

Бекжанова Жанар Сериккалиевна – старший преподаватель, Атырауский университет имени Х. Досмухамедова (Атырау, Казахстан), e-mail: zhanar_b_s@mail.ru

Каракулова Маржан Семетеевна – магистр педагогических наук, старший преподаватель, Каспийский университет технологий и инжиниринга имени Ш. Есенова (Yessenov University) (Актау, Казахстан), e-mail: marzhan.karakulova@yu.edu.kz

Төлегенова Әлия Амангалиқызы – ассоциированный профессор, PhD, Египетский университет исламской культуры «Нур-Мубарак» (Алматы, Казахстан), e-mail: aliyatts@mail.ru

Information about the authors:

Zhasulan Aldabergenovich Karibayev (corresponding author) – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan), e-mail: zhasulan_aldabergen.84@mail.ru

Shynar Bolatkyzy – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan), e-mail: Shynar-14@mail.ru

Zhandos Mukanovich Kozhakanov – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University (Almaty, Kazakhstan), e-mail: zhandos599@mail.ru

Zhanar Serikkaliyeva Bekzhanova – Senior Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau University (Atyrau, Kazakhstan), e-mail: zhanar_b_s@mail.ru

Marzhan Semeteeyna Karakulova – Master of Pedagogical Sciences, Senior Lecturer, Sh. Yessenov Caspian University of Technology and Engineering (Aktau, Kazakhstan), e-mail: marzhan.karakulova@yu.edu.kz

Aliya Amangalikyzy Tolegenova – Associate Professor, PhD, Nur-Mubarak Egyptian University of Islamic Culture (Almaty, Kazakhstan), e-mail: aliyatts@mail.ru

MPHTI 15.31

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-5967.2026.86.1.007>

A. Liyassova^{1*} , Z. Madaliev² , Sh. Zakaryanova³ , G. Kassen⁴ ,

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

*e-mail: aigulkaznu.80@mail.ru

ON THE STUDY OF RESILIENCE AS A FACTOR INFLUENCING THE PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

Abstract

In the context of the transformation of higher education, accompanied by digitalization and increased professional requirements, the problem of the psychological health of university teachers is becoming particularly relevant. In this regard, the study of resilience as a personal resource that supports the psychological stability and professional well-being of teachers is of particular importance. *The purpose* of this study is to analyze the level and structure of resilience of university teachers, as well as to identify its features depending on socio-demographic characteristics as a factor related to psychological health. *Methodology and methods.* The study was carried out within the framework of a cross-sectional design using quantitative methods. The data was collected through an online survey on the Google Forms platform. The study involved 483 university teachers aged 18-73 years. To assess resilience, S. Muddy's adapted methodology was used. The data was processed using descriptive statistics, the Cronbach internal consistency coefficient, as well as parametric and nonparametric comparative analysis methods. The level of statistical significance was assumed to be $p < 0.05$. *The results of the study* showed that the resilience of most teachers is at an average level. The most pronounced component is engagement, while risk-taking is the least pronounced. There were no gender differences in the level of resilience and its components, but age differences were found in individual components, which indicates the variability of the structure of resilience at different stages of professional development with relative stability of the integral indicator. *The scientific novelty* lies in the identification of structural and age-related features of the resilience of university teachers in modern conditions. *The practical significance* is determined by the possibility

of applying the results in the development of psychological support and burnout prevention programs aimed at developing engagement, subjective control and adaptation to changes in the educational environment.

Keywords: resilience, psychological health, university teachers, professional stress, risk taking.

А.Лиясова^{1}, З.Б.Мадалиева², Ш.Закарьянова³, Г.А.Қасен⁴*

Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық Университеті им. Аль-Фараби (Алматы, Қазақстан)

**e-mail: aigulkaznu.80@mail.ru*

К вопросу изучения жизнестойкости как фактора, влияющего на психологическое здоровье преподавателей вуза

