

Living through a Pandemic: How Students Cope

Mary Ann Hollingsworth, PhD
University of West Alabama, USA

Abstract

The Coronavirus pandemic of 2020 has brought much challenge and disruption to the lives of students in elementary through high schools, their families, and their communities. 74 students in a graduate course in human growth and development conducted action research via interviews with volunteers across childhood and adult lifespan stages to ascertain impact and response to the pandemic experience with a special focus on the role of school in that experience. The majority of volunteers were students, with other participants being educators, parents, and various community members. Volunteers were interviewed on reactions to the pandemic experience, positive and negative life experiences both before the pandemic and during the pandemic that influenced coping, and reflections on what their local schools were doing to facilitate educational function. Interview responses aligned with research already published on student experience with the pandemic and also produced new insight for future endeavors by the educational community in promotion of development of protective factors before similar crises occur and optimal interventions by schools during the experience of crises.

Keywords: Students and Covid-19, Schools and Covid-19, Student resilience and risk in crises

Introduction

The Coronavirus (Covid-19) pandemic has brought life disruption across the globe to people of all ages. This disruption has impacted business and industry, national economics, community life, family life, and the lives of individuals. The experience of education is a core life component for people from the ages of five (kindergarten) to the late teens for those who are in college. Education is even a core part of life for children under the age of five who may be in a day-care setting or pre-kindergarten. These contexts of life have moved into a new normal for survival through the pandemic and perhaps laid the foundation for a more permanent new normal.

The Ecological theory of human development by Urie Bronfenbrenner was initially proposed in 1989 and has continued since then to develop as a key framework for the integrated systems of life that have mutual impact with life-long development of individuals. Johnson (2008) emphasized the complex

non-linear changes that can affect the education process for all ages of students. Johnson's research provided in-depth examination of the interaction of the various systemic contexts of the Ecological theory within an individual school. As these contexts impact schools, they likewise impacted the individual students and their respective life contexts.

Szente (2016) noted that a disaster experiences tend to be actions of or on nature such as hurricanes and tornadoes or actions by and on humans such as terrorism or health-related. The Covid-19 pandemic has been likened to the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918-1919 in which one-third of the world's population at that time became infected (CDC, 2020). The Covid-19 pandemic has generated worldwide infection and impact as well. This phenomenon is well aligned with the current framework of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological theory – the Person-Process_Context-Time (PPCT) model (Rosa and Tudge, 2013).

Rosa and Tudge (2013) noted that in the PPCT model, Person is best described as a component of Disposition toward generativity force of pro-activity and goal orientation or disposition toward destructive force of tendencies toward impulsivity, or violence. Person also included "Resource characteristics that helped a person to effectively engage in proximal processes (p. 253). Processes are best described as "a joint function of the developing person and environment (both immediate and remote)" (p. 252). Context was described as those environmental contextual systems that had been a core of the Ecological theory from inception forward – with the four contexts of "Microsystem as the setting that supports face to face interaction between person and others, Meosystem as the relationship that occurs between microsystems, Exosystem as environmental components outside participation by a person, but with influence on the person, and Macrosystem as those environmental influences per the culture the person lives in" (pp. 246-247). Finally Time was described by the model as the timeline of a person's life development journey embedded in the historical times in which a person lives" (p.54).

The experience of students in Covid-19 has been strongly integrated with the systems of life influence and development as portrayed by the ever-evolving Ecological theory by Bronfenbrenner. Much of this also impacted the educational experience of school and students along with impact on the way schools do business. Life before the pandemic, life and school during the pandemic, and life in the future once the pandemic is past are integrated as the person and environmental systems frame ultimate development.

Literature Review:

As Covid-19 is still a global pandemic experience with unknown ending date, published literature is still limited on impact of the experience

and lessons to be learnt – this is still a work in progress. Szente (2016) noted a disaster category that included a health crisis, which could embrace the current Covid-19 pandemic. There is much literature on disaster experience and impact with education that can support study of impact of Covid-19 on the person in the experience of education and the business of education. Guidance from such literature can inform educators and individuals in both development of prevention of negative impact and implementation and sustainment of coping and growing during a disaster or pandemic. Insight can also be gained on parameters for planning future intervention to help students and schools survive and thrive through pandemics or similar disasters.

