Children show great differences in their ways of appraising threat, seeking help, and expressing emotions when facing traumatic events. This chapter focuses on developmental and personality aspects of trauma responses. It is hypothesized that each developmental age provides children unique protecting resources, on one hand, and makes them vulnerable, on the other. These protecting and risk dynamics are analyzed among infants, toddlers, school-age children and adolescents. Concerning the link between personality and trauma, attachment theory and temperament research are viewed. The argument is that insecure-avoidant children are vulnerable due to their tendency to deny dangers, distrust others’ help and cope by distraction and withdrawal. Insecure-ambivalent children are at risk due to their exaggeration of danger and overactivation of negative emotions. Secure children in their part accurately perceive the trauma, trust in their own resources and others’ ability to help, and show balanced emotional, cognitive and behavioral responses. The implications for helping children to cope with war and military violence are discussed.
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Introduction

At this very moment, war and military conflict are going on in Afghanistan, Middle East, and Chechnya. Low intensity war with its sporadic violence and constant danger is reality in many countries in Africa (Angola, Congo), South America (Columbia) and Asia (East Timor, Sri Lanka, Burma), as well as in Northern Ireland and in the Kurdish area in South East Turkey. A considerable amount of children thus witness violence and horrors, experience loss of family members, and face life danger and threat. In scientific terms they are exposed to traumatic stress.

When trying to understand how war and horrors enter a child’s life, we have to ask how old is the child. The developmental stage determines what the child is doing, thinking and feeling when facing danger and threat. Activity, coping strategies, understanding traumatic events, and delineating own and others’ emotions follow specific developmental paths.

Children show great personal differences in the responses to traumatic stress. The theories of attachment and emotional-cognitive working models and research on temperament, the semi-inherited personality structure, may be informative in understanding these differences. They provide underlying mechanisms for the children’s unique ways of appraising threat, seeking help, and showing emotions and
activity. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on developmental and personality aspects of traumatic stress among children, and the implications for helping children to cope with war and military violence.

**Trauma Impact on Developmental Tasks**

War and violence compromise child development by interfering the smooth transition from earlier developmental stage to the next. Literature presents, however, opposing views about the direction of the impact. On the one hand, according to the classic observation by Freud and Burlingham (1943) children are at risk of losing previously acquired developmental skills, and regressing to less mature behavioral modes. For instance, traumatized adolescents may excessively cling to their parents and preschoolers lose newly acquired speech abilities. On the other hand, ‘war children’ are described to grow up too fast and loose the childhood too early. War conditions force them to protect their family members and to solve serious moral and emotional conflicts before their ample maturation.

The age of the child has been considered a risk versus protective factor in traumatic stress. There is a strong argument that the earlier in life a trauma occurs, the more severe the psychiatric consequences are (Breslau, 1998). Evidence is available on victims of sexual abuse and parental violence (Higgins & McCabe, 2001), and military violence (Jensen & Shaw, 1993). Young children are assumed to be more vulnerable due to their magic thinking and ineffective coping mechanisms and less developed cognitive capacity to remember, understand and process the trauma (Fivush, 1998; Schneider, 2000). On the other hand, there is also a strong belief that because young children do not understand the severity of trauma, they would be protected from its negative consequences. However, a meta-analysis by Flechter (1996) showed no differences in the risk of PTSD across developmental stages.

It might be more informative to argue that each developmental age provides children unique protecting resources, on one hand, and makes them vulnerable, on the other (Punamäki, 1999; Pynoos, Steinberg, & Goenjian, 1996). Experiences of war and violence are especially harmful when they interfere with the normative developmental tasks, such as emotional regulation in toddler years, controlling aggressive behavior in middle childhood or forming intimate bonds in adolescence. The impact of traumatic experiences on behavioral, cognitive and emotional development according to the developmental age is analyzed in Table 1.

**Infancy**

Security and protection from danger are fundamental for human survival in infancy (0-18 months). Attachment relationship between the infant and caregiver forms a basis for that: Secure attachment relationship with sensitively available adult provides the infant with a safe haven from which to explore the environment. Insecure attachment relationship in turn forces infants to seek protection elsewhere. In an insecure attachment relationship, children respond either by dismissing their emotional needs and avoiding closeness (insecure-avoidant), or by being flooded by distressing emotions and clinging to attachment figures (insecure-ambivalent) (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1973, Bretherton, 1996; Crittenden, 1997). In extremely deprived, inconsistent and fear-evoking relationship the child may fail forming an organized attachment patterns (disorganised attachment; George & Solomon, 1999; Crittenden, 1985).

