Article

A gender-focused prism on the long-term impact of teachers’ emotional mistreatment on targets’ resilience: Do men and women differ in their quest for social-emotional resources in a masculine society?
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**Abstract:** Resilience as a personal resource enables individuals to cope with stressful life events and to adapt to diverse situations. In the framework of Conservation of Resource (COR) Theory, the current study investigates whether personal and social resources, namely emotional intelligence (EI) and gender, can contribute to resilience for individuals having experienced teacher maltreatment as adolescents. Our findings show that men and women differ in their baselines concerning maltreatment and emotional intelligence. Individual resources in the form of EI and social resources, namely gender, impact resilience. Moreover, gender and UOE, an emotional intelligence facet, interact in their contribution to resilience.

These findings allow us to better comprehend the interrelations between the diverse resources impacted by past teacher maltreatment. Such an understanding can help us in the mitigation of teacher maltreatment and the promotion of a sustainable society.
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1. Introduction

Resilience is defined as the ability to maintain or regain mental health in the face of adversity [1]. Scholars refer to resilience as a resource that enables adaptability and the ability to cope with stressful life events [2,3], or as a restorative mechanism that allows individuals to recover or even grow from adverse conditions [4]. Resilience acts as a resource that nourishes the interaction between individual attributes and the surrounding environment, which includes but is not limited to situational experiences that play a role in shaping one’s resilience [5].

Schools provide a central situational experience that can shape individuals’ resilience, including, more specifically, relations with teachers [6, 2].

Although a substantial body of literature noted that young adults maltreated by teachers have lower levels of resilience than those counterparts who were not maltreated in such a way [7, 8 , 9] , the long-term impact of teachers’ maltreatment on students’ resilience has been largely overlooked [2]. This lack of study stands in contrast to the thoroughly researched understanding that teacher-student relationships play an important role in children’s development [6, 10].

In a parallel route, cultivating emotional intelligence (EI) — the ability to identify, use, understand and regulate emotions [11] — was crucial for shaping ones’ resilience [12] on the one hand, and on the other, now adverse route, as a consumed resource once maltreatment is experienced [13]. Yet the interrelations between EI and resilience in the framework of long-term impact of mistreatment by teachers has also been overlooked.

Finally, the interplay between context (i.e., quality of relations with teachers as expressed by mistreatment) and personal resources (namely EI) as an antecedent of resilience, is shaped by broader social and cultural forces such as gender and its prominence in diverse cultural contexts.

Gender is considered a prominent feature that influences how individuals experience and manage stressful life events [14]. Some research has more specifically shown men to be more resilient than women [15, 16]. At the same time, boys were found more likely to be exposed to mistreatment than girls [17] which in turn may decrease their resilience. These gender differences in resilience may reflect differences in the types of social-ecological stressors that men and women face and anticipate (such as mistreatment), differences in support and personal resources they have and expect to have (such as EI), and differences in the power to negotiate and influence their contexts [15].

The role of gender in the framework of mistreatment should be further examined, especially as a factor that contributes to the development of resilience throughout life and thus as an antecedent of social sustainability of human beings.

Moreover, gender is not an absolute variable, but is highly dependent on the cultural attribution given to it [18,19]. In masculine societies, gender is a resource of power, status, and prestige for men, while for women it may be a barrier and a source of relative deprivation [20].

Taken together, gender, EI and resilience are all resources that individuals seek to restore, maintain, and increase continuously, all of which are impacted by gender [21].

Using the Conservation of Resource (COR) theory allows a better understanding of the interrelations between stress arising from teacher maltreatment, personal resources (i.e., EI and resilience) and social resources (i.e., gender in its cultural context), all of which interact in complex ways as part of a multi-layered process aimed to restore, maintain, and increase resources.

Using COR theory as a theoretical framework proposes a dynamic model of stress that helps us to understand how individuals’ resources function in the process of reducing their exposure to stressors, such as maltreatment by teachers. In this respect, gender, EI and resilience are all resources that interact and nourish each other. Although gender is not a changeable resource from a biological perspective, socially, it interacts with other resources and its view by self and others can be shaped and changed.

Studies have consistently shown that individual psychological differences (also triggered by gender) lead to the adoption of different coping strategies and other emotional and regulatory resources in the face of difficult situations [22].

