

Measures of Indicators of Resilience

Among the many definitions, conceptualizations, and theories of resilience, perhaps the most comprehensive is the “society to cells” model (Szanton, Gill, & Thorpe, 2010), in which the construct of resilience is conceptualized as a multidimensional process that is largely determined by the cumulative interaction of environmental and inherent factors in response to some challenge and manifested within the concepts of resistance, rebound, or recovery. Together, these three distinct conceptualizations of resilience capture the essence of the many available frameworks and definitions of resilience (Szanton et al, 2010). Resistance is shown in individuals or systems that remain unaffected or unchanged in the face of a challenge (Rutter, 2006). Recovery is evident in individuals or systems that experience a temporary setback in terms of their functioning and resume functioning at the pre-challenge level (Bonanno & Mancini, 2008). Rebound is observed in individuals or systems that have thrived or flourished because of the challenge (Aldwin, Spiro, Levenson, & Cupertino, 2001).

However, within the context of the three conceptualizations of resilience (resistance, rebound, and recovery), another theory of resilience acknowledges specific domains with respect to individuals in interaction with their environment that include: 1) what I am; 2) what I have; and 3) what I can do (Grotberg, 2003). The “I am” domain indicates the person’s inner strengths or resources that may include self-determination, optimistic outlook, sense of humor, life satisfaction, and general contentment. The “I have” domain incorporates such factors as external resources (including financial resources) and social support systems that are in place. The “I can” domain refers to specific abilities or interpersonal skills for managing stress or adversity, which include but are not limited to effective problem-solving, spiritual coping, seeking help from others, and maintaining social connections.

To build the science of resilience, reliable and valid measures are needed for indicators of resilience that may reflect resistance, rebound, or recovery from the perspectives of “I am,” “I have,” or “I can do.” Examples of such indicators include acceptance, hardiness, mastery, hope, self-efficacy, sense of coherence, and resourcefulness, among others (Zauszniewski, Bekhet, & Suresky, 2015). Examinations of global measures of resilience are also welcomed.

This special issue will focus on the instrument development and psychometric testing of new, revised, or adapted measures of indicators or aspects of resilience.

Manuscripts may involve but are not limited to:

- 1) Translation of existing measures
- 2) Development / psychometric evaluation / validation of new measures
- 3) Psychometric evaluation / validation of existing measures in new populations
- 4) Determination of cut scores on existing or adapted measures

Special Issue Editor: Jaclene A. Zauszniewski, PhD, RN-BC, FAAN

Submissions due by: June 2018

Expected issue publication: June 2019

* All papers will be peer-reviewed All papers must adhere to Archives author guidelines

References

Aldwin, C.M., Spiro, A., Levenson, M.R., & Cupertino, A.P. (2001). Longitudinal findings from the normative aging study: Personality, individual health trajectories, and mortality. *Psychology and Aging, 16*, 450–564.

Bonanno, G.A., & Mancini, A.D. (2008). The human capacity to thrive in the face of potential trauma. *Pediatrics, 121*, 369–375.

Grotberg, E.H. (2003). *Resilience for today: Gaining strength from adversity*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishing.

Rutter, M. (2006). Implications of resilience concepts for scientific understanding. *Annals of New York Academy of Science, 1094*, 1-12.

Szanton, S.L., Gill, J.M., Thorpe, R.J. (2010). The society to cells model of resilience in older adults. *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics, 30*(1), 5-34.

Zauszniewski, J.A., Bekhet, A.K., & Suresky, M.J. (2015). Indicators of Resilience in Family Members of Persons with Serious Mental Illness. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America* (pp. 131-146). Philadelphia: Elsevier Publishing.