We lack research about attachment development in conditions of war and military violence, where mothers have to protect infants from external dangers and life threat. However, research on mother-child dyads in other adversities is informative here (Scheeringa & Zeanah, 2001). There is increasing evidence that traumatic childhood experiences such as sexual and violent abuse, maternal
depression and deprivation of care and economic adversities form risks for insecure and disorganized attachment patterns (Crittenden, 1985; Greenberg, 1999; Howe, Brandon, Hinings, & Schofield, 1999; Zenah, Boris, & Larrieu, 1997). The underlying mechanism for insecure attachment is insensitive, unpredictable or intrusively overprotective parental care (Crittenden, 1999; Carlson, 1998). Research shows that depression and poverty may strip parental resources and distract their attention from the child. Emotional deprivation, for instance among orphans, is traditionally considered highly risky for insecure and disorganized attachment patterns (Bowlby, 1973; Carlson, 1998). Research on the extremely deprived Romanian orphans partly supports that view, but provides some more elaborated analysis of timing of attachment, and resiliency (Carlson, 1998; Rutter & Era-team, 1998). Early traumatization modifies brain functions (Pynoos, Steinberg, Ornitz, & Goenjian, 1998), which may influences children’s attachment development.

Table 1: Traumatic impact on emotional, cognitive and behavioral development according to the developmental stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developmental stage &amp; salient tasks</th>
<th>Emotional: valence, regulation, recognition &amp; expression</th>
<th>Cognitive: attention, thinking, reasoning &amp; memory</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infancy</strong></td>
<td>Negative emotionality</td>
<td>Vigilance to danger cues</td>
<td>Inadequate clinging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishing security &amp; trust in care relationship</td>
<td>Difficulty to be soothed</td>
<td>Distrust in predictability of events</td>
<td>Irregularities in sleeping and eating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exploring environment</td>
<td>Distrust in available care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive fearfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toddler age</strong></td>
<td>Difficulty in emotional regulation</td>
<td>Vigilance to danger cues</td>
<td>Attention disorders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role taking and social participation</td>
<td>Difficulty in empathy development</td>
<td>Distrust in separating between reality and fantasy</td>
<td>Aggressive or uncontrollable behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Differentiation between imagination and reality</td>
<td>Escalation of intensive fear and hatred</td>
<td>Negative expectations about human virtue</td>
<td>Regressive clinging to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive daydreaming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle childhood</strong></td>
<td>Narrow or biased emotional repertoire</td>
<td>Splitting between good and bad</td>
<td>Concentration problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being aware of own and other’s complex motives and emotions</td>
<td>Selective empathy</td>
<td>Fear shadows reasoning capacity</td>
<td>Adult like commitment to war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning sophisticated reasoning &amp; achievements</td>
<td>Difficulty in aggression regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolescence</strong></td>
<td>Appraisal of own future narrowed and unrealistically pessimistic</td>
<td>Difficulty in making decisions</td>
<td>Acting out behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hypothetical &amp; abstract thinking</td>
<td>Traumatic memories interfere with intimate relationship</td>
<td>Splitting between good and bad</td>
<td>Disregard for dangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Future planning</td>
<td>• Distrust in others</td>
<td>Unrealistic appraisal of dangers</td>
<td>Impulsive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intimate relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distorted belief in one’s invulnerability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
War, dangers and life-threat interfere with the basic parental activities of feeding, protecting, sheltering and teaching trust in human virtues. Middle Eastern parents showed severe concerns about the safety, survival and developmental prospects of their children. They also expressed deep despair and feelings of guilt about not being able to provide security for their offspring, although it was objectively an impossible task (Punamäki, 1986). The infants' core developmental task of seeking security and satisfying curiosity may subsequently be seriously handicapped in war situation.

