IRSTI 15.21.41 https://doi.org/10.26577/JPsS.2020.v73.i2.05

**A.R. Rizulla[1], F.S. Tashimova[2], M.P. Kabakova[2]**

[1]University of International Business, Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: arizulla@mail.ru
[2]Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty,
e-mail: fatima_tashimova@mail.ru, e-mail: pobedovna_70@mail.ru

# THE ANALYSES OF THE STRESS RESILIENCE CONCEPTS' IN THE WORLD PSYCHOLOGY

This paper aims to make an analyses and systemization об /им f stress resilience concepts in the framework of world psychology. Authors begin with the defining the role of stress in humans' life referring to the dual nature of the stress. On the one hand as a power that trigger humans' development and survivance, on the other hand as a power that can destroy humans. The second nature of the stress emphasizes the necessity to cope with it in order to thrive. The ability to cope was referred to the stress resilience ability. Authors analyzed and systemized Russian, Kazakhstani, and the far-abroad countries' concepts of stress resilience. The concepts include both theoretical and experimental world studies of such scientists as Avdulova T.P., Dyakov S.I., Tashimova F.S., Mynabyeva A.K., Garmezy, Luthar, Zigler, Gest, Reed, Masten, and others. The analyses starts from the history of stress resilience studies that primarily were revealed in the literature about schizophrenia. Then early studies of patients with severe disorders focused primarily on understanding maladaptive behavior, and a subgroup of patients with relatively adaptive models that was considered as atypical for them and thus, paved the way to study this atypical behavior as an ability to confront the stress. Authors focused on drawing up a holistic understanding of stress resilience phenomena referring to the world concepts and explaining the mechanisms and main factors of stress resilience. As a summary and referring to the abovementioned concepts this paper offers the definition of stress resilience and a holistic understanding of mechanism and factors of stress resilience.

**Key words:** stress, coping, resilience, adaptation, pdychological health.

А.Р. Ризулла[1], Ф.С. Ташимова[2], М.П. Кабакова[2]

[1]Халықаралық бизнес университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: arizulla@mail.ru
[2]Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Қазақстан, Алматы қ.,
e-mail: fatima_tashimova@mail.ru, e-mail: pobedovna_70@mail.ru

**Әлемдік психологиядағы стресске төзімділік тұжырымдамаларын талдау**

Бұл мақала әлемдік психология шеңберіндегі стресске қарсы тұру тұжырымдамасын талдау мен жүйелеуге арналған. Авторлар мақаланы стресстің адамдар өміріндегі рөлін ашудан бастайды, бұл стресстің қосарлы табиғатын атап көрсетеді, мұнда бір жағынан адамзаттың түр ретінде дамып, өмір сүруіне қозғаушы күш (эволюциялық тәсіл), ал екінші жағынан адамды жоя алатын күш (ситуациялық тәсіл) ретінде. Стрессті жеңудің маңыздылығы адам өмірінің сәттілігін анықтайтын механизм ретінде де атап өтілген. Қиын өмірлік жағдайлармен тіл табыса білу адамның стресске төзімділігін білдіреді. Авторлар қазақстандық, орыс және батыстық стресстерге төзімділік тұжырымдамаларын, соның ішінде Авдулова, Дьяков, Ташимова Ф.С., Мынбаева А.К., Гармези, Лутхар, Зиглер, Гест, Рид, Мастен және басқаларын қоса алғанда, эмпирикалық және эксперименттік зерттеулерді талдайды және жүйелейді. Мақалада шизофрения туралы әдебиетте пайда болған стресстік төзімділікті зерттеу тарихы талданады. Содан кейін ол психикалық ауытқулары бар пациенттердің зерттеу материалдарында дамиды, онда бастапқы назар осы пациенттердің зиянды мінез-құлқын түсінуге бағытталды, олардың арасында бейімделушілік мінез-құлықпен ерекшеленетін топтар бөлінді, бұл әртүрлі бұзылулардан зардап шегетін осы топқа тән емес еді, нәтижесінде бұл анықтама қызығушылықтың пайда болуының бастауы болды. Мақалада күйзеліске төзімділіктің маңызды белгілері және оны ынталандырушы факторлар қарастырылады. Қорытынды ретінде авторлар әлемдік тұжырымдамаларды талдау негізінде стресске төзімділік анықтамасын ұсынды, бұл құбылыс туралы және стресске тұрақтылықты оңтайландыратын негізгі факторлар туралы толық түсінік берді.

