Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională
ISSN: 2066-7329 | e-ISSN: 2067-9270
Covered in: Web of Science (WOS); EBSCO; ERIH+; Google Scholar; Index Copernicus; Ideas RePeC; Econpapers; Socionet; CEEOL; Ulrich ProQuest; Cabell, Journalseek; Scipio; Philpapers; SHERPA/RoMEO repositories; KVK; WorldCat; CrossRef; CrossCheck

2023, Volume 15, Issue 2, pages: 185-197 | https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.2/728
Submitted: December 7th, 2022 | *Accepted for publication:* January 19th, 2023

Protective Factors for Student Resilience

Elena BUJOREAN[1]

[1] "Ştefan cel Mare" University of Suceava, Romania, elena.bujorean@usm.ro

Abstract: Most theorists regard resilience as a process in which the risk factors and the protective factors interact and result in certain specific consequences. The child whose parents migrate for work is in the position of a potential risk factor.

Our study refers to the triadic model of the protective factors for resilience developed by Edith Grotberg (1995). Thus, our investigation focuses on the students' perceptions regarding the availability of some protective factors for resilience such as:

- Individual factors (self-esteem, empathy, responsibility, optimism, hope);
- Interpersonal skills (ability to communicate about their own problems and ask for help, self-efficacy and self-control, autonomy and problem solving);
- A significant social, emotional, and educational support network.

The methodology of the study involved the application of a 15-item questionnaire to a batch of 350 lower-secondary-school students, with an average age of 13.2 years. The study aims to identify whether there are significant differences between students in terms of the protective factors for resilience, depending on gender, residence environment, or family situation of having one or both parents working abroad.

How to cite: Bujorean, E. (2023). Protective factors for student resilience. *Revista Românească pentru Educație Multidimensională, 15*(2), 185-197. https://doi.org/10.18662/rrem/15.2/728

©2023 Published by LUMEN Publishing. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Introduction

Pre-adolescence and adolescence are critical periods of development, marked by numerous changes on the physical, cognitive, emotional, and social planes, as well as by specific processes pertaining to the moulding of the person's ego. Therefore, it is imperative to assess the protective factors and the risks involved in the adolescents' development, as this will help specialists working in the system of psychological, educational, medical, and social services to develop and implement specific interventions, tailored to the developmental needs of each and every adolescent requesting their assistance (Robu & Pruteanu, 2005).

The Theoretical Framework of the Research Problem

Resilience is a promising construct for researchers and public health policy makers, as it can help explain the mechanisms by which human individuals of all ages cope with the risks that arise throughout life. The construct is also useful for understanding the factors and processes which help people to recover when they face various challenges, such as illness or adverse life events (Windle *et al.*, 2011).

The study of resilience provides us with explanations as to why there are individuals and groups who, despite difficulties, respond positively with great ease, emerging from these situations stronger and more empowered in their actions and outcomes. Among the many attempts to explain the causes and consequences of maladaptive behaviour, there is the theory of risk factors and protective factors.

The current generation of young people is facing a number of vulnerabilities, some of them generated by the excessive use of mass media, others deriving from the social, economic, political, cultural, or climatic events they have witnessed/are witnessing. Bonchis (2022, p. 121) argues that the overuse of digital media has the most powerful impact on the children's emotional development. Fewer face-to-face interactions, the lack of parental control over the accessed information (Moscrip, 2019), decreased empathic capacities, all these can lead to experiencing negative emotions. In a Report of the European Commission for the year 2020, it is stated that the present-day generation is more exposed to vulnerabilities compared to previous generations, the pandemic conditions created by the Sars-Cov 2 virus leading to: movement restrictions, cancellation of classes, exacerbation of inequalities generated by the lack of online learning tools (Moscrip, 2019, p.123). In Romania, to these unfavourable conditions are added the

difficulties generated by parents leaving for work abroad. Because the north-eastern part of the country is the region with the lowest level of development, this area has faced a large migration wave. When children remain for a certain period of time without the presence of a parent, grandparent or an adult to ease the household activities for them, to supervise and protect them and to support them, especially at an emotional level, in the actions they undertake, there have been highlighted a series of negative emotional and behavioural effects.

According to the *resilience* theory, the flexibility, regeneration of the strengths of the children exposed to risk cannot always be considered to be lost. This theory argues that there are children with unsuspected powers that allow them to survive in extremely difficult conditions and develop in a fitting manner.

