Stress and Anxiety

Contributions of the STAR Award Winners

Edited by Petra Buchwald, Kathleen A. Moore, Krzysztof Kaniasty, and Paulina Arenas-Landgrave

∠λογος!

STRESS, COPING AND RESILIENCE IN ADOLESCENTS: GROUPS RISK COMPARISON

Paulina Arenas-Landgrave¹, Marisol Pérez-Ramos², Ana Inés Machado³, Petra Buchwald⁴ & Emilia Lucio¹

¹ National Autonomous University of México

² Autonomous Metropolitan University, Iztapalapa

³ Catholic University of Uruguay

² University of Wuppertal, Germany

Email: palandgr@unarn.mx

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between stressful life events and coping strategies associated with emotional risk and resilience in adolescents at school. The total sample included 473 adolescents aged 12 to 16 years from a public school in Mexico City. All participants completed the Life-Events Questionnaire and the Coping Questionnaire for Adolescents. Afterwards, 332 adolescents were classified into three stress risk groups: no risk, high distress and resilients. Results indicated that students with high distress manifested less adaptation to stressful life events and were at higher emotional risk as their main coping strategies were dysfunctional, such as obsessive thoughts and hopelessness, avoidance and self-injury. In contrast, resilient adolescents showed better adaptation to stressful life events as their main coping strategies were functional, such as seeking guidance and finding solutions. Gender differences show that girls are more at emotional risk than boys as they perceive more stressful life events in some areas and use more dysfunctional coping strategies in their problem-solving approach.

Introduction

Over the past decades, research has addressed factors that increase the risk for social, mental and health problems among adolescents. Findings from different studies stress the relationship between adversity and adaptation in youth (Bradshaw, 1990; Brennan, Le Brocque, & Hammen, 2003; Fraser, Kirby, & Smokowski, 2004; Garmezy, 1988) and its consequences in adulthood considering that human development is a continuous process with critical periods in which failure or succes in adaptation has strong influence (Achenbach, 1982). In this regard, adolescence is a particular developmental stage that requires considerable adjustment. Every adolescent has to deal with biological and cognitive changes, and with a series of complex and interrelated socio-psychological tasks such as dramatic shifts in relationships with family, friends, and peers (Coleman & Hagell, 2007).

The occurrence of stressful circumstances can result in difficulties that might exceed the coping skills of this population increasing their vulnerability to maladjustment, and they can even alter adolescents's developmental trajectory (Compas, 1987; Fergusson, Beautrais, &

Horwood, 2003; Obradovic, Burt, & Masten, 2006). It has also emerged that some adolescents exposed to major stressors develop emotional/health problems whereas others don't (Garmezy, 1991; 1993; Luthar, 2006; Rew & Horner, 2003). Furthermore, studies revealed that there are several ways to cope with stress, considering that it is the appraisal of potential stressors which determines the level of distress and the coping strategy displayed by youngsters (Frydenberg, 2004; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Seiffge-Krenke, 2009). While it is impossible to prevent adolescents from being exposed to threats, it is possible and extremely relevant to identify their ways of coping in order to promote positive adaptation to adverse life circumstances as a powerful mental health prevention.

Coping and resilience in adolescents

With regard to adolescents' coping strategies this study focuses on the transactional model of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1987) which states that coping includes innumerous ways of dealing with diverse person-environment transactions. Coping is conceptualized as a process rather than an individual trait, and the person's beliefs, resources, and environmental constraints strongly influence that process. Thus, personal resources are significant factors influencing patterns of development (Compas, Connor-Smith, Saltzman, Thomsen, & Wadsworth, 2001; Frydenberg, 2009, Paulina & Petra, in press). Therefore, based on a development perspective, Seiffge-Krenke (2011) establishes two styles of coping: functional and dysfunctional coping. The former refers to the efforts made to manage the problem (in an active or internal way) and the latter to avoid it.

Focusing on strengths and adaptive processes the study of resilience offers a positive alternative to analyze developmental deficits and mental health problems in adolescents. According to Masten (2006; 2014) resilience has been defined as positive adaptation in the context of risk or adversity and encompasses a wide range of phenomena, including the capacity for doing well under adversity, the achievement of good outcomes among people at high risk for maladaptation, and the processes of coping with challenges. Rutter (2006; 2012) conceptualized resilience as a reduced vulnerability to environmental risk experiences and the relatively successful management of stress. He also pointed out that it depends on individual experiences with extreme stress.

