The Social Construction and Reciprocity of Resilience:

An Empirical Investigation of an Organizational Context

by

Jessica K. Kamrath

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2018 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Sarah J. Tracy, Chair
Elissa A. Adame
Scott Cloutier
Vincent R. Waldron

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2018

ABSTRACT

This research examines the communicative processes of resilience in the organizational context of public education. The research utilizes one-on-one interviews to elicit descriptions of resilience and well-being and collect stories of success and overcoming challenges. The study purpose is two-fold: (1) to understand the ways in which organizational members construct and enact resilience individually and collectively through their talk and stories, and (2) to extend the communication theory of resilience through an empirical investigation of resilience in an organizational context. An iterative, thematic analysis of interview data revealed that resilience, as lived, is a socially constructed, collective process. Findings show resilience in this context is (1) socially constructed through past and present experiences informing the ways organizational members perceive challenges and opportunities for action, (2) contextual in that most challenges are perceived positively as a way to contribute to individual and organizational goals and as part of a "bigger purpose" to students, (3) interactional in that it is constructed and enacted collaboratively through social processes, (4) reciprocal in that working through challenges leads to experience, confidence, and building a repertoire of opportunities for action that become a shared experience between educators and is further reciprocated with students, and (5) is enacted through positive and growth mindsets. This study offers theoretical contributions by extending the communication theory of resilience and illuminating intersections to sensemaking, flow, and implicit person theory. I offer five primary practical applications, discuss limitations, and present future directions highlighting community development and strengths-based approaches.

DEDICATION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to begin by dedicating this dissertation to all of the educators who wake up each

day committed to education, committed to their students, and live that commitment with

passion and dedication. And to all of the teachers who shared their experiences and their

stories with me, I am forever grateful.

Second, I want to thank my dissertation committee for their guidance and support

throughout this process. I truly could not have asked for a better team and each of you

added so much to my life in the last four years (and some of you longer).

I am forever grateful to my advisor – my mentor, my colleague, and someone I

am honored to call my friend – Dr. Sarah J. Tracy. You have forever changed my life

since the moment I met you and we embarked on the journey of "being a leader"

together. As I navigated this thing called a Ph.D., you were with me every step of the way

and your ability to challenge me with compassion has given me the confidence and

strength to push through, taking me beyond what I ever knew I was capable of. You have

truly been my rock. Thank you for always believing in me even when I didn't believe in

myself.

Dr. Vincent Waldron, you have been a part of my journey for the longest. You

shaped my research trajectory, who I have become as a scholar, and who I have become

as a human being. You continually asked me the hard questions, pushing me to always be

critical of my work and never letting me get away with taking the easy next step if it

wasn't going to get me where I needed to go. Thank you for guiding me and standing behind me while I blazed my path.

Dr. Scott Cloutier, you have been space of stability and serenity for me throughout this process, always reminding me to be true to myself. You have guided me on my personal journey forcing me to dig deep into the world in which I exist – a journey that is just beginning. I truly believe our meeting was meant to be. Thank you for not letting me take this experience for granted and opening up my eyes to how powerful we, as human beings, truly are.

Dr. Elissa Adame, you have been an amazing teacher and mentor changing the way I see myself as a researcher. I entered your statistics class coming off of a quantitative GRE score that landed me in the bottom 10%. Your remarkable ability to alter the way I saw statistics and how I saw myself engaging in statistical research has left a permanent imprint on me. You have continued to be a source of support me and fostered my confidence along the way. Thank you for being a space for me to just be me.

Third, thank you to the mentors and friends who offered me guidance and support with this project and the crazy experience that is writing a dissertation and doing a Ph.D. Dr. Belle Edson, Dr. Patrice Buzzanell, Dr. Alaina Zanin, Dr. Bailey Oliver, my conference wife, Sophia Town, all my people from the resilience seminar, and all the friends and colleagues I have met along the way – each of you have become someone I could lean on whether it was to ask questions, talk through ideas, cry, laugh, or just talk about life. I am grateful to have merged paths with each of you and now to call you my mentors and friends.

Fourth, thank you to the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State University for helping fund this dissertation and giving me a home to explore my passion. Thank you to the Transformation Project initiative for funding various endeavors that led to this research project. And a special thank you to Heather Freireich for always knowing everything and my Hugh Downs "mother," Rosemary Carpenter.

Fifth, thank you to my family and friends who supported me throughout this process. Mom, Dad, Brenda, Steve, Andrew, Alyssa, Grandma and Grandpa Eiden, and Grandma Lucy. You are all everything to me and knowing I have you all in my lives pushes me to be a better person. Mom and Dad - you have always taught me to be a strong, independent woman and to stand up for what I believe in. You made me the woman I am today, full of passion and drive, ready to take on the world, and not let anyone bring me down or tell me I can't. I love each and every one of you deeply.

And last, but not least, my ride-or-die – Erik Kamrath. I could never express enough gratitude to you if I lived a million lives over. When we got married and said "for better or worse" I am not sure you quite knew what you were in for. You always push me to be the best version of myself – you challenge me, you support me, and most of all you just love me, like no one ever has. Your unconditional love is just what I needed most during this Ph.D. journey and that is exactly what you gave me. There is no one else I would want to share this crazy ride with and every year just keeps getting better. Thank you for your unconditional love and support. I can't wait to start the next chapter with you – but just remember that you will have to call me doctor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One:

INTRODUCTION

While working as a public educator in Arizona, I would close the door to my classroom every fifty minutes after all of my students had entered the room. This is where I could breathe, this is where I felt passion consume me. When I gazed out into my small room stuffed with desks and bursting with forty-five eleventh graders, I was in my element. We created life in that room – we made the walls come alive. And I didn't want it to end. The bell ringing at the conclusion of each day was like a fire alarm that made my heart stop. And the fires were there, the fires became my reality. As soon as I released that door and swung it open, the oxygen was sucked out and the fires devoured me. The fires shapeshifted into parent e-mails, state initiatives, federal policies, money allocation and the countless other demands that burned best practices and putting students first to the ground. Eventually, the fires were everywhere, and I couldn't put them out fast enough. In May of 2014, I parted ways with public education and had to leave behind my love of teaching. The firestorms finally consumed me, and the little bit of oxygen I had left. I could no longer breathe.

My story has become the story. Since my departure, education continues to experience massive budget cuts to states all across the country and social media storms of uninformed commentaries blaming teachers and a failed education system that cannot be "fixed" with money. An emphasis on groups, parties, and an "us" against "them" mentality. The merry-go-round that pits unions and tenure-track teachers as scapegoats.

A string of mass school shootings leaving more than 400 victims in over 200 school shootings, the death toll steadily rising to over 100 since that fateful day on December 14, 2012 when we learned 20 elementary school children had been shot at Sandy Hook Elementary School (Patel, 2015). It seems now budget cuts and overcrowded classrooms are no longer the biggest problems we face – should we arm teachers…should we not arm teachers?

Recently, students brought the issue to the national stage with a nationwide protest where students and teachers were, quite literally, in a March for Our Lives (New York Times, 2018). I reflected on a memory I had of one particular lockdown. I knew it was not a drill. It was afterschool – we never have lockdown drills afterschool. I was doing off-season training with my track athletes when over the intercom we heard those chilling words, "We are on lockdown." (click). That was always it…click. There was never any more information, and of course, for good reason. There I sat huddled in the training room, in the dark, with two young girls who were there because they were putting in extra work, extra time, in some ways they were there for me. I remember a knot so tight in my stomach it felt like my intestines were tearing like rotted old rope – if someone comes in here what do I do? There isn't room for all of us to hide – I searched around the room for the next step – I will have to hide my two athletes. This only went on for about 20 minutes. But in that moment, I felt like I never had so many thoughts race across my mind – all while keeping a smile on my face, making sarcastic comments, rather whispering sarcastic comments, to make sure everything seemed "fine."

I found out later that an ROTC student was walking across campus with a wooden rifle, a wooden rifle. One that was mistaken for an actual rifle. Now, let's re-play that scenario where I have a gun, where teachers have guns. I re-play this scenario in my mind over, and over, and over, and over…and I don't re-play this scenario to spark a gun debate. I re-play this scenario because the story I told when I started writing this dissertation just a few short years ago has now drastically changed, and the landscape in education has changed. The story I told was about budget cuts, it was about overloaded classrooms, and the inability to deal with parents. What hasn't changed, however, is my commitment to education, my commitment to educators, and my commitment to educators being able to live their passion while also living a good quality of life.

And that story, that one about budget cuts, that is still a story in education and a very current and relevant one at that. In fact, teacher pay has recently come to the forefront as the demands for teachers get higher and higher while the pay stays the same. On the coattails of over 20,000 teachers in West Virginia walking off the job to protest low pay (Wamsley, 2018), Arizona teachers are leading what's called the #RedForEd movement demanding higher pay, basic resources for students, and funding for education to be at least restored to what it was in 2008 (Cano, 2018). Teachers across the state have already organized a "sick-out" forcing the Pendergast district in the West Valley, a district serving about 10,000 students, to close when over 350 teachers called in sick to protest low wages (Cano, Santistevan, White, & Altavena, 2018). Other school districts have staged similar events, such as a "walk-in" where teachers entered a district rally unified in red with signs of protest (Blackwell, 2018).

3

Which brings me to my dissertation and the purpose for sharing my story, and the current story. When I left education in 2014 and started my journey as a Ph.D. student, I had no idea where the story of education would be today and where my story would fit. I started my dissertation journey wanting to hear the stories of educators, all the while wondering how I could use my dissertation to bring these stories to life – stories about overcoming challenges, stories about success, stories about resilience, and stories about well-being. I started this project wanting to hear and experience the voices of educators and bring those voices to the forefront to build community. I want to contribute to a culture of resilience and well-being, so teachers don't have to choose between their passion and making a living wage. I want to draw on the stories of educators so that my story is not the story. I want to be part of creating a new story.

The story begins, or should I say, the story continues.

Chapter One opens by providing an overview of the purpose, goals, and rationale for this dissertation, beyond my own personal experiences and the anecdotal evidence of colleagues, friends, and family. I position my research in the field of organizational communication, specifically in connection with the communicative processes of resilience. I argue that exploring the ways organizational members talk about resilience and well-being coupled with participant stories of success and overcoming challenges can inform the ways in which resilience is communicatively constructed and enacted individually and collectively.

Chapter Two surveys the literature on resilience and well-being through the framework of communication at the individual and organizational levels. I synthesize

scholarship that conceptualizes resilience as (1) an individual cognitive process (i.e. individual traits, skills, and growth) and (2) as a socially constructed process, specifically emphasizing the communication theory of resilience. I overview the literature conceptualizing well-being, most of which is drawn from positive psychology scholarship, and then move to making explicit connections to resilience and how it can be viewed communicatively. The literature review closes by discussing the connections among narratives, resilience, and well-being. Within this section, I briefly overview the asset-based community development approach (ABCD), which guided parts of this research, specifically as an extension of the rationale for collecting stories of success and gathering individual and organizational strengths.

Chapter Three provides a road map to my methodological approach, discussing my participants and research site, while providing a rationale rooted in challenges at both the state level and specific to the organizational site. I also consider my role as a researcher given my unique position as a former educator and my personal ties to the organizational context. I discuss my procedures for data collection, which include a combination of field work and interviews. Lastly, I provide a discussion of my data analysis methods, which consisted of an iterative, thematic analysis.

Chapter Four presents my findings, in which I argue that resilience is a socially constructed, collective process. I found five overall themes to describe the processes of resilience in the organizational setting I explored. I argue resilience in this organizational context is (1) socially constructed, (2), contextual, (3) interactional, (4) reciprocal, and (5) enacted through a positive and growth mindset. I present evidence from participant

descriptions, definitions, and stories of resilience to support these themes. I specifically highlight four novel contributions not currently discussed in resilience scholarship and/or specific to this organizational context, which are (1) resilience is viewed as a positive part of organizational processes in which challenges are perceived positively as a way to contribute to both individual and organizational goals, (2) resilience in this context is enacted as part of a "bigger purpose" to students, (3) resilience is a reciprocal process in which working through challenges leads to experience, confidence, and a repertoire of opportunities for action that is shared between teachers, and is further reciprocated with students to provide opportunities for students to work through challenges and build a repertoire of opportunities for action, and (5) resilience is seen as being enacted through an intentionally created (i.e. a decision or choice) positive and growth mindset.

Chapter Five discusses the study's theoretical contributions and implications, interconnections to existing literature, practical applications, limitations, and future directions. I extend theoretical claims that resilience is socially constructed through an empirical examination of the "as lived" experiences of organizational members in an education institution, or the representation and understanding of human experiences, choices, and options and how those factors influence one's perception of knowledge (Boylorn, 2018). In contrast with conceptual and hypothetical definitions, "lived experiences" create a space for storytelling, interpretation, and meaning making allowing the researcher "to use a single life to learn about society and about how individual experiences are communicated" (Boylorn, 2018). I contribute to the resilience literature and the communication theory of resilience by discussing the implications of four novel

6

contributions not yet considered in the current scholarship – (1) resilience as thriving, (2) a "bigger purpose," (3) resilience as reciprocal, and (4) resilience is enacted through a positive and growth mindset.

Additionally, I suggest that resilience is interconnected with three existing bodies of literature that should be further explored: (1) retrospective sensemaking, (2) flow, and (3) implicit person theory. Each of these bodies of literature present opportunities for scholars to better understand how the processes of resilience unfold and for scholars, educators, and consultants in creating interventions that cultivate resilience. I discuss practical applications by presenting opportunities for developing a culture of resilience and well-being through (1) co-creating organizational narratives and creating a shared vision, (2) individual and community goal setting, (3) mentoring and collaboration, (4) fostering flow experiences, and (5) growth-mindset interventions. Practical implications utilize my findings to provide recommendations for administrators, education leaders, educators, and consultants to implement and further explore ways to build community and cultivate a supportive culture that fosters resilience and well-being. Lastly, I discuss limitations and future directions, specifically focused on setting an agenda for community development and strengths-based approaches.

Toward a Communicatively Constituted Approach to Resilience

Organizational communication scholars have studied the micro and macro communication processes connected to organizational well-being, including the communicative processes of resilience (Beck & Socha, 2015; Buzzanell, 2010; 2018; Cheney, Zorn, Planalp, & Lair, 2008; Waldron, 2014). Research has explored the

communicative aspects of burnout, employee mistreatment, organizational dissent, emotions and organizing, organizational identities through discourses of power, compassion organizing, positive work experiences, and other positive organizational processes (Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006; Frost, 1999; Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000; Kassing, 1998; 2002; 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, Riforgiate, & Fletcher, 2011; Miller, 2007; 2014; Miller, Considine, & Garner, 2007; Tracy & Tretheway, 2005; Way & Tracy, 2012; Waldron, 2009, 2012). In the last decade, scholarship has moved beyond destructive communication processes to include positive organizational scholarship (POS). POS has shifted organizational scholarship to a focus on positive outcomes, processes, and attributes of organizations and their members (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). POS is vast and focuses on positive human potential through understanding what represents the best of the human condition with an emphasis on the dynamics of excellence, thriving, resilience, virtuousness, and more (Cameron et al., 2003). POS explores the enablers, or the processes, capabilities, structures, and methods, and the motivators, such as altruism and unselfishness, related to the outcomes or effects, such as meaningfulness, vitality, and high-quality relationships (Cameron et al., 2003).

POS has contributed to organizational communication scholarship in a variety of areas, such as 1) positive individual attributes, including engagement and creativity, 2) positive emotions, such as subjective well-being and emotional intelligence, 3) positive relationships, such as civility and humor, 4) positive organizational practices, such as mindful organizing and collective efficacy, and 5) positive leadership and change, such as

8

the development of appreciative inquiry and authentic leadership (Avolio & Mhatre, 2012; Bakker & Oerlemans, 2012; Cooper & Sosik, 2012; Cooperrider & Godwin, 2012; Goddard & Salloum, 2012; Porath, 2012; Rothbard & Patil, 2012; Sekerka, Vacharkulksemsuk, & Fredrickson, 2012; Vogus, 2012; Ybarra, Rees, Kross, & Sanchez-Burks; Zhou & Ren, 2012). The list of contributions is by no means exhaustive and scholars continue to advance research focused on developing the scientific endeavor of positive scholarship while promoting positive organizational processes and outcomes.

Positive studies have branched out to include positive organizational communication scholarship, which centers on how communication and social discourse constitute organizations and organizing in constructive ways (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). In addition, scholars have conceptualized positive organizing, which refers to the generative dynamics in and of organizations that enable individuals, groups, and organizations to flourish as a whole (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). Positive organizing bridges POS and positive organizational behavior, or individual-level behavior and improved performance (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011).

Although POS scholars have explored positive subjective states and traits in connection with how organizations can enable positive experiences, communication and critical scholars criticize POS for the lack of attention to discourse, or cultural and historical systems of meanings that inform positive assessments (Fineman, 2006; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). POS is rooted in the discipline of psychology and focuses on behaviors, or the best of the human potential, and what processes enable positive human behaviors. The communication processes, interactions, and behaviors are only implicitly

9

explored and, at times, absent from POS. POS is also criticized for the concentration and focus on individual-level behavior rather than the social and communicative processes that are collaboratively produced (Fineman, 2006; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011). These criticisms link POS to normative assessments of positivity that are driven by moral and ideological agendas of self-realization and happiness (Fineman, 2006).

More specifically, the concepts of resilience and subjective well-being have primarily been explored from a psychology approach focusing on individual traits or biological factors, developmental processes, and circumstantial and environmental elements (Deiner, 2000; Caza & Milton, 2012; Zautra, Hall, & Murray, 2010). From this approach, resilience is "an outcome of successful adaptation to adversity" where characteristics of the person or situation are the indicators of the processes of resilience with a focus on resources and outcomes (Zautra et al., 2010). Scholars have expanded on the conceptualizations of resilience by arguing that resilience includes recovery, or how well people bounce back and recover from adversity, and sustainability, or the capacity to continue forward in the face of adversity (Bonanno, 2004; Masten, 2001; Zautra et al., 2010). Resilience includes a sustained adaptive effort, bouncing back from adversity, and a process of learning and growth rather than a focus on a set of traits, outcomes, risks, or protective factors (Kent, Davis, & Reich, 2014).

Resilience as a communicative process has only more recently been conceptualized. Resilience as a communicative process is "dynamic, integrated, unfolding over time and through events" (Buzzanell, 2010, p. 2). Scholars studying resilience as a communicative process argue that resilience, like all organizational

10

"realities," is communicatively constituted (Buzzanell, 2010; Lucas & Buzznell, 2012) and constituted in language (Schoeneborn et al., 2014). Communication from this point of view constitutes organizing through the ongoing efforts of coordination and control of activity and knowledge, and organizations emerge through communication events and processes, including the collective actors that are talked into being (Cooren, Kuhn, Cornelissen, & Clark, 2011; Schoeneborn, et al., 2014). Buzzanell (2010) argues that resilience can be talked into being through a collaborative exchange resulting in the "co-construction of new stories, rituals, organizing logics, identities, and framings" that can reintegrate individuals into their lives (p. 9).

Given that resilience as a communicative process has more recently been studied, my dissertation research takes on the call to contribute to scholarship and empirical research. Currently, the majority of empirical studies on resilience from a communication framework are focused on family resilience (Afifi & Harrison, 2018; Lucas & Buzzanell, 2012). Studies of organizational resilience are limited to studies on job loss (Buzzanell & Turner, 2003), employment transitions (Beck, Poole, & Ponche, 2015), and career resilience (Buzzanell, 2000). Additionally, some of the empirical work does not focus its research design on resilience, but rather connects past findings to the concept of resilience. As such, there is much work to be done in terms of asking and listening to employees themselves talk about resilience. Indeed, Buzzanell (2010) argues that future research should focus on investigating other processes involved in resilience, such as reframing life experiences, saying:

…human resilience is constituted through communicative processes. It is up to us

to display how our field [communication] contributes distinctively into this

important human process. It is up to us to show how communication can enhance

individuals' and collectivities' well-being and resilience in particular contexts. (p.

10)

I answer this call by studying a particular organizational context, specifically an

education institution, to understand how processes of resilience are communicatively

constructed and enacted in connection with organizational well-being.

Where Have All the Teachers Gone?

Motivating Problem and Study Rationale

A specific organizational concern related to resilience and well-being is the

teacher shortage and lack of quality teachers pervading public education across the

country (Haynes & Maddock, 2014; Seidel, 2014). Researchers estimate that more than

one million teachers either move or leave the profession each year, which equates to

around 230,000 teachers leaving schools annually (Haynes & Maddock, 2014). The cost

of teacher attrition rates is estimated to be between $1 billion and $2.2 billion per year,

varying by state, and the annual attrition rate for first year teachers has increased 40%

over the past two decades (Haynes & Maddock, 2014). Based on teachers' self-reports,

the reasons for turnover are related to lack of support, such as administrative and

community support (Ingersoll, 2001). In addition, school staffing cutbacks, poor salary,

and lack of influence or inclusion of teachers' voices are among the reasons for teacher

turnover (Ingersoll, 2011). These statistics mimic my own experience as a high school

teacher in public education and provide a rationale for conducting this research in a public education institution.

Organizational members of education institutions are confronted with adversity on a daily basis. Much of this adversity is in the form of various tensions, such as the tension between meeting state standards and mandates versus applying best practices or between a focus on standardized test scores versus differentiated assessments that consider the whole student. Scholars have reframed organizational tensions as irrationalities that are normal conditions of organizational life (Trethewey & Ashcraft, 2004). By reframing irrationalities as normative conditions it removes negative connotations, or the view that these are problems that must be removed or resolved, and shifts focus to working within these tensions. Organizational irrationalities are described as constituting the everyday understandings of organizational members' situations and creates an opportunity to explore how organizational members construct resiliency (Buzzanell, Shenoy, Remke, & Lucas, 2009). From this point of view, such irrationalities are not problems to be solved but the bricks and mortar of organizational life.

Indeed, in a study that "examines the ways in which Head Start employees recognize and respond to organizational irrationality" (Remke, 2006, p. ix), researchers found that teachers maintained resilience through reintegrating themselves and others in everyday talk (Buzzanell et al., 2009; Remke, 2006). Teachers maintained resilience by reinterpreting and reframing conflicting demands to bounce back (Buzzanell et al., 2009):

[Head Start] Teachers' ongoing communication flexibly framed conflicting

demands so that they could bounce back from daily fissures in their values and

13

goals, on one hand, and the Head Start mandates, on the other. Unlike resilience

in the face of a singular event, resilient responses to organizational irrationality

required an ongoing series of communicative strategies to respond to seemingly

irrational phenomena that are embedded within organizing itself. (p. 303)

This study further explores the communication processes, interactions, and behaviors of

resilience and well-being. Furthermore, my research situates organizational disruptions

that trigger the processes of resilience as an ongoing set of events that cannot be

eliminated. This research, therefore, does not seek to rid organizations of disruptions or

adversity but rather to explore the processes that prompt organizational members to

bounce back and reintegrate by framing disruptions as part of the processes of resilience

that leads to organizational success stories. In doing so, the study investigates how the

communicative construction of resilience unfolds in language and interacts with various

aspects of well-being.

Exploring the Communicative Construction and Enactment of Resilience in an Organizational Context

Research Purpose and Goals

This research examines the communicative processes of resilience in connection

to organizational well-being in a public education institution. I utilize one-on-one

interviews to gather conceptualizations and descriptions of resilience and well-being and

collect stories of challenges and successes. The purpose of this study is: 1) to understand

the ways in which organizational members construct and enact resilience individually and

collectively through their talk and stories, and 2) to extend the communication theory of

resilience. Through an empirical investigation of a specific organizational context, an education institution, I explore the ways in which organizational members' descriptions of resilience and stories of overcoming challenges and success inform how resilience is constructed and enacted individually and collectively

Specifically, my research investigates how the processes of resilience are conceptualized and enacted by analyzing the "everyday understandings" of resilience and well-being, and how those "everyday" understandings manifest in employee talk and in stories of challenges and successes. In addition, collecting stories of success and the reasons for those successes through interviews and storytelling is a way to draw out positive memories and prompt organizational members to "focus on peak experiences" (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003), while better understanding the processes of resilience. Eliciting stories that focus on success and strengths "is one way in which communities can outgrow a problem or redefine its solution as a product of renewed collaborative action" (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 479). Again, I am interested in ways in which organizational members reframe and "redefine" organizational irrationalities (i.e. "problems" or "challenges") as part of the processes of resilience with the hope of creating a culture of support that fosters resilience and well-being.

Drawing on the stories and lived experiences of teachers to understand the communicative processes of resilience is a way to begin to incorporate teacher voices. Gaining a richer understanding of the communicative processes of resilience is integral to creating opportunities for organizational members to work through, in, and around organizational irrationalities, or redefine challenges, within the existing framework.

Overall, this research provides insights of interest to organizational communication

scholars and consultants, education scholars and consultants, educators, and those

interested in resilience and resilience scholarship.

Chapter Two:

LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Resilience and well-being have several meanings depending on the discipline. In what follows, I review resilience as an individual cognitive process and a socially constructed communicative process. I then synthesize how resilience has been studied and conceptualized in organizational contexts. Additionally, I connect scholarly work on resilience to research on well-being. Lastly, I discuss the ways in which scholars connect stories to resilience and well-being and briefly review the asset-based community development (ABCD) approach as I drew on first steps of the approach in designing my study.

Resilience as an Individual Cognitive Process

Resilience as an individual cognitive process has been described as a personal trait, an individual skill, and an individual process of growth and learning (Beck & Socha, 2015; Kent et al., 2014; Zautra et al., 2010). Three categories of resilience are argued to impact individual resilience: intrapersonal qualities, or inner processes of the person; interpersonal qualities, or qualities of relationships; and social resilience or qualities of relationships to larger groups (Kent et al., 2014). This conceptualization is useful in that it highlights how, when the process of resilience is initiated, individuals respond in the face of challenges at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social levels, all contributing to individual and relational balance. From this point of view, resilience is one way individuals learn and grow, which requires "the physical being of the person" and "an action the person as a living organism does" (Kent et al., 2014).

Although resilience at the individual level is conceptualized as a dynamic process, individual process definitions focus primarily on an essentialized view of relationships as stable entities, rather than examining the always co-constructed and fluid nature of relationships (Buzzanell, 2018). This is something I hope to extend and problematize in my research.

Past research suggests that experiences and environmental factors contribute to the development of individual resilience where the interaction between the individual and the environment forces opportunities and choices of action at crucial junctures (Masten, 2001). When individuals are unable to maintain control over various aspects of their lives, individuals will make choices that initiate actions resulting in bouncing back or conversely to actions that create imbalance. What is less clear in this past research are the ways that these actions and behaviors are a result of communication, interaction, and storytelling. I want to understand how individuals interact with their organizational environment to construct and enact resilience, the ways in which the organizational environment causes imbalance, and how communication processes, behaviors, and interactions can mitigate this.

Resilience as a Socially Constructed, Communicative Process

Resilience has also been conceptualized as a communicative process of reintegrating from disruptions in life and something that is "fundamentally grounded in messages, d/Discourse, and narrative" rather than something that resides in the individual (Buzzanell, 2010, p. 2). In this study, I draw on this conceptualization, exploring how

18

organizational members communicatively construct and enact resilience—both on their own and collectively with one another—within the organizational community.