This adjustment depends on many factors that support and protect development, known as *welfare or protective factors. These* neutralise the impact of external risks on the potential vulnerabilities to which we are all exposed (Salanova, 2022, p. 8). Among the "resilience resources," the cited author mentions the self-regulation of negative emotions, the use of strong points in facing difficulties, strong beliefs about self-efficacy, optimism regarding the future, and a well-established network of social support (id). Classical factors that protect and build immunity to stressors include: the family environment (parental support and involvement is the basic condition for children's harmonious development), the social environment (school-teachers, peers, role models), the child's unique personality traits that allow for a positive approach to life problems, seeking constructive solutions and optimally dealing with emotionally risky experiences. Besides, the predictive validity of early risk indicators varies according to several factors, including individual variation in the children's responses across care systems (Zalkoski & Bullock, 2012, p. 2295).

There are authors who argue that the deficit model is incomplete because it does not specify how individuals adapt to the adverse environment by fine-tuning their cognitive abilities (Ellis et al., 2017, p. 561). Those who are resilient make optimal use of the opportunities and resources around them. Difficulties are seen as learning experiences. Resilient people are able to take positive action in their lives (for example, seeking mentors, pursuing educational opportunities, participating in extracurricular activities).

In order to overcome adversities, children resort to three main sources, called: I have, I am, I can (Roman, 2011, p.124). A child can be loved and accepted (I have), but if he/she does not have internal resources (self-confidence - I am), or does not have interpersonal social skills (I can),

then he/she will not be able to exhibit emotional resistance. On the other hand, a child may have developed self-esteem (I am), but if he/she does not know how to communicate with others or how to overcome obstacles (I can) and does not have in his/her environment people to help him/her (I have), he/she is not resilient. Furthermore, a child can communicate effectively, but if he/she has no empathy or the opportunity to learn from role models (I have), he/she will have real difficulties and we cannot speak of resilience. Therefore, resilience is the combination of these three categories of traits. According to Benzies and Mychasiuk (2009), resilience is optimised when the protective factors are strengthened at all the interactive levels of the socio-ecological model (i.e., individual, family and community). In addition, it is the number of factors rather than the precise combination of factors which was a strong predictor of vulnerability for some categories of children. Thus, the results of the studies suggest that the children could cope with some adversity, but were much more vulnerable when struggling with multiple adversities (Masten, 2014, Masten & Barnes, 2018).

The Research Methodology

Our study refers to the triadic model of the protective factors for resilience developed by Edith Grotberg (Luca, 2012). Thus, our investigation classifies the students' perceptions regarding the availability of the protective factors for resilience as follows:

- Individual factors (self-esteem, empathy, responsibility, optimism, hope);
- Interpersonal skills (the ability to communicate their own problems and ask for assistance, self-efficacy and self-control, autonomy and problem solving);
- A significant network of social, emotional, and educational support.

The study methodology involved the application of a 15-item questionnaire to a batch of 350 lower-secondary-school students, with an average age of 13.2 years. The items were evaluated on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 where 1 – Very much, 5 – Very little. The study aims to identify if there are noteworthy differences between students in terms of the protective factors for resilience, depending on gender, the residence environment or the situation of having one or both parents working abroad. Participating students, as well as their parents, were informed about the objectives of the study and agreed to complete the proposed questionnaire, specifying that they can withdraw from the study at any time.

Data Analysis

In order to check the general attitude of pre-adolescents towards the presence of some protective factors for resilience, we used the t-test for comparing responses with a neutral value of 2.5. When the difference between the mean of the responses to an item and the neutral value is negative, the participants' responses are oriented towards acknowledging the presence of factors favourable to resilience. When the difference value is positive, we can speak of the insinuation in the investigated population of certain factors threatening resilience.