Аннотация

В условиях трансформации высшего образования, сопровождающейся цифровизацией и повышением профессиональных требований, проблема психологического здоровья преподавателей вузов становится особенно актуальной. В связи с этим изучение жизнестойкости как личностного ресурса, поддерживающего психологическую стабильность и профессиональное благополучие педагогов, имеет особое значение. *Целью данного исследования* является анализ уровня и структуры жизнестойкости преподавателей вузов, а также выявление ее особенностей в зависимости от социально-демографических характеристик как фактора, связанного с психологическим здоровьем. *Методы.* Исследование проводилось в рамках перекрестного анализа с использованием количественных методов. Данные были собраны с помощью онлайн-опроса на платформе Google Forms. В исследовании приняли участие 483 преподавателя университетов в возрасте от 18 до 73 лет. Для оценки устойчивости использовалась адаптированная методика С. Мадди. Данные были обработаны с использованием описательной статистики, коэффициента внутренней согласованности Кронбаха, а также параметрических и непараметрических методов сравнительного анализа. Уровень статистической значимости принимался равным $p < 0,05$. *Результаты исследования* показали, что жизнестойкость большинства учителей находится на среднем уровне. Наиболее выраженным компонентом является вовлеченность, в то время как готовность к риску является наименее выраженной. Не было выявлено гендерных различий в уровне жизнестойкости и ее компонентах, но были обнаружены возрастные различия в отдельных компонентах, что свидетельствует о вариабельности структуры жизнестойкости на разных этапах профессионального становления при относительной стабильности интегрального показателя. *Научная новизна* заключается в выявлении структурных и возрастных особенностей жизнестойкости преподавателей вузов в современных условиях. *Практическая значимость определяется* возможностью применения полученных результатов при разработке программ психологической поддержки и профилактики эмоционального выгорания, направленных на развитие вовлеченности, субъективного контроля и адаптации к изменениям в образовательной среде.

Ключевые слова: жизнестойкость, психологическое здоровье, преподаватели вузов, профессиональный стресс, принятие риска.

Лиясова А, Мадалиева З.Б., Закарьянова Ш., Қасен Г.А

Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

**e-mail: aigulkaznu.80@mail.ru*

Университет оқытушыларының психологиялық денсаулығына әсер ететін фактор ретінде өміршеңдікті зерттеу мәселесіне

Аннотация

Цифрландырумен қызметке қойылатын талаптардың жоғарылауымен қатар жүретін жоғары білім берудің трансформациясы жағдайында жоғары оқу орындары оқытушыларының психологиялық денсаулығы мәселесі ерекше өзекті болып отыр. Осыған байланысты педагогтардың психологиялық тұрақтылығы мен кәсіби әл-ауқатын қолдайтын тұлғалық ресурс ретінде өміршеңдікті зерттеу ерекше маңызға ие. *Бұл зерттеудің мақсаты* жоғары оқу орындары оқытушыларының өміршеңдігінің деңгейі мен құрылымын талдау, және оның әлеуметтік-демографиялық ерекшеліктер тұрғысынан психологиялық денсаулық факторы ретінде айқындай болып табылады. *Әдістері.* Зерттеу кросс-секциялық дизайн негізінде сандқ әдістерді қолдану арқылы жүргізілді. Деректер Google Forms платформасында онлайн сауалнама арқылы жиналды. Зерттеуге 18 бен 73 жас аралығындағы 483 университет оқытушылары қатысты. Тұрақтылықты бағалау үшін С.Маддидің бейімделген әдісі қолданылды. Деректер сипаттамалық статистиканы, Кронбахтың ішкі сәйкестік коэффициентін, параметрлік және параметрлік емес салыстырмалы талдау әдістерін қолдана отырып өңделді. Статистикалық маңыздылық деңгейі $p < 0,05$ -ке тең деп қабылданды. *Зерттеу нәтижелері* мұғалімдердің көпшілігінің өміршеңдігі орташа деңгейде екенін көрсетті. Ең жоғарғы деңгейде қатысушылық компоненті болса, ал тәуекелге дайындық ең аз деңгейде байқалады. Өміршеңдік деңгейінде және оның компоненттерінде гендерлік айырмашылықтар анықталған жоқ, бірақ жеке компоненттерде жас айырмашылықтары анықталды, бұл интегралды индикатордың салыстырмалы тұрақтылығымен кәсіби қалыптасудың әртүрлі кезеңдеріндегі өміршеңдік құрылымының өзгергіштігін көрсетеді. *Ғылыми жаңалық*-қазіргі жағдайда жоғары оқу орындары оқытушыларының өміршеңдігінің құрылымдық және жас ерекшеліктерін анықтау. *Практикалық маңыздылығы* білім беру ортасындағы өзгерістерге бейімделуді, субъективті бақылауды дамытуға бағытталған психологиялық қолдау және күйзелістің алдын алу бағдарламаларын әзірлеу кезінде алынған нәтижелерді қолдану мүмкіндігімен анықталады.