Given that the process of resilience is "dynamic, integrated, unfolding over time and through events, evolving into patterns, and dependent on contingencies" (Buzzanell, 2010, p. 2), "resilience is neither something we do alone nor an inherent characteristic that only some people have" (Buzzanell, 2018, p. 98). This conceptualization would suggest that resilience is rather something that is ongoing, and constituted in language and communication processes (Buzzanell, 2018; Buzzanell, 2010). Additionally, "the communication theory of resilience situates resilience in human interaction, drawing upon discursive and material resources" (Buzzanell, 2018, p. 98). Communicatively, then, resilience is constituted in talk and interaction where organizational processes are socially constructed. Furthermore, a communication framework of resilience allows for exploration of the positive aspects of well-being while acknowledging negative emotions, conditions of inequity, and disadvantaged networks or social capital (Becker & Marecek, 2008; Botrell, 2009; Buzzanell, 2010; Fineman, 2006). Resilience is not a solid thing, but is rather a constructed process that is always in motion, constructed and reconstructed through interaction, employee talk, and narrative.

Resilience in organizing.

Organizational resilience has been defined as "a developmental trajectory characterized by demonstrated competence in the face of, and professional growth after, experiences of adversity in the workplace" (Caza & Milton, 2012, p. 896). Further, organizational resilience is said to enable individuals to handle future challenges and

encompass "behavioral, affective, and psychological manifestations of positive adaption and professional growth within the context of significant adversity at work" (Caza & Milton, 2012, p. 896). I am specifically interested in the ways communication can contribute to this "developmental trajectory" and how the communicative processes of resilience can be enacted to work through future challenges.

Organizational resilience is also discussed in relationship to seven contributing behaviors, which are 1) community, or a shared sense of purpose and identity, 2) competence, or the capacity and skills to meet demands, 3) connections, or relationships and linkages that expand capacity and flexibility, 4) commitment, or trust and goodwill, 5) communication, or strong communication to make sense and drive order, 6) coordination, or good timing to ensure alignment, and 7) consideration, or attention to the human factor (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2010; Horne & Orr, 1998). It is important to note that these are labeled "practical behaviors" and even though communication is one of those behaviors, the communicative processes that lead to those behaviors are not considered. My intention is to contribute to these "characteristics of resilient organizations and the elements that must be in place to foster resilience" (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2010, p. 338) through an investigation of how organizational members communicatively construct resilience and how those constructions inform the ways in which these behaviors are enacted individually and collectively.

Organizations can also be viewed as communities and research on community resilience can be applied to organizations. From this perspective, resilience can be understood and cultivated through facets of community development approaches, such as

eliciting positive memories through stories of success, creating a shared history and utilizing social capital (Cloutier & Pfeiffer, 2015; Mathie & Cunningham, 2003).

Education institutions are a specific organizational context where individuals, and even the institutions themselves, do not have a lot of control. In the context of the shifting demands on the job market, researchers argue that a focus on situations and events in which individuals have personal control is key to promoting resilience (Beck et al., 2015; Lamb & Cogan, 2015). Organizational members must work within the existing framework and shift focus to that in which they can control. In addition, social support networks both within and outside of the work environment can promote successful transitions and foster organizational identity anchors (Buzzanell, 2010; Beck et al., 2015; Lamb & Cogan, 2015). This study considers how the processes of resilience can contribute to successful transitions, identity, anchors, and the role of community in building a culture of support.

Education is particularly important as an organizational locus given that teaching is a profession that is marked by significant burnout, emotional labor, stress and adversity, each of which has been widely studied (Boren, 2014; Hochschild, 1983; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Miller, 2014; Miller et al., 2007; Tracy, 2009; Waldron, 2012). Caza & Milton (2012) argue for empirical studies of resilience among "individuals working in high-risk professions" (p. 903). Given teaching is listed as one of these "high risk" professions burdened by burnout and negotiations of emotional labor (Caza & Milton, 2012), the education context is well-poised for a study of resilience.

21

Resilience is argued to be cultivated through organizational social networks, a repertoire of broadened response resources as a result of positive emotions, and through intentional action to change organizational circumstances (Fredrickson, 2001; Masten, 2001; Wadlinger & Isaacowitz, 2006; Zautra, 2009). The question is how does communication as an individual and socially constructed process within an organizational context prompt action to cultivate resilience in these ways? Researching the communicative processes of resilience in a high risk organizational context help answer this question and potentially lead to transformation.

Resilience in Connection with Subjective Well-Being

The literature investigating the connections between resilience and well-being is vast and complex. Scholars have made implicit and explicit ties between resilience and well-being, (Hall & Zautra, 2010; Kent et al., 2014; Lyubomirsky & Della Porta, 2010; Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005; Zautra, 2009; Zautra, et al., 2010), yet these bodies of literature have not been placed in conversation from a communication framework. I am interested in how communicative constructions of resilience, on the one hand, and well-being, on the other, interact with one another. I now discuss the current conceptualizations of well-being, specifically focusing on those derived from a positive psychology approach. Furthermore, I discuss how happiness and well-being can be viewed communicatively, which is the framework I use for this study. I make specific connections between resilience and well-being given that, like resilience, well-being can be viewed communicatively as a process that unfolds over time, as contextual, and embedded in collective social processes.

Conceptualizations of well-being.

In an attempt to shift from a focus on deviance and alleviating mental illness, in the last 20 years psychologists have increasingly focused on the positive aspects of human functioning (Diener, 2000; Norrish & Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Positive psychologists moved to scientifically approach and analyze happiness and "the good life," through coining the term subjective well-being (SWB), considered to be "life satisfaction (global judgements of one's life), satisfaction with important domains (e.g., work satisfaction), positive affect (experiencing many pleasant emotions and moods), and low levels of negative affect (experiencing few unpleasant emotions and moods)" (Deiner, 2000, p. 34). It is argued, then, when people are happy, they are able to make broader judgements about his or her life as a whole (Diener, 2000).

Positive psychologists have contributed to the authentic happiness theory, the happiness set point theory, and the concept of flow. Researchers tend to consider happiness as a three-pronged concept that includes 1) pleasant life, or maximizing positive and pleasurable experiences; 2) the good life, which is a result of developing strengths that an individual enjoys and is passionate about; and 3) the meaningful life, which occurs as a result of contributing to the greater good (Seligman, 2002). What I am particularly interested in for this dissertation is understanding how organizational members construct and enact resilience in connection with individual and community strengths. Understanding how well-being fits into the processes of resilience might serve to maximize positive experiences at work in any one of these three prongs. Doing so can

also broaden the individual's repertoire of positive emotions to draw on during times of adversity, which is argued to lead to resilience (Fredrickson, 2001).

The communicative construction of happiness

I use the terms well-being and happiness interchangeably for the purposes of this research. Happiness is argued to be socially constructed, yet again is connected to individual cognitive processes. The happiness set point posits that happiness levels remain fairly consistent over time despite changes in individual circumstances. (Lyubomirsky, 2007). Our genes, however, do not determine our life experience and behavior (Lyubomirsky, 2007). As such, happiness, at least in part, is something that is intentionally created rather than out of our control. "The key to happiness lies not in changing our genetic makeup (which is impossible) and not in changing our circumstances (i.e. seeking wealth or attractiveness or better colleagues, which is usually impractical) but in our daily intentional activities" (Lyubomirsky, 2007, p. 22). Given that organizational processes are a large part of our daily lives and activities, and the importance of organizational well-being, I seek to understand how subjective well-being intersects with the processes of resilience.

Implicit connections between communication and happiness posit that happiness myths are created in language and discourse, happiness is socially constructed, and that happiness is created through our actions – what we do and how we think (Lyubomirsky, 2007). This is why communication matters in the construction of happiness and in the study of happiness. Happiness is, in part, constructed through language, in the context of society, and in the cultural narratives and stories we tell. Bridging the bodies of literature

24

of resilience and well-being with a focus on narrative sets up a framework for exploring how they co-emerge through employee talk and stories.

Narratives of Strengths as a Path to Resilience and Well-Being

Examining the stories that organizational members tell is a key part of this dissertation study. Buzzanell (2010) argues that "the co-construction of new stories, rituals, organizing logics, identities, emotions and framings require that people develop ways to reintegrate new realities into their lives" (p. 9), which provides a rationale for soliciting narratives. Moreover, "the communication theory of resilience leverages the power of stories, relationships, and creativity, not only to help people survive but (hopefully) to construct a better world" (Buzzanell, 2018, p. 98). Asking people to talk about and tell stories of workplace challenges and successes creates an opportunity for participants to re-frame organizational irrationalities. Framing messages that co-construct normalcy or reconstruct identity anchors can positively reinforce narratives of resilience (Buzzanell, 2010).

Resilience can be created and cultivated through intentional activities and practices, one of those activities being the telling and re-telling of stories. Resilience is argued to be something that can be "learned and cultivated, not solely as a set of skills, but as processes embedded in stories and the act of storytelling" (Buzzanell, 2018). Resilience is something that is driven through "active engagement in a process of revisions" (Beck & Socha, 2015, p. 2) and provides access for individuals and communities to intentionally cultivate resilience through communication processes. Language and communication processes can provide access to resilience through

"creating meaningful connections" and "redefining the meanings associated with stressful conditions" (Waldron, 2014, p. 935)

This dissertation explores the ways in which stories of overcoming challenge and success might prompt the choice to reintegrate or bounce back when faced with an adverse trigger in the organization. Indeed, it would be interesting to hear how organizational members narrate the process of working through, meeting, and potentially overcoming the challenge, and what they learned along the way. Such stories might also touch on individual and communal strengths and assets. In other words, organizational members may discuss what they can control, which is linked to organizational well-being (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2011; Warr, 2013). Individual and communal strengths can become anchors of new organizational narratives that cultivate resilience and well-being. Given that happiness is largely constructed through language and interaction, organizational well-being has the potential to be reinforced in the narratives we tell.

Organizational narratives can co-create and reify individual and communal resilience and well-being. Through understanding how organizational members describe and define resilience and happiness at work for themselves, and for the organization, resilience and well-being might be constructed to meet individual and community needs. Organizations can be transformed as a result of understanding the strengths of individual employees in connection with the organizational community. In addition, exploring how people talk about resilience and happiness leaves space to shift the discourse of each and focus on intentional activities.

Making space for organizational members to challenge dominant narratives can also prompt a focus on "identity exploration" (Beck et al., 2015, p. 123). This stands in contrast to adhering to a potentially fixed identity grounded in upbringing and social norms about what organizational identities and successes look like. I explore the narratives teachers construct through eliciting stories of overcoming challenges and success at work. Descriptions and definitions of resilience and happiness, coupled with stories of success and overcoming challenges, has the potential to create an opportunity to understand how resilience is constructed and enacted in an organizational setting.

Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD).

In connection with organizational narratives and storytelling, the asset-based community development (ABCD) approach draws attention to social assets, utilizes social capital, and can be viewed as a response to dramatic changes in the social, political, and economic landscape, through engaging community members in the first step of the approach, which is collecting stories of success (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). ABCD approaches draw on appreciative inquiry, which posit that knowledge and reality is socially constructed and "language is a vehicle for reinforcing shared meanings attributed to reality" (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 478).

Through ABCD approaches organizational members can construct a shared history and a shared vision for the future (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). This dissertation study gathers stories of success, individual and organizational strengths, and descriptions of the best part of the organization and organizational constraints to create a holistic picture of the processes of resilience and engage organizational members in the

27

first steps of the ABCD approach. I drew off of the ABCD approach to further the rationale for gathering stories of success, and individual and community strengths, as a way to mitigate the exclusion of voices to create a space where organizational values may be co-created, or existing values may have new meaning.

Research question

In order to explore ways in which organizational members are talking about resilience and well-being and evoke stories of successes and challenges through the framework of communication in a specific organizational context, I developed the following research question:

RQ1: How do organizational members' descriptions of resilience and stories of successes and overcoming challenges inform the ways in which resilience is communicatively constructed and enacted individually and collectively within an organizational community?

Chapter Three:

METHODS

To explore my proposed research question, I utilized a variety of qualitative methods to investigate "phronetic questions," or the situated meanings within a particular organizational context (Tracy, 2013). In order to understand the ways in which resilience is constructed and enacted "as lived" in an organizational context, I "focus[ed] on practical activity and practical knowledge in everyday situations in society" (Flyvbjerg, 2012, p. 40). I conducted fieldwork as a participant observer, documented my experiences through field notes and analytic reflections, engaged in ethnographic interviews throughout the process, and conducted semi-structured interviews in two parts – (1) informant interviews and (2) narrative interviews. For my data analysis, I utilized an iterative, constant comparative approach (Charmaz, 2011, 2014; Tracy, 2013) by considering individual-focused and communicative conceptualizations of resilience coupled with theories of resilience while exploring emerging themes in my data.

My goal in utilizing various qualitative research methods was to interweave viewpoints and multiple perspectives while "examin[ing] people's actions and the structures that encourage, shape, and constrain those actions" (Tracy, 2013, p. 22) to achieve crystallization and create a bricolage (Denzin, 2012; Tracy, 2013). I begin with an overview of my participants and research site while additionally creating a context and rationale for each.

Participants, Research Site, Context, and Rationale

Many school districts in Arizona have faced difficulty in retaining teachers given the pay is lower than other states. Arizona houses the lowest paid teachers in the country ranking 50th nationwide when adjusted for cost of living (without the adjustment they rank 49th) (Alder, 2017). Many schools in more recently developed areas in Arizona have experienced growing pains leading to inconsistency in leadership resulting in high employee turnover and vacant positions (Arizona Department of Education, 2015). According to an initial report, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) Educator Recruitment & Retention Task Force (2015) reports that during the 2014-2015 school year 62% of the 79 districts surveyed reported having open teaching positions and 53% of districts and charter schools reported they had between one and five educators break their contract or resign midyear.

This burden is felt by everyone in the organization, leaving students with substitute and unqualified teachers and an increase in class sizes. Lack of professional support, such as structured mentoring, induction and retention programs, eliminated support positions (i.e. counselors, librarians, nurses, and music), and access to both professional development and classroom resources are cited as primary reasons for the teacher shortage and lack of retention (ADE, 2015).

Although the ADE Educator Recruitment & Retention Task Force followed up with a second report in January 2016, they do not provide updated statistics for the data cited above beyond the 2014-2015 school year. Additionally, the ADE "Accountability and Research" webpage only provides data for assessments, graduation rates, dropout

rates, enrollment, and college-going reports (ADE, 2018a), conveying part of their purpose is to "label schools in a fair and systematic manner" (ADE, 2018b). The "Hot Topics" tout the 2017 A-F letter grades for schools, which is a ranking system said to hold schools accountable (Arizona State Board of Education, n.d.). The lack of readily available statistics on teacher retention, teacher pay, and the economic impact of each demonstrates the focus on standardized testing and standardized rankings. Additionally, there are no available empirical qualitative studies illuminating teachers' voices and "as lived" experiences regarding these issues, nor any issues for that matter, on the Arizona Department of Education website.

Research Site

My research was conducted at a high school in Arizona's East Valley of Maricopa County. The school is composed of 78 teachers over 9 departments, 4 administrators, 4 counselors, just under 2000 students, and an undocumented number of support staff. Through several discussions in June 2017, the school Principal became interested in my research and invited me to attend the back to school/professional development days for teachers the week prior to students coming back. The Principal's main concern was that I allowed teachers to get settled into the new school year, a year that included some changes due to turnover in leadership, and that I did not interfere with teachers' interactions with students. I was able to anticipate some concerns prior to our meeting (i.e. not interfering with teachers' interactions with students) and address them, while other concerns were brought up in our meeting (i.e. to not begin interviews until at least the middle/end of August, 2017). I received verbal permission from the principal, in

addition I documented of all e-mail correspondence, and IRB approval for the research (see Appendix A).

I was drawn to studying an education site in Arizona due to pilot interviews which suggested that local educators in Arizona experienced a series of setbacks, lack of support, and inconsistencies in leadership. One teacher described how the elementary school she worked at would solicit teacher input and opinions yet not consider them and implement practices that were outside of what they agreed on or even discussed. Along a similar vein, another teacher discussed a division in his workplace because of the lack of support and the inability for leadership to move the organizational members to work towards a common goal. By locating a site that meets the criteria of experiencing and overcoming setbacks, my sample fits "the parameters of the project's research questions, goals, and purposes" (Tracy, 2013, p. 134).

Additionally, I had firsthand knowledge and anecdotal evidence that the organizational site of my choice experienced administrative turnover resulting in the need to hire the 6th principal for the 2017-2018 school year since the school opened in 2007. Other administrative positions experienced similar turnover and many teachers exited throughout the process. Based on my own account, and that of the organizational members, this specific site went through a particularly challenging time during the last school year. The Principal for the 2016-2017 school year was put on administrative leave in early September, which led to a student walk-out, an uproar amongst parents and staff, and a social media eruption of Facebook pages and tweets dedicated to "SAVE [NAME]." During ethnographic and formal interviews, the staff revealed that they had no

knowledge, and still have no knowledge, of what went on. Soon after being placed on administrative leave, the former Principal "resigned," leaving many questions from staff about the nature of this person's resignation and whether it was truly a resignation or a situation in which this person was forced out. The turmoil left behind was evidenced in both stories of overcoming challenges and stories of success.

This resulted in divisions between the staff and other groups within the community. Many organizational members discussed the residual effects of those divisions in describing their experiences and telling their stories. In addition, many staff discuss still being baffled by the situation and angry and confused over the lack of communication throughout the process. Many participants cited being hopeful but cautious as they took on a new school year with entry of two new administrators, many new teachers, and broken relationships.

This account shows that the challenges educators are facing are way beyond the need to work within the framework of federal, state, and district policies, laws, and mandates. Eliciting participants' descriptions of resilience and stories of challenges and successes to explore the communicative processes of resilience allowed me to incorporate a multivocality of voices and understand how resilience is experienced "as lived" to co-create meaning and a shared history. By understanding the actual "lived experiences and viewpoints" of educators I contribute to scholarship and practical applications in hopes of adding to a deficient conversation about how to retain highly qualified teachers. Furthermore, I hope to create the foundation for a trajectory of research that is focused on building supportive and resilient organizational communities.

Participants

Participants consisted of 28 full-time educators at a public high school in the southeast valley of Arizona, including a mix of teachers, counselors, administrators, and support staff (i.e. aids, athletic secretaries, security guards, etc.). Participants' ages ranged from 21-58 years of age ($M = 40.54$, $SD = 8.54$), with one respondent declining to respond and one respondent indicating her age was "over 50." The sample consisted of 43% male educators and 57% female educators, with the majority of respondents identifying as Caucasian/White (79%). The majority of participants identified as a teacher (79%), followed by counselors (10%), administrators (7%), and support staff (less than 1%). Given that teachers make up 91% of the organization (when considering the numbers for teachers, administrators, and counselors) with counselors and administrators making up just under 5% respectively, these percentages are not surprising.

The number of total overall years in education ranged from 1-35 years ($M = 11.75$ $SD = 8.66$), with the total years at their current institution ranging from 1-17 years ($M = 4.46$, $SD = 3.34$), and the total number of education institutions participants worked for over the course of their career ranged from 1-7 ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.60$). Lastly 71% of my participants cited coaching or advising sports, clubs, or extracurricular activities outside of their regularly contracted hours and nearly half of those positions were unpaid (46%).

Within my sample, 50% of teachers were in their first 5 years at their current institution ($M = 4.46$ years), and 21% were in their first 5 years of teaching overall. Additionally, the two administrators, two counselors, and all the support staff I interviewed were all in their first 5 years at their current institution. The short tenure of

participants is evidence of Arizona school's challenges with retention and turnover, the difficulty in retaining highly qualified teachers, and the overwhelming challenges faced in the first 5 years.

Researcher role.

My role as a researcher moved between a participant observer (Tracy, 2013) and a co-researcher given my past experience as an educator and the stance I took in my interviews. Given my background in teaching, I studied a context in which I am already a member (Tracy, 2013). I was particularly cognizant of the various forms of ethics and engaged self-reflexivity throughout the processes. This "insider" stance enhanced my research and added to both the crystallization and multivocality of voices. I was able to garner trust fairly quickly and this gave me access to professional learning communities (PLCs) at the onset. PLCs, in this organizational context, are teams of teachers who share a common prep period, teach the same course or in the same area (i.e. biology teachers make up a PLC, geometry teachers make up a PLC, etc.), and meet once a week to plan lessons, go through student assessments, and more. In addition, participants I recruited via e-mail responded promptly and expressed their willingness to participate.

Relational ethics were of particular concern in my role as a researcher, collaborator, and having been a teacher. I also have current or past relationships with some of the organizational members. Ellis (2007) discusses ethics as an ethnographic researcher where many times she had a close personal relationship with those in her narratives. She argues that relational ethics should be acted on through the heart and the mind in order to navigate the tension in telling the stories of other people.

35

I would argue that Frost's (1999) concept of 'disinterested love' can also be applied here. Disinterested love is discussed in Frost's (1999) research on compassion in reference to a love that is not self-interested. Throughout this research, I developed complex relationships with my participants and I worked to treat relationships with care (ethics of care as described by Ellis, 2007), compassion, and disinterested love. Given that I interacted with teachers in their planning meetings, attended events, had existing relationships with some of the participants, and identified as a former educator, teachers who I first met during this research were very open and trusting of me. For example, one teacher shared her experiences with breast cancer and negotiating the organizational landscape as a first-year teacher. This conversation occurred during an ethnographic interview. She shared personal experiences about her journey and even showed me her scars from her double mastectomy. I had no prior relationship with this person before I entered the scene and only met her through observing her PLC. In addition, even teachers who knew me from my past experience at the school, but did not have a relationship with me, freely opened up to me and were more than willing to share personal stories.

A question discussed by Ellis (2007) is whether or not researchers and participants can be friends. Prior to entering the scene, I anticipated negotiating this tension throughout the research project. I collaborated closely with organizational members during PLCs and I developed relationships with the participants. It was a continuous negotiation of that relationship – moving between friend and researcher - throughout the entire process. Brydon-Miller & Kral (2011) discuss a particular kind of ethics in participatory action research (PAR), which is covenantal ethics. They argue that

covenantal ethics are continuing to be aware of the good of the community and its members as a reciprocal relationship and process (Brydon-Miller & Kral, 2011). I strove to be continually self-reflexive of my relationships, my stance as a researcher, and covenantal ethics as I engaged with the organizational members and through their sharing of personal stories – formally during the interview process, during PLC observations, and through informal conversations during my time there.

Self-reflexivity.

Researchers discuss self-reflexivity as an important aspect of continually being cognizant of one's own role in the research scene and its ethics (Ellingson, 2011; Ellis, 2007; Gullemin & Gullam, 2004; Tracy 2010). Researchers should be engaged in self-reflexivity to make sense of what emerges in the research process and to continually question motives and actions of self. One way to prompt self-reflexivity is through keeping a journal and through analytic memos—both of which might be considered to be self-narratives. Bochner (2000) argues that "the purpose of self-narratives is to extract meaning from experience rather than to depict experience exactly as lived" creating the "possibilities of meaning" (p. 270). Narratives, then, allow us to "make sense of experience over the course of time" (Bochner, 2000, p. 270). By collecting narratives from research participants, as well as documenting my personal story over the course of my research, I made sense of the experiences of others in connection with my own experience. The process of writing analytic memos about my own story created an opportunity for me to be self-reflexive about my role as a researcher. This process

37

became a way for me to reflect on my own credibility and adherence to the ethics that are significant to qualitative research.

Procedures for Data Collection

This dissertation utilized a combination of fieldwork and interviews to explore the communicative processes of resilience. I began with fieldwork as a participant observer during professional development days and during educators' meetings with professional learning communities (PLCs). As previously described, PLCs place educators in collaborative groups to share expertise with the goal of continuous improvement in teaching and student performance ("Hidden Curriculum," 2014). PLCs are pre-determined and coordinated by school administration and in this case were formed by placing educators in groups based on the subject or area they taught. I also attended various other events throughout the school year such as sporting events. During this time, and throughout the process, I took field notes to document my experiences and engaged in ethnographic interviews.

I solicited interview participants for formal interviews during fieldwork and via e-mail. I conducted semi-structured interviews in two parts. First, I used informant interviews to elicit educators' conceptualizations and descriptions of resilience and well-being, organizational successes and challenges, and individual and organizational strengths. In the second part of the interview I shifted to narrative interviews to elicit educators' stories of resilience, well-being, successes and challenges. (See Table 1 for an overview of research hours and activities)

Observations and field notes.

I negotiated access to the staff professional development days held the week before students returned to school. During this time, teachers engaged in various meetings and professional development activities, in addition to having time to meet in PLCs, plan lessons and set up their classrooms. I observed, took field notes, and introduced myself to the staff. I was able to meet and engage with some of the PLCs during one of the sessions. During the professional development days, the Principal introduced me and provided me the opportunity to engage with staff. I was able to participate in some of the icebreaker activities and make more personal introductions that later aided in soliciting PLCs to observe and interview participants.

In order to solicit PLC participants, I put the request in motion by e-mailing one teacher from the department. The e-mails varied depending on my relationship with the participant and whether or not I was soliciting participation for PLC observations, interviews, or both (see Appendix B for an example e-mail). I also attached the relevant informed consent forms to the e-mail (See Appendices C and D for informed consent forms). The teacher who I made the initial contact with would respond with his or her willingness, or not, to participate and, in many cases, information about the days and times their PLCs met. The next steps were to incorporate the other teachers in the PLC either over e-mail or verbally. I only had one teacher who never responded to me during the course of my research.

Over the course of the Fall 2017 semester, I took on the role of a participant observer in PLC meetings. Participant observers engage in a number of activities, yet

their membership is improvisational, they do not follow the same rules as other members, and they can opt out of certain activities (Tracy, 2013). Each time I worked with a new PLC, I introduced myself and briefly overviewed what I was doing in terms of my research. I gave them time to ask me questions before signing the informed consent for observations (Appendix C), which gave me permission to observe and take field notes during PLC activities.

PLC members were encouraged to ask questions and interact with me throughout the meeting, giving me the opportunity to build trust and rapport. Additionally, I asked questions when appropriate and in consideration of what the teachers were trying to accomplish in the meetings. Given my role as a former teacher, I also provided ideas for lessons and offered advice to challenges I saw occurring in the PLC, within the larger organizational community, and individually.

Over the course of the semester I attended 16 PLC meetings that ranged over the following subject areas: English 10, English 12, Spanish, Biology, Anatomy, Geometry, Spanish, World History, and Algebra. This resulted in 15.5 research hours (See Table 2 for an abbreviated overview of fieldwork). Additionally, I used this time recruit interview participants by sending around voluntary sign-up sheet where I collected their name, personal e-mail, phone number, department, years at current school, and years teaching overall. PLCs became a way for me to explore and navigate the scene.

During the first PLC meeting I sat in a desk positioned outside of the group. I took out my computer and all my materials and did not interact much with the PLC group after I introduced myself, discussed my research, and talked about what I was doing. In

reflecting back on my first experience, I felt like an "outsider" in an education setting, which was an odd feeling. I talked through my experience with one of my committee members and further wrote about it. My reflections from my first PLC meeting observation provide insight into my constant negotiation of my role as a researcher, the importance of engaging in self-reflexivity, and my first perceptions of what is deemed a "collaborative" activity. The observation notes and analytic reflections from my first PLC observation on August 8, 2017 lasting 1 hour and 15 minutes with a group of English teachers (consisting of 4 female teachers and 1 male teacher) are as follows:

The group sat in a way that had one teacher at her desk and the rest of the teachers at a group of desks by the window. The desks were facing each other but they had to turn to face the other teacher's desk (the teacher whose room it was sat at her desk off to the corner). I originally sat in a desk by her desk, which I now feel was not a good choice. I also had my computer open taking notes during the meeting. Basically, it put one teacher "in charge" and placed me as an "outsider." I introduced my project and described what I was doing and what I was asking of the teachers prior to them starting their PLC meeting. The PLC meeting came across very logistical and not at all like a community. They just asked questions like, OK where is everyone at? Who read The Lottery? Who is still reading? What are we doing tomorrow? What are we doing after The Lottery? Etc.

