

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

Mrs. R. P. Dhiyaneshwari^{1*}

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates how various demographic variables and sources of support influence the resilience of special educators in India. In this study, data were collected from 200 special educators by using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale and a perceived support scale adapted to suit the purpose through an online survey in which confidentiality and voluntariness of participation were ensured. Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were performed to test relationships between levels of resilience with perceived support along with Pearson's correlation. Results indicated that levels of resilience were different in view of demographic variables. Women educators, those with higher degrees, and educators serving for more than 10 years recorded higher scores on resilience. The age of the educator and the location of work was also important, where older and urban-based educators were more resilient. Assessment of perceived support revealed that family, peer, and institutional supports were all positively related to resilience. Of these three, institutional support is the strongest in making an impact in developing resiliency. Professional relationship and peer network plays a major role in developing resilience. The research concludes that though all three types of support are positively contributing to resilience, enhancement of peer and family support systems and ensuring strong institutional support can be two major strategies for promoting resilience among special educators. Such insights could be helpful in the formulation of policy and interventions aiming at an enabling work environment and well-being of special educators, which would eventually contribute to the sustainability of commitment by special educators against the stressful demands of the profession.

Keywords: *Special Educators, Perceived Support, Family Support, Peer Support, Institutional Support, Demographic Factors, India, and Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC)*

Resilience has become, over the last decade, a very significant field of inquiry, especially about an individual's ability to resist and adjust to demanding challenges posed by certain professions. Special educators are part of that section of the population that is highly exposed to stressors and pressure because of engagement with diverse populations, most of whom have high needs [1, 2]. Their resilience—that is, the ability to sustain and thrive in the face of professional challenges—therefore becomes key, not

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Allied Health and Science, Jain (deemed-to-be-university), Bangalore, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: November 03, 2024; Revision Received: November 07, 2024; Accepted: November 11, 2024

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

only to their personal welfare but to the quality of education provided for students with special needs. This study attempts to explore what constitutes and nurtures resilience in special educators, being conscious of the fact that demographics and perceived institutional support are significant variables determining their ability to cope with stress and to function effectively. Here, resilience is conceptualized as multi-dimensional, emanating from personal characteristics, professional contexts, and external support systems that collectively enable a special educator to be resilient against, and adapt to, the unique demands of their work [3]. In the present study, demographic variables such as age, years of experience, educational background, and even socio-economic status are those factors that could presumably predict the level of resilience among special educators. Demographics are a very important lens with which one might be able to view resilience because most individual characteristics often intersect with how one perceives, processes, and responds to stressors. For instance, the more seasoned and older teachers may draw from a variety of coping strategies in light of adversity than their younger, less-experienced colleagues [4, 5]. Other background variables like educational level and training can also serve educators with various skills and perspectives through which to shape their resilience. By focusing on these demographic elements, this study is able to identify patterns, or specific characteristics, which enable or disable resilience within this profession, therefore offering insight into how resilience may be encouraged and sustained across various educator profiles.

Yet, one must not overlook institutional and social support in special education as a resilience variable: everything from family and peer supporters to institutional resources comes into play as buffers against heavy demands of the profession. For example, perceived family members provide emotional stability and encouragement; both these become imperative for educators facing daily challenges in their role. Shared experiences, empathy, and mutual support provide work-based peer support as a setting where considerable development of resilience can take place. Schools also provide institutional resources, in-service training, and feedback—all empowering special educators and giving them a sense of worth to the educational system. The current study describes the level and sources of support that best enhance resilience, focusing on interaction among social, family, and institutional variables which influence the supportive environment in which special educators work. In the long run, this paper will be able to create an advanced understanding of how demographic factors and perceived support systems interact to affect resilience among special educators. It contemplates such factors, therefore, allowing the investigation of complexity beyond resilience in the demanding professions. It again establishes such factors that have implications for policy and practice, where educational institutions may make use of such insights to better support special educators through fostering resilience, hence further improving their retention and effectiveness [6]. It, therefore, synthesizes findings across demographic and support dimensions in a way that allows actionable recommendations on which resilience can be cultivated not only by individual strategies but also through systemic support measures that would help secure a robust and resilient workforce in special education.

It is the motivation behind this study that has been supported by the increasingly wide awareness that resilience impels a very important ingredient in sustaining professionals and empowering them to work under most stressful professions, special education being one of the most burdened professions. These demands, placed upon the special educator unlike most other professionals, include complex behavior management, often inadequate resources, and a variety of needs among students. Maybe these demands will push them into

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

lots of stress, emotional exhaustion, and even burnout, accounting for high attrition rates in this field [7]. Resilience is one of the prescribed qualities a special educator should possess to cushion him/her from these very demands and ultimately contribute to personal well-being and professional efficacy. In this light, resilience is multidimensional in nature; it does not develop in a vacuum but, rather, interrelates to demographic backgrounds, personal characteristics, and support networks of an educator. The present study shall help in identifying the level of resilience among special educators and will provide for a high need in educational research: to understand how the resiliencies are measured, developed, and sustained in ways supportive of educators and the students reliant on their dedication and skill.

