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The results of the study of psychological resources of educators of organizations for orphans with different levels of emotional intelligence (EI) are presented. The study involved 186 employees from 39 regions of the Russia. 3 groups were identified: high (N=57), medium (N=83) and lowered (N=34) levels of EI. It is established that the degree of severity and content of psychological resources depend on the level of EI. A group with a high level can be considered as a model. Representatives of the average and lowered level of EI have adaptation mechanisms that compensate for the lack of EI. In a medium group excessively high requirements for their involvement in activities increase the risk of professional burnout, reduce satisfaction with instrumental resources, and increase vulnerability “to a conflict of roles”. The specificity of psychological resources is noted, which is expressed in: 1) the predominance of interpersonal EI (hereinafter MEI) over intrapersonal EI (hereinafter WEI); 2) a certain specificity of the structure of psychological resources, which included 5 components: a) the EI resource as the key; b) the resources of stability and self-regulation in relation to subjective well-being; c) motivational resources associated with the potential of compassion; d) environmental resources and the self-efficacy of emotional self-regulation; e) instrumental resources negatively associated with the conflict of roles.
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Представлены результаты исследования психологических ресурсов воспитателей организаций для детей-сирот с разным уровнем эмоционального интеллекта (ЭИ), проведенного в 2022 г. В исследовании участвовали 186 работников из 39 регионов Российской Федерации. Выделено 3 группы: с высоким (N=57), средним (N=83) и сниженным (N=34) уровнем ЭИ. Установлено, что степень выраженности и содержание психологических ресурсов зависят от уровня ЭИ. Группу с высоким уровнем можно рассматривать в качестве эталонной. У представителей среднего и сниженного уровня ЭИ имеются механизмы адаптации, компенсирующие недостаточность ЭИ. В группе со средним уровнем ЭИ чрезмерно высокие требования к своей вовлеченности в деятельность усиливают риск профессионального выгорания, снижают удовлетворенность инструментальными ресурсами, повышают уязвимость к конфликту ролей. Выделена специфика психологических ресурсов, которая выражается в: 1) преобладании межличностного ЭИ (далее — МЭИ) над внутрилич-
Introduction

The organizational and content changes towards more humanistic methods of work in state-run orphanages [20] have altered the requirements for professional caretakers. In fact, they have to move to the role of a “social mother”, a significant adult for each child, to fulfill their duties of care and upbringing, often for 24 hours a day.

If we take into account that most often children come to the system in a state of acute psycho-trauma, then it is obvious that the orphanage staff find themselves overloaded, with a high stress level, their professional roles are confused, and they face a danger of professional burnout, as a result, the situation leads to high staff turnover. It is no coincidence that researchers characterize the conditions of professionals in the field of children’s rights protection as close to extreme [9].

In this regard, the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation raised the question: what psychological resources should an orphanage employee have so that his activity, on the one hand, contributes to the successful socialization of the child, and, on the other hand, does not threaten the mental health and well-being of the employee himself?

The answer to this question lies in the paradigm of the resource approach, which focuses on the strengths of the individual, internal and external factors of coping with difficult situations, the ability to maintain health, and the ability to adapt, despite the high stress of the situation.

An analysis of international and domestic studies confirms the special role of the personal resources of workers in helping professions [4; 6; 26].

According to the analysis, a strong emotional intelligence prevails as a basic resource, which prevents professional burnout, helps to “establish and maintain trust”, and be less vulnerable to manifestations of psycho-trauma [7; 8], and allows to overcome ongoing stress [2; 19].

Domestic and foreign researchers study emotional intelligence within the ability model framework (J. Mayer, P. Salovey).
and the framework of the mixed-type model (R. Bar-On). In the model of D.V. Lusina, EI is defined as the ability to recognize emotions, intentions, manage them, distinguish motivation, and desires of one’s own and other people, as well as a psychological formation that is formed in the course of a person’s life [7; 8]. Some studies establish correlations between EI and a preferred constructive coping strategy, an optimal level of anxiety, self-esteem, a decrease in emotional burnout, and personal adaptive potential [3].

Educators and teachers consider EI as a factor of job satisfaction, the basis of psychological observation, empathy, and social perception [10; 21; 22].

The studies of invariant and variant socio-psychological characteristics of successful, substitute (fostering) mothers (in many respects close to employees of organizations for orphans), point out the “emotional intelligence” as a key position in the structure of the effectiveness of substitute (out of home) family care [16].