**Түйін сөздер:** стресс, копинг, тұрақтылық, бейімделу, психологиялық денсаулық.

 

А.Р. Ризулла[1], Ф.С. Ташимова[2], М.П. Кабакова[2]
[1]Университет Международного Бизнеса, Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: arizulla@mail.ru
[2]Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби, Казахстан, г. Алматы,
e-mail: fatima_tashimova@mail.ru, e-mail: pobedovna_70@mail.ru

**Анализ концепций стрессоустойчивости в мировой психологии**

Настоящая статья посвящена анализу и систематизации концепций стрессоустойчивости в рамках мировой психологии. Авторы начинают статью с раскрытия роли стресса в жизни людей, подчеркивая двойственную природу стресса, где, с одной стороны, он является триггером развития и выживания человечества как вида (эволюционный подход), с другой стороны, как сила, способная уничтожить человека (ситуационный подход). Также подчеркивается важность совладания над стрессом, как механизма, определяющего успешность жизнедеятельности человека. Способность совладать с трудными жизненными ситуациями относится к стрессоустойчивости личности. Авторы анализируют и систематизируют казахстанские, российские и западные концепции стрессоустойчивости, включающие эмпирические и экспериментальные исследования, среди которых Авдулова Т.П., Дьяков С.И., Ташимова Ф.С., Мынбаева А.К., Garmezy N., Luthar S., Zigler E., Gest S., Reed M., Masten A. и другие. В статье анализируется история изучения стрессоустойчивости, которая берет свое начало в литературе о шизофрении. Затем развивается в материалах исследований пациентов с психическими нарушениями, где изначальное внимание акцентировалось на понимании дезадаптивного поведения этих пациентов, среди которых выделялись группы, отличающиеся адаптивным поведением, что являлось атипичным для данной группы людей, страдающих различными нарушениями, в итоге данная находка явилась началом появления интереса к феномену стрессоустойчивости и ее исследованию. В статье рассмотрены наиболее значимые концепции стрессоустойчивости и факторы ее стимулирующих. В качестве вывода авторы на основе анализа мировых концепций выдвигают определение стрессоустойчивости, дающее целостное понимание данного феномена, и основных факторов, оптимизирующих стрессоустойчивость.

**Ключевые слова:** stress, coping, resilience, adaptation, pdychological health.

## Introduction

Stress phenomena is ambiguous in psychology. Some perceive stress as a threatening event (for example, work with great stress, overpopulation), which entails negative consequences for the mental and physiological state of the body. Such conceptualizations are known as stimulus-based definitions because they characterize stress as a stimulus that triggers certain reactions. However, the definitions of stress based on incentives are problematic, since there is one caveat, the difference in the perception and response of people to complex life events and situations. From this point of view, Lazarus and Folkman emphasize that stress is the process by which a person perceives and reacts to events that he/she assesses as overwhelming or threatening his/her well-being (Lazarus, Folkman, 1984). A person perceives stress in accordance with one's own adaptation to the world, which may differ from the point of view of another person.

Stress is accompanied by physiological reactions of the body and emotional experiences that cause tension and excitement, the long duration of which can cause negative consequences for the human body and health. To maintain an optimal level of physical and psychological well-being, a person should be able to adequately tolerate stress or a threatening situation, which is an indicator of stress resistance.