**Toddler Age**

During the toddler years (3-5) the child learns to regulate and adequately express emotions, and becomes an active member of sibling and peer group. The basic emotions of joy, sadness, disgust, anger and fear become organized into more comprehensive and complex emotions. The higher-order emotions such as shame, guilt and jealousy involve specific appraisals, behavioral and feeling states (Power & Dalgleish, 1999; Saarni, 1999). Children develop their own ‘theory of mind’ as they become more aware of their own and others’ inner world, beliefs and emotions, and perceive causality between thinking and behaving (Carpoendale & Chandler, 1996). The emotional-cognitive sophistication forms in turn preconditions for prosocial and empathetic behavior (Eisenberg, Fabes, Bernzweig, Karbon, Poulin, & Hanish, 1993; Zahn-Waxler & Radke-Yarrow, 1990). During toddler years, children also learn to separate fantasy from reality by intensively practicing imagination, symbolic play and other as-if – activities.

The adaptive cognitive-emotional development is possible in interaction with caring parents and stimulating but safe environment. War and military violence interfere with these conditions. While there is abundant research on trauma impacting adults’ emotional processing, we lack knowledge about how it affects emotions and feelings among toddlers to whom the regulation of emotions is a salient developmental challenge. Trauma victims’ emotional processing involves distortions and biases, and may result in escalating and overwhelming expression, or numbing of feelings (Ehlers, Maercker, & Boos, 2000; Näätänen, Kanninen, Qouta, & Punamäki, 2002).

Most interventions with traumatized preschool children involve playing, drawing and other symbolic activities. They base on assumptions that play allows children to divide their excessive and painful experiences into small quantities, work through them, and assimilate them into to their existing schemas. In play children can process the trauma by symbolizing it and modifying its consequences. (Horowitz, 1999). There are observations that children tend intensively to incorporate their traumatic experiences into their play (Freud & Burlingham, 1943; Terr, 1991; Yule, 2001). Most play researchers agree that symbolic and social play has beneficial influences on cognitive, emotional (Johnsen, 1991; Russ, 1993), and social (Rubin, Hastings, Chen, Stewart, & McNichol, 1998) development. Research is scarce, however, on possible mental health function of incorporating traumatic events in the play.

Play and fantasy in toddler years provide an example of psychic processes that can both protect and make children more vulnerable in traumatic stress. On the positive end, play allows ventilation of feelings and reconstructing the unsafe and dangerous world. We observed Palestinian children using play as a means to engage in the roles of the weak and strong, victims and the persecutor (prison-play,
enemy-play, war-games), to create consoling as-if realities and replaying feelings of fear and courage (funeral play, freedom-fighter play) (Punamäki, 1997). On the negative end, preschool children are vulnerable because traumatic events distort the border between their fantasies and the actual reality. Some preschool children were frightened of the enemy soldiers, because they attributed them magical and omnipotent powers, in addition to the real danger. Intrusive posttraumatic symptoms and nightmares are especially horrifying to preschool children because they may experience that the trauma scene happens again ‘in their head’, and was not an external event. However, the most vulnerable children seem to be those who are too afraid to engage in any symbolic activity due to the vivid horrifying images.

**Middle childhood**

“Are you my buddy” is one of the core questions during the school years, and “How do I succeed in my examinations”, another. Social position and school performance contribute to the well-being and self-esteem of the school age children (Durkin, 1995). Being victim of war atrocities negatively interfere both. Peer popularity is dependent on social competence that in turn consists of dimensions of prosocial orientation and social initiative taking (Rydel, Hagekull & Bohlin, 1997). A socially competent child is helpful and empathetic, and actively suggests games and plays, and finds easily friends. The opposite of social competence is aggressive and hostile or withdrawal and non-communicative behaviour.

There is evidence that learning and concentration problems are frequent among traumatized children (Roussau, Drapeau, & Corin, 1996; Qouta, Punamäki, & El Sarraj, 1995). School performance as an important competence domain is thus in a special risk at this age. Dealing with aggressive impulses that are a precondition for successful peer relationships also seem to be in danger. Follow-up research shows that children’s aggressive behavior decreases with age. Simultaneously their social skills and comprehensive understanding, recognition and expression of emotions increase. The peak of aggressive behavior is in early adolescence (11-13), and for instance fighting decreases considerably between 14 - 16 years of age (Loeber & Hay, 1997; Tremblay, 2000).

