The growing recognition and occurrence of traumatic exposure in the general population has given increased salience to the need to understand the concept of resilience. More than just the “flip side” of a risk factor, the notion of resilience encompasses psychological and biological characteristics, intrinsic to an individual, that might be modifiable and that confer protection against the development of psychopathology in the face of stress. In this review, we provide some perspective on the concept of “resilience” by examining early use of the term in research on “children at risk” and discuss the relationship between risk and resilience factors. We then review psychological and biological factors that may confer resilience to the development of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) following trauma, examine how resilience has been assessed and measured, and discuss issues to be addressed in furthering our understanding of this critical concept going forward. Depression and Anxiety 24:139–152, 2007.
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INTRODUCTION

Increased understanding of the impact of trauma and the characteristics that promote resilience in individuals has recently become more critical given heightened tensions in the international political environment, which have included increased exposure to threats of terrorism and armed conflict. Most of the research on posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) has focused on variables that confer risk factors for developing this disorder after a trauma, despite the fact that the majority of trauma victims do not develop PTSD. Far fewer studies have focused on variables that buffer risk or serve as resilience factors. There is a growing interest in determining and understanding factors that promote resilience to psychopathology in individuals after they experience a traumatic event. Our aim in this article is to review research on resilience, first looking at historical perspectives on the concept of resilience itself, then examining resilience from the perspective of decreased vulnerability to PTSD in reaction to trauma. We review both psychological and biological variables representing resilience, as well as tools that have been used to measure this concept. Last, we suggest that resilience in the context of PTSD includes personal psychological and biological variables or “strengths” that protect against the development of psychopathology in the face of trauma.

The term “resilience” has been used to describe “the positive pole of individual differences in people’s response to stress and adversity” [Rutter, 1987]. Alternative terms have been used, such as “protective factors,” “invulnerability” or “hardiness.” Most of the...
early research on resilience focused on children determined to be “at risk” for later difficulties in life because of adverse life circumstances such as poverty, loss of family cohesion, and parental mental illness. Researchers followed these children over many years and measured their mental health, social, economic, and occupational status, and identified variables that seemed to promote health and well-being, such as good self-esteem and social support. For example, Rutter and colleagues [1976] examined children living in inner-city London and on the Isle of Wight and measured variables, such as low socioeconomic status, severe marital discord, and paternal criminality. The definition of “resilience” in this area of research was not clearly defined, and referred to personal attributes, as well as environmental factors, but was generally used to refer to the children who had lower rates of psychopathology later in life. Factors associated with resilience defined this way included having an easy temperament, self-mastery, planning skills, and a warm, close relationship with an adult [Rutter 1985, 1987].

Garmezy and colleagues followed children of mentally ill parents, as well as children with behavioral disturbance, for more than 10 years. In writing about this research and reviews of the literature on resilience, Garmezy stated that three types of factors in children at risk promote resilience, or success later in life: (1) temperamental or dispositional factors of the individual, (2) family ties and cohesion, and (3) external support systems [Garmezy 1993; Garmezy et al., 1984].

The first category, temperamental factors, includes items found to be relevant in many studies of resilience and protective factors. For example, a number of studies have found that intelligence or cognitive skills are associated with resilience [Garmezy et al., 1984; Werner, 1989; Zimrin, 1986], whereas other studies have indicated that in times of stress, intelligence can be related to vulnerability; this latter finding has been explained by the hypothesis that intelligent children may have a higher sensitivity to certain types of stress [Luthar, 1991]. Another factor that has been examined is sociability or positive response to others [Garmezy et al., 1984; Rubenstein et al., 1989; Werner, 1989]. Luthar [1991] examined several aspects of sociability in adolescents and found that the most significant protective effect resulted from “social expressiveness,” or verbal fluency of communication.

Two widely recognized factors that also fall under this descriptive category are the related concepts of positive self-esteem and an internal locus of control, or a belief in self-efficacy [Luthar, 1991; Rutter, 1987; Werner and Smith, 1982]. Positive self-esteem refers to a sense of self-worth. For example, Zimrin [1986], who followed abused children over 14 years and at follow-up, examined measurements of academic and social success, symptoms of mental illness, and self-reported measures of fulfillment and constructive plans for the future. Subjects who scored higher on the positive measures of functioning at follow-up had higher self-esteem as children.

“Internal locus of control” is defined as the belief that forces shaping one’s life are largely within one’s control [Luthar, 1991]. This belief may influence a person to make more active attempts to overcome difficult situations. The opposite of this concept is found in the theory of “learned helplessness,” in which people who believe themselves to be powerless becomes more passive and restricted in their coping abilities [Abramson et al., 1978]. Luthar [1991] examined inner-city adolescents under varying amounts of life stress, and assessed later academic and interpersonal functioning. She found that a belief in an internal locus of control was protective against stress. This finding has been replicated by others [Werner and Smith, 1982; Zimrin, 1986]. Rutter [1987] wrote that both self-esteem and self-efficacy, or a feeling of control over one’s circumstances, are enhanced by close relationships with others, such as parents or spouses. His research on children also revealed that self-esteem and self-efficacy are enhanced by the successful accomplishment of tasks, for example, “taking on positions of responsibility, and success in nonacademic pursuits (sports, music, craftwork).” Factors related to self-esteem and self-efficacy include positivity, hope, or optimism [Zimrin, 1986].