COR theory, based on four underlying assumptions, allows for an understanding of the drivers and underlying processes of exposure to mistreatment and considers the dynamicity of stress and the process underlying it.

First, COR theory recognizes that people are motivated by resource loss more than by resource gain. Second, it postulates that people must invest resources to protect against future resource loss, to recover from loss, or to gain resources. Third, it emphasizes that resource gain is more prominent in the context of resource loss. Fourth, it notes that when resources are overstretched or exhausted, individuals enter a defensive mode to preserve the self. Moreover, over time, loss of resources impacts the level of resources available that could be used in future stressful events, thus illustrating both the dynamicity of processes and their predictive power [23].

These individual resources enable individuals to deal with adverse life events and stressful situations [24, 25]. In the framework of our study, gender and EI are considered resources that can help, or when absent, prevent individuals from acquiring additional resources, namely resilience, driven by the impact of stressful life events, namely teachers’ past maltreatment of them.

Thus, the overarching aim of the current study is to examine the multi-layered impact of past teacher mistreatment on social-emotional resources, namely EI and resilience, using the COR theory and accounting for gender in its cultural context. Specifically, we will examine whether past mistreatment by teachers as recalled by Arab Israeli adults who live in a society culturally characterized as masculine [26], has impacted their current EI resources and resilience and, if so, whether the impact is different for women and men. Such a comparison was overlooked, although the understanding of the long-term impact of the quality of relations with teachers in the past can help us in the enhancement of individual resilience in a more accurate, gender-sensitive approach and in turn to contribute to social sustainability of men and women.

2. Literature Review

***Resilience***

Resilience can be conceptualized in three different yet overlapping ways [27]. First, as a personal resource that helps individuals overcome disadvantaged circumstances and maintain and regain mental health in the face of adversity [1]. Second, as the competence to cope with stress and threats to well-being [2, 3] and, finally, as a positive functioning indicating recovery from traumatic experience [28]. Common to these different definitions is the fact that resilience occurs in the presence of adversity [27], and that it influences the ability to successfully adapt to adverse circumstances [5].

Resilience can be further looked at as both a process in which personal attributes, environmental factors, and situational experiences interact, and the outcome of this process [28].

As a process, resilience is dynamic and changing [29] and depends on one’s interactions and surrounding environment [27, 29, 30]. Mistreatment can be one element of the surrounding environment.

As an outcome, the building blocks of resilience include positive-affect, self-concept and sense of competence, coping with stress and change and the ability to seek support [12], all of which are encompassed in the concept of expressed through EI. It was further noted that adverse experiences can damage one’s resilience which can become a source of vulnerability and hinder the ability to cope with stressors in the long term [4, 27, 29, 30], thus understanding that the underlying mechanisms that either inhibit or enhance resilience should be addressed.

A substantial body of literature examined the determinants of resilience among maltreated children [31], and noted deficits in resilience when they became young adults relative to non-maltreated counterparts [7,9].

The links between past teacher mistreatment and student resilience have been largely overlooked [32], despite the high prominence and potential impact of teachers’ mistreatment [33].

*Teacher mistreatment*

Teacher mistreatment is defined as a pattern of verbal and non-verbal behaviours of teachers towards students that does not include physical contact [2]. Mistreatment in a school context includes one or more of the following teacher behaviours: yelling, name-calling, insulting, or denigrating (verbal abuse), or ignoring or punishing students (non-verbal abuse) [2, 34]. This behaviour is targeted at a student or group of students [36]. This abusive experience, which can be a one-time or recurring event with different frequencies [34, 36, 37] is a widespread problem in many countries[ 2, 33, 38, 40, 41].

The impact of mistreatment on individual resources is unquestionable. While positive teacher-student relationships act as a defence shield helping students gain and maintain resources and thus contributes to their resilience [42], abusive behaviours towards students are one of the most significant sources of school stress for students [43] resulting in a potential loss of resources [23]. Such resource loss is accompanied by psychological, social, cognitive and somatic consequences for the student’s functioning and adjustment [2, 29, 40] including long-term negative consequences to social-emotional resources [38] including not only resilience but also emotional intelligence [44].