Resilience has been studied from numerous perspectives. We consider the concept within the framework of developmental psychopathology (DP) initially defined as the study of origins and individual patterns of behavioral maladaptation (Sroufe & Rutter, 1984). Developmental psychopathology is an integrative and multidisciplinary approach to both, mental health theory and practice that emphasizes the full range of individual differences in adaptation and development over the life span (Cicchetti, 2013; Rutter, 2013; Sroufe, 2013). In order to identify resilience it is important to consider assessments on both, exposure to adversity (stressful life events) and how well a person is doing in response to the occurrence of adversity (adaptation) (Garmezy, 1991; Rutter 2006). As adaptation is the product of current circumstances, prior experiences and adjustments, maladaptation may be best understood in terms of potential and compensatory risk / protective factors (Rutter 2006; 2013) as well as vulnerability associated with emotional risk.

Although most adolescents are in good mental health some are exposed to different risk factors that might increase the chance or maintenance of harm (Fraser, Kirby, & Smokowski,

2003; Arenas, Lucio, & Forn and range from biological of Masten, 2001). Hence, stress adolescents might be importa-

Currently, cumulative economical, educational and (Arenas in press, Medina-M Navarrete, 2011) increasing The purpose of this study is strategies linked to risk or res

Design

A cross-sectional design through a unique temporal po

Participants

An incidental sample of years (M= 12.97; SD = .77) the study. After being screen groups according to the level 24.7%) and resilients (n=95, as no risk. High distress inclustrategies, resilient adolescencoping strategies. The rest of eliminated.

Instruments

Stressful life events were 2003), a self-report measure you do when any of these perceived normative and no School, Achievement and Questions are answered on a good, b) it happened to me This scale indicates a strong

Coping strategies. Co Adolescents (Lucio, Duran, what adolescents do when 1 (1993) questionnaire: school are answered on a 5-point L less I do that, 4) I often do Cronbach's alpha values be whereas others ermore, studies the appraisal of ey displayed by 109). While it is and extremely stion to adverse

toping includes as Coping in Befs, resources are mith, Saltzman, as Therefore, ples of coping to manage the

fers a positive in adolescents, aptation in the including the nong people at a (2006; 2012) riences and the con individual

toncept within the study of Rutter, 1984), touch to both, differences in Seoufe, 2013). Exposure to be occurrence to product of may be best (Rutter 2006).

Smokowski,

2003; Arenas, Lucio, & Forns, 2012). Risk factors are predictors of undesirable outcomes, and range from biological complications to environmental conditions (Forns et al., 2015; Masten, 2001). Hence, stressful environmental conditions as well as individual differences of adolescents might be important in the study of resilience.

Currently, cumulative and rapid transitions are taking place in Mexico due to economical, educational and social factors and have wreaked havoc among Mexican youths (Arenas in press, Medina-Mora, Borges-Guimaraes, Lara et al. 2005; Pelling & Manuel-Navarrete, 2011) increasing the vulnerability for behavioural and mental health problems. The purpose of this study is to identify the relation between stressful life events and coping strategies linked to risk or resilience in Mexican adolescents.

Method

Design

A cross-sectional design in this study was used. Description of population is made through a unique temporal point (Montero & Leon, 2007).

Participants

An incidental sample of 473 adolescents (49.7% boys and 50.3% girls) aged 12 to 16 years (M= 12.97; SD = .77) from a public school in Mexico City voluntarily participated in the study. After being screened a subsample of 332 students were classified into three risk groups according to the level of reported stress; no risk (n=120, 25.4%), high distress (n=117, 24.7%) and resilients (n=95, 20.1%). Adolescents without any stressful events were classified as no risk. High distress includes three or more stressful life events and disfunctional coping strategies, resilient adolescents indicated three or more stressful life events and functional coping strategies. The rest of the sample (n=141, 29.8%) could not be classified and were eliminated.

