

WHAT DO U.S. ARMY FIELD GRADE OFFICERS PERCEIVE AS
THEIR ROLE IN BUILDING RESILIENCE IN SOLDIERS?

A thesis presented to the Faculty of the U.S. Army
Command and General Staff College in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE
General Studies

by

VIRGINIA A. KNORR, MAJ, U.S. ARMY
B.A., University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa, 2002

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas
2012-02

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved</i> <i>OMB No. 0704-0188</i>		
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 14-12-2012		2. REPORT TYPE Master's Thesis		3. DATES COVERED (From - To) FEB 2012 – DEC 2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE What Do U.S. Army Field Grade Officers Perceive as Their Role in Building Resilience in Soldiers?			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER		
			5b. GRANT NUMBER		
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER		
6. AUTHOR(S) Major Virginia A. Knorr			5d. PROJECT NUMBER		
			5e. TASK NUMBER		
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER		
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Command and General Staff College ATTN: ATZL-SWD-GD Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301			8. PERFORMING ORG REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)		
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)		
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Over the past decade the study of resilience in humans has increased in multiple fields. During the 1970's resilience was viewed as a trait that one was born with, but over the years this idea has decreased in popularity and resilience is now viewed as a process. When resilience is regarded as a process, there is the potential to teach people how to be more resilient. The United States Army is attempting to do just this through the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (CSF) program and the four pillars that support it. Previous research has shown that learned resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them such as peers, parents, and supervisors. With this information it could be deduced that in order for the CSF to show results, senior leaders should have confidence in the CSF and the overall idea that resilience can be built and promoted. This qualitative case study will be an in-depth examination of resilience and how it is perceived and potentially promoted by field grade officers in the Army with the following research question being examined: What do U.S. Army field grade officers perceive as their role in building resilience in Soldiers? With the secondary questions looking at how field grade officers perceive the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program and its ability to promote resilience.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Resilience, Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program (CSFP),					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			19b. PHONE NUMBER (include area code)
(U)	(U)	(U)	(U)	121	

MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Name of Candidate: Major Virginia A. Knorr

Thesis Title: What do U.S. Army Field Grade Officers Perceive as Their Role in Building Resilience in Soldiers?

Approved by:

_____, Thesis Committee Chair
Bill J. McCollum, Ed.D.

_____, Member
Mark A. Tolmachoff, M.A.P.P.

_____, Member
Matthew W. Broaddus, M.A.

Accepted this 14th day of December 2012 by:

_____, Director, Graduate Degree Programs
Robert F. Baumann, Ph.D.

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the student author and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College or any other governmental agency. (References to this study should include the foregoing statement.)

ABSTRACT

WHAT DO U.S. ARMY FIELD GRADE OFFICERS PERCEIVE AS THEIR ROLE IN BUILDING RESILIENCE IN SOLDIERS, by Virginia A. Knorr, 121 pages.

Over the past decade the study of resilience in humans has increased in multiple fields. During the 1970s, resilience was viewed as a trait that one was born with, but over the years this idea has decreased in popularity and resilience is now viewed as a process. When resilience is regarded as a process, there is the potential to teach people how to be more resilient. The United States Army is attempting to do just this through the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (CSF) program and the four main pillars that support it. Previous research has shown that learned resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them such as peers, parents, and supervisors. With this information it could be deduced that in order for the CSF to show results, senior leaders should have confidence in the CSF and the overall idea that resilience can be built and promoted. This qualitative case study will be an in-depth examination of resilience and how it is perceived and potentially promoted by field grade officers in the Army examining the following research question: What do U.S. Army field grade officers perceive as their role in building resilience in Soldiers?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank all those who offered support and encouragement throughout this research project. First, to my husband, Matt, for enduring countless hours of me rambling about resilience and proof reading more drafts than he could have possibly ever wanted. Even while deployed to Afghanistan his support truly made the entire endeavor possible. With this, I would also have to thank our two beautiful daughters, Myah and Avah, for sacrificing a lot of mommy time and enduring long nights of me writing until the early morning and to our son, Jack, for having to endure so much stress even before he came into the world.

I would also like to thank my committee for their expert knowledge and commitment to the project. The committee chair, Dr. Bill McCollum kept the research project focused and on track and served as a guide through the process that allowed me to finish on time. Mr. Matt Broaddus and Mr. Mark Tolmachoff contributed their expert view on the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program and resilience, shared large amounts of research material with me, and continuously gave me the encouragement needed to finish the thesis. I sincerely appreciate them all for being on my committee and for being a part of the team.

I also thank my research seminar group leader, Mr. Herb Merrick, for his qualitative research direction and guidance and the contributions of my seminar group for all their input and suggestions. Finally, I would like to thank my oral comprehensive exam committee: Dr. Bill McCollum, Dr. Alex Bielakowski, Mr. Steve Wieggers, LTC Doug Baker, and MAJ Steve Schnell for their time and effort to include the focus of my research toward the context of the examination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MASTER OF MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE THESIS APPROVAL PAGE	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ACRONYMS	ix
TABLES	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
Primary Research Question	4
Secondary Research Questions	4
Assumptions	5
Definitions	5
Limitations	6
Delimitations	7
Conclusion	7
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Overview	9
Resilience vs. Resiliency	9
Resilience	10
History of Resilience Research	14
Current Research	18
International Resiliency Project	19
Personal Resilience and Resilient Relationships	22
Leadership Behaviors and Subordinate Resilience	25
Positive Psychology	26
Penn Resiliency Program	27
Penn Resiliency Program for Parents	29
Background on the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program	30
Leadership in Relation to Resilience	34
Common Ground in Current Research	36

CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	39
Overview.....	39
Data Collection Methods	39
Data Analysis Methods.....	41
CHAPTER 4 ANALYSIS	44
Overview.....	44
Demographics	44
Analysis of Primary Research Question	45
Analysis of Secondary Research Questions.....	46
What do Field Grade Officers Understand or Believe About Resilience?	46
Do Field Grade Officers Believe Resilience Can be Developed?	47
According to Field Grade Officers, Who is Responsible for Developing Resilient Soldiers?	47
What Have Field Grade Officers Personally Observed or Done to Develop Resilient Soldiers in Their Organizations?	48
What Have Field Grade Officers Done or Observed that May Have Inhibited the Development of Resilient Soldiers in Their Organizations?.....	49
What do Field Grade Officers Understand or Know About the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program?	50
What is the Perception at the Field Grade Level of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program and its Ability to Promote Resilience?	51
How do Field Grade Leaders Perceive the Efficacy of the Army's Institutional Resilience Training?	52
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
Conclusions.....	56
Recommendations.....	59
Recommendations for Future Research.....	60
Final Thoughts	60
APPENDIX A INFORMED CONSENT.....	62
APPENDIX B PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS	64
APPENDIX C INTERVIEW QUESTIONS.....	65
APPENDIX D INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT	67
Participant 1	67
Primary Research Question.....	67
Secondary Research Questions	67
Participant 2	71
Primary Research Question.....	71

Secondary Research Questions	71
Participant 3	74
Primary Research Question.....	74
Secondary Research Questions	74
Participant 4	77
Primary Research Question.....	77
Secondary Research Questions	77
Participant 5	82
Primary Research Question.....	82
Secondary Research Questions	82
Participant 6	86
Primary Research Question.....	86
Secondary Research Questions	86
Participant 7	90
Primary Research Question.....	90
Secondary Research Questions	90
Participant 8	94
Primary Research Question.....	94
Secondary Research Questions	94
Participant 9	96
Primary Research Question.....	96
Secondary Research Questions	97
Participant 10	100
Primary Research Question.....	100
Secondary Research Questions	100
REFERENCE LIST	105
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	110

ACRONYMS

ABC	Adversity-Beliefs-Consequences
CAM	Complementary and Alternate Medicine
CGSC	Command and General Staff College
CRM	Comprehensive Resilience Modules
CSF	Comprehensive Soldier Fitness
FRLT	Full Range Leadership Theory
GAT	Global Assessment Tool
GS	General Schedule
ILE	Intermediate Level Education
IR	Institutional Resilience
IRP	International Resiliency Project
MBA	Master of Business Administration
MRT	Master Resilience Trainer
NCO	Noncommissioned Officer
NIMH	National Institute of Mental Health
PCC	Pre Command Course
PEP	Penn Enhancement Program
PME	Professional Military Education
PRP	Penn Resiliency Program
PRPP	Penn Resiliency Program for Parents
PRRR	Personal Resilience and resilient Relationships
PTSD	Post Traumatic Stress Disorder
RAND	Research and Development

SMA Sergeant Major of the Army

TRADOC U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command

TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Demographics of Participants.....	44

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The great surprise of resilience research is the ordinariness of the phenomena. Resilience appears to be a common phenomenon that results in most cases from the operation of basic human adaptational systems. If those systems are protected and in good working order, development is robust even in the face of severe adversity; if these major systems are impaired, antecedent or consequent to adversity, then the risk of developmental problems is much greater, particularly if the environmental hazards are prolonged.

— Ann S. Masten, *Ordinary Magic: Resilience Processes in Development*

Many different labels or names have been used to describe the natural process of resilience. In popular literature one may hear it called true grit, mental toughness, hardiness, resourcefulness, psychological resilience, emotional resilience, stress resistance and by countless other names. Currently, the general area of resilience is a highly studied area that may someday guide program creation, intervention implementation, and social policymaking. Over the past decade, countless civilian as well as military programs and interventions have been created with the overall goal of building or enhancing resilience in individuals. These programs focus on vastly different target audiences such as children, adolescents, young adults (college students), and adult civilian workers. The United States Army has also created a program called the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (CSF) program to build resilience Army-wide.

The main purpose of this thesis is to look into the Army's CSF program and gain information on what field grade officers perceive as their role in helping to promote resilience in Soldiers at the unit level. The overall need for the program is based on the

fact that the Army has been functioning at a very high operational tempo which has caused an Army-wide increase in post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSD) and suicide rates. Previous research has shown that learned resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them such as peers, parents, and supervisors (Grotberg 1997; Waite and Richardson 2004). With this information, it could be inferred that in order for the CSF program to show greater results, senior leaders must understand how they can assist in and encourage the promotion of resilience in Soldiers, should have confidence in the program, and belief in the overall idea that resilience can be influenced and built. The research study will be an in-depth qualitative case study that examines resilience and how it is promoted and perceived by field grade officers. This research could potentially add to the literature on the perception of the CSF program and what field grade leaders are, or possibly are not, doing to promote resilience at the organizational level. It could also add to the general area of resilience and studies/discussions that revolve around how others/leaders can promote resilience in individuals. It is hoped that this study will assist in assessing our field grade leaders' behavior patterns, opinions, beliefs, and knowledge in regard to resilience and the CSF program and help guide the fourth pillar of the program which encompasses the mandatory resilience training that is administered at all levels of Army leader development.

The Army's CSF program is considered by some to be the largest psychological intervention in history with participants consisting of Soldiers, family members, and Army civilians (Casey 2011; Lester et al. 2011). According to Cornum, Matthews, and Seligman the CSF program, "is designed to increase psychological strength and positive performance and to reduce the incidence of maladaptive responses of the entire U.S.

Army” (2011, 4). The overall need for the program is based on the fact that modern warfare has caused an Army-wide increase in areas including post traumatic stress disorders (PTSD) and suicide rates. These, in turn, can be further attributed to the high pace of current military operations, prolonged and reoccurring separation from family and loved ones, the continuous threat of traumatic incidents that could potentially cause bodily injury or even death, and multiple other contributing factors (Cornum et al. 2011).

In 2008, a proof-of-concept was conducted on the CSF program in order to identify the potential problems and challenges behind the program and its curriculum prior to its implementation Army-wide in 2009 (Lester et al. 2011). The program is designed around the key dimensions of physical, social, emotional, spiritual, and family that are intended to accommodate and adapt to each individual’s needs, and are meant to differentiate the program so it is not a “one size fits all” intervention (Casey 2011). These dimensions are then integrated into the four components or pillars of the CSF program.

The first pillar, which contains the online Global Assessment Tool (GAT) that is used to assess an individual’s resilience strengths and weaknesses; that assessment then leads to the second pillar which entails online self-help modules that are personalized to an individual’s GAT results. The third pillar involves putting certain noncommissioned officers (NCO), warrant officers, commissioned officers, and general schedule (GS) civilians through the Master Resilience Training (MRT) course designed to teach them the needed skills that are designed to build resilience. With this newfound knowledge, they return to their units and are able to teach others how to be more resilient through the use of multiple preconfigured training modules that are specifically designed to increase resilience in individuals. The final pillar of the program is mandatory Institutional

Resilience (IR) training that is built into all levels of leader development training (Casey 2011; Cornum et al. 2011). The CSF program is continuously improved upon as new data are gathered and analyzed in order to better facilitate building psychological resilience in today's Army. It is hoped that the current case study will add to the data by exploring what field grade officer's view as their role in building resilience in Soldiers, as countless studies have explored the idea that resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them (Grotberg 1997, Waite and Richardson 2004). With this general premise taken into consideration, the current case study will address the below research questions.

Primary Research Question

What do U.S. Army field grade officers perceive as their role in building resilience in Soldiers?

Secondary Research Questions

What do field grade officers understand or believe about resilience?

Do field grade officers believe resilience can be developed?

If so, why?

If so, how?

If not, why not?

According to field grade officers, who is responsible for developing resilient Soldiers?

What have field grade officers personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in their organizations?

What have field grade officers done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in their organizations?

What do field grade officers understand or know about the CSF program?

What is the perception at the field grade level of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program and its ability to promote resilience?

How do field grade leaders perceive the efficacy of the Army's Institutional Resilience (IR) training (the fourth pillar of the CSF that guides resilience training at all levels of leader training)?

Assumptions

Two assumptions are essential to the research project. First, the sample drawn for the qualitative interviews are assumed to be representative of the larger Army population of field grade officers. Second, the field grade officers selected will answer the questions with open and honest answers, thus allowing for their true beliefs, perspectives, opinions, and knowledge to be understood.

Definitions

Resilience: Using the definition that guides the CSF program, Reivich et al. state it is “a set of processes that enables good outcomes in spite of serious threats” (2011, 25).

Soldiers: A person who serves in the United States Army. In this case study it is used to reference junior enlisted (E1-E4), noncommissioned officers (E4-E6), and company grade officers (O1-O3).

Limitations

A major limitation of the study is that there is no operational definition for resilience, and scholars often create their own definition based on their own particular area of study. In addition, there is no standard scale or measure for resilience, and studies often measure resilience during times of stress and depression using diverse resilience scales. With drastically conflicting methods of measuring the overall construct of resilience, it is difficult to compare and contrast the different programs designed to enhance or build resilience. Along these same lines, there is no standard list of qualities or factors that are known to promote resilience (e.g. personal competencies, attribution style, social competence, goal orientation, self-efficacy, family environment, etc.). Therefore, most studies focus on vastly different qualities based on the area of study (MacDermid et al. 2008).

Internal to this study, a major limitation is time, which will impact the amount of qualitative data collected. A minimal number of participants could threaten the internal and external validity of the study. According to Merriam (1998), this constraint could limit the richness, thickness of descriptions, and also the analysis of the phenomenon that is being looked at; thus affecting the overall reliability of the case study. Population validity could also be a major threat to external validity in that the sample of participants may not be generalizable back to the Army population or to the general civilian population. Finally, the Hawthorne Effect could threaten internal validity, as participants improve or modify an aspect of their behavior in response to the fact that they know they are being studied. The field grade officers could perform or answer the questions based

on what they think the right answer is, and not actually on their own opinions or experiences because they know their answers are going to be used for research purposes.