Based on these findings we postulate that:

H1 - Past experience of teacher mistreatment will decrease targets’ resilience

***Emotional intelligence (EI)***

Resilience includes a series of individual attributes that can facilitate the ability to cope with stressful life events. These personal resources, both *intra-personal* (cognitive appraisals, positive affect and tolerance of negative affect, impulse control, optimism, stress tolerance, flexibility, and sense of competence) and *interpersonal* (secure relationships, directedness towards others and the ability to engage in the support of others [12, 29]) are typically included in the concept of EI [45], noting the links between the two concepts.

Essentially, EI concerns the effective integration of emotion and cognition, and involves the ability to identify and express emotions, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge in self and others, to assimilate emotions in thoughts and use them in thought processes, and to regulate both positive and negative emotions in self and others [11]. Others have used a broader perspective, looking at social-emotional skills and competencies that underlie EI and have noted that EI allows individuals to cope with daily life and adversity [45] and stress [46]. Similarly, EI was found linked to psychological health [47], subjective well-being [45], and positive attitudes [48]. It has been explained that emotions play a fundamental role in shaping reactions to external stimuli. The ability to identify, use, understand and regulate emotions therefore helps interpret situations as challenging rather than threatening, use a more positive and less negative affect, alter emotions to redirect cognitive processes, obtain new perspectives and solve problems, and react in personally effective ways [35, 49].

Studies have further shown that EI can protect against the likelihood of abusive experiences taking place [50, 51, 52], and help one to cope with mistreatment-related stress [46]. Thus, EI can help students better conserve their resources when faced with mistreatment.

However, EI appears to be a perishable resource which can be depleted by adverse experiences such as mistreatment, and several studies have noted a direct impact of mistreatment on the ability to use EI skills in adults [53] [54], including in educational settings [55]. Less is known about the impacts of teacher mistreatment on EI resources of victimized children, but one study showed teacher mistreatment to be negatively correlated with EI later in life [44].

H2 - Past experience of teacher mistreatment will decrease targets’ EI.

Studies have also more directly connected EI and resilience with the vast majority of such studies showing that people with better EI have better resilience, resilience to stress in particular [49]. Based on these studies, we posed the following hypothesis:

H3 - EI competencies will enhance resilience.

Stress, which arises through mistreatment, was found to be adversely related to resilience and EI [12]. As EI is both an antecedent of resilience [49] and a consumed resource of maltreatments [54], we can postulate that EI will mediate the interrelations between maltreatment and resilience:

H4 - EI will mediate the relations between teacher maltreatment and resilience.

These interrelations are embedded and nourished from the social context namely gender and its cultural context.

***Resilience and EI : a socio-cultural lens***

Gender plays a key role in teacher-student relationships [56, 57] as manifested in teachers’ expectations, attributions of failure and success [58, 59, 60] and diverse attitudes and behaviours towards male and female students. These gender-based diversities and biases are expressed through differences in time allocated for questions for boys and girls, type of answers, praise and condemnations [17, 61]. More specifically, while much more research is needed [2], existing evidence has consistently shown that male students are more likely than females to report emotional victimization by teachers [2, 41, 63, 64]. These findings can be explained by differences in teachers’ interpretations of students’ behaviours and discipline problems that impacts their responses, including mistreatment responses. When teachers interpret student’s discipline problems as reflecting their own failure to manage behaviour in the classroom, which is more likely to happen with boys [39], their response can be inappropriate and even aggressive [65]. These perceptions interact with students’ prior gender expectations and related behaviours acquired from families and society at large that construct social hierarchies based on gender [56]. Thus, we predict that men will report significantly higher levels of past maltreatment by teachers.

H5 - Men will report higher levels of past teacher maltreatment than women.

In turn, these social hierarchies impact the ability to control impulses, to become engaged in relationships and to find support, all which are components of EI.

Indeed, data regarding gender-related EI differences is inconclusive but many studies suggest gender-related EI differences, showing mainly female advantage [61, 66, 67]. Others found that males scored lower than females on the four main EI abilities: perceiving, understanding and regulating emotions [68]. Others did not find such differences [45, 69, 70, 71, 72] but often noted gender-related differences in some EI competencies. Women were often found to demonstrate higher emotional self-awareness, in particular emotional perception [73] , emotional expression [74] and emotion recognition, especially involving less intense emotions [68] as well as interpersonal skills such as empathy and interpersonal relationships [67, 75]. Males, in contrast, were found in some studies to score higher on skills such as impulse control and stress-management [67]. Differences in EI were attributed, at least in part, to socialization processes and expectations as well as early child-parent interactions [76]. In these socialization processes, often shaped by socio-cultural factors, females are encouraged to be cooperative, expressive, and attuned to their interpersonal world, whereas males are led to be openly competitive, independent, and instrumental [67]. In light of this extensive data, we postulate that women’s EI will be higher than men’s.

