THE IMPACT OF STRESS RESILIENCE OF WAR PARTICIPANTS ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS DEATH

LEVON SARGSYAN

Brusov State University, Chair of Management,
PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor

slsargsyanlevon@gmail.com

HAYK AVAGIMYAN

Vanadzor State University, Chair of Pedagogy and Psychology,
PhD in Psychology, Associate Professor

avagym@mail.ru

GARIK HOVAKIMYAN

ASPU after Kh. Abovyan, Applicant at the Chair of Psychology
academician M. Mazmanyan

gar–sjun@inbox.ru

LILIT STEPANYAN

ASPU after Kh. Abovyan, Applicant at the Chair of Psychology
academician M. Mazmanyan

lilit.stepanyan.1989@mail.ru

DOI: 10.54503/2579-2903-2024.2-184

Abstract

This scientific article analyzes the impact of stress resistance on the fear of death of war participants, taking into account the role of value orientations. V. Boyko's stress resistance methodology, D. Templer's "Fear of Death" scale, and S. Schwartz's value orientation test were used. The sample included 200 war participants and 200 non–combatants.

MANCOVA analysis showed that low stress tolerance in combatants is associated with high levels of fear of death, especially in the cognitive–affective aspect. Conformity and volitionalism mediate this relationship, promoting adaptive behavior. The results emphasize that the war experience shapes a unique psychological profile, where stress tolerance and value factors are deeply interconnected. This is important for the prevention of post–traumatic stress disorder by offering targeted interventions aimed at promoting conformity and willpower among individuals with combat experience. For service members without combat experience, strengthening individual resources and independence are paramount. The research contributes to a deeper understanding of the psychological effects of war and can be used practically in military and psychological services.

Key words and phrases: fear of death, war participant, value orientation, conformity, willpower, independence, post–traumatic stress.

ՊԱՏԵՐԱԶՄԻ ՄԱՍՆԱԿԻՑՆԵՐԻ ՍԹՐԵՍԱԿԱՅՈՒՆՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԱԶԴԵՑՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԸ ՄԱՀՎԱՆ ՆԿԱՏՄԱՄԲ ՎԵՐԱԲԵՐՄՈՒՆՔԻ ՎՐԱ

ԼԵՎՈՆ ՍԱՐԳՍՅԱՆ

Վ. Բրյուսովի անվան պետական համալսարան,
Կառավարման ամբիոնի դոցենտ, հ.գ.թ.

slsargsyanlevon@gmail.com

ՀԱՅԿ ԱՎԱԳԻՄՅԱՆ

Վանաձորի պետական համալսարան, Մանկավարժության և հոգեբանության ամբիոնի դոցենտ, հ.գ.թ.

avagym@mail.ru

ԳԱՐԻԿ ՀՈՎԱԿԻՄՅԱՆ

Խ. Աբովյանի անվան ՀՊՄՀ Մ. Մազմանյանի անվան հոգեբանության ամբիոնի հայցորդ

gar-sjun@inbox.ru

ԼԻԼԻԹ ՍՏԵՓԱՆՅԱՆ

Խ. Աբովյանի անվան ՀՊՄՀ Մ. Մազմանյանի անվան հոգեբանության ամբիոնի հայցորդ

lilit.stepanyan.1989@mail.ru

Համառոտագիր

Սույն գիտական հոդվածում վերլուծվում է պատերազմի մասնակիցների սթրեսակայունության ազդեցությունը մահվան վախի վրա՝ հաշվի առնելով արժեքային կողմնորոշումների դերը: Օգտագործվել են Վ. Բոյկոյի սթրեսակայունության մեթոդիկան, Դ. Տեմպլերի «Մահվան վախի» սանդղակը և Շ. Շվարցի արժեքային կողմնորոշումների թեստը: Ընտրանքը ներառել է 200 պատերազմի մասնակիցներ և 200 մարտական գործողություններին չմասնակցած զինծառայող:

MANCOVA վերլուծությունը ցույց է տվել, որ կոմբատանտների ցածր սթրեսակայունությունը կապված է մահվան վախի բարձր մակարդակի հետ, հատկապես կոգնիտիվ-աֆեկտիվ ասպեկտում: Կոնֆորմությունն ու կամեցողությունը միջնորդում են այս կապը՝ խթանելով հարմարվողական վարք: Արդյունքները ընդգծում են, որ պատերազմի փորձը ձևավորում է յուրահատուկ հոգեբանական պրոֆիլ, որտեղ սթրեսակայունությունը և արժեքային գործոնները խորապես փոխկապակցված են: Դա կարևոր է հետտրավմատիկ սթրեսի խանգարումների կանխարգելման համար՝

