided by school administration appears to be an important determinant of psychological resilience. Low school administration support (B = -5.799, β = -0.307, p = .000) has a significant negative impact on psychological resilience. In contrast, high school administration support (B = 1.614, β = .134, p = .016) has a significant positive impact on psychological resilience. Similarly, low workplace partner compatibility (B = -5.521, β = -0.292, p = .000) has a significant negative effect on psychological resilience. In contrast, high workplace partner compatibility (B = 2.117, β = .177, p = .002) is associated with enhanced psychological resilience. Finally, teachers working with students with mild disabilities are found to have higher levels of resilience (B = 1.914, β = .150, p = .000). To prevent multicollinearity issues in the regression analysis, one category of each sociodemographic variable was excluded from the model. In the second regression model, the effects of male gender, middle-income level, 5-10 years of professional experience, and moderate school

administration support on resilience were examined. The findings derived from this analysis are displayed in Table 4.

Table 4. Findings of the Multiple Regression Analysis Between Resilience and Gender, Middle Income Level, 5-10 Years of Experience, Moderate School Administration Support, Moderate Workplace Partner Compatibility, and Moderate-Severe Disability Level

	R	R^2	*F*	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	p	VIF
Constant	.31	.09	5.741	25.324	.745		33.969	.000	
Male				-.359	.832	-.024	-.431	.667	1.056
Middle income				.835	.667	.070	1.251	.212	1.096
5-10 years of experience				-.752	.673	-.060	-1.118	.264	1.036
Moderate school administration support				-.767	.800	-.063	-.959	.338	1.556
Moderate workplace partner compatibility				-1.352	.815	-.110	-1.659	.098	1.566
Disability level				-3.542	.697	-.278	-5.082	.000	1.061

**p <.05

Based on the multiple linear regression analysis findings shown in Table 4, the model's explanatory power for resilience is $R^2 = .01$. It is overall deemed statistically significant ($F = 5.842$, $p < .05$). Examining the regression coefficients, it is determined that gender does not have a significant effect on resilience ($B = -0.359$, $\beta = -0.024$, $t = -0.431$, $p = .667$). Similarly, the middle-income level variable does not significantly predict resilience ($B = 0.835$, $\beta = 0.070$, $t = 1.251$, $p = .212$). Regarding professional experience, having 5-10 years of experience does not have a significant impact on resilience ($B = -0.752$, $\beta = -0.060$, $t = -1.118$, $p = .264$). Additionally, the variable of moderate school administration support is not found to have a significant effect on resilience ($B = -0.767$, $\beta = -0.063$, $t = -0.959$, $p = .338$). Likewise, moderate workplace partner compatibility does not show a significant relationship with resilience ($B = -1.352$, $\beta = -0.110$, $t = -1.659$, $p = .098$). Conversely, educators engaged with students exhibiting moderate to severe disabilities demonstrate notably lower resilience levels ($B = -3.542$, $\beta = -0.278$, $t = -5.082$, $p = .000$). This outcome reinforces the notion that instructors working with students with significant disabilities experience heightened burnout and professional strain.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

Special education teachers are responsible not only for educating individuals with special needs but also for supporting their families. Various factors increase their professional workload, resulting in psychological pressure and a heightened need for social support. Understanding how these challenges influence the psychological resilience of special education teachers is therefore essential. In this context, the present study examined special education teachers' resilience across multiple factors. The analyses revealed that resilience is significantly associated with income level, support from school administration, compatibility with workplace partners, and the severity of students' disabilities.

Additionally, it was found that the independent variables collectively accounted for 59% of the variance in special education teachers' resilience levels. One of the study's primary findings is that gender does not significantly predict psychological resilience. This result is supported by Aras et al. (2023), who similarly reported that gender is not a predictor of psychological resilience. Likewise, another study determined that gender does not significantly influence participants' resilience levels (Bozdağ, 2020). Nurhat's (2017) research with special education teachers further confirms this conclusion. Collectively, these findings indicate that gender does not play a decisive role in the resilience levels of special education teachers. Instead, resilience appears to be shaped by factors such as individual characteristics, professional experience, educational background, and external conditions, rather than being determined solely by gender.