The transition from early adolescence to adolescence is a critical period for aggressive behavior. Research evidences that if the normative decrease of violent and aggressive behavior does not occur, it is probable that severe aggression, often leading to criminality, increases (Loeber & Hay, 1997). A stable violent and aggressive behavior, together with a belief system supporting the legitimacy of violent behavior, forms an especially severe risk for further criminality in adulthood. It has been shown that high levels of aggression-related hormonal changes associate with severely violent behavior, only if the person’s belief system concurs with it. For instance, high testosterone associated with crime of raping (convicted) in the group of men who maintained derogative attitudes towards women (e.g., acceptance of interpersonal violence and sex domination) (Aromäki, 2000). The research implicates that maladaptive cognitive attributions together with other developmental risk factors may lead to pathological aggression.

There seem to be a strong belief that ‘war children’ develop aggressive personality. We speak about ‘lost generations’ in Mozambique and Angola, and aggressive youth in Palestine and Northern Ireland. We believe that as societies at war enhance fighting, aggression and dehumanizing of the enemy, the child development follows similar paths. It is implicitly assumed that a belligerent atmosphere and the morality of emergency situations becomes a part of children’s inner cognitive-emotional schema, personality development and human relationships. It is surprising, however, that we lack systematic
developmental analysis of the prevalence of prosocial and aggressive behavior among children in war zones. We do not know whether there is a normative decrease in aggression in early adolescence also in violent societies. Nevertheless, from intervention perspective, while conflict resolution and peace education are important at every age, they might be especially decisive in the middle childhood and in the transition to adolescence.

**Adolescence and Youth**

In adolescence, planning for future, creating intimate relationships and committing to one’s worldview are important developmental tasks. Young people seek for their own identity and psychosocial resources outside the family. They typically show a strong belief in their own invulnerability and capability to abolish injustice and to change the world. Their abstract thinking is increasingly sophisticated, and they are able to solve conflicting moral and human problems and analyze complex cause-effect considerations. On the other hand, emotionally and socially young people tend to experience themselves as insecure and their emotions oscillate intensively, partly due to the hormonal changes (Booth, 1997; Davison & Susman, 2001). War, fighting and a belligerent atmosphere are salient for young people, who feel strongly that it is their duty to save their people and create a more just society. Their feeling of invulnerability and omnipotence further contributes to their self-sacrificing attitudes and active participation in military and political struggles. They can cognitively understand the severity of dangers, but may emotionally be incapable to realize that they can die like others.

Traumatization in adolescence forms a risk for the creation of lasting human relationships and future planning. Both developmental tasks demand trust in other humans and their benevolence, which is often badly shattered when one falls victim of atrocities (Janoff-Bulman, 1985). Intrusive and horrific memories can be activated in intimate encounters, and subsequently the victim withdraws from closeness with others. Clinical observations reveal that some Palestinian victims of human right abuse (detained at 13-15 years of age) felt isolated and lonely, and experienced that their peers could understand and share their feelings (Punamäki, 2000).

Young people are interested in ideological issues and are constructing their worldviews. A secure life history and a safe environment provide them with an opportunity to try different roles, learn repertoires of emotional expression and train sophisticated problem solving skills. On the contrary, the emergency needs in wartime create an atmosphere where complex moral dilemmas are simplified and people are split as good or bad. Yet, the questions of life and death, justice and injustice, peace and war, killing or mercy, forgiveness or revenge, bravery or cowardliness, fear or confidence are salient. War thus places a great burden on adolescent cognitive-emotional development: social, moral and ideological questions are highly complex, but opportunities for their solutions are narrowed. The successful solution of these dilemmas can lead to strengthened psychological integrity, high moral status and healthy ideological commitment. The unsuccessful solution, in turn, leads to fragmented thinking, immature moral reasoning and extreme views. (Van Ijzendoorn & Zwart-Woustra, 1995).

**Personality and trauma: contribution of attachment theory**

Consistent with other observations, our research among Palestinians has revealed that an objectively similar trauma experience brings subjectively different messages to victims and survivors and causes different mental health consequences (Punamäki, 1986; 1999; Qouta, Punamäki, & El-Sarraj, 1997). For instance, a torture survivor interpreted his experience as “a possibility of deepening my spiritual understanding, and enhancing of psychological insight and religious commitment”, while another perceived imprisonment as “endless humiliation and loss of human dignity”. A mother of six
perceived air raids and curfews as "a proof that our justified struggle makes the occupier shiver and that is why they treat us like non-humans". Another mother reported that “curfew brings me the feelings of horror and fear of death, and I see the faces of soldiers wherever I turn my face”, and the third had a “feeling as if the horrors happen again, and they will expel us again as in 1948”. Finally, we found a great variability in children’s memories of recent night raids and curfews. One wrote that the worst thing was “that my newly planted flowers in the garden died because I was too afraid to go out to water them”, while another reported that “the best thing was the excitement”, and a third child was afraid of what would happen to her father.