Building Resilience Pre-Pandemic or Disaster:

Building resilience and survival or thriving in the midst of a crisis are results of both risk factors and protective factors that have developed within the individual. Forest-Bank, et al (2014) specifically examined development of these with the multitude of students who live in public housing across the United States. Study results indicated impact within Ecological systems that integrate with the student-school experience.

In recent years, there has been increased focus on the role of Social Emotional Learning (SEL) within the context of education. Knight, et al (2019) discussed SEL as primary prevention for students to grow capacity for survival and thriving amidst crises situations. In a study with middle-school students, Knight, et al (2019) implemented a program that had a 16-lesson curriculum on SEL topics such as self-regulation, “understanding boundaries, or recognizing manipulative behaviors. Interactive activities, practice skills, and strategies included in the program incorporated a variety of cognitive–behavioral techniques, expressive art, and metacognition and mindfulness techniques that are geared toward improving emotional regulation, social competence, self-awareness, and motivation through the implementation of a generalized learning experience.” (p. 215). Results indicated efficacy in use of such a curriculum. These lessons could be taught through individualized or group participation in an online setting as well as with face-to-face instruction.

Stark, et al. (2020) noted a shift in the current Covid-19 experience from “coping with immediate impact of the crisis to planning for future success in navigation of a new normal.” (p. S133). They noted that many aspects of life can be protective factors to build the resilience of a child when confronted with life adversity. These protective factors are present in each of the contextual systems within the Ecological theory. Examples that were given were monitoring and warmth of conscientious caregiving and access to appropriate social services and health care within the local community. Stark, et. al. also noted that an experience like the Covid-19 Pandemic could undermine efficacy of protective factors present at onset of a pandemic. This

supported purposeful pro-active intervention during a pandemic for maintenance and strengthening protective factors.

The strongest influences in the developmental trajectory of life are perhaps those instilled in the earlier years of life. Much research has been shared on the impact of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). Sciaraffa, et al. (2013) discussed the promotion of resilience-building by Early Childhood Educators in the presence of these. Though this study was conducted before the current pandemic, insights from the study are still beneficial to a global ACE). Sciaraffa, et al. (2013) noted three core protective systems that can be strengthened with habitual attention from Early Childhood Educators. These systems are individual capacities of the child, the child's connection with a nurturing caregiver and other caring, competent people, and presence within a protective community especially in the areas of faith and culture. (p. 346). Examples of potential intervention by Early Childhood Educators were helping children to build skills or self-regulation and appropriate expression of emotions; strengthening the quality versus quantity of caring by respective Early Childhood teachers and attendants; maintain safe and child-friendly learning environments; and initiation of and collaboration with community-wide efforts to support health and well-being of the community youngest citizens.

In-Pandemic Coping and Growing:

As noted in the previous section, Stark, et al. (2020) indicated need for intervention during a pandemic or other crisis that helped students to sustain and grow personally and academically through the crisis – to both survive and to thrive. Stark et al. shared four implications for intervention, two of which could be within the realm of local school coordination. Schools could support access to mental and physical health services support via telemedicine such as connection between students and families with telehealth practitioners. Schools could also support both short-term and long-term solutions. Short-term solutions could address acute student needs for intervention such as use of local referral for service. Long-term solution integrate coordination of school resource staff such as school counselors, nurses, or social-workers for a combination of in-house and external resources service and education support for students. Examples are increased onsite health checks or psychoeducation classes and groups for students.

Forest-Banks, et al. (2014) summarized individual response to challenges as Coping. Behavioral coping by students included actions such as increase in proactive communication to help self such as asking a teacher for explanation or other type of help for academics. Cognitive coping focused on use of “an internal mental process for discernment of an appropriate response to a challenge” (p. 205). An example of this was a student who wrote thoughts down in a step-by-step fashion to support challenge resolution. Emotional

coping was a person's emotional response to a challenge. A positive response that was shared by one student was release of feeling of anger through expenditure of energy in doing household chores. Spiritual coping was integration of faith or religious beliefs in response to challenges. A student response that exemplified this was reflection on his particular religion's belief in the importance of health minds, bodies, and souls.

The component of family is most prominent in the Ecological theory Microsystem, but also presents a role of influence across other systems with prevention of crisis impact via growth of protective factors as well as with efficacy in survival during crisis, and thriving past a crisis. Lamb (2020) shared multiple ways that families have met the challenges of the pandemic and grown stronger as a unit in the process. One example was family members reading together as parent/child or sibling/sibling. Other examples were watching positive television programs together, making things together from meals to make-do items for use at home, and playing together in both traditional board games or games accessed via the internet. Lamb (2020) indicated the benefit of families continuing this support of each other even as life moved past the confinements of the pandemic.