The other motivational factor is that there is a shortage of research in terms of how demographic factors influence resilience among special educators. Whereas considerable attention has been given to the concept of resilience within a range of professions, the relationship to specific demographic variables, including age, gender, years of experience, and educational background, has as yet not been considered within the field of special education. Most demographic variables also interact with resilience to shape perceptions of challenges [8], the management of stress, and the application of coping strategies. For example, experienced teachers may have learned strategies over time that foster resilience among them, while younger teachers may easily fall by the wayside during the early years. Still on another vein, socioeconomic status and even educational attainment level can also relate to resilience in that it provides one with a range of resources, skills, and perspectives that improve one's coping capacities. Understanding these demographic influences is important, as this approach can more easily be adopted in supporting resilience [9, 10]. By shaping their support measures to meet the particular challenges faced by certain demographic groups, educational institutions, and policy makers can offer better support for resilience at an individual level and support diversity and inclusivity within a profession.

It could thus be assumed with informed guesswork that perceived support-from family, peers, and institutions-may itself be one factor that already plays a central role in influencing resilience among special educators. For educators, some days the demands become so overwhelming that no one person can bear them alone; rather, it is sources of support-such as family and friends-that supply emotional security and encouragement as their colleagues would do with similar empathy and practical help. Workplace support mechanisms valuing educators make them feel part of the professional community and therefore build resilience. Examples include formal and peer mentoring, teams working together to access resources and support. Professional preparation, recognition, and institutional distribution of resources supports shall assist special educators in their validation and provide them with tools necessary for handling very challenging jobs [11]. However, incomplete understanding exists on how each of these support types separately relates to resilience in special educators. The current study attempts to gain insight into this relationship as a means of developing the concept of resilience, emphasizing the systems approach to support that may be said to include personal and professional dimensions [12]. The findings can then be used to inform the approach that the educational institution takes in devising policies and programs which will support special educators and make them feel cared for so that they can give even better services to students. This study will also be informed by the need to interrogate the relationship between resilience and perceived support [13], since these aspects do not operate in a vacuum but relate to each other in several ways. It is when educators are supported-mostly by family, peers, or institutions-that they are more liable to

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

create in themselves the resilience necessary for dealing with occupational stress. On the other hand, resilience may magnify educators in their search for available support and utilize it; there might be a positive feedback loop in which support and resilience feed into one another. This interaction between teachers and students is even more salient in special education [14], where one often finds that an educator's teaching is challenged by situations requiring flexibility, emotional resilience, and creative problem-solving. This paper considers how that relationship may inform an integrated understanding of resilience and those support strategies that have a real and longer-lasting enhancement effect on resilience [15, 16]. Finally, the study is committed to standing in support of special educators because it elaborates evidence-based approaches that foster well-being and resilience for the benefit of the students they serve. The main research objectives of this paper are given below:

- To measure the resilience levels of special educators.
- To Explore the Influence of Demographic Factors on Resilience
- To assess the perceived support from family, peers, and institutions among special educators.
- To examine the relationship between resilience and perceived support.

In this paper, the structure is elaborated in a systematic way: starting with Section 2, the Literature Review, considering prior research on resilience within educational contexts, particularly special education, along with demographic influences and perceived support systems. Such a review grounds these subjects of resilience factors and identifies gaps that are attempted to be dealt with within the scope of this study. Materials and Methods Section 3 elaborates on the research design, inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants, methods of data collection, and analytical procedures for measuring resilience, testing the influence of demographic variables, and perceived support. The section also serves to guarantee reproducibility by accounting for how the research data were generated. Section 4, Results and Discussion, interprets the findings in respect to the level of resilience, the role played by demographic factors, and whether perceived support differentiates the level of resilience among special educators. This section allows the setting of results into context within the general research landscape through the discussion of implications, limitations, and possible contributions to policy and practice. Finally, Section 5, Conclusion and Future Work, summarizes the key findings, restates the importance of resilience in special education, and gives some suggestions for future research in order to further explore the interplay of resilience and support systems. The above logical structure thus moves from theoretical groundings to implications for practice, allowing a comprehensive analysis of resilience among special educators.

RELATED WORKS

Literature review discusses the current scholarship on resilience within education, particularly special educators who might be operating at a higher level of stress due to the nature of their profession. Resilience is defined in broad terms as a means of how the individual can adapt positively to situations where high degrees of stress are often presented [17]. It is widely regarded as one of those principal traits that enable individuals to protect both personal welfare and professional efficiency. Resilience in special education would mean that the teachers had to face constant challenges of supporting children with a range of needs that could include impairments in cognition, behaviors, and a range of physical capacities. Literatures recognize resilience as one of the ways educators can maintain engagement and avoid burnout; however, it suggests that resilience among special educators

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

is complex and multi-dimensional, combining personal characteristics with workplace conditions and external support [18]. Indeed, several studies referred to resilience as an enabling feature that allows longevity in the profession and which enables educators to care and support students with better quality. With a better understanding of resilience, the factors that enable its development and sustainment, especially within special education, are not well explored; hence, an attempt has been made in this paper to address this lacuna.

Demographic variables have been studied by much research to understand how this influence the resilience of a person because most such variables normally affect the way one perceives and responds to challenges at the workplace. In other words, demographic factors influencing resilience refer to those changes in age, gender, years of experience, and educational background that may influence or affect the level of resilience a person may possess [3]. For instance, experienced teachers are most likely to show resilience due to the amalgamation of skills, professional maturity, and adaptive coping strategies that take time to develop. Moreover, demographic factors also include socio-economic background and access to professional training, which further provide the variation in resources and perspectives that could build up or undermine the resilience of educators. Whereas some indicate that the younger the educator, the more enormous their problems with the struggles of the profession, the benefit derived from a lack of experience, yet other studies denote strong networks fill up any gap which would have helped these less experienced educators build their resilience [19]. However, few of them really zero in on just how these demographic factors may affect resilience in this special education setting. Studies that provide specific knowledge and make use of it to elaborate targeted support matching diverse educator profiles are still needed.

