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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is a historical case study that focused on the founding and continuation of the GSSch to define the term, academic resilience and to determine how the GSSch had impacted academic resilience. I examined qualitative data from interviews alongside research published during the founding (i.e. mid-1970s) and continuation (i.e. 1975-2020) of the GSSch. I used the research to examine how the actions of the leadership fit within the social and political climates of their time. This dissertation has gone above and beyond expectations by not only defining the term, academic resilience but also by providing authentic examples of both a resilient academic institution, and a resilient academic leader. My findings and analysis will assist future researchers by providing focus areas when exploring change as well as exploring the legitimacy of an academic leader’s ability and/or institution’s ability to plan for and respond to a potentially harmful provocation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

After having completed an MA in German Studies at the University of New Mexico (UNM), I began working on a Ph.D. in Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education. For the dissertation, I wanted to pick a topic that would incorporate the content area from the MA, the coursework from the Ph.D., and my professional interests. My professional interests included second language acquisition and pedagogy studies, both of which were part of the coursework for the degrees. More specifically, I was interested in educational leadership and the pedagogy found in a German total immersion school.

Background of the Problem

UNM has a German total immersion school. It takes place every summer in the Taos Ski Valley in Northern New Mexico. The full name of the school is The University of New Mexico’s German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley, which I will be abbreviating as GSSch. As an MA student, I attended the GSSch. I found it to be very beneficial to both acquiring enough credits to finish my degree on time and in improving my German skills. One of my advisors in the German Department, Professor Peter Pabisch, was one of the two original founders of the GSSch. Along with his colleague, Professor George Peters, he opened the GSSch in the summer of 1976. Given my experience with the GSSch and my relationship with one of the co-founders, I wanted to explore the possibility of writing a dissertation about the GSSch.

I spoke with my advisor, Professor Walker, about possible dissertation topics. She told me about emerging research in the field of resilience. I quickly went to the UNM library database and downloaded every article I could find on resilience, as it related to
the field of education. To my surprise, there was very little written about resilience in the field of education. Plus, most of what was written went back only as far as 2013. I felt that the emerging field of resilience in education would be a good field to explore for several reasons. First, the GSSch had continued uninterrupted for over 40 years and I was curious as to why it was able to maintain its longevity. Second, resilience in education could provide part of the framework needed to study the GSSch.

After I had conducted a literature review on resilience in education, my advisor provided me with a book from Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi titled, *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. I quickly became engulfed in his concepts of *creativity* and *flow*. To begin with, flow referenced a state of being in which a practitioner is engaged in an activity that he feels agency over. While engaged in this activity, the practitioner is not seeking any external validation, but rather is motivated through intrinsic rewards. Creativity referenced how a practitioner engaged in the activity. Csikszentmihalyi created a chart to help illustrate his point, in which both the skill level required to perform the activity and the challenge level posed to the practitioner when he is engaged in the activity are measured. Flow is achieved at the intersection between the practitioner’s highest skill level and the highest challenge level the practitioner can meet.

I began making connections between Csikszentmihalyi’s *Flow* and Vygotsky’s\(^1\) concept of the *Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)*\(^2\). I thought that they complemented each other, as the ZPD is accessible to students when the teacher properly scaffolds a

---

\(^1\) Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) was a Russian psychologist. He has been praised for making advancements in the field of education for multiple reasons, including providing new theoretical frameworks (i.e. the sociocultural theory framework) and by challenging knowledge-based testing.

\(^2\) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) incorporates four quadrants to explain how students learn. According to Vygotsky, the highest level of learning occurs when a teacher has scaffolded a lesson which is challenging but achievable for the student.
lesson. In other words, the student is reaching his full, academic potential. Flow is accessible to a practitioner when the practitioner himself engages deeply and meaningfully in an activity. In other words, the practitioner is reaching his full, professional potential. I linked these concepts to the GSSch by considering the teachers at the GSSch to be the practitioners. I pondered the question: What would happen if both the teachers and the students were achieving their full potential? Although this question did not become one of the research questions, it did help guide me in my search for a framework for this dissertation by showing that Csikszentmihalyi’s work could be linked to the field of education.

With a focus area and framework in mind, I began exploring problems that could be studied in a dissertation. One of the problems surfaced when I spoke with Professor Pabisch. Professor Pabisch is a UNM professor (emeritus) and a co-founder of the GSSch. He claimed that his summer school provided educational equity and quality in a total immersion environment. He stated that he was one of the original proponents of German Studies in the 1970s, when many universities in America were making the shift away from just German language and literature. He continued to boast that every part of the GSSch was meticulously designed for a specific purpose and that neither the location nor the pedagogy had changed in over 40 years.

After listening to his claim, it seemed conceivable to me that the GSSch could be an example of academic resilience, but I would have to flush out a lot more about the problem to be researched. I proposed that I could investigate the longevity of the GSSch and the tenure of the co-founder through the lens of academic resilience. This led me to the following questions:
1) What is academic resilience?

2) How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?

Before answering these questions, I needed to operationalize key terms such as resilience and academic resilience as well as reconceptualize the concept of (academic) resilience in order to construct a lens through which I could analyze the GSSch. I also sought a framework that would support the research project using a qualitative analysis and would help guide the research by focusing on the following three areas:

1) leadership;

2) pedagogy, and;

3) creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations.

The reasoning for these specific areas, (i.e. leadership, pedagogy, and creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations) stemmed from the fact that one of the co-founders of the GSSch had boasted that every part of the GSSch was meticulously designed for a specific purpose. He claimed that his design had promoted the success and longevity of the GSSch. Before I could commit to the research topic, I needed to have some evidence that addressed the educational leadership and pedagogy of the GSSch during its founding as well as the resilience of the leadership and the institution. The following information informed me about the founding of the GSSch and solidified my decision to make it the focal area of my dissertation research.

The GSSch first opened its doors in 1976. Its mission was to teach the three pillars of German Studies, which were language, literature, and culture, through an immersion program in a remote location. The GSSch attracted students from all around the world, but the majority of the students were from the US. As an immersion program,
and to help improve the language skills of the students, the GSSch required all students to speak only in German. This was not limited just to class time, but also during the breaks and at lunch, the students were to remain in the German language (Heckmann-French and Bond, 1979; Joyce and Appl, 2005; Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, 2010).

The GSSch was designed to be a four week, total immersion program offered through the UNM. The courses, which were divided over two back-to-back two-week sessions, were to run from early June through early July. Even though it is off of the main campus in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the GSSch was still a part of the University. As a part of UNM, the GSSch emulated a university by maintaining academic rigor with a German Studies focus (Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, 2010).

The exact number of credits that a student could register in has fluctuated some. The GSSch recruitment flyers for the 1976 and 1977 summer sessions boasted that undergraduates could receive up to 10 credits, but only the first 8 credits were included in the standard tuition rates. That number dropped to 9 credits in 1978, with only the first 7 credits being included in the standard tuition rates. Currently, students can only register in 7 UNM undergraduate or graduate credits over the full four weeks.

The academic rigor of a university was part of the unique approach to their pedagogy design. Some schools, such as Berlitz only offered a basic level of German knowledge for travelers, with memorized phrases, such as “Where is the bus station?” and “Can I pay with my credit card?” The GSSch claimed that its students would be able to pass an internationally recognized, independent exam, and would be prepared to study in a German speaking university. The independent exam that is administered at the GSSch is called die Goethe Prüfung, which uses the Common European Framework of
Reference for Languages (CEFR) to determine the students’ language levels. If the student met the prerequisite before entering the GSSch, the administration claims that the student will be able to pass a level C1 exam at the end of the four weeks.

Even though the quality standards in a typical, 16 week course may already have been agreed upon within a university setting, the literature added that the total immersion program should design a curriculum in such a way that the students would be better able to engage with the course material than they would in a typical classroom. Joyce & Appl (2005) point out that “These longer immersion experiences allow for some innovative structuring” (p. 190). The expectation of innovative structuring raised the bar for any German immersion summer program as the pedagogy would not be designed around 50 minute intervals of German in an English speaking environment. Specific criteria needed to be given to guide the rational for the GSSch’s pedagogy. I identified four criteria.

The first criterion stated that German total immersion programs were supposed to offer more than just traditional German classes (Heckmann-French and Bond, 1979; Joyce and Appl, 2005). The traditional German classes referenced by these authors were classes in which students were taught German in 50 minute increments, with the goal of language learning. These classes could focus primarily on grammar or use an immersion method (i.e. communicative approach), without teaching explicit grammar. For the purpose of this dissertation, I considered the German courses that I taught at UNM, in which I utilized the communicative approach and I did not teach grammar explicitly during class times, to be traditional as well.

The next criterion was based on the emerging academic term, German Studies. German Studies’ predecessor, simply titled, German, was the study of language and
literature. In the early- to mid-1970’s, researchers proposed that German Studies should be more than just learning to speak the German language, while focusing heavily on the literature. German Studies was also supposed to focus on the cultural aspects found within German speaking communities. Around the same time that the GSSch was being founded, Heckmann-French and Bond (1979) wrote, “Presently, several programs are expanding this traditional approach by including classes and lectures that deal with other aspects of German Studies besides literature, such as history, business, economics, science, philosophy, education, films, and theater” (p. 88). According to multiple researchers, the expansion into German Studies stemmed from political and cultural events. For example, following WWII, Americans understood that the world did not end at the US border. This newly formed global perspective affected the German total immersion programs directly, as college students and the US military pushed for culture within these German total immersion programs (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974).

The third criterion stated that a German summer school, with a focus on German Studies, needed to maintain the same academic rigor as any other program offered within academia. Unlike a language camp (i.e. K-12 day, weekend, and summer language camps) that would just focus on grammar and vocabulary building, or a commercial language school, such as a Berlitz School, which was designed for a short-term traveler, the GSSch needed to help prepare students for a deeper language and cultural entry into a German speaking country, while emulating a university program (Pabisch, 2002, Stieglitz, 1955).

The fourth criterion stated that German summer schools should support teachers
of German, by providing teacher training and/or providing research into the field of German Studies. Heckmann-French and Bond (1979) wrote about seven German summer schools in the US. They believed that knowing about the German summer schools was important to teachers of German, as the German summer schools were supposed to be providing a new level of support for the teachers of German. They stated, “These summer programs offer unique opportunities to improve language skills, expand knowledge in a German-related field of study, and broaden cultural awareness of German-speaking countries” (Heckmann-French & Bond, 1979, p. 87). Unfortunately, very little research has been performed on the GSSch. Not to mention, of these seven German summer schools, only Sommerschule am Pazifik and the GSSch are still operating.

These four criteria, as well as the lack of research performed on the GSSch, showed a need for the dissertation research on the GSSch, as it feeds into the field of German Studies, and by extension, the educational leadership and the pedagogy of a German immersion program. These four criteria also illustrated part of the dialogue from the 1970s research, pertaining to how the pedagogy of the GSSch should be designed and why.

**Statement of the Problem**

Despite the importance of a German immersion program, as stated in the literature, very little research has been conducted on the GSSch. This dissertation research will add to the body of knowledge based on German summer schools, by studying specific aspects of the founding and continuation of the GSSch (i.e. original mission, administrative decisions, pedagogy, student perceptions, etc.). The data gathered on the GSSch will then be applied to a framework that can speak to how an institution
can display resilience. The findings of this dissertation research will argue, with the support of a qualitative analysis, the following, 1) what academic resilience is, and; 2) how the GSSch impacted academic resilience.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the founding and continuation of the GSSch through the lens of academic resilience. By performing this study, I will add to both the bodies of knowledge pertaining to language immersion programs as well as to the emerging field of academic resilience. I will achieve this by examining the founding and continuation of the GSSch through the lens of academic resilience. More specifically, I will add to the bodies of knowledge by focusing on the GSSch’s leadership and pedagogy, as well as the creative ways that the GSSch’s leadership responded to potentially harmful provocation.

I will begin this dissertation research by examining UNM’s campus climate in the 1970s, when UNM had a strong undergraduate program in German. The reason for this is that the 1970s were when the suggestions were made to add a graduate program in German Studies and the GSSch was founded. Pabisch (2002) stated, “Thus a masters program in German Studies could be introduced and maintained due to a strong and reliable undergraduate component” (p. 83). UNM’s administration authorized the MA program in German Studies, which still exists today, but the administration provided criteria for the MA program. To begin with, it had to be incorporated into UNM’s German Department, which already had a BA program in German. Plus, the MA program in German Studies would have to prove itself to be as strong and reliable as its BA counterpart. This included meeting the required number of registered students in each
course being offered as well as each course maintaining academic rigor (Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

To ensure that the MA in German Studies would be deemed reliable in the eyes of the UNM administrators, the creators of the German Studies program needed to identify potentially harmful provocations that could prevent the founding and/or continuation of the program.

Professor Pabisch identified one of the potentially harmful provocations early on. According to Pabisch (2002), the emphasis on faculty research was one of the main reasons why German programs were failing at other universities. Thus, placing too heavy of an emphasis on faculty research within the German department could potentially harm the MA program. He wrote, “Many schools of higher learning that were leaning too much on research interests lost ground, some of them even their entire program” (p. 83). He argued that too much of the older programs that were then being eliminated had held fast to their old method. “Since some graduate programs at U.S. universities and colleges were reduced or even eliminated in the nineties, the contrary development at UNM may come as a surprise to some” (Pabisch, 2002, p. 83). He stated that along with the emphasis on research, the old methods referenced here included teacher-centered lectures, as well as a curriculum based on language and literature (Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

He identified the next potentially harmful provocation as the threat of a conflict between the BA program in German and the MA program in German Studies. The program developers for the MA needed to ensure that the two programs were supporting each other, and not in competition with each other. In other words, they needed the
programs to be interconnected. It was around this point in the discussion that the MA program developers introduced the concept of the GSSch. The original idea was to allow non-native German speakers as well as native or near-native German speakers to enter into an MA program in German Studies. Then, the UNM German department could support the language development of non-native German speakers with a language immersion school. Allowing non-native German speakers into the program was supposed to prevent a conflict between the BA and the MA programs, by promoting a sense of inclusion for all students within the German department, regardless of what their native language was or of what their language proficiency was. Furthermore, the GSSch was to require that the incoming students complete two years of language training (offered through the BA program) before being admitted. The pre-requisite of two years of language training could positively impact student enrollment. The MA students would have to have already met the language requirement before being admitted into the MA program, thus, the two programs (i.e. BA and MA) would not be competing for the same students. Instead of competing, BA students would be tracked into the MA program, as the BA in German (language and literature) and the MA in German Studies (language, literature, and culture) would complement each other. Finally, the MA students would be required to attend the GSSch, which would support student enrollment and possibly be perceived by the UNM administrators as a foundation for reliability and proof of academic rigor (Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

Pabisch (2002) wrote,

According to the statutes, UNM’s M.A. program can only be operated in conjunction with the German Summer School as a dual academic program. Every
M.A. candidate must attend the German Summer School, in addition to his/her course work on campus; some of the students – mostly high school teachers of German from in and out of state – study at Taos during the summers exclusively.

(p. 85)

Applying the term, German Studies supported the introduction of this aforementioned student demographic into the German program, by incorporating culture along with language and literature. Culture allowed for students with a lower German language level to be admitted into the program, thus, any university could offer more opportunities for collaboration and educational opportunities for the students (Brod, 1974; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974).

I placed this data in dialogue with my proposed framework, which included the term, creative, as defined by Csikszentmihalyi. I concluded that the creative ways of responding to potentially harmful provocations proved themselves to be successful in several categories. First, allowing non-native German speakers into the program allowed UNM to tap into a new student demographic. Some scholars did claim that being a native or near native speaker was never an explicit requirement, but it was implied at many universities in the US and in Europe (Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974). Professor Pabisch knew about this implied requirement and stated, “Only 19 of 51 present degree holders speak native German underlining the program’s regard for non-native American students” (Pabisch, 2002, p. 86). These opportunities for collaboration and educational opportunities for the students were reflected in the diversity found in the types of degrees that the students at the GSSch were pursuing. Pabisch (2002) argued, “There is no limit to the combinations of research and teaching options, as
long as the matter deals in its major reflection with the German speaking world” (p. 90). UNM’s German Department broke tradition by incorporating innovative coursework, based on “the three columns of language, literature and culture,” into the pedagogy of the newly designed and interconnected MA program and the GSSch (p. 88).

Finally, Professor Pabisch affirmed that the pedagogy of the GSSch was to incorporate non-traditional teaching methods along with proven teaching methods. “The German Summer School and its graduate program obviously served as one of the positive examples of how to conceptualize and practice “German Studies,” namely by offering a balanced program of traditional and innovative coursework” (Pabisch, 2002, p. 87). He added that these offerings would make the MA program and the GSSch as reliable as the BA program.

Professor Pabisch and the rest of the program designers utilized this final creative way of responding to potentially harmful provocation. It stemmed from the MA and GSSch program designers incorporating non-traditional teaching styles into the newly developing programs, since German Studies, which was a field capable of tapping into a new student demographic, while supporting the pre-existing BA program at UNM, allowed for it. And each creative way of responding exercised by the program designers was in fact their explicit, deliberate response to a potentially harmful provocation.

Research Questions

Creswell (2013) asserted that researchers are often trying to find answers to questions. That is the basis of research. He stated, “Qualitative research begins with assumptions and the use of interpretive/theoretical frameworks that inform the study of research problems addressing the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or
human problem” (p. 44). The data should hold the key to answering the research question. In this dissertation research, the guiding question is

GQ1) In what ways did the GSSch have the potential to invoke academic resilience?

The overarching question is

OQ1) What is academic resilience?

The midrange questions are

MRQ1) How did the leadership of the GSSch respond to potentially harmful provocations?

MRQ2) How was the GSSch positioned after the leadership responded to potentially harmful provocations?

I deemed these questions important as they speak to multiple areas of the GSSch, including its educational leadership, pedagogy, and the overall quality and equity found within its total immersion learning environment. These questions also help guide the project in providing new insights into the word, *resilience*, in an academic context. Answering these questions required that I find a framework that could speak to the impact that the GSSch had on academic resilience, as well as facilitate the coding of the data (i.e. interviews, primary sources, and secondary sources). Although there were several options, I selected a historical case study for the dissertation, as I could perform the research using a resilient educational leadership lens (see Day, 2014; Griffiths & Edwards, 2014; Gu & Day, 2013; and Stewart, 2014), a curriculum theory lens (see Flinders & Thornton, 2017), and a creative lens (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). I could place each event examined in a historical context (see Marshall, 2007). This framework supports the dissertation research by using a qualitative analysis and it helps guide the
dissertation research by focusing on the following three areas:

1) leadership;

2) pedagogy; and

3) creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations.

**Definition of Study Areas**

According to Reed and Blaine (2015), a resilient leader does not simply react to things as they occur, but rather, he thinks ahead and makes contingency plans for possible scenarios. They concluded, “Resilience does not fluctuate on a daily or weekly basis. Instead, resilience reflects a pattern of how leaders view their current reality and how they assess the probability for influencing the future” (p. 460). Multiple researchers spoke of optimism, which is not found in an educational leader’s belief that everything will be just fine. Rather the optimism is found in the educational leader’s belief that he is equipped to deal with the situations as they arise (Day, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Reed, & Blaine, 2015).

**Leadership**

Maulding et al. (2012) stated, “The best leaders identify mistakes early so as to avoid any crises that may arise. When evaluating the seriousness of a crisis, good leaders resist the temptation to oversimplify the situation” (p. 22). The educational leader within an institution does not have to experience trauma first hand (i.e. suffer a car accident or live in poverty), but rather he needs to identify and respond to adversity.

To be effectively displaying resilience, the leader must incorporate optimism into the institutional planning (Day, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Reed, & Blaine, 2015). Reed and Blaine (2015) explained, “Resilient leaders
demonstrate optimistic thinking at two levels. They want to know about what is happening right now and the good, the bad and the ugly. At another level, resilient leaders are realistic optimists as they envision future possibilities” (p. 462). Even as resilient educational leaders look ahead, they need to take into consideration the possibility of future adversity. Rather than viewing the adversity as a negative, they need to see it as a possibility to grow stronger and plan accordingly.

Growing stronger requires a moral purpose. This moral purpose should be self-reflective in nature, which allows for the educational leader to remain overall balanced (Day, 2014; Reed, & Blaine, 2015). Day (2014) pointed out,

However, whilst resilience is an essential attribute, in itself it is not enough. Poor leaders (and teachers) may be resilient. They may survive without changing, without improving. Resilience without the conviction of moral purpose, without a willingness to be self-reflective and learn in order to change in order to continue to improve is not enough. (p. 646)

The researchers announced that this lens, which constructs the moral purpose, should not be too narrowly focused. It should allow for the educational leader to see an adverse situation from multiple perspectives, and take all stakeholders into account (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018). According to Reed and Blaine (2015), understanding a situation from multiple perspectives ensures that the adverse situation that either the stakeholders or the institution are faced with will be taken serious by the leader. They proposed,

Resilient leaders demonstrate the ability to understand, from as many diverse
perspectives as possible, the reality of what is happening when the organization is hit with adversity. Resilient leaders demonstrate the ability to maintain a positive outlook about the future, without denying the obstacles posed by reality. (p. 463)

Neither simply believing that everything will be okay, nor avoiding adverse situations were mentioned in the literature about displays of resilience. What was mentioned was the leader’s ability to plan for and deal with adverse situations. It is in the way that an educational leader deals with, and does not avoid, an adverse situation, that defines him as *resilient* or *not resilient* (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018).

**Pedagogy**

The pedagogy of the GSSch emerged from a series of historical events. Some of the most pertinent for the purpose of this research occurred between the late 1960s and the mid-1970s. This included a decline in student enrollment, the removal of the language requirement for graduation, and poor job placement for holders of a German degree (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974).

I felt it important to place the founding of the GSSch in a historical context before examining the pedagogy, since the pedagogy should be adjusted to fit the needs of that specific time frame. According to Flinders and Thornton (2017), “Any inherited system, good for its time, when held to after its day, hampers social progress” (p. 11). I interpreted this to mean that one of the problems that the German department at UNM had in the mid-1970s, was that their pedagogy was *held to after its day*. Even if the same pedagogy had thrived in the 1960s, replicating the pedagogy used in the 1960s would not
necessarily be to the benefit of the German department, as the social conditions of the 1960s were not being replicated. For example, there was a draft for the Vietnam War in the 1960s. College students were exempt from the draft. I am speculating now, but I find it feasible to argue that the increase in college enrollment rates in the 1960s were somehow tied to the War in Vietnam and/or the draft. Under such circumstances, students enrolling in courses offered through the German department might have been more interested in avoiding the draft than in finding a job. By the mid-1970s, the War in Vietnam had come to an end, as did the draft. Under these new social conditions, students enrolling in courses offered through the German department were more interested in finding a job than in avoiding the draft.

According to Marshall (2007), the historical context is just as important as the pedagogy itself. Although he did not specify any specific subject area (i.e. second language acquisition), he stated, “Curriculum history is, in part, a continual recurrence of focus on three elements: subject matter, learners, and society” (p. 3). Since societies and learners differ with time, the programs themselves must constantly be updated. Although there are many historical events that would have shaped the UNM’s German department in the mid-1970s (i.e. the founding of the educational system in the US, the university’s decision to open a German department, etc.), the historical events that I am most interested in occurred in the 1960s-1970s.

**Creative Ways to Respond to Potentially Harmful Provocations**

There are several terms to examine here, including the word *creative* and *potentially harmful provocations*. The word creativity can have many meanings. I am using the definition provided by Csikszentmihalyi (1996). He argued, “Creativity, at least
as I deal with it in this book, is a process by which a symbolic domain in the culture is changed” (p. 8). For the purposes of this dissertation, the domain in question is the German department. The culture includes American culture, university culture, and the culture of German departments at universities. I am using the term potentially harmful provocation in the context of educational leadership. In other words, the leadership does not suffer a traumatic event, but rather is faced with the challenge of addressing the aftermath of an adverse event or series of events that threatened the continuation of an institution (i.e. a German department at a university being threatened by low student enrollment).

There is an old saying, “That which does not bend, breaks.” By the mid-1970s, the low enrollment rates were acting as warning signs, signaling that German departments needed to come up with a new format, if they were to remain as a department and/or field of study at US universities. In other words, the German departments needed to bend. According to Stern (1974), “To be tested by adversity is no new experience of the university. If the past is any guide at all, higher education, from the Middle Ages onward, has responded to challenge and crisis with inventiveness and creativity” (p. 7). For the purpose of this dissertation, the word stubborn will be used loosely to illustrate a lack of initiative on behalf of the leadership to promote change. I am also using the word stubborn as a way to build a strawman, or an imaginary person, unwilling or unable to rise to a challenge. One example of stubborn leaders would be the leaders of German departments that would not respond to the challenges, but rather chose to hold on to an inherited system, after its day. Their departments did not bend, they broke. I do acknowledge that the removal of some programs, such as the removal of the
French program at SUNY Albany in 2010, are blamed on the university’s budget and not on stubbornness or an inferior program. Obviously, not all programs that close can be considered stubborn. Given the vast majority of reasons why a program can fail (i.e. budget, enrollment trends, etc.), I will not be focusing on the specific reasons why any single program failed, but rather I will focus on the continuation of the GSSci.

Nearly 25 years earlier, Rose (1949) had made the following suggestion to German departments facing challenges: “I would therefore suggest that the goal of the German Department should be defined not as the study of "language and literature,” but as the study of the German people and the German culture” (p. 7). This advice, to incorporate culture, went unheeded until the mid-1970s. Ultimately, culture would prove to be the vital third pillar in the transformation from a German program to a German Studies program (Pabisch, 2002). Rose (1949) continued,

Without venturing to lay down too rigid a definition in anticipation of the findings and conclusions of a representative committee of the body of University teachers of German and other interested parties, the following may perhaps be suggested as a working definition: The purpose of German studies is to arrive at an understanding of the German mind and its cultural products. (emphasis original) (p. 7)

There were several reasons why this advice made sense for academia. To begin with, the language level required to be able to understand German literature in academia was difficult for non-native German speakers to acquire. Plus, the study of language and literature was not leading to job placement in the US (Brod, 1974; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974). Making matters worse, researchers were claiming that the
need for German majors in the job market was uncertain. Stern (1974) proclaimed, “Realistically speaking, the students now entering our graduate schools will probably not enter our profession until 5-7 years from now. What will be the status of the profession at that time?” (p. 10). When trying to answer that question, researchers found few road signs to help guide them. As pointed out by Stern (1974),

What is called for today is both a flexible credo for graduate studies in German and a plan for action. In seeking these, our talents, our ingenuity, our inventiveness, and our good-will for one another will be taxed as rarely before.

(p. 7)

Here, he used the word, flexible. Stubborn leaders could not rescue their departments, but flexible leaders could. I tied Stern’s claim into Csikszentmihalyi’s concept of creative. According to Csikszentmihalyi (1996),

There are two main reasons why looking closely at the lives of creative individuals and the contexts of their accomplishments is useful. The first is the most obvious one: The results of creativity enrich the culture and so they indirectly improve the quality of all our lives. But we may also learn from this knowledge how to make our own lives directly more interesting and productive.

(p. 10)

The claim that I made was that flexible leaders adapt to their time frame. They examine the current social and political climate that they and their institution operate in. Stern (1974) made a good point with the term, flexible, but I found Csikszentmihalyi’s concept of creative to be a better fit for this dissertation, as he has done a thorough job of flushing out its meaning. Thus, I chose to incorporate the wording, creative ways in
which the leaders responded to the harmful provocations (i.e. incorporating a cultural component into a language and literature program) into the dissertation.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this study is that it provides new research in the emerging field or resilience in education as well as new research on the GSSch. I place firsthand accounts of the GSSch within a specific time frame as the participants describe their perceptions of the GSSch. I then view these accounts of the GSSch through the lens of academic resilience, which has never been done before.

The data provided by the participants through interviews offer more than just an anecdotal narrative about the GSSch. They also provide a point of entry for the research, by providing specific details about past events. Camangian (2010) stated, “Cultural narratives that lack critical reflection have potential to be more about amusement than analysis, telling without understanding, summarizing instead of meaning making” (p. 183). This means that while the stories about the GSSch might be amusing, researching the GSSch for entertainment value was not the point of this research. The data provided by the participants through interviews assisted me in conceptualizing how the GSSch learning community was perceived by the participants. By interpreting their responses, I was able to formulate both hypothesis and conclusions about the perception of quality and equity found within this specific total immersion environment. By giving the participants a voice, I was able to insure that I came to a deeper understanding of what they were experiencing at the GSSch than I would have by simply performing an observation.