The attachment paradigm may explain the trauma victims’ unique ways of interpreting threatening cues, regulating emotions, and responding to danger and threat. They may also provide underlying mechanisms for the differences in children’s symptom severity and explain why some children deactivate, and others overactivate their distress. Figure 1 is an information-processing model based on Crick and Dodge (1994) and Damasio (1999), and adapted by Taxell (2000). It illustrates how the personality structure influences the activation and expression of emotions, reasoning and behaving.

According to Bowlby (1973), in the early caring relationship children learn to effectively organize their behavior in potentially dangerous circumstances such as separations and encountering a stranger. The preconditions for secure attachment are that the child can rely on the parents’ capability and sensitivity to provide a ‘secure base’ from where to explore and to seek safety. An insecure-avoidant child in turn experiences that parents do not respond to his/her distress, and learns to rely only
on his/her own strength, distrusts his/her own emotions and focus attention on the non-human environment. Insecure-ambivalent child also experiences insensitive and often unpredictable parenting, but develops a strategy to deal with distress by heightened emotional expression and vigilance for parental attention. Ample evidence shows that early attachment style associates with cognitive-emotional development: for instance, secure children show less aggressive and more empathetic and prosocial behavior (Greenberg, 1999; Rubin, Hastings, Chen, Stewart, & McNichol, 1998). The mental working models, characteristic to each attachment style, are expected to be activated and guide feelings and behaviors in stress and trauma later in life (Bowlby, 1980). There is some evidence that insecure adult attachment styles associate with vulnerability to posttraumatic distress among victims of childhood abuse (Alexander, Anderson, Brand, Schaefer, Grelling, & Kretz, 1998; Muller, Sicoli, & Lemieux, 2000). Less is known, however, about how children with different attachment style process traumatic experiences, appraise threat and cope with stress.

Table 2 presents hypothetical attachment-related responses to trauma. They proceed according to the Transactional Stress–model developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). Trauma exposure is associated with psychological distress through stages of perceiving and appraising the threat and danger (primary appraisal), and evaluating the available support and one’s own resources to deal with stress (secondary appraisal). Next, coping strategies are applied to protect one’s psychological integrity by managing emotions, restructuring meanings, and employing behavioral attempts to change or adapt to the stress. Finally, posttraumatic symptoms and behavioral and mood disorders occur depending of the mediation process of the appraisals and coping strategies.

Exposure to trauma and danger activates the attachment-related working models that were originally learned to guarantee the child’s safety and survival (Bowlby, 1980). Subsequently securely and insecurely attached children show unique ways of interpreting and evaluating the danger and coping with it. Secure children’s observations are realistic and they are able adequately to estimate the severity of danger and their own resources to deal with it. Secure children have learned to trust the adults’ ability to protect them, and are capable of integrating intensive negative emotions and positive cognitive reframing of the painful experience. Apparently secure children choose coping strategies that fit the demands of the stressful encounter (Mikulincer & Florian 1998; Brennan & Shaver, 1998). Insecure-avoidant children tend to deny and underestimate the severity of danger, and often distort and narrow their perceptions of traumatic reality. They numb their negative feelings and employ avoidant and passive coping strategies. Insecure-avoidant children may distrust adults’ capability and willingness to help them. They instead obsessively trust in their own strength and may overestimate their resources in traumatic stress. Insecure-ambivalent children in turn get easily emotionally overexcited, and are intensively involved in traumatic scenes. They cling to adults at every age, and are highly worried about their parents’ well-being. They rely on emotional coping (Mikulincer & Florian, 1998) at the expense of cognitive problem solving. They may fail to distinguish between their own fear-loaded and uncontrollable inner schema and the outer reality. They overestimate the severity of dangers and underestimate their own resources. Parents of ambivalent children find it difficult to soothe them after frightening events. Exposure to trauma thus evokes unique mental working models characteristic to each attachment style.