Delimitations

The study design has been limited in scope by the sample that will be interviewed. These interviews will be restricted to the population that is currently attending either Intermediate Level Education or the School for Command Preparation and field grade officers that work/teach at the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Conclusion

This study explores the general idea that in order for the CSF program to show significant results, the senior leadership, to include field grade officers, must believe that they can enhance resilience in their units and Soldiers through the interactions they have with them, fully understand the CSF program, and believe that it is possible to build psychological resilience. The following literature review focuses on the clarification of the terms resilience and resiliency, definitions of resilience, brief history of resilience research, in depth examination of the CSF program, and all pertinent current research that focuses on programs/interventions that have attempted to teach resilient qualities with an emphasis on the role that others play in promoting learned psychological resilience. An explanation of the methodology used in the research is described in chapter 3. Chapter 4 discusses the findings of the qualitative study and outlines how the majority of the field grade officers responded to the questions asked. The final chapter contains the conclusion

and recommendations for future research in the field of resilience, and more specifically, the CSF program.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter will contain clarification on the terms resilience and resiliency, definitions of resilience, brief history of resilience research, an outline of current research, background on the CSF program, an examination of leadership in relation to resilience, and a review of the common ground found in current research. The current research that is reviewed will be looked at that focuses on the area of psychological resilience with a focus on studies that attempted to teach resilient qualities with an emphasis on the role that others play in promoting learned psychological resilience. The most current interventions and treatment programs are reviewed irrespective of the design of the program or the target audience. The review will then compare and contrast the different methods and programs created to teach resilience. The overarching area that this literature review is looking at is how another person can affect a person's level of resilience.

Resilience vs. Resiliency

The first step in understanding this area of study is differentiating between the terms “resilience” and “resiliency” that are commonly used and misused in literature. Some scholars contend that resilience is a rare and special quality that one is born with, much like a personality trait or a personal characteristic; while others see it as something that develops, is taught, or built upon over a lifetime (Atkinson et al. 2009). Schoon (2006) warns against the first view of resilience as a personality trait since it implies that

a person is at fault for not overcoming an adverse event or period in their life (example of deficit-focused model). Instead, she feels resilience should be looked at as a process with many contributing factors.

Masten (1994) and Schoon (2006) put the two terms of “resilience” and “resiliency” into perspective by stating that the use of the term “resiliency” carries the inference of a personality trait or attribute and should be used with extreme caution. Schoon (2006) goes on to state that the term resilient also should not be used as an adjective to describe an individual or his/her personality characteristics, but instead should be used to communicate the interaction between a person and their environment. This is in keeping with Masten’s (1994) general idea that the term “resilience” should be used exclusively in reference to the process by which one positively modifies his/her life during challenging life conditions. The interchangeability of these two terms in the literature can create confusion.

Therefore, for the purpose of this literature review, the term resilience will be used in reference to the process with the realization that other authors may use the term resiliency—which refers to a trait and not a process—interchangeably. Thus, the term resiliency will be reserved for use when needed to communicate another author’s use of the term and to properly articulate their work or writings.

Resilience

A major issue with much of the research in the area is that there is no universal definition of resilience. The study of resilience has been developed and heavily researched in many different fields, such as psychology, education, epidemiology, allied health care, trauma studies, and social science (Atkins et al. 2009). Even the diverse

military programs and interventions have operationally defined resilience in vastly different ways. These have ranged from the absence of mental illness symptoms and strengths a person possesses versus deficits, to measures of performance and function (Merdith et al. 2011). As with the military, most scholars have created their own operational definition of resilience that fits the information they are attempting to study and articulate in their research. A very simple and straightforward definition of resilience is found in the Merriam Webster online Learner's Dictionary that defines resilience as "the ability to become strong, healthy, or successful again after something bad happens". The following are a few ways in which resilience is defined in current literature:

"The capacity of people to effectively cope with, adjust, or recover from stress or adversity" (Burton et al. 2010, 266).

"The ability to positively adapt to and/or rebound from significant adversity and the distress it often creates" (Schiraldi et al. 2010, 117).

"A dynamic process whereby individuals show adaptive functioning in the face of significant adversity" (Schoon 2006, 6).

"A phenomenon or process reflecting relatively positive adaptation despite experiences of significant adversity or trauma" (Luthar 2006, 742).

"The process and experience of being disrupted by change, opportunities, stressors, and adversity and, after some introspection, ultimately accessing gifts and strengths to grow stronger through the disruption" (Waite and Richardson 2004, 178).

Others have even gone so far as to differentiate between child, adolescent, and adult definitions of resilience. Most definitions focusing on children come from a developmental perspective and often contain reference to healthy development and/or

adjustment (MacDermid et al. 2008). Masten defines resilience from the child and developmental perspective by stating, “resilience refers to a class of phenomena characterized by good outcomes in spite of serious threats to adaptation or development” (2001, 228). Ginsburg also looks at resilience from the child’s standpoint and defines it as “the capacity to rise above difficult circumstances, a trait that allows us to exist in this less-than-perfect world while moving forward with optimism and confidence even in the midst of adversity” (2006, 4). Further, Ginsburg equates resilience with buoyance, or how our bodies naturally rise to the surface when pushed under water, and states that “some [children] float more easily than others, but all children can learn to float” (2006, 4). Ginsburg looks at resilience through a trait-like approach with the caveat that all children can learn to be resilient with added support.

Rak and Patterson (1996) provide counselors with conceptualization of resilience by highlighting personal strengths that have been found in resilient children and the protective or buffering factors that could promote resilience in at-risk children. They further narrow the definition in regards to at-risk children by stating, “resiliency in children is the capacity of those who are exposed to identifiable risk factors to overcome those risks and avoid negative outcomes such as delinquency and behavioral problems, psychological maladjustment, academic difficulties, and physical complications” (Rak and Patterson 1996, 368). They go on to point out personality factors (i.e. problem solving ability, ability to gain positive attention from others, optimistic view of experiences), family factors (i.e. separation from caretaker and level of nurturing during first year of life), environmental support factors (i.e. role models), and self-concept

factors (i.e. self-understanding and self-esteem) that can affect children at different stages of development.

In line with the child definitions of resilience, most adolescent definitions still look at it from a developmental perspective, but new developmental tasks such as adjustment to pubertal change, romantic relationships, and coherent identity are added along with additional assets that facilitate resilience (Masten 1994). Fergus and Zimmerman look at adolescent resilience in regards to the “assets and resources that enable adolescents to overcome the negative effects of risk exposure” (2005, 399). Ahern added that adolescent resilience is, “the process of adaptation to risk that incorporates personal characteristics, family and social support, and community resources” (2006, 181). When looking at resilience from an adolescent perspective, factors such as self-esteem and self-efficacy (Turner et al. 1995) come into consideration and have an important impact on resilience due to the complex developmental changes that are occurring (Reimer 2002; Turner et al. 1995). Most definitions regarding adults focus on successfully overcoming or coping with adversity while still functioning properly and parallel many of the definitions listed previously.

Regardless of whether resilience is viewed from the child (Ginsburg 2006; Masten 2001; Rak and Patterson 1996; Turner et al. 1995), adolescent (Ahern 2005; Fergus and Zimmerman 2005), or adult (Burton et al. 2010; Schiraldi et al. 2010) perspectives, the most current definitions of resilience always look at it as a process and not a personality quality or trait. In addition, the current definitions of resilience always contain two important components: first, exposure to an adverse or traumatic

circumstance or event; and second, the positive adaptation following the exposure (MacDermid et al. 2008; McGeary 2011).

For the purpose of this study, resilience will be viewed as a process in which one is able to positively adapt to stress, adversity, or trauma through the use of both external (family support, community support, and other environmental factors) and internal (self-efficacy, self-esteem, competence, coping skills, and other factors) resources, while avoiding negative or maladaptive outcomes across one's lifespan. It is hard to determine how long positive adaptation or overcoming stress, adversity, or trauma takes, due to the fact that there are many variables involved. These variables can range from how severe the initial adversity is to cultural, environmental, or developmental factors.

History of Resilience Research

Much of the early work dealing with resilience focused on the victims or the survivors of extreme deprivation, maltreatment or abuse (Tizard 1979; Schaffer 1996; Werner and Smith 1992); these survivors were viewed as possessing personality traits such as "hardiness" or "mental toughness" (MacDermid et al. 2008). These earlier studies regarded resilient individuals as having a special immunity or magical quality to overcome adversity or re-bounce following a difficult time (Masten 2001; Sroufe et al. 2005). With time, researchers learned that internal as well as external factors were at work, and these factors helped to enhance or limit an individual's level of resilience.

The early work of Garmezy, Werner, Smith, Rutter, and Masten pioneered research in resilience. Early studies of resilience focused on individuals facing situations of trauma or adversity and their ability to overcome or thrive despite their situations. Garmezy (1973) published some of the earliest findings on the study of resilience, using

epidemiology which initially identified differences between patients who were ill versus those who recovered, then built upon the differentiation between patients to publish the first set of systems or protective factors thought to support the development of resilience in children. Garmezy (1985, 1991) suggested that the protective factors could be grouped by the child's dispositional attributes, supportive family environment, and external support systems. These are very similar to those outlined by current researchers who have created programs and interventions in an attempt to build resilience based on internal and external factors that constitute the process (Burton et al. 2010; Schiraldi et al. 2010; Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi 2000).

Much of our current understanding of resilience was built upon by longitudinal studies looking at children who were born into adverse conditions. These studies tracked children who were considered to be at risk, and identified personal temperaments as well as environmental resources that aided in children overcoming their circumstances to live healthy lives. Werner and Smith's (1992) study in Kauai, Hawaii, which began in 1955, is probably the most well-known study of at risk children (low socioeconomic status, alcoholic, and mentally ill parents). They discovered that by the age of eighteen, one-third of the children who were initially assessed at birth to be at risk had developed into "competent and confident young adults" (Saleebey 1996, 299). Furthermore, by the age of 32, two-thirds of the participants "had turned into caring and efficacious adults" (Saleebey 1996, 300). These findings suggest that factors such as self-efficacy, self-esteem, temperamental characteristics that provoke positive social responses from others, close bond with caregiver for the first year of life, and caring relationship with at least one adult outside of the home can help reduce or cancel the effects of early deficits

(Werner and Smith 1992). Studies such as these have allowed researchers to expand from an understanding of resilience in children to a greater understanding of resilience in adolescents, adults, families, and communities.

Early researchers were dedicated strictly to identifying the features or protective factors that were associated with those who rose above adverse circumstances. Later, research began to identify the underlying developmental processes that led to positive adaptation. When Richardson, Neiger, Jensen, and Kumpfer (1990) described resilience as a developmental process, they looked at it as a series of conscious or unconscious choices. They identified the resilient process as individuals' choices of how to react to adversity or trauma, and how those reactions will further shape a person's future development. Developing successful coping mechanisms, or resilience, will result in successful growth and even greater resilience to future adversity. Masten supports this general idea when she states:

The great surprise of resilience research is the ordinariness of the phenomena. Resilience appears to be a common phenomenon that results in most cases from the operation of basic human adaptational systems. If those systems are protected and in good working order, development is robust even in the face of severe adversity; if these major systems are impaired, antecedent or consequent to adversity, then the risk for developmental problems is much greater, particularly if the environmental hazards are prolonged. (Masten 2001, 221)

When resilience is looked at in this capacity, it gains some clarity in that the process can be considered "ordinary" or a natural part of human adaptation (Masten 2001). When Masten speaks of the basic human adaptational systems she is in essence speaking to the factors or the basic protective systems that individuals possess—standard human resources such as internal or individual systems/factors (learning systems of the human brain, attachment systems, mastery motivation systems, stress response systems,

and self-regulation systems) and external or environmental systems/factors (family systems, school systems, peer systems, cultural and societal systems) that help to nurture the natural process of human adaptation (Masten 1994; 2001; Masten and Obradovic 2007). These systems or factors have since been isolated by researchers and thought to work as protective factors and aid in overcoming adverse situations and reducing the risk of maladaptive behavior.

Masten (2007) delineates the research and study of resilience into four distinct waves that are continuously being expanded upon by current research. The first wave started with the pioneer research previously discussed that looked at children who developed well under adverse or risky conditions. From this research, a small but ever expanding list of protective factors emerged that were positively correlated to positive outcomes. The second wave looked at discovering the underlying processes and systems in human development that explained the list of protective factors revealed in the first wave of research. The third wave takes on a more proactive approach by looking at programs, interventions, and policies that attempt to prevent rather than treat issues associated with maladaptive behavior. These three waves have aided researchers in guiding a fourth wave of research that attempts to link biology, neuroscience, and behavioral adaptation or development to the area of resilience in hopes of elaborating and clarifying the previous three waves of findings (Masten 2007; Masten and Obradovic 2006). Masten and Obradovic (2006) state the fourth wave has the potential to incorporate the role of gene and brain function in relation to resilience and offer a deeper interpretation of how processes work within and across levels to facilitate resilience, thus expanding the findings of previous waves. There is also potential to clarify if adaptive

systems are enduring attributes as previously suggested or if they are “reprogrammable”, if “reprogrammable” the possibility exists to correct developmental problems (attention regulation, stress regulation, and others) that have developed inappropriately. The fourth wave holds the potential to expand on current knowledge and perhaps rebuff assumptions of previous waves.

Clearly, there is a move beyond theories of resilience as a personality trait to understanding resilience as a dynamic developmental process. Researchers have continued to expand and identify assets and factors in resilient individuals and further outline the processes that aid in developing resilience. The idea that resilience is a process which individuals can learn and develop is part of the third wave of resilience research. This research takes a proactive approach to create programs, interventions, and policies to help a person attain resilience. When faced with adversity or trauma, resilience research suggests that with the proper supports or systems in place, individuals can develop strength or have a normal outcome after facing adversity (Higgins 1994). With current research focused on the effectiveness of teaching resilience-related processes to individuals, it has implications in a multitude of areas to include teaching military forces how to be more resilient (Cornum et al. 2011; MacDermid et al. 2008) through the enhancement of both internal and external factors that can help them better overcome adversity.

Current Research

Despite the growth of resilience research, there is still debate surrounding issues such as the accepted definition of resilience, the type of programs or interventions utilized, the different factors that are isolated and promoted in programs, whether or not

resilience can be learned with any true efficacy, how to measure resilience, and what role a person plays in promoting resilience in another. For the purpose of this study, programs and interventions will be highlighted that integrate the general idea that other people in a person's life (parents, teachers, peers, supervisors, and leaders) can help enhance resilience through their behavior and interactions, thus attempting to support the idea that Army field grade officers can enhance resilience in individual Soldiers and units. The studies in the literature review will be looked at irrespective of the population studied due to the fact that few programs/interventions exist that actually discuss/attribute part of the success of building resilience to those around a person. The studies highlighted will lend support to the overall idea that if field grade officers in the Army do not support or believe that they can directly impact an individual's or unit's level of resilience through their interactions and behaviors, or that resilience can be built through the CSF program, then the effects of the program could be hampered or possibly show non-significant results.

International Resiliency Project

The International Resiliency Project (IRP) is a multi-year study funded by the Canadian government in order to “develop a better, more culturally sensitive understanding of how youth around the world effectively cope with the adversities that they face” (ResilienceNet). The project uses both quantitative and qualitative research methods to examine individual, interpersonal, family, community and cultural factors associated with building resilience in youth from around the world. The IRP defines resilience as “a universal capacity which allows a person, group or community to prevent, minimize or overcome the damaging effects of adversity” (Grotberg 1997). Furthermore,

the IRP suggests that through its research, resilience may be promoted in anticipation of adversity, not merely after the fact as a way of dealing with the results of adversity. The IRP was designed to determine what parents, teachers, other adults, and children themselves can do to promote resilience, and conducted international conferences to facilitate global collaboration in addressing the growing interest in resilience.