Furthermore, the literature has emphasized how perceived support develops resilience importantly among teachers. Support systems, such as those from the family, peers, and institutions, constantly arise as components that reduce stress and enhance resilience [20]. For example, family support provides emotional stability and assurance that may help teachers rise above the pressures emanating from their job. The workplace peer support would provide companionship and an understanding of the situation, as one lives with and shares experiences with the provision of resources. It would more so be assured of having a supportive professional community by enhancing this resilience factor. It is a case even cemented through institutional support, which means creating access to resources, training opportunities, mentorship, and recognition of effort through an enabling working environment that considers and invests in the well-being of the educator. Indeed, studies have shown that when educators feel supported on the job by the institutions they work for, a sense of belonging and job commitment are achieved, enhancing their resilience and reducing burnout. With these insights in mind, research specific to special education remains relative, and hence not clear what kinds of support may be most salient for special educators in building resilience [21] perhaps because this unique professional population has not been a focused area of research.

Finally, the literature gives evidence for an interactive, bidirectional relationship between resilience and perceived support systems. Educators are likely to build resilience-easing the process of dealing with professional challenges-when they are strongly supported by family, peers, and institutions. In turn, resilient educators will be most active in seeking support and mobilizing resources. This would create a feedback loop in which support enhances resilience and also resilience may promote educators to actively use their support networks.

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

This interplay between resilience and perceived support is particularly relevant in the context of special education, where the emotional and practical demands are very often heightened. Yet, while general education studies have explored this relationship to a certain degree, there is a lack of dedicated research into how resilience and support impact a special education setting [21]. Understanding this interplay has implications for catering to the holistic support structure for resilience development and a continued culture of support amongst special educators. It is on these bases that this paper seeks to contribute to the literature at hand by investigating these factors through a specialized lens, whose importance is shown by discussing how resilience among special educators can be valued, supported, and developed in the right direction to ensure increased well-being and professional longevity among educators [7].

It could thus be assumed with informed guesswork that perceived support-from family, peers, and institutions-may itself be one factor that already plays a central role in influencing resilience among special educators. For educators, some days the demands become so overwhelming that no one person can bear them alone; rather, it is sources of support-such as family and friends-that supply emotional security and encouragement as their colleagues would do with similar empathy and practical help. Workplace support mechanisms valuing educators make them feel part of the professional community and therefore build resilience. Examples include formal and peer mentoring, teams working together to access resources and support [15, 22]. Professional preparation, recognition, and institutional distribution of resources supports shall assist special educators in their validation and provide them with tools necessary for handling very challenging jobs. However, incomplete understanding exists on how each of these support types separately relates to resilience in special educators [23]. The current study attempts to gain insight into this relationship as a means of developing the concept of resilience, emphasizing the systems approach to support that may be said to include personal and professional dimensions.

The findings can then be used to inform the approach that the educational institution takes in devising policies and programs which will support special educators and make them feel cared for so that they can give even better services to students. This study will also be informed by the need to interrogate the relationship between resilience and perceived support, since these aspects do not operate in a vacuum but relate to each other in several ways [24]. It is when educators are supported-mostly from family, peers, or institutions-that they are more liable to create in themselves the resilience necessary for dealing with occupational stress. On the other hand, resilience may magnify educators in their search for available support and utilize it; there might be a positive feedback loop in which support and resilience feed into one another. This interaction between teachers and students is even more salient in special education, where one often finds that an educator's teaching is challenged by situations requiring flexibility, emotional resilience, and creative problem-solving. This paper considers how that relationship may inform an integrated understanding of resilience and those support strategies that have a real and longer-lasting enhancement effect on resilience [25]. Finally, the study is committed to standing in support of special educators because it elaborates evidence-based approaches that foster well-being and resilience for the benefit of the students they serve.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this work, a quantitative descriptive survey design had been adopted to systematically investigate the association of resilience with perceived support among special educators

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

working in diverse settings in India. The quantitative approach was selected for the present study because it aimed to quantify the level of resilience and factors of perceived support to allow comparison and measurement of the variables in a systematic and clearly defined population of special educators. The descriptive survey design specifically allows the researchers to capture and summarize participants' views on resilience and support without manipulating variables or interfering directly in the professional settings of participants. Such a design is useful in studying natural relationships and patterns in a population since the design provides a snapshot of prevailing conditions and relationships as perceived by participants. By collecting data through a standardized survey, the research study will report on how perceived support influences the resilience levels in a non-subjective way and enable generalization to the wider population of special educators in India. The design also suits the aim of this research, which is to determine significant patterns and trends in resilience and support that eventually inform future policies and support mechanisms for this crucial group of educators.

This is evidenced by the careful design of sample selection as a key part of the methodology to ensure that the respondents themselves could reasonably reflect the wider population of special educators in India. The special educators are very specific groups within a system of education that deals exclusively with children who have various needs that regular educational standards cannot easily categorize. Therefore, it was highly relevant that the sample represents real-world diversity in this profession with respect to geographic location and professional experience. The purposive sampling method was adopted in selecting those that had particular criteria relevant to the objectives of the study. In purposive sampling, the researcher can select the participants with an intention whereby the participants can make a contribution to resilience and support perception in the field of special education. This sampling strategy was ideal for capturing data from educators who had firsthand experience in handling children with special needs, and thus were aware of the challenges and demands of the profession. To this end, the study sampled 200 special educators who had a minimum five-year experience in the profession. The reason this, therefore, becomes a qualification criterion is to ensure that only those with enough professional experience are included, as resilience is often developed and tested through time via direct and protracted engagement in challenging educational environments.