Түйінді сөздер: Өміршеңдік, психологиялық денсаулық, жоғары оқу орны оқытушылары, кәсіби стресс, тәуекелді қабылдау.

Introduction. In the context of the transformation of modern higher education, the professional activity of a university teacher is characterized by a high level of tension, a multifactorial presence of requirements and an increase in the psychological load. The intensification of the educational process, the digitalization of teaching, the expansion of administrative functions, the constant professional self-development and the need for scientific activity create conditions for chronic stress that contribute to reducing the psychological well-being and professional stability of teachers. In this regard, it is especially relevant to study individual resources that ensure the preservation of psychological health and adaptation to professional stresses. One of such resources in modern psychology is resilience, conceptualized by S. Maddi as an integrative personal education that includes engagement, control, and risk-taking.

Resilience reflects a person's ability to maintain inner stability, an active lifestyle, and a subjective sense of meaningfulness in the face of uncertainty and stressful influences. Numerous foreign and domestic studies have shown that resilience helps to reduce the negative effects of stress, prevents the development of emotional burnout and acts as a significant predictor of the psychological health of representatives of socio-humanitarian professions. Despite the growing interest in the problem of psychological health of teachers, research on the resilience of higher school teachers remains fragmentary. Most studies focus on the study of emotional burnout, occupational stress, or coping strategies, while resilience as a systemic personal resource of psychological health is insufficiently analyzed. Meanwhile, the specifics of the university teacher's activities, combining educational, scientific and organizational functions, require a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of psychological stability and factors contributing to the preservation of professional well-being. This problem becomes particularly important in an unstable social and educational

environment, when a teacher is forced to constantly adapt to changing requirements, while maintaining the quality of the educational process and personal involvement in professional activities. In this context, resilience can be considered not only as an individual psychological characteristic, but also as a factor determining the level of psychological health of teachers and their ability to function effectively in the face of professional challenges. The relevance of this study is due to the need for an empirical analysis of the resilience of university teachers as a personal resource for psychological health, as well as identifying the features of its structural components depending on socio-demographic characteristics. The data obtained can be used in the development of programs for psychological support and prevention of professional burnout in the higher education system.

The purpose of this study is to study the resilience of university teachers as a factor affecting psychological health in the context of professional activity.

To achieve this goal, the following research questions were formulated in the study: What is the level of resilience of university teachers in modern professional conditions? Which components of resilience (engagement, control, risk-taking) are the most and least pronounced among higher school teachers? Are the indicators of resilience related to the socio-demographic characteristics of teachers (gender, age, professional status)? Can resilience be considered as a significant personal resource for the psychological health of university teachers?

In accordance with the set goal and research questions, the following research hypothesis was put forward: resilience is a significant personal resource for the psychological health of university teachers and is characterized mainly by an average and high level of severity, with the components of involvement and control dominating. It is also assumed that a higher level of resilience will be characteristic of teachers with extensive professional experience, reflecting the accumulation of adaptive resources in the process of professional development. The scientific novelty of the study is to expand the understanding of resilience as a factor of psychological health of higher school teachers and to identify the features of its structural components in the context of professional activity. The practical significance of the work is determined by the possibility of using the results obtained in the development of preventive and correctional programs aimed at strengthening psychological health and increasing the professional stability of university teachers.