The unique framework implemented in this dissertation holds significance, as
there has never been a complete academic resilience framework applied to a language immersion school before. Although there have been published accounts of real-world models for *longevity* as it applies to a language immersion school there has never been one for academic resilience. After I operationalize the term, academic resilience, it becomes possible to answer the question: *How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?* I will be making progress in the study of academic resilience, as the research will show specifically why the GSSch exhibited or did not exhibit signs of resilience. In either case, I will have constructed a basis for comparison.

**Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations**

My research examines the founding and continuation of the GSSch. I attended this one month, total immersion summer school when I was a graduate student in Foreign Languages and Literature at the University of New Mexico. It is important that I note my positionality, as it shows the reader my biases. These biases hold the potential to influence assumptions about the GSSch and hold the potential to limit the scope of my research.

**Positionality**

I entered into this research with a preconceived notion of what the GSSch is and how important it is to students. It is important that I understand my positionality and how my personal and professional interests in the research could have affected the data collection process, as well as the coding and interpretation of the data described in later chapters. Anderson, Herr, and Nihlen (2007) stated, “Carefully thinking through one’s positionality within an organization is important in understanding how it may impact the trustworthiness of the findings and the ethics of the research process” (p. 9). I interpreted
this to mean that it was important for me to select a method that would allow me to explain my positionality and defend the validity of the research itself.

   My positionality holds the potential to promote a biased approach to the research for several reasons. Along with participating in the GSSch, I have also taken courses with and spoken in detail about the GSSch with one of its co-founders, Professor Pabisch. In the Fall 2018 semester, I registered in Education 690 Dissertation Seminar with him. During this time, he assisted me in locating needed texts for the literature review as well as guided me in locating specific information about the founding of the GSSch. Furthermore, Professor Pabisch was not an official advisor on my MA committee, but he was instrumental in preparing for the comprehensive exams. He was officially an advisor for the Ph.D. on both the committee for the program of study and the comprehensive exams. He was not an official advisor for the dissertation for fear of a possible conflict of interest.

   Validity

   Qualitative methods attempt to place data within a larger context. Even though the ways in which qualitative methods go about collecting data and engage with that data are specific enough that we can uniquely classify the methods (i.e. narrative, ethnography, or historiography), there are points of overlap. Eisner (1985) argued that it was not the specific method chosen that was important, but rather the concept of validity. He stated, Scientific approaches to research ask whether or not the conclusions are supported by the evidence, and further, whether the methods that were used to collect the evidence did not bias the conclusions. In other words, scientific research is always concerned with questions of validity. (p. 191)
Validity, or trustworthiness, which are commonly used in quantitative research, are key terms that often come up in an analysis. As Eisner pointed out, the results are trustworthy if they are supported by the data. Validity overlaps with the previously mentioned key term, positionality. Depending on how I as the researcher am positioned, I can code and interpret the data in such a way that the trustworthiness of the findings can come into question. When I choose a research methodology, I must understand my positionality and have some explanation as to why the reader should consider my research to be trustworthy (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 2007; Efron & Ravid, 2013).

To ensure validity, I have selected academic resilience as the research framework, since it allows for participants provide data and to explain the data they have provided. Academic resilience fits into the research design, which is a historical case study, as it allows for interviews and member checking, which promotes validity in several ways. First, the participants will be explaining events as they experienced them. I will not be explaining events that I observed. Second, the participants will have a chance to examine my interpretations of their interviews, and challenge my interpretations. In other words, the participants will monitor for my biases, and will be given the agency required to ensure that their voices are heard. Finally, the findings will emerge from the data.

Limitations and Delimitations

There were three limitations to this study, as well as three delimitations to this study. The limitations were 1) limited primary source data; 2) recruitment bias, and; 3) limited number of interviews per participant. The delimitations were 1) using artifacts; 2) snowball sampling, and; 3) member checking.

In this dissertation research, I examined events after they had already occurred.
This prevented me from gathering data in real time. The only way that I could gain new, primary source data was through interviews. To help offset the effects of limited primary source data, I chose to search for as many artifacts as possible. I was able to locate two guest books, with hand written inscriptions and drawings dating back to the first GSSch summer session, as well as printed recruitment materials dating back to the first GSSch summer session.

Recruitment bias was an issue, as I did not have a complete list of past students and faculty of the GSSch. The sample that I used in this research originated from convenient sampling. I began by asking people I knew from the GSSch if they were interested in participating in an interview. Each of the participants identified through convenient sampling lived within close proximity to the UNM campus and were able to conduct the interviews in person. This affected the population by no longer including every person involved in the GSSch, but rather included persons within close, physical proximity to the UNM campus. To help offset the effects of convenient sampling, I incorporated snowball sampling. I achieved this when several of the participants I interviewed provided me with contact information for other potential participants.

The final limitation was the limited quantity of interviews per participant. In most cases, I only interviewed the participants one time. To help offset the effects of a single interview, I incorporated member checking, which is a method used to offset researcher biases (Cresswell, 2013). When performing member checking, I paraphrased the arguments that the participants had made during their interviews. Then, I told them how I had paraphrased their statements. Each participant was allowed to clarify their original argument and state if they agreed with the paraphrasing. All of the member checking
occurred one to two months after the original interviews were conducted. I developed each delimitation in response to a limitation. The overall goal was to make my positionality as transparent as possible, in order to ensure the validity of the findings.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I related that in more than 44 years, the GSSch has maintained its commitment to German Studies. The field of German Studies has two strengths, which may have proven instrumental in the founding and continuation of the GSSch. First, German Studies incorporates culture. Ghanem (2015) argued, “While culture is admittedly important, teaching culture in the FL [foreign language] classroom has remained a challenge for the past 50 years. Defining culture and identifying which cultural aspects should be included in the FL classroom are both unclear” (p. 174). Although challenging, Pabisch (2002) argued that the GSSch has brought in culturally relevant pedagogy, hired native and near native German speakers, and introduced students to a variety of culturally relevant media, such as music and film. The second strength has been the GSSch’s academic focus, as opposed to a strict, research focus. This strength supported the BA in German as the program designers pushed for an MA in German Studies. Finally, the founders of the GSSch designed it to emulate a German university and incorporate the three columns of German Studies, (i.e. language, literature, and culture). While it is already clear that the GSSch has continued for more than 44 years, I cannot yet claim that it displays academic resilience. However, by performing this research, I will add new data to the discussion on academic resilience by examining the claims made by one of the co-founders of the GSSch, as well as the founding and the continuation of the GSSch.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

In this chapter, I explored four main areas of research. They were 1) Immersion language learning; 2) Types of popular German programs and teaching methods in the US; 3) Time period of ethnic/heritage studies; and, 4) Resilience. The reason these categories were chosen was to explore the trajectory of the UNM German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley (GSSch) and determine the following:

1) Why is culture important for German Studies?
2) How to develop the framework for this study (i.e. What lens is being developed? What is being discovered?).
3) What is academic resilience?
4) How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?

According to Professor Pabisch, the GSSch had a reputation on the UNM campus for providing a unique education in German Studies. This education was supposed to prepare students for worthy endeavors in a German speaking environment. Having spoken to him about the founding of the GSSch, I was able to learn about how the idea for the GSSch came about. He told me that the first German Summer School was founded in Middlebury, Vermont. Years later, Sommerschule am Pazifik, which is also referenced on websites and in personal communications as die deutsche Sommerschule am Pazifik and the German summer school on the Pacific, was founded by Professor Peters. Professor Peters had a son, also named Professor Peters. The younger Professor Peters (George) teamed up with Professor Pabisch in the 1970s and they opened the GSSch. According to Professor Pabisch, the two Professor Peters did not have a competitive, father-son relationship. In fact, the father gave a lecture at the very first GSSch summer
session in 1976. Later, the father took ideas from the GSSch and began incorporating them into the pedagogy at the Sommerschule am Pazifik. The literature supported Professor Pabisch’s statements about Middlebury, Vermont and the initial founding of the GSSch (Freeman, 1975; Heckmann-French & Bond, 1979; Pabisch, 2002; Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

The very first total immersion German Summer School was founded by Professor Lilian Stroebe in Middlebury Vermont and was set-up as an all women summer camp. It was not promoted as academically challenging, but it was a unique idea (Freeman, 1975; Heckmann-French & Bond, 1979). Heckmann-French and Bond (1979) related, Since the start of Professor Stroebe's first German summer school for forty-one students at Middlebury College in 1915, the German summer school concept has spread to other institutions across the U.S. Although varying in length, the programs retain Professor Stroebe’s concept of total immersion. (p. 87)

Since the basic idea of a total immersion language program originated in the US around 1915 at Middlebury College, and Professor Pabisch stated that Sommerschule am Pazific and the GSSch borrowed from Middlebury College, I chose to begin the timeline for the literature review with the year 1915. Even by going back as far as 1915, I found that there had been very little published about the German Summer Schools in America. Most of the published research focused on either Middlebury College or the GSSch.

As already mentioned, Middlebury College in Middlebury Vermont was credited as having the very first German immersion summer school; however, the Middlebury summer school had a difficult time structuring pedagogy with longevity. Stephen A. Freeman’s book, *The Middlebury College Foreign Language Schools: The story of a*
unique idea gave a comprehensive look at the struggle to form the school. According to Freeman (1975), the faculty did not focus on the quality of the pedagogy in the beginning. He stipulated, “Originally, the reputation of Middlebury’s foreign language summer schools depended not so much on academic superiority, as upon the successful application of a new and unique idea” (p. 164). Freeman reported that Middlebury evolved from a mostly women’s summer camp in 1915, to a language camp for mostly military personnel in the mid-1940s, into a language lab in the 1960s, and finally into a German Studies program in the late 1970s.

The literature found during the literature review disclosed that the GSSch, Sommerschule am Pazifik, and Middlebury College were among the very few language immersion programs. Unlike the Middlebury German Summer School, the GSSch did not have several decades to find its footing. From day one, the GSSch focused on pedagogy and curriculum that promoted quality and equity in a total immersion environment (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant3 7, personal communication, February 26, 2020).

In 2002, Professor Pabisch published the most comprehensive account of the GSSch in his book, Going on thirty years: The German Summer School of New Mexico. In his book, Professor Pabisch acknowledged Middlebury as having the first total immersion summer school; however, he mentioned that the GSSch did not copy their curriculum. Pabisch (2002) explained,

Intelligent reforms do not dispense completely with the old, but maintain and enhance successful concepts. The tried and tested models of the language schools

---

3 The names of the interviewees were replaced with the name “Participant” and a number to protect their privacy. A complete list of participants and their bios are found in Chapter 4.
of ‘Middlebury College in Vermont’ or the ‘German Summer School at the Pacific Ocean’ in Oregon, served as exemplary models for the creation of the GSSch as did the worldwide concept of the Goethe Institute in Munich, Germany.

The founders of the GSSch placed the GSSch on its own trajectory. They did not design to GSSch to operate as a summer camp or as a language lab. Instead, they designed the GSSch with the primary purpose of facilitating a German Studies program. Pabisch (2002) continued,

Academically the GSSch has represented the concept of ‘German Studies’ since its first session, thereby, in these three decades, it has illuminated the German-European world from many angles and viewpoints to almost two thousand advanced students of German and their some five hundred faculty and lecturers. It has meant to be a pedagogical model of higher education that has been open to constant assessment of its educational productivity. Its results can speak for its relative success. (p. 62)

In more than 44 years, the GSSch has maintained its commitment to German Studies. I found two strengths in the field of German Studies, which have potentially proven instrumental in the GSSch’s longevity. First, German Studies incorporates culture through culturally relevant pedagogy. GSSch incorporated culturally relevant pedagogy through the hiring of native and near native German speakers, and by introducing students to a variety of culturally relevant media, such as music and film. The second strength is the GSSch’s academic focus. The founders of the GSSch designed it to emulate a German university and incorporate the three columns of German Studies, (i.e.
language, literature, and culture). With the academic success of the GSSch, the UNM administration granted the German department at UNM permission to offer an MA in German Studies (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Along with its unique academic focus, which was not found in many summer camps or language labs, the GSSch sets itself apart from other universities by isolating the students in a remote area. Mccord and Manning (1976) explained the importance of isolating the students. They argued, “While the situations formed the core of the students' language-learning experience, all aspects of the program were aimed at total immersion. German was used at meals and all extracurricular activities, such as sports, indoor games, and cabin discussions” (p. 102). By isolating the students in a remote part of the Taos Ski Valley, the leadership of the GSSch felt that almost total immersion could be achieved (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Being in Taos Ski Valley held other advantages. As pointed out by Joyce and Appl (2005), immersion allowed the students to engage with the subject areas on a deeper level than what they normally would in a well-disciplined, grammar focus, teacher-centered 50-minute class. Not only has the GSSch promoted the students’ abilities to dig deeper into the content areas that they were studying, it also promoted the learning of advanced vocabulary. This held true not only for the traditional, indoor classroom, but also when having class outside. A good example of an outdoor class at the GSSch is the botanische Wanderung or nature walk. During past nature walks, the students have been
led on a walk through the mountains in Taos Ski Valley. The students had already learned basic vocabulary, such as the word for tree during their lower-division course work. At the GSSch, an experienced and knowledgeable tour guide used advanced vocabulary, such as the types of trees (i.e. elm), plants, and sometimes animals that were seen along the way. By being out in nature, the students were able to engage with language learning differently than if they were in a classroom and they were learning advanced vocabulary (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Several participants as well as the co-founder stated that the most innovative part of the GSSch was the Grundkurs. During the Grundkurs, all of the students assemble for a presentation. The presentation was conducted entirely in German and the students were required to incorporate the presentations into their coursework.

The variety of teaching methods, including the total immersion has challenged the former teacher-centered approach to education that had been used at other schools for language learning. As Tyler (1949) pointed out, “The old school of thought which attempted to teach children to be utterly quiet while they were in school was imposing an educational objective impossible of attainment” (p. 38). Student-centered classrooms, the nature walk, the newspaper, and the talent show are just a few examples of how the GSSch challenged the old school of thought in order to promote the field of German Studies. This variation in activities, which the field of German Studies has allotted for also added equity to the program. More specifically, the faculty at the GSSch made sure that different learning styles and different interests were addressed. Combined, the
features of the GSSch added to the overall quality of education that the students received. This was evident to the faculty of the GSSch by the student’s ability to pass the Goethe exam, which was an objective exam from an outside agency (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

By 1979, there were multiple immersion summer schools across America. At this point, German immersion summer schools were becoming less unique, and a greater emphasis was placed on quality of the curriculum. Heckmann-French and Bond (1979) wrote about the German immersion summer schools that were in competition with each other. They provided a list of the more popular programs.

In addition to Middlebury's sixty-four-year-old program, other programs include the Deutsche Sommerschule am Pazifik at Portland State University, Die Deutsche Sommerschule von New Mexico in Taos bei Santa Fe, sponsored by the University of New Mexico in coordination with the University of Texas at Austin, the Summer Language Institute at the University of California at Santa Cruz, the Deutsche Sommerschule am Atlantik at the University of New Hampshire, a German Summer Graduate School and Workshop at Millersville State College in Pennsylvania, and the Deutsche Wellen am Keuka See at Keuka College in New York. (p. 87)

Each one of these summer schools attempted to bring something unique of its

---

4 The University of Texas at Austin does not collaborate with the University of New Mexico anymore. Now, they participate in a study abroad program.
5 The Summer Language Institute no longer operates. UC Santa Cruz now sends its students to Middlebury.
6 Die Deutsche Sommerschule am Atlantik has been taken over by the University of Rhode Island.
7 The German Summer Graduate School and Workshop at Millersville is now a summer camp for high school students.
8 Keuka College no longer has a German program.
own, in order to distinguish itself from the others. The immersion summer schools could not simply copy Middlebury. In fact, following WWII, Middlebury could not follow its original curriculum. This was based on the fact that quality standards were being established in language programs and the Cold War had created government interest in language programs (Freeman, 1975).

When doing the literature review, I noted that Pabisch (2002) claimed the GSSch was an academic endeavor taken by scholars in the late 1970s. It had continued, uninterrupted ever since. He mentioned that the push for quality in an immersion program was one of the reasons for the longevity of the GSSch. This longevity was complimented by the fact that little had changed in the curriculum since its first year. Pabisch (2002) maintained,

Among the half a dozen schools of this nature in the United States the 36 year old German Summer School of New Mexico has adopted the proven methods of older models (Middlebury, Vermont; Yale; Portland, Oregon), yet has broadened its program from the traditional language and literature approach to almost fifty fields over the years, in combination with the main subject ‘Germanistik.’ (p. 53)

The literature suggested that several German summer schools (i.e. Middlebury and Deutsche Sommerschule am Pazifik) had evolved from an original idea in 1915 into university programs with a reputation for providing an education in German Studies. The literature also stated that this reputation was due in part to the manner in which the German summer schools had positioned themselves academically over the years (Freeman, 1975; Pabisch, 2002).

Search Description
In the following section, I included the search descriptions as well as the research description, which began to construct the methodology for this research by providing both inclusion and exclusion criteria. I found that there were several common approaches to teaching German, such as immersion, memorization, natural approach, and *Stationenlernen* or station learning. When performing the literature review, I found that each approach had its strengths, when applied to a specific situation. However, when selecting the best approach to teach German, educators needed to enquire as to why the student was learning German in the first place. This section:

1) provided an overview of the different approaches to teaching German;
2) explained the academic needs of the students at the GSSch, and;
3) explained why the GSSch was unique.

Tyler (1949) insisted that the reason behind any class needed to be made explicit. He continued, “All aspects of the educational program are really means to accomplish basic educational purposes. Hence, if we are to study an educational program systematically and intelligently we must first be sure as to the educational objectives aimed at” (p. 3). According to Tyler, when examining the course objectives, it was important to examine the student’s motivation for taking the course in the first place. By examining the student’s motivation for taking a course, the faculty could better determine if the course would be a good fit for the student.

In my three years as a German teacher, I found that there were three primary reasons why a student chose to learn a language. These reasons included 1) a language requirement for high school or a college degree; 2) the student wanted to travel or learn just for fun, or; 3) the student had to travel for professional reasons. Each one of these
reasons could be broken down into smaller groups. For example, college students choosing to learn a language for a college degree requirement could be further broken down into language majors and non-language majors.

Wadda and Rios-Font (2017) stated that most university degrees had a language requirement (p. 16). This meant that a college student majoring in theater, with no real interest in learning a second language would still have had to register in a language course to meet the degree’s language requirement. Proficiency might not have been important to this specific student, since he or she was only taking the course as part of the degree requirements.

Another college student at the same university could have been majoring in German Studies. For this college student, language proficiency would be important, since it would be monitored and the attainment of a higher language level would be a requirement for continuing both with the BA and the MA. In other words, what one person found important for a language course was not necessarily what the next person found important (Pabisch, 2002, p. 83).

**Types of Popular German Programs and Teaching Methods**

In my experience with the German language, I had found that there were three primary methods chosen to learn German. These were the Berlitz Method, traditional, 50-minute classes, and total immersion. Ghanem (2015) explained that the term communicative competence is often used in language learning, but a definition for the term has not been agreed upon. He argued, “For the past three decades the main objective of L2 [second language] instruction has been the acquisition of communicative competence, which might be interpreted in different ways even though it is a concept
with which most teachers today are familiar” (p. 174). Each method offered a specialized approach to achieving communicative competence. To begin with the Berlitz Method and the traditional, 50-minute classes were used at the beginner levels. The 50-minute classes and the total immersion were used at the intermediate and advanced levels. There was still some overlap, as the traditional, 50-minute classes could be taught using total immersion methods. The real difference between the beginner, intermediate, and advance total immersion programs was the length of time that they were taught. Weekend and summer total immersion programs\(^9\) were reserved for advanced students (Joyce & Appl, 2005; Pabisch, 2002; Stieglitz, 1955).

**Berlitz Method.** Stieglitz (1955) argued that the Berlitz Method was designed for those interested in learning German, without having any academic or professional motivation for doing it. Their motivation could have been stemming from any number of areas, including family heritage, historical interests, planning a European vacation, or they just found the language interesting (pp. 301-302).

For this group of language learners, the lure to learn came more in the form of conversational German. They wanted to be able to carry on a basic conversation, order food in a restaurant, read a bus schedule, and check into a hotel. Stieglitz (1955) explained,

> The objective of the Berlitz Method is the fourfold aim of understanding, speaking, reading, and writing, with emphasis on speaking from the very beginning. In other words, the primary objective of the method is oral

\(^9\) Middlebury has since changed its admission requirements and now offers a beginner German course at their summer school. In the past few years, UNM has also allowed for students to attend the GSSch with only two semesters of German, rather than four semesters.
communication, going hand in hand with aural comprehension; its secondary objectives are reading and writing. (p. 300)

One of the strengths of the Berlitz Method was that the student already knew the conversations that he or she was going to have. This meant that many of the basic phrases could be memorized. For example, the student might have been drawn towards Oktoberfest in Bavaria. After purchasing his plane tickets, he might only have had one month to prepare for the trip. The trip itself might have only been scheduled to last for five days. At this point, the student only had thirty days to learn enough German, with an emphasis on Oktoberfest, to get him through five days of vacation. The Berlitz Method was an ideal choice for this language learner.

I found that the strength of the Berlitz Method was that their courses were specialized to specific occasions. Most every year Berlitz published a new version of German for travelers as well as German phrase book & dictionary. They even published regional books such as Munich & Bavaria pocket guide, which focused specifically on regional customs, phrases, and Oktoberfest. More recently, Berlitz had offered most of its courses online.

Stielglitz (1955) argued that another advantage of the Berlitz Method was that it was easily adapted by the US military. The reason that it was effective was due to the fact that the military personnel already knew what information the paperwork was going to be asking for. Not only that, embassies began a common dialogue that visitors could memorize in advance (p. 301). If a dignitary was scheduled to travel to Berlin, Rome, and Paris within a thirty day period, he could memorize basic German, Italian, and French phrases in a short period of time.
I found that the greatest weakness to the Berlitz Method was that it did not actually teach the student how to speak the language. Stieglitz (1955) stated, “A direct method is satisfactory only if it allows us to teach all phases of a language, including the initial stage, without having to compromise the direct principle in the interests of clarity” (pp. 302-303). For example, the student might have been taught to ask: *Wo ist der Bus?* The next phrase might have been: *Wo ist die Bushaltestelle?* Even though the student was memorizing the phrases, he was not being told why *Bus* had *der* in front of it and *Bushaltestelle* had *die* in front of it. The next problem came when the traveler was asked a question that he had not memorized, since there was no grammatical foundation for him to work with. A good example of this would be if he learned the word for restaurant, which is *das Restaurant*. Once he was in Germany, a person might have called a restaurant *die Gaststätte* or say: *Es gibt einen türkischen Imbiss.* It had been my finding that even with a dictionary; it was difficult to follow a non-memorized phrase without some background knowledge of the language.

Students of the Berlitz Method have typically been short-term students with an interest in basic conversation. It was a good method for learning memorized phrases on a specific topic in a short amount of time, but it was not a good method if one intended to major in German Studies.

**Traditional, 50-Minute Classes.** When I was teaching the lower-division, 50-minute classes, I utilized the communicative approach. I did not teach grammar and basic vocabulary explicitly in the classroom, but they were assigned as homework. The students were expected to learn the four German cases (i.e. nominative, accusative, dative, and genitive) over a period of three semesters. The students studied basic
concepts, such as gender and rules on capitalization. Finally, they memorized basic phrases and vocabulary words that they were expected to know. These included phrases such as, *How are you? What is your name?* and vocabulary words such as, *man, woman, bike, warm, cold, and rain.* When students asked me about placement into a German class, I would tell them that the proficiency standards vary by language and by location. However, as a good rule of thumb, UNM uses the ACTFL levels: Novice low (NL), Novice mid (NM), Novice high (NH), Intermediate low (IL), Intermediate mid (IM), and Intermediate high (IH). The high school students in New Mexico are given about four years to reach an intermediate level of proficiency, and the college students are given two years.

Not every traditional, 50-minute class is set-up the same. Some teachers utilize a teacher-centered classroom, in which the desks are aligned in straight rows. This classroom design facilitates a learning environment in which students are facing the teacher and are not allowed to speak to each other. In the teacher-centered classroom, the teacher typically has the students perform coursework that is based on explicit grammar and memorization. The teacher also discourages the students from communicating with one another during class time.

Tyler (1949) wrote, “The old school of thought which attempted to teach children to be utterly quiet while they were in school was imposing an educational objective impossible of attainment” (p. 38). He claimed that the way that the students were organized within a classroom affected the learning outcomes.

Duru (2015) proposed that teacher-centered classrooms relied on the teacher providing stimuli for the students to react to, while student-centered classrooms required
the teacher to facilitate learning (pp. 283-284). My classroom was always-student centered. The students did most of the talking and the students primarily interacted with each other.

I found that the strength of the student-centered, 50-minute classroom was that the students could be fully immersed in the language for 50-minutes. When they went home and did their homework, they could read about German grammar in English and complete their homework assignments. I felt that having beginners learn German in both English and German was ideal, as their German abilities were not high enough for German only. They needed to supplement their learning by using some English.

I found that the weakness of the traditional, 50-minute class was increasingly more evident at the higher levels. At the college level, the traditional, 50 minute classroom lacked a long-term exposure to the language. The students spoke English before they entered the classroom. Once they were in the classroom, the students heard and spoke some German. However, they returned to English when the class ended. These brief, 50 minute classes did not give the student enough time or scaffolding to allow them to solidify their language abilities. Multiple researchers stated that the solution to this problem could be found in long term programs, such as study abroad or attending a total immersion weekend or summer school (Freeman, 1975; Heckmann-French & Bond, 1979; Joyce & Appl, 2005; Pabisch, 2002).

**German Summer Schools and German Summer Camps.** There is a difference between a foreign language summer camp and a foreign language summer school. As pointed out by Lally (2000), “A foreign language camp ran the risk of becoming two very distinct entities:
1) A camp comprised of swimming, bonfires, and pillow fights; and

2) A language class complete with explanations, exercises and drills” (p. 6).

In the first group, organizers of a foreign language summer camp designed for recreation and a language (i.e. German) selected a language as the camp theme. Participants at a foreign language summer camp did not have to have prior knowledge of the foreign language or culture. In the second group, students would be learning a foreign language, but there was not a guarantee that the foreign language would be spoken between activities. Often times, the organizers of the summer camps allowed for intermissions and meals to be conducted in English (Freeman, 1975; Heckmann-French & Bond, 1979; Joyce & Appl, 2005; Lally, 2002).

The founders of the GSSch designed a total immersion summer school to help intermediate and advanced students solidify their German. This was made possible by the students learning inside of the classroom and actively engaging with the language outside of the classroom (Pabisch, 2002). The students at any German summer school were usually non-native German speakers. In the US, many of the students were Americans and English was their first language. Before attending the GSSch, admissions required students to have completed either four years of high school German or two years of German at a college. The faculty spoke German at a native or near native level.

Dewey (1916) stated, “The nature of experience can be understood only by noting that it includes an active and a passive element peculiarly combined. On the active hand, experience is trying – a meaning which is made explicit in the connected term experiment” (p. 107). A total immersion summer school, such as the GSSch gave the students the opportunity to experiment with the language in a safe environment.
A university could also accredit a German summer school, but a summer camp could not have accreditation through a university. With accreditation, a German summer school could transfer credits to other universities by provide a transcripted grade, which counted towards a student’s GPA and degree requirements. Tyler (1949) explained further,

The term ‘learning experience’ is not the same as the content with which a course deals nor the activities performed by the teacher. The term ‘learning experience’ refers to the interaction between the learner and the external conditions in the environment to which he can react. (p. 63)

While all German summer schools emphasized language and literature, in an effort to really enhance the learning experience, leadership at some of the German summer schools had introduced culture. Many German summer schools had incorporated culture into their curricula, in order to enhance the external conditions in the environment. The leadership ensured that not only was a German language only rule enforced, but many of the events and courses offered were relevant to the field of German Studies. As Tyler (1949) pointed out, “A second general principle is that the learning experiences must be such that the student obtains satisfactions from carrying on the kind of behavior implied by the objectives” (p. 66). This aforementioned satisfaction could be achieved if the faculty made the pedagogy culturally relevant to the students. Through culturally relevant pedagogy, the students obtained satisfaction by linking the task to their personal interests (Kempf, 1990, p. 14).

**Time Period of Ethnic/Heritage Studies**

In the 1970s, Ethnic Studies as an academic field was not yet widely accepted on
many US college campuses (Bluefarb, 1971; Clarke, 1977; Clements, 1973). There were three popular arguments surrounding Ethnic Studies at the time. They were 1) Ethnic Studies would perpetuate racial tensions at US universities, by alienating the White community; 2) Ethnic Studies would alleviate racial tensions at US universities, by integrating the White community into ethnic dialogues; and 3) the pilot Ethnic Studies programs were improperly integrated at US universities.

