Characteristics of Resiliency in Leadership: Implications for Personal and Organizational
Coping and Adapting Abilities

This monograph summarizes two qualitative studies of the characteristics of resiliency in educational leadership. The first study was conducted in 1999, the second in 2008. The studies examine characteristics of resiliency in educational leaders and explore the implications of resiliency on the functions of the educational organizations. The studies highlight the importance of these characteristics in educational leadership in relation to the high demands on leadership positions in educational organizations. The research identifies specific characteristics of resiliency and strategies that individuals in leadership positions use to cope with stressful situations and compares the characteristics to the literature.

Introduction and Background

Resilience needs in human beings have been a topic of interest among researchers for decades. Research has evolved to a level that delineates the characteristics of resilient people and links these characteristics to success, leadership and advanced emotional intelligence.

Researchers (e.g., Mrazek & Mrazek, 1987; Jew, Green & Kroger,1999) point to certain specific psychological characteristics that are related to resiliency. These characteristics are apparent in the skills and abilities that resilient people use during and after stressful situations. This study utilizes the definition of resiliency in a psychological context (Jew, Green & Kroger, 1999). Mrazek and Mrazek (1987) define resiliency as responses to stress that are influenced by appraisal of the situation and the resultant capacity to process the experience, to attach meaning to the experience, and to incorporate the experience into one's belief system. In this analysis, resiliency is constructed as a belief system, and coping is viewed as a set of behaviors based on a belief system (Jew, Green & Kroger, 1999).

The need for individuals who are resilient in leadership roles seems apparent and is discussed in the literature through a variety of related constructs (e.g., Cooper & Sawaf, 1993; Sergiovanni, 1992; Schein, 1992; & Stoltz, 1997). Historically, the study of leadership characteristics is extensive. Research (e.g., Bass 1984; Burns, 1978; Cuban, 1988) has defined skills and attributes needed by people to survive and to succeed in roles of leadership. However, little research exists in the specific examination of how leaders respond to problems, overcome disappointments, or recover from failures. Throughout the 1990s researchers (e.g., Chawla & Renesch, 1995; Cuban, 1988; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1992) have examined the changing nature of our society and how cultural and societal factors affect the extensive need of our educational organizations to change and develop over time.

Education as social organizational systems

Halsey (1996) suggests that few people outside the ranks of school administrators understand how difficult it is to be a leader in an educational institution. Halsey (1996) describes the challenges, the stressful conditions, the need for administrators to accept a lack of closure, the time constraints for solving problems, and the increasing need to accumulate the knowledge base needed to be responsive to an array of problems. Additionally, Halsey argues that administrators must accept the political nature of their roles and must remain positive in the face of negativity. Halsey (1996) addresses the need for administrators to build resources and strategies to collectively solve problems through building their own resiliency as they continue to build students' resiliency and life skills.

Collins (2005) draws a contrast between great social sectors and great businesses. He likens the building of change in social sectors to turning a giant heavy flywheel, slowly pushing until at some moment the flywheel flies forward with almost unstoppable motion.

The power of the flywheel breeds support which breeds greater success, which breeds more support.

Where adversity was once thought to signal a failure of the individual or the organization, it is increasingly recognized as a legitimate aspect of social organizational systems and a legitimate aspect of individual human interaction within social systems (Owens, 1995). Schein (1992) suggests effective leaders embrace errors. A lack of recovery from conflict or the failure of systems to be resilient is disruptive to the organization and devastating to the individual (Schein, 1992). As the nature and complexities of all organizations have changed, the expectations for people to rebound from failures or problems have increased. These expectations also imply that leaders must quickly learn from problems and take the organization in the direction that will most benefit it after the problem or failure has been resolved (Schein, 1992).

Dorner (1989) reviews the logic of failure and suggests that mistakes are essential to cognition. He suggests leaders need to deal with different situations and different demands through paying attention to the characteristics of processes within and external to the system. In complex systems, any action will affect many other things. Dorner argues most organizations are prone to cynical reactions to failure. He believes organizations need to engage in analysis of the reasons for success and failure.