H6 - Women will have higher EI compared to men.

These gender differences, in turn, are also considered to influence resilience — how individuals manage stressful life events.

Studies have shown males to be more resilient than females [15, 16], suggesting greater protective resources when facing teacher mistreatment. These gender differences may reflect variations in the types of social-ecological stressors that men and women face and anticipate, differences in support and resources they have and expect, and differences in the power to negotiate and influence their contexts [15].

These socializations are rooted in and correspond with cultural attributes that ultimately are considered to be “the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others”—of which one example is gender [19] (p.3). Masculine cultures emphasize emotional and social role differentiation between the genders, highlight success, achievements and competitiveness [77] and expect men to be strong, assertive and ambitious, while women are expected to be feeling-focused, non-aggressive, modest and caring [18]. Thus, in masculine societies, expectations for males and females are aligned with and shaped by what is valued in society [19]. Larger gender differences in seeking social support and discussing emotional difficulties can be expected among members of the masculine Arab culture [26]. Specifically, in these societies, gender is a social resource for men that fosters resilience, but at the same time leads to maltreatment by teachers [2] that in turn reduces resilience. These two contradicting influences may neutralize each other. Thus, we postulate that:

H7 - Gender will impact resilience. Men, in particular those of masculine societies, will be more resilient than women.

H8 - Men and women will report similar levels of resilience.

EI and gender are considered as resources in the framework of COR. Drawing on the third principle of COR, postulating that resource gain is more prominent in the context of resource loss [23] we predict that high levels of EI are more salient in the contexts of gender inferiority. Similarly, under low EI conditions, gender will contribute more to men, as it will be evaluated in the context of EI absence.

Thus, we also postulate that:

H9 - EI competencies and gender interact in a way that EI will enhance resilience more for women.

The overarching goal of the current study is to account for the long-term impact of context (past teacher maltreatment) on individual and social resources and their interrelations. Specifically, the following research hypotheses were therefore formulated as shown in Figure 1:

H1 - Past experience of teacher maltreatment will decrease targets’ resilience

H2 - Past experience of teacher maltreatment will decrease targets’ EI

H3 - EI competencies will enhance resilience.

H4 - EI will mediate the relations between teacher maltreatment and resilience.

H5 - Men will report higher levels of past teacher maltreatment than women.

H7 - Gender will impact resilience. Men, in particular those of masculine societies, will be more resilient than women.

H8 - Men and women will report similar levels of resilience.

H9 - EI competencies and gender interact in a way that EI will enhance resilience more for women.

3. Materials and Methods

*Participants*

The sample consisted of 201 Arabs adults who live in urban and/or rural areas in Northern Israel. Of the sample, 97 were men and 104 were women. The mean age for men was 27.7 (SD = 7.9) and for women the mean age was 25.6 (SD = 6.9). Slightly over 80% of the men and women reported their economic status as good or very good and approximately 75% of each gender group identified themselves as Moslem. Respondents were assured of anonymity and were encouraged to respond truthfully. They were permitted to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason.

*Data Analysis*

Data were analysed using SmartPLS3 [78]and SPSS version 25. Specifically, SPSS was used to examine gender differences concerning the experience of emotional abuse in the past, and to test gender differences concerning current levels of EQ and resilience.

SmartPLS3 was utilized for testing the measurement model and the structural model.

*Instrumentation*

Generally, the EQ components were measured as reflective scales while the past experiences of school violence and resilience were measured as formative scales according to established guidelines [78]. While formative measurement scale evaluation requires assessment of collinearity and the relevance of indicators’ contribution (outer weights), the assessment of reflective scales requires convergent validity and reliability tests and the assessment of outer loading. Results of the measurement models indicated that there is no collinearity or loading issues for the formative measures. Furthermore, as reflected in Table 1, SmartPLS 3 analysis showed that all reflective variables were reliable.