Literature review. In modern health psychology, increasing attention is being paid to the study of personal resources that ensure a person's resistance to stress and the preservation of psychological well-being in conditions of prolonged professional stress. Within the framework of resource approaches, resilience occupies a special place, which is considered as a relatively stable system of personal attitudes that contribute to adaptation and maintenance of psychological stability in adverse and uncertain conditions. Classical empirical studies have shown that resilience performs a protective function, reducing the likelihood of developing negative psychological and somatic effects of stress and mediating the link between stressful life events and personal health (Kobasa, 1979). It was found that it is the features of subjective interpretation and experience of stressful situations, rather than the objective characteristics of stressors, that largely determine the psychological consequences of occupational stress. Further development of the concept of resilience is associated with the works of S. Maddi, in which this construct was presented as an integrative personal education, including three interrelated components: engagement, control, and risk-taking or challenge orientation (Maddi, 2002; Maddi, 2006). Involvement reflects the degree of a person's subjective involvement in an activity and experiencing it as meaningful and meaningful. Control characterizes a person's belief in the ability to influence the events of their own lives and the results of their professional activities. Risk acceptance is associated with a willingness to perceive change and uncertainty not as a threat, but as a source of experience and personal growth. This model has been widely recognized in foreign psychology and has formed the basis for the development of standardized psychodiagnostic techniques used in stress and psychological health research. Modern empirical studies carried out in recent years confirm the significant role of resilience as a resource of psychological health. The results of systematic reviews and meta-analytical studies indicate that resilience is consistently associated with lower levels of

psychological distress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms, as well as higher rates of subjective well-being and life satisfaction (Kunzler et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2023). At the same time, it is emphasized that these connections are preserved while controlling other personal characteristics, which makes it possible to consider resilience as an independent and theoretically sound predictor of psychological health. The study of resilience is particularly relevant in the context of professional activities associated with high emotional and cognitive stress. Teaching and working in the higher education system are traditionally among the professions with an increased risk of developing chronic stress and emotional burnout. Modern reviews show that teachers face a combination of high workload, lack of autonomy, administrative pressure and constant assessment of professional effectiveness, which contributes to the formation of a stable stress state (Madigan, Kim, 2021). In these conditions, personal resources, including resilience, become crucial for maintaining psychological health and professional stability. Empirical research in recent years confirms the protective role of resilience among teachers and teachers of higher education. It has been shown that a higher level of resilience is associated with less emotional exhaustion, reduced symptoms of burnout, and higher satisfaction with professional activities (Skaalvik, Skaalvik, 2021; Romano et al., 2021). At the same time, modern authors emphasize that the structural components of resilience can be correlated with professional and psychological outcomes in different ways. Engagement is closely related to professional motivation and the subjective meaning of work, control is associated with a sense of competence and reduced anxiety, while risk-taking reflects willingness to change, innovate, and adapt to the transformations of the educational environment (Fernet et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2022). In recent years, the problem of the psychological health of higher school teachers has become the subject of active scientific analysis. International studies conducted after 2020 indicate an increase in the level of psychological distress, emotional burnout and dissatisfaction with professional activities among academic staff, especially in the context of digitalization of education, increased demands on scientific productivity and the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic (Pressley, 2021; Alif et al., 2024). The academic environment is increasingly characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, a multiplicity of professional roles, and blurring of the boundaries between work and personal time, which increases the importance of personal resources that provide psychological stability. In the framework of modern higher education research, resilience is considered as an element of resource models of professional well-being. Works devoted to the formation of a culture of well-being in the university environment emphasize the need for an integrated approach to teacher support, including both organizational conditions and the development of individual psychological resources (Brewster et al., 2022, Büchi, 2024). In this context, resilience is an important mechanism for maintaining psychological health and professional engagement in conditions of sustained professional stress.

In the post-Soviet and Central Asian context, including Kazakhstan, the problem of psychological health of teachers is also becoming increasingly relevant. Modern research shows that the well-being of teachers is closely related to the conditions of professional activity, satisfaction of basic psychological needs and a subjective sense of professional autonomy (Malkin et al., 2019; regional studies 2020-2024). Despite the fact that resilience is rarely considered in these works as an independent construct, the data obtained emphasize the importance of personal and resource factors in maintaining the psychological health of teaching staff. Thus, the analysis of modern foreign and domestic research allows us to consider resilience as a significant personal resource of psychological health and professional stability of teachers. At the same time, there remains a shortage of empirical works in the scientific literature aimed at studying the resilience of higher school teachers, especially in the context of the transformation of the educational environment and in the post-Soviet space. This determines the need for further research focused on analyzing the level and structure of university teachers' resilience and clarifying its role as a factor of psychological health, which determines the relevance of this study.