Garfield (1986) conducted studies to analyze the strategies of extraordinary achievers. He addresses course correction, and he categorizes it as a master skill allowing its possessor to use their other skills more effectively. The components of course correction include mental agility, concentration, and learning from mistakes (Garfield, 1986). These high achievers were able to view windows of opportunity, critical points where they could institute course correction to keep within the boundaries of their critical path but also to leap ahead.

Garfield further explains his observations that peak performers not only have resistance to stress but resistance under stress. Garfield (1986) suggests that resilient people recognize and often cultivate certain aspects of behavior that psychologists have come to know as hardiness. Hardiness is made up of openness to change and a feeling of involvement in whatever an individual is doing, and a sense of control over events. Garfield (1986) suggests leaders who can strongly influence the atmosphere of their organization need to have personalities that include the attributes of hardiness.

Statement of the Problem

Several issues exist within the context of these studies. The central focus was to describe the characteristics of resiliency and the resiliency strategies used by educational leaders as they attempt to make sense of challenging times. The first study took place in 1999-2000 and the second series of interviews took place in 2008. The key question within the first study was to what extent are the characteristics of resiliency needed in educational leaders? Beyond that, are resiliency characteristics evident in educational leaders and are these leaders aware of the strategies they may employ to demonstrate these characteristics? An issue within this research examined whether the characteristics defined by the participants in this study were similar to those documented in the research.

Additional issues focused around the question of how educational leaders recover from devastating events. Specifically, how do educational leaders regain strength after they encounter a devastating or difficult issue? In addition to this, to what extent do educational leaders need to understand the elements of building resiliency within themselves? The research that was reestablished in 2008 added the question of differentiating levels of intensity and a comparative analysis of the stressors over the past 9-10 years.

The Context of the Research

The conceptual framework of resiliency is composed of many interrelated issues and is based on research from the fields of invulnerability, vulnerability, stress resistance, the psychology of hope and studies of responses to stress. The conceptual framework of resiliency is identified as the basis for models of prevention in mental health and the development of effective primary prevention programs (Cowen & Work, 1988).

Formal research in resilience occurred over the past sixty years and has been conducted in a wide variety of disciplines. Writings (Frakel, 1959) regarding the nature of resiliency can be traced to events much further through history. Investigation specific to resiliency in children (e.g. Bernard, 1991; Cowen & Werk, 1998; Werner & Smith, 1982) originated in longitudinal studies of children with high risk factors for difficult lives. Research specific to resiliency in adulthood also has its origins in the study of response to adversity (e.g., Frankl, 1959; Stoltz, 1997).

Resiliency research linked to leadership

Glenn (1989) identified elements of character, resiliency, behavioral health, maturity, and self-sufficiency. He developed these as lists of life management assets, which he describes as determinants of successful lives. Resiliency in this context is described as a characteristic of successful life management.

Stoltz (1997) studied adults who had faced extremely adverse conditions in their lives and recovered in surprising manners. Stoltz examined questions such as why do some people given equivalent assets and opportunities overcome adversity while others give up? Stoltz explains that resilient individuals respond to adversity as fleeting and limited. Adversity is viewed as external to them and within their control. He argues that an individual's response to adversity can be interrupted and changed.

Stoltz (1997) specifically discusses the need for resiliency in leadership. He defines successful leaders as persons who are able to turn unexpected losses into opportunities for greater success. Stoltz emphasized the notions that current organizational environments yield chaos through constant change and that leadership skills of the present and future need to incorporate this responsibility to survive and make use of conflict (Stoltz, 1997).

Cooper and Sawaf (1997) examined leadership in corporate settings and determined a high need for resiliency and renewal for executives to survive in leadership positions.

Arguing adversity as an advantage if managed correctly, Siebert (2005) describes a survivor personality characterized by personality traits to cope with workplace challenges. When faced with adversity these personalities do not have a victim mentality, they do not explode or implode. Rather they are described by Siebert as having characteristics that assist them to find opportunity after a setback or external challenge viewing adversity as having possibilities. He describes resilient people as people who help their communities, have advantages over other workers, and are retained and rewarded more frequently, rising to leadership positions.