Items	M	t	p
1.I have people around me whom I can trust, no matter what would happen.	2.65	2.127	0.034*
2.I have people around me who set boundaries to prevent potential dangers to which I could be exposed.	2.51	.166	0.868
3.I have people who teach me how to do things right, the way they do it.	2.26	-3.850	0.000
4.I have people who want me to learn to do things myself.	2.10	-6.644	0.000
5.I have people who help me when I am ill, in danger, or when I want to study.	2.03	-7.272	0.000
6.I am a person whom people can like or love.	2.35	-2.107	0.036
7.I am excited to do nice things for those around me, showing them that I care.	1.70	-16.094	0.000
8.I am a person who has self-respect and respect for others.	1.77	-13.299	0.000
9.I am willing to be responsible.	1.89	-11.067	0.000
10.I am certain that everything will be all right.	2.33	-2.245	0.000
11.I can talk to those around me about the things that scare or trouble me.	3.02	7.419	0.026*
12.I can find solutions to the problems I am faced with.	2.26	-3.761	0.000
13.I can control myself when I feel that I am about to do something wrong.	2.44	-.895	0.371
14.I can tell when it is time to talk to someone or take action.	2.45	-.676	0.500
15.I can find someone to help me when I need it.	2.34	-2.223	0.027

Source: Author's own conception

According to the opinion expressed by the students, there are prerequisites for the development of optimal resilience, with 13 of the factors examined being positively evaluated by the students. At the same time, the table highlights two factors on which the students do not have favourable assessments, the items on which the neutral value is exceeded being 1 and 11. Thus, 24.5% of the students feel that they do not have people around them whom they can trust. Worryingly, 30.2% of students feel that very few can talk to the people around them about the things that scare or bother them. Moreover, the basic statistical inventory also highlights a category of students that cannot be neglected in terms of the risk of facing difficulties in overcoming stressors: 12.4% of students claim that a small proportion of them have people around them to set boundaries, 16.3% of students consider that little and very little do they know when it is time to talk to someone or take some action; 10.2% of pre-adolescents were in the situation to say that they cannot find solutions to the problems they face.

It has been ascertained that, overall, the situation of a family in which one or both parents are migrants for work influences the way in which the protective factors for resilience [F (3.350) = 3.084, p<0. 001] are perceived. The Post Hoc Bonferroni test points out that there are, statistically wise, significant differences among the four groups. The statistical analysis highlights the existence of pronounced differences in environments for the group of students whose both parents are abroad for work and for the students with both parents at home, to the effect that the students with both migrant parents appreciate the protective factors for resilience less favourably than those whose parents are close to them at home (MD=6.10494, p=0.033). At the same time, statistically noteworthy differences have been found in the group of students with both parents working abroad and those whose mother works abroad (MD=7.19697, p = 0.038). The Anova analysis of the items highlights other statistically significant differences: the students with both parents abroad appreciate less than the other groups of students tested that they have around them people who impose boundaries to them and whom they regard as respectable, deserving of love. In addition to this, compared to the group of students whose father is abroad, the students who have both parents working abroad appreciate less the fact that they realise when it is time to talk to someone or take action and find solutions to the problems they face.

The T test for independent samples reveals that there are statistically significant differences between the boys' (MD= 34.34) and the girls' (MD= 33.28) perception regarding the examined protective factors taken as a whole, to the effect that the boys appreciate less favourably than the girls the

degree in which they possess a series of features or circumstances favourable for resilience. An analysis of the data provided by this test reveals other details of note: the boys (MD=2.24) appreciate to a lesser extent than the girls (MD=1.89) that the significant people around them encourage them to solve their problems by themselves; at the same time, the boys prove a more reduced level of self-esteem (MD=2.49) than the girls (MD=2.18), as they appreciate to a lesser extent than the girls that they respect themselves and the others, and they display a less reduced level of optimism than the girls (MD=1.58), stating in less proportion than the latter that they are certain that everything will be all right (MD=1.95). The only protective factor which the boys (MD=2.58) appreciate much more favourably than the girls (MD=2.77) bear on the supportive environment and the extent to which the students feel that they have trustworthy people around them.

Examination of the influence of the residence environment variable on the assessment of protective factors for student resilience is confirmed at the level of individual factors (empathy, responsibility) and social factors (supportive environment)- F (350), 8.287, p = 0.004. Thus, urban students rate this category of protective factors for resilience less favourably than rural students. For each item, the t-test for independent samples reveals other data to be analysed: urban students (MD=3.20) have less faith than rural students (MD=2.92) that they can easily talk about the problems they have and show a lower level of self-efficacy, being less confident that they can find solutions to the problems they face (MD=2.36) than rural students (MD=2.02).