**Ethnic Studies and Racial Tensions at US Universities in the 1970s**

Bluefarb (1971) was opposed to the field of Ethnic Studies, as he saw it as a tool to reinforce segregation in the classroom and perpetuate racial tensions. He cautioned,

> What I am trying to suggest is the promotion on campuses of Ethnic Studies departments, or even interdisciplinary programs, in which *all* ethnic groups would be represented, in which there would be no separate (isolated, segregated, or separatist) departments of Black Studies, Jewish Studies, Mexican-American Studies, Navajo-Indian Studies - in short, no academic apartheid! (p. 67)

By cautioning against what he considered to be a part of apartheid, Bluefarb (1971) was able to construct a framework for an argument, in which the proposed Ethnic Studies would have to be rejected on the grounds of racism. He stated that not only would implementing an Ethnic Studies program reintroduce apartheid, but it would do it in such a way as to alienate the White community. He continued,

> Some time ago, a colleague facetiously suggested that after the plethora of Black, Brown, American-Indian, Jewish Studies, etc., Anglo-Saxon Studies might come as a refreshing change - presumably because the WASP has been made to feel "left out" in recent years. (Bluefarb. 1971, p. 65)
Bluefarb claimed that in order for Ethnic Studies to be accepted on US college campuses, it would have to be structured in a less adversarial manner. Clements (1973) was aware of this argument and of the racial conflicts that had plagued the US university system during the 1960s, but he interpreted Ethnic Studies differently. He concluded, Ethnic studies is democratic in representing the many traditions that have gone into our country. It does not aim at homogeneity as many programs for the so-called disadvantaged do; rather it aims at an appreciation of the diversity of American culture. (p. 532)

Clements claimed that the celebration of diversity as well as promoting programs, which supported democracy, was a far less adversarial approach than the promotion of academic apartheid. According to Clements (1973), one of the strengths of such a program would be that it would finally incorporate the White community into ethnic dialogues. He stated, “Ethnic studies, in my view, is primarily conceived for cultural exposure, with its attendant socializing and democratizing benefits on the students and faculty of the predominantly white college” (p. 532). In this interpretation, Ethnic Studies would not exclude the White community, but rather it would promote inclusion. 

**Ethnic Studies Programs were Improperly Integrated**

I identified the third part of the Ethnic Studies debate as being based on the pilot programs that had already been set-up at US universities. According to Clarke (1977), the problem with an Ethnic Studies program at a US university did not stem from the concept of the program, but rather in its execution. He claimed, “Many Ethnic Studies programs are consequently staffed by well-meaning but mediocre individuals, who are sometimes incapable of effecting significant changes” (p. 125). He stated that empirical knowledge
of what it means to be a minority, such as knowing about the Black community through virtue of having been born Black, was being given to much academic weight.

The reason that academic safeguards had been overlooked, according to Clarke (1977), was due to the fact that radical change had been promoted in the 1960s. He continued,

First, the social, political, and moral climate of the sixties led to hastily created solutions for pressing social problems. The long range planning, specific articulation of objectives, and careful analysis of underlying assumptions and rationally which should characterize any sophisticated decision making process, were subsequently omitted for Ethnic Studies. (p. 125)

His argument challenged not only the staffing of programs, it also challenged the way in which Ethnic Studies would situate itself with other university programs. He continued, “The competition from other programs like Women Studies and Environmental Studies, which are also morally necessary, demands that Ethnic Studies advocates and participants diversify their reasons for requesting, continuing, and expanding Ethnic Studies programs” (Clarke, 1977, p. 128). The competition between the Ethnic Studies programs and other university programs did not prevent Ethnic Studies from continuing to grow, but competition did require that Ethnic Studies were held to the same academic standards as other US university programs.

These three varying perspectives on Ethnic Studies highlighted key points in the 1970’s debates about Ethnic Studies as an academic field at US universities. While they did exist at some US universities, they were highly controversial and not yet accepted as a stable, and in some cases valid, academic program.
German in the US in the 1970s

By the 1970s, the administration at many US universities began downsizing their German departments (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974). There were several key reasons for this cited in the literature, which included 1) Enrollment numbers were dropping at US universities; 2) Many US universities were dropping language requirements for graduation; 3) German was not identified as an important political language (i.e. a language used by the UN); 4) There was no need for a separate German department, as German had been explicitly integrated into other academic departments (i.e. philosophy), in what was already considered a Western or Eurocentric university system; and 5) Researchers began hinting towards German Studies as a viable solution to save German programs at universities.

Enrollment Numbers were Dropping at US Universities

Enrollment at US universities had been fluctuating in the 1960s and 1970s. Student enrollment numbers peaked in the late 1960s and declined in the early 1970s. In response to the declining student enrollment numbers, many US universities began downsizing their German departments (Brod, 1974; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974).

According to Rosenberg (1974), enrollment within the university system was paired with poor job placement for graduates with German degrees. He argued, “We are now watching a decline in the percentage of 18-24-year-olds choosing to come to college (1972: 31.8% of the 18-24 year-olds), and a much slower growth in their absolute numbers” (p. 31). On the one hand, German departments would have to increase their recruitment efforts in order to keep their classrooms full. On the other hand, the pre-existing German programs did not have a reputation for leading to gainful employment.
As pointed out by Rosenberg (1974),

Not all departments are ready to confront the resultant ethical problem: can a department encourage a student to earn a degree if last year 20% of the German Ph.D.'s produced in 1972 either reported themselves to the MLA as jobless or did not even bother to reply to the survey? (p. 32)

The failing German programs in both the US and in Europe that were being eliminated were set-up as either schools for translation, teacher colleges, or had a strong literature and research focus (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974). During this same time period, the German Department at UNM (Pabisch, 2002). Survival or evidence of resilience would require a new format that would break the conventional mold being used by most of the German departments.

The removal of the language requirement from the degree may have supported the university efforts as a whole, but without a mandatory language requirement, the language departments were forced to market their programs to students. Brod (1974) claimed,

Predictably, German departments have reacted to the disappearance of the language requirement and the resulting "free market" situation by seeking new ways to attract students on their own terms … For the most part, the diversification has remained within the liberal arts tradition: courses in literature in translation, for example, or interdisciplinary programs—both graduate and undergraduate—in German Studies. (p. 4)

Multiple researchers supported Brod’s claimed that the German programs themselves were not changing, as nothing new was being added. The German programs
continued to emphasize translation, teaching, literature and research. Of all of these focus areas, translation was perhaps the weakest, as the German community had been well-integrated into US society and there was little need for a college educated translator (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974; Trahan, 1974). According to Trahan (1974),

At present, German professional translation, for example, is neither a prestigious nor a lucrative occupation. The sizable wave of German immigrants during the pre- and postwar years has provided a large contingent of free-lance translators, many of whom are highly educated, bi- or multilingual, and experts in technical fields. (p. 30)

A key phrase used here is technical fields. As the US universities began their shift away from the conventional German programs, which isolated German as its own, unique field, researchers were finding that applying German to a separate content area was far more practical. This practice of applied German was taking place outside of the university system (i.e. through freelance translation), but it had not yet been accepted inside of the university system.

**Many US Universities were Dropping Language Requirements**

Even in 1970, it was obvious to some researchers that the German departments were going to have some problems maintaining their programs through the 1970s. Jennings (1970) asked the question, “Often, these students are-to put it bluntly-’pushed’ into German, and one has to ask: What would happen if the language requirement were dropped (as is presently being considered by many universities)?” (p. 106). The students themselves did not see a point to taking the German courses, let alone majoring in
With the rise of Ethnic Studies and the meager job market for graduates with German degrees, the administration at many US and European universities began either disbanding or downsizing their German programs (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974). According to Brod (1974), there was a need for German departments to revamp themselves, if they were to survive. He stated, 

Serious it is, if one reflects upon dwindling enrollments, unemployment, shrinking budgets, crippled research programs, and in some cases outright elimination of German from the curriculum. Hope, on the other hand, such as it is, derives from the reasonable assumption that German will probably never disappear from U.S. higher education altogether. (p. 1)

By the mid-1970s, when German departments around the country, as well as many in Europe, were being threatened, many of the German department faculty members began blaming the universities’ removal of the language requirements for graduation for the low student enrollment (Brod, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974). Brod (1974) stated,

Obviously there are factors other than the disappearance of the B.A. language requirements involved in the decline in German enrollments. Overall enrollments in higher education have also begun to level off at an annual growth rate of about 1.8% (between 1972 and 1973), as compared with the 10.8% rate reached between 1964 and 1965. Projections indicate that college enrollments will continue their very slow growth over the rest of the decade and then turn downward by 1981. (p. 3)
Placed in a larger context, such as dwindling student enrollment and the overall needs of the university, Brod stated that it made sense for many universities to make necessary sacrifices to ensure the longevity of the university. One such sacrifice was the removal of the language requirement, and in some cases, the removal of the German department. Brod (1974) pointed out that German was almost a stand-alone program, or one without a continuation from high school. He continued,

The erosion of the liberal arts segment of higher education is particularly ominous for German because this is the area that has traditionally absorbed most of its Ph.D.'s. German has never been well established in the secondary schools, where its enrollments amount to only 10.1% of the total FL enrollment and only 2.5% of the total public secondary school enrollment. (p. 4)

Few incoming students had a German background when entering into the university system, and even fewer had any serious interest in taking a German course. Even if the students did want to begin studying German, there was a large gap in the new student’s knowledge and the required knowledge to pursue the degree (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974). Even as early as the 1940s, researchers had identified the language requirement as a problem for German departments. Rose (1949) mentioned,

The examination of literary texts and the historical development of literature will, I think, always constitute the nuclear study leading to the first university degree, but whereas the German student proceeding to a study of his native literature with be familiar with German history and the German social structures, and possess at least a background knowledge of German philosophy, art, and ways of thought,
very little if any of this knowledge will have been acquired by the English student before reaching the university. (p. 6)

The aforementioned claims from the researchers stated that the students with enough background knowledge in German did not want to enter into the German department, since it did not lead to a job. Those students wanting to enter into the German department could not, since they did not have enough background knowledge of the German speaking community. Finally, those beginner language students did not want to take the lower-division German courses, since those courses were no longer required for the degree. This specific structure found in the German departments in the 1970s was contributing to their removal from the universities (Brod, 1974; Grotegut, 1970; Jennings, 1970; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974).

**German was not identified as an Important Political Language**

The research had shown that in the debate as to whether or not the universities should keep their German departments active, topics such as student enrollment, job placement, and student interest were all working to support the disbanding of the German departments and to end the German programs. The next question that some scholars were asking was whether or not the German language held any political significance (Rosenberg, 1974; Stern, 1974; Trahan, 1974). According to Trahan (1974), it did not. She forewarned,

The situation in German is even worse than in other major languages. German does not have the benefit of the geographic proximity of native speakers which Spanish has nor the cultural prestige of French. Nor do the two Germanies, despite their intricate political situation, command the diplomatic weaponry of the
Soviet Union or Communist China. Finally, unlike French, Spanish, Russian, and Chinese, German is not one of the official languages of the United Nations.

(p. 29)

If the German language held great political significance, it would stand to reason that the government jobs and translation jobs would become available to graduates. Thus, the question was restructured, and asked if the German language held any non-war-driven political importance. As with Spanish, the political significance could have been based on proximity, which would require more translators for immigration, border patrol, or even translation within the school system and other government offices. According to Trahan (1974), proximity to a German speaking country did not have much of an impact on university programs in Europe. She stated,

Let us remember that even in Europe there are currently only about fifteen university programs in translation and interpretation; they average 1-3 per country and seem to meet the existing demand. Here only one relatively small undergraduate certificate program existed (at Georgetown University) until 1968, when the Institute's program was established. (p. 29)

With such few schools already filling the demand for German majors in the workforce, it was proving even more difficult for university administrators to come up with a good argument as to why the German departments should be allowed to continue with their current programs.

**German in a Eurocentric University System**

One of the claims found within the immerging Ethnic Studies programs stated that US universities were Eurocentric. Proponents of Ethnic Studies claimed that there was
little diversity and very few non-European representations in the literature. They based their claims on the fact that Germany was a part of Europe, and German was being perceived as being very well represented in the literature. Thus, German Studies existed, at least implicitly, as staples at all Eurocentric, US universities. According to Rosenberg (1974), the proponents of Ethnic Studies were overgeneralizing White. He argued against the claims by providing several reasons why German Studies were not considered staples at US universities. He claimed,

The rising force of German ethnocentricity in this country is past, and the German population is simply too well assimilated. Worse, Germans and their culture still suffer from their associations with some of our worst national memories, which have been transformed into a fund of macabre. (p. 33)

On the one hand, all of the positive aspects of German in academia had already been absorbed by the individual departments (i.e. philosophy, art, or engineering). On the other hand, the unclaimed, negative aspects of German were linked to WWI and WWII. This meant that all of the usable portions of German had already been secured, and the separate German departments could now be removed (Brod, 1974; Jennings, 1970; Rosenberg, 1974).

Brod (1974) highlighted the bottom line. He stated, “Graduate German departments will have to learn to live with retrenchment for a while” (p. 5). The message was clear, the German departments would have to come up with something new, or their university’s administration would disband them.

*Early Interests and Practices in German Studies*

Events of social and/or political significance affect the administration’s decision
making (Flinders & Thornton, 2017). The research showed that at this point in US history, universities chose to promote Ethnic Studies as a way to counteract racism. Moreover, proponents of Ethnic Studies were grouping all Europeans under the heading of White. The university administrators felt both social and political pressures, which demanded politically correct, racially, and ethnically diverse structuring. As a result of this 1960s-1970s political climate, German departments needed to come up with a new format, if they were to remain as departments at US universities.

According to Stern (1974), “To be tested by adversity is no new experience of the university. If the past is any guide at all, higher education, from the Middle Ages onward, has responded to challenge and crisis with inventiveness and creativity” (p. 7). For the purpose of this dissertation, I argued that the leaders of German departments that did not respond to the challenges of the 1970s were examples of stubborn leaders. Those leaders of German departments that would not bend, broke.

Rosenberg (1974) pointed out that most of the jobs that universities were preparing German graduates for were teaching jobs. He argued,

Perhaps the purpose of a German graduate department should include alternatives to the preparation of teachers. According to the National Council on Graduate Education, 50% of those earning doctorates do not teach. Many of these doctorates are granted in the sciences, and their holders can expect to find work in research and industry. (p. 32)

The German departments could re-track their students into a variety of professions in the US. The problem was that many of these professions were English speaking professions. The program’s leaders would have to find a way to make a German
degree fill the requirements for an English speaking profession.

Much like Rose (1949), Rosenberg (1974) had identified culture as a possible addition to the German program. He announced,

While a broad cultural background is lacking in the German Ph.D., cultural interest does appear to be one aspect of FL study that is flourishing. As ethnic groups become prouder of their origins, they sign up for languages, and the third generation seeks to learn what the second generation rejected: the language and culture of their forefathers. (p. 32)

The argument from these researchers stated that it would be advantageous for the German departments to add culture to their German programs. They claimed that first, the incoming students would not require a great deal of background knowledge about the German speaking regions before beginning. Second, culture could be taught in English. Finally, culture could be linked to almost anything, including English speaking professions (Brod, 1974; Rose, 1949; Rosenberg, 1974). Brod (1974) continued,

For the science majors, however, the study of German has generally been limited language with little opportunity for exposure to literature or culture. From this perspective, the development of German Studies is an advance because it focuses directly on the study of German culture, something most Germanic departments do authoritatively. (p. 4)

I considered the claims made by Brod (1974) and Rosenberg (1974) to be the most important claims to focus on for several reasons. First, they reflected the social and political climate found within US universities’ German departments, just one year before Professor Pabisch and Professor (George) Peters took their first steps to found the GSSch.
Second, they hypothesized that if the German departments were to incorporate culture into their pedagogy by making the shift from German to German Studies, students with non-German content areas, such as science majors, could still pursue a German Studies degree. Finally, after graduating, the degree holders could pursue jobs in their content areas, even if the jobs were in English. Through the benefit of hindsight, I concluded that making the shift from German to German Studies was exactly what Professor Pabisch and Professor Peters had done. In other words, the founders of the GSSch had moved forward in a manner consistent with the current body of research as well as in a manner appropriate for their specific social and political climate.

**Operationalizing Academic Resilience for an Academic Framework**

The literature provided many examples of how the word resilience could be used. In the literature review, I examined variations of the word resilience (i.e. resilient, resiliency, etc.) and will be using them interchangeably throughout this section. For the purpose of this research, I operationalized the word, *resilience* by,

1) explaining how the word had been used for both physical objects and for trauma victims;
2) explaining how the word had been used to for a social structure or an institution, and;
3) explaining how the word has been used for an educational leader.

**Resilience of a Physical Object or a Victim of Trauma**

Much of the literature about *resilience* divided the word into two categories. The first was for a physical object, such as a watch or the sole of a shoe. The second was for trauma victims as well as persons, groups, institutions, and societies adapting to changes
in their environment (Adger, 2000; Cicchetti, 2010; Norris, Tracy, & Galea, 2009; Southwick, Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, & Yehuda, 2014; Ungar, 2011). Although neither category was used directly for this research, it was deemed important to show the origins of the word, to better understand how it came into educational leadership.

Southwick, Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, and Yehuda (2014) gave a good explanation of how trauma relates to both a physical object and a trauma victim. They stated,

I have to admit that the best description of resilience is one I heard on TV, in connection with a Timex watch commercial. The watch was described as having the ability to “take a licking and keep on ticking.” So, for an inanimate object, the quality of never breaking despite exposure is a good definition, but for a person, perhaps it is better to conceptualize resilience as a process of moving forward and not returning back. (p. 3)

Southwick et al. (2014) continued to define the word resilience, in relationship to trauma. They argued, “Most of us think of resilience as the ability to bend but not break, bounce back, and perhaps even grow in the face of adverse life experiences” (p. 2). After forming a panel, they agreed that resilience was difficult to universally define. Rather, they felt that the word was content specific. They stated,

The panelists agreed that resilience is a complex construct and it may be defined differently in the context of individuals, families, organizations, societies, and cultures. With regard to the determinants of resilience, there was a consensus that the empirical study of this construct needs to be approached from a multiple level of analysis perspective that includes genetic, epigenetic, developmental,
demographic, cultural, economic, and social variables. The empirical study of
determinates of resilience will inform efforts made at fostering resilience, with the
recognition that resilience may be enhanced on numerous levels (e.g., individual,
family, community, culture). (p. 1)

This concept of adapting to change was a common theme in much of the
literature. As the saying goes, *That which does not bend, breaks*. In that aspect, a resilient
group, institution, or society was one that made necessary changes to adapt to an
environmental change.

**Resilience of a Social Structure or an Institution**

According to Adger (2000), a society was *resilient* if it was capable of
withstanding a change to the ecosystems, in which it was dependent upon. He stated,

Social resilience is an important component of the circumstances under which
individuals and social groups adapt to environmental change. Ecological and
social resilience may be linked through the dependence on ecosystems of
communities and their economic activities. The question is, then, whether
societies dependent on resources and ecosystems are themselves less resilient.
(p. 347)

In Adger’s definition, the group, institution, or society did not change by choice,
but rather by necessity. Before changing, they needed to first feel somehow threatened.
He stated, “Social vulnerability in general encompasses disruption to livelihoods and loss
of security” (Adger, 2000, p. 348). It was this very sense of vulnerability that motivated
them to make the change.

Adger (2000) argued, “Resilience increases the capacity to cope with stress and is
hence a loose antonym for vulnerability” (p. 348). Just like the antonym for up is down, for black is white, he argued that a group, institution, or society was vulnerable to breaking, until they were resilient enough to bend. If that which does not bend, breaks, then that which was no longer vulnerable enough to break was resilient.

Specific to an institution, Adger (2000) stated, “An example of the resilience of institutions can be found in the ability of institutions of common property management to cope with external pressures and stress. Social capital, ecological resilience and social resilience are all tested when upheaval and stress are placed on institutions” (p. 352). In terms of the GSSch, it was the administration that would have had to find a way to adapt to social changes, in order for the school to have survived for over 40 years.

Ungar (2011) gave a similar explanation of resilience, including adapting to external forces and stress. He stated, “This article argues that, because resilience occurs even when risk factors are plentiful, greater emphasis needs to be placed on the role social and physical ecologies play in positive developmental outcomes when individuals encounter significant amounts of stress” (p. 1). In this article, the researcher pointed out that there were many specific details that must be examined in every instance of resilience. He argued,

A major problem with studying resilience is that the term is used to describe both outcomes and the processes leading to those outcomes. Researchers must focus simultaneously on the individual (and the change that occurs) as well as the nature of the protective mechanisms that interact with risk factors to mitigate their impact. (p. 4)

Much like Ungar (2011), Southwick et al. (2014) stated that resilience was both a
means and an end. They argued, “In defining resilience, it is important to specify whether resilience is being viewed as a trait, a process, or an outcome, and it is often tempting to take a binary approach in considering whether resilience is present or absent” (p. 2). With this definition, resilience was both a means and an end to surviving a stress causing change.

There was not a single stress causing change or a single way in which to survive. In some cases, resilience could have been dependent on a resource. Ungar (2011) argued, “Such evidence suggests that in higher risk environments, resilience is more dependent on the availability and accessibility of culturally relevant resources than individual factors” (p. 6). For a failed institution, this could have meant that the administration was capable of coming up with a plan, but the needed, physical resources to implement the plan were missing.

One of the largest focus areas when studying resilience, according to Ungar (2011) was agency. He stated, “The challenge for resilience investigators is to identify processes that are systemic and variable while avoiding excessive focus on individual characteristics that are not under an individual’s control” (p. 10). Resilience, in this sense, was a conscious act. Someone with agency needed to adapt to the stress causing change in such a way that the institution would continue to exist.

Using these definitions for resilience to build a framework for the dissertation, I argued that the GSSch would display resilience, if

1) the administration had enough agency, access to resources, and ability as educational leaders to ensure the longevity of the School;

2) the administration knowingly and intentionally adapted to potentially harmful
provocations in the physical, social, and educational environments, and;

3) the GSSch grew stronger as an institution, after having been placed under a potentially harmful provocation.

**Resilient Educational Leaders**

Just as a physical object (i.e. a watch), and a conceptual object (i.e. an institution) could be resilient, an educational leader was capable of being resilient (Bosworth, & Earthman, 2002; Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Ramrathan, & Ngubane, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018). Despite the fact that all of these researchers had agreed that there was such a thing as a resilient educational leader, they had not come to a consensus about how to define a resilient educational leader.

**The Conceptual Development of Resilience outside of Educational Leadership**

Part of the disagreement when trying to define the word resiliency in an educational leadership framework was stemming from the fact that resiliency was a borrowed word, which did not have origins in educational leadership. According to Bosworth and Earthman (2002), “Resiliency describes the ability of children to overcome adversity and become successful adults” (p. 299). In their definition, the adversity that was to be overcome did not have to be a single event, such as a car accident. It could also have been exposure to an abusive or otherwise adverse environment. They continued, “Resiliency describes children’s responses to both long-term and short-term adversity” (Bosworth, & Earthman, 2002, p. 299). I found two key takeaway points from this article. The first was that resiliency was found in a response to something. The second was that it was reserved for children and used in relation to developmental issues.
When trying to define resilience in an educational leadership framework, whether it was used as a noun, an adjective, or an adverb (i.e. resilient, resilience, etc.), it remained a difficult definition to come to a consensus about. According to Griffins and Edwards (2014),

Resilience is not a concept that easily transcends discourses. Currently, the meanings attributed to it within the field of mainstream psychology dominate public understandings of resilience in ways which we suggest are potentially damaging and of little assistance to hard-pressed practitioners. (p. 500)

Using the field of mainstream psychology, resilience was found in a person’s ability to “bounce back” from a short-term traumatic event (i.e. accident) or a long-time traumatic event (i.e. growing up in poverty) (Bosworth, & Earthman, 2002; Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Ramrathan, & Ngubane, 2013).

The Adoption of Resilience into Educational Leadership

There were several researchers trying to define the word resilience for an educational leadership framework. At times, resilience was used similarly to endurance, trying one’s best, or even optimism (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014). Day (2014) argued,

Although much of the literature on resilience suggests that it is a necessary quality in extreme adverse circumstances – for example, physical or emotional trauma as a result of conflict – it seems obvious that everyday resilience will be an essential quality and a necessary capacity for leaders to lead to their best. (p. 638)

This idea of resilience as a form of endurance in a professional setting was
supported by multiple researchers. For the purpose of this dissertation, I identified four attributes of a resilient leader. Then, I included the names of the researchers with the attributes, to show which researcher supported which attribute. A resilient leader:

1) has an overall sense of well-being (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014);

2) knows how to deal with stress (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Steward, 2014);

3) possesses high levels of emotional intelligence (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018), and;

4) follows a moral purpose (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018).

What I found was lacking from this list of attributes was a traumatic event, since a resilient leader did not have to go through a negative, physical or emotional experience.

As pointed out by Gu, and Day (2013),

> It argues that teacher resilience is not primarily associated with the capacity to ‘bounce back’ or recover from highly traumatic experiences and events but, rather, the capacity to maintain equilibrium and a sense of commitment and agency in the everyday worlds in which teachers teach. (p. 26)

These four attributes overlap each other in much of the literature. Also, there was a consensus among researchers that trauma was not a required pre-requisite to resilience in an educational leadership framework. There was not a complete consensus in the literature about how to define each category or in how to weigh the importance of each
category. An example of the varying structures was evident in Steward (2014), in which the categories were placed under a larger, blanket term. He argued,

In order to gain a deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to or undermine a school leader’s capacity for emotional resilience, the research focused on the significance of upbringing as well as more commonly explored areas: well-being, stress, emotional intelligence and moral purpose. (p. 53)

The same categories appeared in this article, but they fed into the emotional resilience of the educational leader. How the educational leader was raised was also a factor in determining whether or not he was resilient. This was not always the case though. For some researchers, resilience in educational leadership did not begin until the career began. Still, the emotional state of educational leaders over long periods, be it a lifetime (Steward, 2014), 30+ years (Day, 2014), or the span of a career (Day, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012), remained a common theme in many of the articles.

**Remaining Optimistic with a Moral Purpose.** According to Reed and Blaine (2015), a resilient leader did not simply react to things as they occur, but rather, he thought ahead and made contingency plans for possible scenarios. They argued, “Resilience does not fluctuate on a daily or weekly basis. Instead, resilience reflects a pattern of how leaders view their current reality and how they assess the probability for influencing the future” (p. 460). The optimism was not found in an educational leader’s belief that everything would be just fine, but rather it was found in the educational leader’s belief that he was equipped to deal with the situations as they arose (Day, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Reed, & Blaine, 2015).
Maulding et al. (2012) stated, “The best leaders identify mistakes early so as to avoid any crises that may arise. When evaluating the seriousness of a crisis, good leaders resist the temptation to oversimplify the situation” (p. 22). Again, the educational leadership within an institution did not have to experience trauma first hand (i.e. suffer a car accident), but rather they needed to identify and respond to adversity.

To be effective, optimism needed to play a role in institutional planning (Day, 2014; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Reed, & Blaine, 2015). Reed and Blaine (2015) argued, “Resilient leaders demonstrate optimistic thinking at two levels. They want to know about what is happening right now and the good, the bad and the ugly. At another level, resilient leaders are realistic optimists as they envision future possibilities” (p. 462). Even as resilient educational leaders looked ahead, they needed to take into consideration the possible of future adversity. Rather than view the adversity as a negative, they needed to see it as a possibility to grow stronger and plan accordingly.

Growing stronger required a moral purpose. This moral purpose needed to be self-reflective in nature, which allowed for the educational leader to remain overall balanced (Day, 2014; Reed, & Blaine, 2015). Day (2014) argued,

However, whilst resilience is an essential attribute, in itself it is not enough. Poor leaders (and teachers) may be resilient. They may survive without changing, without improving. Resilience without the conviction of moral purpose, without a willingness to be self-reflective and learn in order to change in order to continue to improve is not enough. (p. 646)

The lens, which constructed the moral purpose, should not have been too narrowly focused. It should have allowed for the educational leader to see an adverse
situation from multiple perspectives, and take all stakeholders into account (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018).

According to Reed and Blaine (2015), understanding a situation from multiple perspectives ensured that the adverse situation that either the stakeholders or the institution were faced with was taken seriously by the leadership. They argued,

Resilient leaders demonstrate the ability to understand, from as many diverse perspectives as possible, the reality of what is happening when the organization is hit with adversity. Resilient leaders demonstrate the ability to maintain a positive outlook about the future, without denying the obstacles posed by reality. (p. 463)

**Qualities of Resilience.** Neither simply believing that everything was fine, nor was avoiding adverse situations mentioned in the literature about resilient leaders. What was mentioned was their ability to plan for and deal with adverse situations (Day, 2014; Griffiths, & Edwards, 2014; Gu, & Day, 2013; Reed, & Blaine, 2015; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018). According to Reed and Blaine (2015), “Resilient leaders demonstrate the ability to apply flexible, creative approaches to successfully navigate through obstacles posed by adversity” (p. 464). It was in the way that an educational leader dealt with, and did not avoid, an adverse situation, that defined him as resilient or not resilient.