<u>Purpose of the Study</u>

The purpose of the studies was to explore the characteristics of resiliency in persons who have achieved and survived in positions of leadership in education and to examine the organizational implications.

The goal of the 1999 study was to delineate the characteristics of resiliency that allow educational leaders to recover their strength and spirit after encountering adversity or failure. The 2008 study examined the same questions and added questions that related to intensity and changes in intensity of stressors over the span of the nine years.

Overview of the Study

The studies reflect a qualitative paradigm and present findings from a series of focus groups and in depth individual interviews relating professional experiences and perspectives on resiliency in educational leadership. Examining the literature on the construct of resiliency and then placing the construct within the context of educational administration provided the conceptual framework for the studies.

Methods

A combination of observational and interview data was collected and analyzed based on open-ended questions. The questions examined the participants' evaluation of their needs and skills in resiliency, their understanding of characteristics of resiliency, and the implications of resiliency within their organizations.

Focus groups and individual interviews were conducted with educational administrators. Educational administrators in 1999 were chosen from two administrative categories, school superintendents and special education directors, and in 2008 superintendents were interviewed. A structured, open-ended interview format included eight questions in 1999 and ten questions in 2008, adding the dimension of intensity over time.

Resiliency in Educational Leadership: Initial Impressions

The administrators involved in this study were asked to give their impression of resiliency in educational leadership. Answers among and between focus groups covered a wide range of thoughts. Four themes emerged. The themes were stressful events, emotions, coping needs, and personal outcomes.

Stressful events

A variety of events described by participants were considered to be beyond the scope of daily problems and job stressors. Through use of pattern code analysis, these events could

be clustered into three categories. Some stressful events that occurred were events that were position dependent and specific to the position the participant held in the educational organization. Other events were personal in nature, occurring at home, with friends, or extended family, and were difficult in relation to the demands that exist on the job. A third cluster were events that were organizationally based and affected an organization's response to public demands or societal events. All stressful events were viewed as occurring more frequently over the years.

Emotions

A second theme that emerged as participants' discussed emotional responses to the stressful events. The participants described attempts to cope with stressful times. They described variances in the degree and intensity of their emotions. Several described periodically being surprised by the intensity of their own emotions. Changes in the intensity of emotion were often related to the values that were at the core of their personal mission in their work. During times when emotions or feelings were the most intense, participants described dissonance in their thinking, discomfort, and internal struggle with the situation. Rather, they chose not to worry because so many variables were out of their control.

Inner strength was mentioned and described as something that occurred within them as they faced difficult times in their work. As emotions increased, inner strength was described as something that was either sought or found. This inner strength was attributed to several factors, but most often found due to a sense of doing the right thing.

Several of the participants mentioned anger and controlling their use of anger. Some described this emotion as not very useful. Many participants described the need to keep anger in check. Some of the participants mentioned anger and their struggles in dealing with their anger at individuals or circumstances occurring in the workplace. In addition, angry

people also confronted these administrators. The participants discussed their efforts to learn to decelerate the attacks of angry individuals.

<u>Coping skills and resiliency strategies</u>

A third theme that emerged in this question of overall impressions was one of coping skills or strategies these education administrators used. The participants were aware of their coping skills and when these skills were used. Participants also actively searched for new skills. They reported questioning their skills at times as well as developing questions to ask themselves or others. Gaining perspective, having perspective, or finding perspective was the most frequent strategy mentioned as participants discussed their abilities in the area of resiliency. Frequently, the participants described visiting classrooms or events. Observing students was mentioned as a useful tool for gaining perspective. The ability to change perspectives was mentioned as a helpful attribute. This was described sometimes as reframing a problem but also as adapting to a bigger context.

Listening was mentioned as a skill that was critical to their success in problem solving and relationships. Some participants described their need to learn to listen more and to fix things less. Others mentioned listening to themselves more as well. Listening to ones own intuition was important to participants.

Statements about the need for humor were frequent. Within the focus groups, participants used humor frequently. Participants also found humor in their own weaknesses. Humor, fun, and play were described as critical to the participants' abilities to recover from hurtful events and helpful to them in relationship building.