A first-year teacher finished The Lottery with her students that day and asked what she would be doing tomorrow. The teacher at her desk, a veteran

41

teacher at X school (only a 6th year teacher but has been at X school all 6 of those years), began talking about this café lesson that seemed like a very creative and interesting lesson but also seemed to overwhelm the new teacher. She was talking about buying table cloths at The Dollar Tree and not exactly explaining it in a way that seemed doable to get it prepared for the next day. The new teacher became quiet and seemed to shut down. I made a joke that she didn't have to buy table cloths to try and lighten the mood.

I realized that I didn't position myself as part of the group but rather as a researcher by where I sat and having my computer open. Given that I am a stand for connection, community, and organizational well-being I want to position myself as a participant that is there to help with the 'community' of the professional learning communities.

Teachers seem to know how to collaborate very logistically in the PLCs but there does not seem to be a sense of community. A few teachers after the meeting told me they were glad I wasn't there observing the week before because they were having an inappropriate conversation, which quickly reminded me that I had positioned myself as a researcher. I did have another teacher ask me about speech and debate and if we could meet because she was interested in starting the team/club and the class. The veteran teacher just started teaching AP English this year and was talking to me about some of her concerns.

It was an interesting mix of how people saw me given that I knew the veteran teacher and one other teacher in the PLC from when I worked at X school.

42

The three other teachers I only met that day or during the back to school professional development days (or they at least remembered me because I introduced myself). I did ensure them during my introduction that I was not there as an administrator and what was said and done in the PLCs was not going to be getting back to the administrative team NOR would I discuss anything with my husband. It will be interesting negotiating my role and moving back and forth between researcher, teacher, collaborator, friend, and what I am a stand for.

I include my reflections from my first PLC observation because it was a learning experience as a researcher and it contributed to an understanding of the scene. First, I realized my experience as a former teacher granted access to the site and in many cases garnered trust from teachers that led to their willingness to participate. I was quickly reminded, however, that I was now situated as a researcher. It was almost as if I didn't want to accept this role and internally I was screaming, "NO I am just a passionate educator" – I wasn't, at least I wasn't just this.

Reflecting on this experience provided insight into how I would approach the next PLC observation and any returning observations with this group. For the remainder of my observations I made sure to sit with the group and if teachers were not sitting together as a group I would invite them to. I also never had my computer out during another PLC meeting. I made sure I only took notes after I returned home so the PLC members felt more comfortable. I do want to be clear that I never misled anyone to believe I was not there doing research – I was very clear in my introduction and, again, each member had to sign an informed consent.

Interestingly enough, once I accepted my role as a researcher, I was able to build relationships with the teachers and they seemed to open up to me. For example, during a PLC meeting with a different group we got off track and started talking about salary and benefits. One of the teachers in the group was pregnant and revealed her struggle with feeling unsupported by the district – both monetarily and in other ways such as needing to coordinate a substitute teacher on her own. She did not sign up for short-term disability which left her unpaid for most of her leave. She later discussed more on this experience in one of her stories of individual challenge, but, in that moment, we all had the opportunity to provide support for her in the form of compassionate listening.

Although speculative, I suspect this person would not have opened up to me if I had not reflected on my first experience observing a PLC. I also presume that my continuous negotiation of my role as a researcher – understanding that I am situated as a researcher and educator, how to be clear about that while consciously choosing to be unobtrusive (i.e. not taking my laptop out or taking notes during the PLC), and spatially placing myself in the group – positively impacted my interactions with participants.

The experiences in the PLCs gave me the opportunity to meet and build a rapport with teachers, solicit interview participants, and begin gaining insight into the scene while understanding a specific way educators build community and collaborate. Additionally, my experience highlights the constant negotiation of my role as a researcher while also identifying as a passionate, educator. Throughout the process I engaged in several self-reflexive activities and gained a deeper understanding of the importance of considering my role as a researcher, ethical considerations, personal

subjective values and biases, and my own narrative I was continuing to "write" throughout the process (Bochner, 2000; Ellingson, 2011; Ellis, 2007; Gullemin & Gullam, 2004; Tracy, 2010; Tracy, 2013). The PLC observations, although integral to gaining a deeper understanding of the scene, were not a part of my formal analysis. Rather, these PLC observations set the backdrop for my research scene while creating opportunities to solicit interview participants. I now move to a discussion of the interviews, the core of what supports the findings of this dissertation project.

Interviews.

Overall, I conducted a total of 28 face-to-face interviews. I interviewed 2-3 teachers from each of the 9 departments with a total of 22 teacher interviews, 2 of the 4 administrators, 3 of the 4 counselors and 1 person identifying as support staff. Interviews ranged from 25-53 minutes. I used the transcription service Rev.com to transcribe all interviews. The transcribed interviews resulted in 392 single spaced pages of data (see Table 3 for a summary of interview data). I solicited interview participants during PLC meetings and via e-mail. In some cases, teachers provided names of other potential interviewees and I found their e-mail via the school web page to follow up with them. My target was to interview 2-3 participants from each of the 9 departments, 2 of the 4 administrators, 2 of the 4 counselors, and 2-3 support staff only if time permitted. Given this goal, I was purposeful in recruiting participants to ensure I had a sample of voices from each department, from administration, and from counselors.

Participation was voluntary and an informed consent (see Appendix D) explained to the participants that measures would be taken to ensure confidentiality, such as

removing personally identifying information, the use of pseudonyms, and security of data. All participants received an informed consent and participation in the interview was considered consent to participate. In order to participate, respondents needed to be (1) 18 years of age or older, and (2) currently employed by a public education institution. Participants were asked to provide their name and contact information if they agreed to be contacted for a follow-up interview. Participants were also asked to fill out demographic information including gender, race/ethnicity, current role (i.e. teacher, counselor, administrator, or support staff) years in current role, years at current institution, areas currently teaching (if applicable), the overall number of education institutions they have worked for, and whether or not they were coaching or overseeing clubs and/or extracurricular activities (see Appendix E for demographic questions).

Interviews were conducted from a collaborative/interactive stance to encourage conversations, questions, and begin the process of co-creating meaning (Tracy, 2013). Participants were reminded about the emphasis on confidentiality so they could speak freely about their own individual interpretation of the concepts and specifically regarding any challenges or constraints to the organizational community. Participants were also directed to maintain the confidentiality of other organizational members by referring to others as "my co-worker," "my administrator," or in some other non-identifying way. This interviewing approach "allow[ed] for more emic, emergent understandings" and in turn created a space for interviewees' complex viewpoints and perspectives to be heard (Tracy, 2013, p. 139).

For the first part of the interview, I utilized informant interviews (Tracy, 2013) to prompt participants to describe experiences related to resilience, well-being, PLCs, community and community building, and organizational strengths and challenges. The first set of interview questions prompted participants to discuss and describe how they view the concepts of resilience and well-being at the individual and organizational levels. Participants were further prompted to share what resilience and well-being looked like in action or things they did to contribute to their own resilience and well-being in the organization. Participants were also prompted to discuss any connections they saw between various aspects of interest for this study. For example, participants were asked "How would you define or describe resilience and what does resilience look like?" and "How do you see resilience connected to your work or what does resilience look like at work?" Participants were also prompted to discuss the best part of the organizational community and any challenges and constraints to the organizational community. Lastly, they were asked to describe their experiences in their professional learning communities, how they generally viewed community, and any suggestions for building community (For the complete interview guide see Appendix E).

During the second part of the interview, I shifted to narrative interviews, which are "open-ended, relatively unstructured interviews that encourage the participant to tell stories rather than just answer questions" (Tracy, 2013, p. 141). I began with an open-ended question that elicited narratives of participants' lived experiences of organizational successes and challenges, and how those challenges were overcome, or not. Second, I elicited "success stories" to further understand the processes of resilience and create an

47

opportunity to elicit positive memories as the first step in the asset-based community development approach. For both stories I asked the participants to tell me what they learned from the experience. After participants shared stories of success and challenges I asked them to discuss the strengths of the community and what individual strengths they brought to the community followed up with how they wanted to individually improve and what improvements they wanted to see in the community. Lastly, I asked participants to give one word or phrase that positively described the organizational community. (For the complete interview guide, see Appendix E)

The individual interview responses, then, allowed me to analyze the processes of resilience and how organizational members narratively depict the past and current challenges of the organizational community to generate a holistic picture of the processes of resilience. Stories of success were a way to understand and analyze the organizational strengths and as a first step in crafting narratives of resilience. "Collecting stories of community successes and analyzing the reasons for success" (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003, p. 477) is one of the first steps to an asset-based community development (ABCD) approach. Mathie & Cunningham (2003) extend the argument for the approach highlighting how interviews and storytelling focus on peak experiences and successes of the past to draw out positive memories and construct a "collective analysis of the elements of success" (p. 478). These stories become a reference point for community building and action (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). Interestingly enough, without my prompting, the stories of success always began with a challenge that participants overcame that lead to the success. Most of the stories of overcoming challenges ended in

48

what participants perceived as a "successful" outcome, with the exception of some ongoing, unresolved challenges. Combined the two parts of the interviews provided me multiple data points for analysis.

Data Analysis

For the purposes of the ensuing analysis, I focused on analyzing the interview data. After reading through field notes from participant observations, I realized that its value primarily lied in gaining the required trust for interviews and contextualizing conversations in the interviews. For the analysis of my interview data, then, I used an iterative, constant comparative approach to look for emerging themes in the interview data (Charmaz, 2011, 2014; Tracy, 2013). The constant comparative method is a "circular, iterative, and reflexive" approach (Tracy, 2013, p. 190) making it particularly applicable when analyzing participants' descriptions and connections of the concepts of resilience and well-being. I analyzed how these concepts unfolded in language and the communication processes within the organization to understand how these concepts interacted with one another and what these concepts looked like enacted as lived.

Data immersion.

To analyze the interview responses for RQ1, I used previous scholarly conceptualizations of resilience and well-being as sensitizing concepts to frame the data (Charmaz, Denzin, & Lincoln, 2003, Tracy, 2013) while employing an "inductive and emic" approach to the data to allow meanings to emerge from the field (Tracy, 2013) to understand the ways in which educators construct and enact resilience.

First, I fact-checked and cleaned the interviews by listening to each of the interviews while reading through the transcribed interviews. There were a few places where I was able to clarify what the participant was saying when the transcriber listed it as "crosstalk" or "inaudible." This process also provided the opportunity to begin immersing myself in the data and ask: "What is happening here?" or "What is a story here?" (Creswell, 2007; Tracy, 2013; Weick, 2001). I saved all the revised transcripts as both word and PDF documents and uploaded the documents to Nvivo qualitative data analysis software. I used Nvivo to organize my data and do several rounds of coding while also using manual approaches to analysis.

Open-coding and primary cycle coding.

I further immersed myself in the data by doing a round of "open coding," or going through a process to "open up meaning in the data" (Tracy, 2013, p. 189). This process led to my decision to create coding categories, which were essentially based off of the initial interview questions. For example, "Resilience" was a node (what Nvivo calls codes) with two sub-nodes: "description" to include participants' definitions and descriptions of resilience (e.g. "I think it's that grit. That you just don't quit") and "action" to include the ways in which participants described what they actively did to contribute to their resilience at work (e.g., "I came in before school to make copies and plan"). Using the coding categories, I then moved to primary cycle coding, which refers to initial coding activities, or an "examination of the data and assigning words or phrases that capture their essence" (Tracy, 2013, p. 189). This process consisted of reading through each interview, assigning the data a coding category, and writing analytic

50

memos, or annotations that articulated my interpretations of the data (Tracy, 2013) in Nvivo. The coding categories were not mutually exclusive and at times data could be assigned more than one coding category.

During primary-cycle coding, then, I coded for (1) definitions and descriptions of resilience and well-being, (2) any connection participants saw between the two concepts, (3) ways they thought resilience and well-being could be enhanced, (4) the best parts and constraints of the organizational community, (5) community strengths and improvement, (6) individual strengths and improvement, (7) descriptions of community, (8) how to build community, (9) experiences in PLCs, and (10) one word or phrase to positively describe the organization. (For a list of first round coding categories see Appendix F).

Additionally, I created coding categories/nodes for stories of overcoming challenges and stories of success, each with a sub-node "learn" to code participant responses where I specifically asked them what they learned from the experience. Although some participants discussed what they learned throughout the telling of their stories, I always asked them what they learned to specifically elicit that response and see what they chose to focus in on and/or reiterated.

Secondary cycle coding and theming the data.

I then downloaded from Nvivo each of the nodes and sub-nodes as word documents and began analyzing each of these coding categories looking for emerging themes. "A theme is an extended phrase or sentence that identifies what a unit of data is about and/or what it means" and can consist of "descriptions of behavior within a culture" or "morals from participant stories" (Saldaña, 2016, p. 199). While reading the

51

data in each of the coding categories/nodes and sub-nodes, I took notes on the following: (1) potential themes, (2) connections to scholarly literature, and (3) notes with quotes evidencing what I was finding. This resulted in the following two umbrella coding categories: descriptions of resilience (i.e. resilience, description) and enactment of resilience (i.e. resilience, action).

I conducted a thematic analysis, which is argued to have three principals originally established by Opler (1945) and re-articulated by Ryan & Bernard, 2003: (1) themes are only visible (and thus discoverable) through the manifestation of expressions of data (2) some expressions of a theme are obvious and culturally agreed on, while others are subtler, symbolic, and even idiosyncratic, and (3) the importance of any theme is how often it appears, how pervasive it is across cultural ideas and practices, how often people react when a theme is violated, and the degree to which it is controlled by context. In conducting a thematic analysis, I looked for overlap in how organizational members were individually and collectively conceptualizing and describing resilience and well-being to identify spaces of co-created meaning. Additionally, I examined the ways in which they were describing the enactment of resilience. The analysis of the two umbrella nodes resulted in 10 single-spaced pages of notes (for an example of my coding notes see Appendix J). At this point, I determined I needed to do a loose analysis outline (Tracy, 2013, p. 198) by outlining issues motivating my study, the purpose, guiding questions motivating my analysis, and potential themes that emerged in coding that might answer these questions (Tracy, 2013).

As illustrated in my loose analysis outline (See Appendix H), I initially had 8 emerging themes of resilience descriptions/definitions (e.g. "bigger purpose," experience) and 10 emerging themes of enacting resilience. (e.g. intentionally created, mindset, "talking through"). I then coded the ways to enhance or "contributors" to resilience, well-being descriptions, enactment of well-being, and connections between resilience and well-being using the same iterative process while also keeping in mind the emerging themes. Overall, this resulted in 36 single-spaced pages of typed notes for these 8 coding categories.

I then completed the "focusing the data analysis" activity (Tracy, 2013, p. 193) to re-acquaint myself with the literature in connection to my emerging themes, my intended audience, how I might make theoretical or other contributions, and re-considered my research questions, all with the goal of "winnow[ing] down the number of themes to explore" and "to develop an overarching theme from the data corpus, or an integrative theme that weaves various themes together into a coherent narrative" (Saldaña, 2016, p. 199). After synthesizing my findings from the above data analysis procedures, I wrote out my emerging contributions, which extended the communication theory of resilience and extending scholarship on resilience through an empirical investigation of a particular organizational context.

I then took the opportunity to analyze the remaining coding categories, which referred to how organizational members described the best parts of the organization, the constraints, individual and communal strengths, and the experiences in PLCs, to look for overlap and gain insight into the first steps of the ABCD approach. In doing the loose

analysis outline and focusing the data analysis activities I determined that the most theoretically significant interview questions focused on the descriptions and enactment of resilience and well-being.

Extending the thematic analysis to resilience stories.

Next, I created a clean version of stories of overcoming challenges and success. I extracted the stories and separated stories in cases where participants told more than one story. This process led to the extraction of 34 stories of overcoming challenges over 36 ½ single-spaced pages and 33 stories of success over 25 ½ single-spaced pages. I used a dashed line to indicate where participants were asked what they learned from the experience. Moreover, I did not extract stories participants told throughout the interviews in response to other questions but rather only the stories they told after being specifically prompted.

I conducted a thematic analysis of stories of overcoming challenge and stories of success using the transcribed interviews to further explore RQ1. Tracy (2013) argues that stories construct and shape our experience and therefore provide "a window for understanding how others interpret a certain situation and create a reality that they, in turn, act upon" (p. 29). I used the communicative processes of resilience as the theoretical framework and the emerging themes from the definitions, descriptions, and connections of resilience and well-being. I started by reading a printed version of the stories and handwrote notes while reading. I then used a similar process as I did with the above coding categories/nodes where I typed notes indicating (1) potential themes, (2) connections to scholarly literature, and (3) notes with evidence from the data. In addition,

I used some guiding questions such as (1) what were the main themes, (2) who were the main characters, (3) what were the turning points, (4) what actions and turning points inform resilience, and (5) what are the morals participants took from the story, all with the goal of understanding how organizational members construct and enact resilience within the organizational context. Through the analysis I identified and analyzed themes related to how organizational members were constructing and enacting resilience and how the stories of success were shaped by actions of overcoming adversity.

Throughout my analysis, I consistently went back into the literature to identify and understand the themes that were emerging, what connections there were to existing literature, and what contributions I was finding. I also found connections to other scholarly literature, such as sensemaking, flow, and implicit person theory, and briefly read through scholarship on these theories and concepts to aid in understanding what was going on in my data.

After several iterations of coding and analysis, I condensed my themes to five overarching themes that described the communicative processes of resilience, or the ways in which resilience was constructed and enacted in the organizational setting, each incorporating sub-themes. This is what created the overall backbone of my findings section that suggests resilience is (1) socially constructed, (2) contextual, (3) interactional, (4) reciprocal, and (5) attributed to a positive and growth mindset. Educator stories also provided an opportunity to identify and construct exemplars, or multi-faceted examples, and constructed vignettes, or a striking example that is purposefully made to be representative of the stories of success (Tracy, 2013). Prompting respondents to

55

positively describe their organizational community in one word or phrase created a word map, or visual display, for the organization.

Chapter Four:

FINDINGS

The communication theory of resilience is different from other views of resilience by "focusing on ongoing communicative processes of adaptation and transformation, reactivity and proactivity, stability and change, disruption and reintegration, destabilization and restabilization" (Buzzanell, 2018, p. 99). This theory shifts resilience from a focus on individual traits, something someone does, or individual processes of learning and growth to an ongoing communicative process that is situated in interaction and relationships and enacted in socially constructed contexts (Buzzanell, 2018). Empirical studies exploring resilience in organizational contexts, however, are limited and current literature from a communication perspective focuses on job loss and career resilience rather than the ways in which organizational members are constructing and enacting resilience within organizational contexts. I extend the argument that resilience is a socially constructed process through an analysis of lived experiences and stories of teachers, administrators, counselors, and support staff at a public high school.

The findings from this study show that organizational resilience, as lived, is a socially constructed, collective process that is contextual, interactional, and reciprocal. Additionally, resilience is perceived to be enacted through an intentionally created (i.e. decision or choice) positive and growth mindset. Results of my iterative analysis of interview data and participant stories suggest that resilience in this organizational context is:

(1) socially constructed as both an individual and collective process through past and present experiences, specifically informing the ways in which organizational members perceive challenges and opportunities for action,

(2) contextual in that most challenges are perceived as a positive part of organizational processes,

(3) interactional in that it is constructed and enacted collaboratively through social processes,

(4) reciprocal in that working through challenges leads to experience, confidence, and building a repertoire of skills that becomes a shared experience with educators newly confronting organizational challenges and is further reciprocated to students, and

(5) perceived to be enacted in part due to intentionally creating a positive and growth mindset.

Participants' stories of success extended many of these themes, specifically highlighting how resilience was reciprocated to students. For example, educators talked about creating opportunities for and supporting students through challenges, with the goal of shifting students' perceptions of challenges and expanding their repertoire of perceived opportunities for action. It is important to note that in stories of overcoming challenges, participants referenced their own individual skills and traits when searching for their "moral of the story" of overcoming challenge. The created "moral" of some participant stories reiterates dominant discourses of resilience that focus on individual traits, skills, and growth.

In what follows I present empirical evidence for each of the overarching themes and sub-themes. Essential to my findings is that resilience is an ongoing process and, therefore, these themes are not mutually exclusive as evidenced in participants' lived experiences and accounts. What's more is four of my findings are especially novel contributions to resilience literature and/or are specific to the organizational context. My study shows (1) resilience as thriving where resilience is constructed and enacted as a positive part of organizational processes, (2) resilience in this context is constructed and enacted as part of a "bigger purpose" to students, (3) resilience is reciprocal as a shared process between educators and is further reciprocated to students, and (4) resilience is, in part, perceived to be enacted through a positive and growth mindset and connected to participants' well-being. Furthermore, this study extends the communication theory of resilience by providing one of the few empirical examinations of resilience, communication, and organizing in the field of human communication. In what follows, I focus primarily on synthesizing my participants' descriptions and stories in their own words as evidence for each of the themes. In chapter five, I explicitly connect these findings to several literatures to establish the overall theoretical implications.

Resilience as a Socially Constructed Process

Through my analysis, evidence shows that the ways in which organizational members make sense of resilience, or the ways in which organizational members perceive challenges, impact the ways in which they see themselves and others enacting resilience, or the ways in which they perceive opportunities for action when working through challenges. The ways in which organizational members enact resilience within

59

this particular organizational context relies on retrospective experiences both in and out of the organizational context. An educator in an administrative role constructs resilience through his experience of being "an underdog" his entire life:

> I think it's just again, that grit. That you don't quit. I've been an underdog my entire life. People have told me that I can't do something more often than I can ever count. But everything people said I couldn't accomplish, I accomplished it. (Ricky)

This participant further describes resilience through retrospective sensemaking by revealing various life challenges, such as working through the loss of identity after no longer being able to play college baseball, the suicides of more than one close friend, and almost failing out of college. These experiences shaped how he generally perceives challenges in the present, as noted in saying, "Any of those people in your life and any of those things you've overcome, would they want you to crumble? That's kind of how I see it is, you keep bouncing back" (Ricky).

For this educator, he made sense of his past experiences by positioning himself as an "underdog" and uses the people in his life who supported him through various challenges as a catalyst for working through current challenges. He specifically discusses how he makes sense of resilience in the organizational context through the retrospective accounts of past challenges. He creates a context where current challenges will never be as difficult as past challenges. He says things like, "there's never a day that goes by I don't think about those friends I lost" and "you start to realize…the sun's going to come up tomorrow" and "there is nothing that's so earth shattering you can't keep going." He

further discusses being "the best version" of himself and a mindset of continuing to "improve on that each and every day" illustrating his ability to perceive challenges positively through growth and a "commitment to becoming better at what you do and who you are."

Organizational members rely on retrospective accounts of past experiences to give meaning to challenges and the ways in which organizational challenges are perceived. One educator describes his experience with getting his master's degree and coaching football. He uses those experiences to work through challenges in the classroom:

> Well, sports and teaching are almost the same thing. There's no difference between a locker room and the classroom, or I would say the locker room and dealing with staff, it's the same thing. It's a melting pot. I always use football as a way to get me through anything. I mean, you always know that you got to learn to get along with everybody. At football, you got to work as one with the team, but ... No matter what sport I ever played, you always have to learn to work as a group. If you didn't work as a group, you had limited amount of success, so I know that with teaching it's the same thing. If you're not cohesive as a group, no matter what, you're not going to see success. That's what I usually do. I just use sports, you know the team motto. (Carlos)

This participant derives meaning from his experience in participating and coaching sports. His retrospective account of these experiences to describe resilience, such as "you got to work as one with the team" and "team motto," influences the ways in which he presently constructs and enacts resilience in the organizational setting. He specifically

discusses the influence on how he enacts resilience when challenges arise in the classroom or with other colleagues. In other words, how organizational members perceive an organizational challenge and how they will act, or how they perceive their opportunities for action, is rooted in retrospective sensemaking.

In this particular organizational context, then, evidence shows that resilience is socially constructed through retrospective sensemaking and participants perceive current challenges through past experiences of enacting resilience. Participants were specifically asked to describe or define resilience and discuss what they did to contribute to their resilience within the organization. Many participants started their descriptions with buzz words like "grit," "determination," "bouncing back," "not giving up," etc. Sometimes they would look to me for help by saying things like "is that what you mean?" or "is that what you are looking for" in which case I would say "tell me how you define or describe resilience in your own words for yourself, what is resilience to you or what does resilience look like to you."

Many participants would then begin to draw on their own experiences to describe resilience, saying things like "for me personally, I think I've developed resilience through…" and then talk about their experience or "well, not giving up…" and then go on to describe a time they saw themselves "not giving up." One participant, although articulate in his description, seemed to be searching through his experiences to construct meaning for "resilience." In this part of the interview there were a lot of pauses in his speech and he was looking down at the floor searching for meaning. He began describing resilience as follows:

So, resiliency to me is not everything goes your way, or goes the way you

planned. And the ability to perhaps, maybe adapt or change your plans so that it

works, or sometimes, you've got to go with the belief that your plan is good, it

just hasn't worked out long enough. So, sometimes you have to continue that fight

because you believe in that. But in other times, you have to step back and see

what perhaps is wrong with your plan, and make those adjustments, and fluctuate

in that regard. I think you base it upon result. (Trent)

As the participant continued he began to make sense of resilience based on his

experiences with coaching. I could visibly see the shift when the participant connected

resilience to his own experience with coaching in that the participant made eye contact

with me and his speech flowed. Something clicked for the participant as he drew

retrospectively on his experiences as a coach and the turning point in his speech, as

illustrated in the next excerpt, comes after "coaching:"

If your result is where you need it, then perhaps your plan is working, but if it's

not, so if I'm looking on a teacher experience…coaching it's really easy because

your outcome is pretty much shown. During the game you play, you can see that,

perhaps you need to re-evaluate, or re-teach when you look at tests. It could be

based on assessments and so forth. And sometimes, you just base upon, "Did I do

a good enough job as far as instructing or modeling this, or giving the kids the

opportunity to acquire the skill?" And then sometimes it's just the mastery of the

skill, and so forth. I always refer more as a coach, because I'm more associated

with that, or maybe I do a better job on that, but just evaluating and also hearing

feedback from players. Coaches will say, "Hey, this is where we're deficient. This is where we need to acquire, and this is where we need to just go ahead and develop skill." So, that happens. To me, as far as at practice, it happens daily. So, after practice, we always reevaluate, and say, "Hey, what do we need to get better at, tomorrow?" (Trent)

Participants drew on various past experiences both in and out of the organization as a way to describe and define resilience, such as getting a higher degree, being a single parent, working through challenges with difficult students, classes, and colleagues, negotiating collaboration, working through challenges with turnover, and more. Although the communication theory of resilience argues that resilience is socially constructed, empirical evidence is drawn from studies with families dealing with loss and disruption, resilience in the face of disaster, and during job loss.

Further, my findings demonstrate that educators socially construct the processes of resilience using retrospective sensemaking which in turn impacts the ways in which they perceive challenges and opportunities for action. In other words, organizational members will bring these social constructions to the context of the organization and the interactional processes of constructing and enacting resilience within the organization. Additionally, organizational members perceive challenges positively for the most part making the experiences they draw on, or what they choose to pay attention to, particularly interesting and likely something that will differ based on the context. Next, I discuss how resilience is constructed and enacted within this particular organizational context.

Resilience is a Process that is Contextual: Resilience as Thriving and a "Bigger Purpose"

Participants describe working through, in, and around challenges as a way to contribute to individual and organizational goals – essentially a "bigger purpose" that educators feel they have to their students. In this particular context, participants discuss the desire to have the opportunity to be confronted with challenges that they then have to work through, increasing their confidence and feelings of being an active contributor to their own goals and that of the larger organizational community. The fact that participants in this study often were found to perceive challenges positively contrasts to the ways in which challenges are typically discussed in resilience literature – as something with a negative connotation that must be overcome where thriving is an outcome.