## Main body

In Russian psychology, there are various concepts for understanding the phenomenon of "stress tolerance." So according to the concept of Avdulova T.P. and colleagues (Avdulova, Vitkovskaya, Ponevazh, 2013) stress tolerance refers to the personal characteristic of a person, which determines its ability to reveal its potential and direct it in the right direction. In this regard, I would like to turn to the theory of B. Frederickson (broaden and build theory), which emphasized that the potential of the individual is formed on the basis of positive emotions experienced by the individual. Positive emotions form a person's resistance bank, which helps to overcome difficulties and solve problems productively. If in most cases a person is positively tuned, then the level of stress resistance becomes higher. People in a negative mood are not able to effectively solve problems and tasks. B. Frederickson conducted a series of experiments that showed that a negative mood negatively affects cognitive processes (memory, thinking,

imagination), which in turn reduces the individual's ability to effectively solve problems.

Dyakov I.S. noted the importance of self-regulation and self-organization of the personality, the psychological core of which is the individual's values, through the prism of which the individual makes an assessment of life events (Dyakov, 2016). Subbotin S.V. considered stress resistance as psychological and emotional resistance to a stressful situation, resistance and tolerance (Subbotin, 1992)

Returning to the concept of Avdulova T.P., Vitkovskaya E.V., Ponevazh E.V., Dyakov I.S., and others who offer a characteristic of stress resistance as: willingness to take risks, locus of control, tolerant attitude to uncertainties, self-esteem and ability to make decisions.

Dyakov I.S. on the basis of an experimental study, revealed that a person's productive adaptation to stressful conditions depends on semantic interest, including the motivational sphere of the personality (for example, the interest in receiving any benefit from quick adaptation and solving a problem) (Dyakov, 2016). The semantic interest depends on a personality trait, where he distinguishes two types of personality subjectivity - with an internal and external locus of control, which determine the personality's stress resistance strategy. People with an external locus of control are more risk averse, patient with respect to uncertainty, motivated for success, socially adapted, and low level of rationality. People with an internal locus of control are rational, prefer order and impatient with respect to uncertainty, organized, which expresses a high level of stress tolerance and success in life.

Among the psychological factors affecting stress resistance Khutornaya M.L. in her research revealed such as experiencing distress, expecting failures as a result of experienced failures, health problems, low self-esteem, and lack of time (Khutornaya, 2007).

In the works of leading Russian psychologists (Vygotsky, 1960; Dikaya, 2007; Antsiferova, 1994; Lomov, 1989), sustainability is associated with the maturity of a person and her ability to focus on specific goals, highlighting priorities and building activities to achieve them. Investigations of personality behavior in the face of life difficulties, in other words, coping strategies, which include both productive (problem-oriented, emotionally-oriented) and unproductive (avoidance) (Lazarus, 1984; Thoits, 2010; Kessler, 2000).

In Kazakhstan psychology, stress resistance was studied by such scientists as F.S. Tashimova, N.K. Toksanbaeva, V.A. Ermekbay, D.D. Duysenbekov, E.K. Kalymbetova, A.K. Mynbaeva. F.S. Tashimova emphasized the importance of studying coping strategies as determining the stress resistance of a person, while coping was studied in the framework of its three types such as problem-oriented, emotionally-oriented and socially-oriented. In her studies, she revealed the influence of society on coping with life's difficulties. At the same time, society was considered by her in the framework of the teachings of al-Farabi, where the person was presented as a carrier of significant people in her life, who determined the vital meaning, thoughts of the person and her behavior. The results of her research showed that the positive representation of significant people positively influenced the stress resistance of the individual and copying personality strategies.

Mynbaeva A.K. studied the diagnosis of anxiety levels in the process of body-oriented therapy (Mynbaeva, 2019). The author emphasized that manifestations of bodily behavior carry a significant part of information and personality, including about the state of anxiety. A person being in a conscious state controls his speech for the most part and can hide his emotional state, while the body at the level of the unconscious gives true information about the emotional state of the person.

V.A. Ermekbay and colleagues studied the effect of stress on the emotional stability of health workers (Ermekbay, Duisenbekov, Kalymbetova, 2019). They found that healthcare providers are prone to emotional burnout due to work with sick patients who exhibit different behaviors often negatively associated with their illnesses.