Instruments

Stressful life events were measured by the Life-Events Questionnaire (Lucio & Duran, 2003), a self-report measure composed of 129 items and one open-ended question: "What did you do when any of these bad situations happened to you?". This instrument evaluates perceived normative and non-normative events in seven areas of adolescent's life: Family, School. Achievement and Failure, Social, Personal, Behavior Problems, and Health. Questions are answered on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from a) it happened to me and was good, b) it happened to me and was bad, and c) it happened to me and was not important. This scale indicates a strong reliability of KR-20.89.

Coping strategies. Coping strategies were evaluated using the Coping Scale for Adolescents (Lucio, Duran, Heredia, & Villarruel, 2014). It consists of 45 items assessing what adolescents do when facing problems in eight domains according to Seiffge-Krenke's (1993) questionnaire: school, parents, peers, leisure, partner, self, job and future. Questions are answered on a 5-point Likert scale: 1) I never do that, 2) Sometimes I do that, 3) More or less I do that, 4) I often do that, 5) I always do that. It has internal consistency reporting Cronbach's alpha values between .59 and .89 (Lucio, Duran, Barcelata & Romero, 2016).

Procedure

The school principal provided support to conduct this study and agreed on written consents to be sent to families via students. Parental agreement was obtained and students themselves were asked to provide informed consent before starting the study. Seven clinical psychologists and three psychology students administered the instruments to students in groups consisting of 30 to 35 students during class time.

Analysis

In a comparative study the relation between stressful life events and coping strategies was analyzed by examining the differences between groups with different levels of risk. A Chi-square test was conducted to test the differences between the risk groups regarding stressful life events. Finally, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was carried out to test differences regarding stressful life events and coping strategies between the risk groups; Bonferroni Post Hoc test values are reported.

Results

The number of stressful life events reported by adolescents is presented in Table 1; to check the difference in stressful life events and gender a t-test was conducted. With regard to reported stressful life domains, boys and girls differed only with respect to social events, whereby girls perceived these as more stressful (boys M=50.47, SD=9.01; girls M=53.00, SD=10.70; t=2,49; p=0.04)

Table 1: Stressful life events in the risk group

Stressful Areas	Mean	SD	
Family	56,6	16.2	
Social	52,4	12.2	
Achievement and failure	51.9	10.8	
Health	51.0	12.7	
Personal	52.8	12.7	
Behavior problems	51.8	13.5	
School	50.9	10.0	

With respect to gender differences and coping strategies a t-test was conducted (Table 2).

Girls were more likely to seek help from their circle of friends, while boys were more likely to seek comfort in religion.

Table 2: Significant differe

Distraction and seeking support from friends Religion *p<.05

According to the risk g in each group.

Table 3: Distribution by le

Risk Level	N
No Risk	7.2
High Distress	47
Resilient	41
Total	16
*Note (X2=11.39; gl=	2; p=,

ANOVA shows differer the risk groups presented in 5.

Table 4: Coping strategies

Coping strategies
Positive Thinking and
Finding Solutions
Physiological Responses
Obsessive thoughts &
Hopelessness
Withdrawal
Seeking support in the
family
Distraction & seeking
support from friends
Helplessness and selfinjurious behaviour
Religion
Note: **** p < 001; *p < 05

agreed on written ained and students ady. Seven clinical ats to students in

coping strategies levels of risk. A groups regarding arried out to test the risk groups;

sed in Table 1; to ed. With regard to to social events, i. girls M=53.00.

discted (Table 2). boys were more

Table 2: Significant differences in coping strategies for boys and girls

	Boys		Girls			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	1	
Distraction and seeking				1237	70	
support from friends	45.64	11.20	48.51	9.99	-2.46*	
Religion	53.67	12.12	50.43	10.57	2.94*	
*p < 05		2000	57914500	50000	44.64	

According to the risk groups clasiffication Table 3 shows the distribution of the sample in each group.

Table 3: Distribution by levels of risk for sex (n=332)

	D. D.	fale	F	emale
Risk Level	N	Valid Percent	N	Valid Percent
No Risk	72	45	48	27.9
High Distress	47	29	70	40.6
Resilient	41	26	54	31.3
Total	160	100	172	100
*Note (X2=11.39; g	l-2; p010)			41/04

ANOVA shows differences regarding stressful life events and coping strategies between the risk groups presented in Table 4 followed by its significant statistical difference in Table 5.