Resilience was also not defined by any researcher as the ability to remain stubborn, to get one’s own way, or to always win. Day (2014) argued that a person might be in a leadership role, but he would not even be capable of being resilient, unless he had somehow prepared for his role as an educational leader. He stated,
If the capacity for resilience is indeed the outcome of a dynamic process of interaction within and between individual biographies and their past and present personal and work contexts, it follows that a key role of leaders is to foster individual and organisational resilience. For example, teachers may respond positively or negatively in the presence of challenging circumstances, and this will depend on the quality of leadership as well as the strength of their own commitment. (Day, 2014, p. 643)

Here again, the resilient leader was prepared for the role of leader first, followed by the manner in which he approached challenging or adverse situations. Much of this came from within the leader and was driven by moral guideposts, commitments to a community as well as an institution, and a positive attitude.

By placing all of these arguments together, I argued that resilient educational leaders display the following qualities:

1) They have the proper preparation (i.e. training and/or upbringing) to be resilient;

2) They know how to lead through adverse situations, while maintaining a positive attitude, moral bearings, and overall well-being;

3) They are team players, taking into consideration all of the stakeholders and the institutions that they represent;

4) They plan for, anticipate, and respond to adverse situations, and;

5) They maintain their attitudes, beliefs, and community ties, while delivering results over a long period of time.

**Review of Research: The Reconceptualization of Resilience to Academic Resilience**

Having examined all of the more popular uses of the word, resilience, as well as
how it was currently being used in academia, I argued that academic resilience was a phenomenon which could be studied. The following definitions completed the framework for the research by clearly showcasing the criteria that needed to be fulfilled, in order for something to possess academic resilience.

Definition: Academic resilience is a well-thought out response to an external condition, which threatens to greatly weaken or completely disband an academic program and/or an academic department in an institution of higher learning.

Academic resilience differs from other forms of resilience in the following ways:

1) Academic resilience does not require a physical strain to be placed on an object, in order to test for the object’s structural integrity (i.e. resilience in engineering);

2) Academic resilience does not require a person to have experienced a traumatic event (i.e. resilience in child psychology), and;

3) Academic resilience does require an intentionally restructuring of an academic program and/or of an academic department which was threatened in such a way as to ensure the longevity of the academic program and/or academic program (i.e. a German program at a university).

Academic resilience is found at the intersection of the following two areas:

1) The leadership, which is charged with formulating a response to the threatening, external condition(s), and;

2) The institution of higher learning, in which the threatened academic program and/or academic department is found.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The data should hold the key to answering the research questions (Cresswell, 2013). In this dissertation, the guiding question is

GQ1) In what ways did the GSSch have the potential to invoke academic resilience?

The overarching question is

OQ1) What is academic resilience?

The midrange questions are

MRQ1) How did the leadership of the GSSch respond to potentially harmful provocations?

MRQ2) How was the GSSch positioned after the leadership response to potentially harmful provocations?

I determined these questions to be important as they spoke to multiple areas of the GSSch, including the program’s educational leadership, pedagogy, and the overall quality and equity found within its total immersion learning environment. These questions also helped guide the project in providing new insights into the word, resilience. I also determined that answering these questions required a framework that could speak to the abilities of the GSSch leadership, as well as facilitate the coding of the data. To do this, a historical case study was performed using an academic resilience lens (see Day, 2014; Griffiths & Edwards, 2014; Gu & Day, 2013; and Stewart, 2014), a curriculum theory lens (see Flinders and Thornton, 2017), and a creative lens (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). Each event examined was placed in a historical context (see Marshall, 2007). I found that this framework supported the qualitative research methods incorporated in this
Eisner (1985) stated,

Qualitative methods tend to emphasize the importance of context in understanding, they tend to place great emphasis on the historical conditions within which events and situations occur, and they tend to argue that pieces cannot be understood aside from their relationship to the whole in which they participate (p. 136).

Qualitative methods attempt to place data within a larger context. Since the pieces have to be examined in relationship to the whole, I chose to examine the specific political and cultural events that were occurring during the timeframes examined.

Given the similarities found in several qualitative methods, I could have selected any number of methodologies. However, for my research, which is a historical case study, I utilized phenomenology as a lens or theoretical framework to analyze the data. I divided primary sources and secondary sources into interviews, artifacts, and member checking. I used each of these categories (i.e. interviews, artifacts, and member checking) to triangulate the data. New primary sources were gathered through interviews which incorporated a series of open-ended questions to three distinct target populations. The first population was the co-founder, Professor Pabisch. The second population consisted of former faculty and administration at the GSSch. The third population consisted of former students of the GSSch. The interviews themselves were conducted similarly to how interviews are conducted in narrative research by asking open-ended questions that facilitated a dialogue. Artifacts included GSSch recruitment materials as well as guest books from past summer sessions. Member checking occurred one to two months after
the initial interviews were conducted, and was used to minimize researcher bias, by ensuring that the participants were properly quoted and/or paraphrased.

**Research Design**

I used phenomenology as the lens or theoretical framework to analyze the data. At its core, much of the traditional philosophical understanding of phenomenology can be linked to the original works from German philosophers named Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831). These were the two philosophers responsible for introducing the term phenomenology into the academic community. Even though they helped to introduce the term, many people believe that a different German philosopher named, Edmund Gustav Albrecht Husserl (1859-1938) was responsible for defining the term phenomenology, when he placed it in dialogue with the work of the French philosopher Rene Descartes (1596-1650) (Cucu, 2010; Gadamer, 1975; Maharana, 2009; Martell, 2015; Smith, 2007).

Born in 1859, and educated in German universities, Husserl began his career primarily in the field of mathematics. Over time he began to develop a strong interest in philosophy. Once he entered into philosophy, he began examining the connection between mathematics and philosophy. Even though his early publications were focused on the philosophy of mathematics, his later works had little to do with mathematics. In 1900 and 1901, Husserl published a two volume book titled, *Logische Untersuchungen*. For many followers of phenomenology, 1900 is when the modern phenomenology dialogue truly began. Miron (2016) points out that as the dialogue continued, many new philosophers began adding their own definitions and interpretations. He wrote, “However, adopting Husserl’s phenomenology as their starting point did not prevent his
followers from developing their own independent phenomenological theory” (p. 467). This means that phenomenology continued to develop even after Husserl passed away. Still, he is considered by many to be the founder and is responsible for the current line of dialogue on phenomenology studies (Maharana, 2009; Martell, 2015; Smith, 2007).

According to Smith (2007) Husserl tried to reintroduce phenomenology as its own field of study. He stated, “Husserl set out to establish phenomenology as a new discipline in philosophy and in science generally: a science of consciousness, distinct from psychology, from epistemology, and from other traditional fields of science and philosophy” (p. 188). One way of interpreting his idea of phenomenology would be the study of adjectives and adverbs. Take, for example, the sentence, *The hipster table costs $300*. In this sentence, *the table* is a noun. It is the subject of the sentence. *Costs* is the verb. *$300* is another noun and is the accusative object of the sentence. The adjective is *hipster*. Like most adjectives, the adjective *hipster* is subjective. It cannot be weighed or measured or placed under a microscope, since it is neither a noun nor a measurable action. Zahavi (2019) explained,

Importantly, however, phenomenology is primarily interested in the how rather than in the *what* of objects. Rather than focusing on, say, the weight, rarity, or chemical composition of the object, phenomenology is concerned with the way in which the object shows or displays itself, i.e., in how it appears. (p. 9)

In the example sentence, the table appears to the observer to possess *hipster* qualities. These qualities are subjective and vary by observer. Zahavi (2019) explained, “As should have become clear by now, the reason why phenomenologists are interested in analyzing the structure of conscious intentionality is because they want to clarify the
relation between mind and world” (p. 23). Over time, the same observer can change his mind about the table, especially if the social context changes. Just as the meaning of the word hipster can change over time, the meaning of the word resilience can also change.

Although this explains some of the underpinnings of phenomenology, this research, which uses phenomenological lens to analyze the data, should not be confused with Husserl’s phenomenology. My dissertation incorporates Marshall (2007) into the theoretical framework to support the examination of specific historical events (i.e. trends in college enrollment). The construction of the lens used in conjunction with my phenomenological lens incorporates resilient educational leadership (see Day, 2014; Griffiths & Edwards, 2014; Gu & Day, 2013; and Stewart, 2014), curriculum theory (see Flinders & Thornton, 2017), and the concept of creativity (see Csikszentmihalyi, 1996).

Participants

According to multiple researchers, effectively analyzing data through a phenomenological lens is not dependent on a specific number of participants (Maharana, 2009; Martell, 2015; Smith, 2007; Zahavi, 2019). Zahavi (2019) stated, “Strictly speaking, phenomenology means the science or study of the phenomena” (p. 9). He claimed that the number of participants was relevant only in that the participants provide enough information to the researcher that he could conduct and analyze the study.

Smith (2007) stated that not just anyone could be interviewed for the research. There is a type of participant for the research. More specifically, he claimed that the participant must possess first-hand knowledge of the phenomena in question. Smith (2007) continued,

Phenomenology is the study of consciousness as experienced from the first-person
point of view. By etymology, phenomenology is the study of phenomena, in the root meaning of appearances; or, better, the ways things appear to us in our experience, the ways we experience things in the world around us. (p. 189)

In Smith’s interpretation of how a researcher should analyze data through a phenomenological lens, the researcher tries to recreate the analytical tool with which the researcher would be able to analyze how the individual participant saw the world. The researcher incorporates the interviewee’s perceptions into the research in order to help interpret and triangulate the data. However, the researcher does not rely solely on participants when they relay information from a first-person point of view. Instead, the researcher searches for the thought process and the context in which something occurred. Then, the researcher attempts to triangulate the data by placing the interviews in dialogue with other data.

I chose to follow Smith’s guidance, when I developed the methodology and theoretical framework for my dissertation. I collected primary source data for my dissertation by interviewing participants from three different populations. Each population provided some new data about the founding and the continuation of the GSSch, which may or may not have promoted the idea of the GSSch as displaying academic resilience. Along with recording and transcribing these interviews, it was important for the research that I attempted to understand the interview statements from the perspectives of the participants. Their perspectives allowed me to better understand, code, and triangulate the new data, by placing the participants' statements in a larger, historical context.

There were three unique populations for the interviews. Each population brought
something specific to the research. All three populations contained persons somehow connected to the GSSch. The populations were 1) the co-founder; 2) former faculty and administrators; and 3) former students.

The Co-founder

This has a sample size of one. That is to say that this group, which originally consisted of two people, only has one surviving member. Even though this only allows for a sample size of one, I required information from the co-founder for the research, since I needed an insider’s perspective on the founding and continuation of the GSSch. The co-founder had been identified and he had expressed an interest in performing a series of interviews. He was identified not only as being one of the two co-founders of the GSSch, but also of being the only surviving co-founder of the GSSch. He was the only person capable of speaking about the effect that the adverse conditions of the mid-1970s had on UNM’s German program. He had knowledge of possible pathways that were discussed and rejected, as well as why they were rejected. Furthermore, he was able to speak directly to his perspective on the political climate of that time frame. Finally, he was the one person capable of explaining the rationale behind the founding of the GSSch and an MA program as well as the shift from German to German Studies.

Former Faculty and Administrators

This group had a larger population than the first group. The target sample size consisted of three participants. These participants were former faculty and/or administrators from the GSSch. This sample was important to the research, since they have participated in the German Studies program and they could speak directly to the program, the pedagogy, the leadership, and the emotional and political environment
during their time teaching. The former faculty and administrators were identified and selected by using convenience sampling. They were contacted via email and/or phone.

**Former Students**

This group also had a larger population than the first group. The target sample size consisted of four participants. These participants were former students of the GSSch. The former students were selected through convenient sampling and snowball sampling, by asking faculty and former students I knew and asking if they are in touch with former students.

This sample was important to the research, since they had participated in the GSSch. Unlike the former faculty and administrators, the former students did not have insider information about administrative decisions or even necessarily had knowledge of any adverse conditions that the UNM German department had ever faced. What they spoke to included their empirical data about the 50 minute classes they took on the UNM campus vs. the total immersion environment at the GSSch. Their statements provided students’ prospective on the academic rigor of the GSSch, and explained if or how the GSSch aided in their academic success.

The interviews that the students provided proved useful in the triangulation, by adding new primary source data from non-administrative stakeholders of the GSSch. For example, Patton and Patton (2002) asserted, “A concrete version of theory triangulation for evaluation would involve examining the data from the perspectives of various stakeholder positions. It is common for divergent stakeholders to disagree about program purposes, goals, and means of attaining goals” (pp. 562-563). The interviews from all three groups (i.e. co-founder, former faculty/administrators, and former students) were
examined. Even though the interviews from the former students may seem limited, the former students were stakeholders in the GSSch, with the potential of holding different opinions about what the goals or intended outcomes of the program should be. Each sample had information that the others did not, and each participant held a unique perception of the GSSch.

**IRB and Consent Forms**

Two of the safeguards for both the researcher and the participants is to have the researcher acquire an approved IRB and to have the participants fill out consent forms. (Creswell, 2013; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013). The problem with studying an event that has already occurred, such as the founding of the GSSch is mostly with the consent form, since the data has already been collected by someone other than the researcher. In some cases, the participants cannot be identified or they are no longer alive.

According to Creswell (2013), many decisions are made by the researcher during the data collection process. He argued, “In the field, the researcher makes decisions about what is salient to study, relevant to the purpose of the study, and of interest for focus” (p. 251). Given the fact that I, the researcher was not in the field at the time when most of the primary source material was collected (i.e. 1970s), I was not able to be part of the decision making process addressing what data should be collected and why.

McLean (2007) argued in favor of using primary sources in research. He also argued that an interview counts as a primary source. Given that fact that I chose to perform a historical case study for my dissertation, I deemed it important to include interviews as part of the data. McLean (2007) gave suggestions on how to perform an interview. He stated,
Remember that your time and your interviewees’ time is precious, and that interviews require a considerable amount of set up, prepare for, conduct and process – about ten hours for every hour captured on tape/digital file as a rough rule of thumb. (p. 44)

Along with the time required for each interview, McLean (2007) added that the interviews themselves should be directed towards specific individuals with specific information. He stated, “Ten of fifteen well-chosen, well-conducted interviews will be better than fifty superficial ones” (p. 44). For example, five, one-hour interviews would require about 50 hours to perform. To insure that the time is well spent, the researcher should first have a specific reason for interviewing the person, and second, have specific information that he or she is trying to acquire.

McLean (2007) suggested that interviewers divide their questions into two categories. These categories are direct questions and open-ended questions. He proposed, “Begin the interview with straightforward questions that your interviewee will have no difficulty answering … Ask specific questions to get specific answers, and open-ended ones to get longer, more detailed answers” (p. 45). To ensure that the interviews go smoothly, he suggested that interviewers contact the interviewees in advance and provide information about what will be asked. Provided that the paperwork was properly filled out, the interviews should provide new, quality, primary sources (Creswell, 2013; McLean, 2007).

For this dissertation, participants were initially contacted via email. UNM’s Office of the Institutional Review Board (OIRB) provided a template for the email, which was utilized for the emails. The questions, which consisted of both specific questions and
open-ended questions, were pre-approved by the OIRB.

The next challenge I faced was in trying to validate the findings through triangulation. Creswell (2013) stipulated, “When qualitative researchers locate evidence to document a code or theme in different sources of data, they are triangulating information and providing validity to their findings” (p. 251). The difficulty that I had was that performing research retroactively excluded the possibility of performing an observation. Interviewing did increase the supply of primary sources; however, I was still at the mercy of available, pre-existing primary source material to validate findings through triangulation.

I felt that a historical case study was ideal for my research, since I was interested in performing research, in which the events in question had already occurred. A historical case study allowed for me to analyze data through a phenomenological lens that I had not originally collected, such as pre-existing documents, archival records, and physical artifacts.

A historical case study is somewhat pre-bound by the pre-existing primary source material, but it is also flexible enough that the research questions could be adjusted to fit the pre-existing data. I was faced with ethical challenges surrounding primary source material that were unique to this dissertation. These challenges included determining ownership of the artifacts, the ethical considerations surrounding participant consent, especially for people no longer alive (i.e. Ernie Blake), and the use of publicly disseminated statistical data (i.e. UNM’s Registrar’s office reports on student enrollment).

Creswell (2013) suggested that researchers take a moment to consider the
procedures for data collection, such as institutional review boards (IRBs) and consent forms. He stated,

A typical reaction to thinking about qualitative data collection is to focus in on the actual types of data and the procedures for gathering them. Data collection, however, involves much more. It means gaining permissions, conducting a good qualitative sampling strategy, developing means for recording information both digitally and on paper, storing the data, and anticipating ethical issues that may arise. (p. 145)

The first step I took in the data collection for this dissertation was gaining authorization to collect the data. Then, I placed the collected data in a safe location. I was bound to the same ethical procedures as any other researcher. Historical case studies, although sometimes studying past events, are still considered a qualitative method and do require the same paperwork and safeguards as any other qualitative research.

**Consent Forms**

I contacted possible research participants by phone and/or email. The consent to participate in research document was used. (See Appendix A for a copy of the document). The consent forms were brought to a place where the participant felt comfortable reviewing and signing them. Some of the consent forms were emailed to the participants in advance. The consent forms were either 1) emailed to participants, printed, signed, scanned, and emailed back to me by the participants; or 2) were printed by me, brought to the interview location, and signed by the participants.

For this project, I used open-ended questions during interviews. I recorded the interviews as audio and I took notes on paper during the interviews. (See Appendix B for
a list of questions.)

**Data Collection: Primary and Secondary Sources**

According to McLean (2007), data sources are divided into two groups, which are primary sources and secondary sources. He asserted, “By ‘primary sources’, we mean ones that were created during the period being studied (a letter or the daily newspaper), or at a later date by participants in the events (e.g., memoirs or oral history interviews)” (p. 26). In this dissertation, after a participant participated in an interview, I classified the interview as a primary source.

McLean (2007) defined secondary sources as well. He announced, “‘Secondary sources’ are created later, and include books, films and sound recordings that portray a particular place and/or period” (p. 26). As the researcher, I was not able to personally perform observations since the event being studied had already past, but I was able to find pre-existing data in books and journal articles.

According to Zahavi (2019), primary and secondary sources are commonly used in studies (i.e. historical case studies) that incorporate a phenomenological lens, since the researchers are examining the perceptions of a specific moment in time. He continued, “The focus of phenomenology is on the intersection between mind and world, neither of which can be understood in separation from each other” (p. 30). If I were to understand the meaning given to an object or event, I would need to understand the community that gave the object or event meaning in the first place. Using the earlier example of the *hipster table*, I would need to understand the multiple ways in which the adjective *hipster* was being used at the time that the sentence was formed. For the specific purpose of my research, I need to understand the social and political climate of the 1970s and how the
climate affected the German department at UNM. The greatest limitation that I was faced with was that with the exception of the interviews, I was not able to add new primary sources. In other words, I could not travel back to the 1970s, experience the climate first-hand, and perform observations.

**Data Analysis**

Christopher (2016) affirmed that once the subject provided information and a tool had been selected, it was up to the researcher to use the tool to explain what that data meant. He believed that there was a tendency to give validity to the participant, just for being responsible for providing the data. He added,

Absent valid reasons for acceptance, we cannot be “entitled” to accept narrative researcher knowledge claims from a pragmatic perspective. The critical requirement of an inquiry process, engaged with the rigor and methods of a scientific approach, is absent in narrative research. (p. 113)

In his argument, Christopher does not argue strongly against the tools that the researchers select to interpret the data, but rather against the procedure used to collect the data. According to Christopher, what is missing is a scientific procedure. He continued,

We must understand the ways in which individuals acquired knowledge as discussed in the pragmatic approach. Likewise, we must understand the way in which a narrative researcher understood that information and used it to provide his or her own interpretations, as in the interpretive approach. (Christopher, 2016, p. 114)

In Christopher’s claim, the need for validity places pressure on me as the researcher to provide background information to the readers about the data collection
process, including how the participant gained that data and how I interpreted it. In Christopher’s interpretation, the interview itself simply provides a story. Once the story has been recorded, the emphasis would then be placed on the validity of my design.

When performing the data analysis, McLean (2007) also cautioned researchers about giving authority to a primary source. He stated, “Do not accept the information printed on the back of museum prints uncritically. It may be inaccurate” (p. 50). He claimed that even if the information is accurate, the researcher still needs to examine it with a critical lens. In my dissertation, this examination was not limited to just the published information, but included artifacts (i.e. guest books) as well.

Following McLean’s (2007) interpretation, during the data analysis, I would be required to question everything. Thus, I affirmed that using a phenomenological lens to analyze the data was a logical choice for my dissertation. By design, a phenomenological lens already empowers researcher skepticism by claiming that everything, even quantifiable data is obscured by human perception. Martell (2015) restated, “Phenomenology is the study of phenomena, or that which appears” (p. 423). More specific to my research was the way in which individuals perceived the aspects of the GSSch. Their perceptions remained subjective, since the phenomenon in question appeared a certain way to them.

Martell (2015) claimed that a common example of what appears and is quantifiable yet obscured by human perception is time. We can measure time as one minute equals sixty seconds. This is a fact; it is scientifically measurable and can be quantified. An individual’s perception of time might not coincide with this. For example, when a person is playing, time seems to go by faster. As the saying goes, *Time flies when...*
you are having fun. When that same person is in an uncomfortable position, time seems to go by slower. Even though time itself does not change, the individual’s perception of time changes, based on his or her emotional conditions. In this example, time itself might be quantifiable but the perception of time is not. Thus, when analyzed through a phenomenological lens, time is subjective.

Husserl claimed that everything is connected and in a state of flux. For example, reality exists through human perception. Human perception is influenced by reality. This ties both reality and perception to each other, as one helps to define the other. Furthermore, human perception, such as how much time a human feels has passed is not a reliable scientific tool. A reliable scientific tool would be a watch. The problem with using human perception becomes this: If an unreliable scientific tool defines reality and reality is subjective and changeable, then a subjective and changing reality is being concretely defined by a non-reliable scientific tool. Cucu (2010) argued that statements like these make it difficult to answer the question: What are true things?

The solution offered by the phenomenological perspective to the major crisis of modern culture consists in the impulse of following the doubt experience of Cartesian method, aiming towards the metaphysical naivety, where carrying out a process to human being awareness was anchored. Only the severe filtering of all awareness and of the entire area of information from all fields will allow the apprehending and definitive renouncing to false things and presuppositions initially assumed as true things. (Cucu, 2010, p. 37)

Tying this in with the previous statement from Christopher (2016) and McLean (2007), within phenomenology, true things are only perceived by the participants to be
true. They are perceived to be true by the individual participants, based on the participant’s lived experiences. For the purposes of this dissertation, the participants’ statements were considered valid, only in so far as the data provided within their statements could be triangulated. This is as far as I went with the research, although it could be further argued that reading someone’s research on the GSSch is also phenomenological or that a third party lens is yet another layer of phenomenology.

**Triangulation**

According to Anderson, Herr, and Nihlen (2007), triangulation requires the researcher to examine multiple pieces of datum before making claims about what any single piece of datum could mean. They continued, “The notion of triangulation, or the inclusion of multiple perspectives, guards against viewing events in a simplistic or self-serving way” (p. 41). Triangulation is a method used by researchers to, among other things, increase the validity of their findings by safeguarding against researcher biases, safeguarding against the researcher’s tendencies to naively accept participant’s statements at face value, and to ensure that a claim can be supported by at least three pieces of datum.

The data that I triangulated in this dissertation included qualitative data (i.e. interviews) and quantitative data (i.e. number of students enrolled). Patton and Patton (2002) stated, “Qualitative and quantitative data can be fruitfully combined to elucidate complementary aspects of the same phenomenon” (p. 558). I collected data from multiple sources, including, but not limited to, primary and secondary source document, publicly accessible quantitative information (i.e. student enrollment numbers posted online by UNM’s Registrar’s office), and primary source interviews. Then, I coded the data.
Following the coding of the data, I made claims about what the data revealed. I triangulated these claims using

1) interviews;
2) artifact analysis, and;
3) member checking.

**Conclusion**

I found the following data through the examination of the time frame and the subjective elements surrounding potentially harmful provocations on UNM’s German department, as well as the GSSch, dating back to the 1970s:

1) The steps taken by the GSSch’s leadership to use creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations, and;
2) The effectiveness of the leadership’s responses to potentially harmful provocations, with the advantage of hindsight.

I was able to identify, and support with the data, thirteen unique examples that showed that the founders of the GSSch responded to potentially harmful provocations that they were faced with in the 1970s. I separated these thirteen unique examples into three groups, which were 1) responding in a manner consistent with the suggestions made by the research that was being published in the 1970s; 2) responding in a manner that addressed the criteria for an MA program and the founding of the GSSch, as stated by the administration at UNM, and; 3) responding to the quality standards that the founders placed themselves.

I began by listing examples that showed that the founders of the GSSch responded in a manner consistent with the suggestions made by the research that was
being published in the 1970s. These examples included the criteria that the founders of the GSSch should follow, as stated by the research. These criteria included 1) switch from German to German Studies; 2) offer more to the students than what they would receive in a traditional, 50-minute class; 3) support teachers of German; 4) do not allow faculty to focus too much on research; 5) maintain the same academic rigor as any other university program; 6) chose to bend by implementing new concepts and ideas into the German program, rather than break by being stubborn; and 7) recognize the social and political climate of the university’s German department in its time-frame (i.e. the mid-1970s).

The next examples I identified included the criteria for an MA program and the founding of the GSSch, as stated by the administration at UNM. I identified these criteria as 8) the BA program, the MA program, and the GSSch were not to be in competition with each other, and; 9) the MA program and the GSSch needed to maintain a minimum number of enrolled students, despite the declining student enrollment.

Finally, I identified quality standards that the founders placed themselves. I identified these quality standards as 10) collaborate with other institutions (i.e. Sommerschule am Pazifik); 11) seek best practices (i.e. German only policy), while eliminating unreliable practices (i.e. language lab); 12) incorporate their concept of the Grundkurs into the GSSch, and; 13) strategically position the GSSch within the BA and MA programs offered through the German department, making it difficult for the UNM administrators to eliminate just the GSSch.
Chapter 4: Research Findings and Analysis

Based on the data, I chose to examine the faculty and/or administrators of the GSSch in two separate groups. I divided them into these two groups of faculty and/or administrators based on a time frame and labeled them as

1) The old Guard (the first 3 decades, 1975-2004), and;

2) The new Guard (the following one and a half decades, 2005 – current).

The research questions remained the same, but I placed the emphasis of this research on the old Guard. There were multiple reasons for why I did this.

1) Professor Pabisch was a member of the old Guard;

2) The research examined the founding of the GSSch;

3) 45+ years was too large of a time frame for the scope of this research project;

4) The new Guard is currently seeking creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations. Thus, it is too early to draw conclusions about them, and;

5) Enough time has passed to examine the effects of the responses from the old Guard.

I coded the data as relevant to the old Guard and relevant only to the new Guard.

I concluded that the findings from the data that was coded as relevant to the old Guard promoted the belief that the GSSch displayed signs of academic resilience during its first three decades. The data provided specific examples of provocations that the GSSch’s leadership was faced with, as well as how the leadership charged with formulating a response to those potentially harmful provocations responded. This data spoke to the second research question, the guiding question, and both midrange questions.
The information that I determined to be relevant only to the new Guard was placed in Chapter 5, under the heading of “Future Research.” In the future research section, I used the findings about the old Guard to set-up a possible research project with the purpose of determining if the GSSch is currently displaying signs of academic resilience.

Findings and Analysis (Organized by Research Questions)

Throughout the previous three chapters, I structured questions based on the literature review and the framework. Several of these questions stemmed from the fact that neither the location nor the pedagogy of the GSSch had changed in over 44 years. I incorporated these questions into the dialogue about academic resilience and chose academic resilience as the theoretical framework to guide me in addressing these questions. After some consideration, I flushed out the following two questions for the dissertation:

1) What is academic resilience?

2) How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?

I was able to answer part of the first question about academic resilience during the literature review, when I made the following claim: Academic resilience is found at the intersection of the following two areas:

1) The leadership, which is charged with formulating a response to the potentially harmful provocation(s), and;

2) The institution of higher learning, in which the threatened academic program and/or academic department is found.