Over time, Trauma Informed Practice (TIP) has been developed to help students who are victims of complex trauma that may be initiated with an early adverse childhood experience and sustained through presence of multiple risk factors in the students' lives. Marquez (2020) discussed TIP strategies that could prove beneficial in support of students during the pandemic who already had presence of complex trauma. Marquez (2020) noted that while all students likely have experienced some life setbacks, these have been magnified where disadvantage was already present. Strategies were shared that could be advantageous if used even post-pandemic as part of an ongoing practice. Some of the strategies were establishment of consistency in school routines and communication methods, presentation of instructional material in smaller increments of information in the distance learning formats, and provision of frequent opportunity for students, teachers, and families to engage with each other virtually such as the use with videoconferencing.

The experience of both life and of the educational process has produced inequities across individuals and cultures – before Covid-19, during the pandemic, and in the future after the pandemic fades away. Mogaji (2020) reflected on inequities present in Nigeria with school closures and resolution efforts that could be initiated from national levels down. These efforts included the common alternative response of remote learning via computer technology as well as offering educational venues on other forms of media such as television and radio. An example of this in the United States is teacher use of education programs offered by Public Broadcasting networks. This

diversity of venues provided greater opportunity for teaching to reach learners across the country.

Just as inequities are present for natural born citizens of an area, there has been increased opportunity for increased attention to needs of students and families living in an area that is not of their native culture. An example is with Latino immigrants living in rural settings of the United States. Raffaelli et al (2012) examined risks and resilience building with some of these families. Study results offer potential for help within the current response to the Covid-19 pandemic as well as potential for building a foundation of operation in a new normal. One risk factor that was noted was the lack of capacity for rural communities to adequately support needs of immigrants. Due to cultural differences across the world, this risk factor could be globally common. An effective response to working with the “new” has always been to learn more about the new and the needs of the new to support planning for the needed support. Three indicators of individual and family well-being in this study have been present within the pandemic – “life-satisfaction, financial well-being, and food security.” (p.571). While these three facets of life are not the responsibility of schools and educators, assuming a stance of work with the whole child frames a child and family relationship with a school in which school personnel strive to help guide and support in getting needs met. An example is the use of service learning in classrooms where students may engage in a project such as establishment of an in-school food pantry where members of the school community contribute food to be available to students and families when a real need is present.

Intersection with Education and Schools:

Higher Education has grown exponentially in use of learning modalities that are just now receiving serious attention from the P12 sector on education. Covid-19 has prompted this sector to embrace the alternative of school online in order to continue school in a world of mandatory social distancing. Brass and Lynch (2020) discussed the rise of Personalized Learning even pre-Covi-19 in which online learning platforms have been developed to offer student opportunity for individualized progression through competency-based curriculums aligned with the Common Core standards now in the majority of public schools in the United States. (p. 4.) This discussion mirrored both opportunity and challenge present for schools in current response to education needs per the Covid-19 pandemic and planning for future education frameworks. The greatest challenge and perceived problem with education online is the depersonalization of it for student and teacher participants. Brass and Lynch (2020) noted that proponents of this approach to education of minors provides greater opportunity for learning that better

meets individual student needs and greater capacity for objective tracking of student progress across a curriculum.

Even before the Covid-19 pandemic, the experience of school has contained mixed social and life benefits among students from various backgrounds. Many of these have been magnified during the pandemic in large part due to availability and capability with technology. Friedman, et al. (2020) examined the perceptions on impact from 31 urban Catholic School teachers with their teaching and learning by their students. Study results confirmed the challenge of these particular risk factors as poor students had less time and opportunity for supportive social connection and typical technology tools such as the internet or even a computer at home. Friedman, et al. (2020) also noted the tendency of superiority of hard copy reading material to digital reading material – yet education in the pandemic severely lessened access to hard copy reading sources. This was again a point of inequality across students.

