The Architecture of Resilience: Multisystem Approaches to Mental Health and Positive Development

© 2026 Putri D.*

* Postgraduates student,Diponegoro University, (Semarang, Indonesia), e-mail: p_ri2@live.undip.ac.id

Annotation: Resilience science has moved from early clinical studies of psychopathology risk to a developmental, multisystem understanding of positive adaptation under adversity. In this perspective, resilience is not a fixed trait but the capacity of dynamic systems to respond effectively to challenges that threaten functioning, development, or survival. Such adaptation depends on interacting protective processes across biological, psychological, relational, institutional, and cultural levels. This shift has important consequences for the study of mental health in children and youth because it directs attention away from narrowly individual explanations and toward the coordinated operation of multiple adaptive systems. Research now suggests that multisystem resilience can buffer the effects of adverse childhood experiences, shape developmental pathways, and support positive functioning even in conditions of severe stress. The multisystem framework also provides a stronger basis for intervention by identifying leverage points in families, schools, communities, and broader policy environments.

Key words: Resilience, multisystem approach, adaptation, adversity, mental health

Архитектура устойчивости: мультисистемные подходы к психическому здоровью и позитивному развитию

© 2026 Путри Д.*

* Аспирант, Университет Дипонегоро (Семаранг, Индонезия), электронная почта: p_ri2@live.undip.ac.id

Аннотация: Наука об устойчивости прошла путь от ранних клинических исследований факторов риска психопатологий к пониманию позитивной адаптации в неблагоприятных условиях с позиций психологии развития и мультисистемного подхода. В рамках этой парадигмы устойчивости рассматривается не как статичная личностная черта, а как способность динамических систем эффективно реагировать на вызовы, угрожающие их функционированию, развитию или выживанию. Такая адаптация зависит от взаимодействия защитных процессов на биологическом, психологическом, межличностном, институциональном и культурном уровнях. Этот методологический сдвиг имеет важнейшее значение для изучения психического здоровья детей и молодежи, поскольку он смещает фокус внимания с узкоиндивидуальных объяснений на скоординированное функционирование множества адаптивных систем. Современные исследования показывают, что мультисистемная устойчивости способна смягчать последствия неблагоприятного детского опыта, определять траектории развития и поддерживать благополучное функционирование даже в условиях тяжелого стресса. Кроме того, мультисистемный подход обеспечивает более надежную основу для терапевтического и профилактического вмешательства, позволяя выявить ключевые точки приложения усилий в семьях, школах, местных сообществах и на уровне социальной политики в целом.

Ключевые слова: Устойчивость, мультисистемный подход, адаптация, невзгоды, психическое здоровье

Interest in resilience has intensified because contemporary childhood and adolescence unfold under conditions of accumulating risk. Global disasters, pandemics, armed conflict, forced migration, economic precarity, and environmental instability have heightened concern about how children and youth can sustain healthy development under severe strain (Masten 2021; Masten & Motti-Stefanidi 2020). At

the same time, evidence on adverse childhood experiences has demonstrated that early adversity can exert durable effects on physical health, mental health, learning, and social functioning across the life course, with consequences that may extend across generations (Felitti et al. 1998; Shonkoff et al. 2012; McLaughlin et al. 2020). These developments have made resilience a central concept not only in developmental psychology, but also in psychiatry, education, public health, social work, and disaster research.

Historically, resilience science emerged from studies of risk for psychopathology. Investigators examining children exposed to poverty, family disruption, parental mental illness, violence, and other serious adversities observed that some nevertheless developed in competent and psychologically healthy ways. These findings challenged models that treated risk exposure as leading in a straightforward way to disorder. Early scholars therefore began to ask not only why children fail under adversity, but also why some succeed despite it (Garmezy 1985; Rutter 1987; Werner & Smith 1982). This shift helped establish resilience as a distinct field of inquiry concerned with positive adaptation in the context of significant threat.

The evolution of the field is often described in four broad waves. The first wave was primarily descriptive and sought to identify the characteristics associated with relatively positive outcomes under adverse conditions. The second wave examined the processes that might explain those outcomes, moving from lists of traits to mechanisms of adaptation. The third wave was intervention-oriented and asked whether protective processes could be strengthened intentionally through prevention and treatment. The fourth and current wave is defined by dynamic, systems-based, and integrative models that examine resilience across levels of analysis, from neurobiological processes to family relationships, schools, communities, and cultures (Masten 2007; Masten 2014b; Wright et al. 2013). This trajectory reflects a broader reorientation in developmental science from linear causation to transactional and multilevel explanation.