Table 4: Coping strategies differences between risk levels

			Risk	Groups			
	No.	Risk	High I	Distress	Res	ilient	
Coping strategies	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	F
Positive Thinking and Finding Solutions	48.39	10.84	44.54	10,29	47.09	10,41	3.11*
Physiological Responses	49.34	10.09	55,44	12.06	51.08	9.20	7.21**
Obsessive thoughts & Hopelessness	48.32	11.49	55.17	11.26	50.76	8.91	8.75**
Withdrawal	52.81	12.94	55.70	11.28	52.17	11.24	2.26
Seeking support in the family	51,26	9.76	46.27	8.95	49.53	9.85	8.60**
Distraction & seeking support from friends	47.11	11.39	45.90	10.32	48.65	10.05	1.23
telplessness and self- njurious behaviour	54.02	16.04	58.54	15.09	51.40	11.71	5.54**
Religion Note: *** p < 001: *p < 05	52,85	11.97	51.00	10.54	52.13	11.85	2.43

Functional coping strategies were more often shown in the 'no-risk'-group, whereas dysfunctional strategies were found in the 'high-risk'-group. The group of resilient adolescents mostly occupied a middle position.

Table 5: Multiple comparisons between groups with significant statistical difference (Bonferroni)

(Bonferroni)			A THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE			
Dependent Variable	Comparison groups		Difference of means		Confidence Interval (25%)	
			1121200000	Low	Up	
Positive Thinking and Finding Solutions	High Distress	No Risk	-3.84*	-7.34	37	
		Resilient	-2.55	-6.25	1.15	
Physiological	High	No Risk	6.10*	2.54	9.67	
Responses	Distress					
		Resilient	4.35*	.57	8.14	
Obsessive thoughts & hopelessness	High Distress	No Risk	6.85*	3.27	10.44	
		Resilient	4.41*	.60	8.23	
Seeking support in the family	High Distress	No Risk	-4.99*	-8.21	-1.77	
		Resilient	-3.26	-6.68	.15	
Helplessness and self- injurious behaviour	High Distress	No Risk	4.52	23	9.28	
		Resilient	7.14*	2.09	12.19	
Note: $*n \le 0.5$						

Note: *p≤05

Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine stressful life events and coping strategies among adolescents aged 12 to 16 years in order to analyze their emotional risk and resilience. Our results indicate that the main stressful areas among the risk group were family, personal and social events. Gender differences were reported only for the social area suggesting that girls perceives more distress than boys. According to gender differences in groups at risk it appeared that girls experienced a higher levels of stress, especially regarding interpersonal stress. These results are in line with previous findings showing increased response to interpersonal stressful events in girls (Spirito, Stark Grace et al. 1991; Rudolph, 2002). It also turned out that boys and girls copes in different ways with stressful events; girls tends to use distraction and seeking support from friends whereas boys used more stategies related to religiosity.

According to the coping strategies used within the risk groups there are differences between the high distress and the no risk groups with respect to functional coping strategies such as positive thinking, finding solutions, and seeking support in the family. In contrast to the resilient group the highly stressed groups used more disfunctional coping strategies such as helplessness and self-injury behaviours. All three groups showed differences in strategies such as physiological responses, obsessive thoughts and hopelessness. Neither distraction nor family support seeking differed among high risk and resilient adolescents. This might be due

to the specific personal where it is normal to specific that adolescents spend many work in the far away city or levels as well as their coping risk populations (Forns, Kirc

The perception of stress emotional distress in adoles Tellegen, 2012; Masten 20 competences is a worthwhile from mal-adjustment but enh

With respect to the clin (2013) about the need of prethe differences in coping injurious behaviour in all th intervention strategies to pre is particularly important be (Surrence, Miranda, Marroq Bauchner et al., 2012) were clinical but social and comamong adolescents but also t should learn different ways Barr & Metzger, 2006). T variable-focused methods in means working with their p This can help not only to ex community (Pérez-Ramos, responses depends on the na