The project strongly supports the paradigm of “I have; I am; I Can,” as a way in which resilience can be promoted. These three categories have 36 factors that have been found to promote resilience; I have factors are those external supports and resources that enhance resilience, I am factors are internal factors and personal strengths one possesses, and I can factors are social and interpersonal skills that are learned through everyday interactions (ResilienceNet). For example, one of the I have factors is, “I have people around me I trust and who love me, no matter what” (Grotberg 1997, 6). The overall idea behind these three categories is that children, parents, and other adults can pull from these different factors to promote resilience in children. Not all children will utilize the same or even all of the factors, but the more factors that a child possesses or is exposed to the more options they have in dealing with adversity when it does arise. The IRP utilized this paradigm to assess resilience in parents, teachers, other adults, and the children themselves.

The project design included 15 verbal situations or vignettes of adversity and each subject (adults and children) answered questions for no more than three situations (N = 589 target children and their families). The subjects’ responses were scored on a scale from one to three, with three identifying a complete response that promoted resilience, a score of two consisted of responses of mixed resilient and non-resilient promoting

behavior, and a score of one was given to responses that would not support the development of resilience in children. One assumption of the study was that the subject's responses to the hypothetical situations of adversity would be the same factors (internal, external, and social factors) used to promote real-world resilience in the child (Grotberg 1997).

The IRP's findings suggest that approximately one-third of the parents in the study promoted resilience in their children based on responses to situations of adversity. They also found that adult responses contained more factors that promoted resilience than did older children's (9-11 years old) responses, and older children's responses contained more resilience-promoting factors than younger children's (4-6 years old) responses. From these findings, they hypothesized that older children do as much to promote their own resilience as their parents or other adults do, while younger children may be more dependent upon parents and other adults for resilience promotion (Grotberg 1997). Resilience appeared to be promoted more in situations dealing with helplessness and need as well as when support or help was likely to be available. Resilience was promoted less in situations where there appeared to be a threat to authority, where blame or punishment seemed more crucial than the idea of communicating or understanding the situations, as well as when the individual who could promote resilience had feelings of frustration (Grotberg 1997). This finding reiterates how significant trusting relationships are in the promotion of resilience.

The International Resilience Project's ongoing research suggests that even without interventions and programs being implemented, resilience is being promoted throughout the world through everyday interactions by parents, teachers, other adults, and

children themselves. The studies ultimately concede that resilient behavior does not necessarily depend on programs, interventions, or workshops. They hope to move beyond previous studies that looked at features of children who “beat the odds” and educate parents and other adults about resilience and resilient factors through the use of the paradigm I have, I am, and I can. Changing the transactions between adults and children in this way allows children to have a practical application of the concept and the ability to become more resilient in everyday situations. This study supports the general idea that others can help promote resilience in individuals and that the promotion of resilience is dependent on the environment in which the situation occurs.

Personal Resilience and Resilient Relationships

Personal Resilience and Resilient Relationships (PRRR) is a worksite resilience training program that was conducted to measure the impact of resilience training on psychospiritual health of governmental allied health care employees through their level of resilience/reintegration, self-esteem, locus of control, purpose of life, interpersonal relations, and job satisfaction (Waite and Richardson 2004). It has a component in which supervisors received additional training to assist in promoting resilience in subordinates. The PRRR curriculum is a combination of two different programs, the Personal Resiliency and the Resilient Relationships, which according to Waite and Richardson (2004) is a biopsychospiritual enrichment program designed to improve overall mental and spiritual health. The program was looked at from a Complementary and Alternative Medicine (CAM) perspective that focuses on treating the whole person through utilizing the healing power of an individual’s strengths.

The study included 232 participants broken down by natural work groups within the organization into 12 distinct groups with six groups receiving PRRR training and six groups acting as the control group and receiving absolutely no training. Of the original participants, only 73 in the PRRR training groups and 77 in the control group completed all data analysis and were used in the study. A total of 35 hours of PRRR training was received by the training group once a week for five weeks. According to Waite and Richardson (2004), the PRRR training attempted to target such areas as: (1) innate resilience and how to access, nurture, and use its energy; (2) use of multidisciplinary perspectives of resilience such as Chi (life energy, life-force, or energy flow often used in Chinese medicine and martial arts) and collective unconscious (the part of the mind containing memories and impulses of which the individual is not aware); (3) learn how to recognize and use resilience to increase energy and better focus energy for use in job functions; (4) understand the process/choices of disruptions and reintegration and the capability to grow through adversity and challenges; (5) freeing themselves from actions that threaten job productivity and satisfaction; (6) build interpersonal skills that transform unit relations from destructive to constructive and from constructive to resilient working units.

In addition to the standard PRRR training, the unit managers of the six training groups received six review sessions every other week lasting one to two hours in duration. The reason behind the additional manager training was to help managers better promote the effects of the resilience training and for the researcher to gain added informal feedback on the PRRR (Waite and Richardson 2004). Data from all groups to include managers was gathered one week before training, one week after training, and ten weeks

after training through the use of modified versions of the Spirit Core Scale (Johnson 1998), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg 1965), Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale (Levinson 1972), Purpose of Life Test (Crumbaugh 1968), Health-Promoting Lifestyle Profile II (Walker 1987) and the *Survey 2000 IRS/NTEU Employee Satisfaction instrument* (Internal Revenue Service 2000).

The overall findings of the study concluded that the PRRR training positively increased several studied variables: self-esteem, locus of control, purpose of life, and interpersonal relations. The only variable it did not have a significant impact on was job satisfaction. The study also found that there was little change in the training group scores from their posttest data collection to the ten-week follow-up data collection. The authors postulate that the review sessions given to unit managers helped maintain the effects of the training and speculate that booster sessions may be needed to support long-term effects of such resilience programs/interventions. The study did not attempt to gather longitudinal data to see if the program had lasting effects on the participants, and since the control group received no training, it was not possible to compare the PRRR training group against another type of program or intervention to determine the effective elements of the program. One implication the authors pointed out regarding resilience training was that, “resilience educators need to be resilient to be able to teach resilience” (Waite and Richardson 2004, 182). This study supports the overall idea that others in a person’s life can influence level of resilience and that managers/leaders can have a positive influence on programs designed to build resilience.

Leadership Behaviors and Subordinate Resilience

Hartland et al. (2005) conducted an experiment with 150 part-time Master's of Business Administration (MBA) students in an attempt to determine if leaders help build resilience in employees when they face and deal with setbacks and challenges in their work environment. The researchers used the Full Range Leadership Theory (FRLT) which looks at the transformational aspect of leadership and goes beyond goal achievement to a "higher meaning and purpose" (Hartland et al 2005, 5). The FRLT is based on three classes or types of leader behavior: Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-Faire. Within these different leadership styles, leaders utilize different behaviors when interacting with subordinates. The researchers also incorporated resilience concepts and adaptive coping into the overall conceptualization of the study.

The procedures for the study consisted of six different MBA classes answering one open-ended question in which they were asked to think of a time at work when they experienced a difficult or challenging situation. This was followed by another open-ended question geared towards identifying what helped them deal with the situation they had just described. The remainder of the questionnaire was used to measure their level of resilience, optimism, and their leaders' behavior that was previously discussed. After completion of the questionnaires, the instructor facilitated a discussion involving leadership and subordinate resilience. The two main hypotheses the researchers were attempting to answer through the questionnaires were, "the five transformational leadership dimensions of Attributed Charisma, Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration and the transactional leadership dimension of Contingent Reward will be positively associated

with subordinate resilience before and after controlling for employee optimism” and “ the transactional leadership dimensions of Management-by-Exception Active and Management-by-Exception Passive, and the non-leadership dimension of Laissez-Faire leadership will not be positively associated with subordinate resilience before or after controlling for employee optimism” (Hartland et al. 2005, 7).

The results of the study concluded that hypothesis one was largely supported with Inspirational Motivation being the only dimension out of six (Attributed Charisma, Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Considerations, Contingent Reward) that was not positively associated with subordinate resilience. Interestingly, the second question in the questionnaire revealed that those who stated leaders were a positive factor in dealing with a particular situation showed great levels of resilience compared to those who did not mention leaders as positive factors. Hypothesis number two was also supported with no correlation being found between the FRLT dimensions and resilience.

The research conducted by Harland et al. (2005) contributes to the general area that leaders can positively affect subordinate resilience through a variety of different leadership behaviors. The findings also suggest that there is a need to conduct further research in order to better isolate and identify the factors that directly influence resilience in subordinates.

Positive Psychology

The area of positive psychology is leading the way in attempting to build and teach psychological resilience. It has moved away from the traditional research design that assumed there was no resilience in the absence of risk or adversity and utilizes a

more proactive approach that focuses on prevention and building resilient qualities. Gable and Haidt define positive psychology as “the study of the conditions and processes that contribute to the flourishing or optimal functioning of people, groups, and institutions” (2005, 103). The overall aim of positive psychology is to prevent rather than to treat mental illness (Seligman 2002). According to Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000), research in positive psychology has led to the identification of strengths such as courage, optimism, interpersonal skill, faith, hope, and perseverance that can act as defenses against mental illness and help to increase overall resilience.

Penn Resiliency Program

The Positive Psychology Center at the University of Pennsylvania is credited with creating the Penn Resiliency Program (PRP) which is an intervention designed to teach children and adolescents cognitive-behavioral and social problem-solving skills in an effort to build resilience (Positive Psychology Center). According to Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich, and Linkins (2009), a goal of PRP is to increase a child’s ability to cope with daily stressors and other common problems they are often faced with through the promotion of optimism. This is accomplished by employing a model created by Albert Ellis known as the Adversity-Beliefs-Consequences (ABC) model, which builds on the idea that our beliefs about events affect our emotions and behavior (Seligman et al. 2009). The underlying idea is to get students to think realistically about the daily problems they face by teaching them a variety of different techniques such as assertiveness, creative brainstorming, decision-making, negotiation, relaxation, and other social problem-solving skills (Positive Psychology Center). The skills taught in the PRP curriculum are the core processes that are thought to build resilience; these processes are

introduced and then practiced in a variety of ways that support the use of these new skills in a person's daily life in order to better deal with normal life stressors (Seligman et al. 2009; Positive Psychology Center). The empirical research behind the program is rich and has been evaluated in countless studies; according to Seligman et al. (2009), there have been more than 17 different studies conducted that utilized the PRP curriculum and taken together, these studies suggest the program prevents symptoms of depression and anxiety and appear to be long-lasting with some studies reporting skills enduring for two years or more.

Brunwasser et al. (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of the PRP, and one of their points of contention with the PRP was that there was not enough data available to show that PRP was better than participation in an alternative type of program/intervention. Their thinking regarding this issue is that PRP results could be attributed to such internal factors as increased attention given to participants, group cohesion, or participant's expectation of benefits from the program and not the cognitive-behavioral training within the program designed to decrease depressive symptoms.

The results of the Brunwasser et al. (2009) meta-analysis reinforced the results of an earlier study conducted by Gillham et al. (2007). In this study, three different programs were compared; the PRP (targeted cognitive-behavioral and social problem-solving skills), the Penn Enhancement Program (PEP, targeted stressors associated with adolescent depression and controlled for noncognitive behavioral factors such as adult attention, group cohesion, social support), and a control group (did not participate in either program but, completed the same assessments as the PRP and PEP groups thus controlling for nonspecific variables). The study utilized three different middle schools

located in a suburban metropolitan area in the United States and randomly assigned the 697 participants to one of the three different programs (PRP, PEP, or control group). They concluded that the PRP had inconsistent effects; two of the schools provided positive results for the PRP, whereas a third school did not show that the PRP prevented depressive symptoms any better than the PEP or control group. The authors implied that they could not determine the cause of inconsistencies between the treatment groups and noted that such results had been seen in other PRP studies in which the control groups also showed a reduction in or prevention of depression and depressive symptoms. As with the meta-analysis conducted by Brunwasser et al. (2009), Gillham et al. (2007) also noted that when the PRP has been shown to have a positive impact, it can be unclear if it is the intervention/training program that impacted depression and resilience or other confounding variables or a nonspecific factor such as time spent in a structured environment, additional attention given to the person, or peer support.

Penn Resiliency Program for Parents

The Penn Resiliency Program for Parents (PRPP) is a program specifically designed to get parents involved in the PRP intervention that their children receive by coupling the PRP for children and the PRPP curriculum for parents. The rationale for the program stems from research that has shown family and parental risk factors such as high levels of protectiveness, criticism, intrusiveness, low levels of perceived parental care or support, and other factors can directly affect depression in children (Gillham et al. 2006). In addition, research has shown a direct link between a child's explanatory style, degree of hopelessness, and self-worth and that of their parents (Reivich and Gillham 2009). The overall aim of the PRPP is to teach core cognitive skills to parents which they can utilize

in their own lives, as well as promote and reinforce the same skills to their children (Positive Psychology Center; Reivich and Gillham 2009). According to Reivich and Gillham current studies that have integrated the PRP and the PRPP, “indicate that the parent program tends to improve the parents’ explanatory style for child-related events” (2009, 9); thus supporting the idea that another person who is properly educated about the aspects of resilience can help promote it through their interactions.

Background on the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program

For the past several years, the United States Army has been working with the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), University of Pennsylvania, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, United States Military Academy at West Point, and multiple other organizations in order to create the CSF program that was implemented in 2009 to teach individuals how to become more psychologically resilient. According to the former Chief of Staff of the Army, General George W. Casey Jr., the CSF program is an “integrated, proactive approach to developing psychological resilience in our Soldiers, in their family members, and in the Army’s civilian workforce” (2011, 1). The need for the program was primarily based on the fact that for over a decade the men and women of the United States Army were engaged in persistent conflict in two separate theaters of operation thus, drastically increasing the occurrence of post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSD). The Congressional Research Service (2010) reported that since the year 2000 there were 66,935 deployed and 21,784 non-deployed PTSD cases diagnosed in the U.S. military and of those cases 67 percent belonged to the U.S. Army. According to Cornum, Matthews, and Seligman (2011), up to 70 percent of Soldiers have been personally exposed to traumatic incidents while deployed to one of the theaters of operation. These

events in combination with other stressors add to the high PTSD rates seen in the U.S. Army. In addition to PTSD, there has been an Army-wide increase in suicide with the current numbers equaling 22 deaths per 100,000; these rates are above the civilian population numbers, which were demographically adjusted to match those of the Army (Zoroya 2010).

The above facts lend support to why there has been such a push to build resilience in Soldiers and why such emphasis has been placed on the CSF program. To highlight the importance of resilience, the Army has taken it one step further and included aspects of resilience into its leadership doctrine. The U.S. Army Field Manual 6-22, *Army Leadership* (Headquarters, Department of the Army 2006) delineated 12 leader attributes and 8 leader competencies which add focus to the general idea that leaders must possess certain characteristics and be resilient themselves so that they can complete the mission and help promote resilience in subordinates. According to FM 6-22:

Resilient leaders can recover quickly from setback, shock, injuries, adversity, and stress while maintaining their mission and organized focus. Their resilience rests on will, the inner drive that compels them to keep going, even when exhausted, hungry, afraid, cold, and wet. Resilience helps leaders and their organizations to carry difficult missions to their conclusion. (Headquarters, Department of the Army 2006, 53)

The above definition of resilient leaders is in line with many of the scholarly definitions of resilience, such as that by Burton, Pakenham, and Brown who define it as “the capacity of people to effectively cope with, adjust, or recover from stress or adversity” (2010, 266). The definition of resilience that guides the CSF program and its training is, “a set of processes that enables good outcomes in spite of serious threats” (Reivich, Seligman, and McBride 2011, 25). The overall goal of the CSF program is to build on personal characteristics that have been found to be related to resilience and to

teach our Soldiers, leaders, family members, and civilians how to be more psychologically resilient as members of the Army community.

Not surprisingly, many of the foundational aspects of positive psychology can be found in the CSF program, since Martin Seligman, who is considered the father of positive psychology, also helped create the CSF program. Seligman, who is currently the director of the Positive Psychology Center at the University of Pennsylvania, is credited with providing the resilience training to Army Soldiers. The CSF program began with the Army Chief of Staff wanting to make available to all members of the Army community the skills, knowledge, and abilities to better face the challenges and stresses of being a member of today's Army community. In order to create the program that is in use today there was massive input from not only Seligman and the Positive Psychology Center, but also other leading researchers in academia, the Army medical community, and senior leaders within the Army (Comprehensive Soldier Fitness).