With this claim, I was able to structure specific questions that addressed this
aforementioned intersection. Then, I identified the guiding question, the overarching question, and the midrange questions for my dissertation. I identified the guiding question as: *In what ways did the GSSch have the potential to invoke academic resilience?* I identified the overarching question as: *What is academic resilience?* Finally, I identified the midrange questions as:

1) *How did the leadership of the GSSch respond to potentially harmful provocations?*

2) *How is the GSSch positioned after the leadership responded to potentially harmful provocations?*

I determined that a historical case study would be the best type of research design to use to address these questions for several reasons. First, I could adapt a phenomenological lens to this research by providing a qualitative framework and help guide the research by focusing on the following three areas:

1) leadership;

2) pedagogy, and;

3) creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations.

Second, a historical case study allowed me to perform interviews during the data collection process. I felt that these interviews were important for my dissertation, as they would provide the only source of new, primary source data.

Finally, according to multiple researchers, a phenomenological lens allowed me to examine data from both primary sources (i.e. interviews, artifacts, and member checking) and secondary sources (i.e. literature) (Creswell, 2013; McLean, 2007; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013; Wilson, 2014).
During the data collection process, the participants’ interviews proved to be fundamental in the dialogue pertaining to the GSSch, by providing unique and often detailed accounts of potentially harmful provocations on the GSSch. The findings were organized by research question, because when I was coding the data, I realized that the interviews revealed larger, political events (i.e. the fall of the Berlin Wall) as well as smaller, non-political events (i.e. the closing of Thunderbird Lodge) that affected the GSSch’s trajectory. Each of these correlational events presented themselves as a harmful provocation on the GSSch. The leadership, aka the old Guard of the GSSch was charged with formulating a response to these correlational events in a manner which needed to be consistent with both the GSSch’s mission and UNM’s mission. I also collected additional data, which included former GSSch booklets with specific German vocabulary words, program costs, and Grundkurs themes, as well as guest books from summer sessions with handwritten inscriptions. Following the coding of the data, I made claims based on what the data revealed. I triangulated my claims by using

1) interviews;

2) artifact analysis, and;

3) member checking.

When coding the data from the interviews, I broke down the participants’ statements to show a consensus. Although few people could articulate or agree upon exact definitions to specific terms or events, I allowed their exact quotes to be inserted into the text. These exact quotes served the purpose of providing vital data for the research, as they provided a deeper understanding of what was happening than a mere observation would (McLean, 2007; Reid, Greaves, & Kirby, 2017; Wilson, 2014).
Reid, Greaves, and Kirby (2017) stated, “Qualitative data provide meanings people attach to things, the ways that experiences are interpreted, and so on” (p. 134). I interpreted this to mean that my account of what a typical day at the GSSch was like when I attended it, could provide qualitative data. Not only would I know what I had experienced, but I had also observed others. For example, on the surface, there did not appear to be anything too unique about the GSSch. A typical day began at the hotel, where students had the option of having a private room or having a roommate. Then, the students headed over to the dining hall. This is where the German only rule could be observed, as breakfast, like all other aspects of the GSSch, involved all communications being conducted in the German language. The dining hall was reserved just for the GSSch, which insured that the students would not hear English from other visitors in Taos Ski Valley. Following breakfast, the students attended classes and the Grundkurs. Lunch and dinner were both served in the same dining hall. From beginning to end, all communication occurred in the target language. There was no English spoken.

This brief account of the GSSch provided a cursory view of total immersion. There was information about how the school was organized, how the students were organized, and how the German only rule was incorporated. The problem is that it only provided a cursory understanding of the GSSch. Even if I incorporated my own accounts, that would only provide me with one perspective from one year. This meant that giving a voice to the participants through interviews had a function. The new interviews provided a deeper view with multiple perspectives. The interviews not only provided new data, but the data from the interviews functioned as a bridge to a place reserved for participants’ perceptions of an event. In this research, gaining an understanding of participants’
perceptions was not obtainable through observations but rather through the interviews (Creswell, 2013; McLean, 2007; Reid, Greaves, & Kirby, 2017; Savin-Baden & Major, 2013; Wilson, 2014).

Artifact analysis included a re-examination of:

1) GSSch booklets, flyers, and other recruitment materials;
2) published books and journal articles;
3) syllabi from past sessions of the GSSch;
4) guest books from past sessions of the GSSch, with handwritten notes, dates, and signatures;
5) statistical data, such as student enrollment by year, total credits awarded by UNM’s German department by year, as well as online recruitment material.

I found two guest books with handwritten inscriptions inside of them. The authors of the guest books signed and dated many of their inscriptions. I classified these guest books as artifacts. According to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2003), artifact analysis is the examination of “the various objects created by members of a past or present culture that can be studied as reflections of that culture” (p. 629). I examined these artifacts through the phenomenological framework that I developed for this dissertation.

According to Creswell (2013), “Member checking is a qualitative process during which the researcher asks one or more participants in the study to check the accuracy of the account” (p. 594). I performed member checking after the interviews were transcribed and the information contained within each specific interview had been paraphrased. I asked participants if their interviews had been properly paraphrased. If their interviews had not been properly paraphrased, I allowed the participants to amend their answers. I
also paraphrased during the initial interviews, and I allowed the participants to clarify their answers at that time.

I interviewed eight participants. I identified the eight participants as the co-founder of the GSSch, Professor Pabisch as well as four former students and three faculty and/or administrators of the GSSch. Although the participants were informed in the IRBs that they signed that their identities could be revealed, I chose to assign numbers to their biographies, instead of their names. I also identified their age groups as younger (18-30), middle aged (31-50), older (51-60), and retired (61+ and retired). The list of participants is as follows:

1) The co-founder: An Austrian born US university professor. He not only founded the GSSch in 1976, but he has also continued to this day to teach courses and give Grundkurs lectures there.

2) An older, male, returning student: He took German classes with the co-founder in the 1980s. After retiring, he returned to UNM to pursue a doctorate through the College of Education. He has attended the GSSch for personal reasons and not for college credit three times (2016, 2017, and 2018) and he plans on attending next summer (2020). He is active on campus with extra-curricular activities associated with the UNM German Club as well as most any activity sponsored by the UNM German Department.

3) A younger, female, traditional student: She did her undergrad at UNM in German Studies and is currently pursuing an MA at UNM in German Studies. She is also a teaching assistant for lower-division German courses at UNM. She has attended the GSSch three times. Once as an undergrad (2015), and twice as a grad student

4) An older, male, returning student: He took German courses with the co-founder in 1972, when he was only 19 years old and is still considered to be a traditional student. Since then, he has taken multiple, upper-division German courses with the co-founder. He also took a German, independent study course with the co-founder in the Fall of 2019, and he is currently enrolled in an independent study course for Spring of 2020 with him. He attended the GSSch in 1979, just before completing a doctorate in chemistry. He has also attended the Russian Summer School in Middlebury.

5) A retired, female, school teacher: She attended the first five sessions of the GSSch (1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, and 1980). As a school teacher, she has taught both English as a second language and German as a foreign language. She attended the Goethe Institute in Germany before and after visiting the GSSch.

6) A middle-aged, female, German high school teacher: She attended the GSSch three times as a student and two times as faculty. She has also partnered with UNM multiple times to host a German Weekend, in which high school students spent one to two days in a German immersion environment on the UNM campus. She met the co-founder in 2009, when she was still a grad student. As a German high school teacher, she has worked with the co-founder on multiple, professional endeavors (i.e. German Weekend and GSSch guest lecturer).

7) A retired, male, history professor from UNM: He met the co-founder in 1974. He taught at multiple sessions of the GSSch over the years, including the very first session of the GSSch (1976). He is scheduled to teach at the next session (2020).
8) A middle-aged, male, German lecturer from UNM: He is one of three directors of the GSSch. The three directors rotate, each one taking a different year. Although not always in the role of director, he has been faculty at all but one year of the GSSch since 2008.

In this chapter, I examined the data from the interviews through a phenomenological lens, in order to better understand the data from the perspective of the participants. I addressed all of the potentially harmful provocations mentioned by the participants. I also examined the data from publicly accessible quantitative information as well as data found in artifacts (i.e. the guest books). I coded the data and triangulated the findings.

**Academic Resilience**

In this section, I utilized the theoretical framework for academic resilience to guide the coding. By examining the data through the lens of academic resilience, I was able to organize the findings into two categories. I organized the findings into two categories, based on the research questions. In the first category, I examined what it meant to be a resilient educational leader. In the second category, I examined what it meant for an institution to possess academic resilience. These findings spoke directly to the first research question, the overarching question, and the second midrange question.

**A Resilient Educational Leader**

Based on the literature review, I concluded that a resilient academic leader:

1) maintains an overall sense of well-being;

2) knows how to deal with stress;

3) possesses high levels of emotional intelligence, and;
4) follows a moral purpose.

In this section, I made a table to serve as a visual representation of the data. The table shows the total participant size, which is n=7. I listed the participants’ numbers (i.e. 2-8) underneath the attributes of a resilient educational leader in either the “Agreed” or “Disagreed” category, if the attribute was mentioned in their interviews. I listed the participants’ numbers underneath the attribute in the “Not mentioned” category, if the attribute was not mentioned in their interviews. Participant 1 is not included, since he is the co-founder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute of a resilient educational leader</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader maintains an overall sense of well-being.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader knows how to deal with stress.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader possesses high levels of emotional intelligence.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader follows a moral purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>n=7 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>n=7 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>n=3 2, 3, 7</td>
<td>n=4 2, 4, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=4 4, 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>n=3 3, 6, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.

Table 1 clearly illustrated that of those participants interviewed, none of them explicitly stated that the co-founder was lacking an attribute of a resilient educational leader. All of the participants interviewed explicitly stated that the co-founder possessed at least two of the four attributes of a resilient educational leader. Not every participant
interviewed commented on all four attributes of a resilient educational leader. This could be due in part to the fact that not every attribute of a resilient educational leader was asked about directly in the interviews. In the following section, I examined each attribute of a resilient leader separately.

**Attribute 1: Has an overall Sense of Well-being**

Four students and three faculty members were asked directly during a one-on-one interview, if the co-founder had maintained an *overall sense of well-being* for as long as they had known him. Although there was some discussion about what constituted well-being, such as well-being is the frontrunner for the ability to lead, and well-being is the ability to balance multiple responsibilities, it was determined unanimously that the co-founder had in fact maintained an overall sense of well-being. The theme of inclusion emerged during the interviews on the topic of well-being. Immersion is highlighted in direct quotes from participants, which are listed below and examined in greater detail. Each quote came from the interview transcripts, just after the participants were asked if the co-founder had maintained a sense of well-being.

Several participants mentioned the manner in which the co-founder engaged with those around him. Participant 2 stated, “He has a sense of inclusion and confidence. I guess I would call that well-being” (personal communication, December 30, 2019). Here, the co-founder’s personality reflected positively on Participant 2’s perception of him. These concepts of inclusion and confidence fed into the foundation of well-being for this participant, which is not surprising considering the fact that Participant 2 self-identified as an introvert, which he based on his results from the Myers-Briggs test. He expressed the importance of the welcoming, learning environment provided by the GSSch as being
the support that an introverted student needs before he can take risks in the classroom.

Participant 2 went on to state that he took a course with the co-founder, just to study the way that he spoke. He admired the way that the co-founder spoke with authority and the way that he would often reach his hand out as if grasping an idea in mid-air, before pulling it towards him. This participant believed that the ability to effectively communicate to an audience and make every member of that audience feel as if they belonged was an ability stemming from a personal sense of well-being.

Participant 3 had a similar interpretation as Participant 2. She recalled an example of the first year she was at the GSSch.

I remember that that first year he would go around and introduce himself to each of the students. Ask them what their major was, what they plan on doing with German. So he did seem interested in every single student. He was very involved.

(personal communication, January 7, 2020)

Again, the concept of inclusion was mentioned. The co-founder wanted to make everyone feel as if they were part of the group. He had not exhibited signs of being in a competitive state with those around him nor did he exhibit validation seeking behaviors. This is important as the participants believed that when a leader is working through a collaborative effort to build a supportive environment, that leader is exhibiting his overall sense of well-being (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Participant 4 had known the co-founder since the 1970s. He was a student on the
main UNM campus and had attended the first course that Professor Pabisch ever taught at UNM. Since then, he has attended the GSSch and he has taken multiple courses with Professor Pabisch. These courses include an independent study course with him in the Fall 2019 semester and again in the Spring 2020 semester. Even after having been a student of his off and on for about 48 years, when asked if the co-founder had maintained a sense of well-being, Participant 4 replied, “Yes. Always. Always. I mean, because it was always you know a positive thing to meet him. To see him. And to interact with him. It was always a positive thing. Well-being? He exuded well-being for sure” (personal communication, January 8, 2020). Well-being in this sense was still incorporating inclusion, but was highlighted through an ongoing support in nurturing the classroom dynamics. An ability the co-founder has maintained now for almost half a century.

Participant 7 had a similar response, but he added that the co-founder could take a licken’ and keep on ticken’. He reported, “I envy him. He has an indestructible ego. And I say that in a positive way. He doesn’t ever seem depressed or thrown down by any problem that he encounters” (personal communication, January 2, 2020). He believed that both the co-founder’s diplomatic nature and his ability to understand social interactions gave him the confidence and the ability to adapt very quickly to the demands placed on him.

The well-being of the co-founder had a direct impact on the students, both in the classroom on the main UNM campus and at the GSSch. According to the participants, the co-founder incorporated the students’ cultures and perspectives in the learning process. Through inclusion, he was better able to cater specifically to the students’ academic needs and interests. These redeemable qualities were not overlooked by the participants,
as the consensus was that the curriculum became more personalized and the students were better able to engage with the material through the positive attitude of his leadership (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Day (2014) expanded the concept of inclusion and how it fed into the concept of well-being. In his argument, inclusion included any leader’s ability to actively engage with those he called stakeholders. He stated,

> The evidence from research is not only that successful leaders, especially heads, are always beacons of hope in their schools and communities, but that hope is revised, renewed and reinvigorated through the quality of interactions of teachers with a range of stakeholders. (p. 646)

Professor Pabisch had a reputation for including all of those around him. This included students, faculty, and any other person in the room. According to participants 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, this inclusion provided a quality interaction between the GSSch leadership and its stakeholders. Following the argument from Day (2014), inclusion spoke to the co-founder’s overall sense of well-being. Thus, I accepted inclusion as a valid, observable criterion for supporting the first attribute.

**Attribute 2: Knows How to Deal with Stress**

According to Steward (2014), “Leadership is stressful” (p. 54). He added, “Literature and research make a connection between well-being and managing stress” (p. 62). In his statement, Steward (2014) did not draw a definitive line between the first
attribute of a resilient leader and the second attribute of a resilient leader. Instead, he highlighted the point that how a leader deals with stress has an effect on the leader’s overall sense of well-being. Well-being, of course, is attribute 1. The intention of the statement was to show the importance of the concept of balance among the attributes, as opposed to a clear divide between them.

Multiple faculty members mentioned during their interviews that stress was just a natural part of the job. Everyone working at the GSSch dealt with workplace stress, which could stem from something as simple as not having enough copies of a handout to not having enough students enrolled in a specific course (Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020). The question was not whether or not a leader had stress, but rather a question of how the leader dealt with the stress. When inquiring about the co-founder’s ability to deal with stress, the participants were able to explain how they perceived his ability to deal with stress.

Participant 2 stated that the co-founder was able to deal with stress to such a degree that he did not believe the co-founder ever responded to it. When asked if he could think of a time when the co-founder was overwhelmed with stress, he stated, “No, never. I would say that he is cool. He is cool. He is a cool dude” (personal communication, December 30, 2019). Having known the co-founder since the mid-1980s and having attended multiple courses, multiple GSSch sessions, and observed the co-founder at numerous social events, Participant 2 added,

I have never seen or heard of where events were happening around him and he couldn’t handle it. But where he was in a classroom or even at a social event, he
has always been very much in control of his emotions. A phrase we would probably call *unflappable*. (personal communication, December 30, 2019)

Several participants felt that the co-founder simply perceived stress causing provocations differently than most people. They stated that he was interested in achieving the shared goals of the GSSch. Stress, in this sense, acted as a source of motivation and assisted the co-founder in staying focused on what needed to be done (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

As pointed out by Participant 5, “I don’t think he was overwhelmed with stress. I think he felt the burden of the *deutsche Sommer Schule* [GSSch] and its success” (personal communication, January 14, 2020). There was a difference between stress and burden. In the literature, Steward (2014) argued that “Burnout subjects had a strong need for accolades and they were willing to sacrifice their personal life for the sake of satisfying that need. They had a fragile sense of self which relied heavily on external verification (p. 55). In Steward’s argument, he was referencing administrators and/or faculty members as the *burnout subjects*. He stated that the more administrators and/or faculty member relied on external validation, the less capable that leader would be of dealing with stress. However, the burden that Participant 5 mentioned was not based on a need for external validation. It was based on the co-founder working with compassion to build something of value. He was perceived by Participant 5 to have been struggling at times with his own standards, since he truly wanted the GSSch to be a success.

According to Csikszentmihalyi (1996), *flow* is achieved when a leader is
motivated by intrinsic validation and not from external validation. He added that a leader is more likely to find creative solutions when he is in the flow state, then when he is not. I placed Csikszentmihalyi’s concept of flow in dialogue with Steward’s claim about burnout subjects. I concluded the following: 1) a burnout subject, whether the burnout was temporary, frequent, or permanent, would seek external validation, which would hinder him from entering into the flow state; 2) a burnout subject would be less likely to succeed in responding to an adverse situation than his creative counterpart would; 3) a burnout subject has less longevity than a creative administrator and/or faculty member; 4) a creative administrator and/or faculty member does not require external validation, and; 5) a creative administrator and/or faculty member is more likely to feel a sense of intrinsic motivation that his burnout subject counterpart would.

After I constructed some criteria for a burnout subject and a creative administrator and/or faculty member, I examined Participant 5’s statement within these criteria. I concluded that the co-founder was not a burnout subject, since he was not seeking external validation. His intrinsic motivation to succeed promoted flow and creativity, which increased the likelihood that he would find a solution to an adverse situation. I found evidence to these claims in the longevity of the co-founders career, his success in ensuring the longevity of the GSSch, and Participant 5’s perception of his ability to deal with stress.

Participant 7 recalled that the co-founder had told him many times that he wanted to be a diplomat. If he had not gone into education, he would have gone into politics. He insisted, “I would say he prides himself on being diplomatic. He tries to never say anything that will cut off a conversation or a way back to having cordial relations with
people” (personal communication, January 2, 2020). He maintained that the co-founder did not always get his way; however, no matter how difficult the situation was, compromises would have to be made and various concepts and ideas would have to be accepted. Despite having to make compromises, the co-founder had never formed an adversarial relationship with those around him. These acts of diplomacy were perceived by Participant 7 to be one of the secrets to the co-founder’s powers of persuasion, since the co-founder always had a way back into a conversation and would often restate his argument over multiple meeting times if necessary. It was his diplomacy in these meetings that would win over potential allies (personal communication, January 2, 2020).

The GSSch produced a variety of demands on those charged with the role of leadership. Stress, of course, became a common side effect of those demands. In all of the examples provided, giving in to stress could have complicated the situations further and would potentially have prevented the accomplishing of the overall goals. Feeling the burden of leadership, the co-founder identified opportunities to exhibit acts of diplomacy and inclusion, which was a sentiment that was reiterated numerous times during the interviews. As such, having the know-how to deal with stress was also viewed as a sign of having an overall sense of well-being (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

**Attribute 3: Possesses High Levels of Emotional Intelligence**

Maulding, et al., (2010) stated that emotional intelligence was not one single, isolated attribute that was capable of being bracketed. Emotional intelligence needed to be balanced with all of the attributes. They provided the following definition:
One view might be that emotional intelligence is a part of that large gestalt of personality characteristics that make a leader a leader. That is, emotional intelligence is a contributing or intervening variable that when examined in combination with other positive leadership characteristics enhances the overall effect. (p. 4)

Using this definition to guide the coding for the interview transcripts required a narrowing of the scope, as any positive leadership characteristics could have influenced the findings on the co-founder’s emotional intelligence. Data from the interviews were used to narrow the scope. The data showed a consensus among the interviewees. The consensus of the interviewees was that the positive leadership characteristics that spoke to the co-founder’s emotional intelligence was reflected in his character, communication skills, and ability to maintain a social circle (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

As Participant 7 declared,

I think he is very loyal. You know he has a lot of friends he has built up over the years and he keeps in touch with them. He’s not a user if I can use that term. He’s not an instrumentalizer that just uses people and then forgets about them.

(personal communication, January 2, 2020)

According to Participant 7 and the co-founder himself, the co-founder had
maintained a connection to many people he had taught over the years. He had also maintained cordial relations with several of his colleagues. Even now as an Emeritus Professor, he continues to meet with other professors and faculty that he has known for years and even decades. This was made evident during the interview with him as well, when he rushed off to meet a former co-worker for lunch. The relationships forged in the workforce grew into long-term, informal relationships outside of the workforce (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

The co-founder had also worked with students from diverse backgrounds, such as K-12 students in Austria, college age students in the US, second language learners in multiple countries, and students from varying socio-economic backgrounds. He has spoken in favor of using literacies (i.e. music, art, or story) that were not part of the standardized (i.e. German language and literature) curriculum. This showed emotional intelligence by taking the students’ background and learning preferences into account when they were learning something new. This empathy he feels towards students could have been stemming from the fact that the co-founder himself is often learning something new. Participant 6 interjected, “He lets his curiosity guide him in the things that he likes to do. Like being curious about politics or art or dialect." He did not like to remain fixed in one subject or only work with one idealized student. She continued, “He’s a person that is perpetually curious and he is always researching and doing something new. He’s got his art. He’s got his poetry. He’s got his research projects” (personal

---

10 Professor Pabisch wrote the world’s largest work on German dialect literature, consisting of six bands and over 3,300 pages. Referenced in German as: Pabisch, P. (2019). *Geschichte der deutschspraechigen Dialektliteratur seit der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts: Ein literaturhistorischer Uberblick mit Textbeispielen in 6 Büchern*. Weidler Buchverlag.
communication, January 5, 2020). During this interview, the intrinsic motivation for his actions came up. She believed that he was not motivated by external rewards (i.e. money or material possessions), but rather that he was motivated by internal rewards. This includes the feeling that a person receives after participating in something that he is passionate about as well as the feeling one gets after helping someone learn a little more about themselves. In fact, Participant 6 stated that the GSSch’s students’ ability to explore their own identities construction was the single most important aspect of the GSSch, an aspect which was insisted upon by Professor Pabisch since the first day.

The co-founder’s curiosity and his willingness to engage with students was a reoccurring theme in the interviews, but they were not the only positive leadership characteristics mentioned. Participant 3 mentioned that he would often show great enthusiasm during outdoor activities, such as his botanische Wanderung (botanical walk) that he led every summer. She provided an anecdotal response which went as follows: “He would do the botanische Wanderung, where he would take students on a little hike and he would talk about different plants.” This was an organized event, where the students quickly learned that Professor Pabisch had a passion for the outdoors. She continued,

I remember that a couple other students drove down with him this one time. And it was really scary because we were driving down a hill and he put the brakes on because he saw a really big mushroom. Because he’s an outdoorsy guy and he was really into finding plants. So it was kind of scary that he stopped the car there. But he was really excited ‘cause then he showed us this plant, when he cut it from the ground. And he was just talking about it in German just there. So he
was very enthusiastic. (Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020)

This lesson about mushrooms was just one example that illustrated the co-founder’s engagement with the students. He was sharing his interests with them, through both structured and unstructured events. According to the participants, rather than detracting from the curriculum, impromptu events, such as pulling over to examine a mushroom or performing an impromptu musical piece were common occurrences during the summer sessions, fed additional literacies into the curriculum (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

The participants used the example of building alliances to show ways to deal with stress as well as ways to show emotional intelligence. Other positive leadership characteristics mentioned included the co-founder’s enthusiasm, his passion about a topic, and sharing his passions with others; maintaining loyalties; finding intrinsic sources of motivation, and; embracing diversity. Several of these positive leadership characteristics influenced the curriculum of the GSSch. For example, being capable of promoting student autonomy through curriculum remained an important factor of the GSSch. At the GSSch, the students were not expected to be passively absorbing information but rather questioning information and linking it to their interests and their understandings (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6,
personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

From a leadership perspective, following one’s own curiosities and allowing the students to do the same served a purposeful end. They helped facilitate an optimal learning environment, in which students were imbued with academic freedom and academic support when exploring something new. Having students question information and link it to their interests and their understandings had been a constant component of the GSSch’s curriculum since the first year.

**Attribute 4: Follows a Moral Purpose**

Steward (2014) said it best, when he defined moral purpose as follows: “The highest levels of ‘making a difference’ and ‘service’ are surely the natural territory of school leaders, where ‘moral purpose’ resides” (p. 57). In his research, Steward examined faculty and administrators in a K-12 setting. He added the findings of the interviews from his research that “The interviews revealed that headteachers have a variety of responses to their role. All are driven by a commitment to make a positive difference to the lives of others, which is often described as ‘moral purpose’.” (Steward, 2014, pp. 64-65). By utilizing Steward’s theme “make a positive difference in the lives of others” I was able to code part of the interviews for my dissertation.

According to Steward (2014), if the leaders were to be motivated by external verification (i.e. money), they would be likely to burn out. However, if the leaders were motivated by intrinsic rewards (i.e. a sense of accomplishment), they would be more resilient. Just like with the other three attributes of a resilient leader, follows a moral purpose balanced the means to justify the ends. In other words, certain traits (i.e. loyalty
and inclusion) were the means. They promoted the ends (i.e. making a positive difference to the lives of others). The ends were instrumental in structuring the argument that stated that the co-founder was motivated by intrinsic rewards (i.e. a sense of accomplishment), and not by what Steward (2014) described as “external verification” (p. 55).

The findings showed that the co-founder’s aspirations to change the lives of those surrounding him empowered him to take on leadership roles. Once in those roles, he promoted inclusion as well as professional collaboration.

During the interviews, I did not ask the participants any direct questions pertaining to the moral purpose of the co-founder of the GSSCh. The information for this attribute was obtained by searching through the transcriptions from the interviews for any comment that spoke to his commitment to make a positive difference to the lives of others, which is why coding was key to the analysis. Most of the interviews contained information about his commitment to the field of education, loyalty towards his social and professional circles, continued efforts to create a sense of inclusion for those around him, and his desire to collaborate on projects that would positively impact the community. At no point were references made about him being financially driven or self-serving in any way (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Participant 2 spoke directly about the co-founder’s desire to get to know people
and to make them feel as if they belonged. He stated, “He [the co-founder] seems to
know people and seems to know what they are interested in. … That’s a powerful
characteristic - To have and to show interest in people” (personal communication,
December 30, 2019). Along with his diplomatic approach to dealing with professional
matters, his genuine interest in those around him stood out to most of the participants as
his most dominant trait. (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019;
Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal
communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14,
2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Participant 5 spoke about the intrinsic motivation for the co-founder’s desire to be
in a leadership role. She mentioned, “He made himself known and he would take on
leadership. Very hmm he would take on the whole thing and want to make it work”
(personal communication, January 14, 2020). She felt that there was a driving force
inside of him that went beyond financial incentives that pushed him into leadership roles.
He would have a vision or a concept and he wanted to see it through.

This belief that the co-founder was motivated by internal factors, situated within a
moral purpose was shared by Participant 6 and Participant 7. Participant 6 insisted that
the co-founder was fueled by his own curiosity. Participant 7 mentioned that he had
personally witnessed the co-founder establish other programs such as Camino Real and
an English immersion school in Austria. Camino Real was named after a stretch of road
that spanned from Mexico to New Mexico. This short lived program was focused on
German immigrants in the South West United States and Northern Mexico. Camino Real
was also incorporated into the GSSch for several years. The English immersion school in
Austria is titled, STARS: Student Teachers in Austria Reach Success. It is also a successful summer school co-founded by Professor Pabisch, and is currently being operated by UNM’s College of Education. This remains a sore spot for Professor Pabisch, as he was not ready to relinquish control of the program at the time it transferred over to new leadership. Although he held a limited leadership role in these programs, neither of these programs had turned out as successfully as the GSSch and neither of these programs led to any substantial, financial gain for the co-founder. All of which promoted the notion of a guiding moral purpose, since they provided examples where a lack of an intrinsic, external reward (i.e. money) for the actions were taken. What these programs represented though was the co-founder’s need to follow his interests, engage with those around him, and to build community with a sense of inclusion.