The participants spoke frequently about their beliefs and values. They described using these beliefs and values in their recovery processes after stressful events. These beliefs and

values were also apparent in later discussions of difficulty dealing with personal attacks and discussion of lost missions.

Personal Outcomes

An analysis of the overall language of responses to question one revealed these educational leaders viewed themselves as being resilient individuals. They cited many examples of their use of resiliency in their work as well as many examples of finding out they had more strength to draw upon in difficult times then they might have thought.

An Analysis of When Leaders Need to Call Upon
Resiliency Skills

Two questions dealt with the issue of when and why leaders needed to draw on their skills of resiliency. One question asked participants to specifically think of times when regaining strength was more difficult. The participants worked in positions that were stressful and demanding by nature, and what occurred that was not occurring on a daily basis that purposefully or subconsciously made them need skills of resiliency?

Five clusters emerged as the key factors affecting their ability to bounce back more quickly from certain situations. These factors were the frequency and intensity of problems, the chronic nature of a problem, the problems that were personal in nature, lost missions, and increased demands.

Chronicity

These questions addressed times when things became so difficult in their jobs that these education administrators felt distress. The most frequent factor mentioned was the chronic nature of the problem. This chronicity was defined as sustained conflict "that just wouldn't go away". It was described as a problem so chronic it "wears you down". These types of problems were described as creating pressure over a long period. It was hard to find support in these prolonged problems as well.

<u>Frequency</u>

A second factor was the numbers of problems that needed attention at one time. Participants agreed they could manage two or three problems at a time, but when there were four, five, six difficult problems occurring simultaneously, it was overwhelming.

<u>Personal</u>

There was a third cluster of comments that had a feature of personal concepts at the base of the verbalizations. These comments surrounded events that made an administrator feel personally attacked and presented more personal interruptions to their ability to be resilient. Although participants described trying not to take such attacks personally, these events occurred regularly.

Examples of personal attacks ranged from comments in public meetings that referred to possible mismanagement to campaigns against an administrator. These were described as extremely difficult for individuals to recover from. There also were several participants who had experienced either a direct comment or a suggestion that they had lied or were lying. These were described as devastating insults. Other such comments that seemed to attack the participants' deep personal values were placed in this category of times when things got too difficult.

<u>Lost mission</u>

Factor four included clusters of comments that described participants in a state of lost or confused mission. Such times were when they could not find the reasons they were in their job or when they were questioning why they would do this type of work. In later questions, comments indicated that these administrators work very hard to find ways to keep themselves focused on their mission in educational leadership, but for several participants, there were times when this mission was lost although they could verbalize their mission, it

no longer felt like they were able to work toward it. Their jobs had become too complex to fulfill that mission.

Isolation

The final factor was one that highlighted the isolated nature of their jobs and the ability to discuss the problems embedded in the positions. Many of the superintendents felt they were unable to talk or socialize in their community. The public nature of their position was addressed in all focus groups. Many legal issues or other issues were very confidential and could not be discussed socially or publicly. Participants explained not having support and often not being able to seek support in these situations.

The isolatory factor also represented comments that reflected times when there was no support above them. These were times when they felt their supervisor, whether school board or other, was not there for them nor was supportive of their efforts. At times, they could not find support from colleagues as well.

<div align="center">Moving Beyond</div>

Two questions focused on what these leaders do next when situations were extremely difficult. Numerous answers to this question were provided, and multiple strategies were named. Analysis of the wide range of strategies used by the participants revealed patterns that could be described by four actions, informing, seeking, reflecting, and escaping. Continued analysis revealed actions that were protective in nature and some that were adaptive in nature. Adaptive features assisted these leaders in a process of adjustment to new conditions, while protective features assisted with guarding themselves from the negative situation.

Informing

Participants had an initial response to situations when they were going poorly. It was to inform others who could help with the situation or who could be affected by the event. Regardless of who was informed, the need to inform was mentioned with high frequency.

Seeking

The ability to seek further information was also mentioned with high frequency. This seeking stage was described in various ways but was detailed with intensity and focus on facts and knowledge. Information was sought from sources that were viewed as having more knowledge or could assist in a collective search for solution. This ability to look outward included a focus on solution rather than a focus on self through worry or ruminating.