Many components of the CSF program are currently being implemented Army-wide. With the program in its inception, it is continuously changing and evolving as new data are gathered and analyzed. Currently, there are four main pillars of the program consisting of the Global Assessment Tool (GAT), Comprehensive Resilience Modules (CRM), Master the Resilience Training (MRT) course, and Institutional Resilience (IR) training (Comprehensive Soldier Fitness 2012).

The GAT is an online self-report questionnaire used to measure psychological well-being of Soldiers (Cornum et al. 2011). It specifically concentrates on the domains of emotional fitness, social fitness, family fitness, and spiritual fitness that have been identified as being critical within the CSF Program (Peterson, Park, and Castro 2011).

The data gathered from the GAT will help guide Soldiers into diverse resilience training based on their individual results. The GAT has the potential to gauge the psychological well-being of individual units as well as the Army as a whole (Peterson, Park, and Castro 2011).

The second pillar of the CSF program is the CRM, which consists of online self-help modules that are completed in conjunction with the GAT (Comprehensive Soldier Fitness 2012). The different modules are tailored to the individual Soldier based on the four domains (emotional, social, family, and spiritual fitness) that are related to the Soldier's psychological well-being; in addition to the online modules, the GAT will point Soldiers to different programs that are currently available Army-wide, both formal and informal (Peterson, Park, and Castro 2011).

The third pillar of the CSF program is the MRT course that is specifically designed around empirically-tested work in the area of positive psychology and has been created to give certain noncommissioned officers (NCO), warrant officers, commissioned officers, and general schedule (GS) civilians advanced training in psychological resilience (Reivich, Seligman, and McBride 2011). With this training, their new mission is to take the information they gained at the course back to their units and train their fellow Soldiers to be more psychologically resilient. The overall design of the course is broken down into three main modules: preparation, sustainment, and enhancement (Reivich et al. 2011). With this new training, they are able to facilitate 12 modules at the unit level in order to teach all Soldiers at all levels how to be more psychologically resilient. This training is intended to be incorporated into the unit's training cycle and given throughout the year.

The final pillar of the CSF program is the mandatory IR training found at all levels of Professional Military Education (PME), from the newest privates to senior leaders throughout the Army (Comprehensive Soldier Fitness 2012). The U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) tailors the education and curriculum to the different levels of training based on what is required of an individual at that time in their career, thus teaching new privates vastly different curriculum than that received by senior leaders. According to the former Sergeant Major of the Army (SMA) Kenneth O. Preston, the CSF program, “focuses on building strength and resilience in the individual from day one in the Army, Soldiers serving in positions of increased responsibility need the education to lead their respective formations, including the application of CSF across the populations of Soldiers, DA civilians and families they supervise and are responsible for” (2010, 4). The fourth pillar of the CSF program is, in part, designed to teach senior leaders about resilience so they can help develop it within their subordinates and organizations; it is this aspect of the CSF program that is of concern to this particular study.

Leadership in Relation to Resilience

A major external factor that has been examined for its part in building resilience is how leaders and their leadership can affect an individual’s level of resilience. The focus of this study is to gain field grade leaders perspective regarding their role in building resilience in Soldiers and organizations, and their opinion as to if resilience can be built. According to Harland et al., “subordinates’ resilience may be positively affected by leader behaviors and that there may be a variety of leadership behaviors that positively impact subordinate resilience” (2005, 11). At this time, it is unknown exactly what leader

attributes positively correlate with resilience. Bartone speculated when he related hardiness to resilience that, “The prototypical hardy leader leads by example, providing subordinates with a role model of the hardy approach to life, work, and reactions to stressful experiences” (2006, 144), thus adding support to the idea that a leader’s actions and words can directly affect a subordinate’s level of hardiness or resilience. An in-depth literature review conducted by the RAND Corporation pointed to the fact that within a unit or organization, there are also additional factors that can promote resilience in individuals. For example, a positive command climate that fosters interaction within the unit, promotes pride and support for the unit mission, and provides positive role modeling can impact individual as well as an organizations level of resilience (Meredith et al. 2011).

One could further differentiate how leaders can help build resilience by not only looking at the leader’s relationship with subordinates or the qualities and factors that they possess that positively enhance resilience, but also look at how much emphasis leaders put on current policy and training that are designed to build resilience. For example, leaders can enhance resilience via their relationships with subordinates, but also through the support they show towards training that is specifically geared towards enhancing resilience. Of the programs highlighted by Meredith et al. (2011) the researchers stated that one of the challenges with military resilience programs is getting the buy-in and support from senior leaders, and getting them to understand what their role is in building resilience within the force. This appeared to be a systemic problem within the 23 U.S. military programs they reviewed.

Overall, there is support for the idea that leaders can impact resilience in others and also organizations through their interactions and buy-in. However, there is still debate around the issue as to what factors have the most influence over subordinate and organizational resilience. More empirical and less theory-based research is needed in this area to better understand how leaders enhance subordinate resilience.

Common Ground in Current Research

Resilience is often associated with the presence of certain protective factors or resources that help to foster a process of successful adaptation and change despite risk and adversity. Current research in the area of resilience hypothesizes that resilience is not a personal trait but a developmental process that occurs naturally, leading to skills or factors such as social competence, problem-solving, critical consciousness, autonomy, a sense of purpose, and others. All of the studies described in this literature review have attempted to enhance such skills in order to increase a person's overall level of resilience. However, the particular skills vary widely. For example, the International Resilience Project (IRP) is based on the hypothesis that resilience emerges from resources (external support, trusting relationships, access to services, emotional support outside of the family, religious organizations), personal strengths (self-esteem, hope, faith, morality, locus of control), and sociocognitive skills (creativity, persistence, problem solving, impulse control, social skills, intellectual skills) (Grotberg 1997). The PRRR program looked at innate resilience and reintegration, selected resilient qualities (self-esteem, locus of control, purpose of life, interpersonal relations), and job satisfaction (Waite and Richardson 2004). The PRP and the PRPP look at depression and focus on cognitive-

behavioral and social problem-solving skills in an overall effort to build resilience (Positive Psychology Center).

Of the studies reviewed, the overall idea of enhancing personal skills is a major commonality between them (though skills varied by program). Another commonality is the fact that they all show how an outside person can potentially affect a person's level of resilience. Some of the programs highlighted, such as the IRP and the Leadership Behaviors and Subordinate Resilience, have shown that an outside supportive person can enhance resilience through their everyday interactions with a person. For example, the IRP found that resilience was promoted in children based on parents' responses to situations of adversity and promoted even more when support or help was likely to be available. Whereas resilience was promoted less in situations where there was a threat to authority; blame or punishment seemed more crucial than the idea of communicating or understanding the situations, and when the individual who could promote resilience had feelings of frustration (Grotberg 1997). Similarly, the Leadership Behaviors and Subordinate Resilience program found that supervisors can positively impact a subordinate's level of resilience through their leadership behaviors (Harland et al. 2005). Looking at it from a different perspective, the PRP/PRPP and the PRRR both contain an intervention or program that is explicitly designed to teach people to be more resilient and also contain an aspect within the curriculum that focuses on educating parents and leaders on ways in which they can better promote the skills learned in the program to make the intervention or program more enduring and effective.

Together, all of the programs support the general idea that not only can a person's interactions with another promote resilience, but programs specifically designed to teach

resilience skills to individuals and leaders through a set curriculum can also enhance resilience even more. Thus, supporting the general idea that teaching Soldiers how to become more resilient through the first three pillars of the CSF program, coupled with the fourth pillar of properly educating Army field grade officers on resilience and how they can promote resilience through their interactions and support of the CSF program, could potentially have a positive impact on the level of resilience in Soldiers and organizations.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter provides the methods used to answer the primary as well as the secondary research questions. This study uses a qualitative case study design through interviews that attempt to understand the perceptions, beliefs, and behaviors that field grade officers have with respect to building resilience in today's Soldiers and the CSF program. Previous research has shown that learned resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them such as peers, parents, and supervisors. With this information, it could be deduced that in order for the CSF to show results, senior leaders should understand their role in building resilience in Soldiers, have confidence in the CSF, and believe that resilience can be built and promoted. This research provides an in-depth examination of resilience and how it is perceived and potentially promoted by field grade officers in the Army. The goal is to incorporate the existing literature into an overall hypothesis that states, in order for the CSF program to perform at an optimal level, field grade officers need to understand and support the program. The specific research question posed is: What do U.S. Army field grade officers perceive as their role in building resilience in Soldiers?

Data Collection Methods

The research is a qualitative case study through interviews that attempts to understand what is known about the promotion of resilience and the CSF program through the participant's point of view and experiences. According to Merriam, this

design focuses “on discovery, insight, and understanding from the perspective of those being studied” thus allowing important contributions to be made to the area of study (1998, 1). By way of interviews, the participants were allowed to convey their own perspectives in their own words. The interviews flowed and were based on normal everyday conversation patterns that were semi-structured and purposely controlled by the interviewer (see appendix A for structured questions). The intent was to capture as many of the participants’ views as possible and allow for the interview questions to be adapted based on each individual participant and their responses; therefore allowing questions to be added, deleted, or adapted based on responses. This also allowed the researcher to build saturation in the study by asking follow-up questions that add depth and validity to the research. According to Mason, saturation occurs “when the collection of new data does not shed any further light on the issue under investigation” (2010, 2). According to Merriam (1998) saturation should be attained after approximately ten interviews and once achieved, no further interviews should be needed. All interviews were digitally voice recorded, transcribed by the researcher, and then peer examined in order to ensure accuracy in the transcripts.

Prior to the start of all interviews, the participants signed an informed consent form (see appendix A) to advise them of the purpose of the research, that participation is voluntary and they have the right to withdraw at any time without bias, and to inform them of the confidentiality procedures that are in place. At no time are participants identified by their real names, nor will comments be attributed directly to them as no personally identifiable information was collected during the interview. All participants were given a number at the start of the interview process to ensure confidentiality, but

allow the researcher to properly organize the audio recording, informed consent, and demographic information.

In addition to the informed consent form, all participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire that provided data concerning age, gender, race, marital status, number of combat deployments, amount and type of resilience training participants had experienced, and additional required demographical data (see appendix B). The demographics were congruent with those seen Army-wide with respect to age, gender, ethnicity and other demographics of field grade officers.

Purposeful sampling was conducted to select participants who met the criteria of being active Army field grade officers in the rank of major and lieutenant colonel and who were currently attending Intermediate Level Education (ILE) or the School for Command Preparation at the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) in Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. In addition, aspects of convenience sampling were integrated into the sample criterion due to availability of interviewees at CGSC. The intent of using purposeful sampling was to meet the criterion established in the research questions.

Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis began after the first interview was completed and transcribed and continued to be analyzed as additional interviews were conducted. Coding criterion was established when triangulation was achieved and a clear theme emerged from multiple interview sources (Merriam 1998). Interviews were analyzed and conducted until triangulation was possible and saturation occurred, thus allowing for a clear pattern or theme to emerge in the transcripts and validity to be established. After the interviews were transcribed the researcher coded them. When coding the data, it was noted that

some of the participants gave more than one answer or reason for a question. Subsequently, in the analysis there are more coded answers or reasons than actual participants in the study. Once fully coded, a peer examination of the data was conducted. The purpose of the peer examination was to have an unbiased individual review the transcripts for themes and coding errors not identified by the researcher. Based on the effectiveness of the interviews, enough data was gathered to gain an accurate and general consensus of what field grade officers in the Army perceive as their role in building resilience and their thoughts on the CSF program.

A major implication of such a study could be that if the qualitative interviews show that field grade leaders lack knowledge of the CSF program and do little to promote it at the organizational level, it could have implications on the fourth pillar of the CSF program. This pillar is designed to incorporate mandatory Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader development training; if field grade leaders are not knowledgeable of the CSF program or resilience then it could show that the training is ineffective and needs to be revised or possibly lengthened. The study could also have implications in the general area of how learned resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them, thus potentially adding to the area of research.

As mentioned in chapter 1, many limitations could affect the reliability, validity, and generalizability of the research. As Merriam points out with similar research designs, such studies are often criticized or seen as lacking in the above three domains (1998, 43). However, every reasonable precaution was taken to minimize the potential impact of these domains on this research and as seen in the following chapter, careful analysis of

the data has further ensured reliability in that outsiders agree that the results make sense once the given data is fully analyzed.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

Overview

The data gathered from the qualitative case study is presented in this chapter. Chapter 4 outlines the general demographics of the participants and then analyzes each individual research question. Excerpts taken from the interviews have been added to the chapter to allow for a better understand of the participants' overall perception of the given questions. A transcript of the interviews is at Appendix D.

Demographics

Demographic data was gathered through a one page questionnaire given to each ILE and PCC (Pre-Command Course) participant. The below table provides general group information about the ten students who participated in the case study.

Table 1. Demographics of Participants

Average Age	39.5
Average Years of Service	18.1
Average Number of Combat Tours	3 (With 5 Being the Highest)
Ethnicity	5 Caucasian, 1 African American, 2 Hispanic, 1 Indian, 1 No Answer
Marital Status	10 Married
Average Number of Months Since Taking the Global Assessment Tool (GAT)	6.9 (With 14 Being the Highest)
Highest Level of Education	3 Bachelor Degrees, 7 Masters Degrees
Master Resilience Trained	1 of 10

Source: Created by author.

Analysis of Primary Research Question

The main research question was: What do U.S. Army field grade officers perceive as their role in building resilience in Soldiers? The specific question that was asked to all participants was: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why or how? If not, why? The main research question attempted to gauge field grade officers' perceptions as to what they felt their role was in building resilience in Soldiers, as some studies have explored the idea that resilience can be further enhanced in individuals by those around them through their everyday actions and interactions. This question draws on the fact that if leaders do not know that they play a role in building resilience in Soldiers, then the CSF program may not be as effective.

With this question, saturation was achieved with all participants stating that they did in fact have a role in building resilience in Soldiers. As noted in the methodology, some participants gave more than one reason or explanation as to what their role was in building resilience in Soldiers. Consequently, there are more coded responses to the question than actual participants in the study. The primary reason the participants gave was that such a role was inherent to their job or leadership position with six participants making such comments. Five participants also stated that it was their role to enforce the mandatory training and educational aspect of the CSF program and four individuals made reference to the fact that they had a role in building resilience through more personal ways such as counseling, acting as a role model, or through sharing their own personal experiences with subordinates. An excerpt taken from one of the interviews highlights the two most common themes found: "It is just one of our jobs as leaders. It is also institutionalized; resiliency training is just something you got[sic] to do."

Overall, saturation was reached with all individuals stating that they did in fact have a role in building resilience in Soldiers. It appears that the trend for most of the interviewees was that they thought that their role in building resilience in Soldiers was inherent or a part of their job as a leader. Half of the participants also stated that their role included ensuring that the institutional resilience training was being conducted.

Analysis of Secondary Research Questions

What do Field Grade Officers Understand or Believe About Resilience?

This question was used to subjectively gage the amount of knowledge each individual possessed regarding resilience. There was a wide spectrum of answers given with most trying to operationally define resilience. All ten participants had at least a basic understanding of resilience; most defining it based on an adverse event and then the overcoming of it. Some had a more in-depth understanding of resilience with one individual stating, “before it used to be that you either had it or you didn't and now there have been a lot of studies that you can actually train and build up resiliency by having a well-rounded approach.” However, others had a harder time articulating what they understood or knew about resilience,

I know it's hard to define. We spend a lot of time talking about tough resilient Soldiers. Definition of it from an operational prospective for the force is hard to define. What I know about it is that there's a large push. Resiliency is tied to comprehensive fitness, so not only physical fitness, mental fitness, moral fitness, and I believe all of those tie into the resiliency program.