Participant 7 spoke about how the topics of the GSSch exposed him to concepts and ideas that he would otherwise not be exposed to. He stated,

They really opened up the understanding of what is out there … It’s much better to, especially if you attend the summer school to be exposed to other minds and other thinking that is going on out there in the world in general. 1979 I was there …It was before the Iranians, took over our embassy in Tehran with the Islamic Revolution in November of ’79. So I was at the summer school before we had been exposed to any of that increased thought about terrorism. And so I guess in a way people were a little bit more naive before the Tehran Crisis. It is kind of interesting again today it’s important again. We are just in this crisis [2019-2020 Persian Gulf Crisis] with Iran again. But in any case, the authors and writers and intellectuals that spoke to us opened up our view of the world and let us know
more of what’s out there. What is able to be or in terms of other thought. It was an important contribution to the summer school. (Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020)

The methods of exploring new topics introduced to the students by the GSSch facilitated learning, by making the content relevant to the students. By being exposed to the concept of terrorism for the first time, even though Participant 7 lacked a stable knowledge base for the topic, he was able to engage with the topic. In understanding the basic concept, and having only completed about two years of German courses, he was able to engage in conversations about a current event that interested him. Although not a happy topic, being exposed to what was “going on out there in the world in general” made a positive difference in the life of this participant by opening up his view of the world (Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

This quote supported the claims made by the co-founder in Chapter 2 about the importance of adding a cultural component as the third pillar to the German program at UNM. The third pillar of German Studies (i.e. culture) allowed for the exploration of current events. Not only that, the students themselves were not native speakers or near native speakers, as was often the case when German only had the two pillars (i.e. language and literature).

Additional evidence on the co-founder’s commitment to providing a positive difference in the GSSch and its students were found in the GSSch’s guest books, which served as artifacts in this research. Each guest book was a hard cover book, with standard 8.5x11 plain, white, unruled paper. On the first page of the first book were the words “DER 1. JAHRGANG Juni/Juli 1976” (The 1st cohort June/July 1976). The years
continued all the way up to the summer session of the GSSch in 1987. Following the cohort number and year were handwritten inscriptions, drawings, and signatures from the GSSch’s students and faculty. Although unpublished, the books provided an intimate glimpse into the GSSch’s communities during the first decade.

Preserved on the pages of the guest books were multiple passages with flowery language. These passages showcased the positive atmosphere that the faculty and students were exposed to. Several pages in, under the 1st cohort was an inscription from a supporter of the founding of the GSSch, A. Leslie Wilson. He dated his inscription as Saturday the 26th of June, 1976. He wrote, “Ich fühle, ein großes Abenteuer ist unterwegs, unter blauem Himmel, Sternenächten, und mit Heiterkeit und Fleiß auf allen Seiten” (I feel, a great adventure has begun, under the blue sky, starlit night, and with cheerfulness and diligence on all sides.). Followed up by Shere Lonnan “A truly lovely place to be on such a special day!” (personal communication, July 4, 1976). And UNM’s Dean of Library Series Paul Vanallo, “We thank you very much for your friendship” (personal communication, 1976).

The quote from Participant 7 as well as the passages from the guest books strongly promoted the idea that the GSSch was making a positive difference to the lives of others. The inference that I made was that these guest books contributed to the research by reflecting how the co-founder’s actions were perceived by faculty and students at the GSSch. His actions were perceived as honorable in nature, with the intention of successfully creating a learning community that would make a positive difference to those involved.

The Co-founder as an Example of a Resilient Educational Leader (conclusion)
Both the lenses of academic resilience and phenomenology helped structure how I interpreted the data from the interviews. The issue I investigated in this part of the dissertation centered around finding an authentic example of a resilient educational leader. I placed the individual qualities of a resilient educational leader together, in order to have criteria for a comparison. I found that a resilient educational leader displayed the following qualities:

1) They have the proper preparation (i.e. training and/or experience dealing with adverse situations) to be resilient;

2) They know how to lead during times plagued with one or more potentially harmful provocations, while maintaining a positive attitude, moral bearings, and overall well-being;

3) They are team players, taking into consideration all of the stakeholders and the institutions that they represent;

4) They plan for, anticipate, and respond to adverse situations;

5) They maintain their attitudes, beliefs, and community ties, while delivering results over a long period of time.

Following this line of thought, I stated that if the co-founder possessed these qualities, then he would in fact be an authentic example of a resilient educational leader. To ensure that the data would be valid, I determined that the interview questions should elicit responses that spoke to moments in which the co-founder was in an authentic, academic environment. The focus area of course being the GSSch and/or academic settings in which activities taking place pertained to the topic of German, German Studies, and/or the GSSch (i.e. a faculty meeting on the main UNM campus about the
I concluded that the data supported the idea that the co-founder is an authentic example of a resilient educational leader, since he has been identified by the participants as possessing the four attributes of a resilient leader, as defined by the literature. He has also shown all five required traits of a resilient leader, as outlined in the framework for this research. Data taken from the artifacts (i.e. GSSch booklets and guest books) supported these findings. Finally, member checking confirmed that the participants had in fact meant what they were paraphrased as saying.

**Displays of Resilience by an Academic Institution**

Just as in the previous example of a resilient academic leader, none of the scholarship on resilience of academic institutions that I studied for this dissertation provided me with an authentic example of a resilient academic institution. I was able to identify a specific list of attributes pertaining to academic resilience. I used this list of attributes to construct criteria for identifying an authentic example of a resilient academic institution.

In this section, I examined the GSSch by performing a compare and contrast between the available data and the aforementioned criteria for identifying an example of a resilient academic institution. By using this criteria as a framework, I argued that the GSSch would be an example of a resilient academic institution, if

1) the administration had enough agency, access to resources, and ability as educational leaders to ensure the longevity of the School;

2) the administration knowingly and intentionally adapted to potentially harmful provocations in the physical, social, and educational environments;
3) the GSSch grew stronger as an institution, after having been placed under a potentially harmful provocation.

I began by inquiring about how the GSSch was originally structured, as well as what its original mission was. During this round of coding, I identified several key terms that were mentioned in the interviews. These terms included: the basic schedule, breaks, Grundkurs, and curriculum. Although I primarily focused on the actions of the GSSch administration and/or faculty, I incorporated information from former GSSch students in order to provide both the faculties’ and the students’ perspectives on the effectiveness of the changes.

The GSSch’s Mission and Basic Structure

According to all of the recruitment materials (i.e. GSSch booklets between 1976-2019), multiple faculty members (i.e. Participants 6, 7, and 8), as well as the co-founder himself, the GSSch had not changed its mission or its basic structure in 45 years. The GSSch’s basic structure consists of two, back-to-back two-week sessions. For those students attending both sessions, undergraduate students could register for up to seven credits and graduate students could register for up to six credits. For both undergraduate and graduate students only attending one session, they could register for up to three credits. Individual courses were usually 1-2 credits per two-week session. Some courses were cross listed as undergraduate and graduate level courses, since the courses were set to specific language proficiency levels. Along with the traditional course work, a series of workshops were offered, such as the newspaper and choir. All students were required to register in a Sprachkurs (language course) as well as the Grundkurs. There was also the option to take a Goethe-Institute language exam in order to receive a B1, B2, C1, or C2
At the core of the curriculum, the founders placed the *Grundkurs*, which was a lecture series based on a broad theme. According to Pabisch (2002), they incorporated the *Grundkurs* into the GSSch in a specific fashion. He continued, “This [Grundkurs] is the central teaching unit that also functions as a transition to the seminar part of the whole summer school session” (p. 35). All of the students and faculty assembled during the Grundkurs and this was the only time when the faculty implemented a lecture style class. During the *Sprachkursen*, students wrote about the specific lectures. Then, in the smaller classes, which were divided by the students’ language proficiency, the students conversed with one another in the target language. They spoke about either the specific lecture or the broader theme of the lecture, which allowed for the students to explore the topics on a deeper level. During the *Sprachkursen*, the lower level students attended a breakout session, in which the lecture was described slower and in simpler terms. The faculty asked the higher level students not to explain the lecture, but rather to explore the topic of the lecture. The faculty encouraged the students to link the topic of the lecture to their own personal interests or any area that they were curious about (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Along with the courses and workshops, the GSSch offered *Sonderprogramme*.
(extra-curricular activities). *Sonderprogramme* were optional and did not count towards college credit. Some of the activities mentioned in the GSSch’s booklets over the years have included the following:

- *Abendvorträge und –gespräche* – Evening lectures and conversations;
- *Wandern in die Bergwelt von Taos Ski Valley* – Hiking in the mountains;
- *Botanische Wanderung* – Botanical hike;
- *Filmabende* – Movie night;
- *Volleyballturiere* – Volleyball tournament;
- *Besuch der Santa Fe Opera* – A trip to the Santa Fe Opera.

According to the co-founder, the original meeting times for Sonderprogramme had not changed, neither had the course meeting times. They have always scheduled courses on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. They have not scheduled any courses on Wednesdays or Sundays; however, many of the organized excursions and activities were scheduled on Wednesdays. They purposely left Sundays unstructured with no courses, organized excursions, or activities being offered (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

Several of the participants speculated to why the GSSch schedule was set-up with split days off. Participant 2 felt that recreation was an important part of the learning process. He announced, “You’ve got to have recreation in order to keep the creative process really going. Somebody recognized that” (personal communication, December 30, 2019). For him, the breaks were spaced out just right. The students had two days of class, a break, three days of class, and another break. This allowed the students to remain creative and engaged. Participant 3 hypothesized that this scheduling structure worked in
conjunction with the isolated location. Both of these factors forced the students to interact with each, since they had no other group to interact with. She stated, “I think it is good to have it in such a remote place because then there’s a reason why everyone has to live together.” She pointed out that the location was not near anyone’s home thus, they could not save money by staying at their own places. As for the split days off, she continued, “we get our free days on Wednesday and Sunday, because they don’t want people driving home for the weekend” (personal communication, January 7, 2020). The consensus among all of the participants was that it was the combination of both the location and the split days off that promoted community building and prevented students from having enough time to leave the Taos Ski Valley.

The longer breaks between courses and activities were also referenced as a time for quiet reflection on the topics discussed in the Grundkurs. The Grundkurs remains as one of the unique features of the curriculum found at the GSSch, in that it includes an assembly of all the students for a lecture based on the current theme selected for that specific summer (i.e. the concept of Heimat). (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020); Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020). Pabisch (2002) argued,

Throughout the years, the teaching method of the Grundkurs has always been very difficult and met with mixed feelings. The basic concept of the Grundkurs is
the following: If an American college student is planning to attend a German university for one or two semesters, he or she has to learn how to struggle through and still manage their classes. No professor will be able to show consideration for the problems the student might initially have with German. The Grundkurs anticipates this language and culture shock. (p. 36)

Part of the way that the GSSch incorporated consideration for potential student problems was by allowing the students to make connections between the lecture topic and something personally relevant to them. The consensus remained that the faculty were always likely to be sympathetic towards the students and understand the specific obstacles that the students faced. This ranged from obstacles stemming from their language levels to obstacles stemming from social interactions and new living arrangements. This meant that the GSSch provided students with more opportunities than just learning grammar. It provided students with a chance to hone their soft skills as well (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

According to Participant 5, regardless of what the theme was, the leadership always tried to incorporate current events into the lecture series. This was an explicit component found within their pedagogy. She recalled,

Never know quite what you are going to get into. Whether it is concentration camps in World War II or you would have a visiting professor that was German. Mount Saint Helens had just exploded [1980] and they grabbed this professor [Dr.
Wolfgang Elston] and he came over to Taos Ski Valley and taught a seminar. (personal communication, January 14, 2020)

Dr. Elston taught multiple times at the GSSch and he made inscriptions in the guest books. During the summer session of 1987, he drew a picture of a volcano erupting. Next to the erupting volcano, he wrote, “Mount St. Helens 18.5.80.” Participant 7 recalled a lecture by the geologist Dr. Elston as well. He provided an anecdote that went as follows:

I remember very vividly, for example, a lecture by a geologist. And you would think, What does a geologist have to tell us about German? This was very entertaining. The lecture was called, die Basalte die Goethe nicht kannte. The basalts that Goethe didn’t know anything about. And he pointed to the mountains over here and said Goethe didn’t know anything about Sandia Crest. He said all of this in German of course. And he [Goethe] wrote a poem called America, where he said the only thing that is regrettable about America, which is a wonderful country is that it doesn’t have any basalts. Well he was wrong. So there you are. If you are interested in physical science or geology or whatever, you would get a bit of the vocabulary in German on geology and science and have a laugh about Goethe being wrong too. (personal communication, January 2, 2020)

In his interview, Participant 7 referenced a poem from Goethe. The poem is called, America, du hast es besser or America, you have it better. Loosely translated, Goethe wrote “you have no decaying castles and no basalt”. Participant 7’s anecdote highlighted one example of how a field of study can be integrated into German Studies.
Mountains into his presentation. A traditional German program, with only language and literature, would not have allowed for geology or the Sandia Mountains.

The founders of the GSSch chose to shift German (language and literature) to German Studies (language, literature, and culture). This promoted a conscious choice by the faculty of the GSSch to encourage students to make connections between the GSSch themes for that year and their own interests and/or current events. These connections ensured, by design, that the classroom content would always be relevant to the students. The founders wanted the topics discussed in the Grundkurs to introduce the students to new ideas and to new ways of thinking, without replacing or devaluing the students’ pre-existing ideas and ways of thinking. As expressed by Participant 4, “The authors and writers and intellectuals that spoke to us opened up our view of the world and let us know more of what’s out there. What is able to be or in terms of other thought” (personal communication, January 8, 2020). Making connections across content areas diverted from other methods of teaching, such as those found in a language lab, since it was not a matter of memorization of phrases or of translating from English to German. Making connections across content areas facilitated conversations between students, by providing the students with opportunities to practice German, while exploring new concepts. This is sometimes referred to as content-based instruction, or a method in which the students learn the vocabulary and sentence structures by engaging in an authentic learning environment. The grammar is not explicitly taught.

As the statements strongly implied, the faculty at the GSSch left the students to interpret the intersections of what they already knew and what they had just learned. In the process of trying to make sense of it all, students still had to follow the nur Deutsch
(German only) rule. This combination of both a new language and a new way of perceiving the world, required that the overarching themes remained the same for the entire summer program, and that the coursework incorporated the theme into the individual lessons. In an effort to incorporate such deep reaching themes into an ongoing dialogue as well as graded coursework, the founders of the GSSch felt that the curriculum and the breaks had to complement each other (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Day (2014) claimed that an educational institution required trust and reciprocity from the leadership to be considered resilient. He stated, in other words, trust and trustworthiness are in a reciprocal relationship… Trust is an individual, relational and organisational concept, and its presence and repeated enactment are as vital to successful school improvement as any expression of values, attributes and the decisions that heads may make (p. 645).

The co-founder, Professor Pabisch was the person charged with designing the original schedule, which is now being used for the 45th year in a row. For this section, I enquired about the organizational concepts utilized at the GSSch. The co-founder responded directly to the thought process behind the schedule as well as its importance. His response included an explanation for the longer breaks between the Grundkurs and the Sprachkursen, as well as activities and workshops. He reported, That is a very good question, because in your dissertation you have to write the truth and not just an ideal dreamt or dreamed of. The original mission has also
been drawn out in or designed in this pedagogical architecture is to have a certain let’s say frame, into which you can frame. That stays the same every year. But it is built in such a way that you can exchange things every year, as long as the frame is the same. And that has made it strong. And its frame has been, as you know, five days of classroom teaching. Wednesday and Sunday as free days that have a certain looser program - mostly hikes, excursions or homework. A certain number of hours, specified by the university by the way … we stress or underline very much longer breaks, particularly between the language classes and the Grundkurs, the Grundkurs and the afternoon classes. There are always hours or more than an hour breaks so that they can rest and have an alternative to the strict school situation. And it has only changed occasionally when we had to use another hotel because our hotel was either sold and we lost it or the other hotel was remodeled and we had to seek other quarters. But that was only short term.

So really, I can say that as the co-founder with the authority - Nothing changed in 45 years! (personal communication, December 26, 2019)

Although I found the longevity of the GSSch’s pedagogical architecture to be extremely impressive, longevity in itself was not enough for the title of resilience. In this regard, I needed to examine issues responsible for prompting change as well. I identified three specific issues as being responsible for prompting changes at the GSSch. These included

1) The changing of the Guard;

2) Germany’s radically changing political climate in the 1990s, and;

3) The GSSch’s fluctuating financial situation. .
Parts of these issues are self-evident. For example, the Berlin Wall was opened, which also signified the end of the Cold War (1946-1989). Officially, East and West Germany were reunited with the signing of the Two Plus Four Agreement in 1990, which went into effect in 1991. I assumed that Germany’s radically changing political climate in the 1990s was stemming from the end of the Cold War and the reunification of East and West Germany. For that reason, I did not address specific events from this time frame by name. During the interviews, I sought to elicit information from the participants about how the GSSch was impacted by correlational events (i.e. change in social or political climate, funding, trends in student enrollment, etc.) during this time frame. I did not seek information for the purpose of showing causation. For example, the GSSch received less money from the German government after the fall of the Berlin Wall. I mentioned these two events (i.e. receiving government funding and the fall of the Berlin Wall) as being correlational events. I mentioned both to show the historical context, and not to show cause and effect.

There were three primary goals of these interviews.

1) To better understand how the potentially harmful provocations were interpreted by the GSSch administration and/or faculty;

2) To better understand how the potentially harmful provocations were addressed by the GSSch administration and/or faculty; and;

3) To examine, with the benefit of hindsight, the effectiveness of how those potentially harmful provocations were handled.

Changing of the Guard

The *changing of the Guard* was more of a progression over time and had neither a
definitive beginning nor a definitive ending. In this research, I am using the changing of the Guard to signify the loss of several people responsible for the founding of the GSSch. Two of these people maintained ties to the GSSch up until their deaths (i.e. Ernie Blake and Dr. George Peters). They found ways to serve their community by linking their passions to their agency. Their involvement in the GSSch correlated to their passions. Along with the people, some of the most basic, key components of the GSSch’s original make-up (i.e. Thunderbird Lodge) played an intricate part in both the launching of and the initial momentum of the GSSch. Many of the original resources utilized by the GSSch remained a constant for as long as the individuals responsible for providing the resources were capable of providing them. In this research, there were four key people labeled as the old Guard of the GSSch. They were

1) Ernie Blake;
2) Elizabeth Brownell;
3) Professor George Peters, and;
4) Professor Peter Pabisch.

I did not mean to imply that this was an exhaustive list nor did I mean to imply that the people mentioned in this list worked alone. Professor George Peters had a lot of support from his father. Ernie Blake worked with his wife, Rhoda. Along with Ernie Blake, A. Leslie Willson was credited by the GSSch booklets as being a key supporter of the founding of the GSSch. Elizabeth Brownell had the support of her husband, Tom, and a German speaking staff. Finally, Professor Pabisch praised his wife, Patricia for her support in all of his professional endeavors. I selected these four individuals to represent the old Guard, since the literature and the participants referenced them the most.
Ernie Blake and Professor Peters have since passed away. Elizabeth Brownell and her husband owned the Thunderbird Lodge, which housed the GSSch for the first three decades. She is the only other surviving member of the old Guard. According to the Albuquerque Journal, the Thunderbird Lodge was sold in 2005 and torn down on October 12, 2007 (February, 2014). Elizabeth Brownell is no longer directly associated with the GSSch, but she has often participated in Frühschoppen, which is a formal brunch hosted by the GSSch at the beginning of the second, two-week summer session. Professor Pabisch, now age 82, remains as the last of the original Guard. Although he still maintains an active role in the GSSch, by giving lectures during the Grundkurs and leading the botanische Wanderung, he is no longer charged with the position of GSSch director.

It stands to reason that for the sake of continuity, the old Guard had to find new members to share the idea of the GSSch and its mission, as well as find suitable replacements for lost resources. Given the fact that the GSSch has already scheduled summer sessions for this coming summer (2020), which will commemorate the GSSch’s 45th consecutive year, I concluded that the old Guard was successful in its final task. Thus, I did not inquire about if the GSSch continued, but rather I inquired about how it continued. The research revealed information in two separate themes, which will be explored in this section. The themes were

1) How the GSSch adapted to the changing of the Guard, and;

2) The perceived effects of those adaptations.

In this section, I assembled Ernie Blake’s biography based on newspaper articles and personal communications, since I was not able to find any academic sources
referencing his biography. I began with an article in the Jewish Telegraphic Agency (JTA). According to the JTA, Ernie Blake (1913-1989), along with his wife Rhoda were credited as the founders of the Taos Ski Valley. Blake was born in Germany and given the name, Ernst Hermann Bloch. He immigrated to the US in 1938, served in WWII as part of military intelligence, and later changed his name to Ernie Blake (Heilman, December 2011).

Although no credible source could be found to confirm why he changed his name, it was rumored that Ernie Blake was his military code name, which also sounded less German and more American than his birth name. Given the German stigmata following WWII, and the fact that the military made up a large part of his personal identity, the German Ernst Hermann Bloch reinvented himself as the American Ernie Blake (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Despite the fact that he emigrated and changed his name, Ernie Blake promoted the German language and culture. By the early 1970s, he was looking for a way to combine his resources, such as the Taos Ski Valley, with his passion, German language and culture. As fate would have it, his daughter was a student at UNM at the time and she was taking a German conversation course with Professor Pabisch. Blake asked his daughter to extend an invitation to Professor Pabisch to visit the Taos Ski Valley and discuss ideas for possible future collaborations (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

Professor Pabisch recalled accepting the invitation. He drove up to Taos Ski Valley with his own daughter, then 13 years-old, and had what he remembered as being a
wonderful and productive meeting. He continued,

We clicked immediately. And he [Blake] said, “You know, during the summer that ski valley is empty. We do have a very, still have a distinguished Taos School of Music. But I would also like to have something more or less in speaking.” And to make a long story short, this is how it started. ’73, that first meeting, at ’75 the definite decision to start the school, which had its first session in ’76. And Ernie, Ernest Blake gave us his entire facility at first for free. We had a lecture hall, we had several classes, and of course we had one hotel [the Thunderbird Lodge] … There we were for the first 30 years. And the idea of this total immersion to be run there was just to be realized in the most wonderful way.

(personal communication, December 26, 2019)

Unfortunately, Ernie Blake was not able to pass the baton very well. Several participants mentioned that he had stacks of papers and personal memoirs from his WWII service days, when he allegedly interrogated Hermann Göring and Albert Speer. He felt that these papers held historical importance, since Hermann Wilhelm Göring (1893-1946) was a leader of the Nazi party. Among other things, Göring was responsible for the founding of the Gestapo, leading the Luftwaffe (German Air Force), and later held the rank of Reichsmarschall, which is similar to the US Commander and Chief. Albert Speer (1905-1981) held the rank of Minister of Armaments and War Production during the Nazi era. He leveraged his training as an architecture and position as a building inspector to relocate large portions of the German population. Since both Göring and Speer were well-known Nazi war criminals, Blake would often inquire about possible research opportunities with UNM. He would ask if any professors in the German or History
Departments were interested in him or his documents. Despite his repeated attempts to participate in research, no professor or researcher ever replied to him (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Several participants described Ernie Blake as being very passionate about the GSSch’s mission and stated that he personally felt the burden of making it a success. He invited members of the UNM community to visit him in Taos Ski Valley, provided resources and financial support to the GSSch, and even passed out free ski passes to GSSch students in order to get them to return in the winter (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

I noted that Blake not only provided the GSSch with financial support, he also volunteered as a guest lecturer and participated in extra-curricular activities, such as the nightly news. By volunteering, Blake was able to provide the GSSch with one additional faculty member at no additional cost (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Unfortunately, much like was the case with his WWII archives, he was unsuccessful in fueling a passion for the GSSch in those around him. Following his passing in 1989, the generosity and support bestowed upon the GSSch were lost.

One of the resources that the GSSch utilized in Taos Ski Valley was the Brownell’s Thunderbird Lodge. The Thunderbird Lodge was described by participants as
being rustic and old-fashioned, yet equipped to function as an old-fashioned school
(Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 4, personal
communication, January 8, 2020; Mickey 5 (Participant 5, personal communication,
January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7,
personal communication, January 2, 2020).

Participant 5 spoke fondly of her five summers at the Thunderbird Lodge. She
recalled, “Oh we were all in the Thunderbird Lodge and it was very rustic … We weren’t
in some modern place. There was one modern thing where we had seminars” (personal
communication, January 14, 2020). She went on to explain how the design of the lodge
supported the mission of the GSSch. She felt that the close quarters promoted student
interactions.

Along with the sense of community, she felt that the building’s rustic design made
the German immersion seem more authentic. She continued, “You know, it was very
German. You felt like you weren’t in the United States. And that’s a big positive. You’re
away and just devoted 100% to the experience” (personal communication, January 14,
2020). Her example highlighted the way that the students found the educational value in
both being isolated and in being stripped down to just the most basic essentials.

Participant 7 echoed the sentiments of Participant 5. He spoke in favor of the
isolation and in favor of being stripped of any outside distractions. He stated,

I don’t recall any distractions in the room. I recall just that we had our books and
our desks. You know, a place to study if we needed to … But I don’t recall any
distractions like TV or radio or things like that. That was in the days before PCs
so there weren’t any PCs around. And no telephones either. (personal
He spoke in favor of being stripped down to just the basics, as it allowed the lodge to play off the unique pedagogy, which in this immersion environment was a bit unconventional. More specifically, the Thunderbird Lodge provided a safe space that the students could retreat into, freely explore Grundkurs topics in, fumble around with the grammar, and yet still feel some degree of control over their environment. In other words, when the students were isolated with only the basics, they were not exposed to the same social pressures and day-to-day struggles that they were exposed to on the main campus. The removal of the social pressures and the day-to-day struggles promoted student engagement in the GSSch (Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

After three decades of collaboration with the GSSch, Elizabeth Brownell sold the Thunderbird Lodge in 2005 and went into retirement. Although Elizabeth and Tom Brownell could not be replaced, the GSSch could find new hotels. Taos Ski Valley had many hotels to offer. This is a comprehensive list of the current hotels in the Taos Ski Valley, as published by Taos Ski Valley Chamber: Snakedance Condominiums, Powerderhorn #101, Longhorn Chalet, Cinco Hermanas, Winter’s Hope Condo & Guesthouse, Edelweiss Lodge & Spa, Twining Condominium, Sierra del Sol Condominiums, Condo Belmonte, Alpenglow Chalet, The Austing Haus Bed & Breakfast, Hotel St. Bernard, Rio Hondo Condos, TurnKey Vacation Rentals Santa Fe & Taos, Premiere Properties Vacation Rentals & Property Management, LLC, Adventure Taos Reservations, Alpine Village Suites, St. Bernard Condominiums, Brownell Chalet,
Participant 2 attended the GSSch multiple times in the past few years, and had stayed in several of the above mentioned hotels. In his interview, he stated that the living quarters were not that important to him. What was important to him was having a good roommate. He explained that one summer he had a quiet roommate with a passion for online gaming. They hardly ever spoke to one another. In other summer sessions, he had very talkative roommates and they adhered to the German only policy. When asked to describe the general set-up of the students’ quarters over the past few summers, he replied,

I think somewhat they’re set-up so people will meet people and make friends. I am sure some of it is designed to be a quality environment, to give them privacy to give them study area … They try and accommodate people rather well. If you want a kitchenette, they’ll give you one. (personal communication, December 30, 2019)

Participant 2 did complain about one year when the classroom was at the top of the mountain and the hotels were at the bottom. He recalled, “Like the year we were at the ski lodge [2016], which you know for the coordinators was obnoxious because everything had to be driven up there. And once you’re there, you didn’t want to stay there for the day.” This was followed by a year when several hotels were being remodeled and the GSSch was set-up in a tent. He continued,

On the main part of the campus … you have the various condominiums in there
and there was a tent. We were in the tent. And this last time we had moved to a meeting room … a restaurant and bar that has a dining area, a meeting room. And we were in that meeting room. And so you know they tried to make the environment as comfortable as possible. And also controllable. (personal communication, December 30, 2019)

Despite the *makeshift classrooms, obnoxious logistics, and constant changing of locations*, the GSSch was always able to find some sort of lodging for the students and a space for the classrooms. However, the fact that a location was found did not necessarily mean that it was a suitable location. When discussing the Thunderbird Lodge, several former faculty members spoke out about how losing an authentic, German feeling building affected the GSSch. Participant 6 replied,

> Of course the owners of the Thunderbird Lodge spoke German and the cook spoke German and there was German food and um so a lot of that aspect of like creating an actual little German community. I think that has changed just because of the way that the valley has changed. But I don’t think that has changed the mission of what we are trying to do. It’s just the practical aspects of what happens. (personal communication, January 5, 2020)

Her statement added to the debate about whether or not the GSSch was capable of growing stronger after responding to potentially harmful provocations, such as the closing of the Thunderbird Lodge. She felt that the loss of the Thunderbird Lodge did not constitute as a harmful provocation, unless it somehow threatened the GSSch’s original mission. Students could relocate to different part of Taos Ski Valley, as long as the GSSch held firm to its original mission. In this aspect, the leadership of the GSSch had to
identify key features of the curriculum that promoted the original mission (i.e. the framework, *Grundkurs*, immersion, etc.) and ensure that they were transferred into the new location.