A.V. Lee studied the diagnosis and prevention of suicidal behavior in adolescents (Lee, 2019). Suicidal behavior is the result of a teenager's low level of stress tolerance, his inability to cope with life's difficulties and the decision to commit suicide as the only possible way to solve his problems. In this aspect, a study by John Koopman, who examined Americans who survived a suicide attempt, is interesting (Koopman, 2005). The survivors claimed that they decided to commit suicide due to the fact that they could not cope with constant problems and stress. However, when they jumped off the bridge for the purpose of suicide, they realized that this act was wrong and regretted. J. Koopman revealed a low level of stress resistance in them and emphasized the importance of psychological assistance at this stage.

In foreign psychology, stress tolerance is a dynamic process that manifests itself as a positive adaptation in the context of significant difficulties and includes two critical conditions: (1) exposure to significant threat or serious disasters; and (2)

achieving positive adaptation, despite the significant difficulty of the situation (Garmezy, 1990; Luthar, Zigler, 1991; Masten, Best, Garmezy, 1990). The study of factors that lead to adaptive results in the presence of life difficulties has attracted the minds of many scientists. The beginning of interest in this problem originated in the empirical literature on schizophrenia (Masten et al., 1990). Early studies of patients with severe disorders focused primarily on understanding maladaptive behavior, and a subgroup of patients with relatively adaptive models was considered atypical. By the 1970s, researchers found that patients with schizophrenia with the least severe course of the disease had a premorbid history of relative competency in work, social relationships, marriage, and their ability to fulfill responsibility (Garmezy, 1970; Zigler and Glick, 1986). Although sustainability was not part of the descriptive picture of this atypical schizophrenia, these aspects of premorbid social competence can today be seen as prognostic, relatively stable trajectories.

At the same time, interest in psychological stability was revealed in studies of children whose mothers suffered from schizophrenia (Garmezy, 1974; Garmezy, Streiman, 1974; Masten, 1990). Evidence that many of these children thrived and productively adapted to their environment, despite their high-risk status, led to increased empirical attempts to understand individual differences in stress tolerance.

The next step in the development of stress tolerance studies was the innovative research by Emmy Werner on children in Hawaii (Werner, 1971, 1977). Thanks to her research, the understanding of stress tolerance was expanded to include many unfavorable conditions that were factors affecting the stability of the individual, among which were the socio-economic and associated risks (Garmezy, 1991, 1995; Rutter, 1979; Werner, Smith, 1982, 1992), parental mental illness (Masten, Coatsworth, 1995, 1998), abuse (Beeghly, Cicchetti, 1994; Cicchetti, Rogosch, 1997; Cicchetti, Rogosch, Lynch, Holt, 1993; Moran, Eckenrode, 1992), urban poverty and community violence (Luthar, 1999; Richters, Martinez, 1993), chronic diseases (Wells, Schwebel, 1987) and astroficheskie life events (O'Dougherty-Wright, Masten, Northwood, Hubbard, 1997). The essence of her research was a systematic search for the defenses, resources, and sustainability that distinguished children with a healthy adaptation profile from those who were relatively less fit.

Early research focused mainly on the personal qualities of "happy children," such as self-reliance or high self-esteem (Masten, Garmezy, 1985). However, over time, researchers began to increasingly recognize that sustainability could also be due to factors external to the child. Subsequent studies led to the identification of three groups of factors involved in the development of sustainability: (1) characteristics of the children themselves, (2) aspects of their family, (3) characteristics of their social environment (Masten, Garmezy, 1985; Werner, Smith, 1982, 1992).