Table 2. Traumatic Stress process According to the Child Attachment Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traumatic Stress Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Attachment Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment Style</th>
<th>Recognition of Threat</th>
<th>Appraisal of Resources</th>
<th>Coping Strategies</th>
<th>Psychological Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td><em>Realistic interpretation of danger</em>&lt;br&gt;<em>Balance between inner schemas and environmental cues</em></td>
<td>*Seeking social support&lt;br&gt;*Trusting one’s own capability&lt;br&gt;<em>Trust others’ benevolence</em></td>
<td>*Wide repertoire and situation-adequate&lt;br&gt;*Both active and passive&lt;br&gt;*Both behavioral and mental strategies&lt;br&gt;<em>Both emotion- and problem-focused</em></td>
<td>*Express various symptoms in acute trauma&lt;br&gt;*Less risk for chronic PTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure-avoidant</td>
<td>*Denial of danger&lt;br&gt;*Inner threatening schemas activated</td>
<td>*Distrust others’ willingness and ability to help&lt;br&gt;*Trusting own strength</td>
<td>*Withdrawal &amp; distracting modes&lt;br&gt;*Behavioral models dominate&lt;br&gt;<em>Problem-focused strategies</em></td>
<td>*Possible a-symptomatic in acute trauma&lt;br&gt;*Avoidance PTSD symptoms dominate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecure-ambivalent</td>
<td>*Exaggeration of threat and danger&lt;br&gt;*Inner threatening schemas dominate interpretation</td>
<td>*Despair and disbelief in available resources&lt;br&gt;*Easily disappointed to the received help</td>
<td>*Emotion-focused strategies&lt;br&gt;*Clinging to others</td>
<td>*Both acute and chronic PTSD symptoms&lt;br&gt;*Intrusive PTSD symptoms dominate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td>*Panicking and distraction&lt;br&gt;*Catastrophizing appraisal</td>
<td>*Impulsive and disorganized activity&lt;br&gt;*Conflicting &amp; victimizing interpretations</td>
<td>*Coping mismatch the situational demands&lt;br&gt;*Disorganized and oscillating attempts to cope</td>
<td>*Risks for mental health disorders&lt;br&gt;*Risk for chronic PTSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Personality and posttraumatic distress: contribution of temperament research

Research on temperament may also contribute to understanding why children differ in their distress and vulnerability to psychopathology after traumatic experiences. While almost all children respond with excessive fear, sleeping difficulties and clinging to parents in acute trauma, only a minority develops posttraumatic stress disorders. Yet, the PTSD level among war victims is generally higher than victims of natural disaster (Yule, 2001). Among war-traumatized children, the percentages of PTSD diagnosis vary from 22% among Israeli (Laor, Wolmer, Mayers, Gershon, Weizman, & Cohen, 1997) and 27% among Lebanese (Saigh, 1991) children exposed to shelling, to 52% among South American (Cervantes, Salgado de Snyder, & Padilla, 1989) and 48% among Cambodian (Kinzie, Sack, Angell, Manson, & Rath, 1986) political refugees escaping military atrocities. Research further shows that once
the fighting and danger are over, the posttraumatic symptoms decrease considerable (Laor et al., 1997; Punamäki, Qouta, & El Sarraj, 2001). Epidemiological data among adults evidence that in the due course of about six months the symptoms disappear in about two-thirds of the cases (Kessler, Sonnega, & Bromet, 1995). Yet, research about the course of PTSD is still lacking among children.

A follow-up of adolescent disaster victims showed that 52% developed acute PTSD, and one third recovered during one year. Yet a third had developed a chronic PTSD after 5-8 years (Yule & Udwin, 1991; Yule, Bolton, Udwin, Boyle, O’Ryan, & Nurrish, 2000). It is evident that while being distressed might be a normal reaction to horrors and dangers, being overwhelmed by fear can incite psycho- and neuropathological paths resulting in chronic PTSD.

Traditionally, PTSD has been considered a normal response to an abnormal experience (Herman, 1993). Current research shows, however, that PTSD occurs also in non-extreme situations, and that not all severely exposed victims suffer from PTSD (Shalev, 1996). There must thus be social, personality and biological vulnerabilities that explain the risks for the disorder. It might also be that different factors predict symptoms in acute trauma and chronic PTSD (Shalev, 1996; Shalev & Yehuda, 1998). Child temperament that combines biological resilience and vulnerability factors with developmental interactions may explain some of the differences in the course of posttraumatic reactions.