The sentiments of Participant 6 were not shared by the former students. They insisted that along with having a good roommate, the most important thing was the physical proximity of the classrooms to the hotel rooms. Too many creature comforts disrupted the sense of community, as did the dispersal of students into different hotels. Makeshift accommodations, such as the tent were not considered to be conducive to learning, as it was too noisy inside and did not provide an authentic, German feel. There was also a loss of the sense of a single community that had been found within the Thunderbird Lodge. This single community had been replaced with high school like cliques and communities, with an emphasis on the plural *communities*, within the more recent lodging and classroom combinations (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

In the early years of the GSSch, Professor Pabisch and Professor Peters would alternate years as director of the GSSch. The two co-founders shared a similar vision of what the GSSch should be and spent an entire year planning the very first summer session together. Only after they were both satisfied that the GSSch was going smoothly, and they were convinced that the other one would hold true to their original vision, did they agree to alternate years (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019).

After interviewing all of the participants, I concluded that one of the proving
grounds for any administrator of the GSSch was their ability to secure funding for the summer sessions. I felt that students were not likely to pay the full cost of the GSSch through tuition and there was never a guarantee that a financial donor would continue their support from one year to the next. This meant that regardless of how well the curriculum was set-up, no matter how amazing the lecturers scheduled to speak were, no matter how nice the accommodations were, if there was no outside financial support, there would not be a GSSch (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

According to Participant 7, the old Guard used diplomacy, humor, and persistence to secure the financial support needed to get the GSSch up and running. He stated,

They really invested a great deal of time and effort in getting this thing going. They had to overcome a lot of skepticism and they had to really put their hearts and souls into it … You can imagine that it took a lot of persuasion for example to get the University of New Mexico, which was never rolling in money to say that we want you to subsidize a summer school that isn’t even here on campus, but up here in Lala Land. And you could imagine these bureaucrats, these university bureaucrats saying, “What’s the point of that? You have got to convince us.” So, they were very persistent and very persuasive. (personal communication, January 2, 2020)
More specific to the co-founder, Professor Peters, Participant 7 claimed, “Peters also had a great deal of charm. I don’t think he was quite as stubborn as Peter Pabisch. But he was charming and he could talk people into things. So, they were quite a team” (personal communication, January 2, 2020). Participant 7 did not use the word, stubborn in the same way as I did earlier. He used stubborn to mean motivated or driven. This team of administrators, collectively imbued with diplomacy and charm, humor and persistence, and strong egos leveraged their combined strengths to persuade financial donors to support the GSSch.

In 1989, Blake passed away and the Berlin Wall was opened. Each of these correlational events presented themselves to the GSSch as a potentially harmful provocation. With the opening of the Berlin Wall, the German speaking agencies that had helped financially support the GSSch began investing elsewhere. As Participant 7 pointed out, “The Goethe Institutes and the German government shifted their emphasis a little bit after the fall of the Wall. They invested heavily in Eastern Europe and even Asia” (personal communication, January 2, 2020). Although beneficial to the goals of the German government, the redistribution of funds to other countries held an adverse effect on the GSSch. The funding provided to the GSSch was reduced by more than 50% in just one year (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).

The two co-founders teamed up and found solutions to their financial dilemma. Not to mention, they were able to incorporate the current harmful provocations into the GSSch curriculum. Over the next few summer session, Grundkurs themes were focused on the fall of the Berlin Wall, the reunification of East and West Germany, and the
European Union. The GSSch remained at the Thunderbird Lodge in Taos Ski Valley, where the faculty paid homage to their good friend and long-time supporter, Ernie Blake. In the end, the passing of a key figure added a personal, local element to the learning community and Germany’s radically changing political climate was fueling new discussions and introducing new, relevant topics into the Grundkurs lectures. They were also able to secure funding from other sources, which included a $1,000 scholarship paid for by Professor Pabisch. Under the guidance of Professor Pabisch and Professor Peters, the GSSch had survived a series of potentially harmful provocations and came out stronger than before.

The two co-founders and first defenders of the GSSch’s mission could not operate the summer school forever. Professor Peters passed away and Professor Pabisch became emeritus. The old Guard had to pass the baton to the new Guard, and trust that the new Guard would adhere to the original mission. As was stated by Participant 6 and echoed by Participants 5, 7, and 8, the original mission, to build a safe, learning community in a remote location for the purpose of promoting German Studies through an immersive environment, had to be maintained, if the GSSch were going to continue. The question was: Would the new Guard rise to the challenge?

Although a good question, this final question was reserved for future research. The reason for this being that only the resilience of the GSSch between its founding and its first three decades of operation were examined in this research. The current administration and the current potentially harmful provocations on the GSSch were mentioned for the purpose of comparing and contrasting the two time frames.

**Participant’s Perceptions of Quality and Equity in a Total Immersion Environment**
According to Day (2014), educational leader’s ability to maintain a relevant educational institution could be found by examining the educational leader’s judgement. She argued,

International research has shown repeatedly that successful principals share core ethical and moral purposes and have a range of qualities, strategies and competences; and that the ways in which they apply these relate to their context sensitive judgements about social and policy contexts in which they work. (Day, 2014, p. 647)

When the founders designed the original GSSch curriculum, they wanted to ensure that the course material was relevant to the current social and political contexts that the students were exposed to (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020). This guided me into my next step, which was to formulate a way of gaining the participants’ perspectives on specific terms that could speak to the success of the GSSch leadership’s efforts, as well as the GSSch’s ethical and moral purposes. To foster the connection between the leader’s attempts and the participants’ perceptions, participants were encouraged to operationalize or formulate working definitions for specific terms.

I deemed it important to have the participants define the terms, quality, equity, relevance, diversity, environment, and physical location, as these terms provided scaffolding for understanding how the participants perceived the GSSch. The consensus from the faculty was that quality and equity were found at the intersections of relevance,
diversity, and environment. They felt that student outcomes signified whether or not an academic institute had provided a quality education. If any of these three key components (i.e. relevance, diversity, or environment) were missing, student outcomes would be less than desirable (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

**Attribute 1: Faculty Defined Relevance**

The interviews uncovered the logic that governed the faculty’s popular opinion of what *relevance* is. Relevance is based on the students being able to make a direct connection between the overarching topic and something either current (i.e. an article in a local newspaper) or of personal interest to them (i.e. the role family plays in a refugee camp) (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

According to Participant 6, individuality played an important role in making a topic relevant. She cited the following as being the most important aspect of the GSSch:

> When your primary language is gone and you have to use a different language, and when your cultural milieu is gone, when you’re operating in a different community, you learn more about who you are. Apart from who everybody else is … Who are you apart from your language and apart from your culture and apart from your family and apart from your friends? And who are you when all the persons are gone? And I think that the summer school is a good opportunity to let students explore that and figure out themselves in a different setting. (Participant
She explained that this path to self-discovery begins by stripping an environment down to the basics. Then, strip the individual down to the basics. Finally, introduce a topic. What happens next is that the student, now stripped down to his core being, wrestles with the topic in a way that not only helps the student explore the world around him, but also helps the student explore his own personal identity.

Once stripped down to the basics, faculty insisted that activities outside of the classroom made the pedagogy relevant and facilitated authentic conversations. The students were faced with recreation in a non-judgmental environment through extra-curricular activities (i.e. hiking and playing volley ball), which led students into new avenues for language use. The engagement in the activities motivated the students to engage with the language in ways that they may not have in a classroom. Most of the activities mentioned in the interviews were action oriented, such as hiking and playing volley ball. The activities themselves produced a low stress environment, in which the students were relaxed and simply used the language.

**Attribute 2: Faculty Defined Diversity**

*Diversity* referred to the expansion of subject areas that German Studies allowed for. Prior to the shift to German Studies, German programs at universities focused primarily on language and literature. Under the field of German Studies, any subject area could be introduced, such as engineering, philosophy, politics, etc. (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28,
Participant 7 explained that diversity does not mean that the people involved are of different racial backgrounds, but rather that the people involved are from different parts of the world and have had different life experiences. He clarified,

The students had a diverse type of exposure to instruction. And the faculty recruited to come and teach there were also very diverse. And I don’t mean you know racially and all that sort of thing … I mean, they came from different disciplines and they had grown up in different parts of the world. They had different perspectives to bring. And one of the important ah points of the German summer school the UNM one is insistence from the beginning that it be interdisciplinary. (personal communication, January 2, 2020)

As Participant 7 pointing out, diversity is not related to race. Diversity in German Studies meant that there was a greater focus area for academic study. German Studies had broken free of a way of thinking that focused on a narrow body of knowledge (i.e. language and literature), which was taught by a fairly specific group (i.e. native German speakers educated in a German speaking nation). With German Studies, anybody with academic knowledge was considered to be capable of engaging in a multiplicity of students’ personal and academic interests. The diversity found within the GSSch had served to facilitate new conversations in every summer session (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020).
communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

**Attribute 3: Faculty Defined Environment**

The faculty did not use the term, *environment* to mean a physical space, but rather they embraced the notion of a safe space. They promoted the use of personal attitudes and focused a lot on the amount of agency that the students had in drafting their own educational goals. The GSSch faculty emphasized curiosity and exploration and deemphasized precision and memorization. In this regard, the environment was more of a state of mind that employed the students’ interests. The students were also imbued with the luxury to make mistakes and look silly in a consequence free environment (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

This safe space afforded to the students reinforced the principle of inclusion at the GSSch by harnessing the knowledge and intuition that each student brought and by challenging the students to trust their intuitions and explore further. The faculty provided the support the students needed to explore new topics and to connect new information with prior knowledge. A claim which was supported by student interviews as well (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal
According to Participant 6, environment can either foster or inhibit learning. She argued that a strict environment might only foster memorization or what she called, a party trick. She continued,

A lot of, especially Americans don’t really know what it means to know a second language. They know what it is to be able to ask for food … and they think that if they can order a glass of water or they can order a beer, then they’re speaking the language. That’s just what I would term a party trick. It is just something that you could say if they asked you to say something. But it is not really speaking.

(personal communication, January 5, 2020)

Just as the faculty was not interested in teaching a party trick, the students held no interest in learning a party trick. The students wanted a quality education in an equitable environment. The consensus from the students was that quality and equity were found at the intersections of relevance, physical location, and the learning community. They felt that the administration and faculty of an educational institution were the ones most responsible for ensuring that those key components were present, promoted, and protected at all times. If any of those three key components were missing, student outcomes would be less than desirable (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020).

**Attribute 4: Student Defined Relevance**

The interviews uncovered the logic that governs the students’ opinion of what relevance is. Relevance is based on the personal nature of the curriculum. According to
all of the former students interviewed, the personal nature of the curriculum inadvertently prevented competition among the students. Despite the fact that they were of varying language levels, no one was trying to show off or prove that they were better than the others. There was a sense of humor found within the community and the students were not afraid to make mistakes or to laugh at themselves. You simply had to *show up* and *jump in*. (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020). From the students’ perspective, the GSSch represented more than just another average academic endeavor. It represented a place for self-discovery, with an emphasis on pursuing one’s own interests.

Pursuing one’s own interests was not to mean self-centered but rather the ability to choose. Students became more engaged with the overarching topic, when they were able to make direct connections to the topic. Allowing the students an opportunity to explore the overarching topic, rather than telling the students what to explore, facilitated the students’ ability to make the topic relevant to them. In other words, the faculty was there to mentor the students in learning how to think, not to instruct them on what to think (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

**Attribute 5: Student Defined Physical Location**

The strategic use of the available lodging incorporated the isolation of the Taos Ski Valley in a productive way. The students, even those holding an attachment to social
media or some outside content, were restricted in their ability to communicate with those outside of the Taos Ski Valley. This combination of isolation and communal living arrangements fostered educational success (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Participant 3 spoke about what she experienced, when the group was together. She stated,

I would say that it almost felt like you were kind of away from reality. Like you’re kind of in this fun learning environment, where you are all hanging out. You know, you have all these new friends. And there’s that community again. (personal communication, January 7, 2020)

The living arrangements fostered academic success, since students had to figure out how to communicate outside of the classroom. There was not an instructor or a lesson plan to follow. It was entirely up to the students to work through it together.

There was a clear divide in the way students and faculty answered questions about the living arrangements and their effect on the learning community. Those students familiar with the Thunderbird Lodge stated that there was only one learning community back then. Everyone interacted with everyone (Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

The students relocated to multiple hotels across the Taos Ski Valley interpreted
the grouping of students and faculty as high school like cliques. Participant 3 continued, “Yeah so it was kind of like high school. But not as bad, because people were a little more open to you know sitting down with someone new and saying, ‘Oh what’s your name?’ Things like that” (personal communication, January 7, 2020). The ease with which the students could escape to creature comforts (i.e. private rooms, private kitchens, and social media), and the difficulties students had finding a common location to socialize, detracted from the benefits that the isolation was supposed to provide (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020).

The faculty responses contradicted the above claim. The faculty claimed that different participants played different roles. Some of these roles were official (i.e. teacher or student) and some of these roles were unofficial (i.e. person in a good mood, funny person, creative person, or daring person), but there was only one group. They considered the dispersal of students across multiple hotels to possess no significant effect on the learning community, as everyone still felt the same academic pressures and no one was estranged from the proceedings (Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Summary of Findings

Although slightly varying in priorities, perspectives, and anecdotal responses, all of the participants provided an overall accepting review of the GSSch. Students and faculty alike were inspired emotionally by the learning community found at the GSSch, which was described through, what I would consider to be flowery language (i.e. welcoming, supporting, engaging, comforting, and motivating) by participants trying to
make sense of an emotion or the way that they felt when they were there (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication).

The faculty interviewed operationalized the term *quality* as not just acquiring a second language, but also the relevance of what is being learned. A supportive, immersive environment was essential, as it facilitated a relaxing environment, in which the students were comfortable enough to use only German for an extended period of time. Although presented at times with adverse conditions, the faculty over the past 45 years have championed the mission of the GSSch and responded in some way to the challenges placed in front of them (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

The students interviewed praised the learning environment that was provided for them in Taos Ski Valley. All of the students interviewed championed the mission of the GSSch, to teach German in a remote location through a total immersion method and they insisted that elements of the curriculum (i.e. Grundkurs themes) were broad enough that students were able to explore aspects of the theme that were relevant to them. They also promoted the GSSch as a program that provided them with educational equity in a total immersion environment by providing a welcoming, supportive and yet academically rigorous environment, which catered to their specific interests and learning styles. They
were allowed to relax, fumble, make grammatical mistakes, explore new topics, and discover different uses of the language all well engulfed in a fully supportive learning community (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020).

**How the GSSch impacted Academic Resilience (conclusion)**

I would like to conclude by applauding the old Guard of the GSSch for accomplishing all of this in the state of New Mexico. The old Guard of the GSSch integrated student interests into the pedagogical design in order to help students formulate their own learning objectives. By granting the students agency, the students were able to gain new insights that were relevant to them. These findings, which spoke directly to both the perception of quality and equity in the total immersion environment provided by the GSSch elicited something that few research findings coming out of New Mexico have ever done. These findings portrayed a New Mexico based educational institution in a positive fashion.

I argue that there were three reoccurring portrayals of New Mexico based educational institutions that portrayed these institutions in a negative fashion, prior to my dissertation. These were 1) the fact that New Mexico was once plagued by boarding schools for Native Americans; 2) the fact that New Mexico has continually ranked #50 out of 50 for quality K-12 schools, and; 3) the fact that New Mexico has recently felt the public shaming brought on by the Yazzi/Martinez case.

Sometimes referred to as Indian Residential Schools, boarding schools for Native Americans had a reputation for physical and emotional abuse in the name of assimilation.
They were popular in the late 19th century through the early 20th century. I studied this topic in a social justice course that I took at UNM. I have also been in multiple classes where the topic of boarding schools is brought up. Plus, the book, *Kill the Indian, Save the Man* by Ward Churchill is required reading in several courses at UNM’s College of Education. I concluded that the boarding schools for Native Americans portrayed New Mexico based educational institutions in a negative fashion.

Several independent agencies, such as US News, Forbes, and USA Today, rate schools on college readiness, graduation rates, and test scores. This year, New Mexico was ranked #50 by US News and Forbes. It was ranked #49 by USA Today. As I perused the rankings from past years, and across multiple websites, I found that New Mexico’s K-12 schools were often linked to terms such as, *lowest rated, worst, and places to avoid.* I concluded that these types of ranking systems and terms, which were found on popular websites, portrayed New Mexico’s K-12 schools in a negative fashion.

*Yazzie and Martinez v. State of New Mexico* was a lawsuit from families against New Mexico, in which the families claimed that the New Mexico government had failed to provide a quality education to the K-12 students. The judge ruled in favor of Yazzie and Martinez in July 2018. The court case provided legal documentation that proved New Mexico’s K-12 educational institutions were below community standards.

I mentioned these negative portrayals of New Mexico’s educational system for several reasons. First, Flinders and Thornton (2017) claimed that when studying an academic institution, the social and political situations within which the academic institution is operating must also be examined. I adapted this claim from Flinders and Thornton (2017) into the framework of this dissertation, by examining the social and
political situations of New Mexico in relationship to education.

I mentioned these negative portrayals of New Mexico’s educational system since I performed a historical case study. A historical case study required that I studied the correlational, political environment. For this dissertation, the stereotypes and public opinions of New Mexico’s educational system were linked to the GSSch’s participants’ perspectives on an academic program. I deemed it important to illustrate that academic programs were not necessarily perceived by the people in this region as being providers of positive experiences. Moreover, not all academic programs in New Mexico have a reputation for providing students with the necessary tools needed to pursue worthy academic endeavors.

I concluded that the GSSch had provided a quality and equitable education to students for the past 44 years, in the least likely place. The significance of the findings and analysis of this dissertation is that they supported the claim that under the guidance of the old Guard, the GSSch was an authentic example of a resilient academic institution.
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Discussions, and Suggestions for Future Research

In this chapter, I drew conclusions based on the findings reported in Chapter 4. I organized the conclusions in this chapter similarly to the way that I organized the findings in Chapter 4 in order to support the readability of the dissertation as well as to show an easy to follow correlation between the findings and my conclusions drawn from the findings. I placed suggestions for future research at the end of this chapter, following the discussion about the findings.

The findings of this dissertation answered the following two questions:

1) What is *academic resilience*?

2) How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?

When answering the first question, I made the claim that academic resilience was found at the intersection of the following two areas:

1) The leadership, which is charged with formulating a response to the threatening, external condition(s), and;

2) The institution of higher learning, in which the threatened academic program and/or academic department is found.

With this claim, I developed specific questions that would address this aforementioned intersection. The guiding question was

GQ1) In what ways did the GSSch have the potential to invoke academic resilience?

The overarching question:

OQ1) What is academic resilience?

The midrange questions:
MRQ1) How did the leadership of the GSSch respond to potentially harmful provocations?

MRQ2) How was the GSSch positioned after the leadership responded to potentially harmful provocations?

I answered all of the guiding questions and midrange questions in Chapter 4. The first part of the research questions were answered in Chapter 2 and the second part of the research questions were answered in Chapter 4.

**Conclusions (Organized by Research Questions)**

In this section, I explored the findings of the research, which were listed in two categories:

1) The co-founder as an example of a resilient educational leader, and;

2) The impact that the GSSch made on academic resilience.

I explored each of the aforementioned categories by first providing a summary of each of the findings, then explaining the significance of the findings themselves. When possible, I used the exact wording of previous claims or questions that were examined, in order to reintroduce that specific thread of the conversation.

At the end of Chapter 4, the final research question was answered. The question was: *How has the GSSch impacted academic resilience?* However, during the analysis of the data, I determined that this question had exceeded the scope of this dissertation. Thus, I slightly modified the question, in order to reflect two separate time frames found within the history of the GSSch. I identified these time frames as 1975-2005, and 2005-current. Then, I labeled the leadership of the GSSch from 1975-2005 as the old Guard. I labeled the leadership of the GSSch from 2005-current as the new Guard. Subsequently, I
examined the research question in two parts. The first part of the question asked, *Did the GSSch invoke academic resilience from 1975-2005?* The answer was: *Yes.*

The second part of the question asked, *Has the GSSch continued to invoke academic resilience from 2005-current?* The answer was: *Inconclusive, since not enough time had passed to determine the effectiveness of the actions taken by the new Guard.*

Data pertaining to the GSSch from 2005-current were examined in this chapter, under the heading of future research.

**The GSSch under the Old Guard**

The findings of this research supported the claim that the co-founder of the GSSch, Professor Pabisch was an example of a resilient educational leader. He was also a member of the *old Guard*, or those charged with a leadership role within the GSSch during its first 30 years. The findings also supported that under the guidance of the old Guard, the GSSch was positioned in such a way that the GSSch was determined to have displayed academic resilience. I determined this based on three focus areas provided by the framework. These focus areas were

1) leadership style of the old Guard, with a specific focus on the leadership style of the co-founder, Professor Pabisch;

2) the pedagogy used at the GSSch, including the pedagogical architecture provided by the institution and a personal teaching style provided by an individual teacher, and;

3) the creative ways that the old Guard had responded to potentially harmful provocation within the first three decades of the GSSch’s summer sessions.

The answers to the midrange questions elaborated on each of these focus areas by
examining specific ways in which the old Guard had responded to harmful provocations as well as the ways in which the old Guard was able to position the GSSch. In the end, I determined that the old Guard had effectively responded to harmful provocations in such a way as to not only ensure the longevity of the GSSch and its original mission but also to strengthen the GSSch. This strength was found in the way the curriculum overlapped with a German Studies program at UNM, as well as how the leadership of the GSSch used harmful provocations to strengthen personal relationships with key people (i.e. Elizabeth Brownell and Professor Elston), and incorporated radical political change (i.e. the fall of the Berlin Wall) into the Grundkurs themes. They accomplished all of this without creating a financial burden on the incoming students.

**Discussion**

The findings from this research have highlighted displays of academic resilience by examining the founding and continuation of the University of New Mexico’s German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley (GSSch). Over the past 44 years, there have been many students and faculty members that have participated in the GSSch. Despite the large pool of data to draw from, little has been written about the GSSch.

Along with adding to the body of knowledge about the GSSch, the possible contributions of this study include an increased understanding of the word *resilience* as it pertains to the field of education, the importance of planning for and responding to potentially harmful provocation by the educational leadership of an institution, as well as the positioning of an institution within its current climate (i.e. political, social, financial, etc.). Outlining the characteristics of a resilient educational leader was important, as adverse situations will prompt different responses from different educational leaders.
Given the fact that recent data has supported the claim that a resilient educational leader is better prepared to tackle an adverse situation than a non-resilient educational leader, it is in the best interest of an institution to incorporate a screening device, when hiring educational leaders. Along with the resilience of educational leadership, this research also explored the resilience of an institution by demonstrating the need to prepare for and respond to threatening, external conditions with structural changes. To use the wording from the research, find creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations.

As this research has demonstrated, it is not enough that an educational leader maintains a program for a short period of time to be labeled resilient. An educational leader must maintain a program for a long period of time. He must also demonstrate leadership ability in the face of potentially harmful provocations. In other words, a resilient educational leader is not defined by his ability to lead when everything is going well. A resilient educational leader is defined by his ability to lead when everything is falling apart. It is during these moments of adversity that the true ability of the educational leader is showcased.

This research also demonstrated that an academic institution can display resilience, if the leadership, having been capable of finding creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations, were also able to position the academic institution in such a way that it grew stronger; however, longevity in itself is not enough to provide an academic institution with the label of resilient.

**Suggestions for Future Research outside of the GSSch**

The significance of the findings from this research was found in the need for a real-world example of a resilient educational leader. Given the fact that scholarship on
resilience in an academic environment has only recently been published, beginning around 2014, there remain many gaps in the topic. More specifically, none of the scholarship on resilience in an academic environment that was studied for this research project provided a specific example of a resilient educational leader. Individual traits of a resilient educational leader were listed by a variety of authors (i.e. Gu, & Day, 2013; Maulding, Peters, Roberts, Leonard, & Sparkman, 2012; Steward, 2014; Wilcox, & Lawson, 2018). The authors also provided clearly defined reasoning for including these traits in their lists. These lists of traits and the clearly defined reasoning behind adding these traits to their lists provided me with a framework for identifying a resilient educational leader.

The next step for future research would be to select another location to perform a similar study. If the framework holds up in multiple locations, this research could provide institutions of higher learning with an effective tool for screening their leadership.

Although this framework could prove beneficial at any institution of higher learning, it might be more beneficial to select another German immersion school for a similar study. Given that Middlebury, Sommerschule am Pazifik, and the GSSch are somewhat connected to one another and that they often borrow ideas from each other, it seems logical to consider how the research on the GSSch could influence either of the other two summer schools.

**Suggestions for Future Research: The GSSch under the New Guard**

There was a lot of data collected in this research, which I coded as relevant to the old Guard and relevant only to the new Guard. This dissertation focused mostly on the old Guard; however, another possible contribution to this study is that it set up a similar
study of the new Guard of the GSSch.

I identified the new Guard as those having been charged with the role of leading the GSSch over the past 15 years. The data collected during this dissertation focused heavily on the past five years and included an interview with one of the three current directors of the GSSch. The findings from this dissertation also highlighted the efforts of the new Guard as they championed the cause of the GSSch’s mission. On a superficial level, it appeared that the GSSch had been having difficulties finding creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations. I determined this based on three focus areas provided by the framework. These focus areas were

1) leadership style of the new Guard, with a specific focus on the leadership style of Participant 8;

2) the pedagogy used at the GSSch, including the pedagogical architecture provided by the institution and a personal teaching style provided by an individual teacher, and;

3) the creative ways that the new Guard had responded to potentially harmful provocation within the past 15 GSSch’s summer sessions.

The answers to the midrange questions could elaborate on each of these focus areas by examining specific ways in which the new Guard had responded to harmful provocations as well as the ways in which the new Guard was able to position the GSSch. In the end, it could be determined whether or not the new Guard had attempted to respond to harmful provocations in such a way as to not only ensure the longevity of the GSSch and its original mission but also to strengthen the GSSch.

When addressing this question, the future research would not focus on the
founding of the GSSch or on the old Guard of the GSSch, but rather on the new Guard of the GSSch.

The New Guard of the GSSch

I established that the co-founder of the GSSch was in fact an example of a resilient educational leader. I also established that the old Guard, those charged with a direct or indirect leadership role within the GSSch during its first 30 years, were successful in finding creative ways to respond to potentially harmful provocations. As a result of their actions, the GSSch grew stronger. At this point in the GSSch’s history, the GSSch was an example of academic resilience as both the leadership and the institution had satisfied all required criteria to be labeled as such.

In future research, the new Guard, those charged with a direct or indirect leadership role within the GSSch during the past 15 years could be examined. The purpose of this examination would be to gain a better understanding of the intersection between the new Guard and the GSSch. The available data from this research provided enough information on potentially harmful provocations that have affected the GSSch over the past 15 years to provide scaffolding for a future research proposal. To begin with, I identified five specific potentially harmful provocations from the current data. I based the criteria used to select these five specific potentially harmful provocations on:

1) the time frame. Priority was given to provocations occurring between 2015-present;

2) the frequency at which the provocation was mentioned by participants during the interviews;

3) the severity of harm the provocation was capable of realistically [operationalized
as non-violent and void of legal actions] causing to the original mission of the GSSch;

4) the severity of harm the provocation was capable of realistically causing to the learning community of the GSSch, and;

5) the severity of harm the provocation was capable of realistically causing to the perception of quality and equity of the education provided by the GSSch.

Once I had selected the top five potentially harmful provocations, I placed them into a chart along the horizontal access. I placed data from the research under the provocation that they addressed. I placed the phrases, found a way to creatively respond and did not find a way to creatively respond to the left of the data, along the vertical access. I examined the data by placing them in dialogue with the potentially harmful provocation that they corresponded to. I placed a checkmark next to one of the phrases on the vertical access to show the findings from the examination. The findings from this examination could be used to answer the same guiding question, the overarching question, and the midrange questions from my dissertation. These findings could lead to a conclusion being drawn about the second, and final research question.

On the surface, the sheer longevity of the GSSch, now going into its 45th year, could give the initial impression that it would be an example of academic resilience; however, longevity alone does not satisfy all of the conditions required to be considered an example of academic resilience. To be an example of academic resilience, data must speak to the GSSch’s ability to not only survive harmful provocations, but also grow stronger as a result of the leadership’s creative responses to aforementioned harmful provocations.
The potentially harmful provocations I identified for possible future research were:

1) The hotel that provided an authentic, German feel was lost;

2) The Alpine location that provided an authentic, German feel had been growing expensive and may soon be lost;

3) The dispersal of students throughout the ski valley, as well as the proximity of hotel rooms to classrooms has been hindering efforts to build a single learning community;

4) Professional relationships had been damaged and/or completely severed. No new relationships have been forged, and;

5) Student enrollment has been dropping.