Another key finding of the study is that low income levels significantly affect the resilience of special education teachers. Similarly, Campbell et al. (2009) determined that individuals with lower earnings tend to demonstrate reduced psychological resilience. Additionally, income loss has been identified as an important determinant of resilience (Bonanno et al., 2007). As Garmezy (1992) stated, variables associated with poor socioeconomic conditions can increase vulnerability to negative developmental outcomes and affect individuals' psychological resilience. This suggests that low income levels negatively affect the resilience of special education teachers, shaping their resilience. Furthermore, teachers struggling with economic difficulties require additional support mechanisms, and this situation can also negatively affect their professional motivation.

Another notable finding of the study reveals that professional tenure does not exert a meaningful influence on resilience. Keçili (2022), in a study conducted with 210 special education teachers, reached results that support the findings of the present research. This finding suggests that professional experience alone is insufficient for determining teachers' resilience levels over time and may be associated with other variables.

Indeed, as teaching experience increases, teachers' burnout levels have been found to reach their highest points (Zhao, 2009). Moreover, special education teachers experience higher levels of burnout and stress compared to teachers in other branches (Küçüksüleymanoğlu, 2011). This suggests that, rather than enhancing teachers' psychological resilience, increased professional experience may have the opposite effect. Factors such as burnout, heavier workloads, and elevated stress levels may undermine resilience over time, contributing to its decline.

When examining the resilience levels of special education teachers in relation to school administration support, it was found that low levels of support negatively affect resilience, whereas high levels of support positively influence resilience. This indicates that school administration support is a direct factor shaping the psychological resilience of special education teachers. Insufficient administrative support weakens resilience, making it more difficult for teachers to cope with stress, burnout, and professional challenges. Conversely, strong support from school administrators can enhance teachers' resilience by increasing their motivation and strengthening their commitment to the profession. This finding underscores the crucial role of school administrators in helping teachers feel valued and motivated to improve their performance (Himmetoğlu et al., 2022). Special education teachers who receive support from school principals are more likely to develop stronger professional commitment and higher motivation (Rosenholtz, 1989). Therefore, school administrators, who hold a central position in special education environments, serve as key facilitators in supporting teachers. Their encouragement not only promotes educators' professional growth but also reinforces their psychological resilience (Kıral & Arslan, 2024). The β coefficients in the regression model indicate that administrative support has a moderate effect size on teachers' psychological resilience. The practical significance of this effect suggests that even small increases in administrative support may lead to noticeable improvements in teachers' resilience levels.

When examining the impact of workplace partner compatibility on psychological resilience, it was found that low workplace partner compatibility negatively affects psychological resilience, whereas high workplace partner compatibility positively contributes. A study by İş and Turan (2024) found that a lack of communication between partners is a significant issue among special education teachers and that improvements in coordination are needed. Additionally, it has been determined that partner communication within the classroom is crucial for classroom harmony and enhancing the effectiveness of special education teachers. Special education teachers emphasize the need to create a collaborative environment where responsibilities are shared and healthy communication is maintained to make co-teaching more effective. They also highlight the importance of receiving training on the same topics to develop a shared understanding (Pürsün et al., 2023). In particular, the partner compatibility variable, with a significant coefficient of $\beta = .17$, indicates that this factor plays a practically important role in enhancing teachers' resilience.

The study's final finding highlights that the severity of students' disabilities significantly influences the resilience of special education teachers. Educators working with students who have mild disabilities demonstrate higher levels of resilience compared to those teaching students with moderate to severe disabilities. The disability level of students poses various challenges for special education teachers, including the need to enhance their professional competencies and continuously improve themselves (Vızlı, 2005). Working with students with moderate to severe disabilities may require teachers to exert more emotional and physical effort, which can increase burnout levels and negatively affect psychological resilience. On the other hand, teachers working with students with mild disabilities may be able to maintain higher motivation as they can observe more noticeable progress in their students' development.