In order to work through challenges and thrive within an organizational setting, organizational members often welcomed and desired challenge. One participant discusses resilience in saying:

> I also like a challenge, and to be challenged and then to succeed, or to see that things have been working with some of the changes or some of the things that I was involved with makes me feel more useful, I think. So, resilience is a good thing. Having challenge, like me being challenged and sticking around and getting through it. And teaching is hard sometimes. Not necessarily the teaching itself, but the personalities and the different situations that we have to deal with every day (Chin).

In this case, thriving is part of resilience rather than a result of having gone through the process of resilience. Resilience is constructed positively through continually being presented with challenges and being able to work through, in, and around those challenges, or in other words through enacting resilience. This quote supports the notion that thriving is working through challenges. The participant further discusses being able to succeed and feeling useful as part of this process, while other participants talk about "confidence," "strengths," "skills," and "experience" as evidenced in the following excerpt:

> I mean the more comfortable and confident you are, and the more you feel supportive and healthy and healthy mentally and that you are able to take on new challenges. Or if something comes up that's a difficult situation that you're able to get through that because you feel good about what you're doing at your workplace. (Samuel)

This participant echoes others in citing working through challenges as something that is connected to well-being and a feeling of confidence, in turn making it easier to work through challenges or "difficult situations[s]" demonstrating its cyclical relation to organizational well-being and thriving.

As a result of working through a number of challenges that were derived from the removal of an administrator the year prior, one of the new administrators uses words like "opportunity," to describe the challenges he encountered starting out. He says:

> I think having an opportunity to connect with the district office, that it's not just an extension that you call. Really having solid face time with people down there

so they know who you are and they know what type of leader you are because our

district office is very supportive, but they have to know you're making decisions

that are in the best interest of the school, the kids, the teachers, the district. (Kirk)

He goes on to retrospectively draw on his coaching experiences in positively constructing

challenges. He discusses things like "valuable," "human element," and "opportunity" to

further construct the process of enacting resilience:

I think as we approach people, we know certain ways to approach some that we

would not approach others. I used the same mentality when I was coaching kids. I

could speak to this kid this way and he would respond, and if I used that same

idea with this other kid, they would have quit the team. I look at that same

approach when I'm dealing with kids, discipline, parents, teachers, and the district

office as well. So valuable for me is, I mean, it goes back to the human element.

Professionalism of course and being put together and being organized and doing

your job is basic, but then your approach to trying to do your job is important. So,

that reconfirms that. It [the challenges he faced coming in as a new administrator]

was a good opportunity for me to connect at the time with the district. Which I

think will help and has helped in a number of situations here. (Kirk)

One participant describes going through various challenges as a female athletic

trainer working in male-dominated sports. She perceived her biggest challenge to be

when she shifted careers to teaching sports medicine classes and discusses her experience

with working through challenges related to "learning to be a teacher." She discusses how

she is continually seeking out challenges perceiving them positively as an opportunity.

She views resilience as a process of learning and growth and eventually enacts resilience interactionally through seeking out social support:

I mean for me a huge challenge was learning to be a teacher. Like coming out of nowhere, my whole background is athletic training, sports med, never taught, never even contemplated being in a classroom. They [the school administrators] are like hey you want to do this…it's like being thrown into a room, no curriculum to start with, no nothing. …For me I'm learning to be a different person but still myself…I'm still learning constantly everyday different things to change, to do, and to be a better teacher… I don't think anything, as long as you take it and learn from it, and you adapt just for what it was, it's never a failure, it's just another learning experience. That's the same with any challenge, you have to take something away from it, adapt to it and keep going, I'm still constantly learning. Like I said taking more classes, reading articles things like that and bringing it in, talking to people. I'd say that's how I've adapted and adjusted and I have done that through a lot of different things. (Lizzie)

She perceives challenges as something positive that results in a learning experience that contributes to her goal of "learning to be a teacher." This participant discusses how she is continually pushing herself to take on new challenges and learn new things. She reiterates that working through challenges is part of that process of learning and growth, part of which contribute to both individual and community goals of learning to be a better teacher.

Another participant uses the metaphor of a "puzzle," to convey that challenges are a "fun" activity:

No silver bullet to fix whatever problem, but I am certainly always trying something different. Always trying something new. And it's a challenge. It really is. But it's kinda fun too. It's almost like a puzzle. And when something even works just a little bit, you feel super successful and satisfied" (Olivia)

This participant perceives challenges positively as a way to contribute to individual and organizational goals resulting in a feeling of "success" and "satisfaction." The metaphor of a puzzle further allows the participant to perceive challenges as a process of learning and growth that is "fun."

Participants also describe resilience in connection to well-being through the ability to work through challenges and challenging oneself, "For example, I think that if you give up, that would be negative for your well-being, because if you don't push through, and if you don't challenge yourself, and you don't accept that, then your well-being is affected" (Akshara). Working through challenges leads to participants feeling a sense of accomplishment which is linked to their well-being and part of the process of resilience. Another participant says:

I'm also going to take like the biology test because I would love to be able to teach anatomy and physiology and I can do it for dual enrollment. That's where I'm finding things so I don't get bored, and then want to go do something else because I need a new challenge. For me that's the thing, not getting stressed out, finding stuff but keeping myself challenged as well. (Lizzie)

69

In their descriptions of resilience, educators talked about positively perceiving challenges and their work toward meeting challenges. That said, challenges that are perceived to be out of the control of educators are often perceived negatively, such as time and pay, yet educators seem to focus on what they can control.

Participants say things like, "the negatives come a lot more than the positives do, if you don't understand your purpose and understand why you got into it…then you're not going to last" (Ricky) or "resilience is the ability to maintain focus and maintain a sense of joy in the work you're doing and a sense of satisfaction in spite of all those things that go wrong" (Elijio). Another participant says:

> I mean, the pushing through the education side, because I'd be lying to say there wasn't a point where I was teaching and coaching with a master's degree and yet I was still digging ditches on the weekend to make ends meet. I mean I applied at Costco and those places…I think knowing the goal of wanting to be an administrator to better support my family, and it's not just about the money because if you're doing it for the money for administration that is crazy talk. (Kirk)

This participant focuses on his "goal" rather than focusing on the money or needing to get a second or third job. Participants see the process of resilience as something that contributes to their well-being and thriving allowing them to perceive challenges as something that is part of this positive process or as an opportunity of learning, growth, and working towards goals. This perception, in turn, prompts participants to focus in on some challenges rather than others.

Even in cases where the challenge is seen as something out of the control of participants, then, they reflect back on their "goal[s]" and their ability to contribute to individual and organizational goals as part of the process of working through challenges. In some cases, enacting resilience is letting go of the challenges perceived to be out of the participants' control. Part of resilience, then, is recognizing the type of challenge and whether or not it is something the organizational member wants to take on, all while keeping in mind individual and community goals, and what I have identified as the "bigger purpose" discussed next.

"Bigger purpose:" A commitment to students.

This study suggests that resilience is closely connected to organizational members identifying with and focusing on a "bigger purpose,"—which in this case is a common goal of doing what is best for students. The "bigger purpose" was an integral part of what contributed to organizational members' positive perceptions of challenges and their willingness to work through challenges. The "bigger purpose" is a commitment to students situating organizational challenges in the context of a "calling," or when people believe their lives and work to be inseparable given they are working for fulfillment rather than career advancement or financial gain (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997). This "bigger purpose" contributes to organizational members' enactment of resilience – or the ability to "push through."

In participants' descriptions of resilience, and the ways in which they enacted resilience, they describe a commitment to students. Students become their springboard for action giving them a reason to work through challenges. Counselors, teachers, and

71

administrators all discussed their commitment to students, saying things like, "Working with the kids are rewarding, so that's helpful for me, talking to the kids most of the time" (Victoria), "I've been in this profession so long because I like it. If you don't like 14 to 18-year-old kids, don't be a high school teacher" (Tyler), and "How did I overcome it? My focus was I need to be there for my students, and that's what I focused on… I focused on and my students. I was there for them." (Mia).

Many times, participants would discuss this "bigger purpose" in response to how they enacted resilience – what they did to contribute to their ability to be resilient in the organizational context. The "bigger purpose" became the vehicle by which resilience was enacted and motivated the drive forward through challenges. One participant says:

> You are really either extremely committed to kids and extremely committed to the purpose, and you got to have a purpose…you truly have to have a purpose in education…If you don't, then it's going to be hard to keep fighting through those battles because there are a lot of them…and have that intestinal fortitude to keep battling through those things, or you're not going to last. (Ricky)

The "bigger purpose" further highlights how educators place some challenges out of focus while choosing to work through others.

Participants view their job as "making a difference" which contributes to a "bigger purpose" that allows them to "push forward." In turn, being resilient contributes to well-being and that ability to "make a difference" as illustrated below:

Well, I think that when you're resilient and you're continuing to push forward, and seeing success, that helps with your well-being of understanding because I was resilient, because I kept moving forward that I was able to make a difference. Being able to keep moving forward helps you to be able to see ... It builds that well-being in, well, what I'm doing is making a difference. It's making me a better person. (Brooklyn)

This participant reiterates how working through challenges is rooted in something "bigger" – things like "making a difference" and being a "better person." She highlights how working through challenges is in the context of a "calling" and the ability to make a difference with students.

The "bigger purpose" was also cited as something participants learned in working through challenges. Working through challenges became a space of re-commitment to the "bigger purpose" and reified why they chose education, why education was, in fact, a "calling." Additionally, educators would seek out positive situations and support to gain "perspective" on the daily challenges:

I think here at work I always try to make sure that I seek out kids doing good things. I run into situation where I'll get kids coming in with drugs. We took weapons off kids this year. On days like that I always try to make sure I go watch practices. I always try to make sure I go into classrooms where kids are doing amazing things. That kind of helps balance that a little bit, so I don't start feeling like every kid sucks. You know? A parent yells at me, I go talk to another adult so I don't start thinking every parent sucks. I just try to keep some balance and I

keep some perspective. I don't take myself very seriously, but I take this job very seriously. As long as I keep that balance and keep understanding that what we're doing here, it means something. It's not just a job, it's not just a career, it's a lifestyle. I mean, it's a vocation. I truly feel like I had a calling to become an educator. (Kirk)

Education is a "calling" and resilience is enacted through a "bigger purpose" to students. Additionally, this participant is able to intentionally maintain "perspective" by focusing on and seeking out positive situations, while being mindful of "what we're doing here," or the "bigger purpose." Essentially, he is able to "keep that balance."

Part of resilience, then, is built through relationships with students and continuing to be mindful of those relationships to give educators a "sense of purpose" as evidenced below:

I had a greater understanding ... I started looking more at my sense of purpose, why am I here, and a greater understanding that especially in the world of teaching or in a job where you're doing service. You can't do it for anybody else… You cannot ever step in to a job or a role for accolades or for people to tell you that you're doing a good job, and that you just have to know and be far more reflective on conversations that you have with kids, relationships that you have with them, and who comes and talks to you after they graduate, that kind of stuff. (Gloria)

Interestingly, here this participant says, "you can't do it for anybody else" yet she talks about how she has a "sense of purpose" and does it (her job) for the relationships she

builds with her students even mentioning how much those relationships mean to her. The "bigger purpose" to students exists outside of simply doing something for someone else or even for extrinsic rewards, such as "accolades," but rather it is an intrinsically motivated purpose.

Some participants spoke ambiguously about the "bigger purpose" by saying things like "bigger picture" or "why I'm doing it" (working as an educator). Participants exemplified this in saying, "…and keeping in the back of my mind that this is a job that I have to do and why I'm doing it" (Brooklyn) and "What's your ultimate goal. You have to keep the big picture in mind" (Roman). As illustrated below this "purpose" gives one participant the momentum to "fight through anything:"

> First and foremost you got to understand why you're doing it…I think that that sense of well-being and that balance and things helps with that resilience because, again if you know who you are, and you know what your purpose is and you have that purpose, and you take all those things, all those experiences in life and build them into that machine that's going to accomplish that purpose, you can fight through anything. (Ricky)

Some of the preceding excerpts do not identify students as their "bigger purpose" but rather participants talk generally about a purpose that drives them through. Working through, in, and around challenges are perceived as a way to fulfill this "bigger purpose" contributing to participants' perception that challenges are a positive part of the organizational processes and something that leads to balance and well-being.

The "bigger purpose" is further shaped by a core belief in what educators are doing and why they are doing it, spilling over into who participants see themselves as in their roles as teachers and coaches. The "bigger purpose" becomes enmeshed in participants' identities and core values as illustrated below:

I believe you have to believe what you believe in. You have to know what your core values are, whether as a teacher or as a coach. But, those core values come to your well-being. It's who you are as an individual, and what made up that and whether it's your family background, or religious background, or who you coach with, or so forth, like that, you have to have a core belief in what you're doing is right. And at the end of the day, if you have that, with that well-being, that'll keep you resilient in staying the course, and finishing. (Trent)

What we see in the above excerpts, then, is the point that the "bigger purpose," whether discussed ambiguously or specifically, becomes the means by which participants work through challenges that arise at work. In a way, the "bigger purpose" becomes who they are in that they live the values they believe in through their work – essentially live their purpose.

This "bigger purpose" to students even becomes a reason to work through challenges with students. One participant in an administrative role says:

Our resiliency with our teachers is tough because they'll try and try and try and try and constantly try to work with a kid, and sometimes you're going to make gains and sometimes you're not, and for them, for all our teachers to understand you're working against certain elements that you might not know about and to not

76

take things personal. I mean, you have those big success stories, which helps to

motivate our teachers, like, "I made a difference today." (Kirk)

This participant, again, highlights the ability for educators to focus on what they can

control rather than what they cannot control. He specifically places focus on the positive,

or the "big success stories" rather than the students who are difficult, further using the

success stories as a way to work through challenges with a more demanding student.

For administrators, or those in a leadership role, the "bigger purpose" also comes

from the ability to support teachers as a way to create the best environment for students.

Administrators discuss having a commitment to both teachers and students, with the

overall "bigger purpose" still being driven by a commitment to doing what is best for

students. The "bigger purpose" is multilayered and, depending on the participants' role

within the organization, can include additional responsibilities to ensure the

organizational community is working towards that "bigger purpose."

One administrator discusses how he keeps in mind his goal of working in a

leadership role to support and shape teachers. This goal was what got him "through some

of those days:"

> So, working through some of those days, and that's the hard work of trying to get
>
> through what you need to get through until you have that opportunity to start
>
> working on leadership and helping to really shape and control and support
>
> teachers here. That piece for me, those kind of action steps was kind of a set goal
>
> for myself and wanting to work through it, and then the piece of for myself really
>
> trying to be reflective. (Kirk)

Related to the "bigger purpose," as illustrated in the previous excerpt, includes individual and community goal setting that is driven by a commitment to students. The individual goals and contributions may look different depending on the role of the participant within the organizational community. Working through challenges interactionally and collaboratively are cited by participants as ways to contribute to individual and community goals.

Students as a "bigger purpose," then, emerged as a primary finding in the data – in how organizational members described resilience, talked about enacting resilience, as the reason they worked through challenges, as what they learned from working through challenges, and in stories of success. One participant said, "Like teaching the kids and helping the kids that's where I see it. It's success, I'm a success" (Lizzie). Students are central to the processes of resilience in this particular context and become the catalyst for engaging in the interactional and reciprocal processes of resilience. The "bigger purpose" frames challenges within the context of a "calling." Framing challenges as part of a "bigger purpose" becomes a means for working through challenges and perceiving challenges positively so as to work collectively and collaboratively towards individual and community goals. Next, I will discuss how my findings support resilience as an interactional process.

Resilience is a Process that is Constructed and Enacted Interactionally

Participants' experiences of resilience are described as a continuous interactional process, a finding that further complicates individual focused definitions of resilience that center around individual traits, skills, and processes. In descriptions and stories of

resilience, participants name communicative activities, such as sharing ideas, talking through scenarios and challenges, venting, asking questions, and sharing stories. Resilience, then, is enacted interactionally with the shared goal of working through challenges collectively as a community. As part of the ongoing processes of resilience, participants also discuss social support and feeling valued as a source of enacting resilience interactionally.

As I illustrate below, participants reveal they interactionally work through challenges through (1) collaboration, which includes talking through scenarios/challenges and idea sharing, (2) venting leading to the view that challenges are "shared," (3) giving and receiving feedback prompting reflection, which creates flexibility and adaptability, and (4) social support from administration and colleagues.

Enacting resilience interactionally through collaboration, talking through scenarios/challenges, and idea sharing.

Participants discuss resilience as the ability to talk to their colleagues, share ideas, talk through scenarios and challenges, ask questions, and collaborate. One participant said, "We'll talk at work. I think it's great to have collaboration with the department. We have it really good here. So just having someone to bounce ideas off" (Olivia). Participants discuss a level of vulnerability that is experienced where they feel comfortable asking questions and talking through challenges as a shared experience.

One participant describes an interaction with her co-teacher as they work through a challenge, saying "I know with myself and my co-teacher, we kind of go back and forth and we're like, 'Okay, well, that didn't go really great so let's go back, we'll do this

79

again tomorrow and let's see what we can tweak over there.' So that is resilience within the classroom" (Mia). She further discusses the importance of "understanding of different teaching styles and ideas" in order to work through a "clashing of minds and still continuing to work with those people."

Participants also mention things like being provided a physical space and the time to work through challenges collaboratively. Participants cite things like "having a common place," the ability to collaborate with "colleagues to talk and share ideas," and "better connections and relationships" as contributing to resilience and their ability to enact resilience. One participant said, "it's easier to be resilient as a staff, rather than just individuals" (Bethany). Given that teachers talk about time as a constraint, they specifically identify having time designated to talking with and collaborating with others, whether that is formal or informal, as a source of resilience. Research on community resilience has highlighted collaboration and idea sharing as a means to fostering happiness and resilience in communities (Cloutier, 2015; Cloutier & Pfeiffer, 2015; Houston, Spialek, Cox, Greenwood, First, 2014; Kretzmann, 2010), and my research suggests that elements of these community findings also happen in paid organizational contexts.

One educator emphasizes the importance of building relationships and spending time together "away from the kids" (meaning students) as contributing to both resilience and well-being:

Within our department, our current department leader, she does a really good job, similar to what our administration does, making sure that we're taken care of, that

we have the days that we need, that we're covered if we need coverage. She puts together things like, for example, we eat in the same place. Everybody eats together and we all joke and get adult time away from kids. We kind of lock the doors and make sure that we're able to hang out with other adults. I think that's important too. I think it's really good currently. (Chin)

This educator draws on his ability to simply "talk" with other teachers in his department as something that contributes to resilience. They create a shared space where they can joke and have "adult time." Shared spaces create opportunities for teachers to interactionally enact resilience, even informally through just "talking." Additionally, relationship building is important in enacting resilience and occurs, in part, as a result of interactionally working through challenges.

Another educator solidifies the importance of talking with others and how it specifically relates to her well-being in saying, "I like talking to people. So honestly just having conversations with different people. That makes me happy. Finding out what you like to do or what they like to do, or if they're comfortable in the situation that they're in. That's what I like to do. I like to talk to people" (Autumn). Participants cite things like "feeling comfortable," "feeling appreciated," "bonding" and "connections" as things that contributed to their resilience individually and as a community. Another form of working through challenges interactionally is through venting, discussed next.

Enacting resilience interactionally through venting.

Talking through situations, which is sometimes in the form of venting, prompts a cycle of feedback and reflection. One participant discusses the interactional process as,

"vent[ing]" and "discuss[ing] situations that are new or never encountered, reflect[ing], how could I have done things differently?" Participants discuss how resilience is enacted interactionally through sharing ideas and talking through situations, while also being able to vent and "commiserate together." One participants says:

> At work, I owe a lot of my resilience to my department. We feed off of each other's positivity and comradery and we commiserate together and we talk about things that are maybe not going well in my classes and our successes as well" (Tyrone).

Venting becomes a way for teachers to talk through challenges and, in turn, that interaction builds comradery. Through this cycle of talking through challenges, sometimes in the form of venting, participants work through challenges and then share successes in that same collective space.

One participant actually becomes the space for organizational members to vent, saying:

> Because in the job that I have as a counselor I've got teachers upset with me, I've got students, not really upset with me, but teachers upset, students upset, parents upset. Not really at me, just upset at the situation, so understanding how to not take that so personal and just giving somebody a place to vent. (Brooklyn)

This educator becomes a sounding board to allow organizational members to be heard. In some cases, venting becomes a way for educators to talk about challenges in order to just let them go rather than as a way to work through them.

As one teacher reflects back on her first teaching job, she describes it as

"stressful" because she did not have the space to vent and talk through challenges. She says:

> Or even just vent to sometimes. My first teaching job, I did not have that. And I feel it was very stressful and having that here is huge. And even if they don't fix the problem, and they're not gonna fix the problem, but even if you have someone that's like "Aww...I encountered that same thing. Maybe try this, maybe try that." Having that support is super helpful. (Olivia)

Noteworthy, she discusses how the "problem" doesn't necessarily even need to be "fixed," or even that it won't be fixed, but places the importance on having a sense that challenges are shared, which allows teachers to frame challenges as communal. Educators, as discussed previously, place a focus on the "bigger purpose" rather than the negatives they cannot control.

Resilience is enacted interactionally through a shared sense of purpose and collectively viewing challenges. Moreover, given the common goal of the "bigger purpose," and the inability to have control over various challenges within the organizational context, participants need a space to "vent." In doing so, they recognize the challenge is a shared challenge, and collectively determine if they should move on or work through the challenge. One participant says:

> I don't worry about a lot of things that maybe other people do. At work I'd say it would be talking to your co-workers and realizing that the same problem that you have they have, too. So it's not you. It's like a shared bigger issue that maybe there's no solution" (Gloria)

This participant sees challenges as "shared issues" and as long as there is support, the ability to talk through issues, and camaraderie, organizational members can work through challenges collectively. In some cases, it is understanding that even if there is no solution "we share the same problem." Knowing that a challenge is shared with the community gives this participant the momentum to continue working towards the "bigger purpose" even if the immediate challenge does not have a "solution." Talking through challenges and venting lead to organizational members giving and receiving feedback and further prompting participants to engage in reflection.

Enacting resilience internationally through feedback and reflection

Working through challenges interactionally prompts individual and community reflection. In my findings, participants discuss flexibility and adaptability as an integral part of resilience. This happens as a result of participants working interactionally through the process of resilience by talking through challenges (or venting), giving and receiving feedback, and reflection.

Reflection, then, is a part of the resilience process by aiding organizational members' ability to make sense of what is working, what is not working, and then adapt, shift, and be flexible. Buzzanell (2018) argues that resilience is an ongoing process that includes "adaptation and transformation" positioning resilience in a series of dichotomies (p. 99). Although Buzzanell (2018) discusses adaptation and refocusing, she does not explicitly identify reflection as a key component in the process that leads to the ability to adapt and be flexible. According to the Collins dictionary, reflection is serious and careful consideration or thought leading to contemplation of the result of such thought,

84

idea, or conclusion. My participants cite various instances of reflection throughout their descriptions of resilience and within their stories of success and overcoming challenges.

Participants invoke reflection through statements like "Okay, this didn't go this well, what do we do over here" (Mia) and "resilience is the ability to continue doing what you believe is right in the face of setbacks" (Trent). Participants discuss how everything does not always go according to plan, especially in education, so having the ability to adapt and change plans based on feedback from students and other educators is crucial to resilience.

One participant, who stated above "resilience is the ability to continue doing what you believe is right in the face of setbacks" also discusses the importance of having an awareness of when to shift focus to a new plan. He says:

> You've got to go with the belief that your plan is good, it just hasn't worked out long enough. So, sometimes you have to continue to fight because you believe in that. But other times you have to step back and see what perhaps is wrong with your plan, and make those adjustments, fluctuate in that regard. (Trent).

Resilience, then, is sometimes staying the course and being patient while other times it is using the feedback and support to adapt to a new way of doing something. Resilience is talked about as the ability to shift, adapt, and be flexible, which is tied back to being committed to something "bigger," and educators having the belief in what they are committed to – in essence their "plan." When it gets tough, that "bigger purpose" is always in mind.

In teaching, so many things shift and change within a single day and educators are continually confronted with challenges. Given that educators are working with human beings who can be unpredictable, participants discuss the need to adjust to daily changes, "You never know what's going to happen, somebody comes in, something happens, you got to adjust what you're doing and go with it" (Lizzie). Another participant highlights reflection, flexibility, and adaptability in saying, "So, resiliency to me is not everything goes your way, or goes the way you planned. And the ability to perhaps, maybe adapt or change your plans." (Trent)

Participants discuss collaborating and talking through scenarios in connection with the ability to reflect, adapt, and be flexible, underscoring the interactional process of resilience. Adapting is a result of reflection that is prompted through working through challenges and in talking through challenges, both of which can be done interactionally. Giving and receiving feedback prompts reflection that in turn creates flexibility and adaptability among the organizational members, all of which is done through social support.

Enacting resilience interactionally through social support.

Participants discuss social support from leadership and co-workers as a source of resilience contributing to their ability to work through challenges. Feeling valued and socially supported contributed to participants' ability to enact resilience. Specifically, in relation to leadership, participants said things like, "procedures that make a better learning environment," "new leadership that is working together," leadership that is "highly motivated," and the ability to communicate with leadership through asking

86

questions or asking for help. Resilience, then, can occur interactionally with leadership through support from leadership in various forms.

Relatedly, participants discussed changes in leadership as a source of "hope" and "optimism." Consistent support from administration was a key interactional ingredient to resilience. Participants discuss the "backing of admin," "genuine conversations with leadership," and knowing that "admin has my back and the staff's back." One participant highlights leadership changes, support, and higher expectations as a source of his resilience and well-being, saying:

> I think I've changed in my work environment just because we've had changes in leadership. And so, I think that there's been some structural changes and some things that have helped me currently this year where, last year, it was I felt like I was out on an island and I was the only one trying to keep things kind of together in some ways that are in my area. And so, I think that it's kind of gotten better for me. Before that, it was okay. It was okay that I felt comfortable and felt supported, but now I feel like it's a little bit better just because there's more structure, I think. And I think that there's a good attitude towards the school and the community right now just because we're kind of in this new phase and learning a little bit more about where that's going to take us. (Samuel)

He goes on to discuss how changes in leadership have shifted the ability to work together and enact resilience interactionally as a community, as he illustrates below:

> Just more, you know, a higher expectation of behavior and by the students and more procedures in place to make sure that we have a better learning environment

for the students and more encouragement of ... I shouldn't say more

encouragement. I mean, last year was a difficult year because we really didn't

have much leadership. But more encouragement of working together with other

people and some new faces that are highly motivated and have good attitudes

towards the school and that it's going to be a great place to be and those types of

things. I think it's more like a feeling, like an attitude, that feeling and an

approach from the people at school is a little bit different. (Samuel)

He specifically cites a focus on consistency and higher expectations of behavior for both

staff and students as part of what contributes to their resilience. This participant illustrates

that support from leadership and his colleagues comes in various forms and are a source

of resilience for the entire organizational community. He also highlights the importance

of working together as a community, whether it is "consistency" with expectations,

"encouragement," or "a good attitude."

Enacting resilience interactionally was a source of re-building this organizational

community, some of which had been broken down through various challenges in past

years. One participant discussed the importance of "begin[ing] to rebuild a community in

which we can successfully work through challenges as a community" (Laticia). Another

participant illustrated building the organizational community in connection to well-being

and resilience, saying, "I think building community at the school and the well-being

within the department and within the school helps with the resiliency as well. I really do,

and I think that was part of a focus of common preps, common PLCs" (Kirk).