To better illustrate why the first three items are mentioned as a potentially harmful provocation, I examined the German only policy, the isolation provided by the Taos Ski Valley, and the importance of immersion.

German immersion remains a fundamental aspect of the GSSch. As such, the German only policy outlines the more basic terms and conditions of the GSSch. In an attempt to fully integrate students into a German speaking environment, all students are required to communicate only in German. In return, the GSSch agrees to create safe spaces for the students to use their German. During the interviews, former students and faculty were asked the same, specific questions: Could a similar program exist on the main campus? Why or why not? According to every participant, if the GSSch were forced to relocate from the Taos Ski Valley to the UNM main campus, the German only policy would not be enforceable. Thus, it would not be a true immersion program. The
community feel would also be lost, due to the loss of isolation (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 4, personal communication, January 8, 2020; Participant 5, personal communication, January 14, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

Participant 2 was adamant about the location and he did not believe that the GSSch could operate on the UNM main campus. He answered,

Not at all. Not at all. The idea behind an immersion program is that you isolate and you must use your knowledge of the language to construct language. See when you are at a summer camp you are actually using German to learn German. And on the main campus there would be too much exposure to the outside. That is what you have now with classes. You have German in the classroom, English everywhere else in the world. (personal communication, December 30, 2019)

While it might be possible to maintain immersion in the classroom, Participant 2 felt that immersion would be lost once the class ended. In the Taos Ski Valley, along with the courses that the students take for credit, alternatives to classroom teaching (i.e. sporting events, social events, etc.) are promoted by the faculty of the GSSch. Thus, the German only policy remains in effect outside of the classroom. The students only speak German inside of the classroom, outside of the classroom, during sporting events, social events, and at meals. In other words, the German only policy takes effect on the first day of the summer sessions and continues through the last day of the summer session. The
only exemption is if there is an emergency.

Participant 8 held a similar concern about enforcing the German only policy on the UNM main campus. When asked if a summer session could be held on campus, he answered,

No. I mean, we could do an immersion program on the main campus, but it wouldn’t be the same program … There is nowhere that has the external space that would allow for us to have a German only environment on campus. (personal communication, January 28, 2020)

Both Participant 3 and Participant 5 mentioned that they as students would have had a harder time engaging with the content if the GSSch were located on the UNM main campus. When asked if the GSSch could operate on the main campus, Participant 3 answered,

To an extent … I think the community would be different because we would be in Albuquerque … We’d have more freedom to leave. To drive wherever we wanted to. Let’s leave campus and go hang out at this place. Whereas in Taos, I really like that isolation. That difficulty to leave. As funny as it sounds. (personal communication, January 7, 2020)

For Participant 3, the isolation led to a sharp increase in her ability to focus on the content as well as remain in German at all times. The isolation placed her in a comfortable position, in which she had nothing else to do and nowhere else to be than in the Taos Ski Valley speaking German.

Participant 5 felt that the isolation supported a deeper, more committed approach to learning. She answered,
Oh similar maybe, no otherwise. No, because the atmosphere and the only thing you thought about was German, not other classes. You know, you were totally for those weeks in German. And that, the people enjoyed what they were doing too. Everyone was on the same page. Here you all have different classes. You walk from one classroom to another. You don’t have the immersion. (personal communication, January 14, 2020)

She was in agreement with several participants in that the UNM main campus could incorporate the German only rule inside of the classroom, but not outside of the classroom. There would be just too many readily available opportunities for the students to speak English. Thus, the immersion would be lost.

Participant 4 elaborated on the importance of the isolation by stating that it provided a safe space for the students. He felt that the safe space alleviated a lot of the social pressures that students felt when attempting to speak German for extended periods of time. When asked if the GSSch could operate on the main campus, he answered,

I guess it would be difficult … You have to break down your shyness and just try things that you normally wouldn’t try. And I think that would be more difficult on the main campus where you have so many other English speakers around.

(personal communication, January 8, 2020)

Many participants deemed the isolation to be too important in achieving the overall goal of the GSSch’s mission. Losing access to the Taos Ski Valley could prove detrimental to the students’ learning, as the immersion experience would be lost. The loss of the immersion experience would affect the community and the safe space awarded to the students would no longer exist (Participant 2, personal communication, December 30,
The fourth and fifth potentially harmful provocations on the list somewhat overlapped. In 2016, after more than a decade of being *in consortium* with the California State University Long Beach, the GSSch severed all professional relationships with them. Several participants stated that the original design of the GSSch incorporated rotating faculty each summer. This rotation of faculty ensured that each summer session was unique. The leadership at the GSSch felt that being in consortium with one university entrenched the GSSch in a single format. The leadership at the GSSch further argued that severing ties with the California State University Long Beach actually strengthened the GSSch, by pulling it out of its trench and promoting a new, unique summer session (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

These claims have been directly challenged by the dropping of student enrollment, which has been identified as a potentially harmful provocation. I found guidance for this challenge stemming from the fact that the faculty from the California State University Long Beach brought their students to the GSSch. Along with bringing their own students, they had also forged relations with a university in Alabama. In the summer session just before the consortium was terminated, the California State
University Long Beach was responsible for recruiting about half of the students enrolled at the GSSch. When the consortium with the GSSch came to an end, the California State University Long Beach went in consortium with Sommerschule am Pazifik. The engineering students from Alabama also went to Sommerschule am Pazifik. This resulted in the GSSch struggling to reach a student enrollment above 20 in every summer session since.

I identified another possible focus area for future research, which was the financial support currently awarded to students. The lack of strong, financial support for the students challenged any claim that the GSSch was able to successfully replace Professor Peters and Professor Pabisch. The old Guard as it were, went to bat for the students and secured strong, financial support for them. According to Participant 5, during the first few years of the GSSch, she did not have to pay for anything. Currently, students have to pay about $4,500 for the full four-and-a-half-week experience. This averages out to about $1,000 per week that the students must pay out of pocket. The rising costs of the GSSch might correlate to the declining student enrollment numbers. I base this claim of a correlation on the fact that when scholarships covered all or most of the costs, enrollment numbers were hovering around 100. In recent years, enrollment numbers have been closer to 20.

Participant 8 strongly disagreed with the claim that there was a correlation between student enrollment numbers and the rising costs of the GSSch. He theorized that it was based on marketing and a term he called, *product mortality*. He explained, “This notion of product mortality … It’s a concept that all products go through. They go through the beginning stage, they go through a stage of enhancement and increased sales
or increased, you know, increased student numbers” (personal communication, January 28, 2020). Once the product has reached its peak, it begins to decrease. He felt that German was simply at the end of its product life.

According to Participant 8, German was not the only language affected by this trend. He claimed that the more popular language programs (i.e. German, French, and Spanish) were suffering from declining student enrollment on both the UNM campus as well as nationally. He argued,

At UNM, all of our languages have gone down by about 50% since 2013 in terms of enrollment … Why would the program be in, you know, a difficult spot? It is just because nationally there’s an ethos I guess against language, against learning languages. People are thinking that everybody speaks English. People are being forced to take more requirements for STEM fields [science, technology, engineering, and mathematics] and for engineering. Universities are placing priorities and the priorities are not on languages right now. (personal communication, January 28, 2020)

He stated that these trends also made German programs more competitive with each other. With fewer students to fill the courses, the universities were less likely to send their students to the GSSch. He continued, “The last two years I directed the program. I did extensive outreach. I reached out to every German program in the United States in fact … I got lots of support but very few students” (Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020). He felt that this lack of students coming to the GSSch from outside German programs was stemming from the low enrollment rates at the German programs that he contacted. Nobody wanted to allow their students to receive six
credits in four weeks.

Still on the topic of marketing, Participant 8 explained some creative ways that he had responded to the harmful provocation of low student enrollment. He stated that he would tell the leadership at other German programs that they might be losing students due to the time requirement required to learn the language. If the students could learn faster, such as by advancing an entire level in four weeks, they might reconsider joining the German program at their home university. He continued,

That still doesn’t really work. It only works for programs that don’t have the majors or minors any more. So they don’t care. And so they send the students out to us … That’s the not very happy situation that we are facing moving forward.

(personal communication, January 28, 2020)

It appeared that this member of the new Guard had really championed the cause of the GSSch and that he had been looking for ways to ensure its longevity. During the interview, he cited specific reports, which included one from ACTFL and one from MLA. By using the data to lay down some of the groundwork on the abstract idea of product mortality, he was better able to defend his findings and the reasoning behind the conclusions that he had drawn. This member of the new Guard had been putting in the time and effort to ensure the longevity of the GSSch. He might have put in the time and effort, and he might have used creative ways to respond to the harmful provocation of rising costs and lower student enrollment, but the real question focused on the results of his actions. Future research would have to answer the question: Was his response effective enough to ensure the longevity and the strengthening of the GSSch?

The current research has already revealed that some attempts to respond to
potentially harmful provocations had fallen short in the following areas:

1) The marketing campaign launched by Participant 8 to recruit new students to the GSSch did not yield the desired results;

2) Attempts to alternate faculty members inadvertently severed ties with a partner university, which had been providing the GSSch with about 50% of their students each summer;

3) No new relationships had been forged or strengthened with the current owner of the Taos Ski Valley or with hotel owners;

4) None of the new lodging has been considered to have an authentic German feel by any of the participants;

5) New funding sources for substantial scholarships have not been found;

6) The GSSch leadership has not been able to position the GSSch favorably within the UNM community (i.e. convincing UNM to raise the language requirement);

7) They are at risk of losing the Alpine location, which provides the GSSch with isolation and an authentic German feel, and;

8) Faculty interviewed downplayed the importance of the lodging as well as the proximity of the hotel rooms to the classrooms, although students identified them as important in terms of community building.

Along with the changes made to the Taos Ski Valley as well as the changes made within the university system, there has been an increase in program costs with a decreased interest in German Studies. The new Guard has not found creative ways to respond to 7 of the 8 harmful provocations that they are currently faced with. Their single
creative response, which came in the form of a marketing campaign, failed to yield adequate results. Although the GSSch is going into its 45th consecutive year, I argue that it is in the most vulnerable position that it has ever been in. I base this claim on the consensus from the interviews that stated that the Grundkurs lectures have remained relevant, but the financial support afforded to the students during the founding of the GSSch has never returned (Pabisch, personal communication, December 26, 2019; Participant 2, personal communication, December 30, 2019; Participant 3, personal communication, January 7, 2020; Participant 6, personal communication, January 5, 2020; Participant 7, personal communication, January 2, 2020; Participant 8, personal communication, January 28, 2020).

**Conclusion**

This dissertation focused on the founding and continuation of the GSSch to define the term, *academic resilience* and to determine in what ways the GSSch was an example of academic resilience. This dissertation has gone above and beyond that by providing not only defining the term, academic resilience but also by providing an authentic example of a resilient academic institution, and an authentic example of a resilient academic leader. The persistence of the GSSch’s co-founder, Professor Pabisch and his continued involvement in the GSSch asserted the conclusion that the GSSch from 1975-2005 was an example of academic resilience. Both the institution and its co-founder Professor Pabisch had exhibited all of the characteristics mentioned in the literature on resilience, which have all been supported through first-hand accounts from former GSSch faculty and students, as well as from the data taken from artifacts.

I took great care in this dissertation to articulate the need to coin the phrase,
academic resilience, as well as the need for an authentic model of a resilient, academic institution. I began by carefully constructed research questions for this dissertation. Then, I entered into a dialogue that was guided by these questions with an open curiosity.

When I first learned about resilience, I thought that it was still a free floating theory. Through the literature review, I was able to construct a loose framework for what academic resilience had the potential to be. What the literature review did not reveal was an authentic example of academic resilience in second language acquisition or in German Studies.

I chose phenomenology for the lens, since it allowed for the examination of abstract concepts and ideas. For my dissertation, phenomenology meant that I could examine the construction of a reality. That is to say that I could study a reality only as it implied lived experiences by participants surrounding the founding and continuation of the GSSch.

I collected data on the GSSch, which I had to anchor in some way. I knew that my positionality was inflected by both my role as a former student of the GSSch, as well as by my role as a researcher. These roles served as indicators of the position from which I would be interpreting the data and refining the findings.

I incorporated interviews into the historical case study, since the events I examined had already passed. Then, I incorporated a phenomenological lens to analyze the data, since the interviews provided me with data that spoke to a different truth or a different reality. I used the theoretical framework of academic resilience to formalize the data (i.e. code and examine through different lenses). Once I formalized the data, the data itself provided me with access to an indirect portrayal of the founding and continuation of
the GSSch that I would otherwise not have access to.

The participants’ interviews did provide some authority to the witnesses; however, the point of the interviews was to gather data about the participants’ perceptions of the GSSch. I asked the participants to simplify complex discourse into basic, generalized statements. I did not select the interviews as a way of collecting quantifiable data (i.e. test scores), but rather as a way of gathering perceptions and opinions.

I examined all of the data alongside the research that was being published during that time (i.e. mid-1970s). I used the research to construct criteria that I later used to determine how the data fit within the social and political climates of their time. I examined events as correlational, or occurring at the same time. I did not examine events as causational, nor did I interpret them as Flinders and Thornton (2017) claimed about the social and political climates to be about agency or implication. I felt that the social and political climates did not reflect the actions made by an individual, but rather they animated the effects that social and political actions have on the individual. I also interpreted their claims to mean that the social and political climates created the dominant rhetoric, by providing vocabulary, such as commonly used adjectives (i.e. good, appropriate, encouraging, oppressive, etc.), as well as biases (i.e. Western education is used as a tool for oppression in New Mexico).

My findings and analysis will assist future researchers by providing focus areas when exploring change as well as exploring the legitimacy of an academic leader’s ability and/or institution’s ability to plan for and respond to a potentially harmful provocation.
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Appendix A: IRB Consent Form

Consent to Participate in Research
December 18, 2019

Purpose of the research: You are being asked to participate in a research project that is being done by Dr. Walker and John Reinert, from the College of Education. The purpose of this research is to study resilience in an academic environment by examining the founding and continuation of the UNM German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley. You are being asked to participate because you are either a co-founder, former faculty or a former student of the UNM German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley.

This form will explain what to expect when joining the research, as well as the possible risks and benefits of participation. If you have any questions, please ask one of the project researchers.

What you will do in the project: Your participation will involve 1-3 interviews. The interviews should take about 60 minutes to complete. The interviews will include questions such as In what ways is the UNM German Summer School in Taos Ski Valley different from other immersion schools? What is unique about the location? Your involvement in the research is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate. You can refuse to answer any of the questions at any time. You can end the interviews at any time. There will be names or identifying information associated with your responses.

Risks: There are risks of stress, emotional distress, inconvenience and possible loss of privacy and confidentiality associated with participating in a research study.

Benefits: There is no direct benefit to participating in the project.

Confidentiality of your information: The audio recordings will be saved on a password protected computer. Transcripts will be made of the audio files and the transcripts will be saved on a password protected computer. There are not any outside collaborators. An audio recording device with the audio files from the interviews will be kept locked in an office on the UNM campus when it is not in use. The audio files will be transferred to a password protected computer. The principal investigator, the student investigator, and you, the participant, will have access to the information. The paper records, which includes the consent forms, will be stored in a three ring binder and stored in a locked office on the UNM campus.

We will take measures to protect the security of all your personal information, but we cannot guarantee confidentiality of all research data. The University of New Mexico Institutional Review Board (IRB) that oversees human subject research may be permitted to access your records. Your name will be used in any published reports about this project.

All identifiable information (e.g., your name, email) will be removed from the information collected in this project. After we remove all identifiers, the information may be used for future research or shared with other researchers without your additional informed consent.
Payment: You will not be paid for participating in this project.

**Right to withdraw from the research:** Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You have the right to choose not to participate or to withdraw your participation at any point without penalty. If you would like to withdraw, you can contact either the principal investigator, the student investigator, or both and explain that you have chosen to withdraw from the project. The data collected prior to the participant withdrawing will be used in the research.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research, please contact:
John Reinert, College of Education, Hokona Hall 225, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131. (505) 238-9785. Email address: rein3176@unm.edu

If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, or about what you should do in case of any harm to you, or if you want to obtain information or offer input, please contact the IRB. The IRB is a group of people from UNM and the community who provide independent oversight of safety and ethical issues related to research involving people:
UNM Office of the IRB, (505) 277-2644, irbmaincampus@unm.edu. Website: http://irb.unm.edu/

**CONSENT**

You are making a decision whether to participate in this research. Your signature below indicates that you have read this form (or the form was read to you) and that all questions have been answered to your satisfaction. By signing this consent form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights as a research participant. A copy of this consent form will be provided to you.

I agree to participate in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Adult Participant</th>
<th>Signature of Adult Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Researcher Signature (to be completed at time of informed consent)

I have explained the research to the participant and answered all of their questions. I believe that they understand the information described in this consent form and freely consents to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Research Team Member</th>
<th>Signature of Research Team Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix B: Interview Questions

Student Interview Questions

1. How would you describe the learning community at the German summer school, such as your peers, speakers, and students?

2. What is the *Grundkurs* and how does it fit into the curriculum?

3. In what ways were the courses at the UNM Summer School different from those on campus?

4. What do you think makes the UNM German Summer School unique?

5. How are students’ quarters set-up? Why do you think they are set-up this way?

6. How is the dining area set-up? Why do you think it is set-up this way?

7. Could a similar program exist on the main campus? Why?

8. What skills are required in the students’ day-to-day activities?

9. What is the German only policy and did you feel that it was important?

10. What opportunities did you have to speak German outside of the classroom?

11. What activities take place outside of the classroom?

12. In what ways did the UNM Summer School prepare you for future studies, either in German or future studies in general?

13. How long have you know Professor Pabisch?

14. Since meeting Professor Pabisch, has he maintained a sense of well-being?

15. Can you think of a time when he was overwhelmed with stress?

16. How would you describe his character?

17. Are there any terms or additional information that you would like to introduce (in English or in German)? Please explain.
Faculty Interview Questions

1. How would you define *quality* in relationship to second language acquisition?
   
   Based on your definition, does the UNM German Summer School provide a quality instruction for second language acquisition?

2. How would you describe the difference between a *pedagogical architecture* provided by an institution and a *personal teaching style* provided by an individual teacher?

3. What are the mechanisms of thought that kept the summer school going?

4. How would you describe the learning community, such as your peers, speakers, and students?

5. What is the *Grundkurs* and how does it fit into the curriculum?

6. In what ways is the UNM German Summer School different from other immersion schools? How is it different from a summer camp?

7. What do you think makes the UNM German Summer School unique (i.e. location)?

8. In what ways has the Summer School maintained its original mission and how has it changed?

9. Could a similar program exist on the main campus? Why?

10. Which features of the German Summer School have contributed to it lasting for this long?

11. How flexible is the curriculum? Please explain.

12. How long have you know Professor Pabisch?

13. Since meeting Professor Pabisch, has he maintained a sense of well-being?
14. Can you think of a time when he was overwhelmed with stress?

15. How would you describe his character?

16. Are there any terms or additional information that you would like to introduce (in English or in German)? Please explain.

**Co-founder Interview Questions**

1. Much of the literature stated that student enrollment was declining in the early to mid-1970s, and that many German programs, as well as entire German departments were being disbanded. Can you explain what was happening at UNM and in the German department around this time? Was the German program or the department being threatened?

2. What is the third pillar of German Studies?

3. Can you list some of the larger pieces of your life (i.e. family, teaching, research, religion, etc.) and speak briefly about how they were prioritized and/or balanced?

4. Can you provide a list of people, methodologies, and ideologies that influenced you and your teaching methods (i.e. Kant, Dewey, student-centered, democracy, etc.)?

5. What drew you to these specific people, methodologies, and ideologies? How did you integrate this into your leadership?

6. How would you describe the difference between a *pedagogical architecture* provided by an institution and a *personal teaching style* provided by an individual teacher?

7. Can you tell me about a time when you were under a great deal of stress, and how you handled that stress?
8. Has there been a time when your colleagues or co-collaborators disagreed with your approach to leadership? If yes, how did you resolve this?

9. What is unique about the location?

10. Could a similar program exist on the main campus? Why?

11. What is the Grundkurs and how does it fit into the curriculum?

12. What is the German only policy and why is it important?

13. What opportunities do the students have to speak German outside of the classroom?

14. In what ways has the Summer School maintained its original mission and how has it changed?

15. Which features of the German Summer School have contributed to it lasting for this long?

16. Are there any terms that you would like to introduce (in English or in German)?

   Please explain.
Appendix C: Information from GSSch Booklets

*English – German Vocabulary from GSSch Booklets*

(The 1987 booklet is almost all in German. The 1988 booklet is almost all in English)

Arrival and departure – Ankunft und Abfahrt

Botanical hike - Botanische Wanderung

Bring with – Bitte mitzubringen!

Classes and activities – Unterrichtsplan und besondere Programmmpunkte

Course duration – Kursdauer

Credits – Kredit

Curriculum - das Curriculum

Drive through Taos and surrounding area - Autofarten nach Taos und in die Umgebung

Evening lecture and discussion - Abendvorträge und –gespräche

Exam – Prüfung

Extra-curricular activities - Sonderprogramme

Faculty – das Lehrpersonal

For half a session – Für eine Hälfte des Lehrgange

Formal brunch - Frühschoppen

For the entire session – Für den gesamten Lehrgang

General details - allgemeine Hinweise

Geology excursion - Geologische Exkursion

Guests – Gäste

Hiking in the mountains - Wandern in die Bergwelt von Taos Ski Valley

Insurance and emergency health care – Unfall-und Krankenversicherung
Introduction – Einleitung

Language and conversation courses – Sprach-und Konversationskurse)

Lecture - Vortrag

Lecturers - die Lehrenden

Living arrangements – Unterbringung

Mail and telephones – Post und Telephon

Movie night, music night, choir - Filmabende, Musikabende, Chorabende

Performance by the Taos School of Music - Musikabend mit der Taos School of Music

Registration – Anmeldung

Schedule – Zeitplan

Schedule of fees – Gebührentabelle

Sign-out sheet – Ambeleliste

Special note on meals – Anmerkung über die Mahlzeiten

Special teachers’ program – Zum Programm des Lehrerseminars

Teaching assistants – Lehrassistenten

Teacher training course - das Lehrerseminar

Theater group – Theatergruppe

Transportation – Transportmöglichkeiten

Trip to the Santa Fe Opera - Besuch der Santa Fe Opera

Volleyball- and Wiffleball tournament - Volleyball- und Wiffleballturniere

Weeks – Wochen

What not to bring. – Was Sie nicht mitbringen dürfen.

What to bring. – Was Sie mitbringen sollen.
**Grundkurs Themes by Year**

1976: Germany-America, 200 Years
1977: Aspects of German Culture in the 20th Century
1978: Cultural and Political Perspectives of the German Speaking Countries since 1945
1979: booklet not found
1980: German Culture in Europe
1981: booklet not found
1982: N/A “Lectures and Discussion on German Studies”
1983: 300 Years German Immigration to America; 500 Years Martin Luther
1984: Germany in the 80’s
1985: The German speaking world today
1986: booklet not found
1987: booklet not found
1988: Deutschland aktuell
1989: Die Deutschen in der Welt
1990: Deutschland seit dem 9. November
1991: Die deutsche Welt im Umbruch
1992: Das vereinigte Deutschland im neuen Europa
1993: Die deutschsprachige Welt und Europa
1994: Germany and the German-speaking World in the 1990s
1995: Die atlantische Brücke: Beziehungen zwischen dem deutschsprachigen Europa und den Vereinigten Staaten (The Atlantic Bridge: Relations between German speaking Europe and the USA)
1996: Deutschland und die Deutschen nach der Wende
1997: Deutschland und die Europäische Union
1998: Aspekte deutschsprachiger Kultur
1999: 250 Jahre Goethezeit oder ‘Goethe verworfen’?
2000: booklet not found
2001: Das Neue Millennium: Projeketonen, Phantasien, Realitäten
2003: Deutschsprachige Kulturen – Geschichte und Geschichten
2004: Grenzüberschreitungen: Reale und imaginäre Grenzen in der deutschsprachigen Kultur
2005: Jubelpunkte, Höhepunkte, Wendepunkte
2006: Total Global, Zischen lokalen Traditionen und globaler Kultur
2007: Utopie und Wirklichkeit in der deutschsprachigen Kulturwelt
2008: Freiheit und Demokratie in der deutschsprachigen Kultur
2009: Die Republik als Ideal und Wirklichkeit in der deutschsprachigen Kultur
2010: Das Subjekt der Moderne: Zwischen Poesie und Prosa, Kooperation und Konkurrenz
2011: Wahrheit oder Lüge? Die Logik der Fiktion
2012: Erinnerungen an die Zukunft
2013: Zwischenräume – Grenzen und Möglichkeiten
2014: Europa – Traum und Wirklichkeit
2015: 40 Jahre Deutsche Sommerschule von New Mexico: Transatlantische Beziehungen gestern–heute-morgen
2016: Exodus, Migration, Integration: Flüchtlingskrise in Europa
2017: Populismus und Demokratie: gestern-heute-morgen
2018: Wechselwirkungen: Umwelt, Technologie und Kultur
2019: Grenzen und Grenzüberschreitungen
2020: Traum und Wirklichkeit in der deutschsprachigen Kultur
### Total Costs per Year for Undergraduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for undergraduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for undergraduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,616.00</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,616.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,688.00</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,733.70</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,824.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,824.76</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,824.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,880.00</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3,824.76</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,824.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,832.00</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4,010.61</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,010.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2,091.20</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4,126.66</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,126.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>544.00</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>4,302.75</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,302.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>596.00</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>4,478.84</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,478.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>649.00</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4,441.96</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,441.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>698.50</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>4,748.94</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,748.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>748.00</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,528.50</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,528.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>806.50</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,660.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>865.00</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,660.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,043.00</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,820.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,040.00</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,136.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,098.00</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,275.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,163.00</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,387.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,228.00</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,223.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1,274.00</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,356.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,332.50</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,479.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All prices were taken from the GSSch booklets.  
**The booklets from 1979, 1981, 1986, 2000, and 2016 were not found. These prices were averaged from the year before and the year after.  
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**Total Costs per Year for Graduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,688.00</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,876.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,972.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,880.00</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,972.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,879.00</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,168.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,141.30</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,284.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,240.00</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,435.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,249.20</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,587.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,406.00</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,615.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,452.00</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4,926.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>748.00</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,601.00</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>806.50</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>865.00</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prices in US Dollars
Year of the Summer Session
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total costs for graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1,043.00</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,930.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,229.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,098.00</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,384.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,164.50</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,231.00</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,336.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1,307.00</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,349.50</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All prices were taken from the GSSch booklets.
**The booklets from 1979, 1981, 1986, 2000, and 2016 were not found. These prices were averaged from the year before and the year after.
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Appendix D: Student Enrollment Trends

GSSch Enrollment Trends under the New Guard

Data taken from UNM’s Office of the Registrar at the following location:

https://registrar.unm.edu/reports--statistics/index.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer/Year</th>
<th>Total # of credit hours students registered for at the GSSch</th>
<th>Summer/Year</th>
<th>Total # of credit hours students registered for at the GSSch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.

Graph 3.
**German Enrollment Trends at UNM Since 1958**

Data taken from the Modern Language Association’s website at the following location:

https://apps.mla.org/flsurvey_search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undergrad</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1958/ Fall</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959/ Fall</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/ Fall</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/ Fall</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/ Fall</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/ Fall</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/ Fall</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/ Fall</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972/ Fall</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974/ Fall</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977/ Fall</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980/ Fall</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983/ Fall</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/ Fall</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/ Fall</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/ Fall</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/ Fall</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/ Fall</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/ Fall</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/ Fall</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/ Fall</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.

Average 1950s – 279 undergraduates

Average 1960s – 537 undergraduates

Average 1970s – 454 undergraduates / 2 graduates reported in 1972 (no program existed)

Average 1980s – 329 undergraduates / 6 graduates (rounded off)

Average 1990s – 304 undergraduates / 17 graduates

Average 2000s – 295 undergraduates / 18 graduates

Average 2010s – 301 undergraduates / 15 graduates
Graph 4.
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Appendix E: Attributes of a Resilient Educational Leader

**Participant Defined Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute of a resilient educational leader.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader maintains an overall sense of well-being.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader knows how to deal with stress.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader possesses emotional intelligence.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader follows a moral purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>2, 3, 7</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 8</td>
<td>3, 6, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1.

**Literature Defined Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A resilient educational leader maintains an overall sense of well-being.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader knows how to deal with stress.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader possesses high levels of emotional intelligence.</th>
<th>A resilient educational leader follows a moral purpose.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Chart 2.
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