The concept of psychological resources by D.A. Leontiev and emotional intelligence D.V. Lusina [6; 7; 8] became the theoretical and methodological basis of this study.

The purpose of the study is to identify and analyze the psychological resources of orphanages’ employees with different levels of emotional intelligence.

Goals:
1. Select groups of workers with different levels of EI and analyze their socio-demographic characteristics: age, education, marital status, having their own children, work experience in the CPS (child protective services) system, and satisfaction with this experience.
2. Conduct a comparative analysis of the psychological resources of workers with different levels of EI, based on the theoretical model of D.A. Leontiev. [6]
3. Identify the structure of the psychological resources of workers.

Hypothesis:
The identification of the groups of workers with different levels of EI will lead to understanding the specifics of personal resources such as sustainability, self-regulation as well as motivational and instrumental resources, and will reveal the structure of psychological resources that characterize this particular category of workers.

Organization, Methods and Procedure of the Research

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical standards of the Declaration of Helsinki 1964. The informants gave their written consent to participate.

EI was measured using the “ЭмИн” questionnaire (Emotional Intelligent) by D.V. Lucina.

Methods were selected in accordance with the structure of D.A. Leontiev.

Resources of sustainability and self-regulation: an abbreviated version of the Test of Resilience [14]; the methodology “Compassion Fatigue among Specialists in Helping Professions” [11]; Subjective Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) [12].

Motivational resources were determined by means of a questionnaire of professional motivation [13], the Utrecht Scale of Work Enthusiasm [5], and the author’s questionnaire of satisfaction with certain aspects of work activity.

Tool resources: questionnaire “Professional Competencies of Orphanages’ Employees” (V.N. Osln).

The study involved 174 caretakers (average age 44.2 ± 10.7) from 39 regions of the Russian Federation. The vast majority were women (91.95%). Almost all informants (96%) were brought up in parental families. Every 3rd (31.7%) has no children, and every 2nd (46.8%) is not married. The majority (50.6%) have a basic pedagogical education, every 5th one has psychological (9.2%) training or training in social work (9.2%). That makes a typical
worker: a woman over 40, often single, with a pedagogical education.

When processing the data, the following were used: the k-means method to identify groups with preliminary normalization of data through z-values; one-way analysis of variance ANOVA to analyze differences between groups in terms of quantitative indicators; $c^2$ for the analysis of differences in qualitative characteristics, factor analysis for structuring the data array and highlighting the structure of the psychological resources of workers. The calculations were made using the SPSS-21 program.

**Results**

To identify the groups of workers with different levels of EI, a cluster analysis was carried out using the k-means method, taking into account the generalized results of the “ЭмИн” (EI) methodology. The data were preliminarily normalized (Fig. 1).

The first cluster (N=83) included workers with average scores on all EI scales (Group with an average level of EI). The second cluster (N=57) includes employees with high scores on EI scales (Group with a high level of EI). The third cluster (N=34) — employees with low scores of all characteristics of EI (Group with a reduced level of EI).

The clusters did not differ in socio-demographic characteristics: age ($F=0.568; p=0.421$); education ($c^2=5.382$ at $p=0.716$); marital status ($c^2=6.159$ at $p=0.406$); the presence of their children ($c^2=1.176$ at $p=0.555$); work experience ($c^2=13.062$ at $p=0.110$); satisfaction with work experience ($c^2=6.601$ at $p=0.159$).

A comparative analysis of the personal resources of employees depending on different levels of EI was carried out using a one-way analysis of variance. Table 1 presents the characteristics for which significant differences were found between the groups.

Caretakers with different levels of EI differ in all characteristics of resilience, subjective well-being, and the potential for compassion (resilience resources). The highest level of expression of these characteristics was found in workers with a high level of EI. The same pattern was found in motivational resources. The conflict of roles

![Fig. 1. Results of cluster analysis using the k-means method (z-values)](image_url)
Таблица 1