The second and third types of factors listed by Garmezy [1993] involve ties to family and other social support systems, such as school or church. Characteristics of these factors include a feeling of warmth, and supportiveness and closeness in the family or other social structure, along with “the presence of some caring adult,” including a neighbor, parents of peers, or a teacher; the protective effect of family and familylike relationships was confirmed by additional research [Bifulco et al., 1987; Werner, 1989]. These resilience factors are summarized in Table 1.

Resilience has also been examined in adults. Early research measured resilience in populations with significant medical problems or undergoing stressful life experiences. Kobasa [1979b] introduced the concept of “hardiness,” which has been defined as a stable personality resource that consists of three psychological attitudes and cognitions: commitment, challenge, and control. “Commitment” refers to an ability to turn events into something meaningful and important; “control” refers to the belief that, with effort, individuals can influence the course of events around them, and “challenge” refers to a belief that fulfillment in life results from the growth and wisdom gained from difficult or challenging experiences [Maddi and Khoshaba, 1994]. The composite variable of hardiness has been assessed with various scales measuring these three factors in a number of populations, such as adults experiencing stressful life events [Bartone et al., 1989; Ford et al., 2000; Lang et al., 2003; Northhouse et al., 2002; Williams and Lawler, 2001]. For example, in a study examining patients with HIV-AIDS, a high
TABLE 1. Resilience factors in high-risk children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Outcome protected against</th>
<th>Resilience factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse leading to hospitalization</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Poor “adjustment” (low school and work achievement, psychopathology)</td>
<td>Feeling of control (internal locus of control), self-esteem, cognitive abilities, hope and fantasy (mental images of safety) [Zimrin, 1986]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“High-risk”: poverty, parental psychopathology, family discord</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Delinquency, mental health problems, teenage pregnancy</td>
<td>Positive self-concept, internal locus of control, sociability, social support outside of family [Werner, 1992]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family discord, parental psychopathology, overcrowding due to poverty</td>
<td>Children from low-income families</td>
<td>Delinquency</td>
<td>Close relationship with an adult, positive self-concept, taking responsibilities for younger siblings, easy temperament, self-mastery, planning skills [Rutter, 1985]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood psychiatric disorder</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Worse symptoms at follow-up</td>
<td>Family cohesion (not being placed in temporary state care) [Rutter et al., 1976]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic stress (poverty, parental disability, illnesses)</td>
<td>Children with mentally ill parents or with behavioral problems</td>
<td>Low “competence” (poor school and social performance)</td>
<td>Higher IQ, higher socioeconomic status, family cohesion, external support systems [Garmezy et al., 1984]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual life stressors, poverty, disruptive events</td>
<td>Inner-city adolescents</td>
<td>Poor competence (academic performance, interpersonal performance)</td>
<td>Intelligence, internal locus of control, social skills (verbal fluency of communication), ego development, positive life events [Luthar, 1999]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reared in institution</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>Teenage pregnancy, poorer functioning in adulthood (unstable marriage, job)</td>
<td>Close, confiding relationships, future planning, self-esteem, self-efficacy [Rutter, 1987]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

score in hardiness was associated with lower psychological distress and higher quality of life [Farber et al., 2000]. In another study, hardiness was associated with decreased time loss due to injury in athletes [Ford et al., 2000]. Several of the factors in the construct of hardiness overlap with attributes listed in the developmental psychology literature cited earlier. For example, the personality style of "control," the feeling that one can influence the course of events around him or her, is similar to the concept of internal locus of control described earlier; aspects of "challenge" sound very much like "optimism."

**RESILIENCE AND PTSD**

More recently, the term "resilience" has been used in the context of acute trauma, such as combat, assault, accidents, or natural disasters. In this context, resilient individuals are those who experience a trauma but do not develop PTSD. About 50–60% of Americans are exposed to significant traumatic events over the course of their lifetime; of those exposed, 8–20% develop PTSD [Kessler et al., 1995]. We now review some of the factors already discussed as contributing to resilience that are also relevant in this context.

**RISK FACTORS FOR PTSD**

A number of risk factors for PTSD have been identified and include pretrauma, peritrauma, and posttrauma variables. Pretrauma variables exist before the trauma occurs. Examples include lower educational level [Kessler et al., 1999]; lower intelligence [Orr et al., 1998]; neurodevelopmental delays, such as delayed onset of walking and speech, as well as learning disabilities [Orr et al., 1998]; previous history of mental disorders [Kessler et al., 1999]; and female gender [Brewin et al., 2000]. Relevant peritraumatic variables include the magnitude of the stressor [Carlier et al., 1997] and immediate reactions to the stressor, such as fear of threats to one’s safety [Basoglu et al., 2005] or dissociation [Marmar et al., 1994]. Pertinent posttraumatic variables include perceived social support [King et al., 1998; Koenen et al., 2003], subsequent life stress [Green and Berlin, 1987], and ongoing threat to safety [Basoglu et al., 2005].

Brewin et al. [2000] performed a meta-analysis of PTSD risk factors identified in 85 different studies. Effect sizes were combined to provide scores representing the strength of each predictive effect. They found the strongest combined effect sizes for (in order) (1) lack of perceived social support, (2) subsequent life stress, (3) trauma severity, (4) adverse childhood, and (5) low intelligence.