The sampling of participants has, therefore, been done from urban and rural areas to capture the varied experiences of special educators in different contexts in India. This decision is based on an acknowledgment that there is a wide variation in the educational setting between urban and rural environments, with resource availability, institutional support, and community engagement often being sharply different. The study has thus been able to explore any differences in resilience and perceived support that might be derived from geographic contexts and provide a broad overview concerning special education in India. Diversity within the sample enhances generalization of findings and allows a more complex consideration of those elements which might make certain contributions to resilience among special educators. Second, the sampling across different regions is a recognition that the challenges of education are peculiar to India and mechanisms of resources and support might be very dissimilar for professionals in their effects. These contextual variables in the sampling make the research representative and generalizable across regions and types of schools in India.

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

A sample size of 200 was selected as this balanced both depth and breadth in data collection. This is an adequate number that permits statistical analysis to ensure this study can be confident in identifying trends, patterns, and correlations, while also being feasible to handle. For the usually narrow sample group, such a sample size is equally sufficient in capturing the variation within the experiences of special educators and small enough to allow for an in-depth analysis of the data. Only the educators who were selected to participate in the survey were asked to answer questions regarding perception of resilience and levels of support from family, peers, and institutions. With its focus on a well-defined sample of experienced educators, this present study will provide a workable understanding of the association between resilience and perceived support and, therefore, valuable information to stakeholders in their quest to make meaningful modifications towards improvement in the support structures available to special educators. In doing so, it ensures that the findings will be relevant, accurate, and of value to inform policy and practice concerning special education in India.

Resilience Scale

The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale is the most widely used tool in the measurement of resilience levels within individuals. Its robust psychometric properties and reliability, consistent across different populations and cultural settings, make it one of the preferred choices in assessing resilience. It offers two versions: a 10-item and a 25-item version that delineate the multidimensional nature of resilience for a complete look at resilience as a psychological construct. The 10-item version, the CD-RISC-10, is short and thus particularly suitable for brief procedures. It is supported by high internal consistency and good test-retest reliability across different contexts, making it appropriate to study resilience among diverse groups of educators. It has proved to be especially valid in the Indian population. The 25-item version of the CD-RISC extends nuanced dimensions of resilience on a five-point response range from "not true at all" to "true nearly all the time." The extended version allows a score range from 0 to 100, thus enabling an in-depth look into the resilience factors. Here, resilience is seen as the synthesis of five critical components: individual competence and determination, the ability to modulate and trust during stress, a capacity for letting go and a move toward secure relationships, a sense of control, and the presence of spiritual influences. Each one of these components adds to the resilience-as-a-strong, dynamic quality enabling individuals to emerge from adversity and to flourish in environments beset by challenges. This 25-item CD-RISC assesses these facets on how individuals draw upon different facets of resilience in times of stress, beating the odds, and/or sustaining their mental and emotional equilibrium.

The **CD-RISC** is a valuable asset in research involving special educators since the scale provides a deep insight into how resilience functions within such a demanding educational setting. This high reliability that exists across different cultural and occupational settings therefore makes the scale of utmost importance to this research study as it ensures that the results will be reflective of the true resilience levels of educators in India. Both versions were cross-culturally validated, and the CD-RISC may thus be an adaptive and reliable measure; it can capture the complexity of resilience by yielding a fine-grained understanding of the ways that educators manage demands associated with the support of children with special needs. The nature of comprehensiveness allows a researcher to estimate the resilience of a factor in such a manner that includes broad psychological resilience, as well as more narrow factors creating an individual's capability to handle work pressures and demands effectively.

Perceived Support Scale (PSS)

Perceived Support Scale (PSS) is a scale to measure the support of a person from significant sources such as family, peers, and institutions. It is a 15-item scale with responses measured on a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". This therefore gives the participants a chance to show to what extent they feel supported by those different groups in their lives. The PSS sums the support from family, peers, and institutions and provides a broad-angle snapshot of the supporting structure surrounding the person in his or her life-the degree to which each source is expected to contribute toward emotional, social, and practical well-being. A Likert scale format has been chosen because the data collected would be standardized and thus easy to analyze, which means quantitative comparison between different perceived levels of support across participants will be enabled. More importantly, the emphasis on multiple sources of support in the PSS makes it more applicable to special educators whose work requires coping with demands of their difficult occupation through the combination of family understanding, peer collaboration, and institutional support.

In fact, the data collection has been conducted through an online survey in order to allow for convenience and reach geographically dispersed participants with an assurance of confidentiality and on a wholly voluntary basis. The online format will ensure that special educators from anywhere and with whatever work schedule can take part in the survey on minimal disturbance. The survey instrument was designed in such a way that it would collect anonymous data to make sure honest responses were ensured while responding to items referring to resilience levels and perceived support. Participants completed a demographic form, the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) which measured one's resilience, and the Perceived Support Scale (PSS) assessing perceived support. The demographic information sheet collected the following: initials, years of age, sex, workplace, qualifications, experience in years, and the disabilities dealt with by the educators. These demographic variables will be important in this study for the assessment of heterogeneity in the sample of participants since their age, experience, and kinds of disabilities managed affect the resilience of each educator and the perceived support.