Over the past two decades, the focus of empirical study of this phenomenon has shifted from defining protective factors to understanding basic defense processes. Scientists seek to understand how factors such as the personality of a child, family, and the environment can contribute to stress tolerance (Cowen , 1997; Luthar, 1999). Such attention to the main mechanisms is a significant shift in the development of theory and research in this area, as well as for the development of appropriate strategies for the prevention and adjustment of therapy for people with difficulties (Cicchetti, Toth, 1991, 1992; Luthar, 1993; Masten, 1990; Rutter, 1990).

In the definition of «sustainability» there is a wide variety of designs. In theoretical terms, for example, Ratter (1987, 1990), for example, characterized sustainability as a positive end, the outcome of the use of personal resources by a person who was in a high-risk zone. Masten and her colleagues (Masten, 1994; Masten, 1990) distinguish between three groups of persistent phenomena: those in which (1) people at higher risk show better results than expected, (2) positive adaptation persists despite stressful experiences and (3) quick recovery from injury.

In empirical studies, the approaches used to understand sustainability also varied across laboratories (Cicchetti, Garmezy, 1993; Gordon, Song, 1994; Kaufman, Cook, Arny, Jones, Pittinsky, 1994; Luthar, Cushing, 1999; Stouthamer-Loeber, 1993; Tarter, Vanyukov, 1999; Tolan, 1996). Some scientists noted that sustainability is expressed in successful adaptation in several areas of life (Tolan, 1996), while others noted that successful adaptation in one significant area is sufficient with at least average indicators in other areas (Luthar, 1991 ; Luthar, Doernberger, Zigler, 1993; Egeland, Farber, 1987; Radke-Yarrow, Sherman, 1990). This understanding of sustainability suggests that sustainability does not necessarily cover all areas of human activity, but the most important / important area for this person.

Resilience researchers also have a different understanding of the relationship between risk conditions and competency. Some researchers emphasized the relationship between the level of problems and the level of sustainability (for example, having

a low level of problems in life is a sign of high competence) based on an analysis of biographical data. Other researchers used variable-based analysis and relied either on models of the main effects or on models related to interaction effects (Luthar, Cushing, 1999). This variety of dimensions has sparked controversy in the scientific community about a common understanding of this phenomenon (Kaplan, 1999).

However, a review of the literature (Cicchetti, Garmezy, 1993; Luthar, Zigler, 1991; Masten, 1990; Masten, Coatsworth, 1995, 1998; Rutter, 1990; Werner, 1990, 1995) revealed synchronous data on many correlates sustainability in several studies that have used different measurement strategies. In these studies, the importance of close and high-quality relationships with adults (parents), effective schools and the presence of communication with prosocial adults in society was revealed.

There are also concepts that emphasize the importance of personality traits in determining stress tolerance. Thus, the theory of "ego sustainability" developed by Gene and Jack Block (1980) notes that the stability of the ego includes a set of traits that reflect the general resourcefulness and tenacity of character, as well as the flexibility of functioning in response to changing environmental circumstances. Illustrative descriptors for the California Q-sort measure

(Block, 1969) include "interaction with the world, but not submission to it" and "integrated characteristics under stress".

On the other hand, Luthar (Luthar, 1996) emphasized that stress tolerance is a dynamic process that develops depending on the experience gained. However, personality characteristics, such as for example consciousness and openness to experience (Big Fives) play a significant role in the productive development of this sustainability. For example, openness to new experience allows an individual to leave the comfort zone and apply the most effective coping strategies, which in turn increases the individual's resistance to stress. Consciousness correctly systematize information and develop an effective coping strategy in a difficult life situation, which also indicates the importance of personality traits in the development of stress tolerance.

Luthar also advocates the inclusion of more differentiated terms to refer to stress tolerance as a process (Luthar, 1993). He offers terms such as "protective and stabilizing" (when the attribute in question provides stability in competence, despite the increasing risk); "Strengthening protection" (a person copes with stress, so that his competence increases with increasing risk); or "protective, but responsive" (when a stressful situation motivates a person to solve a problem, however, if the level of stress increases, then resistance begins to subside); "Vulnerable-stable" person remains at a stable level, despite the change in stress level; and "vulnerable and responsive," when vulnerability increases with stress.