Materials and methods. The present study is based on the personality-resource and health psychology approaches, in which psychological health is considered as a result of the interaction of

professional requirements and individual resources of the individual. S. Maddi's concept of resilience was used as the methodological basis of the study, according to which a person's ability to maintain psychological stability under stress is determined by a system of stable attitudes, including engagement, control and risk acceptance.

This approach allows us to consider resilience not only as an individual psychological characteristic, but also as a factor in maintaining psychological health in professional activities. The study was organized in the form of a cross-sectional empirical study using quantitative methods. Such a design is reasonable for studying the prevalence and structure of personal resources in a professional group, as well as for analyzing the relationships between psychological characteristics and socio-demographic parameters. The choice of cross-sectional design is determined by the purpose of the study aimed at identifying the current level of resilience of university teachers in a modern educational environment. Empirical data was collected using an online questionnaire developed and distributed on the Google Forms platform. The choice of this tool was determined by its accessibility, ease of use and the ability to cover a wide geographical sample of university teachers. The use of the online format provided standardized conditions for completing the questionnaire, as well as minimized the researcher's influence on the respondents' responses. The questionnaire was distributed through electronic mailings and professional teaching communities, which made it possible to involve teachers of various ages and professional status. Participation in the study was voluntary. Before filling out the questionnaire, the respondents were provided with information about the research objectives, the principles of anonymity and confidentiality, as well as the right to refuse to participate at any stage. The answers were recorded in an impersonal form and used exclusively in a generalized form for scientific purposes, which meets the basic ethical requirements for conducting psychological research. 483 university teachers participated in the study. The age range of the respondents ranged from 18 to 73 years old, which ensured representation of various stages of professional and life development. The heterogeneity of the sample by age and professional status allowed us to consider the data obtained as reflecting a wide range of conditions and contexts of professional activity in the higher education system. The S. Maddi resilience methodology was chosen to measure resilience, as it is one of the most theoretically sound and empirically validated methods for evaluating this construct. Unlike alternative tools that focus primarily on measuring resilience, stress tolerance, or coping strategies, the Maddi technique allows you to assess resilience as an integrated personal resource that includes cognitive, motivational, and behavioral components. This corresponds to the purpose of this study, which aims to analyze resilience as a factor of psychological health, rather than as a situational response to stress. In addition, the Maddi technique is widely used in studies of occupational stress and psychological health of teachers and representatives of other professions associated with high emotional stress, which ensures comparability of the results obtained with data from previous studies. In this study, an adapted version of the methodology was used, which includes 43 statements. The reduction in the number of points compared to the original version was due to the technical features of the online survey and did not affect the theoretical structure of the measured construct. The respondents assessed the degree of agreement with the statements of the questionnaire on the Likert scale. When processing the data, the forward and reverse scaling of individual points was taken into account. The calculation of the integral indicator of resilience and the indicators of its components of engagement, control and risk acceptance was carried out in accordance with the key methodology. The reliability of the adapted version of the questionnaire was assessed using the Cronbach internal consistency coefficient, the values of which corresponded to generally accepted criteria for the reliability of psychodiagnostic techniques. Statistical data processing was carried out using descriptive and comparative statistical methods. The average values, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum values on the resilience scale and its components were calculated. Parametric and nonparametric methods were used to analyze the differences between the groups of respondents, depending on the nature of the data distribution. The level of statistical significance was assumed to be $p < 0.05$. The obtained results were interpreted taking into account the theoretical

provisions of the concept of resilience and the data of modern research in the field of health psychology and educational psychology.

Results. 483 respondents participated in the study. According to the survey data, after normalization of text responses by gender, the sample was dominated by women (389; 80.5%), men made up 80 people (16.6%), others/ did not indicate gender — 14 people (2.9%). The age was correctly indicated by 414 respondents in the range of 18-73 years ($M = 39.60$; $SD = 14.40$); the rest of the age responses contained omissions or incorrect values and were not included in age comparisons. When processing the data, a standard scheme for calculating the resilience test was used, to obtain indicators of engagement, control, risk acceptance, and an integral resilience indicator.