These data are further analyzed by SPSS with the purpose of applying descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics demarcate demographic variables, scores of resilience, and perceived support scores in order to show an overview of preliminary patterns and characteristics within the data. The approach shall be to find substantial relationships and differences between the levels of resilience and perceived support during the inferential statistical analyses. In determining the magnitude and direction of resilience and perceived support, Pearson's correlation analysis was used. This statistical test would be necessary for the determination of the linear relationship and thereby helps to quantify the manner with which an increase in perceived support may relate to changes in resilience among special educators. The following Pearson's correlation shall, therefore, be instructive and indicative whether family, peer, and institutional supports act to enable or facilitate resilience within this profession and form tentative bases on which interventions and policy enhancements may be designed to support special educators. Through these analyses, the study attempts to underline some important connections that may suggest a few future directions for developing resilience among educators working in special needs contexts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The section goes into a deeper analysis of the results deduced from analyzing levels of resilience and perceived support among the special educators. First, the section outlines descriptive statistics, which generally offer the demographic composition and the general features of the respondents in the study. Analyzing the trends of the patterns of the scores of resilience and perceived support from family, peers, and institutions that the participants in this study have exhibited denotes outstanding trends and variations. Besides that, findings such as these have to be put up against available literature that furthers the explanation of how special educators' resilience is influenced by the support networks around them. Discussion: The presentation will outline the identified relationships, demarcating how demographic variables-in particular-influence the level of resilience that experience in years and the kind of disability managed bring forth. It will also measure the correlation between perceived support and resilience to show how supportive environments make it easier for educators to cope better with demands related to their roles. This section situates these findings within a broader education and psychological context in which implications of such findings for practice are discussed, and potential directions of future research on the support of resilience development among special educators are considered.

Table 1 presents the resilience among special educators, which provides an overview of the resilience scores obtained from the 200 participants. As it is possible to see, with the mean score for resilience at 3.8, it could be concluded that generally, these educators have a moderate to strong capacity to adapt, manage stress, and recover from challenges associated with their demands in the career service. The standard deviation of 0.50 reflects a relatively low variability around the resilience scores, meaning educators' scores cluster closely around the mean. This may suggest a certain strength in coping ability shared in this sample. The minimum value is 2.5 and the maximum 5.0; these indicate that there is some variation, but even the lowest scores suggest a baseline level of resilience, with some scorers being remarkably high in resilience. These results highlighted the fact that resilience has played an important part among special educators in acting as the basis on which they have provided effective support for children with special needs. Resilience is considered basal level comprehension, providing a solid ground for further and deeper understanding of what factors promote or confront resilience in this occupation.

Ob 1: To measure the resilience levels of special educators in India.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Resilience and Perceived Support

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Resilience Score	200	3.8	0.50	2.5	5.0

Ob 2: To Explore the Influence of Demographic Factors on Resilience

Table 2. Resilience Scores of Special Educators Based on Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	N	Mean Resilience Score	Standard Deviation	t-value / F-value	p-value
Gender					
- Male	90	3.7	0.52	1.25	> 0.05
- Female	110	3.9	0.48		

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

Demographic Variable	N	Mean Resilience Score	Standard Deviation	t-value / F-value	p-value
Years of Experience					
- Less than 5 years	60	3.6	0.54	4.20	< 0.01
- 5-10 years	80	3.8	0.50		
- More than 10 years	60	4.0	0.46		
Educational Qualification					
- Bachelor's Degree	70	3.6	0.55	3.75	< 0.05
- Master's Degree	90	3.9	0.48		
- Doctorate	40	4.1	0.44		
Age					
- Below 30 years	50	3.7	0.53	2.95	< 0.05
- 30-40 years	90	3.8	0.49		
- Above 40 years	60	4.0	0.47		
Work Location					
- Urban	120	3.9	0.49	2.80	< 0.05
- Rural	80	3.7	0.51		
Type of Disability Handled					
- Intellectual Disability	70	3.6	0.55	3.90	< 0.01
- Physical Disability	60	3.8	0.50		
- Multiple Disabilities	40	4.1	0.45		
- Autism Spectrum Disorder	30	3.9	0.48		

Analysis of special educators' resilience scores by various demographic variables provides an overview of the variables that would influence resilience levels. In terms of gender, the result has shown that female educators had a slightly higher mean resilience score of 3.9 compared to 3.7 for their male counterparts. Although this difference was noticed, the associated t-value of 1.25 and a p-value greater than 0.05 suggest that gender differences in resilience are not statistically significant. That is to say, male and female educators express equal quantities of resilience. From this point, it can be said that gender may not stand to be a main factor affecting resilience among special educators; these may develop resilience based on experiences and professional challenges which stand to be equal regardless of gender. Among special educators, years of experience were a strong predictor, with the F value being significant at $p < 0.01$. It was found that special educators with more than ten years of experience had an average score on resilience as 4.0 while those less than five years of experience reported an average score of 3.6. The longer a special educator's experience level, the more confident they will be in the coping mechanisms and adaptive skills one will have learned through time to help add to their resilience. A mid-level experience level of 5-10 years of teaching service demonstrated an intermediate mean score of 3.8, further indicating that resilience would grow incrementally over time with growing familiarity and mastery of strategies to deal with the diverse needs of students with disabilities.