Discussions

The analysis of our study data reveals two risk factors for pre-teen resilience that should be of concern to teachers, counsellors and social services. Thus, more than one in four students feel that they cannot talk to those around them about the issues that worry them and feel to a lesser extent that they have people around them they can trust. This study is in line with the data from another survey among 6th-10th grade students in Suceava County which reveals that 26% of adolescents are reluctant to disclose to their parents what concerns them (Bujorean, 2019). Despite the democratisation of parent-child and teacher-student relationships, it seems that students do not have enough confidence to communicate with the adults around them, preferring the opinion of peers or friends. Possibly due to excessive guilt-tripping, they may sometimes feel that parents do not understand them, although this impression may be induced by their entourage. Educators should bear in mind that at this age stage psychologists

recommend adopting the role of consultant rather than controller of the adolescent's behaviour. Thus, it is advisable to give the child more independence, supporting and encouraging him/her to make choices that are best for him/her, while maintaining firm boundaries.

The fact that the boys rate less favourably than the girls favourable factors for resilience such as self-esteem, optimism, encouragement of personal autonomy, support from people they trust, may also be due to a school and family climate that is more protective of girls. Female dominance in school may be the cause of an attitude of ignorance or even hostility towards boys, towards their intellectual or affective potential (Sarivan & Sâmihăian, 2006, p. 8). Boys are perceived as less conscientious, less obedient, and more oppositional than girls. But it seems that today's Romanian families do not encourage enough autonomy in teenage boys. These data contradict the gendered educational practices documented in the literature. For example, in American culture, independence, isolation by distancing oneself from the family, and differentiation are encouraged as characteristics of the boys' psychological development (Morris-Shaffer & Perlman-Gordon, 2006, p.20).

Special social situations can accentuate the vulnerability of some students to difficulties. The fact that the students with both parents living abroad value the protective factors for resilience to a lesser extent than the other categories of children in the study confirms this general finding. Other studies have also indicated a number of educational and emotional problems faced by this category of children. Although leaving for work is temporary, the effects on the children can be similar to those of a long-term or permanent separation, with some children feeling confused, different, quite lonely, neglected or even unhappy (Toth et al., 2007, Luca et al., 2009, Stegar, 2015, Bujorean, 2021). The children whose parents are abroad should be considered at risk. An important element of the new educational policies should be to strengthen the link between the school and the social welfare system by defining effective procedures for transferring information from teachers, head teachers and school counsellors to social workers and vice versa.

Implications on educational practices

School experience can influence resilience in two ways, through: a) knowledge, academic competences and reasoning skills, which become assets to resilience, while providing challenges to be overcome; b) the contribution of other, less obvious, factors that accompany intelligence and effort, to which school success is generally linked. Research on how to

improve resilience in the school environment has described six characteristics of a resilient classroom (Doll, 2013, p.401). Three of these bear on the quality of the relationships in the school environment: (1) the quality of the relationships that exist between teacher and students in the classroom; (2) the nature of the relationships that exist among classmates; and (3) the degree of the collaboration and connection that exists between the classroom and the students' families. The classroom practices that support student autonomy and self-control appear to be other important protective factors. Thus, resilient classrooms (4) encourage students to set goals and make decisions about their own learning path, and there are practices (5) whereby students are supported in managing their own behaviour (academic self-control) and (6) the degree to which classrooms support students' confidence that they will succeed in school (academic self-efficacy). An important point made by the cited author is that resilient classrooms promote optimism and hope among children.

Adopting a *proactive perspective*, teachers and school counsellors can apply resilience-building strategies aimed at: the ability to make adaptive decisions and maintain an optimistic view of what will happen in the future, strategically challenged positive emotions using a sense of humour, relaxation and mindfulness techniques in order to reduce the stress and anxiety generated by what happens to us in everyday life. Proactive resilience involves not only successfully adapting to overcome obstacles, but also being able to identify potential risks in the future without necessarily having personally experienced them directly (mentally visualising these risks, observing what happens to others (Salanova, 2022, p.50).

Many students arrive at school with low self-esteem, while others develop a lower self-esteem as a result of academic failure. There is a causal relationship between the formation of self-esteem in students and the unconditional acceptance as an attitude of the teacher or adult in general (Băban, 2001). The message of worth and uniqueness conveyed by the adult is very important in preventing self-distrust. A failure should not be perceived as a symptom of worthlessness, but as a situation to be resolved.