Based on the findings of this study, several practice-oriented recommendations have been developed to strengthen the psychological resilience of special education teachers. Since professional experience does not directly enhance resilience and may instead contribute to burnout, schools should establish structured mentoring programs that provide experienced teachers with ongoing psychological support, stress-management training, and peer supervision. Considering that support from school administration is a significant factor influencing resilience, school leaders should implement concrete practices such as regular feedback meetings, appreciation and recognition systems, balanced workload distribution, and open-door communication policies. Additionally, school administrations can develop annual professional well-being action plans that include resilience workshops and group counseling sessions for teachers. Creating formal protocols for classroom communication, shared responsibility, and conflict-resolution strategies can further enhance partner compatibility. Finally, for teachers

working with students with moderate to severe disabilities, targeted support should be implemented to alleviate workload and protect teachers' psychological resilience.

Limitations

This study provides valuable insights by identifying the factors influencing the resilience levels of special education teachers. However, certain limitations should be noted. Firstly, the research was conducted within a specific geographical region, and without replication on a larger sample, the generalizability of the findings may be restricted. Additionally, the cross-sectional research design employed in this study may not adequately establish causal relationships between variables. Therefore, longitudinal studies are necessary to gain a deeper understanding of the long-term effects on psychological resilience. Moreover, uncontrolled factors such as school type, class size, and teachers' personal characteristics may also influence psychological resilience. Finally, since teachers' resilience is shaped by both professional and familial and personal factors, future research should adopt a more comprehensive evaluation approach.

Statements of Publication Ethics

All rules included in the "Directive for Scientific Research and Publication Ethics in Higher Education Institutions" have been adhered to, and none of the "Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics" included in the second section of the Directive have been implemented.

Researchers' Contribution Rate

All authors have contributed equally to the preparation of this manuscript.

Authors	Literature review	Method	Data Collection	Data Analysis	Results	Conclusion
Author 1	☒	☐	☒	☐	☒	☒
Author 2	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐	☒

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding this study.

REFERENCES

Akçamete, G., Kaner, S. ve Sucuoğlu, B. (2001). *Öğretmenlerde tükenmişlik iş doyumu ve kişilik.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Aras, N.Y., Topkaya, N. & Şahin, E. (2023). Yetişkin bireylerde psikolojik sağlamlığın yordayıcısı olarak cinsiyet, çocukluk çağı travmaları, yaşamda anlam ve öz şefkat. *İçtimaiyat Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 168–183. https://doi.org/10.33709/ictimaiyat.1168719

Aslan, O., & Topuz, İ. (2025a). The role of tendencies toward digital game addiction in explaining preschool children's resilience. *Adıyaman University Journal of Educational Sciences, 15*(1), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.17984/adyuebd.1613749

Aslan, O., Topuz, İ., & Eldeleklioğlu, J. (2025b). Investigating the mediating role of digital game addiction in the relationship between adolescents' school belonging and resilience. *Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, *42*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/20590776.2024.2402398

Balcı, A. (2001). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler* (10. basım). Pegem Akademi.

Block, J., & Kremen, A. M. (1996). IQ and ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(2), 349–361. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.2.349

Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2007). What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources, and life stress. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *75*(5), 671–682. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.75.5.671

Bozdağ, F. (2020). Pandemi sürecinde psikolojik sağlamlık. *Turkish Studies, 15*(6), 247–257. https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.44890

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2009). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum*. Pegem Akademi.

Campbell, L., Forde, D. R., & Stein, M. B. (2009). Demographic and childhood environmental predictors of resilience in a community sample. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *43*(12), 1007–1012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2009.01.013

Çapan, B. E., & Arıcıoğlu, A. (2014). Psikolojik sağlamlığın yordayıcısı olarak affedicilik. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(4), 70-82. https://doi.org/10.19160/e-ijer.05325

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2014). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları* (3.basım). Pegem Akademi.

Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa psikolojik sağlamlık ölçeği'nin Türkçe uyarlaması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being, 3*(1), 93-102.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3.basım). Sage Publications Ltd.

Garmezy, N. (1992). Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 34, 416-430. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764291034004003

Garmezy, N. (1993). Children in poverty: Resilience despite risk. *Psychiatry, 56*(1), 127–136. https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1993.11024627

Greene, R. R. (2002). *Resiliency: An integrated approach to practice, policy, and research.* NASW Press.

Gürgan, U. (2006). *Grupla psikolojik danışmanın üniversite öğrencilerinin yılmazlık düzeylerine etkisi* [Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi]. Ankara Üniversitesi.