Educational qualification also played a very important role; the higher the academic achievements, the higher the resilient score. For instance, the special educators who

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

responded with the doctorate degree had means of 4.1, followed by the master's degrees with a score of 3.9 and bachelor's degrees with 3.6. The obtained F-value is 3.75, and the p-value is below 0.05; therefore, these differences are statistically significant. It would therefore mean that educationally professional training has imparted more articulate problem-solving skills, theoretical knowledge, and strategies in the realities of overcoming challenges to the instructors and hence further perpetuating resilience. It is a sign of continued learning and professional growth, making one more resilient by increasing the resources an educator can draw upon to adapt to and flourish under pressure. The influence of age as another demographic factor on resilience was that special educators over 40 years showed the highest mean score of 4.0 in resilience. The age group from 30-40 years had a mean score of 3.8 while educators below 30 years had a relatively low mean score of 3.7. From the ANOVA test, the $F=2.95$ and p-value is less than 0.05, indicating that differences in resilience due to age are significant. It could be indicative that maturity and life experiences are important in resilience development; this would imply that, with greater life experience, older educators develop better means of coping with adversity in their private and professional lives. The ability to draw upon such an experience may give them a psychological advantage through access to greater resources and more adaptive strategies.

Work location also showed extreme variations, with the higher mean score of 3.9 for special educators based in urban areas compared to 3.7 for those working in rural areas. The resulting F-value of 2.80 and the p-value of less than 0.05 strongly indicate that the difference will be significant at a 95% confidence level. Results could reflect the differences in resource availability, professional development opportunities, and support mechanisms between urban and rural areas. The resilience of urban educators is enhanced by more organized support, improved amenities, and networks of collaboration. Similarly, lesser resources and perceived isolation from professional contacts might further exacerbate the challenges experienced by educators in rural settings and affect their levels of resilience. The level of disability that educators addressed also played a determining role in their resilience. The highest was from educators working with students with multiple disabilities, with a mean score of 4.1, showing a very good ability to handle complexities that were multi-faceted in nature. This followed the educators handling autism spectrum disorder with a mean score of 3.9, physical disabilities with a mean score of 3.8, and intellectual disabilities with a mean score of 3.6. This difference is statistically significant, as the F-value is 3.90 with a p-value of less than 0.01. It is suggested that the type and severity of the disabilities that the professionals deal with contribute to the development of resilience. Indeed, dealing with a few or more serious disabilities involves a wider range of acquired skills and coping mechanisms and, therefore, might contribute to higher resilience.

In other words, the analysis proves that the resilience of special educators is multi-dimensional and depends on an interaction of demographic variables. There were no significant differences according to gender, but years of experience, educational qualifications, age, work location, and the type of disability handled all showed a significant effect. These findings point to the need for focused support and resources toward building resilience, especially at early career stages with lower levels of educational qualification or working in resource-constrained settings. The benefit of these demographic influences in understanding can be made to lead and assist in the development of policy and programs on resilience enhancement and well-being fostering for special educators.

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

Ob 3: To assess the perceived support from family, peers, and institutions among special educators.

Table 3. Perceived Support Levels from Family, Peers, and Institutions among Special Educators

Variable	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Perceived Support	200	4.2	0.45	3.0	5.0
Family Support	200	4.3	0.48	3.0	5.0
Peer Support	200	4.1	0.50	2.5	5.0
Institutional Support	200	4.0	0.52	2.0	5.0

Ob 4: To examine the relationship between resilience and perceived support.

Table 4. Correlation Matrix for Resilience and Perceived Support

Variable	Resilience	Family Support	Peer Support	Institutional Support
Resilience	1.00	0.55**	0.68**	0.50**
Family Support	0.55**	1.00	0.45**	0.40**
Peer Support	0.68**	0.45**	1.00	0.48**
Institutional Support	0.50**	0.40**	0.48**	1.00

Note: $p < 0.01$

As shown in Table 3, on average, special educators reported a strong sense of support, tending with an overall perceived support mean score of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 0.45, indicative of relatively consistent experiences of support across the sample. Family support is the highest among the three at 4.3 averages, while the standard deviation is a little higher at 0.48, which means that although most felt adequately supported by their families, there was some variability. Mean of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 0.50 underlines the critical relevance of peer support and collegiality, although educators' actual reported experiences with these latter factors are slightly more dispersed. This points to a general view in which special educators perceive good institutional support. The institutional support is represented by the mean of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.52, while it is the most variable among the three types of support measured. This could indicate variability in policies, different leadership styles, and resource access that might affect just how supported educators feel within their working environments.

Table 4 shows the resilience by different types of perceived support. As shown by the correlation matrix, statistically significant positive correlations of large size were observed between resilience and all three types of support, $p < 0.01$. This association was most robust between resilience and peer support, $r = 0.68$, thus showing that encouragement and collaboration from colleagues are critical in strengthening special educators' resilience. Family support also shares a significant correlation with resilience, $r = 0.55$, which means a stable and supportive home environment greatly enhances the ability of educators to cope with stress and immediately respond to challenges in their professional life. The institutional support is also moderately related to resilience, $r = 0.50$, reflecting the worth of structured support systems within educational organizations themselves. While these correlations point out that family and institutional support are present, peer relationships stand high in the

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

special educators' quest to seek strength, most probably through shared experiences and understanding of professional challenges.

The mutual correlations among family, peer, and institutional support suggest an intertwined web of influence. For instance, family support is positively related to both peer support, with $r = 0.45$, and institutional support, with $r = 0.40$. This may indicate some degree of overlap; for instance, a good family base may promote more successful involvement and support from both peers and institutions. This argument is further supported by the fact that peer and institutional support are related at $r = 0.48$, reinforcing positive dynamics among colleagues and at the same time probably further nurturing these dynamics through the enabling institutional framework. These findings all together indicate the multi-faceted nature of perceived support and an integral role it plays in fostering resilience among special educators. This multidimensional support structure underlines the fact that education policy and practice should focus on the establishment of collaborative environments, the mobilization of families within support networks, and the assurance that regular and meaningful support from the institutional level is available to enhance the resilience of educators and, as a result, their professional effectiveness and satisfaction.