The next important aspect concerns the sustainability label, what is the acceptable level? According to Gest, Reed, Masten the assessment should be based on the nature of the risk being studied and the consequences that this risk may entail (severe or catastrophic events), the emphasis should be on maintaining the optimal functioning of the person (close to average) (Gest, Reed, Masten, 1999).

Thus, summarizing the above assessment of stress resistance is based on the following criteria:

1) the priority domains of life for the individual at this stage of its psychological development;

2) consideration of these domains jointly or separately, depending on the possibility of their coexistence;

3) sustainability criteria should provide for optimal functioning.

**Conclusion**

Based on the analysis of the literature, we define stress tolerance as the psychological stability of a person in a stressful situation, which allows to efficiently solve problems / problems and to establish the optimal functioning of this person. Effective problem solving involves productive coping strategies of the individual.

Productive coping strategies are problem-oriented (POC) and emotionally - oriented coping (EOC), since both strategies are aimed at solving a problem (POC - finding information and solving a problem; EOC - managing emotions and thereby solving a problem) and relieving stress. All three strategies can interact with each other and even work simultaneously (Kryukova, 2001).

An analysis of global concepts of stress tolerance, including Kazakhstani, allows us to emphasize that stress resilience depends on such factors as self-regulation, personality potential, emotional and psychological stability, semantic determinants, behavioral aspects of the personality, coping strategies, productive and unproductive protective mechanisms, and personality competencies in in the event of a stressful situation, external factors (discrimination, culture) and internal factors (personal characteristics, values and beliefs).

**References**

Almukhambetova B.Zh., Toksanbaeva N.K. (2018). Poyavlenie trevojnosti u studentov s osobimi obrazovatlnimi potrebnostyami v processe obucheniya [Anxiety formation of students with special needs in education process]. *Psychology and Sociology Bulletin of KazNU*, **no** 4(67), pp. 11-21.

Antsiferova L.L. (1994). Lichnost v trudnih zhiznennih usloviyah: pereosmislenie, preobrazovanie situacii I psihologicheskaya zashita [Person in difficult life circumstances: rethinking, reframing of the situation and psychological defense]. *Psychological journal*, Vol. 15, no 1, pp. 3-18.

Avdulova T.P., Vitkovskaya E.V., Ponevazh E.V. (2013). Riskovoe povedenie v yunosti: otklonenie ili norma? [Risk behavior in adolescence: pathology or norn?]. *Clinical and special psychology*, no 3, pp. 36-44.

Beeghly M., Cicchetti D. (1994). Child maltreatment, attachment, and the self system: emergence of an internal state lexicon in toddlers at high social risk. *Development and Psychology*, Vol. 6(1), pp.5-30.

Block J. (1969). Parents of schizophrenic, neurotic, asthmatic, and congenitally ill children. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, no 20, pp. 659–674.

Cicchetti D., Rogosch F.A. (1997). The Role of Self-Organisation in the Promotion of Resilience in Maltreated Children. *Developmental Psychopathology*, Vol. 9, pp. 797-815.

Cicchetti D., Toth S.L. (1991). *Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychopathology, Vol. 2. Internalizing and externalizing expressions of dysfunction.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 215 p.

*Cicchetti D., Rogosch F.A., Lynch M., Holt K.D. (1993). Resilience in maltreated children: Processes leading to adaptive outcome. Development and Psychopathology, no 5(4), pp. 629-647.*

Koopman R., Wagenmakers A. J., Manders R. J., Zorenc A. H., Senden J. M., Gorselink M. (2005). Combined ingestion of protein and free leucine with carbohydrate increases postexercise muscle protein synthesis in vivo in male subjects. *American Journal of Physiology and Endocrinology*, no 288, pp. 645–653.

Cowen E. L., Wyman P. A., Work W. C., Kim J., Fagen D. B., Magnus K. B. (1997). Followup study of young stress affected and stress resilient urban children. *Development and Psychopathology*, no 9, pp. 565-577.