Peritraumatic dissociation has also been suggested as a possible predictor and risk factor for PTSD. In a meta-analysis of studies on PTSD, Ozer et al. [2003] found that, of the seven predictors examined, peritraumatic dissociation had the largest effect size for predicting PTSD symptoms. In a study of crew members who survived a flooding and fire incident on a submarine, investigators found that peritraumatic dissociation was associated with an increased likelihood of subsequent PTSD [Berg et al., 2005], and in young adult survivors of community violence, peritraumatic dissociation was highly correlated with the develop-
RISK FACTORS VERSUS RESILIENCE FACTORS

The question of whether a factor associated with resilience can be considered the converse of a risk factor has been raised. Intuitively, some risk factors seem to tap similar domains as resilience factors, whereas others do not. For example, “social support” could represent a person’s ability to gather social resources, a possible “resiliency” characteristic. However, since neurodevelopmental delays in childhood appear to represent a risk factor for the development of PTSD, it does not seem useful to think of a lack of neurodevelopmental delays as conferring particular resilience. Similarly, though being female is a risk factor for developing PTSD after a trauma, it does not seem particularly informative to think that being male represents a resiliency factor.

Rutter [1987] has argued that resilience is more than just the “flip-side” of risk factors, but rather represents qualities encompassing process and mechanisms that confer protection. Risk factors “lead directly to disorder,” whereas resilience factors “operate indirectly, with their effects apparent only by virtue of their interactions” with other variables. For example, a positive coping strategy that confers resilience may not be apparent except when a stressful event causes it to be revealed.

Another way to conceptualize whether a variable associated with PTSD is a resiliency or risk factor is to examine whether it influences the positive pole (i.e., creating protective changes), or whether it affects the individual in a negative way, adding harmful influences or removing protective ones. However, even this conceptualization is not without difficulties, because an individual’s characteristics can be viewed from multiple perspectives. For example, social support (measured as perceived social support) may be seen either as a potential risk factor for PTSD or as a manifestation of resilience, representing the presence or absence of an individual’s ability to garner a critical resource to buffer the impact of traumatic stress.

If we define a resiliency characteristic as a factor that is intrinsic to the individual and that might be modifiable (e.g., unlike gender or neurodevelopmental delays), then we can describe a set of psychological and biological factors that may be interrelated and that confer protection against psychopathology in the face of stress—in this case, PTSD. Using this definition, we can examine the previously described psychological variables, as well as biological variables associated with resilience. Although some variables seem to indicate environmental factors, such as social support and family cohesion, it is individuals’ contribution to these factors that confers their status as characteristics of resilience. For example, a resilient person may have the ability to seek and extract support from others, and enhance his or her social support; similarly, the person contributes to the cohesion in his or her family. The examination of group behavior that may confer protection, or “community resilience,” is beyond the scope of this review. “Protective factors” in PTSD might include environmental factors outside of the individual’s control, such as socioeconomic status and lower levels of subsequent life stress; however, it is difficult to determine the relative contribution that an individual makes to these factors.

PSYCHOLOGICAL RESILIENCE TO PTSD

Psychological resiliency variables with regard to PTSD would ideally be measured before the onset of trauma, and correlated with the subsequent development of PTSD. However, this is almost never the case in empirical studies. Most of the data describe attributes of the segment of the group exposed to the trauma that did not end up developing PTSD, or that developed comparatively fewer symptoms. However, in some cases, the presence or absence of resiliency characteristics may be expressed only after a trauma occurs; thus, these characteristics may not be detectable in the unstressed state. Alternatively, it is possible that a protective psychological factor, such as an internal locus of control, may be learnable or improvable after a trauma and before the onset of PTSD a month or more later. Further research is needed in this area.

Coping styles have been examined in traumatized populations, with better outcomes associated with positive or action-oriented styles. For example, Johnsen et al. [2002] measured three dimensions of coping styles in soldiers caught in an avalanche. They found that “task-focused coping” (e.g., “I make a plan of action”) or “emotion-focused coping” (e.g., “I let my feelings out”), as opposed to an “avoidant coping style” (e.g., “I refuse to believe that it happened”), was associated with lower PTSD symptom scores. Similarly, research examining coping strategies in fire service personnel found that an avoidant coping style was associated with a higher level of PTSD symptoms following trauma exposure [Beaton et al., 1999]; however, retrospective assessment of avoidance as a coping strategy may be confounded by the fact that
avoidance is a common symptom in PTSD and may thus represent a result of PTSD rather than a predictor. Other coping strategies were nonsignificantly associated with protection from PTSD symptoms, such as “cognitive positive self-talk” (i.e. “I remind myself that I am providing help” and “I remind myself that things could be worse”). In a study of women who had been assaulted, Valentiner et al. [1996] correlated PTSD symptoms with higher scores on a factor construct that they called “wishful thinking” (i.e., “You wished that you could change the way you felt”) and negatively correlated with “positive distancing” (i.e., “You accepted the next best thing to what you wanted”). Hope, optimism, and religious behavior (i.e., prayer and faith), were also associated with fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression after the September 11, 2001, events, although PTSD symptoms were not specifically assessed [Ai et al., 2005b].