Many participants focus on the importance of community in providing social support as a way to work through challenges. Some participants cite their colleagues as providing the social support needed to work through those challenges. One participant describes her department in particular as the reason he was able to get through the challenges from the previous year:

> In terms of the work environment here, it's the colleagues I work with, at least at a departmental level, it's we don't have ... even when we were going through some strife at a school level, last year and then the previous couple of years. At a department level, we were able to maintain ... we work within ourselves, and so in our own little world, we feel appreciated, we're good friends where we work together really well, and so it maintains that healthy environment. (Tyrone)

This participant demonstrates how his department created a space to work through larger organizational challenges through social support. He mentions things like appreciation and creating a "healthy environment" within larger organizational strife as a way for him to work through the various organizational challenges he encountered in previous years.

One participant reiterates the importance of social support from colleagues describing a tough lesson. He further discusses how well-being contributes to the ability to enact resilience in the excerpt below:

> The well-being side, I mean, if people feel supported, feel cared for, feel accepted, when times get tough, being resilient is going to be much easier and it's not going to feel like, it's just not going to add up and it's just going to build up and be frustrating. That overall sense of well-being all around needs to be there so that

when things are frustrating and tough you know though I had a tough day in the classroom, I had a tough day with the lesson, but I could go back and I could actually have dialogue with people within my department that I could have a conversation with. (Kirk)

This participant sees social support as "feeling cared for" and "feeling accepted" while also reiterating the importance of being able to talk through challenges or "dialogue with people."

Clearly, encouragement and backing from superiors is a key part of resilience. Additionally, support from colleagues is a source of resilience for many in this organizational context. Participants cite feeling valued as part of what enables them to take on new challenges and then engage in the interactional processes of resilience with others, with one participant saying, "You have to feel valued. If you don't feel valued, you don't do well." (Ginger). Participants see working through challenges collaboratively as a way to navigate new experiences and explore possible directions. Here, resilience, then, is, in part, constructed and enacted as an interactional, collective process. The interactional process of talking through scenarios and giving and receiving feedback leads to reflection, adaptability, and flexibility. Through this interactional process, participants and the larger educational community, learn and grow both individually and collectively. Working through challenges collectively and collaboratively as part of an interactional process leads to organizational members gaining experience and building a repertoire of opportunities for action that is furthered shared between educators as part of the processes of resilience.

90

Resilience is a Process that is Reciprocal

Resilience is a reciprocal process in which working through challenges leads to experience, confidence, and a repertoire of opportunities for action that are shared between teachers. The reciprocity of resilience is further enacted interactionally with students where teachers provide opportunities, support, and a safe space for students to work through challenges with the goal of shifting student mindsets to positively perceive challenges and build a repertoire of opportunities for action when approaching future challenges.

In order to reciprocate resilience, educators discuss gaining "experience" from working through challenges that allows them to build a repertoire of opportunities for action that is shared, or reciprocated, between educators. An experienced teacher who has been in the field for over 20 years illustrates how gaining experience can be integral to enacting resilience. He says:

> For me personally, I've developed more resilience from just teaching for a long time and having been department chair before. A lot of the things that I experience, I've experienced before. So sometimes, the first time you encounter something and you've never dealt with it, that can sometimes cause things get out of whack because you're sort of, navigating those unchartered waters, so to speak. (Elijio)

Participants discuss how these experiences can be shared with others "less experienced" or newly confronting challenges. Within the interactional process, participants discuss things like "mentor less experienced," "partner up with someone who

is less experienced," and having "empathy for less experienced." Educators discuss developing relationships to "provide a sense of mentoring" and act in a "supportive" role.

One participant illuminates the reciprocity of resilience as a result of working through challenges and gaining "confidence." He says resilience is, "The confidence to accept new challenges and work through them collaboratively" (Samuel). He goes on to underscore the reciprocal process of resilience saying, "Having that strong community and support between people to work through those types of things and feel confident in your own abilities and the support that you will get through it together" (Samuel). Building confidence through working through challenges leads to experience and building a repertoire of opportunities for action that can then be shared with others. Sharing experience, or that repertoire of opportunities for action, is fundamental for creating a supportive environment where resilience thrives.

Talking through ideas and challenges with other teachers as part of the interactional processes of resilience contributed to one teacher's ability to work through challenges. She further cites her years of experience and having worked through similar challenges in the past as a contributing factor in what gives her the ability to shift her mindset to not take "certain things personally." Having experienced certain challenges in the past shifts her perception about similar challenges when they arise giving her the confidence to work through these challenges in the present.

> Yeah, I mean those kinds of things are good to have, you know if I have a good
> conversation with my co-teacher, or yeah, a lesson going well, those are all, you
> know, good things that will keep you going. But, I kind of feel like even if my

lesson doesn't go well or something, it's not going to hurt you for the rest of the

day. You know what I mean? I feel like I've been teaching a long time so I don't

take certain things personally. I can come in do my thing. (Laticia)

As seen here and throughout, the ongoing processes of resilience present a good amount

of overlap where parts of the process happen simultaneously. Talking through ideas is

interactional, while her built repertoire of opportunities for action prompt her to view the

challenge differently than if she was "inexperienced." Many times this experience, then,

is discussed as being shared with other teachers going through similar challenges as a

way to reciprocate resilience. This is where the interactional process is taken a step

further and that experience is shared, or in other words, resilience is reciprocated.

Participants discuss confidence and experience as integral to enacting resilience

and reciprocating resilience. Interaction with students also impacts resilience and well-

being. Specifically, educators discuss feeling confident in what they are teaching as a

way for them to work through challenges with students, especially when something is

new. In reflecting back on her experience as a first-year teacher and how her classes then

and now, impact her ability to "rebound," another participant says:

So I can say the way my classes go during the day 100% impact the way I feel at

the end of the day. And I think that's true for so many of us. Because you can just

walk down the hall and say hello and tell when a teacher's having a bad day. But

for me, for sure. And I think that kind of goes part back to the first-year teacher.

Because when I was a first-year teacher, they were either good days or they were

bad days. You were at home giddy and on fire or you were at home crying in

93

tears. And there wasn't a lot of middle ground. And then the next two years, I

found that middle ground where I could have a crap day but still rebound. And

this year has kind of taken me back to that either I'm giddy or I'm pissed off at

myself for not doing better or whatever. (Jaclyn)

This participant's experiences as a first-year teacher are particularly relevant given she is

now teaching advanced placement (AP) classes for the first time and feels like a "first-

year teacher" again. Prior to this, she discusses the importance of having someone to talk

to and vent to make sense of her experiences and the importance of sharing challenges

with "more experienced" teachers.

One participant turned to especially "positive" or "resilient," and "more

experienced" teachers, as a source of support as evidenced in the following excerpt:

The organization, for healthy well-being at the organization level, you have to

have resilient people. And part of that is finding them to begin with. The other

part is you need to have professionals, once you find them, you surround the

people who don't have it as well to be around them with the hope of ... one that

doesn't poison the one, but it can encourage the other where people who have

those natural innate ability to do that, you can get a different perspective on how

to do that. (Roman)

Although this participant describes resilience as "innate" in this example, throughout our

conversation, he also continually recognizes the ability to develop resilience through

interactional support, learning and growth. He exemplifies the reciprocity of resilience as

something that can be spread contagiously, like positivity. Resilience, then, can also be

94

reciprocated through simply enacting resilience and by seeing how others work through challenges, or being mentored by someone viewed as being particularly "resilient."

An exemplar of the reciprocal process follows. The story he tells highlights the value of an experienced teacher working through a particular challenge and being a source of support for a "less experienced" teacher:

I think the more you can partner up with somebody who's maybe, less experienced with somebody who's more experienced, provided that the more experienced person is helpful, then that can be a tremendous benefit. Because yeah, you're gonna come in frustrated, sometimes you just need to vent, sometimes it's a situation you've never encountered. And just to have a sounding board, say, "Hey, this is what happened. Here's what I tried. Could I have done things differently?" Or, "What do you think of what I did?" Or if you have no idea what to do, "Just tell me what I'm supposed to do." Sometimes, especially brand-new teachers, they have no idea how to handle certain situations. They just want somebody to come in and say, "Okay, here's what you do. You move this kid over here and you set up this policy." And that's what they need. They just need somebody that will kind of, help them navigate those new experiences and show them some possible directions that they can go. That goes a long way. And also, to have people that are kind of, overseeing the less experienced people to just be empathetic and understand that we were all there. We've all been there and we've all done that. And not to hit people over the head for making a rookie mistake. Because they're rookies. If you're a rookie, you're going to make a

mistake, you know? And just kind of, being supportive in that sense. Now

granted, the person may have done something that probably, wasn't the best

approach. But then you handle that tactfully and say, "Here's what you did. We

can't do that again, but here's what you can do next time." Kind of, show them a

better way of handling the situation. (Elijio)

As illustrated, resilience is enacted via talking through scenarios, venting, providing

feedback and support, and creating an opportunity for the "less experienced" person to

reframe the challenge. He specifically recommends mentoring and placing less

experienced teachers with more experienced teachers as a way to "help them navigate

those new experiences and show them some possible directions they can go." This

exemplar demonstrates the interactional and reciprocal processes of resilience as integral

to new and less experienced teachers' ability to work through challenges.

Experienced teachers may have a greater repertoire of opportunities for action

when working through challenges, however, the reciprocal process is not one-directional

from experienced teachers to new teachers. Educators are continually confronted with

new challenges whether that be a new lesson, course, method of teaching, or a

particularly challenging student or classroom management issue. Experience is contextual

and shared among networks of teachers. One participant reflects on her first-year of

teaching to discuss the importance of enacting resilience reciprocally with other teachers

new to the profession:

That was a difficult part, because it was a whole new ... I had no idea of anybody

that I started working with when I first moved out here. But I really made

96

connections with other new teachers in trying to kind of find other people that had

the similar background as me, so not necessarily family background, but I guess

that are around the same age. One of my closest friends, she is from Arizona, but

is about the same age. We kind of went through the same things at the same time.

Started teaching at the same time, so her struggles could've also been my

struggles, which really, I think made us closer as friends. (Bethany)

This particular experience was from a former school and this participant discusses the

difficulty in forming these supportive relationships at her current school. Her experience

demonstrates the importance of reciprocity at all levels and between all groups within the

organization. Additionally, the various excerpts highlight, again. how the process is

continuous and ongoing. Resilience enacted interactionally and reciprocally many times

occur together in the same exchange, or rather are occurring simultaneously.

Resilience is constructed as something that leads to confidence and experience

and this is done through social support and the ability to talk through ideas. One

participant says, "I think that [resilience] also comes from confidence, knowing your

content area, being able to work through problems, problem solve" (Isabella). Through

the interactional and reciprocal processes of resilience, organizational members were able

to get the support and confidence to move forward and continue to work through

organizational challenges. Working through those organizational challenges shifted their

perception of challenges and enhanced their perceived opportunities for action, which in

turn gave them more confidence and experience and a new way to engage in the

interactional process with other educators. One participant says:

97

If you've dealt with a situation before, then you come into that situation with a

certain amount of experience. Maybe it was good, maybe it was bad, maybe

you've tried some things that worked, or you've tried something that didn't work,

but all that contributed to how you're going to handle a situation in the future if

you're in a similar situation" (Elijio).

The ability to persevere and ask yourself "how do you come back after something

hard" coupled with the ability to work through the challenge and make adjustments

builds confidence and the skills to take on new challenges. As previously discussed,

reflection is a part of the process where participants discuss stepping back and assessing

"what happened here, is this the result I want, or do I redo it?" Part of that is simply

understanding what others need to be able to work through challenges. Another

participant describes the reciprocal processes of resilience in saying:

I would say that I want the best for everybody, so whatever I can do to help them,

conquer that goal or do whatever I can, whether it's literally at my desk or it's

helping the girls with a stunt or something [referring to coaching cheer]. That I

think is just being there for people and helping people through everything just

overcoming their challenges and stuff. That I think is where the resilience part

comes in, is that if they can trust me and I can trust them, then you can definitely

get whatever you want to do. You can handle anything. (Autumn)

Reciprocity, for this participant, also requires trust on some level in order to be able to

share experience and expertise. She also mentions reciprocating resilience to students

through coaching cheer and teaching or helping them with a stunt. Many participants

discussed using their experience as a way to create opportunities for students to work through challenges in a supportive space, further discussed below.

Extending the reciprocal process to students.

Educators discuss how resilience happens reciprocally between teachers and is furthered shared between educators and students. The reciprocity of resilience goes beyond an interaction between educators and is further shared between various groups within the organizational community, such as between students and teachers and students and their peers. As evidenced below, the process of resilience is continuous, interactional, and reciprocal between everyone in the organizational community, including students, further contributing to well-being:

> I mean, individually for sure, but as a collective. When the students see us happy and we have a relationship or some kind of connection with another teacher, they can talk to us about ... the students can talk to us about who their teacher is and if they're having an issue, then I feel like I can go to that teacher and say, "Hey, how's it going? I have this student, we're having some issues. What do you see for a potential for them as well?" (Bethany)

Here this participant discusses how it spreads through the organization even trickling down to students and giving them the perception that they can approach teachers with challenges. This participant shows how resilience is ongoing within the entire organizational community.

Another participant shares her continuing challenges with attention deficit disorder and how it affects her experiences with students as they take on their own challenges. She says:

> I go in and take it [a content area test necessary to get certified as a teacher] they're like yeah you totally passed, I was like huh pretty cool. Like hey, I actually can do this. I can do it and I do teach the kids and the kids do learn from me and I pass something on or the kids that go, whoa if she can do that why can't I do that. I have had some parents look at it too in meetings and stuff they're like, you're as ADHD as my kid but here you're at this level doing this so it's giving people hope, it's giving people an idea of like nothing should stop you. (Lizzie)

She further emphasizes the importance of learning from working through challenges and how she can become a source of support and inspiration for students working through similar challenges based on her experience. She is able to reciprocate resilience to her students through her experiences, the experiences that she deems as a "success."

One teacher talks about working through a challenge he had with teaching a new web design class. He knew nothing about the course nor did he have any practical experience. The reciprocal process of resilience is illustrated below, in which this educator worked through his own challenge with "the bigger" purpose in mind and he is now able to reciprocate that to students. He says:

> Talking about web design to the point where now I can see kids actually create these websites, and they get excited because they realize that they could do it, and we're actually to the point where we can make websites that look pretty cool, and

100

actually something that you'd find. I get excited for that because the kids could

figure out that they could do it, themselves, and I know that I had some part of

that success. (Trent)

Education is situated in a process of learning and growth where students are prompted to

take on the challenges presented in their classes. Teachers take on the responsibility of

giving students the opportunity to take on challenges and support the process. Educators

share their expertise about a particular subject in order to challenge students and increase

their opportunities for action in taking on those challenges.

Educators also discuss times when students are successful in pushing through

these challenges with other students, in addition to with the educators themselves, as

evidenced in the following excerpt:

I'm doing the pilot program for math this year. My co-teacher and I were

struggling while we were doing this lesson, because it's a different way of

teaching. This one lesson we did…where one of my weakest math SPED [special

education] students who normally doesn't participate, always needs redirection,

and just is a pain, he was completely on task. He was asking questions, was

asking what is a function, how do you do this? Why do you do this? Why do you

know it's a function? And just watching his interaction with those kids and his

group and just him participating, that made my day. it made my co-teacher's day,

which it was a Friday, last period of the day and we were so excited. Teaching

math [these moments] don't come very often, but that was my ah-ha moment out

there. When I finally saw it clicking with students or that they're just talking math

and asking questions about math. It was good. (Mia)

She shows how the student works through a challenge with the two educators and is able

to work through the challenge interactionally with other students. She goes on to further

discuss how continuing to find new ways to teach, specifically teach students who have

not succeeded in math, is a way for her to engage in the reciprocal processes of resilience

while continuing to focus on the "bigger purpose"

Participant experiences and stories with students further highlight the interactional

and reciprocal processes of resilience, specifically, how that process is enacted

interactionally with students. Resilience as a reciprocal process positions challenges an

opportunity giving students, and educators as previously discussed, a collective,

supportive space to work through challenges. Educators discuss the desire to create

opportunities for students to work through challenges in order for students to build a

repertoire of opportunities for action that create a mindset where challenges are positively

perceived as part of a process of learning and growth – a process that students can further

reciprocate to both teachers and their peers. Next, I discuss how participants frame

resilience as a mindset that allows them to positively perceive challenges and continue to

work through challenges.

Resilience is enacted through a positive and growth mindset

Despite all the evidence that, as lived, resilience is a constructed process that is

interactional and reciprocal, my findings also suggest how and why it might be that the

dominant definition of resilience is still related to an individual skill and process.

Interestingly, participants also define resilience as a specific mindset (i.e. a decision or choice) that includes growth, learning, and the ability to "focus on the positive and letting go of the negative to move on with your day" (Alejandra). Participants also say things like, "I'm in control of myself and how I take things" (Tyler).

In this organizational context, a mindset is a perception that prompts organizational members to construct challenges positively as something that concurrently leads to organizational well-being. The ability to work through challenges results in organizational members feelings of success, accomplishment, and of being an active contributor to the organization and "bigger purpose." One participant illustrates how resilience is enacted through a positive and growth mindset, giving him agency that situates challenges as something "we all face," or as part of everyday life:

> You just got to decide, this is who I am, this is what I'm going to do and you just do it. You keep bouncing back from it. We all face adversity. We all face tragedy. You just got to realize that's something that's going to make me stronger. It's not something that I need crumble over. (Ricky)

Participants also emphasize their own optimism and focus on the positive. This is evidenced in comments like "Put it out of your mind," "forget about it," and "move on." The ability to work through challenges is framed as a mindset, or a decision to "move on with your day." Another participant expands on this saying:

> Especially for a teacher too because you have so many things happen throughout the day, you have to be able to change, or go with the flow, or bounce back from let's say you have a bad class one day and they're just crazy and everything is

going horribly. By the next class you have to put that out of your mind and move

on. So I feel like you just have to forget about it and change your attitude and be

able to just move on with your day. (Laticia)

Resilience as an individual mindset includes the notion that it is an intentional

decision. One participant says, "nothing that can stop you unless you decide to stop

yourself" (Ricky), while another participant says, "I put a lot of effort into my mindset

each day" (Hannah). These examples highlight how participants still credit individual

mindset and choice for their ability to bounce back from challenge. Indeed, resilience is

described by one participant as a "choice of how to approach frustrations" and "hav[ing]

the ability to get back on course, flexibility to steer differently" (Trent).

Expanding on an earlier point that educators place a focus on the positive while

choosing not to focus on the negative, or things seemingly out of the control of the

participants, is exemplified below:

I think that in order to have resilience, you have to be positive and you have to be

at a good place. If you're not there, then you're going to just dwell on the negative

and there's a lot of negative in teaching. If you look at the way the press portrays

teachers and parents, and I just think you have to be positive and find those

positive moments within your day or else you're just going to get bogged down

by everything that needs to get done. (Ashley)

She reiterates other participants' experiences that there can be a number of challenges

that arise throughout the day, so it is important to focus on the positive. She specifically

connects the abundance of challenges experienced throughout her day to her career in

education. She feels the only way to continue with a career in education is to focus on the positive with the alternative being that educators will just "get bogged down by everything that needs to be done."

Participants further describe having a positive mindset as a way to allow for growth and learning, as illustrated in saying things like, "Instead of being stuck in the same pattern, or routine, or mindset…find a way to turn it around or fix it" (Laticia) and "All right, today was not a good day. How do I improve and make it better? How do you improve if it went wrong? And if it did go right, what was good about it that you can use in a different situation?" (Mia). Participants here clearly demonstrate a mindset of "not giving up" and a willingness to learn, grow, be flexible, and adapt.

The following participants illustrate how a mindset centered around growing and learning contributes to resilience in saying, "There's some days that you feel beaten down. Like "Ugh, there's no way. There's nothing I can do with these guys." And then maybe the next day you get your strength back and you make a little progress" (Oliva), "Being able to see the positivity in all situations, being able to learn from the experience, but then overcoming it and taking the experience and using it to do better" (Gloria), and "Trying again in the face of failure, trying something different or harder in the face of adversity or difficulty" (Darrius). One participant further reiterates this process of focusing on growth in talking through what she might say to herself as the challenge is occurring. She says:

> Kinda not giving up and not... Well, not giving up. So if something's not going as you wished it would, which happens a lot, just not being like we've had other

people that we've worked with in the past that have been like "Well, I can't do it with that class. I'm not doing it. I'm not doing any lab because they don't listen or they don't behave. And I'm just not gonna do it." And really, they just didn't do it. Where I am like constantly "Okay, well this isn't working." Especially behaviorally. And it's a challenge. It really is because some behaviors really get in the way of certain lessons. And instead of just not doing it, it's like okay, let's move their seats or change, or talk to parents, or whatever. Again and again and again. Changing it up until you get some semblance of success perhaps, or not. But just not giving up on it. And I know as a teacher resilience, but I feel like it's just not giving up. And just keep trying something different until something works a little better. (Olivia)

Her inner dialogue demonstrates how she focuses on working through the process and continuing to try different things until something works. She also touches on an example of someone who may not have a growth mindset showing how they end up "just not doing it" because they made up their mind that the challenge was not something they could work through. She reiterates how resilience in teaching is "trying something different until something works a little better," or essentially continuing to grow and learn to "not give up."

The "bigger purpose" or love for what participants do creates a mindset that frames working through challenges positively as a way to contribute to that commitment and passion. One participant says:

I think your frame of mind in the profession is, do you want to stay in it, one. So, if you have that, the buy-in begin with, if you have someone who has already let their mind wander, it's harder to do that, but, one is what's your ultimate goal. You have to keep the big picture, if you wanna stay then you have to work with and around things. Two it's also the notion of persistence. (Roman)

The "bigger purpose" contributes to creating a positive and growth frame of mind, contributing to this participant's ability to work through challenges and be "persistent." Other participants exemplify this in saying, "I'm a really positive person. I love my job and it just makes it easy" (Ashley), and "I think it's more like a feeling, like an attitude" (Samuel). Another participant discusses how being intentional about her mindset is a continuous process throughout the day that occurs as part of working through challenges, or, in other words, as part of the process of enacting resilience as evidenced below:

Because, if you have, again, for me, a lot of it is my mindset. If I go into work that day telling myself everything, no matter what, it's just another day. We're gonna get through it. If something doesn't happen, then we can make it happen the next day, or if we don't get something done, even though I'd rather it got done, but I can get it done the next day. Reminding myself that constantly, helps me tackle situations with more ease, I think. It helps me not get so upset about my computer not working, because if we don't get it done today ... I'd rather it got done today, but it's okay, life goes on, stuff happens. I just try to stay, I don't know, just make sure my mindset is positive. That's such a big thing, and then just try to get as much as we can get done at that time. (Hannah)

107

Participants discussion of mindsets demonstrates that their mindset is not fixed but rather something they intentionally create at various points throughout their day. Creating a positive mindset that frames challenges positively as a process of learning and growth contributes to participants' well-being. Additionally, the "bigger purpose" coupled with a positive and growth mindset frames challenges positively as an opportunity to learn and grow ultimately as a way to contribute to the "bigger purpose. A positive mindset is, in part, created collectively through sharing experiences in working through challenges with other educators and students in hopes of building their repertoire for opportunities for action. Another part of maintaining a positive mindset is participants' identifying being aware of when they are "out of balance" and their well-being is being negatively impacted. This awareness is discussed next.

Awareness.

Resilience is also talked about as an "awareness" and knowing when to let go of a challenge. An awareness was talked about in a way that helped my participants identify when they needed to "take a step back" or take a break in order to not get overwhelmed or burned out. Given that organizational irrationalities occur constantly throughout the day, part of resilience is knowing "what battles to fight." One participant says:

The big thing for me is actually finding what battles I want to fight. Really, with education particularly, there's so many times after doing it so long, knowing what's important, and knowing what's perhaps maybe not so important, and I know they say everything's important but I always try and determine which mountain I'm willing to die on, and which one's aren't worth dying on, and then

just moving on through that. So, I think really, the biggest thing is just not being overwhelmed with what they always want to try and throw at you. And just know, after a certain time, where the landmines are, and where not to step. (Trent)

Remarkably, knowing which challenges to take on is actually part of resilience for this person rather than something that is seen as a failure or weakness. Participants discuss this awareness of knowing when to avoid certain situations. One participant illustrates this in saying:

If you are resilient, then you can be able to reflect and just move on from situations it will help you grow. It will help you grow as a person because you can understand and fix things. And then it also helps your well-being because you're like, "All right, well, now that I know the situation, I could either learn to avoid it or I can learn to fix it," and so you don't end up being in that same situation again, or hopefully don't. (Mia)

As evidenced throughout these findings, above is another example of how these processes are, as Buzzanell (2010) argues, dynamic, ongoing, continuous, and integrated. The participant discusses a reflection, a growth mindset, well-being, and having an awareness of learning to "avoid" the challenge or "fix it."

Resilience has to do with having the wisdom to say no – which is something that teachers learn through experience and in engaging in a process of learning and growth from working through challenges. One participant highlights this in saying, "Being resilient is also learning to say no or knowing when enough is enough" (Alejandra). Another participant highlights knowing when to say no or take a break in saying:

109

In the classroom, no matter ... and in the organization, the school in general, no

matter what is thrown at us, it feels like there's always something else. You know

that, being in education, "Do this. Oh. You're a person that does everything.

Here's more," and being resilient and saying, "Okay," but also saying, "Where's

enough?" But being resilient and saying, "When's enough?" and pushing through,

and knowing your limits, and just being trying to get through it all, because

everyone's life is this chaotic. (Akshara)

Having an awareness to draw the line and say no is clearly a factor that participants

believed was instrumental for creating resilience in their organization.

Dominant discourses frame resilience.

The previous discussion of individual mindsets lends itself to the idea that some

participants view resilience as an individual "cognitive process." Participants discuss that

resilience is enacted interactionally through talking through scenarios with others, getting

feedback on how to approach challenges, seeking social support, asking questions, and

reflection and it is also described using dominant definitions focused on the individual.

Participant descriptions and stories suggest that, as lived, resilience is a process that is

ongoing, interactional, and reciprocal. However, some participants reverted back to

dominant understandings when asked to define resilience. One participant says:

Now if you want to be more resilient, you have ... It's a cognitive process of

thinking, "Okay, I've got this, I need to overcome it. "So you talk things out, you

have to talk with challenges that you have with other people, talk it out with other

people to approach it. It is having your self-esteem also comes into that, how you

110

value yourself, how do you see yourself in the profession, how you see yourself

personally, as being able to overcome certain thing. (Roman)

Although this participant uses phrases like "cognitive process of thinking, I would argue

this participant is constructing resilience in language, through self-talk. What he goes on

to describe beyond this "cognitive process," is talking through challenges with other

people and building confidence through the interactional process. He is socially

constructing resilience based on his own experiences using retrospective sensemaking

and through his experiences with others.

Interestingly, then, when telling stories of successes and overcoming challenges,

resilience is oftentimes linked to collective interactional processes. When deriving the

lesson from these stories, however, participants sometimes attribute what they learned or

their ability to overcome challenge to an individual trait, characteristic, or part of their

individual growth. This is noteworthy in understanding how organizational members are

constructing and enacting resilience.

The participant from above goes on to describe resilience as something that was

"part innate," or within a fixed mindset, saying:

It's very difficult at least for me, the concept of resiliency 'cause you can create

the scenario the best where you can, where you're not overloading people, and

you have support and time. But even then, that isn't enough for some people, it

doesn't work still. And so, other challenges they run across it, it still isn't enough,

or it's too much, and that's where it's part innate, and it's part environment"

(Roman)

These tensions are worth noting and highlight the power of language and dominant discourses in stories of overcoming challenges, success, work, and what all of those mean. These discourses shape how participants describe and tell stories of resilience. Given that resilience appears to be socially and collectively constructed in life, as lived, those dominant discourses might be valuably shifted through re-creating what resilience means in the organization.