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics of resilience indicators (N = 483)*

Indicator	Average (M)	Standard. off (SD)	Min.	Max.
Engagement	33.75	9.22	6	54
Control	28,62	7.12	7	51
Risk taking	15,89	5.44	1	30
Resilience (bottom line)	78,25	19,40	21	132

The internal consistency of the Cronbach's alpha scales was: resilience $\alpha = 0.876$; engagement $\alpha = 0.789$; control $\alpha = 0.634$; risk acceptance $\alpha = 0.660$, which generally indicates acceptable reliability of the instrument for group analysis in this sample. These parameters correspond to approaches to the assessment of psychometric properties and the use of 45-point resilience meters in empirical research.

Table 2. *Comparison of resilience indicators by gender (Welch t-test)*

Indicator	Women (n = 389) M \pm SD	Men (n = 80) M \pm SD	p
Engagement	33,68 \pm 9,12	34.81 \pm 9.96	0,348
Control	28,41 \pm 6,89	30,05 \pm 8,29	0,102
Risk taking	15,85 \pm 5,40	15,95 \pm 5,74	0,890
Resilience (bottom line)	77,94 \pm 18,92	80,81 \pm 22,12	0,282

There were no statistically significant differences by gender in the severity of resilience and its components in this sample ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3. *Comparison by age group (ANOVA; age 18-73, n = 414)*

Age group	n	Engagement M \pm SD	Control M \pm SD	Risk acceptance M \pm SD	Risk acceptance M \pm SD
18-29	121	31,97 \pm 8,97	28,51 \pm 6,73	16,44 \pm 5,39	16,44 \pm 5,39
30-44	136	34,05 \pm 9,72	29,46 \pm 7,19	16,38 \pm 5,94	16,38 \pm 5,94
45-59	109	35,48 \pm 8,47	28,49 \pm 6,87	15,26 \pm 5,06	15,26 \pm 5,06
60-73	48	35,15 \pm 9,93	27,94 \pm 7,65	13,83 \pm 4,80	13,83 \pm 4,80

The analysis of variance showed differences between the age groups in terms of engagement ($p = 0.025$) and risk acceptance ($p = 0.015$), while the differences in control and overall resilience did not reach statistical significance ($p > 0.05$). Paired comparisons with the Bonferroni correction indicated that engagement was higher in the 45-59 group compared to 18-29 ($p_{adj} = 0.015$), and risk acceptance was higher in the 18-29 group compared to 60-73 ($p_{adj} = 0.017$).

Table 4. *Distribution of respondents by levels of resilience and its components (N = 483)*

Indicator	Low level, n (%)	Average level, n (%)	High level, n (%)
Engagement	92 (19,0%)	284 (58,8%)	107 (22,2%)
Control	118 (24,4%)	276 (57,1%)	89 (18,4%)
Risk taking	141 (29,2%)	251 (52,0%)	91 (18,8%)
Resilience (bottom line)	104 (21,5%)	279 (57,8%)	100 (20,7%)

For additional analysis of the data obtained, the respondents were distributed according to the levels of severity of resilience and its structural components. The levels were identified based on the empirical distribution of indicators in the sample using a standard approach to classifying values into low, medium and high levels, used in research using the S. Maddi resilience methodology. As shown in Table 4, the majority of the study participants have indicators of resilience and its components within the average level. The engagement indicator is the most pronounced in terms of the proportion of respondents with an average level, while the largest proportion of respondents with a low level is noted on the risk acceptance scale. A high level of integral resilience was found in about a fifth of the sample.