Finally, the Life-Even information about how add validity (Tovar, 2007) and it the developmental psychoadolescents the instrument they are in trouble. However not static. Instead, they char resources at hand. As other strategies highly variable if (Avison, 2010). This is a litthey are not sensible to these -risk'-group, whereas group of resilient

statistical difference

	ce Interval
Low -7,34	5%) Up -,37
-6.25	1.15
2.54	9.67
.57 3.27	8.14 10.44
,60 -8.21	8.23 -1.77
-6.68 23	.15 9.28
2.09	12,19

and resilience. Our family, personal and suggesting that girls in groups at risk it garding interpersonal acreased response to adolph, 2002). It also nots: girls tends to use e stategies related to

there are differences onal coping strategies family. In contrast to coping strategies such ferences in strategies wither distraction nor the This might be due to the specific personal conditions in our sample. Most adolescents stem from urban areas where it is normal to spend less time with the family. Urban live conditions in Mexico imply that adolescents spend many hours alone without parental supervision because parents are at work in the far away city or on agricultural work. Thus, in city adolescents stress and risk levels as well as their coping strategies can complement to what other studies have found in risk populations (Forns, Kirchner et al., 2015).

The perception of stressful life events over the last year can be used as an indicator of emotional distress in adolescents and is similar to results from other studies (Masten & Tellegen, 2012; Masten 2014). These results stresses that the promotion of help seeking competences is a worthwhile intervention for adolescents at risk as it might not protect them from mal-adjustment but enhance their personal resources.

With respect to the clinical implications of these results and in accordance whith Rutter (2013) about the need of prevention and intervention considering culture and social context, the differences in coping with obssesive thoughts, hoplessness, helplessness, and selfinjurious behaviour in all three groups underlines the importance to develop and implement intervention strategies to prevent behaviour and health problems among this population. This is particularly important because we know that cognitive vulnerabilities like rumination (Surrence, Miranda, Marroquin et al., 2009) and cognitive inflexibility (Miranda, Gallagher, Bauchner et al., 2012) were found to predict suicidal ideation in later years. Hence, not only clinical but social and community interventions strategies are of evident concern not only among adolescents but also for their context. Parents, teachers and other community members should learn different ways to approach and interact with youngsters (Smetana, Campione-Barr & Metzger, 2006). This also emphasizes the relevance of considering person-and variable-focused methods in the study of stress and resilience. For children and adolescents it means working with their parents and family members as well as with school authorities. This can help not only to explain risk circumstances, but also to promote competence of the community (Pérez-Ramos, 2017), As Compas (1998) pointed out the efficacy of coping responses depends on the nature of the response and the context in which it is used.

Finally, the Life-Events Questionnaire (Lucio & Duran, 2003) provides useful information about how adolescents cope with their stressful live events. It has concurrent validity (Tovar, 2007) and is also useful for screening risk and no risk groups, according to the developmental psychopathology approach. With regard to coping assessment in adolescents the instrument was helpful to identify the main strategies adolescents use when they are in trouble. However, it should be underlined that adolescents' coping strategies are not static. Instead, they change according to the environmental situation and the personal resources at hand. As other studies have already reported resilient adolescents use coping strategies highly variable in order to constantly adapt to their current live time situation (Avison, 2010). This is a limitation that must be considered in the use of the instruments, as they are not sensible to these changes.

Conclusions

The current study provided evidence for functional and dysfunctional coping patterns in Mexican adolescents. Results emphasize the need of implementing primary preventive programs in accordance to personal factors such as coping strategies and gender in order to improve adolescents' general well-being and mental health potential.

Findings of this study are limited to the sample and the cross-sectional self-report data. Therefore, no causal direction can be inferred. Furthermore, another comparison variable must be considered for future studies, as suicidal risk or violence in the family/community context.

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by Grant of UNAM-DGAPA-PAPIIT <<IA303716>>. To all the project participants, to the students, parents and school authorities for your enthusiastic participation. To Consuelo Duran, who provided technical assistance and statistical support.