Developmental systems theory has been especially important in this transformation. In such models, development is understood as the product of reciprocal interactions among multiple systems that operate simultaneously and change over time. Genetic activity, neural plasticity, physiological stress regulation, cognition, emotion, behavior, caregiving, peer relations, institutional supports, and cultural practices all shape one another in continuous exchange (Bronfenbrenner & Morris 2006; Gottlieb 2007; Lerner 2006; Overton 2013). From this standpoint, resilience cannot be reduced to a personality trait or a single protective factor. It is better understood as a property of dynamic systems that preserve, restore, or reorganize functioning under challenge.

A multisystem definition follows from this theoretical shift. Resilience may be defined as the capacity of a dynamic system to adapt successfully through multisystem processes to challenges that threaten its functioning, development, or viability (Masten 2016; Ungar 2018). This definition is deliberately scalable. It can be applied to physiological systems such as immune or stress-response processes, to persons, to families, to schools, to communities, and to wider social ecologies. The advantage of this definition is conceptual and practical. Conceptually, it supports communication across disciplines that focus on different levels of organization. Practically, it directs research and intervention toward the links among systems rather than toward isolated variables.

Several implications follow from a developmental systems perspective. First, resilience is dynamic rather than static: it changes over time as the systems that support adaptation develop, weaken, or reorganize. Second, resilience is distributed. A child's adaptive capacity depends not only on individual skills, but also on the availability of caregiving, institutional protection, educational opportunity, social inclusion, and cultural resources. Third, resilience can unfold along multiple pathways. Some children show relative stability under stress, others experience disruption followed by recovery, and still others develop through complex combinations of vulnerability and compensation. Fourth, resilience can cascade

across domains and generations. Gains in one area, such as caregiving quality or self-regulation, may lead to positive changes in other areas, whereas impairments may also spread if not interrupted (Masten & Cicchetti 2016).

These implications reshape the basic questions of resilience research. Investigators ask what kinds of threats are under study, how successful adaptation should be defined, what factors are associated with better-than-expected outcomes, when and how such factors operate, and how resilience may be fostered or restored. The study of resilience therefore requires attention both to adversity and to competence. Without clearly identified threat, the concept loses specificity; without criteria for adaptation, it becomes indistinguishable from general well-being (Luthar 1991; Luthar 2006).

Risk in resilience research refers to an elevated probability of undesirable outcomes. In childhood studies, risk has been operationalized in many ways, including maltreatment, chronic poverty, racism and discrimination, community violence, family instability, parental psychopathology, institutional rearing, displacement, and disaster exposure. One influential development was the shift from single-risk models to cumulative-risk approaches. Researchers found that adversities often cluster and that their combined burden predicts outcomes more powerfully than any isolated factor. This led to the widespread use of cumulative-risk indices and to the diffusion of adverse childhood experiences questionnaires in research and public health surveillance (Evans et al. 2013; Felitti et al. 1998).

Cumulative measures have considerable value because they reveal dose-response relations: as the number or intensity of adversities rises, the likelihood of developmental, behavioral, and health problems increases. They also support the view that different adversities may converge on common pathways, such as chronic stress activation, impaired caregiving, or disrupted learning opportunities. Yet cumulative scores also have limitations. They can obscure meaningful differences among types of threat, developmental timing, duration, and context. For example, chronic neglect, acute disaster exposure, and structural discrimination may all

contribute to cumulative burden but do not operate through identical mechanisms. A multisystem resilience framework therefore treats cumulative risk as informative but incomplete, requiring more precise analysis of processes and timing.

The second essential component in resilience research is the criterion used to judge adaptation. Early studies often defined resilience negatively, as the absence of disorder among high-risk individuals. Contemporary work increasingly incorporates positive developmental criteria, including social competence, academic progress, emotional regulation, physical health, role performance, and subjective well-being. Longitudinal developmental studies have shown the importance of age-salient tasks as indicators of adaptive functioning. Secure attachment, language acquisition, learning, peer relationships, autonomy, and effective participation in school and community life are examples of tasks whose successful negotiation predicts later competence (Masten & Coatsworth 1998; Sroufe et al. 2005; Masten & Tellegen 2012). Such criteria are always culturally and historically situated, but they remain indispensable for evaluating how well development is proceeding under adverse conditions.