Reflecting

All participants mentioned a type of reflective activity. Many participants mentioned reflection as a means of coping. Reflection was most often purposeful and solitary in nature. Query was often a part of the participant's reflective processes.

Escaping

Escaping through a variety of activities was discussed. Sometimes actual travel was involved, but this was not seen as a positive tool when one was so immersed that they were unable to ignore the problem. Many simpler means of escape were described. A variety of strategies for seeking personal affirmations were sought during these difficult times. Solitude was sometimes a part of escape.

<div align="center">

Summary of the Findings 2008

</div>

The comparative analysis of findings from 1999-2008 shows changes in respondents needs for resiliency. Respondents viewed the need as being changed in intensity with

significant increases to a higher level of intense, sometimes hateful attacks that were personal, embarrassing and could be extreme and even threatening in nature.

The administrators involved in this study were asked to give their impression of resiliency in educational leadership. All respondents believed the intensity of needs have changed over time and have increased the stress on superintendents. Because of this and the personal nature of intensity the need for strategies to get through it had become more intense, evident and noticeable. A single theme emerged throughout these interviews comparing with several themes emerging in 1999-2000. The current theme was central to increased attacks that were personal in nature. Both the intensity of the stress and the personal nature of the attacks caused pain, wounding, and fear in the respondents. When asked why it was different the respondents described information that could be categorized as in the use of computers to either anonymously or without face, define the attack against the organization or the person. Words that were new to the research were words such as cyber bullying, anti superintendent websites, web sites with constant misinformation, law suits, harassing phone calls and emails, publications or other communications with negative comments about the management of the district or more directly and personally the superintendent. Some attacks were purposeful, organized and long lived.

The question of when do you need to be resilient in your work yielded differences as well. Respondents described personal attacks, organized efforts, and angry threatening efforts. They described these as anonymous ways to attack or faceless ways to attack. Attacks were in forms of websites, law suits, releasing misinformation, press releases, editorials, and inflammatory information to television reporters who produce investigative type reporting. Antecedents were frequently described as referendum and budget cuts.

Two questions focused on what these leaders do next when situations were extremely difficult. Numerous answers to this question were provided, and multiple strategies were named. This theme continues as we examine responses for what participants do to regain strength and the strategies they employ to regain strength. While in 1999 a few respondents were at a loss for examples in needing resiliency in their work, there were no respondents in 2008 who did not have a need and some who stated they had not regained strength and were still struggling to come back. Some had questioned leaving their role or removing them selves from the attack. Respondents were in need of more support on a personal level; both calling together small groups within the organization and sometimes large groups to inoculate the organization about the attack. Superintendents mentioned the need for collegial support and described this as not occurring on a frequent enough basis. Also mentioned was declining support for public education. Participants described an attempt to focus on other things while being attacked, assigning the front to others, while attempting to focus in other areas.

<center>Gaining strength: The Recovery 1999 and 2008</center>

Throughout adverse situations the participants were able to focus on goals, to fight back the negative, and to focus on hope for resolution. When the administrators were asked to describe the strategies they used to regain strength, they described support from colleagues or friends, physical health and exercise, creative projects, spirituality, plans and goals, reflection, and cognitive strategies. They describe this recovery process as "gaining back energy", "recharging", "focusing", and "returning to focus". Several participants discussed the need to retreat or to isolate themselves through a wide range of activities. Several participants mentioned religion as a tool that not only is with them in their daily endeavors but also assisted them through the difficult times.

15

Observations of recovery

Mistakes, problems, and anger often were described as left behind and forgotten. The language these participants used was laden with values as they described the meaning in their work. Beliefs, values and ethics were spoken of often with emphasis on drive and hard work. Laughter came easily to participants. A high value was placed on forgiveness. While forgiveness was not named as a tool, it was observed and described in different ways.

Participants reported themselves as resilient and talked themselves through situations by telling themselves they could get to the other side of the adversity. This ability to characterize oneself as resilient may be a critical component in the ability to withstand adversity. The participants were individuals who see themselves as able to recover from hard times. The language of these participants and the culture exhibited in their discussions indicate a desire and an expectation to be resilient. They want to serve as models and to help others be resilient. Service to others was frequently mentioned. Other characteristics are similar to the research of adult resiliency.