Discussion. The data obtained in the course of the study allow us to consider the features of the resilience of university teachers in the context of modern ideas about psychological health and professional stability. First of all, it should be noted that the predominance of the average level of resilience in the sample is consistent with the results of most foreign studies conducted using S. Maddi's methodology in professional groups characterized by high cognitive and emotional stress (Maddi, 2006; Eschleman et al., 2010). The average level of resilience is interpreted as the availability of basic personal resources sufficient to maintain psychological stability, but not excluding vulnerability to chronic occupational stress. The dominance of the involvement component in the structure of university teachers' resilience is one of the key results of the study. Similar data are presented in works devoted to educators and teachers, where engagement is considered as a reflection of professional identity, orientation towards meaning and the subjective significance of pedagogical activity (Chan, 2003; Skaalvik, Skaalvik, 2021). High involvement among teachers may be associated with awareness of the social importance of the profession, sustained motivation to transfer knowledge and maintain interest in professional activities even under high workload conditions.

At the same time, the less pronounced level of the risk-taking component is consistent with the results of studies showing that representatives of the academic environment tend to perceive changes and uncertainty as a source of stress rather than as an incentive for development (Pressley, 2021; Brewster et al., 2022). In conditions of strict regulation of the educational process, administrative control and high responsibility for performance, risk orientation may decrease, which is reflected in the structure of teachers' resilience. This result does not indicate a shortage of psychological resources, but rather indicates the specifics of the professional context of higher education. The data obtained on the absence of statistically significant differences by gender in the level of resilience and its components correspond to a number of foreign studies, which emphasize that in professional teaching groups, gender differences are inferior in importance to the influence of organizational and contextual factors (Eschleman et al., 2010; García-Carmona et al., 2019). This allows us to consider the resilience of university teachers as a universal personal resource that does not depend directly on gender. The analysis of age differences revealed a more complex picture. On the one hand, the absence of significant differences in the integral indicator of resilience indicates the relative stability of this personal resource at different stages of life and professional path. On the other hand, the revealed differences in the components of engagement and risk acceptance indicate that the structure of resilience can transform with age. Higher involvement among middle-aged teachers may reflect professional maturity, accumulated experience, and the stability of professional identity, which is consistent with data on the nonlinear dynamics of teachers' professional well-being (Madigan and Kim, 2021; Fedorov, 2020). The reduction in risk acceptance among older age groups is also

confirmed in foreign studies, which note that with age, the focus on stability and predictability of the professional environment increases, while the willingness to change and experiment may decrease (Maddi, 2002). In the context of higher education, this may be due to both institutional constraints and the subjective experience of interacting with reforms and transformations of the educational system. The results obtained confirm the idea of resilience as a significant personal resource for the psychological health of university teachers. The structural features of resilience identified in the study reflect the specifics of professional activity in the academic environment and are consistent with the data of modern research in the field of educational psychology and health psychology. At the same time, the results indicate the need for a differentiated approach to supporting the psychological health of teachers, taking into account age characteristics and resilience components, which is of practical importance for the development of psychological support programs in the higher education system.

Conclusion. The conducted research made it possible to obtain a holistic view of the resilience of university teachers as a personal resource related to psychological health in the context of modern professional activity. Based on the analysis of empirical data, it was found that the resilience of the majority of the study participants is characterized mainly by an average level of severity, which indicates that teachers have basic adaptive resources that allow them to maintain psychological stability under conditions of professional stress, but do not exclude vulnerability to chronic stress. A structural analysis of resilience has shown that the most pronounced component is engagement, reflecting professional involvement, the subjective importance of teaching activities and the preservation of semantic orientation in work. At the same time, the risk-taking component turned out to be the least pronounced, which indicates the limited willingness of teachers to perceive change and uncertainty as a resource for development. This result reflects the specifics of the academic environment, characterized by high regulation and external requirements, and does not indicate a lack of resilience as such. The absence of statistically significant differences by gender in the level of resilience and its components allows us to consider this personal resource as a universal characteristic of university teachers, formed mainly under the influence of professional context rather than gender factors. At the same time, the revealed age differences in individual components of resilience indicate the dynamic nature of its structure. Higher involvement among middle-aged teachers and lower risk-taking among older age groups reflect the peculiarities of professional development and accumulation of experience in the higher education system. The results obtained confirm the idea of resilience as a significant personal resource for the psychological health of university teachers and allow us to clarify its structural features in a professional context. The study showed that resilience is not a static characteristic, but is manifested through a different configuration of components at different stages of the professional path. This highlights the need for a differentiated approach to supporting the psychological health of teachers, taking into account age and professional characteristics.