From the question, what do you understand or know about resilience, it was assessed that all had at a minimum a general understanding of resilience and what it was.

Do Field Grade Officers Believe Resilience Can be Developed?

The second question was once again trying to get at what the participants believed in regards to resilience and if they thought it could be developed. The precise question asked was: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why or how? If not, why? All respondents indicated that resilience could be developed or built. The reasons given varied. Four participants indicated that it can be developed through one's life experiences over time, four indicated development through formalized training designed to enhance resilience (like the CSF program), two indicated development through how an individual is raised or brought up, two referenced development through coping or cognitive processes, and one indicated some people being more naturally inclined towards being resilient. The participant stated, "I think that some people are more naturally inclined to be resilient, but that does not mean that if you are not naturally like that it cannot be developed." Even though saturation was achieved with the question, ways in which the participants believed resilience could be developed varied widely.

According to Field Grade Officers, Who is Responsible for Developing Resilient Soldiers?

Participants were asked the following question: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers? This question was phrased in such a way as to give the participants thoughts on who may be most responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers. Saturation was reached with six officers stating that everyone is responsible for building resilience in Soldiers. However, there were significant differences when they stated who is directly responsible for the development;

six indicated the direct or first line leader, five indicated the MRT and associated training, two indicated it is a commander's responsibility or should be a top-down approach, and one interviewee placing primary responsibility on the Chaplain. An example of data that was double-coded and possessed both the primary and secondary responses can be seen in this excerpt taken from one of the interviews: "Everybody in the chain, but most importantly the direct supervisor. You know if it is a squad leader for younger Soldiers or a detachment sergeant, NCOIC. It depends on who is next in the Soldier's direct chain of command. Direct line supervisor is most responsible." The one response that was not expected from any of the participants, let alone from a future battalion commander in the PCC course was when he stated, "I am going to put the resilience mission on my Chaplain for the most part as the executor." Army chaplains hold responsibility for the suicide prevention training and possibly the component of spiritual fitness within the CSF program, but they should not be looked at as an "executor" for building resilience in Soldiers.

What Have Field Grade Officers Personally Observed or Done to Develop Resilient Soldiers in Their Organizations?

This secondary question attempted to isolate factors in which field grade officers had seen or done that may have encouraged the development of resilience in Soldiers. There were six reference made regarding training or programs that were implemented that developed resilience in Soldiers, six additional comments regarding how one interacts with individuals develops resilience in Soldiers, and two additional references were made to the climate that is set in the unit or the standards that are set within it. An example of an excerpt that was coded as interactions was,

True story. I had a Soldier that decided one Friday evening to come to my office and say that he wanted to take his life and that he will take his life and came to say goodbye to me. Why, because my personality, always talking to everyone, so how do I believe you can make people more resilient? By talking to them. Asking them, Hey, how are you doing, how's life, what are your plans? Not just checking the block, but really listening to the answer. That's what I believe.

The answers to this secondary question were then compared to the previous secondary question that asked the participants if they thought resilience could be developed. This was done because many of the participants listed ways or factors that they thought could develop resilience. References to training appeared to be a common theme with both questions, possibly because training is the primary way field grade leaders are see resilience.

What Have Field Grade Officers Done or Observed that May Have Inhibited the Development of Resilient Soldiers in Their Organizations?

Again, this secondary question was trying to isolate factors which field grade officers had seen or done that may have inhibited the development of resilience in Soldiers. All ten participants referenced only one factor, making it easy to code the responses. The most common factor was related to the environment or interactions with individuals with five comments alone these lines. Three individuals mentioned time, in reference to the fact that there was not enough time to properly conduct resilience training. One individual also mentioned lack of funding being a factor, in that you need money in your training budget to conduct some types of training. The last factor that was indicated was the general idea that they could have inhibited the development of resilience in Soldiers simply by not fully understanding resilience or the CSF program. An example of a response that was coded as environmental or interactions with

individuals was, “Maybe made things more stressful than they had to be.” “Attacking the individual personally inhibits resiliency and also being dismissive of things.”

The responses from this question were then compared against the previous question and the secondary question that asked if the participants thought resilience could be developed. The factor of training was seen in all the questions. The first two questions indicated that training was seen as a factor that promoted resilience, and in the above question the lack of time to train was seen as an inhibitor that had been perceived by the participants. Training was a common response seen in all three of the questions possibly due to it being the primary mode in which field grade leaders have been exposed to the idea that resilience can be developed.

What do Field Grade Officers Understand or Know About the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program?

This secondary research question was trying to get the field grade officers to subjectively gage their own level of knowledge of the CSF program. The specific question that was asked was: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program? Even when giving the participants a predetermined scale to gage their level of understanding, two individuals went outside the scale and answered with, “a lot”. One participant stated, “I would say I know a lot. I would say that I’m very familiar with it and how to instruct people on resiliency, but I don’t think that I could teach the master course right now or anything like that.” Five individuals stated they knew a fair amount about the CSF program and three participants stated they knew a little about the program. An excerpt from one participant that elaborated on why he

thought he knew a little was, “I think I know a little. I know the basics. I went through the test, but before the program, I think that I was pretty resilient before because of the way that I was brought up. Brought up in the Caribbean, third-world country, a lot of sicknesses, things like that. It made me resilient before coming to America.” Prior to asking this question it was thought that most would answer a fair amount, due to the massive push in the Army over the past three years and the mandatory unit and institutional training that takes place at all levels. This question revealed that there are field grade leaders who feel they only know a little about the CSF program even after receiving organizational and IR training. It is the field grade leaders that push the program down to the company level, and if they themselves do not know that much about the program it could be hard for them to accomplish such a task.

What is the Perception at the Field Grade Level
of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program
and its Ability to Promote Resilience?

This secondary question was attempting to gauge field grade leader’s perception or overall buy-in of the CSF program by asking them, what is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience? This question was coded based on the participants overall perception being positive, negative, or neutral. Five of the participants had a positive overall perception of program, three had a negative overall perception of the program, and two were coded as having a mixed perception or stating they did not have enough information to properly gauge the CSF program. Secondary comments or trends that were seen in the responses were that there must be buy-in and that the program is good only if implemented correctly. One negative response was, “I don't think it will achieve what it is meant to. I just think it is just another program drawn

out for people to learn. I have a feeling that it is not going to do much for me. I won't say it did much for me.” A response coded as positive that included the secondary response was, “I think it is a good idea. I haven't been in the operational unit for a while so I don't know if the implementation is actually happening and if it is reaching the soldiers or if it is just kind of a check the block like a lot of the suicide prevention training was. So if it is done like that it's not going to help. If it is actually believed in it I think it could work.”

In order for a program to see maximum results, those who are responsible for the implementation must feel positive about the program and also possess buy-in, if this is lacking the program may not be as effective. The responses to the question were not as positive as one would expect from field grade officers who are responsible for the implementation of the CSF program within organizations and the level of buy-in also appears to be lacking. If these results are indicative of the larger Army field grade population, than it would appear that only half of all field grade officers have a positive perception of the CSF program, which could be problematic and an indication that the program is not operating at its maximum level and possible being reduced in effectiveness.

How do Field Grade Leaders Perceive the Efficacy of the Army's Institutional Resilience Training?

This question was attempting to understand field grade leaders' perception of Institutional Resilience (IR) training which is received at all levels of Army training from the youngest private to the most senior officers. The exact question that was asked was, do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is

effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why not? The participants' responses were coded as either having a positive or negative perception of the fourth pillar of the CSF program. Four of the participants had a positive perception and six had a negative perception of the fourth pillar of the program. The positive reasons given by participants were that the training reminds you there is a program so you can pass down the information, it helps with suicide prevention, and the fourth pillar works if you apply what you learned and practice it in the field. Some of the negative reasons participants gave were that the program is better for younger Soldiers and officers and that the training is not long enough.

After the participants answered the initial questions, the researcher asked them all how they felt about the resilience training they received during ILE or PCC. For the ILE students five out of six of them had a negative response to the training that they received and only one had a positive perception of it. An example of a negative response received was, "Considering that I can't remember any of the specifics about it. I don't think it made a big impression on me." Others made reference to the fact that it did not do a lot for them. The one positive response stated,

Well I think, just the main idea was that look here is a program. You are the best judge on what you need you know. They kind of gave us the schematic if you will. This is what is available, here is what we have, here is how you can do it, you asses your needs and then you know where to go when you need something. If anything it is exposure and it is on us to go and utilize what we need or think we need.

For the ILE students some of their answers could be contributed to the fact that they received the training during the core phase of ILE and they were interviewed during the elective phase; almost seven months had passed since they had the IR training at ILE.

One of the ILE participants made a very good point when she stated, "I just remember we

had a debate about its usefulness, resiliency and why resiliency is important. Not necessarily how can we take this back to our units and as field grade officers how we can try to instill resiliency in others.” A suggestion for CGSC would be to update the IR training that ILE students receive. This could be done by giving them an overview of the CSF program, then instructing them on what their role as a field grade leader is in regard to building resilience in Soldiers and how they could positively influence resilience in Soldiers. An additional suggestion would be integrating resilience training throughout the ILE curriculum, making it a thread seen in multiple blocks of instruction.

The responses from the PCC participants were split with two feeling positive about the IR training they received and two feeling negatively about it. One for the PCC participants made some very valid point when he stated,

It was a briefing. It wasn't training, per se. It didn't teach me how to do anything. It reviewed the topics that were concerned, talked about the numbers in the Army. This is a one-star general talking to us, so it was very broad-based. The first thing that I need to do is sit-down with my MRT and ask them what exactly is this and how can we do this? I don't understand enough about it to be able to incorporate it. I would like to say let's incorporate resiliency into every part of our training, which is possible. Stronger teams build more resilient people, but I don't know what tools are in the kit bag to be able to do that.

Another participant stated,

I'm the proponent of the unpopular opinion. I don't think it was effective. If we're serious about making not only commanders but those junior leaders that we talked about effective trainers and masters of understanding the problem set and how to get past it, a one-hour pitch in a big room isn't enough. If we're going to say its serious business, we should treat it like a 40-hour course.

Both participants made some very valid points in that the IR training that they receive is very broad and does not give field grade leaders the tools they would like to have when they leave CGSC.

The training that the PCC participants differed from the ILE participants in that less time had gone by since they had the IR training, which was weeks rather than months, but their responses were still split between positive and negative and they made similar recommendations or points regarding IR training. The analysis of this particular secondary question is applicable to CGSC and may not apply to other TRADOC environments. This question in the case study lacks representativeness or transferability to the larger Army IR training programs, therefore the responses to the question lacks external validity.

The analysis of the primary and secondary questions in the case study provide a better understanding of how field grade officers perceive resilience and the CSF program. Although the participants in the study represent only a small portion of the larger Army population, their answers bring to light the premise that there could be issues with the CSF program. Chapter 5 discusses the overall conclusions drawn from the study as well as recommendations that may aid in enhancing the CSF program.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The results of the primary research question revealed that field grade leaders do in fact believe that they have a role in building resilience in Soldiers, but they do not have a clear idea as to exactly what that role is. This could be mitigated by creating a leader program that would delineate what a leader's role is and how they can have an impact on building resilience in Soldiers.

From the secondary research questions, the first three were used to gauge what field grade leaders knew and understood about resilience and who they thought was responsible for developing it in Soldiers. The first question revealed that field grade leaders had a general understanding of resilience and on some level were able to operationally define it to varying degrees. This question gave a baseline for what the participants knew regarding resilience as during the interview, they expanded on what they knew and understood about resilience. The second question supported the fact that field grade leaders believed that resilience could be developed or built in an individual, but it was unclear through what means resilience could be developed as their answers ranged from through an individual's experiences to individuals being more naturally incline or resilient. The third question showed that most felt it was everyone's responsibility to develop resilient Soldiers, but the answers varied as to who was most responsible for that development. The first three secondary questions point to the fact that field grade leaders at all levels could benefit from a course focused on resilience and

ways that it can be developed or enhanced, thus giving field grade leaders the tools to help promote resilience in individuals.

The next two secondary questions were used to isolate factors that field grade officers had seen or done that may have encouraged or inhibited the development of resilience in Soldiers. These two questions were then looked at along with the responses to the secondary question that asked if they believed resilience could be developed. This was done because responses to all three of the questions contained factors or ways in which the participants felt resilience was encouraged or inhibited. The one trend that was seen between all the questions was responses by the participants that stated training or a lack thereof was a way in which resilience could be developed or inhibited. An explanation for all the references to training may be that this is the only method for promoting resilience that some field grade leaders are exposed to. It may be beneficial to educate leaders in the different ways that resilience can be promoted through everyday actions and interactions and through the use of external (family support, community support, caring person outside of the home, and other environmental factors) and internal (self-efficacy, self-esteem, competence, coping skills, and other internal protective factors) factors that are known to promote resilience in individuals.

Secondary questions six and seven both focused on the CSF program and what field grade officer's knew or understood about the program as well as their perception of its ability to promote resilience. These questions highlighted the fact that all field grade officers had a general understanding of the CSF program, but only a few had a positive perception of the program. It is unknown how successful how successful the CSF program is if those responsible for its implementation have a negative perception of the

program and lack overall buy-in of it. Additional training may be needed at the field grade level in order to create a more positive perception of the program and thus gain buy-in for the program.

The final secondary question looked at field grade leaders' perception of IR training, which led into a follow-up question of what they thought about the IR training they received at CGSC. With over half of the participants having a negative perception of IR training and also the IR training received at the college, the curriculum that field grade leaders receive may need to be revised and the IR training received at the different levels scrutinized to see if it is meeting its intent. If the intent of IR training is merely to give a brief overview of the CSF program and resilience, then it is meeting that intent. If the intent is to give individuals the tools they need to fully understand and have a working knowledge of the program and resilience, then it is not meeting that intent and revisions should be made.

Overall, the results of the secondary research questions in the case study added depth to the primary question and helped to validate the fact that field grade leaders in today's Army believe they have a role in building resilience in Soldiers. They also have a general understanding of the CSF program and resilience overall, but do not fully grasp the intricacies of the program and at the organizational level do very little intentionally to assist in the promotion of resilience. This could in part be due to the underlying fact that some leaders have limited knowledge of the CSF program or how their everyday actions and interactions with subordinates could help promote individual resilience. The study also revealed that most ILE and some PCC respondents did not gain that much

information from the mandatory Institutional Resilience (IR) training that takes place at the Command and General Staff College.

Recommendations

Most of the research surrounding the CSF program is in its infancy, and the results regarding the effectiveness of the four pillars may not be published for years to come due to the fact that the true effects of the program could take years to realize. Thus far, the Army has released very little preliminary data to the public about the program or its efficacy; with most of the literature surrounding the program being written by Army personnel or those working with the Army on the project. Eidelson, Pilisuk, and Soldz (2011) voiced their concerns with the CSF program through an article in Truth-out.org illustrating what they call the “dark side of Comprehensive Soldier Fitness” program. In the article, they noted that the PRP, on which the CSF program is based, has produced only modest and inconsistent results as also noted in a meta-analysis conducted by Brunwasser et al. (2009). This also is in keeping with the findings that the PRP shows greater success when taught and administered by trained research staff of the PRP, and not when taught by graduate students, teachers, counselors, or other members of the community (Brunwasser et al. 2009; Gillham et al. 2007; Seligman et al. 2009). They also point to the fact that the PRP is geared toward a non-military population, even more specifically towards adolescents and children. This additional information regarding the CSF program is not an attempt to dispute the CSF program, but rather to point out some limitations with some of the research in positive psychology, and thus with building psychological resilience in the Army through the CSF and the four pillars that are currently in place. The qualitative study that was conducted in this research project at the

CGSC supports the general premise that some of the pillars may need to be reevaluated as they may not be producing the results that were intended when the curriculum was devised.