Methodologically, resilience research has drawn on both person-focused and variable-focused strategies. Person-focused research examines individuals or groups who display resilient functioning and seeks to characterize their developmental patterns. This approach captures the organization of adaptation in whole persons and is especially useful for identifying meaningful pathways. Classic clinical cases, narrative studies, and longitudinal follow-ups all helped establish the reality of resilience phenomena by showing that positive development under adversity is not anomalous, even if it is not universal. Such studies also highlighted recurring protective patterns, including supportive relationships, problem-solving competence, agency, self-regulation, and access to valued social roles.

Variable-focused research, by contrast, investigates the statistical relations among measures of adversity, adaptation, and protective factors. This tradition has been crucial for testing hypotheses about mediation, moderation, and mechanism. It

supports more precise analysis of whether a factor is promotive in general, protective under specific conditions of risk, or part of a broader adaptive system. Variable-focused work has clarified, for example, the importance of caregiving quality, school engagement, executive functioning, and social support as factors that shape trajectories under adversity (Masten 2001; Masten 2014b). In contemporary resilience science, these two approaches are increasingly combined rather than opposed.

Pathway models are one of the most useful bridges between person-focused and developmental-systems perspectives. Instead of treating adaptation as a static outcome, pathway models examine trajectories over time. Several broad patterns recur in the literature: resistance, in which functioning remains relatively stable despite exposure to stress; breakdown followed by recovery; and forms of positive transformation or growth after adversity. These pathways are not merely descriptive. They help identify turning points, sensitive periods, and the conditions under which developmental course changes direction. In this sense, resilience is not a binary category but a temporal process shaped by cumulative transactions.

Advances in longitudinal statistics have made it possible to test pathway models more rigorously. Growth mixture modeling, for example, allows researchers to identify latent subgroups within a population that follow different developmental trajectories over time (Muthén & Muthén 2000). Such techniques have been used in research on trauma, disaster recovery, child maltreatment, and familial vulnerability to identify resilient, recovering, and chronically symptomatic pathways. Their value lies not only in describing heterogeneity, but also in linking different pathways to antecedent conditions and later outcomes.

The concept of developmental cascades further strengthens multisystem explanation. A cascade occurs when change in one domain or system influences functioning in another domain over time. Academic success may improve self-concept and behavior; improved parenting may reduce coercive family interaction and strengthen children’s self-regulation; better self-regulation may, in turn, support

school engagement and peer functioning. Conversely, problems may also cascade across systems, intensifying risk. Cascade models are therefore well suited to resilience science because they illuminate how small shifts in adaptive systems may produce broader developmental change (Masten & Cicchetti 2010; Patterson et al. 2010).

As the field has matured, researchers have adopted increasingly sophisticated models of dynamic change. Some work draws on nonlinear systems approaches to examine coordination, synchrony, and variability in behavior and physiology. Other work uses network models that conceptualize mental health problems as systems of interacting symptoms and resilience factors as influences that weaken, interrupt, or reorganize those interactions. In this view, resilience is not located in one superior attribute; rather, it may lie in patterns of flexibility and buffering that prevent a stress-activated network from settling into persistent disorder (Kalisch et al. 2019). These approaches are especially promising because they align resilience theory with contemporary models of complex adaptive systems.

The multisystem perspective also has major implications for intervention. Resilience-oriented intervention differs from older deficit-focused approaches in that it seeks not only to treat symptoms after breakdown, but also to identify and strengthen the adaptive systems that support competent development. Broadly speaking, interventions can reduce exposure to harm, increase access to promotive resources, or directly enhance the functioning of key adaptive processes. The practical question is not whether resilience can be manufactured in the abstract, but which systems are most malleable, when they are most malleable, and how intervention in one system may influence others.

Evidence consistently indicates that parenting and the quality of early caregiver-child relationships are among the most powerful leverage points. Across many forms of adversity, interventions that strengthen caregiving sensitivity, structure, monitoring, and emotional support can improve children’s behavioral regulation, social competence, and mental health outcomes (National Research

Council & Institute of Medicine 2009; Sandler et al. 2011). Their importance is not surprising. Caregiving systems organize safety, learning, stress regulation, and socialization early in life, and they connect children to broader institutional and community resources. Because caregiving operates at the junction of biological, relational, and environmental processes, improvements in this domain often have wide developmental effects.