[INSERT TABLE 1 HERE]

Specifically, emotional abuse by teachers was measured through a nine-item self-report, Emotional Abuse Scale (EAS) assessing the frequency of various types of emotional abuse suffered at the hands of the teacher within a school context. This scale was developed by Nearchou (2018) and was based on the revised Psychological Maltreatment Subscale (PMS) by Whitted & Dupper (2008) [2, 40]. The items of EAS include verbal and non-verbal behaviours that are generally perceived as incidents of emotional abuse or neglect by teachers based on the literature review. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was applied to test whether the scale structure fits to data and the results showed a good fit [2]. The scale was translated from English to Hebrew by using the translation-back translation procedure [79]. All items are rated on a 4-point Likert scale (0 =Never happened, to 3= Happened four times or more). Participants were asked to indicate if and how often they experienced the specific behaviour by their teacher when they were students at school such as: “Your teacher said bad things about your family.” As we were interested in comparing whether the participant had been mistreated by a teacher on each of the items, the items were recoded to 0 = Never happened and 1 = Happened at least once.

Emotional Intelligence was measured through the 16-item Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) [80] based on the Salovey-Mayer EI framework [11] that covers four EI dimensions: Self-Emotion Appraisal )SEA(; Others’ Emotion Appraisal )OEA(; Use of Emotions )UOE(; and Regulation of Emotions (ROE(, each comprising four items. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each statement on the associated EI questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). A sample statement was: “I really understand what I feel.”

Resilience was measured through the Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM-12), a 12-item, self-report measure assessing the current resilience of the participant developed by Liebenberg, Unger & Leblanc (2013) [81]. The scale was translated from English to Hebrew by using the translation-back translation procedure[79]. All items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (0 =Not True about me to 5= Very true about me) and asked the participants to indicate to what extent do the following sentences describe correctly how they feel these days. For example, "I am trying to finish what I am starting" and "I know how to get help and support when I need it".

*Procedure*

Questionnaires were distributed online to students at one college in northern Israel. Using a snowball approach, the students were asked to invite family members, friends, and acquaintances to participate in the study. Likewise, the link was distributed via WhatsApp groups and Facebook. The sample was limited to those at least 18 years old. Participants were informed that their responses would remain anonymous and that participation was voluntary. In line with ethical standards, the study was approved by the Ethical Review Board of the Institute.

4. Results

To determine whether participants’ emotional abuse differed across gender, a binomial test was applied [82]. The pattern was consistent. Men experienced every one of the items more frequently than women (*p*< .002).

Additionally, an independent sample t-test analysis was conducted to test for differences between men and women in their EI levels and their resilience. The test showed that, on average, women (M = 4.08, SD = 0.62) have significantly higher EI than men in all sub scales (M = 3.85, SD = 0.70; t (199)= -2.53, p< .05). However, no significant differences were found between men and women in their resilience [t (199)= -1.39, p> .05)].

To assess the research hypotheses, the research model was constructed in SmartPLS3 as follows.

As shown in Figure 1, based on the theoretical model, paths were specified between Gender, past experienced school mistreatment, four EI dimensions and resilience. Additionally, the moderating effect of gender on the relationship between UOE and resilience was tested. Our research model also accounted for the mediation effect of EI on the relationship between past experienced school mistreatment and resilience.

[INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]

Figure 2 illustrates the results. The *R2* result for resilience was moderate (0.55), whereas the *R2* value of each of the EI dimensions was rather weak and ranged from 3-7%, except for the UOE subscale (0.13). In addition to measuring the *R2* values, the change in the *R2* value when a specified exogenous construct is omitted from the model was tested to evaluate its impact on the endogenous constructs. This measure is referred to as the *f2* effect size where values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35, respectively, represent small, medium, and large effects [78].

Results indicated weak effect sizes of past experienced teacher mistreatment on EI components. Specifically, past experienced teacher mistreatment had weak effects on OEA (0.032), ROE (0.039), SEA (0.075), and UOE (0.149). In turn, these components had weak effect size on resilience: SEA (0.089), UOE (0.216) and finally the interaction effect size was (0.035).