This relationship points out a moderate positive relationship, which means that the special educators who perceived higher levels of support from their family tended to be more resilient. Generally, family support provides emotional stability, reassurance, and encouragement that are helpful in helping educators put up with the demanding nature of their profession. Such support would offer a base of psychological security whereby educators feel secure in their personal life, and this, in turn, bolsters them against professional stressors. The buffering effect of burnout could perhaps be reduced, and long-term mental stability achieved by the presence of understanding and empathetic family members, which in turn would allow educators to bring fresh energy and flexibility to the role.

Among the measured relationships, the resilience and peer support relationship is the strongest, showing a statistically significant positive relation. That is to say, peer support is an influential variable that would positively affect resilience among special educators. Only through receiving support from people who can understand experiences and challenges alike does one achieve a feeling of community and shared purpose. The exchange of knowledge, advice, and shared coping strategies through educators can provide the necessary reassurance and practical insights to develop their stress management capacity and maintain their mental health. Peer support creates an atmosphere of collaboration and respect that allows them to feel less isolated and better equipped to push through in overcoming their struggles. Resilience and institutional support also correlated positively, though a bit lower. That might suggest there is a limit to the number of ways in which institutional support-administrative support, resource access, professional development-can be positive in terms of resilience, just like the support of family or peers. Whether such institutional support actually proves effective will be a function of how consistent and successful it has been. When institutions provide comprehensive support, educators will find structural security and opportunities for professional growth that help them achieve resilience. On the other hand, institutional support is one of the significant pillars of resilience in sustaining the long-term professional commitment and well-being of educators.

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

Summary of Findings

The results of this study lead to a few other important points on resilience levels and perceived support among special educators in India. For example, the resilience scores have demographically varied with variables like gender, years of experience, and education qualification-females, those having more than ten years of experience, and those having qualifications as high as a doctorate give high scores accordingly. Thirdly, educators above 40 years and those teaching in urban areas yielded higher resiliency scores than their younger counterparts and those teaching in rural areas. These findings propose that experience, age, and education form a basis for building resilience as this can be attributed to professional knowledge one has amassed and also coping skills that increase with age. Perceived support assessment showed that special educators received different forms of support from family, peers, and institutions. Of these, family support has a moderate positive significant correlation with resilience; hence, emotional and moral support from the family significantly strengthened the capability of educators to handle or manage stress. The strongest association was related to peer support, citing the use of collegiate interaction, shared experience, and professional camaraderie in improving educators' adaptive potential. On the other hand, institutional support was positively related to resilience; the relationship was somewhat weaker, suggesting resources and administrative support are helpful yet perhaps not as salient as personal and peer connections. Such findings bring out poignantly the multilevel nature of resilience among special educators, with personal and professional contingencies at play along with the environmental one. They also hint at dedicated efforts toward strengthening support systems, hardening professional networks, and garnering institutional support consistently as ways of building and sustaining resilience in this critical workforce.

CONCLUSION

The present investigation represents an effort toward comprehensive investigation into the resilience and perceived support of special educators in India, outlining the critical factors that contribute to resilient navigation through the challenges faced by this professional group. Indeed, while the perceived level of resilience varied among special educators, demographic variables such as gender, years of experience, educational qualifications, and work location were notable influential factors. The third theme revealed that perceived support from the family, peer, and institutional levels became an integral part of resilience, with each contributing in their own way to the total experience of the educators. Of these, peer support showed the highest positive correlation with resilience, underlining how a support system nurtured communication between peers and thus encouraged one another. These findings point towards multi-dimensional support structure for special educators, which integrates strong family ties, robust peer networks, and reliable institutional backing into the enhancement of resilience. Only then will the policymakers, administrators, and educators be in a position to apply specific strategies toward reinforcement because they are aware of such diverse needs that special educators have. They will be sure that their commitment to such enterprises will be long-lived. Longitudinal effects of the insights listed above into support mechanisms and resilience training programs need to be pursued in further research with a view to informing better interventions for promoting mental well-being and professional satisfaction among special educators. Overall, this study emphasized the support structures as a way in which teachers could be empowered to develop their resilience in order to deal with the many challenges existing within the profession of special education.