Summary of Findings

In summary, my findings present empirical evidence that suggest the process of resilience is an ongoing, socially constructed, interactional, reciprocal process that is contextual and resides in language. Additionally, when asked to define resilience or make sense of their stories of challenge, participants sometimes connect it to their own individual positive mindset and awareness of when to say no. In addition, my findings suggest that organizational members in many cases perceive challenges and the process of working through challenges positively rather than only viewing the outcome as positive. In Chapter Five, I relate these findings to several specific literatures and discuss how they extend current conceptualizations of resilience.

Chapter Five:

DISCUSSION

This projects' findings empirically demonstrate the ways in which resilience unfolds communicatively in a particular organizational context, the "high risk" profession of public education. Although there is a considerable amount of research on resilience (Caza & Milton, 2012; Denhardt & Denhardt, 2010; Zautra et al., 2010), how resilience unfolds communicatively has only more recently been studied and theorized (Beck & Socha, 2015; Buzzanell, 2010, 2018; Buzzanell & Shenoy-Packer, 2015; Buzzanell, et al., 2009). This project adds to this research by unpacking stories of "as lived" experiences of resilience as well as the ways that organizational members made sense of these experiences. In this final chapter, I review theoretical implications, practical applications, limitations, and future directions of the research.

Theoretical Implications

My findings strengthen communicative conceptualizations of resilience by adding evidence to the ways that resilience is largely created in interaction. Educators' stories of resilience, as lived, show that resilience is a socially constructed, collective process that is contextual, interactional, and reciprocal. These properties are not mutually exclusive and interact concurrently as part of the ongoing processes of resilience. My findings further complicate the communication theory of resilience given that organizational members rely on dominant discourses that center around individual traits, skills and strengths to explain what they glean from observing their own resilience, or the "moral" of their resilience story.

As synthesized in this chapter, four findings are especially notable for contributing to and complicating the scholarship on resilience. These are (1) resilience as thriving, (2) resilience as connected to a "bigger purpose," (3) resilience is reciprocal, and (4) resilience as attributed to and enacted through a positive and growth mindset. These findings suggest that resilience intersects with three important literatures that have not been central to previous theoretical discussions of resilience. These include (1) organizational sensemaking, specifically retrospective sensemaking, (2) implicit person theories (IPT), specifically incremental theory and growth mindset messages, and (3) flow. I expand upon these key findings and connect them with these theoretical literatures below.

Social Constructions and Retrospective Sensemaking as a Key Aspect of Resilience

First, educators' descriptions of resilience clearly indicate that their framing of past experiences plays a central role in shaping how they construct and make sense of current challenges. Eliciting organizational members' definitions and descriptions of resilience coupled with how they saw themselves enacting resilience gave me insight into the ways in which they perceived and made sense of challenges. Specifically, organizational members relied on retrospective memories of enacting resilience to give meaning to challenges in the present and determine what opportunities there were for action – or the ways in which they could work through the challenge. This reliance on retrospective memories suggests the salience of sensemaking as a literature and practice for understanding resilience. What is sensemaking?

Sensemaking unfolds in language and meanings are materialized in language, talk, and communication that serve as a springboard to action and behavior (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005). Indeed, this literature elucidates how organizational members make sense of adverse situations. The sensemaking process provides a map for how challenges are perceived prompting the perceived opportunities for action. Sensemaking is the interpretive process for organizational members to understand and share understandings about what the organization is about, what it does well, what it does poorly, what problems it faces, and how it should resolve them (Weick, 1995). Sensemaking, then, is the interpretive process by which organizational members can individually and collectively make sense of challenges, their opportunities for action, and how they can collectively and collaboratively enact resilience. Sensemaking is grounded in both individual and social activity and therefore organizational members make sense of organizational disruptions individually and as an organizational community. According to the theory of sensemaking, organizational members are active agents who construct sensible events in language (Weick, 1995; Weick, et al., 2005). Sensemaking "involves the ongoing retrospective development of plausible images that rationalize what people are doing" (Weick et al., 2005, p. 409).

In this study, I found that participants describe resilience in reference to past and present experiences when working through challenges. Organizational members were specifically influenced and driven by the "bigger purpose." This "bigger purpose" framed challenges positively where working through the challenge was an opportunity to contribute to that "bigger purpose." The commitment to students and education, then,

became a way for organizational members to rationalize working through challenges and doing it often.

Organizational members' retrospective sensemaking of resilience and well-being, coupled with stories of success and overcoming challenges, framed past challenges as an experience of learning and growth that allowed them to adapt and perceive current challenges positively in the organizational context. Sensemaking theory helps elucidate the power of doing this. When challenges are viewed through retrospective sensemaking, "an action can become an object of attention only after it has occurred" (Weick, 1995, p. 26). What was particularly interesting is the actions my participants drew on constructed current challenges as something they could work through, in, and around based on their past experience. In other words, what participants made the action mean were "heavily influenced by the situational context" (Weick, 1995, p. 26). The situational context of the organization, in this case education, was rooted in the "bigger purpose." Participants drew specifically on challenges in which they succeeded or overcame the challenge to view current challenges positively. Further, given the action that participants took relied on past experiences, which progressively built a repertoire of opportunities for action, educators gained experience and confidence when approaching current challenges.

It was interesting to see that sometimes the story or "moral" that participants took from their resilience relied on dominant narratives of individual traits, skills, and growth. Although their stories showed the interactional nature of resilience, that was not always the meaning participants created for themselves. Organizational sensemaking asks these two questions: 1) How does something come to be an event for organizational members,

116

and 2) What does an event mean (Weick et al., 2005). Organizational members ask themselves "what's the story here?" and "now what should I do?" (Weick et al., 2005). In some situations, participants relied on dominant narratives of individual traits, skills, and strengths as the meaning of their story. Participants concluded from the story that they were especially tough-minded. Those who are still actively in the profession have also created a story where working through organizational challenges contributes to a "bigger purpose." The meaning of the "bigger purpose" has allowed organizational members to work through challenges they may have otherwise viewed as negative and/or been unwilling to work through.

Drawing retrospectively on memories engages organizational members in the process of the "redrafting of an emerging story" (Weick, et al., p. 415). Sensemaking clarifies how participants draw on both lived experiences as well as dominant narratives. In future research (which I discuss in-depth below), it will be important to understand how and why organizational members construct working through challenges as a positive part of the organizing processes and to consider how these constructions serve particular groups more than others or have specific "benefits and costs" (Buzzanell, 2018, p. 99). Additionally, sensemaking attunes scholars to be critically aware of the "emerging story" and how such stories of resilience and well-being might become normative in a way that produces negative consequences, such as burnout or being seen as not fully committed to the "bigger purpose" if one chooses not to work through challenges.

This is an important and critical point. Narratives of individual strengths may set organizational members up to be disappointed with themselves and others when they

perceive themselves to be "weak." Past research suggests that resilience emerges, in part, from immersion in supportive social structures, such as well-functioning families and schools (Masten, 2001). The "tough-minded" individual is the hero of many dominant narratives but it may be the more "ordinary heroism," such as just showing up to the classroom everyday prepared and calm, that determines the success of an organization or school. Resilience may be facilitated by administrative processes that simplify/facilitate/support this ordinary heroism, which may be key, especially when individuals are stressed by the daily demands of the work[1]. It will be important to understand, then, how supportive organizational structures (i.e. a culture that intentionally cultivates well-being and resilience) play a role in how organizational members see themselves and others enacting resilience, in addition to understanding how a focus on individual strengths facilitates, or inhibits, a supportive culture.

Positive and Growth Mindsets, Implicit Person Theories, and Resilience

Second, my findings demonstrate the power of dominant attributions about work and success in American society resulting in connection to growth mindset. The ways in which organizational members talk about resilience as mindset (one that allows them to positively perceive challenges and to see working through challenges as a process of learning and growth) connects to implicit person theory. Implicit theories are centered around "the malleability of human characteristics" (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 303). One implicit theory is incremental theory, which frames "intellectual ability as something that can be grown or developed over time," (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 303), rather than as a

---

[1] I would like to acknowledge Vincent R. Waldron for this insight and contribution.

fixed entity (entity theory being another implicit theory). In connection to implicit person theories, resilience is perceived to be a positive and growth mindset that situates the ability to work through challenges in a positive mindset and the ability to continue to work through challenges in a process of growth that includes flexibility, adaptability, reflection, and building a repertoire of opportunities for action. Resilience is enacted through what many organizational members describe as a "positive" mindset and participants further root challenges in an opportunity for growth.

Implicit person theory has been studied in connection to resilience with students, however, this connection has not been made in organizational contexts. In research with students, Yeager & Dweck (2012) argue that "the theory that intelligence is fixed and unchangeable can lead students to interpret academic challenges as a sign that they may lack intelligence – that they may be "dumb" or might be seen as "dumb" (p. 302). Applying this argument to my research, if someone considers themselves to have a fixed mindset, this could certainly impact the ways in which organizational members perceive challenges.

My research suggests that organizational members refer to their mindsets as they interpret how they are able to work through challenges and perceived opportunities for action. In a review of research demonstrating the impact of students' mindsets in the face of academic and social challenge, researchers found that:

> Students who believe (or are taught) that intellectual abilities are qualities that can
> be developed (as opposed to qualities that are fixed) tend to show higher

119

achievement across challenging school transitions and greater course completion

rates in challenging math courses. (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 302)

Educators are said to foster these mindsets and create resilience in educational settings

(Yeager & Dweck, 2012). The important part to note is that if students have fixed

mindsets when they enter the classroom, teachers can strategically use messages to help

foster growth mindsets, or the belief that their abilities can be developed. Likewise, the

findings of this study suggest that the ways that organizational members talk about their

mindset intersects with the ways they frame challenge and overcome it. In short, the

ways in which organizational leaders (through socialization, training, and ongoing

messaging) influence employees' perception of challenges and opportunities for action,

creates an opportunity to promote growth rather than fixed mindsets. Organizations can

usefully promote the idea that resilience is a mindset, or intentional choice that is

constructed and developed.

Outside of the communication discipline, resilience has been framed as "a

developmental trajectory characterized by demonstrated competence in the face of, and

professional growth after, experiences of adversity in the workplace" (Caza & Milton,

2012, p. 896), which is viewed as "positive." In addition, Caza and Milton (2012) argue

that competence and growth enable individuals to handle future challenges. Here, the

focus is on the individual through growth and development, with resilience resulting

"from an interaction of the individual, the adversity, and the individual's social

environment" (Caza & Milton, 2012, p. 897).

Participants in my study highlight this "developmental trajectory" in the ways they make sense of resilience. Where my study parts ways with Caza & Milton (2012), though is that my findings suggest that resilience is enacted interactionally and reciprocally at the group and organizational rather than the individual level (even if, after the fact, participants make sense of it as an individual process). As illustrated in my findings chapter, working through challenges is a way to contribute to both individual, group, and organizational goals, specifically a student-focused "bigger purpose." Organizational members view challenges positively as an opportunity for learning and growth and, therefore, willingly engage in this developmental trajectory. In this way, resilience does not belong to the individual as much as it belongs to the collective.

Interaction affects the way that challenges are perceived, and therefore this impacts the ability to even engage in individual development. If an organizational structure does not allow for challenges to be perceived positively as an opportunity of learning and growth, then it is unlikely learning and growth will occur. As they reflect on larger organizational and interactional experiences, participants in my study view challenges as an opportunity to further build their repertoire of skills and opportunities for action. The process of learning and growth (what has been called a "developmental trajectory") is accomplished through a process of working through challenges interactionally and reciprocally – giving and receiving feedback, reflecting, adapting, and being flexible.

In addition to identifying a positive and growth mindset, participants drew on prominent d/Discourses of resilience. Although descriptions of resilience as lived show

the interactional and reciprocal processes of resilience, when asked how they overcame the challenge, participants attributed this to individual strengths, such as individual "determination," "perseverance," and "grit." Participants reinforce how success cannot be achieved without individual efforts to overcome challenges or adversity—things like having the right optimistic outlook or a simple awareness of when enough is enough. These findings highlight the ways in which participants drew on individual narratives of what success means. Buzzanell (2018) argues that "the goals of the communication theory of resilience are to understand and explain how people utilize discursive and material resources to constitute the new normal of their lives after disruption, loss, trauma, and disaster" (p. 100). One way participants did this was through dominant narratives of overcoming challenges and success.

Participants emphasized individual skills and strengths as what they learned from the experience, such as learning how strong they were or how they could do anything they put their mind to. In fact, participants believe that resilience can be an opportunity to learn, grow, and gain experience, or to continue to build a repertoire of opportunities for action. As previously discussed, it is important to be aware of the "emerging story" and the "benefits and costs" (Buzzanell, 2018). These findings are a reminder to continue to be critical of the "material resources" and "ideological structures" in which resilience is constructed and enacted.

Overall, a positive and growth mindset coupled with dominant d/Discourses impact the ways in which participants viewed challenges and opportunities for action, or in other words how they constructed and enacted resilience. How capable my participants

perceived they were in working through a challenge determined how they saw the challenges (positive, negative, capable, not capable), how they enacted resilience (action capacities and action opportunities), and how they perceived the outcome (whether or not they felt they contributed to their individual goals and the overall goals of the organizational community). This process of enacting resilience occurred in both the collective and the individual. A particular mindset, or positive perception, was part of what led to confidence and feeling like they were contributing to the "bigger purpose."

Resilience as Thriving, a "Bigger Purpose," Reciprocity, and Flow

Third, my findings suggest that resilience is not all about overcoming or bouncing back from challenge, but instead is about thriving in the face of challenge, reciprocally interacting with others, connecting to a larger purpose, and finding flow. Interestingly enough, I found that organizational members are perceiving most challenges positively. Meanwhile, challenges that organizational members perceive they have no agency over, or challenges that are perceived negatively, are placed out of focus or "let go." Resilience is viewed as a positive part of the organizing processes in which challenges are perceived positively as a way to contribute to both individual and organizational goals.

A key element to participant descriptions and stories is how participants discuss resilience as a collective, interactional process. Throughout the interviews participants say things like, "I had gotten some information from friends," "I went out and sought answers," "listening to other people," "going and watching people," talking through "why they're doing it," "talking to people and listening to what they're actually saying," and so on. Participants draw retrospectively on past experiences while simultaneously recalling on their commitment to the "bigger purpose" to drive them to collaboratively and

collectively work through challenges interactionally. Participants did this by talking through various scenarios, giving and receiving feedback, observing others, reflecting, and making adjustments. Participants also enacted resilience interactionally through venting about shared challenges that provided a space of support to propel them to continue to work through challenges.

Participants' perceptions of challenges are continually in flux shifting how organizational members perceive challenges and opportunities for action. Experience is discussed as an enhanced set of skills and as something that is shared with educators new to the field or educators taking on new challenges (i.e. teaching a new course, new curriculum, teaching with no resources, a particularly difficult group of students, etc.). Resilience, then, is developed from reciprocal experiences with working through challenges, shifting how challenges are perceived, and the perceived opportunities for action – something that creates experience and confidence.

Understanding that reciprocity is part of resilience creates an opportunity to intentionally create spaces for educators to share experiences and work towards retaining highly qualified teachers, specifically new teachers. Eventually educators gain the experience to navigate through organizational disruptions and irrationalities. The process of feedback, reflection, and support is important in creating a positive perception of challenges and building the repertoire of opportunities for action with the goal of alleviating burnout and retaining highly qualified teachers. "As lived" this is what educators are doing, but what support structures are currently in place and what could be

further developed and cultivated to create these support structures? To retain highly qualified teachers? These are important questions to extend this trajectory of research.

An interesting connection to my findings were the parallels between resilience and flow. The findings demonstrating the overall process of resilience in this organizational context (i.e. the ongoing, integrated, socially constructed process that is contextual, interactional, and reciprocal) suggests that resilience is connected to flow – "characterized by complete absorption in what one does" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 89). The conditions of flow include "(1) perceived challenges, or opportunities for action, that stretch (neither overmatching nor underutilizing) existing skills; a sense that one is engaging challenges at a level appropriate to one's capacities, and (2) clear proximal goals and immediate feedback about the progress being made" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 90). Put simply, flow is considered to be the balance between a state of arousal and control. Past research has not explicitly connected flow to resilience, yet my research empirically indicates that key parts of flow (e.g., how challenges are perceived, how opportunities for action are perceived, setting feasible yet stretching goals, etc.) are closely connected to the processes of resilience and subjective well-being in the organizational context. Flow is considered to be a blissful state that people strive to stay in the midst of. From this point of view, the "thriving" part of resilience may not be in returning to the status quo, but instead might be the joy of meeting and playing with the challenge.

Participants implicitly discuss the elements of a flow experience when they talk about the joy of being challenged by their work. Given that flow is argued to be a

125

contributing factor to happiness and well-being (Lyubomirsky, 2007; Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005; Seligman, 2002), identifying that flow is connected to resilience contributes to theories on both resilience and flow. Specifically, I found that the role of experience, confidence, awareness, and a commitment to a "bigger purpose" is related to flow's subjective experience of "engaging just-manageable challenges by tackling a series of goals, continuously processing feedback about progress, and adjusting action based on this feedback" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 90). My findings that feedback and reflection are an integral part of resilience parallel the experience of flow yet seem to exist in a more drawn out interactional process rather than the individual micro processes of feedback occurring during flow (e.g., most of the flow research views feedback from the material craft at hand, such as skiing where the mountain gives immediate feedback to when the skier has done something wrong).

In the context of flow, sensemaking matters because the ways in which participants perceive challenges and how they make sense of action capacities and action opportunities will directly correlate to how they enact resilience, and whether this will be a blissful or frustrating part of the job. According to flow research, when employees find a sweet spot where "perceived challenges" are met with equally useful "perceived opportunities for action," challenge is fun and desired rather than overwhelming. In this study, educators often describe challenges as positive in the sense that they provide a feeling of success and leave them believing they have contributed to both individual and organizational goals. Educators are working together toward a "bigger purpose" which has everything to do with their students. From this vantage, resilience, or the ability to

126

work through challenges and contribute to individual and community goals, is thriving. Being able to interactionally work through those challenges creates an opportunity to reciprocate resilience and in turn builds resilience and fosters well-being.

Experience of the flow activity is "intrinsically rewarding, such that often the end goal is just an excuse for the process" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 90). In the case of educators, their "intrinsic motivation" is their "bigger purpose" to students. Participants describe teaching as a "calling" driven by intrinsic motivation rather than a means to an end. As previously described, those who view their work as a calling "love their work and think that it contributes to making the world a better place" (Wrzesniewski, et al., 1997, p. 22). Wrzesniewski et al. (1997) further argue that intrinsic motivation, which is analyzed by challenge and enjoyment, is most associated with callings. Educators know they have this "bigger purpose" which is essentially "for the students" yet, interestingly enough, in teaching there is not necessarily immediate feedback from students in the form of a tangible product (e.g. a student having a successful career as a writer because a lesson prompted a love of writing) – something argued to be an aspect of flow. However, they do have moments where they, on the one hand, see students falling asleep in class, or on the other hand can viscerally feel or see the "light bulb turning on" in students' heads. In this way, they receive immediate feedback.

As mentioned earlier, flow is that sweet spot between ability and challenges. "Entering flow depends on establishing a balance between perceived action capacities and perceived action opportunities" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005. p. 90).

127

Teachers want to take on new challenges or be challenged at work, yet they also require the confidence, skills, and support to be able to work through these challenges. In other words, similar to challenges in the flow experience, the challenge must not be beyond their perceived opportunities for action or it will create anxiety while if the challenge is too low it will create boredom. Overcoming challenges must be met with a positive perception that one has the ability or skills needed in any given situation, and that the situation itself is worth taking on. It is important to understand and further investigate how the degree of challenge is specifically tied to teacher retention or burnout. Participants describe how they enjoy being challenged, and, in turn succeeding, which makes them feel useful, confident, and contributory—something that leads to practical implications.

Practical Applications

Five primary practical arguments emerge from this study: (1) co-creating organizational narratives and a shared vision can prompt a shared history focused on strengths and success leading to resilience, (2) individual and community goal setting create a commitment to a shared purpose that frames challenges positively, (3) the reciprocal and interactional construction of resilience show the importance of mentoring and collaboration, (4) when teachers are able to meet challenges with appropriate skills and get feedback, then meeting challenges can result in flow-like experiences that enhance resilience and well-being and, (5) interventions that shift the way participants make sense of their mindsets, and specifically lean toward growth mindsets, could positively impact resilience.

Co-creating organizational narratives and crafting a vision.

Organizations can valuably utilize strategic communication, such as community storytelling and visioning, to create stories that promote and reconstruct resilience and well-being. Houston et al. (2015) argue that strategic communication provides opportunities to foster community resilience and enhance community relationships and connections. Once researchers have established a relationship with organizational community members, collaborative approaches can be used to create narratives of resilience that promote well-being through human connection.

Narratives can co-create organizational community norms and values that encourage a continuation of the current vision and a focus on organizational strengths and assets. Part of this process is constructed through narrative, or the stories people tell in life as lived. Narratives, then, can create an organizational culture that fosters resilience and supports well-being. Organizational leaders can also create opportunities for employees to collaboratively create a vision and culture that provides a sense of commitment and drives the ability to work through challenges. Given that sensemaking is social, it will be powerful for organizational members to work collaboratively, and continue to bridge relationships with scholars, to identify and map community assets and individual strengths.

One way to do this is by organizational leaders/members collaborating with each other, scholars, and community members to solicit narratives of success with the purpose of identifying, categorizing, and mapping community strengths and assets. Organizational members can then work on crafting an organizational vision based off of these assets that

create a common goal and "context specific messages" of resilience and well-being (for more on this See "Future Directions" and "Collaborative Community Development Approaches"). One community framework organizations can draw on is the sustainability through happiness framework (StHF) given its role in developing communities through the framework of happiness. Cloutier & Pfeiffer (2015) argue for a collaborative approach for working in communities. The Sustainability through Happiness Framework (StHF) is a cyclical process that employs participation from various community stakeholders in developing communities through sustainable interventions. StHF specifically discusses ways to incorporate a visioning stage. Collaboration with participants, community members, organizational members, or other various stakeholders empower multivocality of voices to co-create values, goals, meanings, and outcomes, or in other words create shared narratives. This process is reciprocal creating buy-in from community members, thus generating more stakeholders or an even greater stake in the community or organization. This framework can be utilized by shifting a focus to creating a supportive culture that fosters resilience and well-being.

Individual and community goal setting.

Resilience in this context is enacted as part of a "bigger purpose" to students, something that can be facilitated by individual and community goal setting that is driven by the "bigger purpose." Creating opportunities for organizational members to become clear on what they are committed to and creating action steps and goals to collectively work towards that commitment are integral in constructing challenges positively.

130

Individual goals and contributions may look different depending on the role of the participant within the organizational community.

Participants cite working through challenges interactionally and collaboratively as a way to contribute to individual and community goals. Lyubomirsky (2007) discusses six benefits to goal pursuit, which are: (1) providing a sense of purpose and a feeling of control over our lives, (2) having meaningful goals boosts self-esteem making us feel confident and efficacious, (3) pursuing goals adds structure and meaning to our life, (4) committing to goals helps us master our time, (5) we are able to better cope with problems, and (6) the pursuit of goals involves engaging with other people.

In this organizational context, the "bigger purpose" frames challenges within the context of a "calling" with a focus on intrinsic goals. Extending the discussion above, Lyubomirsky (2007) argues that "intrinsic goals are those that you pursue because they are inherently satisfying and meaningful to you" (p. 208) developing you as a person and evidenced to bring personal joy and happiness. Constructing challenges as part of a "bigger purpose" becomes a catalyst for working through challenges and perceiving challenges positively as a way to work collaboratively towards individual and community goals. Organizations can use the "bigger purpose" to drive individual goals and, if there is not a shared "bigger purpose," organizations can utilize the recommendations from visioning and co-creating organizational narratives as a starting place for collaboratively building that shared purpose.

Mentoring and collaboration.

Given that resilience was found to be a reciprocal process that is shared among educators and students, creating a space for mentoring relationships and collaboration is essential to interactionally enacting resilience. In this particular organizational context, administrators have set up professional learning communities, yet need to find ways to prompt the community building aspect of these PLCs. PLCs were used in this case primarily for instrumental goals, while the community building potential of these small groups were unrealized. Organizational members also discussed their desire to have a specific physical space outside of their classroom to interact and collaborate with other teachers. Building and fostering mentoring relationships can enhance the reciprocity of resilience and aid new teachers in working through organizational challenges while further providing a support system for organizational members taking on new challenges.

Flow experiences and organizational well-being.

The direction of the unfolding flow experience is shaped by both the person and the environment. Resilience can be enacted interactionally through talking and engaging with organizational members, but is flow only an individual experience? Within flow experiences, what you notice and what you pay attention to is your experience – it is your life (Lyubomirsky, 2007). If flow is an awareness and controlling what you pay attention to, a focus on successes and strengths through creating a shared history can shift attention to enhance resilience. Narratives of success, focusing on how organizational members overcame challenges, and what they learned versus the challenge itself, or the level of difficulty, can create a positive perception of challenges. Given this connection to flow,

132

learning about activities that have the potential to create opportunities for organizational members to enter flow can impact both resilience and well-being, understanding that flow is not something one can be in all the time.

In this study, educators said they liked challenge and disliked becoming bored when they were not challenged enough. Staying in flow requires that "attention be held by this limited stimulus field" or boredom, apathy, and anxiety creep in ((Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 92). Indeed, "if challenges begin to exceed skills, one first becomes vigilant then anxious" and "if skills begin to exceed challenges, one first relaxes and becomes bored" (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2005, p. 90)—something that may be problematic to educators as exemplified in the following participant viewpoint:

> Sometimes though I get bored, like currently I'm getting bored. I'm trying to find like okay, I got at least one new class that I know I'm coming in, so I'll have to figure out how to do that. That will keep me a little bit busy and help out some stuff because I start to get antsy and just don't know what else to do. I'm also going to take like the biology test to help figure out, yeah because I would love to be able to teach anatomy and physiology and I can do it for dual enrollment. That's where I'm like I'm finding things so I don't get bored, and then want to go do something else because I need a new challenge. For me that's the thing, not getting stressed out, finding stuff but keeping myself challenged as well. (Lizzie)

In short, to create well-being, schools must not only be concerned about too many challenges, but also, not enough of them. Finding ways to encourage flow experiences can enhance resilience and well-being within the organization. And, getting teachers into

133

this flow experience requires new challenges and also teachers who feel they have the skills to address and play with these challenges.

Growth-mindset interventions.

Yeager & Dweck (2012) question what causes resilience and what can be done to increase it while further considering what determines whether a student will give up or embrace the obstacle and work to overcome it. My findings suggest that this notion is integral to organizational members. "Resilience – or whether students [and I would add teachers] respond positively to challenges – is crucial for success in school and in life" (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 302). This research project further connects resilience to implicit person theories by framing resilience as a collective way of sensemaking. From this vantage, a growth mindset is both about having a mind that grows and how people collectively and retrospectively make sense of and discursively center in on some interpretations versus others.

In many interviews, participants discuss growth by asking themselves, "how do I get better" or "do I need to shift my goals or my focus" in reference to enacting resilience. They ask, "when something doesn't work, then what do I need to do differently?" These questions are also tied to reflection and how teachers are constantly discussing being flexible and adaptable. The ways organizational members construct and enact resilience is through a process of learning and sensemaking in turn contributes to a mindset that enables them to continue to work through challenges.