These leaders describe facing adversity with flexible thinking, focus, goal orientation, and determination. They view problem solving as challenging. They strive not to take things personally.

Implications for the Organization

According to one participant, "The mood of the organization depends on the leader's resiliency." Participants felt as leaders it was critical to be resilient for the organization. They felt as leaders they needed to promote an organization that allowed for creativity and thinking in different ways. They felt the notion of a resilient organization must exist from the school board to the staff and students. They described this notion to be critical for the individuals and the organization to have permission to fail and to learn from the failure.

Summary

Findings suggest that problems became harder to recover from if they were personal in nature, became isolative, or became associated with lost mission. In contrast, the 2008 participants expressed one major theme of personal attacks.

These participants believe their behavior effects the organization. Their attempts to stay strong are attempts to shield others and keep the fight away from the organization.

Unlike the characteristics of learned helplessness (Deiner & Dweck, 1978), resilient individuals see themselves as able to recover from hard times. Findings of this study suggest the participants did not dwell in negative thoughts; there were no excuses for failure. The participants in this study believed what one does will make a difference. Worry was discussed but rejected as a worthwhile activity. The participants believed they could do well, and when they could not move beyond something, they described active searches for ways to think about it in a different way.

The findings suggest that these leaders in education were able to cope in difficult times through an inner strength that they attributed to gaining knowledge from their past experiences. Reminiscent of the research of Sternberg (1997), the findings suggest these leaders had the intellectual abilities to sort through things and had fluid reasoning to analyze strengths and analyze weaknesses. These leaders sought help and support for their weaknesses and demonstrated self-monitoring and self-control.

Similar to Benard's (1991) studies of resilient children, several social competencies were described by the participants of these studies. The social competencies described in this study existed through the establishment of positive relationships and the ability to draw on these relationships. Strong problem solving skills were evident and witnessed throughout

the findings. The participants were resourceful in seeking help from others. They also demonstrated autonomy and a sense of control over their environment.

The findings, in relation to what happened when things went poorly, suggested that educational leaders had coping skills that were both adaptive to the circumstances and protective in nature. Rutter (1985) argued certain protective factors existed in resilient individuals. He suggested that resistance to stress is relative and not absolute, that resistance is both environmental and constitutional, and that the degree of resistance varies over time and according to circumstances. These features were apparent in the findings as well. The participants reported being surprised when they were struggling to recover from stressful events. This study revealed successful educational administrators who described times where it was overwhelming or at least more difficult to return to purpose.

Demos (1989) suggests resilient individuals have persistence with an ability to know when enough is enough and a capacity to develop a range of flexible strategies and skills. Participants showed persistence through difficult times and displayed a wide range of strategies useful in chosen situations. They described the ability to decide, "enough is enough".

Features of self efficacy (Bandura, 1977; 1982) such as goal commitment, control over their life, and self-regulation of thoughts, were described by the participants. These individuals persisted when things felt overwhelming. They described surprise in themselves when they were struggling to cope.

Many of these same features are identified in the research related to the psychology of hope (Snyder, 1994). The characteristics identified by the participants of this study that align with the features of high hope individuals include a sense of well being, an ability to solve problems, and an ability to choose not to ruminate or worry. The findings of this study also

suggest that the leaders have networks of support, but could use and appreciate more collegial support. The participants had the ability to concentrate on what needed to be done in the midst of difficult stressors. The participants also used humor as a coping strategy. Faith, religion and affirmation were mentioned.

Some participants described the need to engage in self-talk to encourage them so they could get through difficult times. Others mentioned observing and studying coping skills in others. Wolin and Wolin (1993) argue that by learning about resiliency individuals can become more resilient.

Many of the participants described attributes of paradoxical thinking. Siebert (2005) describes personality qualities that are counterbalanced qualities, paradoxical complexities that increase resiliency. Examples as described by Siebert were being creative and analytical, serious and playful, sensitive and tough, optimistic and pessimistic. He explains that counterbalanced personality qualities indicate that one has developed advanced emotional intelligence yielding increased resiliency.

