Ethical Viewpoint

Redefining Stress: From Universal Pathology to Individual variability

Amresh Shrivastava[1,2], Avinash De Sousa[3]

[1]Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychiatry, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada.
[2]Director, Mansik-Shakti Foundation, Mumbai.
[3]Consultant Psychiatrist and Founder Trustee, Desousa Foundation, Mumbai.
Corresponding author: Avinash De Sousa
Email – avinashdes888@gmail.com

(Paper received – 5th April 2025, Peer review completed – 26th June 2025, Accepted – 30th June 2025)

Stress is often framed as a negative phenomenon, yet it plays a crucial role in adaptation, motivation, and survival. Hans Selye's [1] introduction of eustress (beneficial stress) and distress (harmful stress) underscores that not all stressors lead to pathological outcomes. The growing body of evidence necessitates a nuanced perspective, one that evaluates stress not merely as a precursor to disease but as a dynamic force influenced by individual variability and resilience.

The Complexity of Stress Responses

Stress is an inevitable aspect of life, influencing cognitive, emotional, and physiological processes. While moderate stress can enhance motivation and performance [2], excessive stress is implicated in mental and physical disorders [3]. The response to stress is highly individualized, determined by genetic, environmental, and psychological factors. Recognizing this variability is key to understanding why some individuals thrive under pressure while others succumb to its detrimental effects.

Stress arises from diverse sources, including occupational, financial, interpersonal, and environmental factors. Coping strategies, social support, and resilience play critical roles in stress management [4]. While most individuals adapt successfully, chronic stress is linked to severe health consequences such as burnout, cardiovascular disease, and psychiatric disorders [5]. The traditional view that stress is universally harmful is thus inadequate. Emerging research suggests that stress outcomes depend on a complex interplay of resilience, coping mechanisms, and biological predispositions.

Resilience as a Moderator of Stress Impact

Individual differences in stress susceptibility stem from genetic predispositions, early life experiences, and personality traits [6]. Factors such as neuroticism, low social support, and childhood adversity increase vulnerability to stress-related disorders [7]. The diathesis-stress model explains how personal vulnerabilities interact with environmental stressors, making stress outcomes unpredictable [8]. Conversely, resilience—defined as the capacity to adapt positively to adversity—plays a key role in mitigating stress and promoting better mental health outcomes [9].

Stress susceptibility is influenced by neurobiological mechanisms, including serotonin transporter gene variants, hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis dysregulation, and differences in neurotransmitter functioning [10-11]. Moreover, the subjective appraisal of stress significantly impacts its effects—individuals with high self-efficacy and positive cognitive reappraisal are more likely to perceive stress as a challenge rather than a threat [12]. Chronic stress disrupts mental health through mechanisms such as neuroinflammation and neuronal atrophy, but resilience factors, including neurogenesis and cognitive flexibility, counteract these adverse effects [13].

Beyond Pathologization: The Yerkes-Dodson Law and the Adaptive Potential of Stress

The relationship between stress and performance is non-linear. The Yerkes-Dodson Law [14] posits that moderate levels of stress enhance performance, whereas excessive stress impairs cognitive and emotional functioning. Understanding stress requires a shift from viewing it as inherently harmful to recognizing its adaptive potential.

- **Threshold Effects**: Mild to moderate stress improves cognitive function and problem-solving skills, while excessive stress overwhelms adaptive capacities, leading to burnout.
- **Resilience and Recovery**: Individuals with high resilience recover more rapidly from stress, whereas those with lower resilience experience prolonged distress [15].
- **Contextual and Cultural Variability**: Social support systems, cultural beliefs, and coping mechanisms shape stress responses. Collectivist societies may buffer stress through community support, while individualistic cultures emphasize self-reliance.

The Challenge of Measuring Stress

Despite extensive research, stress measurement remains imprecise due to its subjective nature and fluctuating biological indicators. Traditional self-report measures, such as the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) and the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI), are prone to recall biases. Biological markers, including cortisol levels, heart rate variability (HRV), and inflammatory cytokines, offer objective insights but are influenced by external factors such as lifestyle, medication, and circadian rhythms.