Children differ from a very early age in the valence and intensity of mood and emotional expression, threshold for pain, need for rhythm and regularity and tolerance for excitement, as well as distractibility, activity and novelty seeking (Thomas & Chess, 1977; Rothbart & Bates, 1998). Temperament involves behavioral and emotional characteristics that are constitutional and stable over time, have neuropsychological underpinnings, and are to some degree inherited (Goldsmith, 1993; Katainen, 1999; Keltikangas-Järvinen, Rääkkönen, & Lehtimäki, 1993). There is abundant research on how temperamental dimensions such as emotionality, activity and sociability associate with child development and mental health (for review, Rothbart & Bates, 1998).

We lack, however, research on whether and how temperament style would protect or increase the vulnerability of children’s mental health in traumatic stress. Research on resiliency has revealed some temperamental and other personality characteristics that may explain why some children blossom despite of adversities and trauma. The protective characteristics include activity, curiosity (involving novelty seeking), intelligence (Apfel & Simon, 1996; Rutter, 2000), creativity and mental flexibility (Qouta, Punamäki, & El Sarraj, 2001). Sociability, involving cooperativeness, extraversion and need for affiliation, may also be protective because they facilitate social support that is crucial in traumatic stress (Punamäki, Qouta, Komproe, Elmasri, & De Jong, submitted).

We may hypothesize that some temperamental dimensions are especially salient in the course of posttraumatic distress: threshold for pain and pleasure, valence and intensity of fear, sadness and anger, emotional arousal and regulation, and novelty seeking behavior. Our observations among the Middle Eastern mother-child dyads in dangerous situations such as night raids and curfews indicate that small children differ greatly in the speed and acceleration of emotional arousal, the intensity of fear, and how easily mothers can calm them down and soothe their distress. It seems that children who show curiosity, activity and a tendency to seek novelty tolerate more stress, as compared with children who need regularity and show low threshold for stimuli. The goodness-of-fit between personality and environment seems to be decisive for child endurance even in a highly traumatic situation.

The underlying mechanisms of temperament differences reflect a child’s capacity for self-modulation, general arousal of the motor and emotion system, attention persistency, recovery time from
distress, and ability to tolerate and deal with negative emotions (Katainen, 1999; Rothbart & Bates, 1998). These mechanisms contribute to the different ways children perceive and evaluate danger, process emotions and cope with losses and violence. Some mechanisms are constitutional, others children learn during their early attachment relationships. Nevertheless, they are further interwoven in children’s developmental trajectories and shaped in the context of family and society atmosphere (Belsky, Fish, & Isabella, 1991). It would be essential to know about the ways through which a belligerent atmosphere of fear, hatred and threat influences personality development, including temperament expression.

**Helping children to cope with war and violence**

Intervention programs among militarily traumatized children generally aim at enhancing effective coping abilities, promote resiliency and provide social support. Few, however, explicitly analyze how, why and when specific intervention strategies are applied. There seem to an implicit assumption that traumatization makes people alike and that interindividual differences play a lesser role in victimization. According to attachment theory (Bowlby, 1980), the opposite happens: early learned personality schemas of dealing with danger and threat are activated in life threat. Subsequently persons with different attachment styles vary in their recognizing, managing and recovering from traumatic experiences. They also respond differently to help, develop different therapeutic alliances and process differently traumatic memories (Kanninen, Salo, & Punamäki, 2000; Näätänen et al., 2002).

Interventions should thus be tailored to meet the vulnerabilities and strength of secure and insecure children, and consider the goodness of fit between environment and temperament. In war conditions where thousands of children are in need of psychosocial first aid and enhancement of self-help, consideration of personality factors may sound superfluous. Yet, knowledge about them is essential in tailoring effective interventions. For instance, it is not meaningful to encourage behaviorally active coping strategies or feeling ventilation among insecure-ambivalent children, who rather would benefit from cognitive reframing and regulating of emotions.

It is generally stated that trauma exposure dramatically shatters the victims’ fundamental assumptions and representations about themselves, other people, and the world (Horowitz, 1999; Janoff-Bulman, 1985). Attachment theory contributes to trauma research by specifying the contents and dynamics of this ‘shattering’ process. The representations of benevolence versus malevolence of other people are shaped in the early maternal relationship. They will be gradually generalized to guide thinking, feeling and remembering in other relationships, and will be activated especially in danger. Our research on political prisoners evidenced that the dynamics of the ‘shattering’ of earlier assumptions differed for men with secure and insecure attachment styles. Securely attached were more vulnerable to human-induced maltreatment than preoccupied (ambivalent in childhood), apparently because their inner working models mish-matched with the new inhuman and cruel experience. Preoccupied men in turn expected people to be malevolent and their inner working models thus matched with the inhuman and cruel interaction (Kanninen, Punamäki, & Qouta, submitted).

Coping strategies are crucial determinants of child well being vs. pathology in traumatic stress. Children aim at protecting their well-being either by altering the painful situation or by manipulating their own thinking and feelings (Rutter, 2000). In many war situations, children of all ages have committed themselves to defend and fight for their country, which indicate active and problem-focused coping modes. Their motive is to protect their own and their families’ security (Netland, 2001; Punamäki & Puhakka, 1997). They may also protect their well-being by denying the painful situation
and numbing feelings of fear and despair (Almqvist, 2000; Punamäki & Puhakka, 1997). Sometimes they flee the unbearable reality into their fantasy world and distract attention to less provocative activities. In an extreme case, the mental withdrawal and distraction may result in dissociative states of mind. Children learn to ‘hypnotize’ themselves as-if outsiders, and experience that the violence is happening to somebody else than to them (Hornstein, 1996).

Coping serves an enormous task of psychological and sometimes physical survival in a war situation. The general assumption that active and problem-focused coping strategies are effective, and passive and emotion-focused ineffective (Alwin, 1994) seems not to apply to war-related traumatic stress. The question of effectiveness is more complex, and should be considered in terms of personality differences and goodness of fit with the challenges that war and military violence places on children. Middle Eastern researchers have shown that although some coping strategies such as denial and avoidance are theoretically maladaptive, they were the last resort for traumatized children, and thus effective (Punamäki, Mohammad, & Abdulrahman, (submitted); Weisenberg, Schwarzwald, Waysman, Solomon, & Klingman, 1993). According to an alternative view, avoidant coping strategies are typical for insecure-avoidant children, and may be effective for them, whereas active and problem solving strategies suit secure children, and explain their good adjustment after trauma. When tailoring effective interventions, it is important first to familiarize with children’s characteristic ways of coping. Children should not be stripped of their personal ways of responding to trauma, but they can be guided to create a new and broader repertoire of strategies.

The insightful work on the development of emotional competence and emotion-regulation (Saarni, 1999; Shields & Cicchetti, 1997; Davies & Cummings, 1995) may contribute to understanding personality differences in children coping with war atrocities. The idea that emotion-focused coping is considered maladaptive and ineffective in trauma encounters is based on an outdated view of feelings as something irrational and thus disturbing. According to current research, emotions serve an adaptive function by reorganizing behavior into purposeful action. Emotions are an integral part of person-environment transactions that contribute to psychological adaptation (Lazarus, 1991; Frijda, 1986). Emotional repertoire, measured by emotional recognition, expression and regulation, is an integral part of coping with dangers.

Further, research on symbolic and imagery processes (Bretherton, 1984; Singer & Singer, 1981) can contribute to enhancing effective coping in war conditions. Effective coping requires ability to shift and manipulate mental images, rely on soothing and consoling memories, construct new metaphors and create comprehensive narratives to replace fragmented horror pictures (Garbarino, 2001; Punamäki, 1997; Qouta et al., 1997).

Researchers agree that a wide repertoire of coping modes and their situation-sensitive, flexible and adequate employment are effective, and should thus facilitate recovery and good mental health (Rutter, 2000). Yet, war and military violence form a trap or vicious circle to child development: the more the victims are in need for a wide repertoire of coping strategies, the less capable they are in realizing it and the more they rely on a narrow range of coping strategies. This discrepancy urges adults to help children to employ multiple and productive coping modes despite of traumatisation. Enhancing effective coping is important, because successful coping with traumatic stress promotes high self-esteem, meaningfulness and positive affect, which are cornerstones of mental health (Folkman & Moskowitz, 2000; Garbarino, 2001).

Conclusion
War experiences dramatically impact children’s minds and behavior, involving changes in thinking, remembering, problem solving, as well as feelings and emotional expressions. The presence of life threat, aggression and the enemy forms a complex childhood environment, and poses unique developmental tasks for children. War and violence become a part of family communication, moral reasoning, and the formation of identity, friendship and intimacy. The interventions even on a mass scale should be tailored to meet the individual’s unique ways of appraising, understanding, and coping with the trauma.
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