Much of school success or failure rests on the shoulders of the administrative leadership. Gyang (2020) discussed the sense of helplessness felt by many school leaders in Nigeria with the Covid-19 pandemic and response to recovery with implementation of a Community-Based Education Leadership Model. This model foster collaboration between school and community leadership toward successful navigation of the new normal of remote learning to keep the school experience functional. The focus was on integration of three types of leadership. These were “1. Administrative leadership that is hierarchical and controlling; 2. Enabling leadership that encourages creative problem solving, learning, and adaptability; and 3. Adaptive leadership that is dynamic and empowers change.” (p. 75). Through focused development and coordination of these facets of leadership, schools were able to better maneuver the challenges of education amidst the pandemic, and also establish precedence for increased efficacy between school and community with support of student progress after the pandemic.

A common experience in the face of challenge, change, or disaster is the need for many people to wear multiple hats and work beyond the “job description.” Pollock (2020) shared a two-pronged approach that has become common in the response of some school leaders in Ontario, Canada. These school leaders have led effort to have safe schools with workable contexts for the future. They have also led efforts as instructional leaders toward a framework of digital instruction. Pollock (2020) suggested that school leaders lead integration of preventive practices into curriculum and teacher professional development so that focus could be consistently present. There was also encouragement for school leaders to promote and lead development of protocols and practice for response to potential crises. A final suggestion was for school leaders to promote habitual self-care with the school leader-

self providing the prime example for doing this. In the second prong of leadership with digital instructions, Pollock (2020) addressed need for school leaders to become as expert as possible in the nuances of delivery of remote instruction and to coordinate and monitor this in the same efficacy needed for good leadership of face-to-face instruction.

Hung, et al. (2020) also addressed the role of education leadership in birthing a new normal of learning management during the Covid-19 pandemic. This study, conducted in Singapore, presented quicker movement in a direction of digital education foundation that had already begun. Hung, et al. (2020) noted that the pandemic had presented crisis, there was great opportunity in the midst of that crisis, particularly in the realm of education leadership. Three barriers to successful progression were identified that needed management in a new normal – infrastructure to promote equality in Student Learning space such as promotion of internet access across student communities and homes; development and oversight of appropriate pedagogy for digital learning; and appropriate development and encouragement of ecological sustainability across the environmental systems discussed earlier per the Bronfenbrenner developmental model.

Pandemic educational crisis and response has been global with lessons learned shared also by educators in Australia. Kidson, et al. (2020) noted that the key focus in the midst of a crisis is assuredly that of survival with post-crisis being an opportunity to reevaluate former policies and practices in the light of lessons learned during the crisis. Through the challenges and responses experienced from the local school level to the National Cabinet level, insight was gained on the need to decentralize management to the local level in the heart of crisis and then to integrate local voices in renewed national guidance and oversight through post-crisis recovery.

Foundations for Future Survival and Thriving:

Many schools have instituted a component known as “Alternative School:” which provides for continuing education of students whose behavior has consistently presented disruption for classmates. The Covid-10 pandemic has prevented an alternative to the regular normal of school. While reasoning for the alternative might be different, lessons learned with conduct of alternative school can still be useful in building foundations for future survival and thriving in the education arena for whatever crises may appear. Zolloski, et al. (2016) studied facets of personal resilience that had been developed by students participating in alternative school environments. For many of the participants, the alternative school experience served as a protective factor in and of itself. Examples shared by student participants were greater sense of personal goals and means to achieve these, a more focused view of success as

doing what one wants to do and needs to do versus success as other-defined, and a view of resilience as the basic capacity to keep going and never give up.

Children from Pre-Kindergarten at four years of age to adolescents at 18 years of age spend a considerable percentage of their lives for those years in the context of “school.” Christiansen and Christainsen (1997) noted that many of the life needs that students bring with them to school are met in the routine experience of school. Examples are socialization with peers, connection with positive and caring adult role models, opportunity to achieve in their respective talents and capacity such as academics, sports, or extra-curricular organizations, and preparation for the independence of adulthood.

Christiansen and Christainsen (1997) suggested several supportive components that schools can initiate or strengthen development of protective factors for students as they move past the current pandemic and toward a viable and successful life in adulthood. They noted the key in provision of benefit from these is a mindset of purposeful pro-activity on the part of the school. One example was re-integration of adjunct skills building to the academic curriculum. A pendulum swing has already begun on this as schools lessen focus on just academic subjects covered in the annual “state test” to include more opportunity for students to participate in sports, special interest clubs, or creative endeavors such as art, music, or drama training and performance within the context of school. Two other important supports were key investment of family into students and mentoring by school personnel such as teachers or extra-curricular sponsors.