References

- Achenbach, T. (1982). Developmental Psychopathology. New York: John Wiley & Sons,
- Arenas, P., Lucio, E., & Forns, M. (2012). Indicadores diferenciales de personalidad frente al riesgo de suicidio en adolescentes. Revista Iberoamericana de Diagnóstico y Evaluación Psicológica, 1(33), 51-74.
- Avison, W. R. (2010). Incorporating children's lives into a life course perspective on stress and mental health. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 51(4), 361-375.
- Bradshaw, J. (1990). Child poverty and deprivation in the UK. London: National Children's Bureau.
- Brennan, P., Le Brocque, R., & Hammen, C. (2003). Maternal Depression, Parent –Child Relationships, and Resilient Outcomes in Adolescence. Journal Am. Academy Child Adolesc. Psychiatry, 42(12), 1469-1477.
- Cicchetti, D. (2010). Resilience under conditions of extreme stress: A multilevel perspective. World Psychiatry, 9, 145-154.
- Cicchetti, D. (2013). An overview of Developmental Psychopathology. The Oxfordhandbook of developmental psychology, Vol. 2, England: Oxford.
- Coleman, J. & Hagell, A. (2007). Adolescence, risk and resilience. Against the odds. West Sussex, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Compas, B. E. (1987). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence. Psychological Bulletin, 101(3), 393-403.
- Compas, B. (1998). An Agenda for Coping Research and Theory: Basic and Applied Developmental Issues. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 22(2), 231-237.
- Compas, B., Connor-Smith, J., Saltzman, H., Thomsen, A., & Wadsworth, M. (2001). Coping with stress during childhood and adolescence: problems, progress, and potential in theory and research. Psychological Bulletin, 127(1), 87-127.
- Ferguson, D. M., Beautrais, A. L., & Horwood, L. J. (2003). Vulnerability and resiliency to suicidal behaviours in young people. Psychological Medicine, 33(1), 61-73.
- Forns, M., Kirchner, T., Lucio Gómez-Maqueo, E., Arenas-Landgrave, P., Soler, L., et al. (2015). The Ability of Multi-Type Maltreatment and Poly-Victimization Approaches to Reflect Psychopathological Impairment of Victimization in Spanish Community

- Adolescents, Journal 4494,1000187
- Fraser, M. W., Kirby, L. D., M. W. Fraser (Ed.), 13-66). Washington,
- Frydenberg, E. (2004). Thri Connecticut, EE, UU
- Frydenberg, E. & Lewis, R. coping amongst Aus 37, 51-64.
- Garmezy, N. (1988). Stress Coping, and Develop
- Garmezy, N. (1991). Resilie environments. Pediat
- Gamezy, N. (1993). Resi associated with pove
- Gelhaar, T., Seiffge-Krenke P., Steinhausen, HO stressors: A seven northern Europe. Eur
- Kumpulainen, K., & Ranas school age: Their pr and Neglect, 24, 156
- Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S.
- coping, European Jo Lucio, E., & Durán, C. (2 Moderno,
- Lucio, E., Durán, C., Heres para Adolescentes. UNAM.
- Lucio, E., Duran, P. Barcel Escala de Afrontami Adolescents' Coping 8(1), 36-48.
- Luthar, S. (2006). Resilienc In D. Ciochetti & I Disorder and Adapta
- Masten, M. (2014). Ordinary Masten, A. (2001). Ordin Psychologist, 56, 22
- Masten, A., & Obradovic, J Academy of Science
- Masten, A. S., & Tellege Contributions of th Psychopathology, 24
- Medina-Mora, M., Borges Bautista, C. (2005) postraumático en la j

coping patterns in primary preventive gender in order to

al self-report data, emparison variable family/community

A303716>>. To all your enthusiastic tatistical support.

Wiley & Sons, esonalidad frente al de Diagnóstico y

erspective on stress 11-375, National Children's

tion, Parent -Child

m. Academy Child

hilevel perspective.

logy. The Oxford

nst the odds. West

mee. Psychological

Basic and Applied pment, 22(2), 231-

M. (2001). Coping is, and potential in

ty and resiliency to , 61-73,

P., Soler, L., et al. leation Approaches panish Community Adolescents, Journal of Child and Adolescent Behavior, 3(187). doi:10.4172/2375-4494.1000187

Fraser, M. W., Kirby, L. D., & Smokowski, P. R. (2004). Risk and resilience in childhood. In M. W. Fraser (Ed.), Risk and resilience in childhood: An ecological perspective (pp. 13-66). Washington, DC: NASW.

Frydenberg, E. (2004). Thriving, Surviving, or Going Under: Coping with Everyday Lives. Connecticut, EE. UU.: Information Age Publishing.

Frydenberg, E. & Lewis, R. (2009). The relationship between problem-solving efficacy and coping amongst Australian adolescents, British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 37, 51-64.