The blindfolding procedure was also used to assess the predictive relevance (*Q2*) of the path model. Values larger than 0 suggest that the model has predictive relevance for a specific endogenous construct [78]. The *Q2* values showed predictive relevance of all endogenous scales: OEA (0.013); ROE (0.026); Resilience (0.128); SEA(0.040); UOE (0.085).

Significance analyses of the direct and indirect effects are specified in Table 2 and Figure 3.

[INSERT TABLE 2 AND FIGURE 3 HERE]

As can be seen in Table 2, past experience of teacher mistreatment had a negative impact on all components of EI. Resilience was explained through SEA and UOE. Additionally, gender moderated the relationship between UOE and resilience and was also the only variable that mediated the relationship between past experience of teacher mistreatment and resilience.

In order to understand the meaning of the interaction, simple slope analysis as presented in Figure 4, revealed that high UOE contributes more to women’s resilience than men, while low UOE damaged women’s resilience more than it impacts men.

5. Discussion

The current study addressed the long-term impact of context (teacher mistreatment) on individual (EI and resilience) and social (gender) resources and their interrelations in the framework of COR. In this respect, it allowed us to understand the complex, diverse, and at times even opposed forces that construct individual resources. In doing so, the current study took a broader stand accounting for individual and social attributes that shape one’s resilience in the context of teacher mistreatment.

Our first two predictions focused on the long-term impact of teachers’ maltreatment on resilience. Although deficits in resilience in mistreated young adults relative to non-maltreated counterparts were noted [7, 9], the interrelations between past teachers’ mistreatment and students’ resilience and their impact on EI have been largely overlooked [32], despite the prominence and potential impact [33] of teachers’ mistreatment, including the long-term impact [38]. This finding reinforces the notion that teachers play a key role in cultivating individuals’ socio-emotional competencies as noted by Stein & Book (2000) [83]. In this regard, schools and teachers should not only preserve students’ resilience but also act as a defence shield, protecting students’ individual resources that could be otherwise depleted over time due to life experiences through all their interactions.

In turn, the existence of EI as a resource was positively correlated with resilience. This finding extends those of previous studies [49] to the context of teacher mistreatment and finds support in COR’s second principle that postulates that people must invest resources to protect against future resource loss, recover from loss, or gain resources [23].

Additionally, it was found that EI mediates the relations between teachers’ mistreatment and resilience. This finding follows who also showed the mediation of EI in the relationship between maltreatment at work and work outcomes and extends it to educational settings [55]. It can be explained that the ability to identify and understand negative emotions arising from mistreatment helps using mechanisms to regulate and reconcile them.

The hypotheses H5 - H9 considered gender in its social construction as a resource[26], and its ability to interact with the context (i.e. maltreatment), its impact in terms of individual resources and its interaction with EI as a personal resource.

As predicted, men, compared with women, reported higher levels of past teachers’ maltreatment, consistent with other research [57] that noted that gender plays a key role in teacher-student relationships and with studies that more directly showed that males are more prone to teacher victimization compared to females [2, 41, 64].

On a different and opposite route, we found support for the differences between women and men concerning their EI levels. Our findings show that women possess higher levels of EI, a personal resource now in favour of females. This finding corresponds with previous findings showing female advantage on EI [62, 66, 67], or its main abilities: perceiving, understanding and regulating emotions [68].

These differences were attributed to differences in early child-parent interactions [76] and to socialization processes in which females are encouraged to be attuned to their emotions and interpersonal world, processes that cultivate EI competencies. In particular, in Israeli Arab culture, women are raised to be domestic and the provider of emotional support to their families [26]. Males on the other hand are led to be openly competitive, independent, and instrumental [67], to not share emotional distress or seek support, in particular in masculine societies where they maintain their power and dominance [26]. In this respect, gender, as a resource, allows future enhancement of resources in line with COR second principle postulating that people must invest resources to protect against future resource loss, recover from loss, or gain resources [23].

As predicted, we did not find gender differences in resilience. This equality can be explained through the COR perspective that allows a deeper and more dynamic understanding of this finding. On the one hand, studies found males to be more resilient than females [15]. One explanation lies in gender inequality and the power that males hold acting as a resource [84]. In particular, Israeli-Arab women continue to accept their social status as lower than that of men [26]. On the other hand, other studies supported the notion that males, compared to females, are more likely to be victimized [2, 41, 64) as they display behaviours that challenge teachers’ class management. These two contradicting paths neutralize each other, whereby gender contributes to men’s resilience and EI contributes to women’s resilience through masculine perceptions and attributions.