Psychological Resources in Groups of Workers with Different Levels of EI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean Deviation</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Differences of Level Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.96±5.8</td>
<td>15.927</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.57±5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.85±6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.86±4.5</td>
<td>23.187</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.75±4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.08±4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.0±3.7</td>
<td>22.768</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.2±3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.97±3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.83±13.3</td>
<td>22.488</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.5±11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39.9±13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Well-being</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.5±7.8</td>
<td>12.948</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58.4±7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.6±6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion Potential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.0±10.5</td>
<td>7.109</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96.6±18.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85.2±14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8±0.5</td>
<td>6.819</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Self-efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0±0.8</td>
<td>6.882</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal (Intrinsic) Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1±0.9</td>
<td>5.350</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8±1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3±1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7±0.9</td>
<td>6.399</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7±1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9±1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5±0.7</td>
<td>3.345</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and Mutual Respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8±0.7</td>
<td>9.662</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Satisfaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9±0.7</td>
<td>10.734</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is more characteristic of workers with medium and low levels of EI. Employees with a high level of EI valued trust and mutual respect in the team, rated satisfaction with support, and working conditions more highly.

Self-regulation resources (self-efficacy of emotional regulation, procedural self-efficacy) are most pronounced in workers with a high level of EI. And it is noticeable that self-efficacy of emotional regulation of workers with an average level of EI is typical to the same extent for workers with a high level of EI, then procedural self-efficacy in this group is at the same level as in workers with a reduced level of EI.

An analysis of differences in instrumental resources showed that knowledge of the orphans’ psychology (p=0.000); childhood trauma (p=0.001); resocialization of orphans (p=0.003) was more highly rated by workers with high and medium levels of EI. Significant differences in the subjective assessments of employees with different levels of EI (higher were rated by employees with high and medium levels of EI) were obtained for the following skills:

- establishing tolerant relationships with orphanage residents/children (p=0.025);
- give an accurate description of the behavior of children (p=0.007);
- form normative behavioral skills among children (p=0.003);
- motivate children to achieve (p=0.034);
- teach children relationship-building skills (p=0.019);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Mean Deviation</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>Differences of Level Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Working Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6±0.8</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9±0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Absorption</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9±1.2</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6±1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2±1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Passion for the Activity (General Engagement)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.1±1.1</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.0±1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5±1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Subjective Assessment of Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3±0.9</td>
<td>8.481</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3±1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Subjective Assessment of Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7±0.6</td>
<td>4.187</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2±0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Subjective Assessment of Ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5±0.7</td>
<td>3.549</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1±0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• balance relations between children and caretakers (p=0.027);
• encourage children to build positive interaction with socially positive peers (p=0.029);
• involve children in the self-management system and teach them task-solving skills within the institutional environment and in their own lives (p = 0.047).

Such skills as correction of disruptive behavior among pupils (p=0.016); helping kids to transfer acquired social skills into new social situations (p=0.011); applying kids’ motivation appropriately to the circumstances (p=0.004) were also highly rated by employees with high and medium levels of EI.

Table 2
Structure of psychological resources of employees of the guardianship system
(Factor analysis by the method of principal components, varimax rotation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General EI</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Emotions</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal EI</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Management</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal EI</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardiness (Resilience)</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Taking</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

The selected EI indicators clearly divided all participants into 3 groups. The most numerous was the group with an average level, which correlates with the results of other studies [24; 25].

The manifestation of the majority of resources increases in accordance with the raising of EI level, so the group with a high level of EI can be considered as a “reference” (group 1) for this category of workers (Table 1).

The representatives of the average and reduced levels of EI (groups 2 and 3, respectively), demonstrate some resources with a degree that exceeded or corresponded to the degree of participants of group 1 with a higher level of EI. In group 2, this referred to motivational resources, in group 3 — to procedural self-efficacy. These resources can be considered as adaptation mechanisms that compensate for the lack of EI.

The high level of requirements for one’s involvement in the work [13] in group 2 contributed to greater vulnerability to “role conflict”. It draws attention to the fact that among the informants of group 1, the degree of its severity is the lowest, which can be attributed to better psychological health.

Employees of group 1 are more able to consider and manage the behavior of children, motivate them to achieve (the highest score among other competencies), choose more constructive methods of pedagogical influence, verbalize feedback to children (the ability to give an accurate description of pupil’s behavior), initiate their activity (the ability to involve pupils in the system of self-government). They are also able to model effective tolerant interaction with different partners, normalize behaviors, establish trust relationships with them, help to integrate into educational organizations, and act as a mediator between children and teachers (the ability to balance relations between them).

In the self-assessment of workers in group 2, one can clearly see dissatisfac-
tion with their ability to control the behavior of pupils, which indicates feelings of helplessness in implementing their job duties. Compared to informants with a high level of EI, they rate their professional skills lower, but they have communicative competencies, practically at the level of group 1, which allow them to build positive relationships with pupils, initiate their activity, which can be attributed to specific instrumental resources that allow them to adapt in an organization.