Himmetoğlu, B., Shikhkamalova, V. ve Bayrak, C. (2022). Özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin karşılaştıkları sorunlar ve bu sorunların çözümünde okul yöneticilerinin rolü. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi, 12*(3), 1597-1618. https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.1003550

İş, E., & Turan, Ş. (2024). Resmî kurumlarda çalışan özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin karşılaştığı mesleki problemler ve çözüm stratejileri. *Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Ereğli Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 6*(2), 953-975. https://doi.org/10.51119/ereegf.2024.116

Jacelon, C. S. (1997). The trait and process of resilience. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *25*(1), 123-129. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2648.1997.1997025123.x

Karaırmak, Ö. (2006). Psikolojik sağlamlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, *3*(26), 129-142.

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (24.basım). Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Keçili, B. (2022). *Özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık öz yeterlik ve psikolojik yardım alma tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Ege Üniversitesi.

Kıral, B., ve Arslan, P. (2024). Özel eğitim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin okul yöneticileri tarafından güçlendirilmesi. *Millî Eğitim, 53* (241), 209-240. https://doi.org/ 10.37669/milliegitim.1209363"

Küçüksüleymanoğlu, R. (2011). Burnout syndrome levels of teachers in special education schools in Turkey. *International Journal of Special Education,* 26, 53–63.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1988). The impact of interpersonal environment on burnout and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9*(4), 297–308. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030090402

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*(3), 543–562. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2006). Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge. *Oxford University Press.*

Masten, A. S. (1994). *Resilience in individual development: Successful adaptation despite risk and adversity.* In M. Wang & E. Gordon (Eds.), Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects (pp. 3–25). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Ordinary magic: Resilience in development. *Guilford Press.*

Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2016). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (6.basım). Pyrczak Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315266978

Nurhat, T. (2017). *Özel eğitimde çalışan öğretmenlerin psikolojik dayanıklılık ve tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Beykent Üniversitesi.

Pürsün, T., Yapar, B. ve Arslantaş, S. (2023). Özel eğitim öğretmenlerinin ekiple öğretim deneyimleri. *Trakya Eğitim Dergisi, 13*(2), 1092-1107. https://doi.org/10.24315/tred.1118240

Ramirez, M. (2007). Resilience: A concept analysis. *Nursing Forum, 42*(2), 73–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2007.00070.x

Saloviita, T., & Pakarinen, E. (2021). Teacher burnout explained: Teacher-, student-, and organisation-level variables. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *97*, 103221.

Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Jennifer Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 15*(3), 194–200. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705500802222972

Sucuoğlu, B., & Kuloğlu, N. (1996). Özürlü çocuklarla çalışan öğretmenlerde tükenmişliğin değerlendirilmesi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, *10*(36), 44-60.

Şahin, D. (2014). *Öğretmelerin öz duyarlıklarının psikolojik sağlamlık ve yaşam doyumu açısından incelenmesi.* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics.* Boston: Pearson.

Topuz, İ., Aslan, O., & Bedel, A. (2025). Okul öncesi dönemde psikolojik sağlamlık ve problem davranışlar arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* (*65*), 3345-3360. https://doi.org/10.53444/deubefd.1634734

Uçar, T. (2014). *Özel eğitim okulu öğretmenlerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin ve mesleki sosyal destek düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi.

Uzun, K., & Yaprakdal, P. (2022). Öğretmenlerin mesleki tükenmişliklerine alternatif bir çözüm yolu olarak pozitif psikolojinin kullanılması. *Ordu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*, *12*(3), 2823-2864.

Vızlı, C. (2005). *Görme engelliler ilköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlere normal ilköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin tükenmişlik düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması Üsküdar ilçesi örneği*. [Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi]. Marmara Üniversitesi.

Werner, E. E. (2000). Protective factors and individual resilience. In J. P. Shonkoff & S. J. Meisels (Eds.), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 115–132). Cambridge University Press.

Zhao, N. (2009). *A study on teachers' teaching efficacy, job satisfaction, job burnout and their correlation in Wuhan special schools.* [Unpublished Master Thesis]. Central China Normal University.