Recommendations for Future Research

This researcher suggests future research focusing isolating the different pillars of the CSF program attempting to answer the following questions: What are the factors in a person that most influence resilience in another person? Does leadership impact the overall level of measurable resilience in Soldiers or an organization? If so, is the training received in the fourth pillar sufficient throughout one's career to teach leaders how to build resilient subordinates? How do peers influence the level of resilience that an individual possesses and can they help promote resilience in the same capacity as senior leaders? If so, does additional training need to be added to the CSF program that highlights this area? The questions are countless and they all lead into the one main question regarding the overall CSF program that requires further research: What is the true efficacy of the different pillars of the CSF program and can resilience be taught with any true efficacy to Army Soldiers?

Final Thoughts

After conducting this research of the CSF program and the massive effort the Army has put forth in an attempt to increase resilience, some two thoughts are apparent. First, the CSF program is still immature. At this point it is unknown if the different pillars of the program will improve resilience in Soldiers, and if such training is enduring. Second, within the Command and General Staff College, the fourth pillar of the CSF

program is receiving negative to mixed results among field grade leaders. This small aspect of the CSF program could be easily altered with a revised curriculum for both the ILE and PCC students. In the final analysis, if this is the only scholarly contributed by this research, then it was successful and worth the time and effort that was put in to conducting the qualitative research study.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

Title: Perception of Army field grade officers regarding resilience and the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program.

Principal Investigator: Virginia Knorr

Purpose: You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of the study is to gather information regarding resilience and the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program. You are invited to participate because you are currently a student at the Command and General Staff College and meet the demographics of the study.

Procedures: If you decide to participate, the following information will be looked at: your answers to 5 interview questions, along with 5 demographic questions that you will be asked to complete. We will compile all information and ensure that your personal information is not directly associated with any of the data. Analysis of the data collected will be conducted after all interviews have been conducted.

Time required: If you agree to participate, it should not take more than twenty minutes of your time.

Risks: There are no risks greater than those encountered in everyday activities.

Benefits: Your responses will be used to provide insight and information on how field grade officers perceive resilience and the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program.

Compensation: No compensation is provided for your participation.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal: Participation in research is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study. If you decide to be in the study and change your mind, you have the right to drop out at any time. You may skip questions or stop participating at any time without bias.

Confidentiality: We will not identify you, or attribute comments to you that are made during the session, and we will NOT include your name or other personally identifiable information in our interview notes or reports.

We cannot provide “confidentiality” or “non-attribution” to a participant regarding comments involving criminal activity/behavior, or statements that pose a threat to yourself or others. Do NOT discuss or comment on classified or operationally sensitive information during this session.

Contact Persons: You may contact Virginia Knorr at (254) 258-2070 or via email at Virginia.a.knorr@us.army.mil if you have questions about this study. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this research study, you may contact the Quality Assurance Office at usarmy.leavenworth.tradoc.mbx.cgsc-qao@mail.mil.

Copy of Consent Form to Subject: I will give you a copy of this consent form to keep.

If you are willing to volunteer for this research, please sign below.

_____	_____
Participant	Date
_____	_____
Principal Investigator or Researcher Obtaining Consent	Date

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS

Age _____ Gender _____ Ethnicity _____

Highest level of education _____ Marital Status _____

Rank _____ Years of Service _____

Number of Combat Tours _____ Branch _____

Number of months since you took the Global Assessment Tool (GAT) _____

Master Resilience Trained ____ Yes ____ No

Type of resilience training you have participated in _____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers?

If so, why and how?

If not, why not?

2. What do you understand or know about resilience?

3. Do you believe resilience can be developed?

If so, why and how?

If not, why not?

4. Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

5. What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

6. What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

7. Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

8. What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

9. Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience?

If yes, why?

If not, why?

APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT

Participant 1

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, I think as leaders it is our job to show them that they can be successful and then also show them when they are not successful that it is just a temporary setback and that they can overcome whatever they want, whatever they excel at.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: You know that I have had the unit level training. We talk about it here all the time. It's being able to bounce back and to accept that when things get difficult that it is not a forever state. That things will eventually get better, you can make it better.

Interviewer: So what you are saying is that you do believe that resilience can be developed.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, I think that some people are more naturally inclined to be resilient, but that does not mean that if you are not naturally like that it cannot be developed.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: Everybody, I think it is about how we set up our training, I think it is about the standards that we set for our soldiers, and it is how we enforce everything. For example, if we set a training standard and the soldiers don't meet it they should be held to that standard go back and redo it and once they succeed they should be rewarded for their success.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: I don't know if I did anything consciously, because when we were talking about resilience. But when I was a company commander and really involved in setting up training and preparing soldiers, we were talking about being resilient, but we had not done the master resilient trainer. We didn't really have an Army program. So, I don't think I did anything consciously. Probably after having learning about what makes more resilient soldier, probably subconsciously it was the climate that we set. It was holding people to standard, not letting them get away with not meeting the standard and saying it is ok, everything will be all right, but not doing it in a way that we're punishing them, but just reinforcing success.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Probably by not really understanding resilience. I am sure we did not put anything in place to ensure that it was one of the things we trained on or improved upon. I'm not sure if I've seen anything that really hindered resilience, but we just did not really acknowledge it. It was more neglect.

Interviewer: So it was before 2010 when all our trainers were trained?

Interviewee: Yes, I was in NATO after that so it was a very small unit. But when I was involved more with training soldiers it was in a combat unit, it was before the Army as a whole had started talking about resiliency.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: Probably a lot.

Interviewer: You know a lot about it, do you want to elaborate on that?

Interviewee: I have taken all your little online evaluations, so I've done myself, provided feedback for others. I have had two commanders that were very much into the different pillars and being very strong, not just militarily or physically or things like that.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: I think the idea is good, but like a lot of Army programs the institution is not(really good) and while yes, it is getting some awareness out there

and we are now talking more there are more things than being physically strong...being good at your job. I think how we implement it is not always effective.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: I don't think it is highly effective. I think that having went through some of the programs...I think that it is good for younger soldiers and officers that don't know much about resiliency, that haven't deployed, who may have gotten married young, you know a lot of different things that could go wrong. I did not find it as useful for people who had deployed a couple of times; you know who were more mature in their relationships. Some things like that. I think that in all instances when you are trying to reach an audience that is maybe a little more inexperienced, and we have to be very careful how we do it. Some of the people who I have seen teach this probably they were not the best people to go to the master resilience trainer course. So then of course, the message is diluted and you know it is not very effective training. And so probably one of my biggest comments about the whole thing is, I think it is a good program, I think we can develop it but we have to pick the right people to go to the course and be certified as trainers

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training received at ILE?

Interviewee: Considering that I can't remember any of the specifics about it. I don't think it made a big impression on me. I know we talked about resiliency and I know we talked about it in L100 and another one that we talked about it some. But I just remember we had a debate about its usefulness resiliency and why resiliency is

important. Not necessarily how can we take this back to our units and as field grade officers how we can try to instill resiliency in others.

Participant 2

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Of course I have a roll. You know, because of the education for the soldiers the young soldiers, who are not experienced who might have some issues. Such that they have not dealt with previously. My role as a leader is to you know help them through counseling sessions. In order to deal with those issues.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: I would say that is a little tricky. Resiliency as far as I understand it is something that is based on experience, you know for me not your typical.....a little older. I've seen so many things, I've had a lot of experiences, how people have dealt with issues being marital, you know being career related. In the end, the ownness is on that individual on how to do the right thing you know. Committing suicide is not the answer to a problem. So, that is where experience comes in where that individual has to deal with their problem. Takes care of it in a mature way rather than look for a copout.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, I believe that it can be developed or built. Again like I talked about, the experiences out of that building or developing process how you see things over time, how you relate to people over time. You typically see a soldier come in and experiences as a one or two years of serves soldier is different from when you reach ten years you cannot get used to the system the information takes time.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: Everybody in the chain, but most importantly the direct supervisor. You know if it is a squad leader for younger soldiers or a Detachment SGT, NCOIC. It depends on who is next in the Soldier's direct chain of command. Direct line supervisor is most responsible.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Well, my previous organizations where I had soldiers, we have done is a lot team building, a lot of briefings, You know there are so many programs that prevention of suicide, SHARP training, there are so many training that you seize the opportunity to talk to the Soldiers. Safety programs. Those are all the programs that are already in existence that you can use as a forum to educate soldiers.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: I would not say any inhibitions. I guess the biggest might just be time, time to schedule that practical life that provides the firm to develop the soldier. So I would say time would be the biggest.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: I would say I know a fair amount about the program. That those are some of the downfalls of the program because even when you read through the questions physically you can respond how you please. Some people are subjective in the response they provide. So you are talking about the GAT. Yes

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: I don't think it will achieve what it is meant to. I just think it is just another program drawn out for people to learn. I have a feeling that it is not going to do much for me. I won't say it did much for me.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: Institutional you cannot go wrong with the information that it provides to the Soldier. Again it will help in one way or another....I still think that time will tell its effectiveness. But based on everything that it was aimed at achieving cut down on suicide rates we have not seen much. Things still seem at the same level. Success I would say no, I would say no in terms of success.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training you received at ILE?

Interviewee: I don't even remember it at all. Again from my foxhole it depends on the individual. People are formed, people have grown up, people have their set ways. All these new programs really do very little in reforming people are changing their ways of reasoning. They can sustain the training. For me it is just another training and it didn't matter.

Participant 3

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes. Understanding the problems of the office and the family and things like that all factor into what a soldier is. Not only the professional aspect but the personal aspect. Having been trained, having lived a longer than most, I think that I bring that experience to them.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: Overall it's the ability to deal with adversity issues, being personal or professional, being able to exist, I guess survive.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I don't know if it can be built, but developed, yes. I think looking over the years at what people have gone through, for example, the way that they're

brought up, I believe that you can always add to that. They already have established morals and ethics – they already have that. You can always build on that. People can get stronger. We do it with PT; we do it with everything else. Psychologically, you're helping to build that person.

Interviewer: So you think your life events build resiliency?

Interviewee: Absolutely. Life changing events, you can have them.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I think everyone is responsible. As far as who is most responsible for it, I would believe that the first level that has interaction with that individual. The first line leader, squad leader.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: True story. I had a soldier that decided one Friday evening to come to my office and say that he wanted to take his life and that he will take his life and came to say goodbye to me. Why, because my personality, always talking to everyone, so how do I believe you can make people more resilient? By talking to them. Asking them, "Hey, how are you doing, how's life, what are your plans?" Not just checking the block, but really listening to the answer. That's what I believe.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: I can't think of anything I've done to inhibit them. I think I might have, not intentionally, given them the answers, I guess? Giving them my experience and make it theirs, I guess. Like here is what I did and this is how I handled it, and they tried it and it might not have worked for them. I guess that could inhibit it.

Interviewer: By not letting them figure it out for themselves, maybe?

Interviewee: Like trying to pacify them, like giving a baby a pacifier to quiet them. Spoon feeding them the answer.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: I think I know a little. I know the basic. I went through the test, but before the program, I think that I was pretty resilient before because of the way that I was brought up. Brought up in the Caribbean, third-world country, a lot of sicknesses, things like that. It made me resilient before coming to America.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: I have mixed views about that. I think a lot of the CSF is check-the-block because we have to get it done, or it needs to be done, so just do it. Trying to actually employ the CSF, like I go back to my saying, waiting for the answer. You know, we have to get it done by Friday, so we all just get it done.

Interviewer: What you did the GAT?

Interviewee: Yeah. You picked the answers that would not trigger something. I could see people doing that.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: I would say that any type of training on any level reminds the individual that he has the responsibility to project that information to individuals. It's a good reminder of this is a program that the military has. That's how I look at it. It reminds you that the program is there, and whatever you learn you just pass it down.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training you received at ILE?

Interviewee: I went through the motions.

Interviewer: Nothing sunk in with you?

Interviewee: Nothing sunk in, no.

Participant 4

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I do. Not only through Comprehensive Soldier and Family Fitness and resiliency training, I believe that resiliency means that your soldiers are trained capable and have the capacity to react and respond, not only to normal life stressors, but operational stressors. Courses and training have their piece, but hard, tough realistic training can ensure soldier resiliency.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: I know it's hard to define. We spend a lot of time talking about tough resilient soldiers. Definition of it from an operational perspective for the force is hard to define. What I know about it is that there's a large push. Resiliency is tied to comprehensive fitness, so not only physical fitness, mental fitness, moral fitness, and I believe all of those tie into the resiliency program.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yeah. I think from the entry level follow-on through first unit of assignment and further units of assignment, I think it's definitely a building block. The shock of initial entry, because we're getting different soldiers than when I was. We're getting different soldiers that need to be taught how to cope with the pressures of life and as they progress through their career they'll learn not only through life experiences but also through the formalized program of resiliency and fitness training. It's a building block process. The short answer is yes, resiliency can be taught from the initial entry point to future units of assignment.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I believe it's the – I put a lot of weight and importance on the first line supervisor – the NCO, and on the officer side. Having said that, we owe those junior and mid-grade NCOs and those junior officers the tools with which to do that. Those are the guys that interact with the soldiers on a daily basis, every day all day. While the burden is on them, we owe them, from the "T" in DOTMLPF; we owe them that training

capability and those rocks to put in their rucksacks so that they can speak in an intelligent manor about resiliency and learn how to cope. And it's not just "Ok, Johnny, you've had a tough day today, and here's a way to cope with it." It's how you balance your checkbook, here's how you manage your finances. All of that is tied to resiliency. I think we've put a label on what we used to just call responsibility. You're responsible for your own actions. A responsible person who makes clear, concise, adult decisions is arguably a very resilient person. So the short answer is junior leaders within the organizational training Army need to provide that building block to those leaders. And then commanders allocate the time, assets and money so that they have the ability to train to gain those tools to use with their troops.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: I'm a big fan of hard PT. It's a team focus. What I've personally done in the last 12-16 months, I've been a Brigade XO and a Brigade DCO. From a brigade staff perspective – because that's who I interact with on a daily basis – we do exceedingly tough team-focused kind of PT stuff. It builds the team, lots of challenges in there. A lot of free interaction. We do synch meetings that are less of a rote memorization synch process, but more of an open mic free exchange of ideas as to how to make us better – stronger, lighter, faster, more lethal. But again, it's a different population of soldiers. The most junior person that I interact with are captains. So we've got captains, majors, senior warrant officers, senior NCOs, that are the people that I interact with. Arguably a higher level of resiliency as compared to a 19 year-old private or a 21 year old second lieutenant. So again, short answer, the comprehensive fitness piece of people

that I interact with. Tough, realistic, challenging PT that builds the team, and the free interchange of ideas between individuals regardless of rank makes the unit better, makes the person a better thinker.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization? Done?

Interviewee: Arguably very little. Probably put myself at risk helping trooper's work their way through--and by troopers a couple of non-attributional cases within my current unit of assignment--several captains were having massive issues that they're being helped through. Just by that interchange and the free interchange of ideas. Inhibiting resiliency? Back to the allocation of time. Like I said before, we owe our most junior responsible leaders the tools, if we don't give them the time to train, arguably in the Army, a lot of things, 350-1 training, EO, SHARP, and these are all big ticket items right now for the Chief and the Vice-Chief, and SecDef has said "you will fix these things or we're going to tell you how to fix them." Those items, unless senior leaders tell people to do it, are the last thing allocated time and assets for. And arguably they are some of the most important. If you take care of them first and accurately and well, then all of that other stuff that we really, really need to do the business of training for and fighting wars, becomes that much easier. So, to inhibit resiliency, the lack of allocation of time.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: I'd say a fair amount, but not a lot. And that's something that I've got to work on for the next 6 months prior to taking command. I've got to get smarter with the programs. I'm a fan of holistic timelines. You can take something that that's so critical. One, we're being told its critical, and two, it is critical because it's the health of the force. You've got to drop those things into your long range training plan. And arguably, like we were talking before, you've got a long rang training plan that says you're going to do individual and collective training, and I'm going to do gunnery here, and an MRX here, and a CPX here. Then you go back and see where you can plug that stuff in. It should be concurrent lines of effort. So I've got to get smarter. I know a fair amount about it, but I've got to get better.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: My perception is that it's something that we've been doing for a long, long time, but it's got a new – not only did we re-label something that we've been doing all along – but we've allocated new duties to show its importance to the force. So we've got a person, not just a thing, but a person and assets allocated to it now. So I don't know if that answers your question?