Promoting an "ethic of caring" in school typically involves efforts to maintain relationships, connections and compassion. Toshalis (2012) shows how, in classrooms where teacher-student relationships are characterised by aesthetic rather than genuine caring, there can be potentially harmful effects. Thus, teachers who do not express genuine care are more concerned with logistics and the outcomes of teaching rather than with the cultural, political and emotional aspects of the teacher-student relationship. Caring only about

student test scores, attendance at formal activities, and adherence to dress code and rules can dramatically undermine the students' investing in their academic success and the relationships that will build resilience.

Studies that have empirically demonstrated that social and emotional learning programmes have a significant impact in reducing maladaptive behaviours, while also providing the premise for counteracting risk factors and promoting the protective factors for resilience. SEL programs can improve classroom climate by empowering educators with effective classroom management techniques that promote positive discipline. Social and emotional learning programs could facilitate learning open means of communicating conflicts, problems and emotional difficulties; when these skills are applied in the classroom, educator-student relationships improve and educators are better able to motivate students and convey information effectively (Reyes et al., 2013, pp.358-363).

Teachers can help students to:

- Identify sources of social support and establish deep connections with others;

- Demonstrate compassion and engage in pro-social and volunteer activities that strengthen their sense of self-efficacy and enable them to seek sources of meaning and significance in their own lives;

- See problems as challenges that can be overcome. Students will be receptive to seek solutions to the problems they face when they are made aware that: every problem has a solution; problems are learning opportunities that help them grow; there is a lesson in every challenge and a lesson is never given until we are ready to learn from it.

- Accept change as an indispensable part of life. Accepting circumstances that cannot be changed can help them focus on the circumstances which they can change.

- Face difficulties rather than passively contemplating adversity or adopting various unhealthy ways of compensation;

- Look at their own problems in a broader perspective. Extremely frustrating situations often activate the belief that they can no longer be endured. In such circumstances it is extremely effective for students to "step outside" the situation and look at things as if they were happening to someone else. If in principle that someone else could handle them, it helps to ask the question "How am I inferior to this person?"

- Cultivate a hopeful outlook about the present and the future. Get students used to visualizing goals rather than focusing on what causes fear and worry.

Last but not least, the introduction of counselling programmes to reduce the stress associated with testing would be of real help to a certain category of students. A significant stressor in school life is the fear of failure and school assessment. Assessment can be experienced as a violent act by students because it induces competition, ranking and comparison.

The head teachers will help the students: to identify the stressors specific to their status as students, as well as the stimulating and braking factors for school activities. Other objectives will include:

- Optimising positive motivation for success in current and selection assessments;

- Assessing cognitive strategies used during the learning process and on tests, as well as school motivation and the level of test anxiety;

- Equipping students with review and emotional self-control techniques in the exam room.

Concern for the quality of the school climate is another way of strengthening students' personalities. An inclusive climate in which all students feel equally accepted, where rules are clear and violence is not tolerated, is a climate in which children will experience a state of physical and emotional security.

Acknowledgment

This paper was presented at the 8th edition of the ENSEC Conference on the topic Social Emotional Learning and Positive Development held at Suceava, Romania, between 30th of June to 3rd of July 2022.

References

Băban, A. (2001). *Consiliere educațională. Ghid metodologic pentru orele de dirigenție și consigliere* [Educational counseling. Methodological guide for leadership and counseling classes]. Impremeria „Ardealul".

Benzies, K., & Mychasiuk, R. (2009). Fostering family resiliency: a review of the key protective factors. *Child & Family Social Work, 14*(1), 103-114. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2008.00586.x

Bonchis, E. (2022). Generaţia Z. Educaţie şi vulnerabilităţi [Generation Z. Education and vulnerabilities]. In G. Pânişoară (coord, *Parenting de la A la Z* [Parenting from A to Z]. Polirom.

Bujorean, E. (2019). Assesment of family environment and of the relationship between generations-data from an investigation in Suceava County.

International Journal of Social and Educational Innovation, *6*(11), 37-44. https://www.journals.aseiacademic.org/index.php/ijsei/article/view/132

Bujorean, E. (2021). A Study on the Effects of Migration on Middle-School Pupils in Suceava County. In M. Suditu, & C. G. Safta (coord.), *Challenges and contraints in the knowledge society* (pp. 1290134). Institutul European Publishing House.