Executive function has also become a central target. Skills such as inhibitory control, working memory, attention regulation, and cognitive flexibility are implicated in learning, emotional regulation, and adaptive decision-making. They are also shaped by stress exposure and caregiving conditions. Research suggests that executive function is a malleable mediator that can be strengthened through developmentally timed intervention, particularly in early childhood, and that gains in this domain may support resilience across multiple contexts (Zelazo 2020). The significance of such work lies in its potential to link neurodevelopmental plasticity with applied prevention.

Intervention effects are often broader than expected because adaptive systems are interconnected. Family-based interventions may improve parent behavior, child behavior, sibling outcomes, and school adjustment simultaneously. These wider effects are well described by cascade models, which show how change in one process spreads through relational and institutional networks. They also help explain why some interventions endure while others fade: durable effects are more likely when programs alter foundational skills or relationships that continue to generate benefits over time (Patterson et al. 2010; Sandler et al. 2011).

A multisystem perspective also supports multigenerational and multisector strategies. Children’s resilience is affected by adult mental health, economic stability, schooling, neighborhood safety, and access to health and social services. For this reason, interventions limited to one child in isolation may be less effective than those that address family functioning, parental well-being, educational opportunity, and community support together. This logic is increasingly visible in humanitarian and

public-health efforts, including responses to disaster, war, displacement, and pandemic disruption (Masten & Motti-Stefanidi 2020; Ungar & Theron 2020). The broader implication is that resilience promotion is partly a matter of policy design and institutional coordination, not only of individual treatment.

Recent theory has also expanded the field by reconsidering how sensitivity to context operates. Differential susceptibility models propose that some individuals are more responsive to environmental conditions in both negative and positive directions. The same features that increase vulnerability in harsh settings may amplify benefit under supportive conditions (Belsky & Pluess 2009; Ellis et al. 2011). This perspective complicates older notions of fixed vulnerability because it implies that risk is relational: outcomes depend on the match between person and context. It also underscores the importance of identifying for whom particular interventions work best.

A related line of inquiry concerns so-called hidden talents. From this standpoint, some behaviors or cognitive styles that appear maladaptive in mainstream settings may reflect adaptation to high-risk environments. Rapid threat detection, heightened vigilance, context-sensitive shifting of attention, or social strategies developed under danger may have functional value in harsh conditions, even if they conflict with school-based norms. The challenge for resilience science is to distinguish between costly adaptation and pathology, and to determine whether such skills can be redirected toward constructive outcomes without romanticizing adversity itself (Ellis et al. 2020).

Culture is equally central to a multisystem account. Protective processes are not identical across settings; they are mediated by cultural values, practices, institutions, and meanings. Communities transmit norms of endurance, caregiving, spirituality, belonging, and collective responsibility that may sustain young people under stress. Culturally grounded models of resilience therefore emphasize that adaptive systems are embedded in historically shaped ecologies and that no universal checklist can capture all protective resources (Theron et al. 2015; Ungar 2018). This

insight is especially important for research with racially, ethnically, and socially marginalized populations, where resilience may depend in part on identity, collective memory, resistance, and culturally specific forms of support.

Migration provides a vivid example of the need for multisystem analysis. Children and youth affected by forced migration or displacement face simultaneous disruptions in safety, family continuity, education, language environment, legal status, and social belonging. Yet outcomes remain heterogeneous. Some children experience severe and enduring distress, whereas others maintain or recover adaptive functioning when families, schools, communities, and institutions provide coordinated support. A resilience framework is therefore particularly valuable for understanding adaptation under migration because it can integrate trauma exposure with social inclusion, opportunity structures, and cultural continuity.

Future research must address several challenges. One is methodological: resilience across system levels cannot be captured adequately by single-time-point designs or by one-dimensional measures. Researchers need models that integrate biological, psychological, relational, and contextual processes over time. Another challenge concerns developmental timing. Interventions may be more or less effective depending on when adversity occurs, when plasticity is greatest, and when adaptive systems are most open to support or repair. A third challenge is translational. If resilience is multisystemic, then effective action requires collaboration across disciplines and institutions that often operate separately.

The field also faces a normative challenge. Resilience should not become a way of shifting responsibility from institutions to children, families, or communities that are already overburdened. A scientifically adequate and ethically responsible resilience framework must recognize structural inequality, racism, forced displacement, and policy failure as conditions that shape developmental risk. Promoting resilience therefore requires not only strengthening individual or family processes, but also reducing avoidable adversity and expanding access to social, educational, and health-protective systems.