Garfield (1986) argued resilient people are not immune to stress but show resistance under stress. Resilient people, according to Garfield, engage in course correction. Participants describe components of course correction within the repertoire of skills they used. They described questions they ask themselves or ask others who are called upon to help them. These questions represented a willingness to change courses. The participants also used language that described personal changes they made in recovery from stressful events.

Stoltz (1997) suggests that people will suffer if they respond to adversity as if it is out of their control. People who respond to adversity as being within their control will successfully endure. Stoltz further suggests we respond to adversity in subconscious, consistent patterns

that can be changed if interrupted. The linkage between these is suggested to affect one's

mental health and physical health (Stoltz, 1997).

Not unlike the descriptors from the work of Stoltz (1997), the participants most often

believed the adversity to be limited and within their control. Beyond that, they viewed their

reactions as changeable and interruptible. They actively questioned their responses. They

thought about and regulated their responses, and sometimes they replaced old habits of

response.

Making plans, goal setting, and goal orientation were important to these leaders. This

focus on goals demonstrates an understanding of control over their environment. They saw

themselves as being able to change things through planning, through reasoning out

problems, and through seeking different ways to do things.

The abilities to think in different ways, or to think in paradox were held with high value.

The reframing of an issue was suggested as a means of problem solving. Feelings of failure

were mentioned however. There was evidence that these individuals regulated their

thoughts. The participants worked on thinking about things in different ways.

<div align="center">Implications</div>

If resiliency can be taught, anyone who works in stressful positions should study the

characteristics associated with it. Resiliency is needed to survive in all aspects of life and

through all sorts of set backs we encounter. In relation to thriving through organized attacks

the answer is twofold; individuals need to increase preparation and we need to collectively

increase the inoculation of the public about attacks.

In difficult times, high tolerance for ambiguity is needed. Developing and displaying a

wider range of coping skills assists one's ability to be tolerant. The ability to learn and

develop successful means of coping is critical to being a resilient individual. The social

competencies associated with individuals who have high hope could be useful to individuals who struggle with coping through difficult situations.

The identification and recognition of our beliefs and values are important for success in any career. The results of this study imply our beliefs, values and ethics may be associated with our resiliency as well.

Theoretical implications

Researchers need to further investigate resiliency in both adults and children. Further research needs to be completed on definitions and theories of resiliency. Continued study in the social competencies associated with coping and resilient individuals is needed as well. Further research is needed to understand the nature of and the implications of the personal attacks these leaders have encountered.

Conclusions

These studies have attempted to broaden the understanding of resiliency needs in educational organizations and of the characteristics needed by educational administrators to be successful in these positions. The individual needs for coping and resiliency skills in educational administrators are extensive.

Implications for the organization are numerous. Organizations need to pay attention to the building of cultures that honor the discovery that can occur through mistakes, attacks and stressful times. In conclusion, resiliency is more than bouncing back from adversity. Resiliency is more about acting out of beliefs and values in difficult times, about flexibility in thought and reasoning and openness to others' knowledge. Resiliency is about moving successfully through adversity and as a result, producing concomitant self-improvement.

References

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1982). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. Developmental Psychology, 25, 729-735.

Bass, B.M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Benard, B. (1991). Fostering resiliency in kids: Protective factors in the family, school, and community. Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-free Schools and communities.

Benard, B., & Marshall, K. (1997). A Framework for Practice: Tapping Innate Resilience. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Burns, J .M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper Row.

Chawla, S. & Renesch, J. (1995). Learning organizations: Developing cultures for tomorrow's workplace. Portland, OR: Productivity Press.

Collins,J. (2005). Good to Great and the Social Sectors A Monograph to accompany good to great. Good to Great. New York: Harper Collins.

Cooper, K. C., & Sawaf, A. (1997). Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations. New York: Grosset Putnam.

Cowen, E. L., (1986). Primary prevention in mental health: A decade of retrospect and a decade of prospect. In M. Kessler & S. E., Goldston (Eds.). Decade of progress in primary prevention (3-45). Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Cowen, E. L. & Work, W.C. (1988). Resilient children, psychological wellness, and primary prevention. American Journal of Community Psychology,16, 591-607.