Garmezy, N. (1988). Stressors of Childhood. In N. Garmezy & M. Rutter (Eds.), Stress, Coping, and Development in Children (pp. 43-84). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins (1988).

Garmezy, N. (1991). Resiliency in children's adaptation to negative life events and stressed environments. Pediatric Annals, 20(9), 459-466.

Garmezy, N. (1993). Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. American Behavioral Scientist, 34, 416-430.

Gelhaar, T., Seiffge-Krenke, I., Borge, A., Cicognani, E., Cunha, M., Loncaric, D., Macek, P., Steinhausen, HC. & Winkler, C. (2007). Adolescent coping with everyday stressors: A seven nation-study with young from central, eastern, southern and northern Europe. European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 4(2), 129 – 156.

Kumpulainen, K., & Ranasen, E. (2000). Children involved in bullying at elementary and school age: Their psychiatric symptoms and deviance in adolescence. Child Abuse and Neglect, 24, 1567-1577.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal and coping. New York: Springer.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1987). Transactional theory and research on emotions and coping. European Journal of Personality, 1(3), 141-169.

Lucio, E., & Durán, C. (2003). Cuestionario de Sucesos de Vida. México: El Manual Moderno.

Lucio, E., Durán, C., Heredia, C., & Villarruel, B. (2010). Cuestionario de Afrontamiento para Adolescentes. Versión para investigación. México: Facultad de Psicología, UNAM.

Lucio, E., Duran, P. Barcelata, B., & Romero, E. (2016). Propiedades psicométricas de la Escala de Afrontamiento para Adolescentes: EA-A. (Psychometric properties of the Adolescents' Coping Scale: CS-A). Revista Mexicana de Investigación en Psicología, 8(1), 36-48.

Luthar, S. (2006). Resilience in Development: A synthesis of Research across five decades. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), Developmental Psychopathology. Vol 3. Risk, Disorder and Adaptation (pp. 739-795). New Jersey: Wiley.

Masten, M. (2014). Ordinary Magic. Resilience in Development. New York: Guilford Press. Masten, A. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. American Psychologist, 56, 227-238.

Masten, A., & Obradovic, J (2006). Competence and Resilience in Development. New York Academy of Sciences, 13-27, doi: 10.1196/annals.1376.003

Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (2012). Resilience in developmental psychopathology: Contributions of the Project Competence Longitudinal Study. Development and Psychopathology, 24, 345–361.

Medina-Mora, M., Borges-Guimaracs, G., Lara, C., Ramos-Lira, L., Zambrano, J., Fleiz-Bautista, C. (2005). Prevalencia de sucesos violentos y de trastomo por estrés postraumático en la población mexicana, Salud Pública de México, 47(1), 822.