The practical significance of the research lies in the possibility of using the data obtained in the development of programs for psychological support and prevention of professional burnout in the higher education system. The emphasis on developing engagement and maintaining a subjective sense of control can help strengthen the psychological health of teachers, while creating conditions for safe acceptance of professional changes can be considered as a promising area of work with a risk-taking component. The findings provide the basis for further research aimed at in-depth analysis of teacher resilience and its role in ensuring sustainability and well-being in the context of higher education transformation.

References

1. Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Stressful life events, personality, and health: An inquiry into hardiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.1.1>
2. Maddi, S. R. (2002). The story of hardiness: Twenty years of theorizing, research, and practice. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54(3), 173–185. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1061-4087.54.3.173>
3. Maddi, S. R. (2006). Hardiness: The courage to grow from stresses. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1(3), 160–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760600619609>

4. Künzler, A. M., Helmreich, I., Chmitorz, A., König, J., Binder, H., & Wessa, M. (2020). Psychological interventions to foster resilience in healthcare professionals. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, (7), CD012527. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012527.pub2>
5. Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021). Towards an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta-analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers' intentions to quit. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 105, Article 103425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103425>
6. Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2021). Teacher burnout: Relations between emotional exhaustion, job satisfaction, and motivation. *Teacher Development*, 25(3), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1913404>
7. Fernet, C., Trépanier, S.-G., Austin, S., Gagné, M., & Forest, J. (2020). Transformational leadership and teacher burnout. *Educational Psychology*, 40(6), 703–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2019.1642833>
8. Pressley, T. (2021). Factors contributing to teacher burnout during COVID-19. *Educational Researcher*, 50(5), 325–327. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211004138>
9. Brewster, L., Jones, E., Priestley, M., Wilbraham, S., & Hughes, G. (2022). Cultures of wellbeing and mental health in the university setting. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(4), 548–560. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1986473>
10. Alif, F.S., et al. (2024). Health and wellbeing of staff working at higher education institutions globally. *BMC Public Health*, 24, Article 365. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19365-1>
11. Liu, Y., Wang, Z., Zhou, C., & Li, T. (2023). Affect and resilience on mental health. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 320, 239–247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2022.09.091>
12. Romano, L., Tang, X., Hietajärvi, L., Salmela-Aro, K., & Fiorilli, C. (2021). Students' and teachers' well-being and resilience during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 33, 1143–1185. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09618-0>
13. García-Carmona, M., Marín, M. D., & Aguayo, R. (2019). Burnout syndrome in secondary school teachers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22, 189–208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9471-9>
14. Büchi, M. (2021). Digital well-being theory and research. *New Media & Society*, 26(1), 172–189. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211056851>
15. Fedorov, A., Ilaltdinova, E., & Frolova, S. (2020). Teachers' professional well-being: State and factors. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(5), 1698–1710. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.08050>

Information about the authors:

Liyassova Aigul – corresponding author, Master of Psychological Sciences, PhD student of the Department of General and Applied Psychology, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: aigulkaznu.80@mail.ru

Madalievа Zabira Bekeshovna – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Department of General and Applied Psychology, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: madalievaz.b@gmail.com

Zakaryanova Shynar – Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Senior Lecturer of the Department of Philosophy, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: shynarzakaryanova@gmail.com

Kassen Gulmira Amankyzy – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of General and Applied Psychology, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan. E-mail: gulmira.kassen@mail.ru

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Лияссова А. – хат-хабар авторы, психология ғылымдарының магистрі, Жалпы және қолданбалы психология кафедрасының докторанты, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: aigulkaznu.80@mail.ru

Мадалиева З.Б. – педагогика ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Жалпы және қолданбалы психология кафедрасы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: madalievaz.b@gmail.com

Закарянova Ш. – психология ғылымдарының кандидаты, философия кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: shynarzakaryanova@gmail.com

Кассен Г.А. – педагогика ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, Жалпы және қолданбалы психология кафедрасы, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан. E-mail: gulmira.kassen@mail.ru

Сведения об авторах: