Received 05/15/09
Revised 01/18/10
Accepted 02/16/10

The Relationship Between Active Coping and Trait Resilience Across U.S. and Taiwanese College Student Samples

Ming-Hui Li and Takeshi Nishikawa

This study compared predictors of active coping (people's tendency to actively cope with stress) among college students in the United States and Taiwan. In both samples, trait resilience predicted active coping and mediated the effect of self-efficacy on active coping. The findings indicate that trait resilience influences college students' active coping with stress, regardless of their cultural backgrounds. Implications on how to help college students enhance trait resilience are discussed.

College students frequently experience stressful situations related to academia, financial issues, relationships (including role strains), work, and safety issues (Dungan, 2002; Howard, Schiraldi, Pineda, & Campanella, 2006; Li, 2006). Stressful situations are "events or conditions that demand adjustments beyond the normal wear and tear of daily living" (Gadzella, 1994, p. 396). Researchers have indicated that unsuccessful adaptation to college stressors can contribute to college students' vulnerability to depression, which is one of the major mental health problems faced by college students (Dao, Lee, & Chang, 2007). The University Health Services at the University of Michigan (2009) reported that depression is twice as common in college students than in the general population. The American College Health Association (2007) reported that 10% of male college students and 18% of female college students have been diagnosed with depression, and 39% of male college students and 48% of female college students have been so depressed that it was difficult to function at least once in the past year. To help stress victims adapt better to college stressors, researchers have studied coping among college students (e.g., Araki, 2008; Gipple, Lee, & Puig, 2006).

Individuals may respond to stressful situations with a variety of coping responses, such as distraction (Stone & Neale, 1984), planning (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989), accepting responsibility (Lazarus & Folkman, 1988), and collectivistic coping (Yeh, Arora, & Wu, 2006). Although coping responses differ among individuals, Amirkhan (1990) posited that human coping responses can be categorized generally into three basic coping styles: problem solving, social support seeking, and avoidance. MacArthur and MacArthur (1998) indicated that some individuals tend to actively cope with stressors whereas others often avoid stressors. Individuals with the active

Ming-Hui Li, Department of Human Services and Counseling, and Takeshi Nishikawa, Department of Economics and Finance, St. John's University. Takeshi Nishikawa is now at Business School, University of Colorado Denver. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ming-Hui Li, Department of Human Services and Counseling, School of Education, St. John's University, 8000 Utopia Parkway, Queens, NY 11439 (e-mail: lim@stjohns.edu).

© 2012 by the American Counseling Association. All rights reserved.

coping style tend to apply either behavioral or psychological responses aimed to change the nature of the stressor or how one thinks about it. Individuals with the avoidant coping style, in contrast, tend to engage in activities such as alcohol use or mental states such as withdrawal that keep them from directly addressing the stressors. On the basis of Amirkhan's (1990) and MacArthur and MacArthur's (1998) concepts of coping, we defined *active coping* in this study as a coping style characterized by solving problems, seeking social support, and directly addressing the stressors (counteravoidance).

The active coping style affects individuals' causal attributions and help-seeking behaviors in the process of adapting to stressful situations (Pizzolato, 2004), and, therefore, active coping is related to positive adaptation to stressful college life (Feenstra, Banyard, Rines, & Hopkins, 2001). To improve college students' ability to cope actively, researchers have examined factors that influence active coping in this population. For example, McGown and Fraser (1995) found that male students and older students use more active coping than do their female and younger counterparts. Zeidner (1994) reported that students' active coping is negatively associated with depression and anxiety. Although these studies contribute to a better understanding of active coping among college students, the studies tended to share one common limitation: They focused on one country only. Because many international students study at U.S. universities, it seems appropriate to study active coping using cross-country samples. Indeed, a review of literature showed that there is a dearth of research addressing active coping across countries. The present study seeks to fill this gap in the literature by examining predictors of active coping in two college samples, one from the United States and the other from Taiwan.

The influence of culture on coping has been reported in earlier studies (Cortina & Wasti, 2005; Rokach, Bacanli, & Ramberan, 2000) suggesting that active coping may be affected by culture. However, it is more difficult to assume the same influence of culture on the predictors of active coping. We posited that it is highly possible that the level of active coping may be influenced by cultural background, but the traits that relate to one's active coping may be less influenced by cultural background. Findings of this study may provide insightful information for college counselors who practice multicultural counseling.

Stress, Trait Resilience, Self-Efficacy, and Secure Attachment as Predictors of Active Coping

In this study, we examined stress, trait resilience, self-efficacy, and secure attachment as predictors of active coping. Process-oriented coping researchers (e.g., Olff, Langeland, & Gersons, 2005) posited that when people encounter stressful situations, their cognitive appraisal system assesses the situations and thus plays a vital role in influencing the stress-coping process. These research-

ers suggested that cognitive appraisal is a perception-related process, implying that perception-related traits such as trait resilience, self-efficacy, and secure attachment can predict the active coping style.

Trait resilience is a trait associated with resistance to and recovery from stressful life events (Ong, Bergeman, Bisconti, & Wallace, 2006). Researchers indicated that resilient individuals have a positive view of stressful situations and tend to actively cope with stress (Garmezy, 1991). Simeon et al. (2007) suggested that resilient individuals take more risks in life than those who are less resilient. In addition, trait resilience has been found to buffer the effect of stress (Waugh, 2007) and generates positive emotions (Fredrickson, Tugade, Waugh, & Larkin, 2005). The positive relationship between resilience and active coping has been reported (Li, 2006; Slone & Shoshani, 2006).

Self-efficacy refers to people's perceptions of their capacity for performing in a certain situation and of their ability to achieve desired goals (VandenBos, 2007). Bandura (1977) suggested that self-efficacy can lead people to perform behaviors to successfully finish a difficult task. Self-efficacy has been shown by researchers such as Ramos-Sanchez and Nichols (2007) to influence adjustment to college life. More recent studies revealed similar findings. For example, Trouillet, Gana, Lourel, and Fort (2009) found that self-efficacy can predict problem solving, and Chan (2008) reported a positive correlation between self-efficacy and active coping.

Secure attachment is a positive cognitive schema associated with one's belief that others are generally accepting and responsive (VandenBos, 2007). Collins and Feeney (2000) proposed that securely attached individuals are likely to seek support in times of need. Banyard and Cantor (2004) found that college students with secure attachment tend to adapt well to college stressors. Secure attachment's influence on coping has been explored by researchers such as Hawkins, Howard, and Oyebode (2007) and Haranin (2009). Hawkins and colleagues reported that securely attached individuals are more likely than their insecurely attached counterparts are to apply the coping style of social support seeking. Haranin found that attachment was positively correlated with both social support seeking and problem solving.

Regardless of their cultural backgrounds, college students encounter stressful situations and have to be able to cope with them. On the basis of the literature, we made the following two hypotheses: The first hypothesis is that there is a difference between U.S. and Taiwanese samples in their levels of active coping, and the second hypothesis is that stress, trait resilience, self-efficacy, and secure attachment can predict active coping in both samples.

Method

Participants

Participants were 264 college students recruited from a business school in a metropolitan area of the East Coast of the United States and 329 college

students enrolled in a business school in a metropolitan area of the West Coast of Taiwan. These are exact numbers of students from the two business schools who volunteered to participate in this study. The U.S. sample comprised 129 (49.9 %) male students and 135 (51.1%) female students. The mean age of the sample was 19.61 years (*SD* = 1.73, range = 17–29). The Taiwanese sample comprised 47 (14.3 %) male students and 282 (85.7 %) female students. Their mean age was 19.7 years (*SD* = 1.21, range = 18–22).

Procedure

The first author obtained permission from the universities and from the faculty members to recruit participants from their classes. The author went to classrooms to recruit voluntary participants, who completed a questionnaire during class time and then returned it to the author. The faculty members and the author emphasized the voluntary nature of the study. Students who decided not to participate were instructed to remain in their seats quietly while the participants completed the questionnaire. The participants were asked to identify a stressful situation that they had experienced in the past 6 months. Then they were asked to respond to the coping instrument, the Coping Strategy Indicator (CSI; Amirkhan, 1990), based on their recollections of how they responded to the identified situation. To help participants identify and categorize a stressful situation, the author asked them to use a few sentences to describe a stressful situation they had experienced within the past 6 months, and then check the box on the questionnaire that corresponded to the identified stressful situation. The available boxes were stressful situations related to academia, relationships, work, money, health problem/traffic accident, and responsibility. Because this study was guided by the process-oriented approach to coping (as discussed earlier), we assumed that coping styles may change at different times in the coping process. For this reason, participants were asked to respond to the coping instrument based on their initial responses (within 2 days) to the identified situation. Participants were instructed to respond to all other instruments in the questionnaire based on their general life experiences and general belief about what kind of person they considered themselves to be.

Instruments

Data were collected using a questionnaire containing demographic information, the CSI (Amirkhan, 1990), the Resilience Scale (Wagnild & Young, 1993), the Revised Adult Attachment Scale (AAS-Revised; Collins, 1996), the General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSS; English version: Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995; Chinese version: Zhang & Schwarzer, 1995), and the Student-Life Stress Inventory (SSI; Gadzella, 1991). All of the instruments except the GSS were translated into Chinese for Taiwanese participants by a group of bilingual graduate students. A translation and back-translation procedure

(Werner & Campbell, as cited in Geisinger, 2003) was conducted to ensure the accuracy of language transference. The back-translated instruments were compared with the original instruments and were found to be close in meaning, indicating a correct translation.

CSI. Active coping in this study was measured by the CSI (Amirkhan, 1990), a 33-item, 3-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all,* 2 = *a little,* 3 = *a lot*) that measures the three most basic human coping styles: problem solving, social support seeking, and avoidance. The CSI is composed of three subscales that measure the three coping styles. Two example items of the CSI are "When stressed, I set some goals for myself to deal with the situation" and "When stressed, I let my feelings out to a friend." The CSI can be used to assess coping styles in different stressful situations. Respondents are asked to answer items based on their coping experience with an identified stressful situation within the past 6 months. The first author confirmed with Amirkhan (author of the CSI) that this scale could be used to measure active coping by totaling the scores on the three subscales, with the scores on the Avoidance subscale being reverse coded. Thus, in this study, active coping was measured accordingly.

Amirkhan (1990) reported good reliability for the three CSI subscales. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the Problem Solving, Seeking Social Support, and Avoidance subscales were found to be .89, .93, and .84, respectively. He also demonstrated concurrent validity of this scale. In the present study, the coefficient alphas for the English and the Chinese versions of the CSI were .89 and .81, respectively. In addition, the coefficient alpha values for the three subscales of the CSI were .88 (Problem Solving), .93 (Seeking Social Support), and .76 (Avoidance) for the English version and .86 (Problem Solving), .88 (Seeking Social Support), and .68 (Avoidance) for the Chinese version.

Resilience Scale. Trait resilience in this study was measured by the Resilience Scale (Wagnild & Young, 1993). The scale measures individuals' trait resilience in general life situations (general resilience). The Resilience Scale is a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree*) to 7 (*agree*) that contains 25 items such as "My life has meaning" and "Keeping interested in things is important to me." Wignild and Young (1993) demonstrated concurrent validity of the Resilience Scale and reported that the internal consistency of the scale ranged from .76 to .91 in different studies. In the present study, the coefficient alphas for the English and the Chinese versions of the Resilience Scale were .87 and .90, respectively.

AAS-Revised. Secure attachment was measured by the AAS-Revised (Collins, 1996), an 18-item, 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very*) that measures adults' attachment styles in general life situations (general secure attachment). Two example items are "I find it relatively easy to get close to people" and "I do not worry about people getting too close to me." Collins (1996) reported that the Cronbach's alpha for this scale ranged from .77 to .85. The AAS-Revised is based on the original Adult Attachment Scale (AAS; Collins & Read, 1990). Collins and Read (1990) demonstrated convergent validity of the AAS. In the present study, the coefficient alphas

for the English and the Chinese versions of the AAS-Revised were .74 and .75, respectively.

GSS. Self-efficacy in this study was measured by the GSS, which was originally developed in Germany by Jerusalem and Schwarzer in 1981 (as cited in Schwarzer, Bäßler, Kwiatek, Schröder, & Zhang, 1996). The GSS measures individuals' self-efficacy in general life situations (general self-efficacy). Both the English and the Chinese versions of the GSS were translated in 1995, with the former done by Schwarzer and Jerusalem and the latter by Zhang and Schwarzer. The GSS is a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 4 (*exactly true*) that consists of 10 items such as "If I am in a bind, I can usually think of something to do" and "It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals." The Free University of Berlin (2003) demonstrated convergent validity of the GSS and reported that the Cronbach's alpha values of this scale ranged from .76 to .90. In the present study, the coefficient alphas for the English and the Chinese versions of the GSS were .81 and .87, respectively.

SSI. Stress in this study was measured by the SSI (Gadzella, 1991). The SSI is a self-reported, 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*most of the time*) that includes 51 items measuring participants' stress levels in general college life situations (general college life stress). This scale measures stress from frustrations, conflicts, competitions, life changes, meeting deadlines, interpersonal difficulties, and self-expectations. Two example items are "I worry and get anxious about taking tests" and "I have a tendency to procrastinate." Gadzella and Baloglu (2001) reported an alpha value of .92 for the whole inventory. Gadzella, Masten, and Stacks (1998) demonstrated convergent validity of the SSI. In the present study, the coefficient alphas for the English and the Chinese versions of the SSI were .93 and .89, respectively.

Results

We conducted a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to detect whether cultural difference influences active coping. The results showed that the U.S. sample (M = 70.05, SD = 9.93) presented a lower level of active coping than did the Taiwanese sample (M = 73.61, SD = 8.99), $F(1, 591) = 20.95$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$. To further explore the effect of culture on the three dimensions of active coping, we conducted a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) in which culture (U.S. vs. Taiwan) served as the independent variable and problem solving, social support seeking, and counteravoidance served as the dependent variables. Significance was found between the two cultures on the three dimensions of active coping, Wilks's $\Lambda = .958$, $F(3, 589) = 8.66$, $p < .05$. As a follow-up test to the MANOVA, we conducted ANOVA on each of the dependent variables (Weinfurt, 1995). The results of the follow-up tests indicated that (a) the U.S. sample showed a significantly lower level of social support seeking (M = 23.08, SD = 6.39) than did the Taiwanese sample (M = 24.87, SD = 5.28), $F(1, 591) = 13.99$, $p < .017$; (b) the U.S. sample showed a significantly lower level of counteravoidance (M = 20.73, SD = 4.08) than

did the Taiwanese sample ($M = 19.68$, $SD = 4.48$), $F(1, 591) = 8.78$, $p < .017$; and (c) no difference in problem solving was found between these two samples, $F(1, 591) = 3.70$, $p > .017$. There were differences in the degrees of freedom associated with the MANOVA (in this case, $F[3, 589]$) and ANOVA (in this case, $F[1, 591]$). The differences were due to the different ways by which degrees of freedom were obtained for MANOVAs and ANOVAs (see Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1998, p. 361; Stevens, 2002, p. 216).

The results of a multiple regression analysis related to Hypothesis 2 are presented in Table 1 (Condition C). In the U.S. sample, the multiple regression results showed that the only effective predictor of active coping was trait resilience, $F(1, 262) = 7.18$, $p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, which explained about 2.3% of the variance in active coping. In this sample, beta values for trait resilience, secure attachment, self-efficacy, and stress were .16, .02, .06, and .11, respectively. In the Taiwanese sample, trait resilience and secure attachment were found to be predictive of active coping. The linear combination of trait

TABLE 1

Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Trait Resilience (Condition A) and Active Coping (Conditions B and C)

Independent Variable	β	Adjusted R^2	F	p
Condition A: dependent variable = trait resilience				
United States		.31	59.31*	.000*
Self-efficacy	.45*	.26		
Stress	–.23*	.05		
Secure attachment	.09			
Taiwan		.36	93.36*	.000*
Self-efficacy	.55*	.33		
Stress	–.17*	.03		
Secure attachment	–.04			
Condition B: dependent variable = active coping				
United States		.01	4.08*	.045*
Self-efficacy	.12*	.01		
Stress	.07			
Secure attachment	.04			
Taiwan		.05	9.18*	.000*
Self-efficacy	.19*	.04		
Stress	–.02			
Secure attachment	.11*	.01		
Condition C: dependent variable = active coping				
United States		.02	7.18*	.008*
Trait resilience	.16*	.02		
Secure attachment	.02			
Self-efficacy	.06			
Stress	.11			
Taiwan		.10	18.57*	.000*
Trait resilience	.29*	.09		
Secure attachment	.11*	.01		
Self-efficacy	.03			
Stress	.03			

*$p < .05$.

resilience and secure attachment was significantly related to active coping, $F(2, 326) = 18.57$, $p < .05$, adjusted $R^2 = .10$. Approximately 8.8% of the variance in active coping could be accounted for by trait resilience (adjusted $R^2 = .09$), whereas only about 0.9% of the variance could be accounted for by secure attachment (adjusted $R^2 = .01$). Beta values for trait resilience, secure attachment, self-efficacy, and stress were .29, .11, .03, and .03, respectively.

Self-efficacy did not effectively predict active coping in either the U.S. or the Taiwanese sample; however, in both samples, self-efficacy was found to be highly correlated with trait resilience, which predicted active coping. The highly correlated relationship between these two traits ($r = .51$ in the U.S. sample, $r = .58$ in the Taiwanese sample) has been reported by Roberts (2007). The finding of a high correlation between self-efficacy and trait resilience, combined with other findings that (a) trait resilience was effective in predicting active coping in both the U.S. and the Taiwanese samples and (b) self-efficacy significantly correlated with active coping in both samples ($r = .12$ in the U.S. sample, $r = .20$ in the Taiwanese sample), seemed to indicate that the effect of self-efficacy on active coping can be mediated by trait resilience in both samples.

To examine the hypothesis that trait resilience can mediate between self-efficacy and active coping in both samples, we applied Baron and Kenny's (1986) mediation method. Based on their method, three conditions must be met for trait resilience to mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and active coping: For Condition A, self-efficacy must be significantly associated with trait resilience; for Condition B, self-efficacy must be significantly associated with active coping; and for Condition C, the relationship between self-efficacy and active coping is no longer significant when controlling for trait resilience. We applied multiple regression procedures to test these conditions. Regarding Condition A, results showed that self-efficacy and stress could each predict trait resilience in both the U.S. and the Taiwanese samples. Regarding Condition B, self-efficacy was the only variable that could predict active coping in the U.S. sample, whereas self-efficacy and secure attachment could each predict active coping in the Taiwanese sample. Regarding Condition C, trait resilience was the only effective predictor of active coping in the U.S. sample, whereas trait resilience and secure attachment could each predict active coping in the Taiwanese sample. These results (see Table 1) indicated that trait resilience could mediate the effect of self-efficacy on active coping in both samples.

Discussion

With regard to our first hypothesis, the findings showed that Taiwanese participants had higher levels of active coping, social support seeking, and counteravoidance than did their U.S. counterparts. These findings are consistent with previous researchers' suggestion that cultural factors influence coping styles (Cortina & Wasti, 2005; Rokach et al., 2000).

The difference in social support seeking and counteravoidance between the U.S. and the Taiwanese students may be related to the values and

emphasis that each culture places on independence/interdependence (Brammer, 2004). Taiwanese society, as with many Asian societies, tends to be collectivistic, and many Taiwanese people value interdependence. By contrast, American society emphasizes individualism (Edwards, Knoche, Aukrust, Kumru, & Kim, 2006). Therefore, it is possible that the interdependence-oriented Taiwanese society encourages people to seek help from social networks in times of stress, whereas the independence-oriented American society may influence some people to seek social support with reluctance. When people are more willing to seek social support, they may feel they are being supported; therefore, they can be more likely than reluctant support seekers to face stress (counteravoidance). Taiwanese college students, as opposed to their U.S. peers, seemed to have higher levels of active coping. Taiwanese students' higher levels of active coping may be related to their higher levels of social support seeking and counteravoidance, because social support seeking and counteravoidance are two of the three dimensions of active coping. Active coping can be either behavioral or psychological responses that attempt to change the nature of the stressor or how one thinks about it (MacArthur & MacArthur, 1998). When people are supported by others and do not escape stress, they may try to change the nature of the stressor or how they think about it. One word of caution is that although the level of active coping was found to be different in this study, the effect size ($\eta^2 = .03$) was relatively small; therefore, we are cautious about coming to any conclusion. More studies need to be done to examine whether the difference in active coping occurs in samples outside the college population.

With regard to our second hypothesis, trait resilience was found to be the most effective predictor of active coping in both U.S. and Taiwanese samples. An additional finding was that trait resilience could mediate the effect of self-efficacy on active coping across the two cultures.

Trait Resilience Consistently Predicts Active Coping Across Cultures

The finding that trait resilience was the most effective predictor of active coping is similar to previous researchers' reports that resilient individuals tend to actively cope with stressful situations (Lee, 2006). Trait resilience buffers the effect of stress (Waugh, 2007), generates positive emotions (Fredrickson et al., 2005), shapes a positive perspective of stressful situations (Garmezy, 1991), and thus leads individuals to adopt an active attitude toward life stressors. This active attitude may influence students of both cultures to cope with stressors actively.

The finding that trait resilience explained only 2.3% of variance in active coping in the U.S. sample and 8.8% in the Taiwanese sample showed that this trait could not explain a great portion of the variance in active coping, indicating that some more important variables such as cognitive flexibility (Shapiro, Carlson, Astin, & Freedman, 2006) and self-regulation (Papalia,

Olds, & Feldman, 2007) skills were not included in this regression model. Trait resilience reflects individuals' general beliefs about their ability to bounce back from stressful situations (Wagnild & Young, 1993). However, trait resilience may not reflect cognitive flexibility and self-regulation skills these individuals actually applied to cope with a stressful situation that occurred in the past. Cognitive flexibility enables individuals to consider a stressful situation from different perspectives, and self-regulation helps them manage a variety of concurrent thoughts and emotions in order to decide how to actively cope with the situation (i.e., how to solve the problem, who to seek for support, and not to avoid the situation). Thus, the finding that trait resilience did not greatly influence students' active coping may mean that resilient people not only rely on an active attitude but also depend on resiliency skills such as cognitive flexibility and self-regulation to cope with stress.

Trait Resilience Mediates the Effect of Self-Efficacy on Active Coping Across Cultures

Self-efficacy was positively and strongly correlated with trait resilience (r = .51 in U.S. sample, r = .58 in Taiwanese sample), and self-efficacy was the most effective predictor of trait resilience in both the U.S. and the Taiwanese samples (see Table 1, Condition A). In addition, trait resilience could mediate the effect of self-efficacy on active coping in both samples. These findings seemed to confirm Yi's (2006) suggestion that self-efficacy contributes to the development of trait resilience in the coping process. These findings, together with the findings from the first hypothesis, showed that (a) although college students' tendency to actively cope with stressful situations may be influenced by culture, the relationships among active coping, trait resilience, and self-efficacy remain consistent across cultures and (b) although self-efficacy's influence on active coping was not directly observed in the presence of trait resilience, the influence should not be neglected. The two hypotheses of this study were supported; however, definite conclusions are not warranted at this point, and future studies are encouraged to duplicate this study using samples that include individuals from other cultures.

Limitations

The present study has several limitations. First, the data were obtained exclusively from participants' self-reports of how they coped with a stressful situation in the past; therefore, the data might not perfectly reflect participants' coping experiences. Second, the study focused only on the initial stage of coping; as a result, findings of this study are likely to be different from those of studies exploring long-term coping. Third, the samples were composed of undergraduate students majoring in business; consequently, it is not appropriate to generalize the findings of the present study to all college students. Finally, there were more female than male students in the Taiwanese sample, whereas the U.S. sample was distributed fairly equally between genders. However,

it is normal in Taiwan that more female than male students attend business schools (Taiwan Ministry of Education, 2008).

Implications for Counselors

The interdependence-oriented Taiwanese students were more likely to seek social support and directly address stressors compared with their independence-oriented U.S. counterparts. Also, the Taiwanese students seemed to be more likely than the U.S. students to actively cope with stressful situations. These findings seemed to imply that a stronger atmosphere of interdependence is related to a higher tendency to actively cope with stressful situations. On the basis of this implication, we recommend that counselors encourage independence-oriented students' active coping by enhancing their interdependence, especially in times of stress. One approach to enhancing interdependence is group counseling. With appropriate leadership, group counseling can provide an environment for stressed students to interact with one another meaningfully, creating a group cohesion that is characterized by interdependence (Gladding, 2008).

Although a cultural effect was found for active coping, trait resilience constantly predicted active coping and mediated the effect of self-efficacy on active coping in both cultures. The implication of these findings may be that college counselors can enhance clients' trait resilience and self-efficacy to help the clients actively cope with stress, no matter where the clients were raised (in the United States or in Taiwan). In addition, trait resilience remained the most effective predictor of active coping in both cultures. Taking these findings together, this study suggests that college counselors direct much of their efforts toward enhancing students' trait resilience. In turn, these efforts can improve students' tendency to actively cope with stress.

Masten (2001) proposed that trait resilience is developed from successful adaptation to developmentally appropriate difficulties, such as adapting to a new teacher and taking a new course. Echoing Masten's proposal, many researchers (e.g., Hines, Merdinger, & Wyatt, 2005; McKim, 2005) have suggested that family, school, and community are important in influencing people to adapt to difficult situations. Hines et al. (2005) emphasized that the experience of applying resources in family, school, or community to adapt to difficulties is a major source of developing resilience. Miller (2002) further argued that the experience alone is not sufficient for developing trait resilience; the ability to describe in detail the experience of applying the resources is also necessary.

On the basis of these resilience researchers' suggestions, college counselors may help their clients enhance trait resilience by (a) looking at the clients' past successful adaptations to developmentally appropriate difficult situations; (b) identifying personal, family, school, or community resources that supported them in adapting to the situations; (c) describing in a step-by-step manner how they used these resources to adapt to the situations; and (d) identifying a current developmental difficulty and documenting day-to-day adaptation experiences in a daily resilience

log. College counselors may also want to direct the clients to review their less successful adaptation experiences and deal with negative feelings associated with these experiences, as well as guide them to explore resources that could have been used to yield a more positive outcome. Counselors may educate clients about the development of resilience. Some clients may not have such knowledge and, therefore, may be reluctant to spend time exploring their past and current experiences of adapting to developmental difficulties. In addition, counselors are encouraged to enhance not only clients' trait resilience but also their resiliency skills. Although trait resilience activates an active attitude toward life stressors, it does not seem to greatly influence students' active coping. Resiliency skills such as cognitive flexibility (Shapiro et al., 2006) and self-regulation (Papalia et al., 2007) may also be required to influence individuals to cope actively.

References

American College Health Association. (2007). *American College Health Association–National College Health Assessment: Reference group data report, spring 2007.* Retrieved from http://www.acha-ncha.org/docs/ACHA-NCHA_Reference_Group_Report_Spring2007.pdf

Amirkhan, J. H. (1990). A factor analytically derived measure of coping: The Coping Strategy Indicator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59,* 1066–1074.

Araki, Y. (2008). Japanese college students' pessimism, coping strategies and anxiety: Validation of the Japanese Defensive Pessimism Inventory (JDPI). *Japanese Journal of Psychology, 79,* 9–17.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Banyard, V. L., & Cantor, E. N. (2004). Adjustment to college among trauma survivors: An exploratory study of resilience. *Journal of College Student Development, 45,* 207–221.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual strategy and statistical consideration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51,* 1173–1182.

Brammer, R. (2004). *Diversity in counseling.* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56,* 267–283.

Chan, D. W. (2008). Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and coping among Chinese prospective and in-service teachers in Hong Kong. *Educational Psychology, 28,* 397–408.

Collins, N. L. (1996). Working models of attachment: Implications for explanation, emotion, and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 810–832.

Collins, N. L., & Feeney, B. C. (2000). A safe haven: An attachment theory perspective on support-seeking and caregiving processes in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 1053–1073.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couple. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 644–663.

Cortina, L. M., & Wasti, S. A. (2005). Profiles in coping: Responses to sexual harassment across persons, organizations, and cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 182–192.

Dao, T. K., Lee, D., & Chang, H. L. (2007). Acculturation level, perceived English fluency, perceived social support level, and depression among Taiwanese international students. *College Student Journal, 41,* 287–295.

Dungan, D. E. (2002). Five days of stress and coping in the lives of college students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62*(10-B), 4827.

Edwards, C. P., Knoche, L., Aukrust, V., Kumru, A., & Kim, M. (2006). Parental ethnotheories of child development: Looking beyond independence and individualism in American belief systems. In K. Uichol, K. S. Yang, & K. K. Hwang (Eds.), *Indigenous and cultural psychology: Understanding people in context* (pp. 141–162). New York, NY: Spring Science + Business Media.

Feenstra, J. S., Banyard, V. L., Rines, E. N., & Hopkins, K. R. (2001). First-year students' adaptation to college: The role of family variables and individual coping. *Journal of College Student Development, 42,* 106–113.

Fredrickson, B. L., Tugade, M. M., Waugh, C. E., & Larkin, G. R. (2005). What good are positive emotions in crises? A prospective study of resilience and emotions following the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11th, 2001. *Rivista Sperimentale di Freniatria: La Rivista della Salute Mentale, 129,* 69–99.

Free University of Berlin. (2003). *The General Self-Efficacy Scale.* Retrieved from http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/engscal.htm

Gadzella, B. M. (1991). *Student-Life Stress Inventory.* Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

Gadzella, B. M. (1994). Student-Life Stress Inventory: Identification of and reactions to stressors. *Psychological Reports, 74,* 395–402.

Gadzella, B. M., & Baloglu, M. (2001). Confirmatory factor analysis and internal consistency of the Student-Life Stress Inventory. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 28,* 84–89.

Gadzella, B. M., Masten, W. G., & Stacks, J. (1998). Students' stress and their learning strategies, test anxiety, and attributions. *College Student Journal, 32,* 416–422.

Garmezy, N. (1991). Resilience in children's adaptation to negative life events and stressed environments. *Pediatric Annals, 20,* 455–466.

Geisinger, K. F. (2003). Test and assessment in cross-cultural psychology. In J. R. Graham, J. A. Naglieri, & I. B. Weiner (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Assessment of psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 95–117). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Gipple, D. E., Lee, S. M., & Puig, A. (2006). Coping and dissociation among female college students: Reporting childhood abuse experiences. *Journal of College Counseling, 9,* 33–46.

Gladding, S. T. (2008). *Groups: A counseling specialty* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Haranin, E. C. (2009). The mediational role of coping style in the relationship between positive and negative affect and parent and peer attachment. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 69*(7-B), 4483.

Hawkins, A. C., Howard, R. A., & Oyebode, J. R. (2007). Stress and coping in hospice nursing staff: The impact of attachment styles. *Psycho-Oncology, 16,* 563–572.

Hines, A. M., Merdinger, J., & Wyatt, P. (2005). Former foster youth attending college: Resilience and the transition to young adulthood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 75,* 381–394.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Howard, D. E., Schiraldi, G., Pineda, A., & Campanella, R. (2006). Stress and mental health among college students: Overview and promising prevention interventions. In M. V. Landow (Ed.), *Stress and mental health of college students* (pp. 91–123). New York, NY: Nova Science.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1988). *Manual for the Ways of Coping Questionnaire* (Research ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Lee, T. K. (2006). Resilience as a positive youth development construct: Conceptual bases and implications for curriculum development. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health, 18,* 475–482.

Li, M. H. (2006). Stress, traits of resilience, secure attachment, and self-efficacy as predictors of active coping among Taiwanese students (China). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(4-A), 1233.

MacArthur, J. D., & MacArthur, C. T. (1998). *Coping strategies.* Retrieved from http://www.macses.ucsf.edu/Research/Psychosocial/notebook/coping.html

Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56,* 227–238.

McGown, A., & Fraser, G. (1995). The effect of sociodemographic variables on the use of active and avoidance coping strategies. *Psychological Studies, 40,* 157–169.

McKim, M. K. (2005). Review of resilience in children, families and communities: Linking context to practice and policy. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne, 46,* 260–261.

Miller, M. (2002). Resilience elements in students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58,* 291–298.
Olff, M., Langeland, W., & Gersons, B. P. (2005). Effects of appraisal and coping on the neuroendocrine response to extreme stress. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 29,* 457–467.
Ong, A. D., Bergeman, C. S., Bisconti, T. L., & Wallace, K. A. (2006). Psychological resilience, positive emotions, and successful adaptation to stress in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91,* 730–749.
Papalia, D. E., Olds, S. W., & Feldman, R. D. (2007). *Human development* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
Pizzolato, J. E. (2004). Coping with conflict: Self-authorship, coping, and adaptation to college in first-year, high-risk students. *Journal of College Student Development, 45,* 425–442.
Ramos-Sanchez, L., & Nichols, L. (2007). Self-efficacy of first-generation and non-first-generation college students: The relationship with academic performance and college adjustment. *Journal of College Counseling, 10,* 6–18.
Roberts, K. A. (2007). Self-efficacy, self-concept, and social competence as resources supporting resilience and psychological well-being in young adults reared within the military community. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 68*(2-B), 1319.
Rokach, A., Bacanli, H., & Ramberan, G. (2000). Coping with loneliness: A cross-cultural comparison. *European Psychologist, 5,* 302–311.
Schwarzer, R., Bäßler, J., Kwiatek, P., Schröder, K., & Zhang, J. X. (1996). The assessment of optimistic self-beliefs: Comparison of the German, Spanish, and Chinese versions of the General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. Retrieved from http://web.fu-berlin.de/gesund/gesu_engl/lingua5.htm
Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio—Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35–37). Windsor, England: NFER-Nelson.
Shapiro, S. L., Carlson, L. E., Astin, J. A., & Freedman, B. (2006). Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 62,* 373–386.
Simeon, D., Yehuda, R., Cunill, R., Knutelska, M., Putnamc, F. W., & Smith, L. M. (2007). Factors associated with resilience in healthy adults. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 32,* 1149–1152.
Slone, M., & Shoshani, A. (2006). Feeling Safe: An Israeli intervention program for helping children cope with exposure to political violence and terrorism. In J. Kuriansky (Ed.), *Terror in the Holy Land: Inside the anguish of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict* (pp. 173–182). Westport, CT: Praeger/Greenwood.
Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
Stone, A. A., & Neale, J. M. (1984). New measure of daily coping: Development and preliminary results. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 892–906.
Taiwan Ministry of Education. (2008). *Gender statistics: e106-7*. Retrieved from http://english.moe.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=9874&CtNode=404&mp=1
Trouillet, R., Gana, K., Lourel, M., & Fort, I. (2009). Predictive value of age for coping: The role of self-efficacy, social support satisfaction and perceived stress. *Aging and Mental Health, 13,* 357–366.
University Health Services at the University of Michigan. (2009). *Depression*. Retrieved from http://www.uhs.umich.edu/depression
VandenBos, G. R. (2007). *APA dictionary of psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement, 1,* 165–178.
Waugh, C. E. (2007). Adapting to life's slings and arrows: Individual difference in resilience when recovering from an anticipated threat. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(7-B), 4162.
Weinfurt, K. P. (1995). Multivariate analysis of variance. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 245–276). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Yeh, C. J., Arora, A. K., & Wu, K. A. (2006). A new theoretical model of collectivistic coping. In P. T. P. Wong & L. C. J. Wong (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural perspectives on stress and coping* (pp. 55–72). Dallas, TX: Spring Publications.

Yi, J. P. (2006). Exploring trait resilience in association with mental and physical health. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 67*(2-B), 1175.

Zeidner, M. (1994). Personal and contextual determinants of coping and anxiety in an evaluative situation: A prospective study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16,* 899–918.

Zhang, J. X., & Schwarzer, R. (1995). Measuring optimistic self-beliefs: A Chinese adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Psychologia, 38,* 174–181.