Doll, B. (2013). Enhancing Resilience in Classrooms. In S. Goldstein & R. B. Brooks (eds.), *Handbook of Resilience in Children* (pp. 525–537). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-14728-9_28

Ellis, B. J., Bianchi, J., Griskevicius, V., & Frankenhuis, W. E. (2017). Beyond Risk and Protective Factors: An Adaptation-Based Approach to Resilience. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(4), 561–587. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617693054

Luca, C. (2012). Perspective asupra conceptelor de rezilienţă si coping [Perspectives on the concepts of resilience and coping]. In C. Luca, M. M. Pivniceru, A. S. Gulei, L. Foca, M. Pop, O-E. Amazilitei, G. Acasandrei, N. Ungurianu, D-A. Zaharia, & M-K. Rotaru (Eds.), *Metodologie de asistenţă psihosocială a copiilor remigranţi* [Psychosocial assistance methodology of remigrant children] (pp. 23-97). Sedcom Libris.

Luca, C., Pascaru, Gh., & Foca, L. (2009). *Manual pentru profesioniştii care lucrează cu copiii rămaşi singuri acasă ca urmare a plecării părinţilor la muncă în străinătate* [Manual for professionals who work with children left alone at home as a result of their parents going to work abroad]. Terra Nostra.

Masten, A.S. (2014). Global perspectives on resilience in children and youth. *Child Development, 85*(1), 6–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12205

Masten, A. S., & Barnes, A. (2018). Resilience in Children: Developmental Perspectives. *Children*, *5*(7), 98. https://doi.org/10.3390/children5070098

Morris-Shaffer, S., & Perlman-Gordon, L. (2006). *Cum să comunici cu băieţii adolescenţi* [How to communicate with teenage boys]. Amaltea.

Moscrip, A. (2019). *Generation Z's Positive and Negative Attributes and the Impact on Empathy After a Community-Based Learning ExperienceEmpathy After a Community-Based Learning Experince* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. University of North Florida.

Reyes, J. A., Elias, M. J., Parker, S. J., Rosenblatt, J. L. (2013). Promoting Educational Equity in Disadvantaged Youth: The Role of Resilience and Social-Emotional Learning. In S. Goldstein, & R. Brooks (eds.), *Handbook of Resilience in Children* (pp. 349–370). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3661-4_20

Robu, V., & Pruteanu, L. M. (2015). Evaluarea rezilienţei adolescenţilor: Proprietăţi psihometrice ale unui instrument—Brief Resilience Scale [Assessing

resilience in adolescents: Psychometric properties of an instrument—Brief Resilience Scale]. *Revista de Psihologie, 61(2)*, 109–120.

Roman, D. (2011). Familia şi şcoala [Family and school]. E. Bonchiş (coord), *Familia si rolul ei în educarea copilului* [The family and its role in the education of the child]. Polirom.

Salanova, M. (2022). *Rezilienta* [Resilience]. Litera.

Sarivan, L., & Sâmihăian, F. (2006). *Dimensiunea de gen în aria curriculară Limbă şi comunicare: ghid pentru cadre didactice* [The gender dimension in the language and communication curricular area: a guide for teaching staff]. MarLink.

Stegar, I. (2015). Efectele emigrării părinţilor în opinia adolescenţilor [The effects of parental emigration in the opinion of adolescents]. In E. Zamfir, S. M., Stănescu, & D. Arpinte (coord), *Asistența socială în România după 25 de ani* [Social assistance in Romania after 25 years]. Eikon.

Toshalis, E. (2012). The Retoric of Care: Preservice Teacher Discourses that Depoliticize, Deflect, and Deceive. *Urban Review*, *44*, 1-35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-011-0177-y

Toth, G., Toth, A., & Voicu, O. (2007). *Efectele migraţiei: copiii rămaşi acasă* [The effects of migration: children left at home]. Fundaţia Soros România.

Windle, G., Bennett, K.M. & Noyes, J. (2011). A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health Qual Life Outcomes, 9*, 8. https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-9-8

Zalkoski, S. M., & Bullock, L. M. (2012). Resilience in children and youth: A review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *34,* 2295-2303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.08.009