Interviewer: Do you think it's doing what it's supposed to be doing within the system?

Interviewee: Having had enough of a view across the formation, I haven't had a large enough pool of people to watch. Because at the end of the day, I'm focused on the staff and subordinate battalion headquarters. I'm not a commander yet. So I haven't had a

good view. I can't gauge its effectiveness. I can gauge the effectiveness to about a 50-60 person blast radius, that's about it.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: I'm the proponent of the unpopular opinion. I don't think it was effective. If we're serious about making not only commanders but those junior leaders that we talked about effective trainers and masters of understanding the problem set and how to get past it, a one-hour pitch in a big room isn't enough. If we're going to say its serious business, we should treat it like a 40-hour course.

Participant 5

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes. It's very important so that they can continue to focus on their job. If they learn and know resiliency at home and in their own personal life, it allows them to concentrate on the job and their training.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: Resiliency is about balance to me. About learning how to cope and deal with all of the stressors, not only that we deal with every day, but also experience in our job.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I believe so. I think so. Yes.

Interviewer: How or why? If you can feel it can be built, how do you think you can make somebody more resilient?

Interviewee: The classes are a good way to do it, but I think the whole application of it is all within the person. From how they apply it and if they're actually doing those things in their life, it will make them better. If they do what the CSF lays out, it will build resilience? Not by the numbers necessarily, but you know they take that and they apply it. Everybody deals differently, but I think that they can take that and see how it applies to them, maybe tweak it a little bit then yes, I think it's very possible to build resiliency.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I think it's everybody's responsibility to do that. I'm a big believer in the top-down approach. The guy that's sitting at the head of the table has to be the one pushing and setting the example for everyone else to follow, and also charged with leading by example. You can't have the guy at the head of the table doing something different than you're trying to accomplish.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: I had about 4 soldiers in Afghanistan last time that were going through a lot of marital problems and I jokingly say all the time that I think I'm an

anomaly because I do genuinely love my wife and have a great family life and am very happy. I sat down with them and gave them a lot of examples of things that I do at home with my wife and family to cope with a lot of stressors that we had at this last duty station. And it worked out really good – it worked out for all 4 of those guys – really tried that and applied it to their lives and it was a good news story when I left there.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: You know, I don't know that I can put my finger on something that was a particular incident that was actually done. I think that time is a big thing. I think that you have to allow the soldiers to have a lot of time to be able to do that, spend time with their families. And as soon as you start coming up with a bunch of bull crap and bullshit things to do that takes them away from being able to spend time at home it's huge. That would be the one thing that I see. That's a hard balance and goes back to what we talked about earlier that you have a mission that you're trying to accomplish and train for, but how do you put in that time? Time would be the biggest thing that we take away from them.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: I would say I know a lot. I would say that I'm very familiar with it and how to instruct people on resiliency, but I don't think that I could teach the master course right now or anything like that.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: Again, that goes back to what I said earlier. It's only as good as the person that it's given to, if they're receptive and open to it and willing to take what they learn and the steps and apply it to their life to make it work. I mean, it's a good program and I think that it briefs well. But a good brief is only as good as the people that are going to go execute it.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: From my experience, and I can only go by my experience, it helped make me aware that there was a program and that I had to go back and educate myself more on it because it was something that I was having to deal with as a battalion XO and I was dealing with those issues. But I think that the blocks of instruction we did get serves the purpose that it makes you aware that there is a program out there and they kind of bait the hook and tell you what it's about then it's up to you or whatever unit you're in to make sure you educate yourself on how to apply the program.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training you received at the PCC?

Interviewee: It was quick. That's just something to bait to hook to say that there's a program out there. I take almost offense when people especially our senior leaders, get up there and say "Everything's great, everything's good. We've got all of these programs out there that are working great." And people like me and you who are working down there at the nug level that are having to deal with it. We don't live in a glass house; we

know that things aren't really that great. But again, there are great programs like this, and people like me and you take the time to educate ourselves and how to apply it and make sure that our soldiers are taking advantage of that. Barring giving the whole course, I think that's sufficient, what they throw up there. When you're somewhere like this you just have to be aware that there are programs out there and where to get more information.

Participant 6

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I do. I do, because it should be inherit within the leadership that you do. I mean, it's positive influence on people, not supporting the negatives, but supporting the positives, so they feel worth out of their life.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: I probably don't know enough. That's the scary thing. As leaders, we talk about it a lot, but when are we actually trained on it? Resilience is the ability for a soldier or someone to bounce back from an adverse action.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I think that it can be enhanced. If it wasn't initially set in your foundation from your home, engrained in you in those ages from like 5 to like 10, when

you're starting to develop those things, it would be harder, not impossible, for it to happen. But it can definitely be enhanced. You have to have somebody with an initial capability of say 10% to get them to 50%. But if you'd had no personal struggles in their life, you might have just as many problems. Sometimes there are soldiers that have had an adverse family that are actually more resilient than guys who grew up in the Ward and June Cleaver version.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I think the commander at every level is responsible for that. But the person actually to do it, I think it's up to the leaders, the resiliency trainers who empower and educate the leaders so that they can continue to build resilience at all times within their training. It doesn't have to be a separate training event, it can be daily operations.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Set a positive environment. You set a positive environment, is what I want to do as a battalion commander. But what I've done in the past as an executive officer or 2IC or something if you listen to their concerns and help them to define their concerns and solve them themselves, using reflective listening, and let them voice that out, I think you're better at it. And once again be positive about things. Don't be a candy man. You can still enforce high standards and have resilient soldiers. Don't shelter them. When they screw up tell them that they screwed up. Ask them why they screwed up. Ask

them how they're going to fix it. And then that kid will be more resilient, and that action next time, as long as you don't degrade them, it will help.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Attacking the individual personally inhibits resiliency, and also being dismissive of things. Because the problems that you don't perceive as a problem and dismiss it from the soldier, especially publicly, because that's where the worst part of it is at the senior leader level, will have exponential effects on that guy. And again, this isn't a touchy-feely thing; it's more about making that soldier feel that his worth is something. Basically, everybody, most people, 99% of people in the Army want to do a good job and be acknowledged for it. And when they say something or have something that is their view, they need to be acknowledged and not dismissed.

Interviewer: You feel that if you don't acknowledge that you're making them feel that they don't matter?

Interviewee: It may not be your decision. It may be that you didn't show up for work for 3 days, you still screwed up and here's your article 15, you know? Just be honest with them and up front. Acknowledge that they did something and then work to find a solution for it. Because where most guys get in trouble with resiliency or not being resilient is that they have no way to rebound from it.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: I would say a little about the program.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: It's only as good as the individual that takes it. It gives no leader oversight to it. It gives no leadership input to it other than "execute that". The only thing as a leader that you can do it go in there and see if that soldier has or hasn't done it and you can see you're unit's overall completion. If I look and see how many people have high school diplomas or not have high school diplomas in my formation that's no measure of intelligence. I would say equally that the taking of the GAT is no measure of resiliency. Yeah, you can't tell what the level of your unit's resilience is. But yet again we talk about that the commander is responsible for it, without a tool to do it.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: For the senior leader ones – I can't really speak to the junior pieces of it—we have Army values. Why isn't that incorporated into the Army values for the younger guys so that it becomes more inherent in what we do. The training that we get at this level isn't training. I get more briefed on it. In my opinion, it doesn't give me any physical methodology as to how to conduct the training, how to oversee the training, or to evaluate the training. Some of this is on me too; I haven't looked into it enough. The class that we got two weeks ago was "Here's the Army's plan for resiliency and here are the numbers, here is where we're at." It didn't really train me on anything.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training you received at the PCC?

Interviewee: It was a briefing. It wasn't training, per se. It didn't teach me how to do anything. It reviewed the topics that were concerned, talked about the numbers in the Army. This is a one-star general talking to us, so it was very broad-based. The first thing that I need to do is sit down with my MRT and ask them what exactly is this and how can we do this? I don't understand enough about it to be able to incorporate it – I would like to say let's incorporate resiliency into every part of our training – which is possible. Stronger teams build more resilient people, but I don't know what tools are in the kit bag to be able to do that.

Participant 7

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not? Yes.

Interviewee: Well I am about to be a BN commander and you set the tone for the BN. This is obviously something that is very important in the Army right now as we come out of Afghanistan there is still a lot of issues out there that these Soldiers are dealing with and resiliency will help them thru it. I think it is a great program and as a commander you have to enforce that.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: You know that is a really tough question, because there are so many levels to it. It is making you a stronger person. It is making you, I mean if I could read the definition of resilience that's what it would be. Being stronger, it is kind of like you have

spiritual fitness, physical fitness, but you also have this resiliency fitness. I don't know if I answered your question.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, I do, in fact it is proven. Like 20% increase if you do resiliency training and went well. You can see the line go up about 20%.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I think that the answer is everyone. I would say a lot of the focus is on the Chaplain, which is one of the ones you did not mention.

Interviewer: No, I didn't mention him at all...that is usually not one that most people bring up even though they are very closely linked to suicide prevention and awareness that has been going on. I mean that is why we are doing the resilience training.

Interviewee: I am going to put the resilience mission on my Chaplain for the most part as the executor.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: You've got the mandatory annual training. I think that is a start, but really it is just talking. Like when you see someone with a problem or issue and you can see it in their eyes or face or how they carry themselves. Don't walk by it. You know. Hey, what's on your mind, let's talk. You know and listen, listen to the person, see what is going on in their lives and a lot of times the fact that you took the time to talk to them

will help them out. Get it off their chest or you could give them guidance or you could send them where they need to go to get help. I think that is the first thing, just trying to recognize it when someone is having a problem and address it and not just walking by.

Interviewer: Would you call that active listening or communication? Is that kind of what you are talking about?

Interviewee: Ya, more listening. I think you can see when there is a problem, you can see when someone is going through something by the way they carry themselves, by the way they talk, look, patterns. You know he has been late every day. It seems like there are indicators and you need to be looking for those.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Well, I think sometimes in the Army we have this suck it up and drive on mentality. I have used the phrase myself in the past and that really is not what resiliency is about. So, I would say trying to kill that mentality. Hey, well just do it you are a soldier, deal with it. You know, hide your emotions, can't do that.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: A fair amount. I think they do a very good job in the pre-command course talking about it. There was like 3 hours of really good discussion a lot of good readings. I think we are getting better at teaching the fundamentals of resiliency. A fair amount would be the answer.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: Very favorable impression. I like it. Sometime I think that when the words are too big like comprehensive, say it again.

Interviewer: The Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program.

Interviewee: Exactly, people go what. I think the name is too long. I like resiliency. I think people get that, but when you try to Comprehensive eee...Most people are not going to remember it unless they are as deep into it as you are. But that encompasses a lot of different things, not just resiliency. So that is the title they gave to, the umbrella they gave to all the things that fall under it. Resiliency being one of them.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: Ya, that goes back to the last question. In the PCC the institutional training we received was first class. It was very good, it made us think. It really sold the program to me. So speaking from that perspective, PCC. Very good, but I don't know what it is like at the Captains career course, BOLC, or any of the other schools. It is effective.

Interviewer: I can tell you, I looked over you all's slides and I think yours is more effective than what the MAJs got here. Who I am looking at here is MAJ and LTC across the board. And the response I got from the MAJ was what resilience training, when did we get that. So I guess it depends on what level you are at.

Interviewee: The whole suicide thing is what is driving this right now. This is the Army's answer to how we are going to get after suicide prevention and I think it is the right answer, it is good, it is changing mindsets of people. Like I said, we are not the suck it up and drive on Army, we are the hey, you have a problem, let's talk about it. It is ok, let's get you some help. We have to shift to that, leaders have to shift to that and it starts at us. It starts with BN CDRs and senior leadership. I think it is fantastic, I think that the Army has it right.

Participant 8

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, well in a leadership position everything that goes well or poorly in your unit rests on the leader. And lot of time the soldiers don't have a role model. A lot of soldiers we've dealt with don't have that strong upbringing with the family and don't have that support system, so you become it.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: There is a lot. Before it used to be that you either had it or you didn't and now there has been a lot of studies that you can actually train and build up resiliency by having a well-rounded approach. You have lacking in some areas it can impact everywhere.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: I think it can. There are coping mechanisms to deal with stress. Don't know to what extent, some people are going to be more resilient than others but I think you can improve the resiliency within an individual.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I believe it would fall mostly to the NCOs and also the company grade officers, because they have the most daily interaction. I mean the field grade officers and the SGMs help develop a plan but implementations going to have to take place at a lower level because they have the daily interactions.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Most effective thing that I saw was just the buildup of trust between the Soldiers and the leadership. If the Soldiers trusted the leaders and had respect for them and the leaders respected the Soldiers. The problems came out early. If that communication got broke down then there was no communication the issues didn't get arose early and then we had some catastrophic incidences.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Just within the infantry you can get the alpha male machismo. Where if you bring up a problem that is a sign of weakness and just shutting people down right

away as opposed to actually listening to them. Hearing them out even if you think they are just complaining at least hear them out. When people get shut down right away they don't see any place to bring their problems to and that leads to lack of resiliency.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: A little.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: I think it is a good idea. I haven't been in the operational unit for a while so I don't know if the implementation is actually happening and if it is reaching the soldiers or if it is just kind of a check the block like a lot of the suicide prevention training was. So if it is done like that it's not going to help. If it is actually believed in it I think it could work.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: I don't remember it so obvious it didn't do its job. I don't think it is as much as we need.

Participant 9

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Absolutely. It is just one of our jobs as leaders. It is also institutionalized; resiliency training is just something you got to do.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: I've had level one, kind of the basic introduction. I've sent 3 NCOs to the program down at Pen State so they have come back and shared all their teaching program teaching, brochures.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes, to me it is more of a cognitive thinking pattern. It is something you can teach, something you can learn. So it breaks down things like looking at something that may depress you. Say you have no money this week so it is teaching you to look at things that you can actually control in that scenario, what are things to start shaping your environment as opposed to like hope to change type things. It is actually breaking down things, this is what you can control, this is what you can't control, these are the paths that you can move left and right. So it is a system in my mind.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: Well now that we have institutionalized it, that Master Resiliency training that is kind of their job. It is train the trainer so NCOs as mentor leaders. So I guess two MRT and NCOs.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: PT, PT, PT, PT, PT. Always PT. No matter how bad you feel you go do some running and everything that is probably 50% of it right there, just getting your body right. The second part is all this training that you schedule once a month resiliency training and you actually set it up in a way that its responsible. The people actually learn from it. So it can work it is not a joke like a lot of people laugh at. It's good training.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Maybe made things more stressful than they had to be. Inhibited the development of resiliency is that the questions?

Interviewer: What have you observed that may have inhibited it?

Interviewee: I would say making situations more stressful than they have to be. So when someone screws up, blowing it out of proportion instead of bringing the solutions to correct it.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: A fair amount.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: The only thing I guess it does if you're totally being honest with yourself it will allow an individual to say, well, ok, maybe I have more stress than normal in my life. So that is all it does. It is just informing you.

Interviewer: So you have to buy into the program?

Interviewee: Ya you have to buy into it and be honest with yourself. So you have to trust that people aren't going to use this for some data base and hunt you out. Can't laugh at it. You have to be actually honest and look at the results.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: Ya, I wouldn't write it all off. What is effective is actually practicing, putting the steps into place. Actual examples, where you can use things. In the classroom environment I don't know if it is really effective, but if you were to take certain situations than apply it then ya, I guess.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training your received at ILE?