Family involvement has been a desired support for developmental success of students and has typically been a marker for positive student progression through their P12 career. Lack of family involvement and support has tended to correlate with unsuccessful progression in school. Garbacz, et al. (2016) noted positive association between family involvement with schools about their students and both participation with school and achievement at school. They also noted negative association between family involvement and behavior problems and student dropout. Typical interaction between school and family has been provision of school initiated information to families about students, conduct of some learning activities at home such as monitoring of student homework, and some cases of care-giver volunteering with school activities or parent-teacher associations to support the work of learning and school. The pandemic-inspired exodus of students from the school building to the home has increased family involvement in their education whether a welcome increase or not.

Future school intervention to help students survive and thrive through the remainder of the pandemic and afterwards would benefit from purposeful strengthening of family involvement. Garbacz et al. (2016) encouraged specific planning for a core of family involvement with school that included

integration of family representatives in problem-solving response by the school, clarification of expectations for student school work in the context of home such as completion of homework or reading time by younger students with adults at home, creation and maintenance of school physical space that is family-friendly, and strengthening bid-directional family-school communication.

The Covid-19 pandemic has been unprecedented in its specific nuances. However, large-impact crises have occurred throughout history and will continue to occur in the future. Examples are natural disasters and terrorism. This pandemic can serve as a reminder to build and maintain a foundation of prevention, intervention, and postvention. Pfefferbaum, et al (2014) addressed the need for the construct of coping to be core in planning for future disaster responses. Promotion of coping can be framed with building protective factors and reduction of risk factors. As risk factors are often external to the individual, community or even culture, a more efficient approach would be to work on building protective factors. Pfefferbaum, et al. (2014) noted the benefit of strengthening social support with families, communities and in-school as well as strengthening access to routine community resources for daily living needs and access to spiritual support.

Methodology:

A qualitative, action-research study was integrated into a graduate course on human growth and development in which 74 students interviewed acquaintance volunteers from childhood to adulthood about impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on their personal resilience with a focus on the role of the school experience in this. Volunteers answered questions on reactions to the experience of Covid-19, negative and positive life factors before Covid-19 that may have contributed to their management of the pandemic experience, negative and positive life factors during Covid-19 that may have contributed to their management of the pandemic experience and sources of strength and support during the pandemic. Two questions were answered on what local schools were doing to help the education process through the pandemic and what the volunteer would like to see local schools do additionally to further help the education process during this time. Students in the graduate course were asked to reflect on what they could do as future educators to help students to build pre-crisis resilience and what they could also do as response intervention in the midst of a future crisis with similarities to the pandemic.

Participants:

The study included two sets of participants. The first set were 84 students enrolled in a graduate level course on human growth and development with most students being current educators training to be future

school counselors. The second set of participants were the volunteers who were interviewed on their Covid-19 experience. This study was conducted during terms for summer and fall of 2020. Volunteer participants consisted of family, friends, or colleagues known by student participants in their local communities. Table 1 depicts the age range, gender, and any other pertinent characteristics about participants.

Table 1 - Study Participant Characteristics.

Study Factor	Frequency
Childhood: 6 to 11 years of age	13
Adolescence: 12 to 18 years of age	21
Early Adulthood: 20 to 39 years of age	18
Middle Adulthood: 40 to 59 years of age	15
Senior Adulthood: 60 years of age or older	7
Male	21
Female	53
Elementary – High School Students	34
Profession as an educator	7
Parent of Elementary – High School Student	8
Other	25

Procedure:

In their research, students first selected a volunteer whom they knew from their circle of family, friends, or coworkers with whom they could safely interview within the parameters of Covid-19 pandemic precautions. They obtained agreement of the person for a confidential interview about the experience, and then interviewed the person with a set of questions from the instructor as shared below. The second part of the research was to share personal reflection on what they learned from the research that they could use in their future work as counselors. This was framed in a Summary and Reflection paper to include a section on Pathway of Prevention in which the student shared insight on pro-activity that he or she could do to help students build resilience prior to the occurrence of a crisis. A section was also included on Pathway of Successful Management in which the student shared insight on potential responsive interventions to help students survive and thrive in the midst of a crisis.

Table 2 - Interview Questions

1. Describe the impact of Covid-19 on this person – this is an initial statement given by the person.
2. Describe the immediate reaction to the experience – days and several weeks afterwards.
3. Describe the current reaction to the experience – now at the time of your course.