Past mindset research indicates that "students' mindsets can be changed and that doing so can promote resilience" (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 303). A specific connection

134

to my research, and "how efforts to change mindsets can increase resilience even without removing adversities students encounter in school" (Yeager & Dweck, 2012, p. 303), is how organizational members work within the framework of organizational irrationalities and adversity. This is aligned with my argument that we cannot remove organizational irrationalities and disruptions. How is it, then, that we can communicatively construct resilience in a way that allows organizational members to work through challenges? Based on my findings, growth mindset messages about challenges and positioning challenges as a space of learning and growth construct challenges in a way that cultivates resilience.

Adversity is not something that can be removed from an organization so how is it, then, that organizations can foster resilience to work through, in, and around challenges? My findings demonstrate that organizational members, in this context, are constructing resilience in this way giving researchers insight into the ways challenges are constructed. It will be important to extend this research to better understand how and why they perceive challenges positively. Understanding growth mindset interventions with students, then, and how organizational leaders use growth mindset messages will be a resource and next step in furthering my research on the communicative construction of resilience. Next, I discuss limitations and future directions of this research.

Limitations and Future Directions

Limitations of this study are (1) that it focuses on a single organizational context (2) teachers make up the majority of my sample compared to administrators, counselors,

and support staff, and (3) it focuses on educators who are currently in the profession and not those who have left it.

In regard to the first limitation, my first-hand knowledge of this school's challenges supported my choice of studying this particular organizational context. However, focusing on one school presents limitations in understanding the bigger picture of the ways in which educators construct and enact resilience and the even bigger picture of how organizational members construct and enact resilience across contexts.

Additionally, given the mix of employees at one school, teachers made up the majority of organizational members. Administrators, counselors, and support staff, then, could be better represented in the sample to understand their role in the interactional and reciprocal processes of resilience.

In order to better understand how to retain highly qualified teachers, it would be useful to study teachers who have left the profession. There are a lot of statistics about education and educators, many of which are cited throughout this research, that paint a grim picture. Teacher pay, teacher retention – teachers in their first five years who left the profession, leaving in the middle of the year, or leaving the profession completely - class sizes, resources, and more all contribute to a bleak future in education. In order to understand another face of the resilience phenomenon, it would be valuable to capture the "lived experiences" of teachers who decided to leave the profession. In order to create a holistic picture of organizational resilience, then, it will be crucial to understand how a focus on "survivors" in the profession shaped how organizational members perceive challenges and opportunities for action. Specifically, with attention to seeing overcoming

challenges as thriving and a way to contribute to the "bigger purpose." I want to continue to understand how we can retain highly qualified teachers, how we can create a culture of resilience and well-being, and how we can essentially transform education. I am committed and passionate to these issues and will continue to take on this endeavor through the future directions discussed next.

Future directions.

This dissertation study of the communicative processes of resilience started a trajectory in organizational communication of empirically studying resilience in an organizational context. I hope to continue that trajectory by continuing the conversation with educators, organizational leaders, and organizational members through research, teaching, and collaborative work. Specifically, this study suggests that in future research, scholars should (1) continue to engage in empirical examinations of resilience in both education and other organizational contexts, (2) gather the "lived experiences" of organizational members who exited the organization, or specifically left teaching, to create a more holistic picture of the processes of resilience, and (3) explore how to build community and a culture of resilience that is collaboratively created and includes employee voices.

First, scholars should further engage in empirical examinations of resilience in other organizational contexts from a communication framework. It will be important to explore resilience as a socially constructed process that is contextual to understand the constitutive processes of organizing, organizational sensemaking, and how resilience is constructed and enacted in different organizational contexts. Given the theoretical

137

implications of the current study, future research could valuably consider the role of sensemaking, implicit theories, and flow from the beginning of the future research.

It would be interesting to see if organizational members in other contexts see challenges positively. I would like to get a deeper picture of what challenges are viewed positively, what challenges are viewed negatively, and why. Additionally, integral to further exploration is how positive and negative mindsets contribute to how challenges are perceived and the notion that being challenged and working through challenges is thriving. Thriving has been argued to be enabled by motivation, or "an individual's core passions act as "sparks" to fuel one's interest in growing knowledge and/or skills, drive the creating of a nurturing environment and, ultimately, enable thriving" (Brown, Arnold, Fletcher, & Standage, 2017). Additionally, a contextual enabler for thriving is argued to be a "challenge environment" that provides an appropriate balance of challenge and difficulty (Brown et al., 2017), yet empirical studies connecting resilience and well-being to a challenge environment need to be explored. Specifically, I wonder: Even though a "bigger purpose" to students won't be relevant to all contexts, scholars can further investigate how a "bigger purpose" or commitment to something bigger can contribute to perceiving challenges positively and the ability to enact resilience collaboratively and collectively.

Relatedly, an interesting avenue for study would be a more in-depth exploration of what the reciprocal processes of resilience look like in an educational context and if this is reciprocity is enacted in other organizational contexts. I have been reflecting on the reciprocal processes of resilience in the context of my own experiences as a graduate

138

student. For example, as graduate students work with advisors, I wonder how advisors use their experience as a way to reciprocate resilience. How is resilience a shared experience then, and how does the relationship unfold to either reciprocate resilience, or not. I am curious how reciprocity positively impacts resilience in graduate school and what it looks like within the entire system. Resilience as a reciprocal process has a lot of avenues for future research in organizational contexts and at other levels of analysis, such as relational, family, and community resilience.

A second important future direction is to gather the "lived experiences" of organizational members who exited the organization, or specifically left teaching, to create a more holistic picture of the processes of resilience. One the goals of my research is to find ways to retain highly qualified teachers and, in order to do that, it will be important to understand why some teachers left the profession in the first place. Some participants talked about the educators who decided to leave and go to another school or those who left education completely. Remarkably, my participants did not describe the teachers who left as being "not resilient" but rather saw their choice to leave as a form of resilience. In my findings, participants discussed an "awareness" of knowing when to say no or change the course or when they needed support. To them, knowing when it was time to leave a particular organization or knowing when it was time to change professions was a way of enacting resilience contributing to organizational well-being. It would be fascinating to hear their stories.

Third scholars should explore how to build community and a culture of resilience that is collaboratively created and includes employee voices. Many participant interviews

discuss treading the fine line between micro-managing and support. Understanding how organizational leaders can provide support and create a culture of resilience collaboratively with their employees is important in ensuring employees do not feel like they are being micro-managed. In this particular context, teachers like to be challenged and they like working through new challenges as a way to feel they have contributed to organizational goals. Working through challenges leads to confidence and experience that should be utilized rather than underestimated.

Educators do not always have control over curriculum, state testing, and other federal and state mandates. Creatively and collaboratively working through challenges provides a way for teachers to reciprocate their expertise with other educators, and students, giving them a sense of agency. Organizational leaders must be mindful, then, of how to create an environment that allows teachers to enact resilience and build their repertoire of opportunities for action. Again, there is a fine line between micromanaging and support, how much challenge is too much, and how much challenge is not enough.

Building off creating a culture that fosters opportunities to collaboratively take on challenges, scholars should also begin to better understand how to build community without implementing "mandatory fun." Some participants describe how they enjoy staff get togethers that are organized both on and off campus, while others do not want any part of it. Some feel games, icebreaker activities, staff bowling, or holiday parties are a waste of time while others discuss how they love these events and want more of them. Interestingly, participants agree that community and building community is important. Fineman (2006) argues that "prescribed fun" can be counterintuitive when fun is

140

obligatory and forced. Many times these types of activities create "a culture of fun" that only allows for normative emotions and interactions, such as publicly shaming those who don't want to participate, and, again work counterintuitively. The same care and critical lens should be applied when thinking about the ways in which an organizational community can create a culture of resilience and well-being.

The question is: How do you, then, build community and create a community of resilience and well-being? How do you navigate the tensions previously described so community is built intentionally yet organically? Next, I discuss specific community development and strengths-based approaches for creating a culture of resilience and well-being noting that these should also be further empirically tested to understand the impact in an organizational context.

Setting an Agenda for Future Collaborative Community Development Approaches.

One way to extend scholarship, collaboratively build community, and foster a culture of resilience is through utilizing participatory approaches. In this next section, I set out a detailed rationale for the important next step of this dissertation study – one that would take the theoretical findings developed here and utilize aspects of participatory action research (PAR) while moving beyond this PAR to begin applying and understanding the transferability of community development approaches, such as asset-based community development. Much of the communication scholarship focuses on PAR, which specifically aims to identify and solve a community problem while attending to "broader social, economic, and political forces that shape these issues" (Brydon-Miller & Kral, 2011). Using collaborative approaches that allow goals to emerge and focus on

141

community and organizational strengths can generate buy-in and forward continuous action.

Community development approaches have the potential to positively transform organizations similar to the ways these approaches have positively impacted communities, which emerges through collaboration, building community connection, focusing on strengths, and utilizing social capital. Scholars can become participatory collaborators by utilizing approaches that generate dialogue and foster collaboration, such as participatory action research (PAR), asset-based community development approaches (ABCD), and dialogic action (DA).

Each method approaches organizational and community problems differently, with PAR identifying and attending to social justice issues within a community (Brydon-Miller & Kral, 2011), ABCD identifying community assets to drive community development (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003), and with DA emphasizing the emergence of the particular focus through dialogical action of convening, reflecting, and acting (Montoya & Kent, 2011). Each of these approaches can be spaces for dialogue to co-create meaning that bring together different levels of knowledge. Collaborative approaches are not without limitations, such as the complexities of differing worldviews, mindsets, values, and backgrounds that each member brings with them.

Collaborative approaches, however, elicit collaborative processes that allow for the emergence of co-created knowledge, dialogue, and action. PAR is a collaborative process that rests in cycles of action and reflection to solve concrete community problems "while deepening understanding of the broader social, economic, and political forces that

142

shape these issues" (Brydon-Miller & Kral, 2011). This approach focuses on meaningful

community change through critical reflection and action leading to transformation

(Brydon-Miller & Kral, 2011). As previously described, ABCD draws attention to social

assets, utilizes social capital, and can be viewed as a response to dramatic changes in the

social, political, and economic landscape (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). The ABCD

approach uses participatory development and lessons from citizenship and civil society to

develop communities and approach issues that result from the dramatic changes

previously discussed (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). DA uses dialogue to focus on

community strengths and build community through attending to emergent goals, values,

and ideas (Montoya & Kent, 2011).

Each approach considers mindsets in different ways and co-participants should

engage in reflexivity and prompt spaces for reflexivity through discussion and reflection.

In my research, I drew on the ABCD approach as part of my rationale for eliciting stories

of success and community and individual strengths. ABCD approaches draw on

appreciative inquiry, which posit that knowledge and reality is socially constructed and

language is a vehicle for reinforcing shared meanings attributed to reality (Mathie &

Cunningham, 2003). Through ABCD approaches organizational members can construct a

shared history and a shared vision for the future (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). In

addition, organizational members can build strategic relationships with the immediate

organizational community and the larger community.

Emphasizing strategic relationships "provides a lens to explore how organizations

(private for profit, private nonprofit, or public), governments, and individuals interact,

143

connect, and collaborate" (Houston, et al., 2015, p. 273). Using collaborative approaches can build strategic relationships and begin to develop community relationships that infiltrate the entire community at various levels. Strategic relationships create an opportunity for organizational interventions or series of interventions to be implemented while simultaneously creating buy-in from the organizational community through the success of the various phases of the research.

Reflected best-self exercise (RBS).

One way to elicit community strengths while strengthening organizational members commitment to individual and organizational goals is through the reflected best-self-exercise. The reflected best-self exercise (RBS) was developed to achieve four main goals: 1) to generate awareness of how others see you when you are at your best; 2) to enhance understanding about what kinds of work situations bring out the best in you; 3) To create personal and career development plans and actions, based upon the reflections that your reflected best-self feedback generates; and 3) to provide a tool for future times when you may be discouraged and need to get back on track (Quinn, Dutton, & Spreitzer, 2003). The RBS is argued to be a pathway for positive identity construction, lead to purposeful and authentic engagement at work, and overcome formal and informal challenges (Roberts, 2013; Roberts, Dutton, Spreitzer, Heaphy, & Quinn, 2005). In such a framework, challenges are discussed in a way that stretches individuals in new direction and as something that takes individuals out of their routines providing an opportunity for action (Csikszentmihalyi, 1993; Csikszentmihalyi & Rathunde, 1993; Roberts, et al., 2005). In the context of resilience, the RBS is a strength-building activity that can lead

144

people to being better equipped to overcome organizational challenges and potentially create flow experiences for organizational members.

The RBS exercise can be a source of support for shifting the mindsets of organizational members to promote a focus on flexibility and adaptability, which are key aspects of resilience. Organizational members can essentially learn to develop career flexibility. Additionally, creating opportunities for teachers to explore the reasons they chose teaching as a career path in the first place can also be a space of re-commitment. "Callings," or strong desires to spend life doing a certain kind of work (Wrzesniewski et al., 1997), can redefine career pathways and promote resilience when challenges are presented. The dominant narratives about 'success' and 'careers' focus on a particular path that does not allow for flexibility or adaptability, which are key components to resilience. The RBS exercise prompts participants to explore their calling and authentically re-commit to education. Participants in this study explicitly discuss the "bigger purpose" and identify teaching as a "calling" reinforcing the argument that many teachers chose teaching because they saw it as a calling.

Whether it is my own research, others,' or mine in collaboration with others, I hope that the next steps of this research project prompt collaborative research like that which I've described in the former several pages. I believe that such a project not only would further extend our theoretical understandings of resilience in organizations but would provide opportunities for participants to actively engage in communication that would attend to sensemaking and strength building practices that would enhance their resilience, shape growth mindsets, and set them up for future flow experiences.

145

Conclusion

In this chapter I discussed this study's theoretical and practical contributions, specifically demonstrating how organizational members positively perceive challenges as part of the processes of organizing in connection to a "bigger purpose" to students and that resilience as a reciprocal process that is shared between the members of the organizational community. I also drew connections between the study's findings and several literatures that have not been an explicit part of organizational resilience in the past, including literatures on organizational sensemaking, flow, and implicit person theories. I highlighted practical implications, discussed limitations, provided recommendations for future directions and laid out a detailed rationale for future collaborative and community development research.

This research project began with my story as an educator and the hope of creating a new story, one that is driven by my passion for education and my passion for retaining highly qualified teachers. What I learned is that my story is an important part of the story. The hope and optimism I heard in talking with teachers and hearing their stories made me realize we are all part of collectively authoring this ongoing story called "teaching." Together, each of our voices is an integral part of continuing to write our story, a story that (hopefully) "construct[s] a better world" (Buzzanell, 2018) for teachers, a world I am committed to creating.

REFERENCES

Adler, M. (2017). *Fact check: Does Arizona rank last in teacher pay?* Retrieved from
http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/fact-check/2017/01/31/fact-check-
arizona-teacher-pay-ranking/96367232/

Afifi, T.D. & Harrison, K. (2018). Theory of resilience and relational load (TRRL):
Understanding families as systems of stress and calibration. . In D.O. Braithwaite,
E.A. Sutter, & K. Floyd (Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication:
Multiple Perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 324-336). New York, NY: Routledge

Arizona Department of Education. (2018a). *Accountability & Research: Data.* Retrieved
from http://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/data/

Arizona Department of Education. (2018b). *Accountability & Research: Welcome.*
Retrieved from https://www.azed.gov/accountability-research/

Arizona Department of Education Educator Retention and Recruitment Task Force
(2015). *Educator retention and recruitment report.* Arizona Department of
Education.

Arizona State Board of Education. (n.d.). *Preliminary letter grades.* Retrieved from
https://azsbe.az.gov/f-school-letter-grades

Avolio, B.J., & Mhatre, K.H. (2012). Advances in theory and research on authentic
leadership. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of
Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 773-783). New York, NY: Oxford
University Press.

Bakker, A.B., & Oerlemans, W.G.M. (2012). Subjective well-being in organizations. In
K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive
Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 178-189). New York, NY: Oxford University
Press.

Beck, G.A., Poole, A.M., & Ponche, L.M. (2015). Employment transitions in the
aftermath of economic collapse: Emerging and older adults. In G.A. Beck & T.A.
Socha (Eds). *Communicating hope and resilience across the lifespan* (Vol. 4 pp.
119-1137). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Beck, G.A., & Socha, T.A. (2015). Embracing the insights of "Murphy": New frontiers
of communication, hope, and resilience across the lifespan. In G.A. Beck & T.A.
Socha (Eds). *Communicating hope and resilience across the lifespan* (Vol. 4 pp.
1-12). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Becker, D. & Maracek, J. (2008). Positive psychology: History in the remaking? *Theory & Psychology, 18,* 591-604.

Bochner, A. (2000). Criteria Against Ourselves, *Qualitative Inquiry, 6,* 266-272.

Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events?. *American psychologist, 59*(1), 20.

Boren, J.P. (2014). The relationships between co-rumination, social support, stress, and burnout among working adults. *Communication Quarterly, 28*(1), 3-25.

Bottrell, D. (2009). Dealing with disadvantage: Resilience and the social capital of young people's networks. *Youth & Society, 40,* 476-501.

Boylorn, R. (2008). Lived experience. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 490-490). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd. doi: 10.4135/9781412963909.n250

Blackwell, C. (2018). 'Red for Ed' teacher movement continues in Chandler. Retrieved from http://www.fox10phoenix.com/news/arizona-news/red-for-ed-teacher-movement-continues-in-chandler

Brown, D.J., Arnold, R., Fletcher, D., & Standage, M. (2017). Human thriving: A conceptual debate and literature review. *European Psychologist, 22*(3), 167-179.

Brydon-Miller, M. & Kral, M. (2011). Jazz and the banyan tree: Roots and riffs on participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed., pp. 387-400). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buzzanell, P.M. (2000). The promise and practice of the new career and social contract: Illusions exposed and suggestions for reform. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking Organizational and Managerial Communication form Feminist Perspectives.* (pp. 209-235). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Buzzanell, P. M. (2010). Resilience: Talking, resisting, and imagining new normalcies into being. *Journal of Communication, 60*(1), 1-14.

Buzzanell, P.M. (2018) Communication theory of resilience: Enacting adaptive-transformative processes when families experience loss and disruption. In D.O. Braithwaite, E.A. Sutter, & K. Floyd (Eds.), *Engaging Theories in Family Communication: Multiple Perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 98-109). New York, NY: Routledge

Buzzanell, P.M. & Shenoy-Packer, S. (2015). Resilience, work, and family
  communication across the lifespan. In G.A. Beck & T.A. Socha (Eds).
  Communicating hope and resilience across the lifespan (Vol. 4 pp. 138-155).
  New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Buzzanell, P.M., Shenoy, S., Remke, R.V., Lucas, K. (2009). Responses to destructive
  organizational contexts: Intersubjectivity creating resilience to foster human
  dignity and hope. In P. Lutgen-Sandvik & B. Davenport Sypher (Eds),
  Destructive Organizational Communication (pp. 293-315). New York, NY:
  Routledge.

Buzzanell, P.M. & Turner, L.G. (2003). Emotion work revealed by job loss discourse:
  Backgrounding-foregrounding of feelings, construction of normalcy, and (re)
  instituting of traditional masculinities. *Journal of Applied Communication
  Research, 31,* 22-57.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., Quinn. (2003). Foundations of positive organizational
  scholarship. In K. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive
  organizational scholarship* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cano, R. (2018). *Arizona teachers leading #RedForEd movement will give demands at
  Wednesday rally.* Retrieved from
  https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-
  education/2018/03/27/arizona-educators-united-redfored-give-demands-
  wednesday-rally-state-capitol/457659002/

Cano, R., Santisteven, R., White, K., & Altavena, L. (2018). *Arizona teachers stage sick-
  out over pay, in #RedForEd protest.* Retrieved from
  https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/glendale-
  education/2018/03/21/arizona-teachers-stage-sick-out-over-pay-continue-
  redfored-effort/444460002/

Caza, B.B., Milton, L.P. (2012). Resilience at work: Building capability in the face of
  adversity. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of
  Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 895-908). New York, NY: Oxford
  University Press.

Charmaz, K. (2011). Grounded theory methods in social justice research. In N. K. Denzin
  & Y.S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed., pp. 359-380).
  Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. Sage.

Charmaz, K., Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). Strategies of qualitative inquiry.

Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods, 249-291.

Cheney, G., Zorn, T., Planalp, S., & Lair, D. (2008). Meaningful work and personal/social well-being: Orgnaizatioanl communication engages the meanings of work. In C. Beck (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook, 33,* 136-185.

Cloutier, S. 2015. In pursuit of happiness: Moving our communities toward a sustainable and happy future. *The International Journal of Sustainability in Economic, Social and Cultural Context* 11(3):29-40.

Cloutier, S. & Pfeiffer, D. (2015). Sustainability through Happiness: A Framework for Sustainable Development. *Sustainable Development*. doi: 10.1002/sd.1593

Collins Dictionary. (2018) *Reflection.* Retrieved from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/reflection

Cooper, C.D., & Sosik, J.J. (2012). The laughter advantage: cultivating high-quality connections and workplace outcomes through humor. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 474-489). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cooerrider, D.L., & Godwin, L.N. (2012). Positive organizational development: innovation-inspired change in an economy and ecology of strengths. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 737-750). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cooren, F., Kuhn, T., Cornelissen, J. P., & Clark, T. (2011). Communication, organizing and organization: An overview and introduction to the special issue. *Organizational Studies, 32,* 1149-1170.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). *Th evolving self; A psychology for the third millennium.* New York: Harper Collins.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Rathunde, K. (1993). The measurement of flow in everyday life: toward a theory of emergent motivation.

Denhardt, J. & Denhardt, R. (2010). Building organizational resilience and adaptive management. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience: Concepts, methods, and applications* (pp. 333-349). New York: Guilford Press.

Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 6*(2), 80-88.

Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness, and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist, 55*, 34-43.

Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. (2006). Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*, 59-96.

Ellingson, L. L. (2011). Analysis and representation across the continuum. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (4th ed., pp. 595-610). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. (2007). Telling secrets, revealing lives: Relational ethics in research with intimate others. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*, 3-29.

Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: Concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 270-291.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2012). Making social science matter. In G. Papanagnou (Ed.), *Social Science and Policy Challenges: Democracy, Values, and Capacities* (pp. 25-56). Paris: UNESCO.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 218-226.

Frost, P.J. (1999). Why compassion counts! *Journal of Management Inquiry, 8*, 127-133.

Frost, P. J, Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*, (pp. 25-45). London: Sage.

Goddard, R.D. & Salloum, S.J. (2012). Collective efficacy beliefs, organizational excellence, and leadership. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 642-650). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative inquiry, 10*(2), 261-280.

Hall, J.S., & Zautra, A.J. (2010). Indicators of community resilience. What are they, why

bother?. In J.W. Reich, A.J. Zautra, & J.S. Hall (Eds). *Handbook of Adult Resilience* (pp. 350-371). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Haynes, M. & Maddock, A. (2014). *On the path to equity: Improving the effectiveness of beginning teachers.* Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Education.

Hidden curriculum (2014, August 26). In S. Abbot (ed.), *The Glossary of Education Reform*. Retrieved from http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum

Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feelings.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Horne, John F., I.,II, & Orr, J. E. (1998). Assessing behaviors that create resilient organizations. *Employment Relations Today, 24*(4), 29-39.

Houston, J. B., Spialek, M. L., Cox, J., Greenwood, M. M., & First, J. (2015). The centrality of communication and media in fostering community resilience: A framework for assessment and intervention. *American Behavioral Scientist, 59*(2), 270-283.

Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher Turnover and Teacher Shortages: An Organizational Analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(3), 499-534.

Kassing, J. W. (1998). Development and validation of the organizational dissent scale. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *12*(2), 183-228.

Kassing, J.W. (2002). Speaking up: Identifying employees' upward dissent strategies, *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 187-209.

Kassing, J. W. (2011). *Dissent in organizations*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart R. (2005). Participatory action research. In N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., 567-605). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kent, M., Davis, M. C., & Reich, J. W. (2014). Introduction. In Kent, M., Davis, M.C., & Stuart Hall (Eds.)., *The resilience handbook: Approaches to stress and trauma* (pp. xii-xix). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kretzmann, J.P. (2010). Asset-based strategies for building resilient communities. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience: Concepts, methods, and applications* (pp.484-495). New York: Guilford Press.

Lamb, D., & Cogan, N. (2015). Coping with work-related stressors and building

resilience in mental health workers: A comparative focus group study using interpretative   phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 1-19.

Lucas, K., & Buzzanell, P. M. (2012). Memorable messages of hard times: Constructing short-and long-term resiliencies through family communication. *Journal of Family Communication*, *12*(3), 189-208.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Riforgiate, S. & Fletcher, C. (2011). Work as a source of positive emotional experiences and the discourses informing positive assessment. *Western Journal of Communication. 75*(1), 2-27.

Lyubomirsky, S. (2007). *The How of Happiness: A New Approach to Getting the Life You Want*. NewYork, NY: Penguin Group.

Lyubomirsky, S., & Della Porta, M. (2010). Boosting happiness, buttressing resilience: Results from cognitive and behavioral interventions. In J. W. Reich, A. J. Zautra, & J. Hall (Eds.), *Handbook of adult resilience: Concepts, methods, and applications* (pp.450-464). New York: Guilford Press.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 111-131.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 397-422.

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*(3), 227-238.

Mathie, A., & Cunningham, G. (2003). From clients to citizens: Asset-based community development as a strategy for community-driven development. *Development and Practice, 13*(5), 474-486.

Miller, K. I. (2007). Compassionate communication in the workplace: Exploring processes of noticing, connecting, and responding. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *35*(3), 223-245.

Miller, K. (2014). Organizational emotions and compassion at work. In L. L. Putnam & D. K. Mumby (Eds.). *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Communication* (pp. 569-588). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Miller, K. I., Considine, J., & Garner, J. (2007). "Let me tell you about my job": Exploring the terrain of emotion in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*(3), 231-260.

153

Montoya, M.J., & Kent, E.E. (2011). Dialogical action: Moving from community-based to community-driven participatory research. *Qualitative Health Research, 21*(7), 1000-1011. doi: 10.1177/1049732311403500

Nakamura, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2005). The concept of flow. *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 89-105). Cary, NC: Oxford University Press.

Norrish, J.M., & Vella-Brodrick, D.A. (2008). Is the study of happiness a worthy scientific pursuit? *Springer Science+Business Media, (87)*, 393-407.

Opler, M.E. (1945). Themes as dynamic forces in culture. *American Journal of Sociology 5*, 198-206.

Patel, J.K. (2018). After Sandy Hook, more than 400 people have been shot in over 200 school shootings. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/02/15/us/school-shootings-sandy-hook-parkland.html

Porath, C.L. (2012). Civility. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 439-448). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Quinn, R.E., Dutton, J. & Spreitzer, G. (2003). *Reflected best-self feedback exercise: Assignments and instruction to participants.* Product number 001B. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Regents, Positive Organizational Scholarship Research Group.

Remke, R.V. (2006). *(Ir)Rationalities at work: The logics, heart, and soul of Head Start.* Doctoral Dissertation. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University.

Roberts, L.M. (2013). Reflected best self engagement at work: Positive identity, alignment, and the pursuit of vitality and value creation. In S.A. David, I. Boniwell, & A.C. Ayers (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Happiness* (pp. 767-782). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D., & Quinn, R.E. (2005). Composing the Reflected Best-Self portrait: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work organizations. *The Academy of Management Review, 30*(4), 712-736.

Rothbard, N.P., Patil, S.V. (2012). Being there: Work engagement and positive

organizational scholarship. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 56-69). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, G. & Bernard, H.R. (2003). Techniques to identify themes. *Field Methods, 15*(1), 85-109.