Interviewee: Honestly I didn't get a lot. I got more from my unit. The unit I came from we did actual structured resiliency and comprehensive fitness training. So, I got more out of that. We were taking normal everyday things that add stress to your life, breaking them down and how do you maneuver through a problem. Whereas here I think we are broadly touching on the things that everyone knows you are supposed to do this, you're supposed to do that. Everyone kind of knows that. If you take a real problem and dissect it and show how you can control left and right, I think that is more effective.

Participant 10

Primary Research Question

Interviewer: Do you feel that you have a role in building resilience in Soldiers? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes. One of the rolls I was the XO for the squadrons, support squadron. So one of my roles was to make sure we develop all the pillars that the Army established to make sure they are resilient in financial, spiritual, and physical. To make sure if the soldier encountered any problems or challenges, he would be able to cope, identify, and resolve his own issues without degrading into a bad situation he could not control and it would affect his family and unit members' type of performance.

Secondary Research Questions

Interviewer: What do you understand or know about resilience?

Interviewee: Resilience from what I understand is the ability to cope with situations and problems and find solutions that essentially help you cope and manage your daily positions, responsibilities, and things you need to get done throuout the day.

Interviewer: Do you believe resilience can be developed? If so, why and how? If not, why not?

Interviewee: Yes. It is something that is learned and can be developed. And the ways that you develop them: one is through exposure through theory, ways how to develop, how to become aware of your situations and circumstances. Solutions help. And then put them in practice every day. Some people, specifically young people don't have those coping skills, don't understand that we all have problems and there are solutions. Put them together, we all have problems, this is how you deal with them, this is the class,

this is how you put it in practice. And they start practicing, they realize there is hope, suicide is not an answer, hurting themselves or a family member. That there is a solution.

Interviewer: Who do you feel is responsible for developing resilience in Soldiers; the NCOs, Master Resilience Trainers, company grade officers, field grade officers, or general officers?

Interviewee: I think it is everybody's role. More specifically, the person close to the problem would be the NCO, because he is the first one who identifies the Soldier has an issue or observes issues with his performance, personal life, family life, financial life. So he is the first one who should be identified. Then take it to the next level should be officers, because they develop the program and expose the soldiers to the programs implement systems so there are checks and balance to make sure everyone is going to these training programs.

Interviewer: What have you personally observed or done to develop resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: When we first got back from a deployment with my last unit. What we did was set up a program with the instillation; they already had a program established. We used our facilities to make sure everyone went through a financial class. You know you had some money you saved up, what are you doing with your money, what is the smart thing to do with your money, saving it, investing it, making sure you don't get loans, high interest rate. And how to manage your family. Spiritual, making sure you family has access to and exposed to some type of spiritual training needs are fulfilled. And of course physical training, making sure everyone is aware of not only the traditional gym and PT, but also other programs that the instillation had. Like the spiritual fitness

training center things there on post. And were also able to get special prices for people who wanted to exercise, not on post but off post. Like gyms so they could continue to do that away from the Army environment, they felt stress in the Army doing PT because it was so directed. They were able to go off post and do exercises they wanted to do at a very low stress level. So we kind of put that together.

Interviewer: What have you done or observed that may have inhibited the development of resilient Soldiers in an organization?

Interviewee: Funding. Normally a lot of this is driven by funding. So there is not the funding available you can't hire the financial advisors that kind of come in and look at your financial situation. They kind of look at a Soldier. Like a PFC, what he earns, what are his expenses, and how to manage that, how to save, how to prep for the future. If you don't have the money to do and hire these financial experts than that is one area they can't develop. Same thing for other counselors that specialize in certain needs. If there is no money for funding than you can't develop that or teach them how to cope with those skills or issues. So I think the biggest for me is money.

Interviewer: Would you say you know a lot about the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program, a fair amount about the program, a little about the program, or nothing at all about the program?

Interviewee: A fair amount. I am not a master resilience trainer, trained person. But I just know we have sent people to school and they have come back implemented a program, maintained it, managed it. I know it is important for everyone to make sure they continue. It is like any other skill, it's perishable. If you're not constantly training it,

exercising, executing it. Eventually you know, it's like any other fluid skill, you lose it. So I think it is very important.

Interviewer: What is your perception of the CSF program and its ability to promote resilience?

Interviewee: I think it is a new area the Army went into, I think in my mind, it is effective. A lot of people gained a lot of value from what we instituted in my unit. As far as the pillars and what is available at the instillation. I think the Army is in the right direction. There is more to improve on like anything else, but I think the Army is doing good as far as exposing. At the end of the day it is up to the individual how much they want to take away. We will take you, give you the class, show you what techniques and you know how to manage your money. But at the end of the day it is up to the individual to promote it and execute it.

Interviewer: Do you think the fourth pillar of the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness program which consists of the Institutional Resilience (IR) training at all levels of leader training is effective at teaching leaders about resilience? If yes, why? If not, why?

Interviewee: Ya, I think so, because everyone is exposed to the same problems from the lowest level to the highest level. I've see people with financial problems in key positions. I've seen people in key positions go through divorce or go through problems. So we are exposed to the same hazards and the same problems that every level is exposed to. So I think it is something we need to promote at every level.

Interviewer: What did you think of the IR training you received at ILE?

Interviewee: Well I think, just the main idea was that look here is a program. You are the best judge on what you need you know. They kind of gave us the schematic if you

will. This is what is available, here is what we have, here is how you can do it, you assess your needs and then you know where to go when you need something. If anything it is exposure and it is on us to go and utilize what we need or think we need.

REFERENCE LIST

- Ahern, Nancy R. 2006. Adolescent resilience: An evolutionary concept analysis. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing* 21, no. 3: 175-185.
- Algoe, Sara, and Barbara Fredrickson. 2011. Emotional fitness and the movement of affective science from lab to field. *American Psychologist* 66: 35-41
- Atkinson, P. A., C. R. Martin, and J. Rankin. 2009. Resilience revisited. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing* 16: 137-145.
- Azar, Beth. 2011. Positive psychology advances, with growing pains. *American Psychological Association* 42, no. 4: 32.
- Barton, Paul T. 2006. Resilience under military operational stress: Can leaders influence hardiness. *Military Psychology* 18: 131-148.
- Brunwasser, Steven M., Jane E. Gillham, and Eric S. Kim. 2009. A meta-analytic review of the Penn resiliency program's effect on depressive symptoms. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 77, no. 6: 1042-1054.
- Burton, Nicola W., Ken I. Pakenham, and Wendy J. Brown. 2010. Feasibility and effectiveness of psychosocial resilience training: A pilot study of the READY program. *Psychology, Health, and Medicine* 15: 266-277.
- Casey, George W. Jr. 2011. Comprehensive soldier fitness: A vision for resilience in the United States Army. *American Psychologist* 66, no. 1: 1-3.
- Comprehensive Soldier Fitness. <http://csf.army.mil/index.html> (accessed May 16, 2012).
- Congressional Research Service. 2010. *U.S. military casualty statistics: Operation New Dawn, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation Enduring Freedom*. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RS22452.pdf> (accessed March 12, 2012).
- Cornum, Rhonda, Michael D. Matthews, and Martin E. P. Seligman. 2011. Comprehensive soldier fitness: Building resilience in a challenging institutional context. *American Psychologist* 66: 4-9.
- Eidelson, Roy, Marc Pilisuk, and Stephen Soldz. 2011. The dark side of "comprehensive soldier fitness." Truthout. <http://www.truth-out.org> (accessed April 15, 2012).
- Federal Business Opportunities. 2009. U-comprehensive soldier fitness (CSF) Army resiliency training. <https://www.fbo.gov> (accessed November 15, 2011).

- Fergus, Stevenson, and Marc Zimmerman. 2005. Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Reviews Public Health* 26: 399-419.
- Gable, Shelly L., and Jonathan Haidt. 2005. What (and why) is positive psychology? *Review of General Psychology* 6, no. 2: 103-110.
- Garnezy, Norman. 1973. Competence and adaptation in adult schizophrenic patients and children at risk. In *Schizophrenia: The first ten Dean Award Lectures*, ed. Stanley R. Dean, 163-204. New York: MSS Information Corp.
- . 1985. Stress-resistant children: The search for protective factors. In *Recent research in developmental psychopathology. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, ed. J. E. Stevenson, Book Supplement, no. 4, 213-233. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- . 1991. Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. *The American Behavioral Scientist* 34, no. 4: 416-430.
- Gillham, Jane E., Karen J. Reivich, Derik R. Freres, Tara M. Chaplin, Andrew J. Shatte, Barbra Samuels, Andrea G. L. Elkon, Samantha Litzinger, Marisa Lascher, Robert Gallop, and Martin E. P. Seligman. 2007. School-based prevention of depressive symptoms: A randomized controlled study of the effectiveness and specificity of the Penn Resiliency Program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 75, no. 1: 9-19.
- Gillham, Jane E., Karen J. Reivich, Derik R. Freres, Marisa Lascher, Samantha Litzinger, Andrew J. Shatte, and Martin E. P. Seligman. 2006. School-based prevention of depression and anxiety symptoms in early adolescence: A pilot of a parent intervention component. *School Psychology Quarterly* 21, no. 3: 323-348.
- Grotberg, Edith. 1997. *The international resilience project: Findings from the research and the effectiveness of interventions*. ResilienceNet. <http://resilnet.uiuc.edu/library> (accessed November 12, 2011).
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. 2006. Field Manual 6-22, *Army leadership*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army, Deputy Chief of Staff of Personnel, G1. 2009. Army demographics: FY09 Army profile. <http://www.armyg1.army.mil/hr/docs/demographics/FY09%20Army%20Profile.pdf> (accessed March 15, 2012).
- Higgins, Gina O'Connell. 1994. *Resilient adults: Overcoming a cruel past*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lester, Paul B., Sharon McBride, Paul D. Bliese, and Amy B. Adler. 2011. Bringing science to bear: An empirical assessment of the comprehensive soldier fitness program. *American Psychologist* 66 (January): 77-81.
- Luthar, Suniya S. 2006. Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades. In *Developmental psychopathology: Risk, Disorder and Adaptations*, edited by D. C. Cicchetti, D. J., 2nd ed., Vol. 3, 739-795. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- MacDermid, Shelley M., Rita Samper, Rona Schwarz, Jacob Nishida, and Dan Nyaronga. 2008. *Understanding and promoting resilience in military families*. <http://www.cfs.purdue.edu/mfri/public/publications/reports.aspx> (accessed March 26, 2012).
- Mason, Mark. 2010. Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 11, no. 3 (September): 1-15.
- Masten, Ann S. 1994. Resilience in individual development: Successful adaptation despite risk and adversity. In *Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects*, edited by Margaret C. Wang and Edmund W. Gordon, 3-25. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- . 2001. Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist* 56: 227-238.
- . 2007. Resilience in developing systems: Progress and promise as the fourth wave rises. *Development and Psychopathology* 19: 921-930.
- Masten, Ann S., and Jelena Obradovic. 2006. Competence and resilience in development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*: 13-27.
- McGeary, Donald. 2011. Making sense of resilience. *Military Medicine* 176: 603-604.
- Meredith, Lisa S., Cathy D. Sherbourne, Sarah Gaillot, Lydia Hansell, Hans V. Ritschard, Andrew M. Parker, and Glenda Wrenn. 2011. *Promoting psychological resilience in the U.S. military*. Sant Monica: RAND Corporation.
- Merriam, Sharan B. 1998. *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary online. s.v. "resilience." <http://www.learnersdictionary.com/search/resilience> (accessed March 12, 2012).

- Peterson, Christopher, Nansook Park, and Carl A. Castro. 2011. Assessment for the U.S. Army comprehensive soldier fitness program: The global assessment tool. *American Psychologist* 66, no. 1: 10-18.
- Positive Psychology Center. University of Pennsylvania. <http://www.ppc.sas.upenn.edu/prpsum.htm> (accessed May 15, 2012).
- Preston, Kenneth O. 2010. From the SMA: What is the comprehensive soldier fitness? *The NCO Journal* 19, no. 5 (May): 2-4.
- Rak, Carl F., and Lewis E. Patterson. 1996. Promoting resilience in at-risk children. *Journal of Counseling and Development* 74, no. 4: 368-376.
- Reimer, Michele S. 2002. Gender, risk, and resilience in middle school context. *Children and Schools* 24, no. 1: 35-47.
- Reivich, Karen J., and Jane Gillham. 2009. Penn resiliency program executive summary. 1-34.
- Reivich, Karen J., Martin E. P. Seligman, and Sharon McBride. 2011. Master resilience training in the U.S. Army. *American Psychologist* 66: 25-34.
- Richardson, Glenn E., Brad L. Neiger, S. Jensen, and Karol L. Kumpfer. 1990. The resiliency model. *Health Education* 21: 33-39.
- ResilienceNet. www.resilnet.uiuc.edu (accessed March 16, 2012).
- Saleebey, Dennis. 1996. The strengths perspective in social work practice: Extensions and cautions. *Social Work* 41, no. 3: 296-305.
- Schaffer, Rudolph H. 1996. *Social development*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Schiraldi, Glenn R., Theresa K. Jackson, Stephen L. Brown, and Jessica B. Jordan. 2010. Resilience training for functioning adults: Program description and preliminary findings from a pilot investigation. *International Journal of Emergency Mental Health* 12, no. 2: 117-130.
- Schoon, Ingrid. 2006. *Risk and resilience: Adaptations in changing times*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Seligman, Martin E. P. 2002. Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, edited by C. R. Snyder and Shane J. Lopez, 3-9. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Seligman, Martin E. P., and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. 2000. Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist* 55, no. 1: 5-14.

- Seligman, Martin E. P., Randal M. Ernst, Jane Gillham, Karen Reivich, and Mark Linkins. 2009. Positive education: Positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education* 35, no. 3: 293-311.
- Seligman, Martin E. P., Tracy A. Steen, Nansook Park, and Christopher Peterson. 2005. Positive psychology progress empirical validation of interventions. *American Psychologist* 60, no. 5: 410-421.
- Sood, Amit, Kavita Prasad, Darrell Schroeder, and Varkey Prathibha. 2011. Stress management and resilience training among department of medicine faculty: A pilot randomized clinical trial. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, Advance online publication.
- Sroufe, L. Allen., Byron Egeland, Elizabeth A. Carlson, and W. Andrew Collins. 2005. *The development of the person: The Minnesota study of risk and adaptation from birth to adulthood*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tizard, Barbara. 1979. Later effects of unusual experiences in infancy. In *The first year of life: psychological and medical implications of early experience*, edited by David Schaffer and Judy Dunn. Chichester: Wiley
- Turner, Sandra, Elaine Norman, and Sharyn Zunz. 1995. Enhancing resiliency in girls and boys: A case for gender specific adolescent prevention programming. *Journal of Primary Prevention* 16, no. 1: 25-38.
- Waite, Phillip J., and Glenn E. Richardson. 2004. Determining the efficacy of resiliency training in the work site. *Journal of Allied Health* 33, no. 3: 178-183.
- Werner, Emmy E., and Ruth S. Smith. 1992. *Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Zoroya, Gregg. 2010. Army reports record number of suicides for June. *USA Today*. July 18. http://www.usatoday.com/news/military/2010-07-15-army-suicides_N.htm (accessed March 12, 2012).

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

Combined Arms Research Library
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College
250 Gibbon Ave.
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2314

Defense Technical Information Center/OCA
825 John J. Kingman Rd., Suite 944
Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

Dr. Bill J. McCollum
DCL
USACGSC
100 Stimson Avenue
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

Mr. Mark A. Tolmachoff
CGSS
USACGSC
100 Stimson Avenue
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301

Mr. Matthew W. Broaddus
DCL
USACGSC
100 Stimson Avenue
Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027-2301