Another variable also associated with resilience in the child development and adult life stress literature reviewed earlier is the belief in an internal locus of control, which is one of the three concepts measured in the Hardiness Scale [Kobasa, 1979b]. An internal locus of control (feeling that one can generally influence one’s life circumstances) has been associated with lower levels of PTSD symptoms in several [Bolstad and Zinkbarg, 1997; Casella and Motta, 1990; Kuterovac-Jagodic, 2003; Marmar et al., 1996; Soet et al., 2003] but not all [Kilpatrick and Williams, 1998] studies. For example, locus of control was measured prior to trauma in a study of women going through childbirth [Soet et al., 2003]. Out of 103 subjects, 14 women reported PTSD symptoms from the experience 1 month later. Greater premorbid internal locus of control significantly predicted the lack of PTSD symptoms [Soet et al., 2003]. Similarly, in another study, children with higher levels of internal locus of control who were exposed to war-related events such as violence or loss of home had lower rates of PTSD symptoms at a 3-year follow-up [Kuterovac-Jagodic, 2003]. Similarly, the concept of “hardiness” we discussed earlier includes the measurement of perceived control as a critical cognitive variable. An examination of hardiness in a group of Vietnam veterans after war-related trauma was associated with a lower likelihood of developing PTSD symptoms [King et al., 1998]. Consistent with the concept of locus of control, a “sense of control” over the specific traumatic situation may also protect against PTSD. Although this has not been prospectively tested, it has been examined in individuals undergoing treatment for PTSD and is associated with improved maintenance of treatment gains [Livanou et al., 2002].

Psychological preparedness may promote a sense of control over the trauma: In a study examining psychopathology in individuals who were tortured, those who were political activists appeared to have more resilience. These individual were thought to be protected by their commitment to a cause, training in stoicism, and prior knowledge about torture techniques [Basoglu et al., 1997]. Other researchers have also found that prior training in emergency work appears to enhance resilience [Alvarez and Hunt, 2005; Hagh-Shenas et al., 2005].

Similar to findings in the childhood resiliency research, multiple studies of adult trauma have found that perceived social support and family cohesion are associated with greater resilience [King et al., 1998; Koenen et al., 2003; Perry et al., 1992], although some authors did not find this effect [e.g., Hyman, 2004]. For example, firefighters were asked about various job-related traumas and the amount of social support they received from their employer, union, family, spouse, and friends. Perceived support from all sources examined was associated with lower psychological distress [Regehr et al., 2000]. Similarly, King et al. [1998], who examined resilience variables in a group of 1,632 Vietnam veterans, found that several factors, including higher levels of both perceived (“functional”) and structural (i.e., membership in organizations) social support were associated with a lower likelihood of PTSD. In a study of Kosovan Albanian refugees living in England [Turner et al., 2003], family cohesion was associated with lower risk for PTSD symptoms. Although these factors may appear to be protective factors rather than resiliency factors, outside of the control of the individual, there is evidence that the individual’s active engagement in relationships, rather than just the increased availability of support, helps mediate the protection from PTSD. In the firefighter study described earlier, relational capacity was strongly associated with lack of symptoms, and high scores on the interpersonal styles of insecurity and alienation were related to PTSD symptoms, suggesting that the protection against symptoms involves the individual’s ability to use and sustain such support [Regehr et al., 2000]. This is similar to findings in the child development literature that positive interpersonal response to others is associated with resilience to stressful life events [Garmezy et al., 1984; Werner, 1989]. However, as with most variables in the trauma literature, perceived social support has generally been measured after the trauma occurred; this limitation presents the possible confound that the disorder interferes with the individual’s ability to activate and utilize social support.

Previous exposure to trauma or stress has a complicated relationship to resilience. A history of prior exposure to trauma, such as child abuse, is generally associated with the development of more severe PTSD symptoms after a new trauma [Chang et al., 2005; Fullerton et al., 2004]. However, it appears that certain types of exposure to stress may have a protective effect for individuals later exposed to new trauma. Rutter [1987] writes that the impact of the stress depends on how the individual experiences it. He states that “protection [from adverse sequelae] in this case resides not in the evasion of the risk, but
in successful engagement with it.” Interestingly, in one of the studies of firefighters cited earlier, Reggehr et al. [2000] found that a higher number of traumatic exposures actually increased subjects’ sense of internal locus of control and self-efficacy. Thus, trauma exposure may represent a protective rather than vulnerability factor for adverse posttraumatic sequelae, if it is associated with an increased sense of mastery or growth. Table 2 summarizes some of the resilience factors that have been identified in the PTSD studies we have mentioned.

**BIOLICAL MEASURES OF RESILIENCE**

A growing body of research has focused on determining physiological or biological differences in individuals who experienced a trauma and either developed or did not develop PTSD. Similar to the studies of psychological variables, studies of biological variables have relied mostly on assessments of groups of people only after a traumatic event has occurred. However, determination of true biological resilience factors would involve assessing these variables before the onset of a trauma. Unfortunately, very few prospectively derived data exist. Most studies have examined differences in individuals with PTSD compared to a normal population; few data exist examining the relative differences in a trauma-exposed population that did not develop PTSD. However, examination of the neurobiology of PTSD may inform our understanding of the critical factors underlying resilience and shape future lines of inquiry.

**Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis.**

Much of the research on the pathophysiology of PTSD has focused on dysregulation of the HPA axis. Evidence suggesting a role for HPA axis dysregulation in the development of PTSD is supported by clinical studies demonstrating decreased 24-hour urinary cortisol levels in subjects with PTSD. For example, Yehuda et al. [1995] examined 22 Holocaust survivors with PTSD and 25 without PTSD. Subjects with PTSD had an average of 32.6 μg of cortisol in their 24-hour urine sample, compared to 62.7 μg of cortisol in those without PTSD. This finding replicates data from a number of studies [Mason et al., 1986; Yehuda et al., 1990, 1993], although other studies have reported higher than normal cortisol levels in individuals with PTSD [De Bellis et al., 1999; Lemieux and Coe, 1995; Maes et al., 1998; Pitman and Orr, 1990; Rasmusson et al., 2001]; in all, nine of the 12 studies examining 24-hour urinary cortisol have found abnormal cortisol levels, either high or low, in patients with PTSD. The discrepancies in findings reported in different studies may be attributable, in part, to differences in illness severity among the patient populations studied: with lower cortisol levels associated with more severely ill patients (i.e., hospitalized) and higher cortisol levels associated with less ill patients (i.e., outpatients; Rasmusson et al., 2003). Other factors contributing to these discrepancies include differences in the timing of measurements relative to the acuity of the disorder (acute vs. chronic), and differences in measurement techniques, with some researchers measuring plasma or saliva cortisol at fixed times during the day, whereas others measured it after waking or after performance of a dexamethasone suppression test. However, even studies employing similar methodology have yielded discrepant results, suggesting the potential importance of broadening the area of inquiry to include alternative measurements of neuroendocrine function.

Relevant to the issue of cortisol and PTSD are results from the study by Schelling et al. [2001], in which hydrocortisone administration to patients shortly after the onset of septic shock decreased the subsequent development of PTSD symptoms. This

### TABLE 2. Resilience factors in PTSD studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Resilience factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fleeing homeland</td>
<td>Adult refugees</td>
<td>Family cohesion [Turner et al., 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalanche</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>Task-focused or emotion-focused coping style, as opposed to avoidant coping style [Johnsen et al., 2002]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Coping styles using “positive distancing” vs. ‘wishful thinking’ [Valentiner et al., 1996]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War-zone stressors</td>
<td>Vietnam veterans</td>
<td>Resilience–recovery factors: hardiness (control, commitment, challenge), social support, fewer additional stressful life events [King et al., 1998, 1999]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Psychological preparedness for arrest and torture (i.e., prior knowledge of torture events, training in stoicism) [Basoglu et al., 1997]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childbirth trauma</td>
<td>Women (pre- and postchildbirth)</td>
<td>Internal locus of control [Soet et al., 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War-related events</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Internal locus of control [Kuterovac-Jagodic, 2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firefighters</td>
<td>Work-related traumatic events</td>
<td>Ability to use and sustain social support, higher number of traumatic exposures (with the effect of increasing internal locus of control and self-efficacy) [Reggehr et al., 2000]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn injury</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Perceived social support [Perry et al., 1992]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11th attacks in NY</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Hope and optimism [Ai et al., 2005a] and religious behavior [Ai et al., 2005b]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
seems to indicate a protective effect of glucocorticoids at the time of trauma. Reduction in the development of PTSD associated with hydrocortisone administration has been replicated in patients undergoing cardiac surgery [Schelling et al., 2004] and was postulated to confer a protective effect by interfering with retrieval of traumatic memories, an effect of glucocorticoids that has been demonstrated in animal models [Roozendaal, 2003]. This observation led to a small trial in which cortisol was used as a treatment for chronic PTSD. Three patients were administered low-dose (10 mg/day) cortisol orally in a 3-month, placebo-controlled, crossover design study. All three patients experienced reductions in reexperiencing symptoms, and one had decreased avoidance symptoms [Aerni et al., 2004].

In addition to cortisol, dehydroepiandrosterone (DHEA) and its metabolite dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate (DHEAS) are also adrenal gland products that are secreted in response to ACTH. Animal studies have indicated that DHEAS is released under stressful conditions and exhibits memory-enhancing, anti-depressant, anxiolytic, and antiaggression properties [Morgan et al., 2004]. In cell culture experiments, DHEA and DHEAS enhanced neuronal survival in the face of N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor–induced toxicity, leading the authors to conclude that DHEA and DHEAS are important protectors of cells undergoing damage or stress [Kimonides et al., 1998]. These studies suggest that DHEA and DHEAS are involved in modulating an organism’s vulnerability to stress. Studies examining levels of DHEA and DHEAS in PTSD have also generated mixed results; some researchers have found higher than normal levels in subjects with PTSD, whereas others found lower than normal levels in subjects with PTSD and depression [Sondergaard et al., 2002; Spivak et al., 2000].

DHEA appears to have an antagonistic relationship with cortisol. Whereas cortisol is a glucocorticoid, DHEA has antiglucocorticoid properties that appear to protect neurons [Blauer et al., 1991; Browne et al., 1992]. For example, research on metabolites of DHEA in the brain suggests that they interfere with uptake of activated glucocorticoid receptors [Morfin and Starka, 2001]. In addition, administration of DHEA in humans resulted in a decrease of plasma cortisol [Kroboth et al., 2003]. Given this antagonistic relationship of DHEA(S) with cortisol, and because cortisol is associated with improved emotional memory encoding [Buchanan and Lovallo, 2001; Cordero et al., 2002], DHEA(S) may antagonize these enhanced memory effects, resulting in decreased PTSD symptoms of reexperiencing, such as nightmares or flashbacks. Because of the antagonistic relationship, levels of DHEA(S) may be more meaningful when examined in relationship with cortisol—indeed, preclinical and clinical data have found the DHEAS:cortisol ratio associated with improved functioning [Morgan et al., 2004]. For example, in a study of HIV+ men, psychotherapy improved the DHEA:cortisol decline seen in this population [Crueess et al., 1999]. In a recent study of soldiers enrolled in military survival school, Morgan et al. [2004] found that DHEAS:cortisol ratios during stress were higher in those subjects who were able to perform better under intense stress.