Saldaña, J. (2016) *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schoeneborn, D., Blaschke, S., Cooren, F., McPhee, R. D., Seidl, D., & Taylor, J. R. (2014). The three schools of CCO thinking: Interactive dialogue and systematic comparison. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *28*(2), 285-316.

Seidel (2014). *The teacher dropout crisis*. Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/sections/ed/2014/07/18/332343240/the-teacher-dropout-crisis

Sekerka, L.E., Vacharkulksemsuk, T., & Fredrickson, B.L. (2012). Positive emotions: Broadening and building upward spirals of sustainable enterprise. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 168-177). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Seligman, M.E. (2002). *Authentic Happiness.* New York, NY: Atria Paperback

Seligman, M.E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-18.

The New York Times. (2018). *March for our lives highlights: Students protesting guns say 'Enough is Enough.'* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/24/us/march-for-our-lives.html

Tracy, S. J. (2009). Management burnout and moving toward employee engagement: A critical review and communicative approach toward reinvigorating the study of stress at work. In P. Lutgen-Sandvik & B. Davenport Sypher (Eds.), *The Destructive side of Organizational Communication: Processes, Consequences and Constructive Ways of Organizing* (pp. 77-98). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tracy, S.J. (2010). Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(10), 837-851.

Tracy, S.J. (2013) *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tracy, S. J., & Trethewey, A. (2005). Fracturing the real-self↔fake-self dichotomy: Moving toward crystallized organizational identities. *Communication Theory, 15*, 168-195.

Trethewey, A. & Ashcraft, K.L. (2007). Special issue introduction: Practicing disorganization: The development of applied perspectives on living with tension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*(2), 81-88.

Vogus, T.J. (2012). Mindful organizing: Establishing and extending the foundations of highly reliable performance. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 664-676). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Wadlinger, H. A., & Isaacowitz, D. M. (2006). Positive mood broadens visual attention to positive stimuli. *Motivation and Emotion*, *30*(1), 87-99.

Waldron, V.R. (2009). Emotional tyranny at work: Suppressing the moral emotions. In P. Lutgen-Sandvik & B. Davenport Sypher (Eds), *Destructive Organizational Communication: Processes, Consequences, & Constructive Ways of Organizing* (pp. 9-26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Waldron, V.R. (2012). *Communicating Emotion at Work.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Waldron, V.R. (2014) Reslience. In T. Thompson (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Health Communication* (pp. 935-936). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wamsley, L. (2018). *West Virginia's teachers walk off the job, protesting low pay and benefit cuts.* Retrieved from https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2018/02/22/588086091/west-virginias-teachers-walk-off-the-job-protesting-low-pay-and-benefit-cuts

Warr, P. (2013). Jobs and job-holders: Two sources of happiness and unhappiness. In S.A. David, I. Boniwell, & A.C. Ayers (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Happiness* (pp. 733-750). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Way, D., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Conceptualizing compassion as recognizing, relating, and (re)acting: An ethnographic study of compassionate communication at hospice. *Communication Monographs, 79*, 292-315.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Weick, K.E. (2001). *Making sense of the organization.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Business.

Weick, K.E., Sutcliffe, K.M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16*(4), p. 409-421.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of research in personality*, *31*(1), 21-33.

Ybarra, O., Rees, L., Kross, E., Sanchez-Burks, J. (2012). Social context and the psychology of emotional intelligence: A key to creating positive organizations. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 201-214). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Yeager, D.S. & Dweck, C. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(4), 302-314.

Zautra, A. J. (2009). Resilience: One part recovery, two parts sustainability. *Journal of Personality, 77*(6), 1935-1943.

Zautra, A.J., Hall, J.S., Murray, K.E. (2010). Resilience: A new definition of health for people and communities. In J.W. Reich, A.J. Zautra, & J.S. Hall (Eds). *Handbook of Adult Resilience* (pp. 3-29). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Zhou, J. & Ren. R. (2012). Striving for creativity: Building positive contexts in the workplace. In K.S. Cameron & G.M. Spreitzer (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 97-109). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Table 1

Summary of Research Hours

Type of Data	Hours Spent Collecting the Data
Participant observation in PLCs	15.5 hours
Interviews	18.5 hours
Informal interviews and observations	18 hours
Meetings with primary contacts	4 hours
Other (i.e. Professional Development Days; Attending Events)	9 hours
Total	65 research hours

Table 2*

Summary of Observations and Field Work

Date	Time	Length	Activity	Notes	
7/19/2017	12:30PM - 3:30PM	3hrs	Observe professional development/back to school days		All teachers
7/20/2017	12:30PM - 3:30PM	3hrs	Observe professional development/back to school days		All teachers
8/8/2017	2:15PM-3:30PM	1hr 15min	Observe/Participate in English 10 PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	5 members in attendance (all members in attendance
8/10/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in English 12 PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	3 members in attendance (all members in attendance; one inclusion/SPED teacher)
8/17/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in English 12 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion; discussed personal issue and got feedback; set up interviews	3 members in attendance (all members in attendance; one inclusion/SPED teacher)
8/18/2017	6:30PM-9:30PM	3hrs	Attended football game to build rapport and talk with other departments about getting involved in PLCs	Talked with various teachers and specifically talked with history deparment chair about getting involved in PLCs	Various Teachers/Attendance not required/Some Teachers sign up to work events doing various things (i.e. selling tickets, working the gate,
8/22/2017	2:15PM-3:30PM	1hr15min	Observe/Participate in English 10 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion; discussed personal issue and got feedback; set up interviews	4 member in attendance (One member not in attendance) Found out one member is fighting breast cancer and was at her chemo appointment
8/24/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in English 12 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion	3 members in attendance (all members in attendance; one inclusion/SPED teacher)
8/22/2017	2:15PM-2:50PM	35min	Observe/Particpate in English 10 PLC	Observed/particpated in discussion	3 members in attendance (2 members not in attendance)
8/24/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in English 12 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion	3 members in attendance (all members in attendance; one inclusion/SPED teacher)
8/29/2017	2:15PM-2:50PM	25min	Observe/Participate in English 10 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion	2 members in attendance (3 members not in attendance but one popped in)
9/7/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in English 12 PLC	Observed/participated in discussion	3 members (all in attendance; one inclusion/SPED teacher)
10/24/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Spanish PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	3 members in attendance (1 does not have prep during this period)
10/26/2017	9:30AM-10:30AM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Biology PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	4 members in attendance (some missing)
10/26/2017	11:00AM-12:00PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Anatomy PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	2 members in attendance (all members in attendance)
10/31/2017	10:45AM-11:45AM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Geometry PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	5 members in attendance (all members in attendance; one inclusion SPED teacher)
10/31/2017	12:15PM-1:15PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Spanish PLC	Observed/participated in discussion	3 members (all in attendance)
11/1/2017	2:30PM-3:30PM	1hr	Observe/Participate in World History PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	3 members (all in attendance; one does not teach World History but sits in - this person is the department head)
11/3/2017	7:30AM-8:30AM	1hr	Observe/Participate in Algebra PLC	Introduced myself and my research; PLC members signed consent; recruited interview participants; Observed discussion	5 members (I believe all were in attendance; 1 person is an aide)

*Table not inclusive of all events (i.e. sporting events) nor does this table include ethnographic interviews

159

Table 3

Summary of Interview Data

	Total Number of Interviews	Total Duration	Total Single Spaced Transcribed Pages	Date Range	Range of Time of Day Interviews Conducted
Interviews	28	18 hours; 26 minutes; 54 seconds	392 pages	8/21/2017 – 12/12/2017	8:00AM – 6:45 PM

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) APPROVAL FORM

EXEMPTION GRANTED

Sarah Tracy
Human Communication, Hugh Downs School of

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title:	Narratives of Organizational Successes and Employee Strengths as a Method Toward Employee Resilience, Well-Being, & Sustainability
Investigator:	Sarah Tracy
IRB ID:	STUDY00006610
Funding:	None
Grant Title:	None
Grant ID:	None
Documents Reviewed:	• Focus Group Observations and Generated Products Informed Consent , Category: Consent Form; • Observations and Products Generated Verbal Script , Category: Recruitment Materials; • Kamrath Dissertation Protocol , Category: IRB Protocol; • Kamrath Interview Guide, Category: Measures (Survey questions/Interview questions /interview guides/focus group questions); • Interview Informed Consent , Category: Consent Form; • Kamrath Interview Verbal Script , Category: Recruitment Materials; • Reflected Best Self Exercise , Category: Participant materials (specific directions for them);

480/965-7709 Sarah.Tracy@asu.edu

Dear Sarah Tracy:

On 8/8/2017 the ASU IRB reviewed the following protocol:

The IRB determined that the protocol is considered exempt pursuant to Federal Regulations 45CFR46 (2) Tests, surveys, interviews, or observation on 8/8/2017.

In conducting this protocol you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

IRB Administrator

cc: Jessica Kamrath Jessica
        Kamrath

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PLC AND INTERVIEW RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Hello Anonymous:

I am not sure if you remember me from the back to school professional development days, but my name is Jessica Kamrath. I used to teach at X school and now I am doctoral student at ASU. Anonymous2 gave me your name and said you might be interested in participating in my dissertation research. For my dissertation, I am interested in the communication processes of resilience, well-being, and community building in the organization and specifically how we can create a culture of resilience and well-being to retain good teachers.

I was hoping I could come and participate in your PLC next week and set up an interview with you. During the PLC I would introduce myself and give a quick overview of my research and what I am doing. Then I would basically just hang out during your PLC and participate in any way that your group feels comfortable. Let me know if this will work for your team next week and if so, what time you all meet.

I would also like to do an interview with you that should last about 30-45 minutes. Let me know if you would be willing to participate and if so, a good time for you.

I have attached more information about the interview and PLC observations in the informed consents, so you can take a look at those and let me know if you have any questions.

I know teachers already have so little time so thank you so much for any help and/or participation!

Be Happy & Be Well,

Jessica Kamrath, M.A.
Research Assistant, Center for Strategic Communication, NCAA Mind Matters
Graduate Teaching Associate
PhD Student, Communication
The Hugh Downs School of Human Communication
Arizona State University
jkamrath@asu.edu

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT: FIELD WORK & OBSERVATIONS

Narratives of Organizational Successes and Employee Strengths as a Method Toward
Employee Resilience, Well-Being, & Sustainability

*Please read the following explanation of this study. Signing this form will indicate you
have been informed about the study and that you consent to participate. I want to ensure
you understand what you are being asked to do and what risks and benefits – if any – are
associated with the study so you can make an informed decision on whether or not you
want to participate.*

Dear Participant,

I am a researcher in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State
University under the direction of Dr. Sarah J. Tracy, PhD. My research focuses on the
communicative processes of resilience in connection to organizational well-being and
sustainability. I am particularly interested in the ways in which organizational members
overcome challenges and how stories of community successes can develop a supportive
organizational culture that fosters resilience and well-being. I want to understand the
ways organizational members engage in dialogue to identify, map, and analyze
community assets/strengths through facilitated activities. In addition, I want to explore
the ways in which these collaborative activities foster reslience and individual and
organizational well-being.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve granting access to your professional
learning community (PLC) to observe and conduct collaborative activities. Your PLC
activities will provide a snapshot of the overall picture of the processes of resilience and,
therefore, I am also asking for access to any materials produced from collaborative
activities, such as the reflected best-self table, reflected best-self portrait, reflected best-
self reflection, individual strengths, journals, or any other materials generated during
these activities.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. PLC activities may be audio recorded
ONLY if every member of the PLC consents. Recordings will only be used for research
purposes. Only the research team will have access to these recordings. Let me know if, at
any time, you no longer wish to be recorded and I will stop. To protect your identity and
the identities of others, all data collected from field notes and the collaborative activities
will remain anonymous and pseudonyms will be used. If you choose not to participate or
to withdraw from the study at any time there will be no penalty. Although you will
participate in these collaborative activities as part of your professional learning
communities, you can opt out of allowing the researcher to take field notes or use
individual products as a result of these activities. There are no foreseeable risks or
discomforts to your participation.

The field observations and analysis of products generated during collaborative activities will be used to develop greater insight into the ways in which a focus on strengths and assets can foster resilience and organizational well-being. To ensure that your confidentiality is protected, no personally identifying information will be used. Thus, the privacy of your data will be maintained and no identifying information will be used. To reduce concerns about confidentiality, you can choose or be assigned a pseudonym. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or publications but your name will not be known. Results will only be shared in the aggregate form. To reduce concerns about confidentiality, you can choose or be assigned a pseudonym.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact a member of the research team, Jessica Kamrath, at jkamrath@asu.edu or Dr. Sarah J. Tracy at sarah.tracy@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Please read the authorization statement below, check the research activities that you are providing consent for, and print and sign your name as your consent to participate. You can choose to participate in all research activities, only some, or none.

I have read this paper about the study, or it was read to me. I know the possible risks and benefits. I know that being in this study is voluntary. I choose to be in this study. I know that I can withdraw at any time. I have received, on the date of the signature, a copy of this document.

☐ **I give the researchers permission to observe and take field notes of PLC activities.**

☐ **I give the researchers permission to analyze any and all products generated during collaborative activities, including my reflected best-self table, reflected best-self portrait, reflected best-self reflection, individual strengths, journals, or any other materials generated during these activities.**

☐ **I give the researchers permission to audio record PLC activities.**

Name of Participant (printed) _____

Signature of Participant _____ Date _____

Verbal Script

Narratives of Organizational Successes and Employee Strengths as a Method Toward
Employee Resilience, Well-Being, & Sustainability

I am a researcher in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State
University under the direction of Dr. Sarah J. Tracy, PhD. My research focuses on the
communicative processes of resilience in connection to organizational well-being and
sustainability. I am particularly interested in the ways in which organizational members
overcome challenges and how stories of community successes can develop a supportive
organizational culture that fosters resilience and well-being. I want to understand the
ways organizational members engage in dialogue to identify, map, and analyze
community assets/strengths through facilitated activities.

In addition, to conducting interviews with teachers, administrators, and counselors, I am
inviting your consent to allow me to collaborate with and observe the Professional
Learning Communities. There will be times, then, that I will be taking field notes of these
activities. Observations of PLC activities, professional development days, and the
collaborative activities provides a snapshot of the bigger picture. I am, therefore, also
asking for access to any materials produced during the PLC collaborative activities, such
as the reflected best-self table, reflected best-self portrait, reflected best-self reflection,
individual strengths, journals, or any other materials generated during these activities,
that you think would be beneficial to understanding resilience and well-being in the
education institutions.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and, therefore, granting access to your PLC
activities is voluntary. In order to participate, you will need to read and sign the informed
consent and sign a permission letter granting access to your PLC.

If you have any questions please contact the researcher using the information provided
below.

Jessica K. Kamrath   Sarah J. Tracy, Ph.D.
jkamrath@asu.edu   sarah.tracy@asu.edu
Graduate Student   Professor

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT: INTERVIEWS

Informed Consent

Narratives of Organizational Successes and Employee Strengths as a Method Toward
Employee Resilience, Well-Being, & Sustainability

*Please read the following explanation of this study. Reading this form will indicate you
have been informed about the study and participation in the interview is your consent to
participate. I want to ensure you understand what you are being asked to do and what
risks and benefits – if any – are associated with the study so you can make an informed
decision on whether or not you want to participate.*

Dear Participant,

I am a researcher in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State
University under the direction of Dr. Sarah J. Tracy, PhD. My research focuses on the
communicative processes of resilience in connection to organizational well-being and
sustainability. I am particularly interested in the ways in which organizational members
overcome challenges and how stories of community successes can develop a supportive
organizational culture that fosters resilience and well-being.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve completing an interview that should
take approximately 30-45 minutes. In order to qualify for participation in this study you
must be:

1. 18 years of age or older
2. Currently employed by a public education institution

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can skip questions if you wish. The
interviews will occur at a time and place that is most convenient for you. Interviews will
be audio recorded and recordings will only be used for research purposes. Only the
research team will have access to the recordings. The recordings will be deleted
immediately after being transcribed and any published quotes will be anonymous. To
protect your identity and the identities of others, please refrain from using names or other
identifying information during the interview. Let me know if, at any time, you do not
want to be recorded and I will stop. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from
the study at any time there will be no penalty. There are no foreseeable risks or
discomforts to your participation.

Your responses to the interview questions will be used to develop greater insight into the
communicative processes of reslience while building social capital within the educational
community by understanding the organizational capacities for overcoming challenges. To
ensure that your confidentiality is protected, no personally identifying information will be
used. Thus, the privacy of your data will be maintained and no identifying information
will be used. The results of this study may be used in reports, presentations, or

publications but your name will not be known. Results will only be shared in the aggregate form. You may be contacted by the researchers after the interview if any follow-up or clarification is necessary.

To reduce concerns about confidentiality, you will choose or be assigned a pseudonym, and none of your information will be kept under your real name. All electronic files of observation notes, interview transcripts, and audio files will be kept in physically secured locations by using password-protected files and locked drawers.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please contact a member of the research team, Jessica Kamrath, at jkamrath@asu.edu or Dr. Sarah J. Tracy at sarah.tracy@asu.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Please read the authorization statement below. Participation in the interview will be considered your consent to participate.

I have read this paper about the study, or it was read to me. I know the possible risks and benefits. I know that being in this study is voluntary. I choose to be in this study. I know that I can withdraw at any time. I have received, on the date of the signature, a copy of this document. I realize I will be audio recorded. Let me know if you consent to participate in this interview.

If you agree to be contacted for a 15-20 minute follow-up, please provide your preferred contact method below. If you do not wish to be contacted for a follow-up you can leave the fields below blank.

Name _____

E-mail_____

Phone _____

Verbal Script

Narratives of Organizational Successes and Employee Strengths as a Method Toward
Employee Resilience, Well-Being, & Sustainability

I am a researcher in the Hugh Downs School of Human Communication at Arizona State
University under the direction of Dr. Sarah J. Tracy, PhD. My research focuses on the
communicative processes of resilience in connection to organizational well-being and
sustainability. I am particularly interested in the ways in which organizational members
overcome challenges and how stories of community successes can develop a supportive
organizational culture that fosters resilience and well-being.

I am inviting your participation, which will involve completing an interview that should
take approximately 30-45 minutes. In order to qualify for participation in this study you
must be:
1. 18 years of age or older
2. Currently employed by a public education institution

Your participation in this study is voluntary. In order to participate, you will need to read
the informed consent.

If you have any questions please contact the researcher using the information provided
below.

Jessica K. Kamrath   Sarah J. Tracy, Ph.D.
jkamrath@asu.edu   sarah.tracy@asu.edu
Graduate Student   Professor

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW GUIDE AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Interview Guide

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this research. Remember that your participation is voluntary and you can skip questions if you wish. This interview is being audio recorded and you can stop the recording at any time. In order to maintain the confidentiality of you and your co-workers, please refer to others as "my administrator," "my co-worker" or in some other non-identifying way. Do you have any questions before we start?

1. How would you describe or define individual well-being? What might the components of individual well-being be or what might contribute to your individual happiness?

2. What does this look like in your organization? What would contribute to individual well-being at work?

3. How would you define or describe reslience? What does resilience look like for you or others at work?

4. What are the connections between individual well-being and resilience, if any?

5. What is the best part of your organizational community or what do you LOVE about your community?

6. What are constraints or challenges in your organizational community?

7. In what ways do you think you could increase or enhance resilience or well-being in your organization?

8. Describe your Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)

9. How do you view the 'community' in PLCs? How do you see this now? How is this developed? How could this be further developed in the future?

Narrative Inquiry Questions:

1. Tell me about any challenges your organization/community has had to overcome (Prompt participants to describe a community challenge and an individual challenge). Think back and describe the particular challenge or challenges in as much detail as possible. How did individuals or the organization/community as a whole overcome those challenges. Describe what happened in as much detail as possible. What were people doing? What were people saying. What did you learn from the experience or what do you think organizational/community members learned? What current challenges do you have in your organizational and/or what challenges do you foresee in the future? How might you overcome those challenges?

2. Tell me a story about organizational/community successes in as much detail as possible (Prompt participants to describe a community success and an individual success). What was the situation, what were people doing, what were people saying and why do you describe this particular situation/event/instance as successful? What did you or organizational/community members learn from this situation/event/instance? What might you utilize in present or future situations/events/instances?

3. What are the strengths of your organizational community?

4. What are your individual strengths that you bring to the community?

5. What is one thing you want to improve individually and in the community? How can your community support you?

6. Give me one word or phrase that positively describes your organizational

    community. Either something you see now or something you want to see in the

    future.

Demographic Questions

Please indicate your age as of your last birthday… _____ years.

What is your gender? (check one)

Female	_____	Gender Variant/Non-Conforming	_____
Male	_____	Not listed (optional fill-in)	_____
Transgender Female	_____	Prefer not to respond	_____
Transgender Male	_____		

What is your race/ethnicity? (check one)

Asian/Pacific Islander	_____	African-American	_____
Caucasian/White	_____	Other/Multi-Racial	_____
Hispanic	_____	Native American/Alaska Native	_____
Prefer not to Respond	_____		

Current role (check one):
Teacher	_____
Counselor	_____
Administrator	_____
Support Staff	_____
Aide	_____

To the nearest year, how long have you been a teacher/administrator/counselor?

To the nearest year, how long have you been at your current institution?

What area(s) do you teach?

Overall, how many education institutions have you worked for?

Are you involved in any coaching, clubs, or extracurricular activities on campus? If so, please list what those are and what your role/involvement is.

APPENIDX F

FIRST ROUND CODING CATEGORIES

First Round Coding

Nodes & Sub nodes
Well-Being
Description
Action
Resilience
Description
Action
Connections – RS & WB
Ways to Enhance – RS & WB
Community
Descriptions
How to Build
PLC
Best Parts & Constraints of Org
Best Parts of Org
Constraints & Challenges of Org
Strengths & Improvement
Community Improvements
Community Strengths
Individual Improvements
Individual Strengths
One Word
Description or Phrase (if applicable)
Word or phrase

APPENDIX G

SAMPLE CODING NOTES

Potential Themes/Codes
Confidence
Goal/Commitment to something bigger than oneself
Support
Flexibility
Adaptability
Growth mindset

Connections to other scholarly literature:
Growth Mindset = More resilient and able to bounce back because they are able to learn and make adjustments
Flow – the sweet spot between ability and challenge; teachers want to take on new challenges and be challenges at work but they also want the confidence, skills, and support to be able to work through these challenges
Subjective well-being – I explicitly pulled out these connections but the participants explicitly saw resilience and well-being as connected and discussed the ways in which they were.

Notes on Resilience Descriptions

-Grit
-Don't quit
-Ppl that are underdogs or people that have been told they cannot do something – this implicitly creates resilience because they push to do it and prove ppl wrong
-It is a DECISION
-"There's nothing that can stop you unless you decide to stop yourself" (Ricky).
-Flexibility, understanding you cannot control everything
-Understand you are working against some elements (i.e. try and try again but "sometimes you're going to make gains and sometimes you're not…" (Kirk).
-ability to bounce back
-"actually even working with the kids are rewarding. So that's helpful for me, talking to the kids most of the time" (Victoria)
-"having the ability to change direction" (Victoria).
-Admin is supportive
-"Getting things done by any means necessary" (Brooklyn).
-Focusing on the most important things
-"…and keeping in the back of my mind that this is a job that I have to do and why I'm doing it" (Brooklyn).
-"…but I knew this when I got into this profession I'd never be rich" (Tyler).
-bad stuff is going to happen and good stuff is going to happen. "To me I let the good stuff affect me better than that bad stuff…let the good stuff affect you more" (Tyler).
-"I've been in this profession so long because I like it. If you don't like 14 to 18 year old kids, don't be a high school teacher" (Tyler)
-"being able to deal with stuff, adjust, adapt, and keep going" (Lizzie)

-bounce back, deal with stuff and keep going. "It's like something happens, okay it's going to, whatever it is, how do you deal with it, how do you keep going, not letting that get to you" (Lizzie)

-Changes daily

-Need to adjust what you're doing and go with it "How am I going to deal with this problem not letting something stop you?" (Lizzie)

-adapt, adjust

-" Resilience is the ability to continue doing what you believe is right in the face of setbacks" (Trent)

APPENDIX H

LOOSE ANALYSIS OUTLINE

Loose Analysis Outline

Issues motivating the study
1. Teacher shortages
2. Lack of quality teachers – specifically in AZ
3. Organizational irrationalities and tensions: Framework of federal and state mandates
4. How do organizational leaders and members build a culture of resilience and well-being through communication processes, interactions, and behaviors? To retain high quality teachers in this case?
5. How can we utilize community building and community/strengths-based approaches to build a culture of resilience and well-being?

Purpose
This research examines the communicative processes of resilience in connection with organizational well-being in public education institutions.
To understand:
1. The ways in which organizational members conceptualize and talk about resilience and well-being
2. The ways in which organizational members enact resilience and well-being
3. The ways in which organizational members make connections between resilience and well-being
4. The ways in which stories of challenges and successes communicatively construct and foster reslience individually and collectively
5. The ways in which organizational members build community

Guiding questions motivating the analysis

RQ1: How do organizational members conceptualize and talk about resilience and well-being and what connections do they see?
RQ2: How do organizational members enact resilience and well-being?
RQ3: How do stories organizational members tell about organizational successes, challenges, and strengths inform the ways in which organizational members construct resilience in everyday activities and with one another as a community?

Potential themes that emerged in coding that might answer these questions

Resilience Descriptions/Definitions
1. Bigger Purpose
2. Confidence
3. Growth Mindset
4. Awareness
5. Support
6. Experience
7. Adaptability

184

8. Flexibility

Enactment of Resilience
1. Intentional/Created in language (i.e. decision/choice)
2. Mindset
3. Goal setting and action steps
4. Reflection
5. Feedback
6. Make Adjustments
7. "Talk through"
8. Vent
9. Recall student success stories
10. Ask for help/Ask Qs

Ways to enhance/Contributors to resilience
1. Support
2. Communication
3. Consistency
4. Dialogue
5. Building relationships
6. Building trust
7. Feeling valued
8. Idea sharing
9. Venting
10. Taking ownership
11. Building community
12. Balance of support versus micromanaging
13. Collaboration
14. Time

Well-Being Descriptions
1. Preparation (being prepared)
2. Balance
3. Support
4. Meaningful/Fulling work (connection to "bigger purpose")
5. Present
6. Pushing forward
7. Comfortable (Connected to confidence, idea sharing, and ability to contribute to individual and community goals
8. Awareness (how to balance everything and also mental state when out of balance)
9. Satisfaction
10. Ability to move through challenges
11. Welcome and want to be challenged or have opportunity to push self out of comfort zone in safe environment

Enactment of Well-Being
1. Being prepared
2. Organized
3. Finding ways to challenge oneself
4. Outside contributors (time with family, extracurriculars, exercise, etc.)
5. Seeking out stories of success
6. Seeking out positive interactions with students and other adults (i.e. watching practice or engaged classroom)
7. Remembering "bigger purpose"
8. Building camaraderie, community
9. Building relationships

-Many evoked stories of resilience – specific instances or times and how they maintained well-being int hat situation. These stories involved challenges

Teachers need:
-Time
-Support
-Structures in place
-Consistency
-Feeling cared, supported, valued, but not micromanaged

Connections of Resilience and Well-Being

Resilience leading to well-being
"Bigger purpose" Goal allows you to push through challenges which in turn increase your well-being
Sense of accomplishment – from pushing through challenges, increasing well-being
Overcoming challenges = sense of success = contributes to well-being and sense of worth, confidence, ability to contribute to individual and community goals

Well-being leading to reslience
Support (cared for, accepted, valued) allows people to have a higher well-being and in turn push through
More balanced you are the more ability you have to work through challenges and disruptions

Multi-directional (all are multi-directional above are specifically in the direction participants saw them)
Community
"work family"
Talking with people