REFERENCES

- [1] Q. Fu and X. Zhang, "Promoting community resilience through disaster education: Review of community-based interventions with a focus on teacher resilience and well-being," *PLoS one*, vol. 19, p. e0296393, 2024.
- [2] M. J. Santos-Villalba, J. J. Leiva-Olivencia, J. L. González-Sodis, and M. J. Alcalá del Olmo-Fernández, "Resilience Strategies of Students in Highly Complex Educational Contexts: Opportunities for Inclusive Pedagogical Transformation," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, p. 265, 2024.
- [3] S. N. Sato, E. Condes Moreno, A. Rubio-Zarapuz, A. A. Dalamitros, R. Yañez-Sepulveda, J. F. Tornero-Aguilera, *et al.*, "Navigating the new normal: Adapting online and distance learning in the post-pandemic era," *Education Sciences*, vol. 14, p. 19, 2023.
- [4] M. Goniewicz, A. Włoszczak-Szubzda, A. M. Al-Wathinani, and K. Goniewicz, "Resilience in emergency medicine during COVID-19: evaluating staff expectations and preparedness," *Journal of Personalized Medicine*, vol. 13, p. 1545, 2023.
- [5] D. Bagdžiūnienė, A. Kazlauskienė, D. Nasvytienė, and E. Sakadolskis, "Resources of emotional resilience and its mediating role in teachers' well-being and intention to leave," *Frontiers in psychology*, vol. 14, p. 1305979, 2023.
- [6] Y. Nissim and A. Danial-Saad, "The Resilient Teacher: Unveiling the Positive Impact of the Collaborative Practicum Model on Novice Teachers," *Education Sciences*, vol. 13, p. 1162, 2023.
- [7] H. D. Trieu, P. Van Nguyen, T. T. Nguyen, H. M. Vu, and K. Tran, "Information technology capabilities and organizational ambidexterity facilitating organizational resilience and firm performance of SMEs," *Asia Pacific Management Review*, vol. 28, pp. 544-555, 2023.
- [8] K. Brewer, H. Ziegler, S. Kurdian, and J. Nguyen, "Relationships of individual and workplace characteristics with nurses' moral resilience," *Nursing ethics*, vol. 31, pp. 432-442, 2024.
- [9] A.-S. Antoniou, G. Charitaki, and D. Mastrogiannis, "Supporting in-service special educational needs teachers to stay engaged: A two-step hierarchical linear regression analysis," *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, vol. 28, pp. 1571-1587, 2023.
- [10] A. A. Adamu, S. H. Raza, and B. Mohamad, "Organizational resilience: unveiling the role of strategic internal crisis management on employee sensemaking and sensegiving," *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, vol. 73, pp. 2068-2091, 2024.
- [11] R. Zhi, Y. Wang, and A. Derakhshan, "On the role of academic buoyancy and self-efficacy in predicting teachers' work engagement: A case of Chinese english as a foreign language teachers," *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, vol. 131, pp. 612-629, 2024.
- [12] M. Fahmi, E. Sarilita, and G. Wilar, "Building Resilient Communities: Rapid Response to a Crisis through Nusantara Module's Character Education and Social Contribution Initiative," *Sustainability*, vol. 15, p. 13300, 2023.
- [13] E. A. Skinner, "Four guideposts toward an integrated model of academic motivation: Motivational resilience, academic identity, complex social ecologies, and development," *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 35, p. 80, 2023.
- [14] P. Aithal, S. Prabhu, and S. Aithal, "Future of Higher Education through Technology Prediction and Forecasting," *Poornaprajna International Journal of Management, Education, and Social Science (PIJMESS)*, vol. 1, pp. 01-50, 2024.

Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education

- [15] C. J. Wiedermann, V. Barbieri, B. Plagg, P. Marino, G. Piccoliori, and A. Engl, "Fortifying the foundations: a comprehensive approach to enhancing mental health support in educational policies amidst crises," in *Healthcare*, 2023, p. 1423.
- [16] F. Shen, W. Ye, C. Wang, and X. Huang, "Effects of Organizational Factors on Identification of Young Returnees from Urban Areas with Rural Societies—A Perspective of Adaptability," *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 167, pp. 363-390, 2023.
- [17] G. M. Mu, Y. Wang, N. Zhu, and D. Zhou, "Resilience to neoliberal structural constraints: lessons from Chinese inclusive education teachers," *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, vol. 28, pp. 1755-1770, 2024.
- [18] A. Fehérvári and A. Varga, "Resilience and inclusion. Evaluation of an educational support programme," *Educational Studies*, vol. 49, pp. 147-165, 2023.
- [19] J. A. Nielsen, L. Mathiassen, O. Benfeldt, S. Madsen, C. Haslam, and E. Penttinen, "Organizational resilience and digital resources: Evidence from responding to exogenous shock by going virtual," *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 73, p. 102687, 2023.
- [20] A. Junça Silva and D. Pinto, "Training under an extreme context: the role of organizational support and adaptability on the motivation transfer and performance after training," *Personnel Review*, vol. 53, pp. 743-770, 2024.
- [21] B. Abubakar, S. Sanusi, R. Razali, T. K. Yeninarsih, and M. Mujiburrahman, "Parenting Education in Islamic Families within the Framework of Family Resilience in Aceh, Indonesia," *Samarah: Jurnal Hukum Keluarga Dan Hukum Islam*, vol. 7, pp. 1121-1147, 2023.
- [22] I. M. Tvedt, I. D. Tommelein, O. J. Klakegg, and J.-M. Wong, "Organizational values in support of leadership styles fostering organizational resilience: a process perspective," *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, vol. 16, pp. 258-278, 2023.
- [23] N. Martinez, O. K. Kilag, and R. Macario, "The Impact of Organizational Culture on Leadership Strategies in Crisis Management," *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education (2994-9521)*, vol. 1, pp. 454-466, 2023.
- [24] M. Gunawan, B. Soetjipto, and L. Sudhartio, "How to link organizational resilience to transformational entrepreneurship behavior as theoretical framework gap—A systematic literature review," *F1000Research*, vol. 12, 2023.
- [25] A. Ryan, S. Geiger, H. Haugh, O. Branzei, B. L. Gray, T. B. Lawrence, *et al.*, "Emplaced partnerships and the ethics of care, recognition and resilience," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 184, pp. 757-772, 2023.

Acknowledgement

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

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Dhiyaneshwari, R.P. (2024). Navigating Resilience: The Interplay of Demographics and Institutional Support in Special Education. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 12(4), 1145-1161. DIP:18.01.106.20241204, DOI:10.25215/1204.106