**Catecholamines.** The stress response involves both the sympathetic nervous system and the HPA axis; consequently, there has also been an interest in norepinephrine and epinephrine in patients with PTSD. For example, Kosten et al. [1987] measured urinary norepinephrine and epinephrine levels in hospitalized patients with PTSD, and found higher levels of norepinephrine than in other hospitalized psychiatric control groups with depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. This finding has been replicated by some [Lemieux and Coe, 1995; Yehuda et al., 1992, 1998] but not all [McFall et al., 1992; Murburg et al., 1995] investigators. Other groups reported an increased release of catecholamines in PTSD subjects after exposure to combat-related stimuli, such as films or evocative sounds [Blanchard et al., 1991; Libeberzon et al., 1999; McFall et al., 1990].

A few studies have examined norepinephrine or epinephrine levels at the time of trauma, to investigate their potential relationship with later development of PTSD. Delahanty et al. [2005] examined urinary epinephrine levels in children admitted to the hospital after an acute trauma and found that elevated epinephrine levels were associated with higher levels of PTSD symptoms 6 weeks later. Schelling [2002] reported that patients who received epinephrine as part of their intensive care unit (ICU) medical care had more types of trauma memories 6 months later compared to similarly severely ill patients in the ICU who had not received epinephrine.

Adrenergic stimulation has been shown to enhance memory consolidation in animals and humans. For example, administering amphetamine to human subjects before learning of word lists enhances memory of those words [Soetens et al., 1995]. A significant part of the memory consolidation process appears to continue after exposure to the memory task, which is also enhanced by noradrenergic stimulation. For example, Southwick et al. [1993] administered yohimbine, which stimulates norepinephrine release, to subjects after they viewed slides of an emotionally arousing story. Increased 3-methoxy-4-hydroxyphenyl-glycol (MHPG, a noradrenergic metabolite) levels were associated with enhanced memory of the story. In another study, among normal subjects, memory was greater for emotionally arousing stories than for neutral stories. Propranolol, a β-adrenergic receptor antagonist, blocked the enhanced memory for emotionally arousing stories [Cahill et al., 1994]. The findings of increased memory consolidation associated with increased adrenergic tone may have significant implications for the pathogenesis of PTSD, which is hypothesized to be attributable to an overconsolidation...
of the trauma memory, resulting in the intrusive recollections and reexperiencing symptoms in PTSD [Pitman et al., 2002].

**Neuropeptide Y (NPY).** NPY, a 36-amino acid peptide that is colocalized with neurons containing norepinephrine, may be a natural resiliency factor for stress. NPY is anxiolytic when administered intraventricularly in animals [Heilig et al., 1989]. NPY administration promotes sleep, as well as decreases cortisol and ACTH production in humans [Antonijevic et al., 2000]. Widdowson et al. [1992] reported lower NPY levels in the brains of individuals who had committed suicide. Individuals trained to remain unperturbed under stress manifest increased levels of NPY after a stressful event: Morgan et al. [2004] measured NPY 24 hours after Special Forces soldiers and non–Special Forces soldiers underwent a simulated prisoner-of-war experience. The Special Forces soldiers regained their normal NPY levels 24 hours later, whereas levels in the non–Special Forces were significantly lower. This finding was hypothesized to suggest that Special Forces soldiers had physiologically adjusted to handle stress better, either as a result of their native endowment or by dint of their training, and the normalized NPY levels served as a marker of this resilience. Supporting this hypothesis, individuals with PTSD have been found to have lower NPY levels at baseline and a blunted yohimbine-induced NPY increase [Rasmussen et al., 2000]. NPY may exert its stress-buffering effect by way of its counterregulatory effects on the locus coeruleus–norepinephrine system (NPY appears to inhibit norepinephrine release) and on corticotropin-releasing hormone [CRH; NPY blocks CRH’s anxiogenic effects; Britton et al., 2000]. In addition, NPY may disrupt fearful memory consolidation; injection of NPY in the amygdala of mice impaired memory in a foot shock task [Flood et al., 1989].

**Allopregnanolone.** Allopregnanolone, another product of the adrenal gland associated with the stress response, may be a potential resiliency factor relevant to the development of PTSD. Stress lowers γ-amino-butyric acid A (GABA-A) transmission, causing neuronal overexcitation; allopregnanolone modulates the GABA-A receptor, counteracting this effect of stress [Higashi et al., 2005]. For example, Bitran et al. [1995] showed that administration of the allopregnanolone precursor progesterone in rats produces a decrease in anxiety similar to that observed after the administration of benzodiazepine compounds, and that allopregnanolone’s effects on the GABA-A receptor mediate this effect. Similarly, Higashi et al. [2005] found that allopregnanolone increased in rats exposed to recorded distress cries of other rats, as a putative homeostatic mechanism to counteract stress. Allopregnanolone increased in students undergoing test-taking stress [Droogleever Fortuyn et al., 2004]. Perhaps resilience corresponds, in part, to an ability to increase allopregnanolone levels during stress.