Conclusions

Resilience science has advanced from the identification of unusually competent children in high-risk groups to a far more sophisticated account of adaptation in dynamic systems. The core lesson of this development is that resilience is neither rare nor magical, but it is also not reducible to individual toughness. It emerges from the operation and coordination of multiple adaptive systems within persons and across their environments. This insight changes how mental health, prevention, and positive development should be studied and supported.

A multisystem framework offers a stronger basis for explaining why some children and youth maintain or regain healthy functioning despite adversity. It accommodates heterogeneity in pathways, clarifies the significance of developmental timing, and helps connect research on psychopathology, competence, intervention, culture, and social systems. It also encourages more realistic intervention models that strengthen caregiving, self-regulation, school supports, community resources, and institutional responses together rather than in isolation.

The architecture of resilience is therefore best understood as relational, developmental, and systemic. As risks to children and youth become more interconnected on a global scale, resilience science will be most useful when it advances equally integrated models of protection, recovery, and positive adaptation.

References:

1. Aburn G, Gott M, Hoare K. 2016. What is resilience? An integrative review of the empirical literature. J. Adv. Nurs. 72:980–1000
2. Belsky J, Pluess M. 2009. Beyond diathesis stress: differential susceptibility to environmental influences. Psychol. Bull. 135:885–908
3. Bronfenbrenner U, Morris PA. 2006. The bioecological model of human development. In Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 1, 6th ed.
4. Cicchetti D. 2010. Resilience under conditions of extreme stress: a multilevel perspective. World Psychiatry 9:145–154

5. Cicchetti D, Rogosch F. 1996. Equifinality and multifinality in developmental psychopathology. Dev. Psychopathol. 8:597–600
6. Cicchetti D, Blender JA. 2006. A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective on resilience. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 1094:248–258
7. Cummings EM, Valentino K. 2015. Developmental psychopathology. In Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science, Vol. 1, 7th ed.
8. Ellis BJ, Boyce WT, Belsky J, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, van IJzendoorn MH. 2011. Differential susceptibility to the environment: an evolutionary-neurodevelopmental theory. Dev. Psychopathol. 23:7–28
9. Ellis BJ, Abrams LS, Masten AS, Sternberg RJ, Tottenham N, Frankenhuis WE. 2020. Hidden talents in harsh environments. Dev. Psychopathol. 32:95–113
10. Evans GW, Li D, Whipple SS. 2013. Cumulative risk and child development. Psychol. Bull. 139:1342–1396
11. Felitti VJ, Anda RF, Nordenberg D, Williamson DF, Spitz AM, Edwards V, Koss MP, Marks JS. 1998. Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: the Adverse Childhood Experiences study. Am. J. Prev. Med. 14:245–258
12. Fritz J, de Graaff AM, Caisley H, van Harmelen AL, Wilkinson PO. 2018. A systematic review of amenable resilience factors that moderate and/or mediate the relationship between childhood adversity and mental health in young people. Front. Psychiatry 9:230
13. Garmezy N. 1985. Stress-resistant children: the search for protective factors. In Recent Research in Developmental Psychopathology.
14. Garmezy N, Masten AS, Tellegen A. 1984. The study of stress and competence in children: a building block for developmental psychopathology. Child Dev. 55:97–111
15. Gottlieb G. 2007. Probabilistic epigenesis. Dev. Sci. 10:1–11.

16. Kalisch R, Cramer AOJ, Binder H, Fritz J, Leertouwer I, Lunansky G, Meyer B, Timmer J, Veer IM, van Harmelen AL. 2019. Deconstructing and reconstructing resilience: a dynamic network approach. Perspect. Psychol. Sci. 14:765–777

17. Lerner RM. 2006. Developmental science, developmental systems, and contemporary theories. In Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 1, 6th ed.

18. Liu JJW, Reed M, Girard TA. 2017. Advancing resilience: an integrative, multi-system model of resilience. Pers. Individ. Differ. 111:111–118

19. Luthar SS. 1991. Vulnerability and resilience: a study of high-risk adolescents. Child Dev. 62:600–616

20. Luthar SS. 2006. Resilience in development: a synthesis of research across five decades. In Developmental Psychopathology, Vol. 3, 2nd ed.