Dikaya L.G. (2007). Adaptaciya: metodologicheskie problemy I osnovniye napravleniya issledovanii [Adaptation: methodological problems and basic attitudes in the research]. M.: Psychology Institute RAS, Vol.3, pp. 17-42.

Dyakov S. I. (2016). Stressoustoichivost studentov. Paradigma subektnoi samoorganizacii lichnosti [Stress resilience of students. Paradigm of personality self-organization]. *Education and Science*, no 6, pp. 97-109.

Farber E. A., Egeland B. (1987). Invulnerability among abused and neglected children. In E. J. Anthony, B. J. Cohler (Eds.), *The Guilford psychiatry series. The invulnerable child,* Guilford Press, pp. 253–288.

Ermekbay V.A., Duysenbekov D.D., Kalymbetova E.K. Sailinova K.K. (2019). The problem of occupational stress as one of the factors of the deterioration of the psycho-emotional state of medical workers. *Psychology and Sociology Bulletin of KazNU*, no 1(68), pp. 56-69.

Fredrickson B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positivepsychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist: Special Issue*, no 56, pp. 218–226.

Garmezy N. (1991). Resilience in children's adaptation to negative life events and stressed environments. Pediatrics, No 20, pp. 459–466.

Garmezy N, Streitman S. (1974). Children at risk: The search for the antecedents of schizophrenia: Conceptual models and research methods. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, no 8, pp. 14–90.

Block J.H., Block J. (1980). The role of ego-control and ego resiliency in the organization of behavior. *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology*, Vol. 13, pp. 39–101.

Gest S.D., Reed M., Masten A.S. (1999). Measuring developmental changes in exposure to adversity: A life chart and rating scale approach. *Development and Psychopathology*, no 11, pp. 171–192.

Gordon E.W., Song L.D. (1994). Variations in the experience of resilience. In: Wang M.C., Gordon E.W., editors. Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects. Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ, pp. 27–43.

Kaplan H.B. (1999). Toward an understanding of resilience: A critical review of definitions and models. In: Glantz M.D., Johnson J.R., editors. Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations. Plenum: New York, pp. 17–83.

Kaufman J., Cook A., Arny L., Jones B., Pittinsky T. (1994). Problems defining resiliency: Illustrations from the study of maltreated children. *Development and Psychopathology,* no 6, pp. 215–229.

Kessler R.C. (2000). Posttraumatic stress disorder: the burden to the individual and to society. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, no 61 (5), pp. 4 - 12.

Khutornaya M.L. (2007). Razvitie stressoustoichivosti studentov v usloviyah intellektualnih ispitanii [Development of stress resilience of the students in the conditions of intellectual trials]. Moscow Government University, 175 p.

Kryukova T.L. (2001). Psichologiya sovladayushego povedeniya [Psychology of coping behavior]. Kostroma, 265 p.

Lazarus, R. S., Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer, 365 p.

Lee A.V., Kadyrzhan D.E., Kozlov V.V., Aimaganbetova O.Kh., Faizulina A.K. (2019). Diagnostics and prevention of suicidal behavior among teenagers. *Psychology and Sociology Bulletin of KazNU*, no 4(71), pp. 116-123.

Lomov B.F. (1989). Sistemnii podhod I sistema determinizma v psihologii [System approach and system of determinism in psychology]. *Psychology Journal,* no 4, pp. 19-33.

Luthar S.S., Cushing G. Measurement issues in the empirical study of resilience: An overview. In: Glantz M.D., Johnson J.L., editors. Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations. Plenum, New York, pp. 129–160.

Luthar S.S. (1999). Poverty and children's adjustment. Sage: Newbury Park, CA, 235 p.

Luthar S.S., Zigler E. (1991). Vulnerability and competence: A review of research on resilience in childhood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, no 61, pp. 6–22.

Masten A, Coatsworth J.D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments: Lessons from research on successful children. *American Psychologist*, no 53, pp. 205–220.