Interestingly, allopregnanolone levels decrease when mice are socially isolated and placed in individual living quarters [Dong et al., 2001]. Because social contact and support in humans promotes resilience and protects against anxiety and depression, this effect may be mediated in part by changes in levels of allopregnanolone and other neuroactive steroids.

**MEASUREMENT OF RESILIENCE**

Numerous scales for measuring resilience and hardiness have been developed over the years; however, there has been little consensus on which scales most effectively describe and quantitatively evaluate resiliency characteristics.

Some early studies examining resilience in children and adolescents used combinations of scales examining specific resilient characteristics and risk factors, such as locus of control [Luthar, 1991]. Some scales that have been commonly used to measure the locus-of-control component of resilience include the Locus of Control Scale [Nowicki and Strickland, 1973] and the Internal–External Locus of Control Scale [Rotter, 1966]. Other scales have been used collectively to assess competence or coping skills, two qualities that may be related to resilience. Measures of social competence used in Luthar’s study [1991] included the Teacher–Child Rating Scale [Hightower et al., 1986], the Revised Class Play Scale [for peer assessment; Masten et al., 1983], and school grades.

In addition, a number of instruments have been developed to measure hardiness—a concept related to resilience—based on Kobasa’s [1979b] original description of the core elements of commitment, control, and challenge. As with resilience scales, there has been little consistency either in the scales selected for use in studies or in the way the scales have been applied to measure hardiness [Funk and Houston, 1987]. An early instrument, the Hardiness Scale [Kobasa et al., 1982], comprises five different scales—including the Alienation from Self scale, the Alienation from Work scale, the Powerlessness scale, all three scales from the Alienation Test [Maddi et al., 1979]; the Security scale of the California Life Goals Evaluation Schedule [cited by Kobasa, 1979a]; and the External Locus of Control Scale [Rotter et al., 1962]—all containing items corresponding to different aspects of hardiness. Commitment is measured by the Alienation from Self and Alienation from Work scales; control is measured by the External Locus of Control and Powerlessness scales; and challenge is assessed by the Security scale [Hull et al., 1987]. These scales provide an important context for the resiliency scales, which incorporate the core concepts of hardiness, as previously discussed.

Following criticisms of the design and validity of the original Hardiness Scale [Funk and Houston, 1987; Hull et al., 1987], a new measure, the Personal Views Survey (PVS), was developed by Maddi and Khoshaba [1994]. This new and shorter measure
includes 45 rating-scale items selected from the original composite Hardiness Scale. Selection of items was based on an evaluation of each item's psychometric validity by Bartone et al. [1989]. The scale also contains a smaller number of items (i.e., 45) than the Hardiness Scale (which contains 90 items between the different subscales) and may therefore be a more practical clinical tool. The PVS exhibits a positive correlation with health status [Campbell et al., 1989] and a negative correlation with psychopathological tendencies, as assessed by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory [after controlling for negative affectivity; Maddi and Khoshaba, 1994]. Another research group [King et al., 1998] incorporated 11 items that roughly corresponded to the commitment, control, and challenge elements of hardiness into a larger survey, the National Survey of the Vietnam Generation of the National Vietnam Veterans Readjustment Study [NVVRS; Kulka et al., 1990]. They examined the relationship of these measurements with war zone stressors and PTSD symptomatology in Vietnam veterans [King et al., 1998] as part of the NVVRS. As detailed earlier, researchers have created new scales by selecting from the previously established items or by choosing items for larger surveys that correspond to the three hardiness components.

The relationship of hardiness to resilience has not been clearly defined, but the hardiness characteristics of commitment, control, and challenge appear to be considered features of resilience, and resilience scales have used the construct of hardiness as a key point of quantitative evaluation. For example, Connor and Davidson [2003] included the three components of hardiness into a resilience scale that is discussed next.

One of the earliest scales to include the term “resilience” in its title was the Resilience Scale [RS; Wagnild and Young, 1993], which includes 25 items and evaluates qualities of personal competence and acceptance of self and life. This scale was used in a study that examined resilience in sheltered, battered women [Humphreys, 2003]. The Resilience Scale for Adults (RSA), independently developed by Friborg et al., contains items related to five components of resilience: personal competence, social competence, family cohesion, social support and personal structure [Friborg et al., 2003; Hjemdal et al., 2001]. Each of the five components corresponds to one of the three key categories of resilience described by Werner 1989, 1993), Rutter [1990], and Garmezy [1993]: dispositional attributes, family cohesion, and external support systems, respectively.