Our last and most interesting prediction was that EI competencies and gender interact in a way that high EI will enhance resilience more for women, while in its absence gender will contribute more to resilience of men than women. This finding can be explained by the third principle of COR postulating that resource gain is more prominent in the context of resource loss [23]. When EI is high, especially the UOE facet that is higher among women [85], it is much more meaningful for women who are inferior in terms of gender. In other words, UOE, which is the ability of a person to make the best use of emotions gearing them towards positive emotions and constructive activities, contributes more to women, as they lack the advantage of gender, especially in a masculine society [26]. Alternatively, when UOE is low, being a man in terms of resources is an advantage that is more salient in the context of low EI resources.

From a theoretical perspective, the utilization of COR allows us to account for the long-term impact of maltreatment and predict levels of resilience that were framed as resources. Additionally, accounting for gender in various forms of mistreatment is scantly addressed in the literature. Only (ref) considered gender yet overlooked its interaction with other resources, namely EI. From a practical point of view, several implications to education systems arise from the findings and should be addressed as teacher mistreatment hinders the essence of education and bears many negative outcomes for students. These implications concern the identification, intervention, and prevention of mistreatment all which allows a comprehensive viewpoint of dealing with mistreatment [86].

In order to improve identification of teacher mistreatment, schools and teachers should become aware of the prevalence of mistreatment taking place, in particular as teaching is taking place behind closed doors, and efforts must therefore be made to create systems that identify mistreatment. As a starting point, schools should increase awareness of mistreatment and its implications and train teachers to identify occurrences of mistreatment [87]. Even though most of them will not take an active part in students’ victimizations, as bystanders they have a key role in identifying such occurrences [88].

From an intervention perspective, schools should invest in in-service trainings that develop active teachers’ social emotional skills that stand in contrast to mistreatment.

Teachers as potential bystanders should not only identify but also be able to support the targets of mistreatment [5, 87, 88, 89]. This can be achieved through comprehensive EI trainings for teachers, who could then both be able to create a supportive, caring and respectful climate in their class as well and to develop resilience and social emotional skills in their students through modelling, daily interactions and direct teaching.

From a student perspective, students should be taught to act both as victims and as bystanders in cases of mistreatment. SEL processes can enhance students’ resilience and ability to cope with mistreatment cases that have not been identified by the system, thus minimizing both their occurrence and their negative impact. These efforts collide with the more general recent aim of schools to develop resilience and social-emotional skills in students in order to equip them with skills required for coping and succeeding in the 21st century. More specifically, attention should be given to enhancing girls’ UOE, given its specific impact on them, and to the cultural context in which the program takes place.

A third pillar of the above-mentioned comprehensive approach for mitigating mistreatment is teachers entering education systems. In this respect, acceptance to education studies and recruiting new teachers to schools should include an evaluation of social-emotional skills that allow teachers to build a safe and empathetic class climate [90].

*Limitations*

While the study has wide implications for teachers and education systems, a number of limitations can be indicated. One limitation of the current study is its cross-sectional design that does not allow us to inform causality. It might also be that EI can reduce maltreatment, rather than mistreatment damaging EI levels. Yet this alternate viewpoint can be tested in future studies.

Additionally, the current study measured all constructs, including past mistreatment experience, at a single point in time. A longitudinal perspective would help to further validate its results. Furthermore, as mistreatment is a multi-dimensional emotional experience, a mixed method study that incorporates qualitative interviews of mistreatment experiences, perceived impacts and coping mechanisms could help shed light on the complex role of personal and situational factors.

Although some limitations were noted, the current study allows us a deeper understanding of the interrelations between social and individual resources when facing stress. Furthermore, it also allows us to design educational processes that will positively impact students’ personal and social resources and help construct positive and respectful relationships.

All in all, this study’s findings can contribute to a sustainable society in which violence is denounced and equality is promoted by cultivating UOE of women and EI more generally for all individuals. From a different angle, it calls for the promotion of feminine societies that believe in promoting human development, gender equity and care for the weak [90] in order to shape sustainable societies.
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