- Miranda, R., Gallagher, M., Bauchner, B., Vaysman, R., & Marroquin, B. (2012). Cognizinflexibility as a prospective predictor of suicidal ideation among young adults with a suicide attempt history. Depress Anxiety, 29(3), 180-186. doi: 10.1002/da.20915
- Montero, I., & León, O. G. (2007). A guide for naming research studies in psychologic International Journal of clinical and Health psychology, 7(3), 847-862.
- Obradovic, J., Burt, K. & Masten, A. (2006). Pathways of Adaption from Adolescence to Young Adulthood. New York Academy of Sciences, 1094, 340-344.
- Olweus, D. (1995). Bullying or peer abuse in school: Fact and Intervention. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4, 196-200.
- Pelling, M., & Manuel-Navarrete, D. (2011). From resilience to transformation: The adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers. Ecology and Society, 16(2): 11. URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss2/art11/
- Pérez-Ramos, M. (2017). Construcción de bienestar a través de la comunidad. Desarrollo de una intervención psicosocial de la escuela a los hogares. In C. Piedrahita. P. Vommaro & C. Fuentes (Eds.), Formación para la Crítica y Construcción de Territorios de Paz (pp. 236-247). Colombia: CLACSO
- Rew, L. & Horner, S. (2003). Personal Strengths of Homeless Adolescents Living in a High-Risk Environment. Advances in Nursing Science, 26(2), 90-101.
- Rudolph, K. D. (2002). Gender differences in emotional responses to interpersonal stress during adolescence. Journal of Adolescent Health, 30(4), 3-13.
- Rutter, M. (2006). Implications of Resilience Concepts for Scientific Understanding. New York Academy of Sciences, 1094, 1-12.
- Rutter, M. (2012). Resilience as a dynamic concept. Development and Psychopathology, 24, 335-344. doi: 10.107/S0954579412000028
- Rutter, M. (2013). Developmental Psychopathology: A paradigm shift or just a relabeling?. Development and Psychopathology, 25, 1201-1213. doi:10.1017/S0954579413000564
- Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger, A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. Annual Review of Psychology, 57, 255-284.
- Sciffge-Krenke, I. (2011). Coping with relationship stressors: A decade review. Journal of Research Adolescence, 21(1), 196-210. DOI: 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00723.x.
- Seiffge-Krenke, I., Aunola, K. & Nurmi, J. (2009). Changes in Stress Perception and Coping During Adolescence: The Role of Situational and Personal Factors. Child Development, January/February, 80(1), 259-279
- Seiffge-Krenke, I. (1993). Coping behavior in normal and clinical samples: more similarities than differences? Journal of Adolescence 16, 285-303.
- Spirito, A., Stark, L. J., Grace, N., & Stamoulis, D. (1991). Common problems and coping strategies reported in childhood and early adolescence. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 20(5), 531-544. doi: 10.1007/BF01540636
- Sroufe, L. A., & Rutter, M. (1984). The domain of developmental psychopathology. Child Development, 55, 17-29.
- Sroufe, L. A. (2013). The promise of development psychopathology: past and present. Development and Psychopathology, 25(4), 1215-1224, doi: 10.1017/S0954579413000576
- Surrence, K., Miranda, R., & Marroquin, B. M. (2009). Brooding and reflective rumination among suicide attempters: cognitive vulnerability to suicidal ideation. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 47(9), 803-808. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2009.06.001
- Tovar, J. A. (2007). Psicometria: tests psicométricos, confiabilidad y validez. Psicología. Tópicos de actualidad, 85-108.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de

Cover: Mathias Kehren

©Copyright Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH 2019 All rights reserved.

ISBN 978-3-8325-4934-3

Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH Comeniushof, Gubener Str. 47, 10243 Berlin Tel.: +49 (0)30 42 85 10 90

Tel.: +49 (0)30 42 85 10 90 Fax: +49 (0)30 42 85 10 92

INTERNET: https://www.logos-verlag.de

Part One - STAR Life

- I Threat and the rise of fea Stevan E. Hobfoll
- 2 Academic motivation and Moshe Zeidner & Reem El
- Job insecurity and stress Esther Greenglass, Lisa File
- 4 Anxiety and cerebrovascu Komel Sipos & Michael Be
- 5 My STAR Journey: Then Erica Frydenberg
- 6 Social anxiety and alcohol hypothesis Joel W. Godfredson & Kath
- 7 A reflection on the resource Petra Buchwald
- 8 Mixed methods but not mi occupational stress research Barbara J. Kennedy & Linda

Part Two - STAR Early

- Posttraumatic growth in ad Eva Kallay
- Episodic future thinking: e. symptoms Laura Visu-Petra & Alexand
- 11 Cognitive (in)flexibility: por development? Oana Mărcuş & Lmara Visu-F
- 12 Effects of trait emotion regulation Siobhán M. Griffin & Siobhán

This book celebrates the 40th anniversary of the STAR Society – the enduring legacy of our esteemed colleagues Charles Spielberger, Henk Van Der Ploeg, and Ralf Schwarzer who conceptualised the idea for a society focused on the measure of stress. Since that time, the focus has moved on from measurement alone, to include stress, coping and resilience: theory, research, and practice.

Exactly 20 years after its inception, we initiated the annual STAR Lifetime Career Award to members with a long and distinguished history of scientific contributions in the field of stress, anxiety and coping. Around the same time, the STAR Early Career Award was established to honour researchers achievements in the science of stress research within the first five years post their doctorate. Last, but not least STAR society gives a STAR Student Development Award to a student for the best paper on stress, anxiety and coping in theory, practice or research in the previous year.

We invited all past award winners to contribute to this book which has yielded an exciting overview of the work of the individual researchers and their current research focus. We thank those who have found the time to contribute to this book.

Logos Verlag Berlin

ISBN 978-3-8325-4934-3