The most recently developed instrument for measuring resilience is the 25-item Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor and Davidson, 2003), which incorporates items from earlier resiliency research, including those corresponding to Kobasa's hardiness model and Rutter's list of resilient characteristics from his 1985 review, including self-esteem, “action orientation,” adaptability to change, the ability to develop strategies around a clear goal, skillfulness in social problem solving, sense of humor during stressful events, and a number of other items. In addition, the scale also measures patience and endurance as introduced by Lyons [1991], as well as components of “faith” and “belief in benevolent intervention” or “optimism” adapted from the biographical literature describing the explorer Shackleton's expeditions [Connor and Davidson, 2003]. Subject responses to the list of 25 statements cover a 5-point range, from not true at all to true nearly all the time. This scale was validated with samples of the general population, primary care outpatients, psychiatric outpatients, patients with generalized anxiety disorder, and patients with PTSD [Connor and Davidson, 2003]. Ideally, a scale of resilience would be examined in a trauma-exposed control group that did not develop PTSD, because these are probably the individuals most likely to be truly resilient. Unfortunately, data assessing resilience instruments in this population are not available. To give a rough estimate of the frequency of use of these resilience and hardiness scales in the psychiatric literature, the number of Medline abstract mentions is provided in Table 3.

The variety of approaches that have attempted to capture the concept of resilience reflects the difficulty of defining this notion. The American Heritage Dictionary [2000] defines resilience as “the ability to recover quickly from illness, change, or misfortune; buoyancy.” From this definition of resilience, which incorporates the idea of a response to some event or situation, the question emerges about whether resilience can be measured by a set of questions at a single point in time, as opposed to observing a subject during a stressful experience and then determining how well he or she returns to normal functioning. Otherwise, a set of questions at a single time point may end up only capturing state characteristics, such as positive attitudes or mood. Using this reasoning, a true resilience scale would measure an individual's reaction to an experimental stress paradigm or to stressful life events or traumas over time. With PTSD, a resiliency-measuring instrument would need to be administered to subjects prior to experiencing a trauma and then demonstrated to predict resistance to the development of stress-related disorders. Unfortunately, these kinds of prospectively derived data are not currently available.

In addition, it is not clear whether a resiliency scale can truly measure improvement in resilience, independent from improvement in symptoms of PTSD or other disorders, because the term “resilience” defines individuals who were protected from developing the disorder in the first place. For example, it may not be valid to describe subjects who improve after pharmacological or psychotherapeutic treatment as “more resilient,” separately from simply being successfully treated for their disorder. To use the term “resilience” in this context, the measurement of resilience should
show that the subjects are better able to handle stress or trauma, independent of their treatment response.

CONCLUSION

Many variables associated with the absence of PTSD are considered features of “resilience.” This term has been used in various contexts and populations, and a clarification of the meaning of this term in the context of PTSD would be helpful. In this article, we propose that the term “resilience” refers to psychological or biological factors that may have been alterable at some point, and that confer protection from PTSD. Many psychosocial variables, including positive or action-oriented coping styles, internal locus of control, cognitive abilities, and social support, have been examined in individuals who have experienced trauma or other hardship. Several biological variables appear to be promising lines of inquiry for further research of resilience, such as DHEA(S), allopregnanolone, and NPY. As more knowledge is gained in the area, possible connections between the psychological and biological variables can be explored.

Ideally, these variables should be measured prospectively, before a trauma, or before the onset of PTSD, then correlated with rates of later PTSD symptoms. In addition, the use of the term “resilience” is less meaningful when applied to changes seen after successful treatment of a psychiatric disorder; it does not seem valid to link the idea of resilience to decreasing symptoms without establishing that that a decrease in symptoms is associated with a better ability to handle stress or trauma. For example, a medication treatment study showing an improvement in symptoms does not necessarily demonstrate that resilience is enhanced, as any measures of resilience examined in the absence of further trauma exposure may be confounded with the treatment effect. Indeed, it is rare to find a study showing additional trauma exposure following treatment for PTSD symptoms. In one study however, earthquake survivors treated successfully with cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) maintained therapeutic gains despite ongoing earthquake aftershocks, suggesting a possible enhancement of resilience, although exposure to aftershocks was not systematically measured [Basoglu et al., 2003]. Researchers have also examined the effect of early treatment after a trauma (i.e., before the onset of PTSD, but after the individual has started to experience some traumatic stress symptoms). In several studies, CBT, which included education, exposure, cognitive restructuring, and relaxation training, decrease PTSD symptoms more than did supportive counseling [Ehlers and Clark, 2003].

Further research is warranted to better explore the relationships between such interventions and later symptoms. In addition, prospective studies should examine psychological and biological resilience characteristics in populations likely to experience trauma, or in the interval between trauma exposure and symptom development. These approaches will help define resilience characteristics and guide the development of interventions to enhance them.
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**TABLE 3. Resilience scales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resilience scale</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Core concepts</th>
<th>Frequency of use*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD-RISC [Connor and Davidson, 2003]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Hardiness (control, commitment, change viewed as challenge), developing strategy with a clear goal, action orientation, strong self-esteem, adaptability to change, social problem-solving skills, humor, strengthening effect of stress, acceptance of responsibility in dealing with stress, secure emotional relationships, previous achievement, patience, ability to endure stress, faith, belief in benevolent intervention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS [Kobasa, 1979b]; (composed of previously validated subscales)—a newer version of the scale is the PVS, also known as the HardiSurvey</td>
<td>90 (varies for PVS and HardiSurvey)</td>
<td>Subscales: Alienation from Self scale and Alienation from Work scale (commitment); Security and Cognitive Structure (challenge); Powerlessness scale and External Locus of Control scale (control)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS [Wagnild and Young, 1993]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Personal competence, acceptance of Self and Life</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA [Friborg et al., 2003]</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Personal competence, social competence, Family coherence, social support, personal structure</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of studies using the scale according to Medline abstract searches.