4. Negative Life factors before the experience that may have contributed to management of the experience.
5. Negative Life factors during the experience that may have hindered ability to manage the experience.
6. Positive Life factors before the experience that may have positively influenced ability to manage the experience.
7. Positive Life factors during the experience that may have helped the ability to manage the experience.
8. What helps the volunteer to stay personally strong now in light of this life challenge?
9. What are local schools doing to help the education process?
10. What else would the person like for the schools to do to help the education process?

Data Analysis and Findings:

Volunteer responses to interview questions and graduate course students reflections were analyzed for themes related to the experience of school in the pandemic and the preferred school response to help create a better school experience while moving forward in and out of the pandemic. These were grouped by the categories of Student, Educator, Parent, and Other. All persons in the category of Other represented a variety of professional backgrounds and were all adults. They still responded to the interview questions about school.

Themes present in Student Responses

As the focus of the study was toward students and the pandemic, student responses were examined for both individual response as well as thoughts about the role of school. Most students indicated a sense of joy at getting out of school for some early spring break, which soon turned into sadness and frustration at being physically separated from friends and even from their teachers. Many students expressed frustration at use of distance learning, and indicated a preference for face-to-face time in the classroom and increased appreciation for their teachers. Adolescent students reported building some habits they considered to be bad, such as overeating or under-exercising. All ages of students reported frustration at limitations for sports activities. Many indicated development of boredom over the months of the pandemic. Students who were high school seniors reported negative feelings about missing a traditional prom or traditional graduation ceremony.

Common responses by students on what schools were doing in the midst of the pandemic included health precautions such as sanitization, social distancing, wearing masks, and increased reliance on technology. Rigor of school work was mixed as some students reported increased amounts of work and some reported more leniency in submission deadlines of work. Several students suggested increased availability of tutoring service per the challenges of learning online. Many students expressed a desire for schools to “move

back to normal” as soon as they could, with a desire to get away from learning online.

Themes present in Educator Responses

Educator responses were examined for themes regarding the role of schools in prevention and future directions. Educator responses on what schools were doing in the pandemic tended to mirror student responses with some additional details on interventions such as use of emergency grant funding to purchase laptops or chrome books for student households and hiring cleaning services with capacity above that of the routine school housekeeping capacity. Educator reflections on additional school action moving forward included attention to organization for more virtual operation and school attention to more support of teachers in this new normal of operation.

Themes present in Parent Responses

Parental responses presented a theme of satisfaction with what schools were doing to support students such as technology support and some increased parental communication via technology modalities. Suggestions were for more information blasts from the school to families on a regular schedule, such as biweekly. Suggestions for additional intervention included more helps for students who might be struggling at the elementary levels versus families having to generate their own supports for these students. Many parents also indicated desire for support training for them from schools in how to work with their children on the school learning management systems, logging-in, etc.

Themes present in Responses of Other

Responses by volunteers who did not have direct interaction with schools tended to reflect common information shared on media news sources. These varied from local newspapers to national news television programs. Some thoughtful insight from volunteers in the Other category included consideration for school Hot Lines for families and community as well as a more universal learning platform across districts.

Themes in Graduate Student Reflection on Prevention

The most common insight shared by students was to focus on the building of positive habits in self-care for themselves and for promotion with their students and student families. Student insight on this included promotion of time for relaxation and recreation to help people de-stress. Common student reflections for helping students was to promote the building of good skills for academic achievement which could later translate to good

adult work skills such as self-regulation, goal-setting and monitoring, and regular attention to core academic skills such as math and reading.

Themes in Graduate Student Reflection on Intervention

Student insight on intervention amidst a crisis tended to be to also promote effective self-care during a crisis. Other common reflections were to maintain routine and rigor as well as effective two-way communication with all stakeholders such as students, families, and community members.

Conclusion

This student research supported insight presented from literature reviewed on facets of building resilience pre-pandemic, survival and thriving during the pandemic, and needs for forward movement of people and schools past the pandemic. The role of schools as an integral player in daily student, family, and community life was supported both outside and within crisis situations, such as the Covid-19 pandemic. Students gained practical insight on what would be important focus for them as future educational counselors both in helping students to build resilience and protective factors to assist with getting through any future crises. They also gained insight on possible best practices while in the midst of a crisis.