Masten A, Garmezy N. (1985). Risk, vulnerability, and protective factors in developmental psychopathology. In: Lahey B, Kazdin A, editors. Advances in clinical child psychology, Vol. 8, Plenum Press: New York, pp. 1–52.

Masten A.S. (1994). Resilience in individual development: Successful adaptation despite risk and adversity. In: Wang M.C., Gordon E.W., editors. Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects, Erlbaum, NJ, pp. 3–25.

Masten A., Best K., Garmezy N. (1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. *Development and Psychopathology*, no 2, pp. 425–444.

Moran P.B., Eckenrode J. (1992). Protective personality characteristics among adolescent victims of maltreatment. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, no 16, pp. 743–754.

Mynbaeva A.K., Batanova A., Frshlova B.N. (2019). Diagnosing anxiety and using body-oriented therapy: a study of 5th grade pupils. *Psychology and Sociology Bulletin of KazNU*, no 4(71), pp. 4-15.

O'Dougherty-Wright M., Masten A.S., Northwood A., Hubbard J.J. (1997). Long-term effects of massive trauma: Developmental and psychobiological perspectives. In: Cicchetti D., Toth S.L., editors. Rochester Symposium on Developmental Psychopathology: Vol. 8. Developmental perspectives on trauma. University of Rochester Press: Rochester, NY, pp. 181–225.

Radke-Yarrow M., Sherman T. (1990). Hard growing: Children who survive. In: Rolf J., Masten A., Cicchetti D., Nuechterlein K., Weintraub S., editors. Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology. Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 97–119.

Richters J.E., Martinez P.E. (1993). Violent communities, family choices, and children's chances: An algorithm for improving the odds. *Development and Psychopathology*, no 5, pp. 609–627.

Rutter M. (1990). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. In: Rolf J., Masten A.S., Cicchetti D., Nuechterlein K.H., Weintraub S., editors. Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology. Cambridge, New York, pp. 181–214.

Stouthamer-Loeber M., Loeber R., Farrington D.P., Zhang Q., van Kammen W., Maguin E. (1993). The double edge of protective and risk factors for delinquency: Interrelations and developmental patterns. *Development and Psychopathology,* no 5, pp. 683–701.

Subbotin S.V. (1992). Ustoichivost k psichicheskomu stress kak harakeristiki metaindividualnosti uchitelya [Psychological stress resilience as a meta-individualistic characteristic of a teacher]. Dissertation of candidate of psychology science, Perm, 152 p.

Tarter R.E., Vanyukov M. (1999). Re-visiting the validity of the construct of resilience. In: Glantz M.D., Johnson J.L., editors. Resiliency and development: Positive life adaptations. Plenum, New York, pp. 85–100.

Tashimova F.S., Rizulla A.R. (2012). K problem smisloobrazovaniya subekta kak mnogolikogo mira [The meaning formation os a person as a many faced world]. Saarbrucken, Deutschland: LAPLAMBERT Academic Publishing GmbH&Co, 385 p.

Thoits P.A. (2010). Stress and Health: Major Findings and Policy Implications. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 51, pp. 41-53.

Tolan P.T. (1996). How resilient is the concept of resilience? *The Community Psychologist,* no 29, pp. 12–15.

Vygotsky L.S. (1960). Razvitiye vishich psihicheskih funkcii [Development of high psyche functions]. Big Soviet Encyclopedia, 560 p.

Wells R.D., Schwebel A.I. (1987). Chronically ill children and their mothers: Predictors of resilience and vulnerability to hospitalization and surgical stress. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, no 18, pp. 83–89.

Werner E.E., Smith R.S. (1992). Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 315 p.

Werner E.E., Bierman J.M., French F.E. (1971). The children of Kauai Honolulu. University of Hawaii Press, Hawaii, 247 p.

Werner E.E. (1995). Resilience in development. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, Vol. 3, pp. 81–85.

Zigler E., Glick M. (1986). A developmental approach to adult psychopathology. Wiley, New York, 256 p.