Digital health innovations provide promising solutions for real-time stress monitoring. AI-driven assessment platforms integrate physiological data (e.g., HRV, sleep patterns) and behavioral indicators (e.g., smartphone usage, speech analysis) to personalize stress interventions. Integrating psychometric tools, biological markers, and digital tracking can enhance stress assessment accuracy and improve early intervention strategies.

Policy Implications and Future Directions

The public health impact of chronic stress is substantial, contributing to non-communicable diseases (NCDs) such as hypertension, diabetes, and cardiovascular disorders. Workplace stress reduces productivity, increases absenteeism, and raises healthcare costs. Academic stress, particularly in competitive environments, exacerbates mental health risks, including anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation.

To address these challenges, we propose the following policy interventions:

1. Digital Stress Monitoring: AI-driven stress assessment tools should be integrated into routine healthcare screenings to identify high-risk individuals.
2. School and Workplace Interventions: Institutions should implement mindfulness programs, resilience training, and flexible work/study policies to mitigate stress.
3. Biopsychosocial Screening Models: Standardized stress screening using multidimensional assessments (psychometric tools, biomarkers, and digital analytics) should be incorporated into healthcare settings.
4. Public Awareness Campaigns: National initiatives should focus on enhancing stress literacy, promoting resilience, and encouraging adaptive coping mechanisms.

Conclusion

Stress should no longer be viewed as a universal pathology but rather as a complex, individualized phenomenon. Future research must focus on personalized stress management strategies that balance the benefits of moderate stress while mitigating its risks. By leveraging resilience-building strategies, digital health innovations, and policy interventions, we can redefine stress management and improve mental well-being on a societal level.

REFERENCES

1. Selye H. Stress and distress. Comprehensive therapy 1975;1(8):9-13.
2. Caspi A, Bolger N, Eckenrode J. Linking person and context in the daily stress process. Journal of Personal Soc Psychol 1987;52(1):184-90.
3. Lupien SJ, McEwen BS, Gunnar MR, Heim C. Effects of stress throughout the lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. Nat Rev Neurosci 2009;10(6):434-45.
4. Danese A, Caspi A, Williams B, Ambler A, Sugden K, Mika J, Werts H, Freeman J, Pariante CM, Moffitt TE, Arseneault L. Biological embedding of stress through inflammation processes in childhood. Mol Psychiatry 2011;16(3):244-6.
5. Caspi A, Moffitt TE. Gene–environment interactions in psychiatry: joining forces with neuroscience. Nat Rev Neurosci 2006;7(7):583-90.
6. Herrman H, Stewart DE, Diaz-Granados N, Berger EL, Jackson B, Yuen T. What is resilience?. Can J Psychiatry 2011;56(5):258-65.
7. Wolff S, Wolff S. The concept of resilience. Austr NZ J Psychiatry 1995;29(4):565-74.
8. Rutter M. Resilience: Some conceptual considerations. Social Work 2023;4:122-7.
9. Masten AS, Obradović J. Competence and resilience in development. Ann NY Acad Sci 2006;1094(1):13-27.
10. Adler CE, Aldunce P, Indvik K, Alegría D, Borquez R, Galaz V. Resilience. Edward Elgar Publishing; 2015 Nov 27.
11. Russo SJ, Murrough JW, Han MH, Charney DS, Nestler EJ. Neurobiology of resilience. Nat Neurosci 2012;15(11):1475-84.
12. Osório C, Probert T, Jones E, Young AH, Robbins I. Adapting to stress: understanding the neurobiology of resilience. Behav Med 2017;43(4):307-22.
13. Cathomas F, Murrough JW, Nestler EJ, Han MH, Russo SJ. Neurobiology of resilience: interface between mind and body. Biol Psychiatry 2019;86(6):410-20.
14. Miela R, Cubała WJ, Mazurkiewicz DW, Jakuszkowiak-Wojten K. The neurobiology of addiction. A vulnerability/resilience perspective. Eur J Psychiatry 2018;32(3):139-48.
15. Rutter M. Resilience as a dynamic concept. Dev Psychopathol 2012;24(2):335-44.

****

Acknowledgements – Nil
Conflict of Interest – Nil
Funding – Nil.