Employees of group 3 among their professional competencies give a higher rating to the ability to influence the behavior of pupils and a lower understanding of its causes, which may indicate the choice of authoritarian discipline. They doubt their own ability to become a model of normative behavior for children.

It draws attention to the fact that self-assessment of the ability to form social and everyday skills in children, and the ability to maintain high-quality informal relations with orphanage residents are independent of the level of EI, which can be attributed to the general resources of workers.

Factor analysis brought EI and its components to the role of a key resource. Of interest is the ratio of the factor weights of intrapersonal EI and internal EI (Table 2): intrapersonal EI makes a greater contribution to the success of employees. The ratio of intrapersonal EI and internal EI and their impact on the success of activities is assessed differently in studies.

Samples of teachers and other educators show a direct correlation between adaptive abilities and a greater degree of internal EI [3; 17; 18; 22], unlike a study of EI of teachers in urban and rural schools, which proved the predominance of internal EI to be a significant problem for professional activity, creating “additional conflicts, not allowing a comprehensive approach to the organization of professional performance” [24].

Based on these findings, orphanages’ employees are more focused on the inner world and emotional manifestations of the child and colleagues, and less on themselves. The latter is also confirmed by the higher factorial weight of the “understanding of emotions”, “their causes, the ability to predict their consequences” component compared to the control over their intensity and external expression.

The upbringing of traumatized orphaned children requires the ability to withstand stressful situations, i.e., a high level of hardness [6]. These resources took 2nd place in the structure of factors. When compared with the “norm” [14], even among the representatives of group 1, the result does not exceed the average values. The “inverted” hierarchy of resilience components draws attention: “control”, “risk acceptance”, “involvement”. In all likelihood, this hierarchy can be considered as psychological protection of employees in a situation of high uncertainty and confidence in a positive result of activity. A high level of motivation and involvement in activities, as mentioned above, is associated with a high degree of severity of the “role conflict” indicator.

Motivational resources (3rd place in the structure) reflect the energy supply of the individual’s actions to overcome a stressful situation [6]. The greatest factor load is carried by indicators of a positive attitude to work “preoccupation with activity”, which is experienced as part of one’s own identity, and vocation. The structure of the factor includes “compassion potential”, which prevents the development of “compassion fatigue”, which implies emotional, mental, and physical exhaustion [11]. In group 2, this indicator is significantly lower than in informants with a high level of EI, which confirms the risk of developing “compassion fatigue”.

On the 4th place — the factor of environmental resources. Here, the resource “trust and mutual respect” bears the greatest factor load as the most important condition for
the development of any organization [1]. It also determines the level of development of pedagogical communication [23] and is a source of “satisfaction with support and working conditions”, and self-efficacy of the emotional regulation of employees. For pupils, these relations are of an exceptional nature, because of the lack of basic trust in the world, models of trusting and respectful relationships contributing to their subsequent desocialization [16].

The last in the factor structure were instrumental resources: instrumental skills and competencies [6]. Preference is given to professional skills. Their scores are higher for workers with high EI. It draws attention to the fact that the conflict of roles turned out to be with a negative value in this factor.

**Conclusion**

The article analyzes new empirical data on the psychological resources of caretakers in organizations for orphans under the new requirements [20]. The structure of the psychological resources of educators, in general, corresponds to the concept of D.A. Leontiev, but one can find in it certain specifics that are characteristics of this particular category. Five components of the psychological resources of workers were identified:

1. EI resource, which has taken a key position;
2. resources of sustainability and self-regulation (hardiness and subjective well-being);
3. motivational resources positively associated with the potential for compassion;
4. environmental resources associated with emotional self-regulation;
5. instrumental resources negatively associated with role conflict.

The priority of interpersonal EI over internal EI was revealed, which distinguishes this category of workers from school teachers and other professional groups, which, in all likelihood, is associated with the peculiarities of working with orphans.

Representatives of groups with medium and low levels of EI have specific adaptation mechanisms that compensate for the insufficiency of EI: employees with an average level of EI have motivational resources; in workers with reduced-procedural self-efficacy.

The allocated psychological resources will make it possible to predict the success of the adaptation of caretakers in organizations for orphans, as well as to develop targeted programs aimed at preventing professional burnout, strengthening psychological health, and increasing efficiency in raising children.
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