References:

1. Brass, J., & Lynch, T. L. (2020). Personalized learning: A history of the present. *JCT: Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 35(2), 3.
2. CDC (2020). 1918 Pandemic (H1N1 virus). Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/flu/pandemic-resources/1918-pandemic-h1n1.html>
3. Christiansen, J., & Christiansen, J. L. (1997). Using protective factors to enhance resilience and school.. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 33(2), 86. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1177/105345129703300203>
4. Forrest-Bank, S., Nicotera, N., Anthony, E., Gonzales, B., & Jenson, J. (2014). Risk, Protection, and resilience among youth residing in public housing neighborhoods. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 31(4), 295–314. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1007/s10560-013-0325-1>
5. Friedman AA, Rosen-Reynoso M, Cownie III CT, Hunter CJ.(2020). Looking at Catholic Schools' responses to the COVID-19 pandemic through the lens of Catholic social teaching principles. *Journal of Catholic Education*. 23(1), 214. Accessed November 29, 2020. <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.uwa.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=146780297&site=eds-live>

6. Garbacz, S. A., McIntosh, K., Eagle, J. W., Dowd-Eagle, S. E., Hirano, K. A., & Ruppert, T. (2016). Family engagement within schoolwide positive behavioral interventions and supports. *Preventing School Failure*, 60(1), 60–69. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1080/1045988X.2014.976809>
7. Gyang, T. S. (2020). Educational leadership response to the COVID-19 pandemic crisis in Nigeria. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 48(3), 73–79.
8. Hung, D., Jun Song Huang, & Chloe Tan. (2020). Leadership in times of pandemics: Reflections from Singapore. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 48(2), 56–63.
9. Johnson, E.S. (2008). Ecological systems and Complexity Theory: Toward an alternative model of accountability in education complicity: *An International Journal of Complexity and Education*. 5 (1), 1- 10
10. Kidson, P., Lipscombe, K., & Tindall-Ford, S. (2020). Co-designing educational policy: Professional voice and policy making post-COVID. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 48(3), 15–22.
11. Knight, M. A., Haboush-Deloye, A., Goldberg, P. M., & Grob, K. (2019). Strategies and tools to embrace prevention with upstream programs: A novel pilot program for enhancing social and emotional protective factors in middle school students. *Children & Schools*, 41(4), 213–220. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1093/cs/cdz020>
12. Lamb, A. (2020). Family togetherness: A dozen ideas to bridge school and home. *Teacher Librarian*, 48(1), 54–57.
13. Márquez Aponte, E. (2020). Trauma-informed strategies to support complexly traumatized adolescents in schools in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Theory in Action*, 13(3), 124.
14. Mogaji, I. M. (2020). Understanding Educational responses to school closure during the COVID-19 pandemic: A case for equity in Nigeria. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 48(1), 59–65.
15. Pfefferbaum, B., Noffsinger, M., Wind, L., & Allen, J. (2014). Children’s coping in the context of disasters and terrorism. *Journal of Loss & Trauma*, 19(1), 78–97. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1080/15325024.2013.791797>

16. Pollock, K. (2020). School leaders' work during the COVID-19 pandemic: A two-pronged approach. *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))*, 48(3), 38–44.
17. Raffaelli, M., Tran, S. P., Wiley, A. R., Galarza-Heras, M., & Lazarevic, V. (2012). Risk and resilience in rural communities: The experiences of immigrant Latina mothers. *Family Relations*, 61(4), 559–570.
18. Rosa, E.M. & Tudge, J. (2013) Urie Bronfenbrenner's theory of human development: Its evolution from ecology to bioecology. *Journal of Family Theory & Review* 5, 243–258 DOI:10.1111/jftr.12022
19. Sciaraffa, M. A., Zeanah, P. D., & Zeanah, C. H. (2018). Understanding and promoting resilience in the context of adverse childhood experiences. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 46(3), 343–353. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1007/s10643-017-0869-3>
20. Szente, J. (2016). Assisting children caught in disasters: Resources and suggestions for practitioners. *Early Childhood Educ J* 44, 201–207 DOI 10.1007/s10643-015-0709-2
21. Stark, A. M., White, A. E., Rotter, N. S., & Basu, A. (2020). Shifting from survival to supporting resilience in children and families in the COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons for informing U.S. mental health priorities. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 12(S1), S133–S135. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1037/tra0000781>
22. Zolkoski, S. M., Bullock, L. M., & Gable, R. A. (2016). Factors associated with student resilience: Perspectives of graduates of alternative education programs. *Preventing School Failure*, 60(3), 231–243. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.uwa.edu/10.1080/1045988X.2015.1101677>