21. Luthar SS, Cicchetti D. 2000. The construct of resilience: implications for interventions and social policies. Dev. Psychopathol. 12:857–885

22. Masten AS. 2001. Ordinary magic: resilience processes in development. Am. Psychol. 56:227–238

23. Masten AS. 2007. Resilience in developing systems: progress and promise as the fourth wave rises. Dev. Psychopathol. 19:921–930

24. Masten AS. 2011. Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity. Dev. Psychopathol. 23:493–506

25. Masten AS. 2014b. Ordinary Magic: Resilience in Development. New York: Guilford

26. Masten AS. 2016. Resilience in developing systems: the promise of integrated approaches. Eur. J. Dev. Psychol. 13:297–312

27. Masten AS. 2021. Resilience of children in disasters: a multisystem perspective. Int. J. Psychol. 56:1–11

28. Masten AS, Cicchetti D. 2016. Resilience in development: progress and transformation. In Developmental Psychopathology, Vol. 4, 3rd ed.

29. Masten AS, Coatsworth JD. 1998. The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments. Am. Psychol. 53:205–220

30. Masten AS, Motti-Stefanidi F. 2020. Multisystem resilience for children and youth in disaster: reflections in the context of COVID-19. Advers. Resil. Sci. 1:95–106

31. Masten AS, Tellegen A. 2012. Resilience in developmental psychopathology: contributions of the Project Competence Longitudinal Study. Dev. Psychopathol. 24:345–361

32. McEwen BS. 2020. A life-course, epigenetic perspective on resilience in brain and body. In Stress Resilience.

33. McLaughlin KA, Colich NL, Rodman AM, Weissman DG. 2020. Mechanisms linking childhood trauma exposure and psychopathology: a transdiagnostic model of risk and resilience. BMC Med. 18:96

34. Muthén B, Muthén LK. 2000. Integrating person-centered and variable-centered analyses: growth mixture modeling with latent trajectory classes. Alcohol. Clin. Exp. Res. 24:882–891

35. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. 2009. Depression in Parents, Parenting, and Children: Opportunities to Improve Identification, Treatment, and Prevention. Washington, DC: National Academies Press

36. Overton WF. 2013. A new paradigm for developmental science: relationism and relational-developmental systems. Appl. Dev. Sci. 17:94–107

37. Panter-Brick C, Leckman JF. 2013. Resilience in child development–interconnected pathways to wellbeing. J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 54:333–336

38. Patterson GR, Forgatch MS, DeGarmo DS. 2010. Cascading effects following intervention. Dev. Psychopathol. 22:949–970

39. Rutter M. 1987. Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. Am. J. Orthopsychiatry 57:316–331

40. Sandler I, Schoenfelder E, Wolchik SA, MacKinnon DP. 2011. Long-term impact of prevention programs to promote effective parenting: lasting effects but uncertain processes. Annu. Rev. Psychol. 62:299–329

41. Shonkoff JP, Garner AS, Siegel BS, Dobbins MI, Earls MF, McGuinn L, Pascoe J, Wood DL. 2012. The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress. Pediatrics 129:e232–e246

42. Sroufe LA, Egeland B, Carlson EA, Collins WA. 2005. The Development of the Person: The Minnesota Study of Risk and Adaptation from Birth to Adulthood. New York: Guilford.

43. Theron LC, Liebenberg L, Ungar M, eds. 2015. Youth Resilience and Culture: Commonalities and Complexities. New York: Springer.

44. Ungar M. 2018. Systemic resilience: principles and processes for a science of change in the context of adversity. Ecol. Soc. 23:34.

45. Ungar M, Theron L. 2020. Resilience and mental health: how multisystemic processes contribute to positive outcomes. Lancet Psychiatry 7:441–448

46. van IJzendoorn MH, Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Coughlan B, Reijman S. 2020. Annual research review: umbrella synthesis of meta-analyses on child maltreatment antecedents and interventions. J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 61:272–290.

47. Werner EE, Smith RS. 1982. Vulnerable but Invincible: A Longitudinal Study of Children and Youth. New York: McGraw-Hill

48. Wright MO, Masten AS, Narayan AJ. 2013. Resilience processes in development: four waves of research on positive adaptation in the context of adversity. In Handbook of Resilience in Children, 2nd ed.

49. Zelazo PD. 2020. Executive function and psychopathology: a neurodevelopmental perspective. Annu. Rev. Clin. Psychol. 16:431–454.