Cuban, L.(1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools.
Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Demos, V. (1989). Resiliency in infancy. In T. Dugan & R. Coles (Eds.), The child in
our times. New York: Mazel.

Diener, C. I. & Dweck, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous
changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 5, 451-462.

 Dorner, D. (1989). The logic of failure: Recognizing and avoiding error in complex
situations. Reading, MA: Perseus.

Dweck, C. S. (1975). The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of
learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 674-685.

Frankl, V. E. (1959). Man's search for meaning. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Garfield, C. (1986). Peak performers: The new heroes of American business. New York:
Avon.

Garmezy, N., Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (1984). The study of stress and competence
in children: A building block for developmental psychopathology. Child Development, 55,
97-111.

Glenn, S. (1989). Raising self-reliant children in a self-indulgent world. Rocklin, CA:
Prima Publishing.

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam.

Graziano, W. G. & Bryant, W. H., (1998). Self-monitoring and the self-attribution of
positive emotions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 250-261.

 Halsey, V., (1996). Who's really at risk in today's schools? Thrust for Educational
Leadership, 26, 4-8.

Henderson, N. & Milstein, M. (1996). Resiliency in schools: Making it happen for students and educators. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Henderson, N. (1997). Make resiliency happen. The Education Digest, 63, 15-18.

Higgins, G. (1994). Resilient adults: Overcoming a cruel past. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities. 34, 271-280.

Jew, C. L., Green, K. E., Kroger, J., (1999). Development and validation of a measure of resiliency. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development. 32, 75-89.

Krovetz, M.L. (1999). Resiliency: A key element for supporting youth at risk. The Clearing House, 3, 121-123.

Larsen, R. J. & Ketelaar, T., (1991). Personality and susceptibility to positive and negative emotional states. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 132-140.

Mrazek, P. J., & Mrazek, D., (1987). Resilience in child maltreatment victims: A conceptual exploration. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 357-365.

Owens, R. G. (1995). Organizational behavior in education. Needham Heights, MA.: Allyn & Bacon.

Pransky, G. S. & Mills, R. (1993). Psychology of mind: The basis of health realization. Paper presented at the 11th annual conference of The Psychology of Mind.

Pransky, G. S. (1998). The renaissance of psychology. New York: Sulzburger & Graham.

Rutter, M. (1985). Resilience in the face of adversity. British Journal of Pscyhiatry, 147, 598-611.

Schein, E.H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday Currency.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Moral leadership: getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Seligman, M. E. P. & Schulman, P. (1986). Explanatory styles as a predictor of productivity and quitting among life insurance sales agents. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50, 832-838.

Siebert, A. (2005). The Resiliency Advantage. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler.

Snyder, C. R. (1994). The psychology of hope. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Snyder, C. R., & Higgins, R. L. (1988). Excuses: Their effective role in the negotiation of reality. Psychological Bulletin, 104, 23-35.

Snyder, C. R., & Ingram, R. E. (1983). Company motivates the miserable: the impact of consensus information on help seeking for psychological problems. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 118-26.

Snyder, C.R., Irving, S. S., & Holleran, S. (1993). Reality negotiation and valence linkage self theories. In L. Montrada, S. H. Fillipp, & M. Lerner (Eds.), Crises and loses in the adult years. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Snyder, C.R. (1994). The psychology of hope. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Snyder, M. (1987). Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self monitoring. New York: Freeman.

Sternberg, R.J. (1997). Successful intelligence: How practical and creative intelligence determine success in life. New York: Plume.

Stoltz, P. G. (1997). Adversity quotient: Turning obstacles into opportunities. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Werner, E. E. (1989). High risk children in young adulthood: A longitudinal study from birth to 32 years. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 72-81.

Werner, E.E., & Smith, R.S. (1982). <u>Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of</u> <u>resilient children and youth.</u> New York: McGraw Hill.

Wolin, S. J. & Wolin, S. (1993). <u>The Resilient Self: How Survivors of Troubled Families</u> <u>Rise Above Adversity</u>. New York: Villard.