առաջարկելով թիրախային միջամտություններ, որոնք ուղղված են կոնֆորմության և կամեցողության խթանմանը մարտական փորձ ունեցող անհատների շրջանում: Մարտական փորձառություն չունեցող զինծառայողների համար առաջնային են անհատական ռեսուրսների ամրապնդումն ու ինքնուրույնությունը: Հետազոտությունը նպաստում է պատերազմի հոգեբանական հետևանքների խորացված ընկալմանը և գործնականում կարող է օգտագործվել ռազմական և հոգեբանական ծառայություններում:

Բանալի բառեր և բառակապակցություններ. մահվան վախ, պատերազմի մասնակից, արժեքային կողմնորոշում, կոնֆորմություն, կամեցողություն, ինքնուրույնություն, հետտրավմատիկ սթրես:

ВЛИЯНИЕ СТРЕССОУСТОЙЧИВОСТИ УЧАСТНИКОВ ВОЙНЫ НА ОТНОШЕНИЕ К СМЕРТИ

ЛЕВОН САРГСЯН

Государственный университет имени В. Брюсова, кафедра менеджмента, к.пс.н., доцент

slsargsyanlevon@gmail.com

ГАЙК АВАГИМЯН

Ванадзорсдкий Государственный Университет, кафедра педагогики и психологии, к.пс.н., доцент

avagym@mail.ru

ГАРИК ОВАКИМЯН

АГПУ им. Х. Абовяна, Соискатель кафедры психологии имени академика М. Мазманяна

gar–sjun@inbox.ru

ЛИЛИТ СТЕПАНЯН

АГПУ им. Х. Абовяна, Соискатель кафедры психологии имени академика М. Мазманяна

lilit.stepanyan.1989@mail.ru

Аннотация

В данной научной статье анализируется влияние стрессоустойчивости участников войны на страх смерти с учетом роли ценностных ориентаций. Использовались методика стрессоустойчивости В. Бойко, шкала «Страха смерти» Д. Темплера и тест ценностных ориентаций Ш. Шварца. Выборка включала 200 участников боевых действий и 200 военнослужащих без боевого опыта.

MANCOVA-анализ показал, что низкая стрессоустойчивость комбатантов связана с высоким уровнем страха смерти, особенно в когнитивно-аффективном аспекте. Конформизм и воля опосредуют эту связь, способствуя адаптивному поведению. Результаты подчеркивают, что военный опыт формирует уникальный психологический профиль, где стрессоустойчивость и ценностные факторы тесно взаимосвязаны. Это важно для профилактики посттравматических стрессовых расстройств, предлагая целевые интервенции, направленные на усиление конформизма и воли у лиц с боевым опытом. Для военнослужащих без боевого опыта приоритетными являются укрепление личностных ресурсов и самостоятельности. Исследование углубляет понимание психологических последствий войны и может быть применено в военных и психологических службах.

Ключевые слова и словосочетания: страх смерти, участник войны, ценностные ориентации, конформизм, воля, самостоятельность, посттравматический стресс.

Introduction

The study of the psychological state of participants in military operations is one of the primary issues of modern psychology, as combat stress situations profoundly affect stress resistance, value orientations, and existential anxieties. The experience of war, which includes constant threat of death and traumatic events, forms adaptive mechanisms that can either strengthen or undermine a person's psychological stability.

From the perspective of existential psychology, the confrontation with death, as noted by V. Frankl, I. Yalom, and E. Fromm, causes a fear of "nothingness," but can also stimulate self-transcendence – the search for the meaning of life [7]. J. Rheingold notes that in the psychology of the individual, death acquires the meaning of the realization of a specific vital purpose, contrasting it with the organic end of life, which is obviously meaningless [9, p. 4].

E. Fromm rejected the idea that the fear of death is the fear of the end of life. He believed that the fear of death is actually the fear of the loss of what we have: body, property, identity, the only way to reduce which is to get rid of the desire to possess [11].

Eternal questions (life and death) acquire special significance in combat conditions, when the proximity of death does not allow consciousness to postpone their solution for the future. This experience leaves a mark on consciousness, influencing its attitude towards death and, consequently, on further value orientations when the combatant returns to peaceful life. The key to revealing the features of changes in the consciousness of a combatant may be a comparative analysis of the attitudes of individuals who participated in the war and those who did not participate.

All other human problems arise from the encounter with death (L. Binswanger, M. Boss, D. Bujenthal, R. May, V. Frankl, I. Yalom). The encounter with death is a terrifying but inseparable part of every person's life [2; 3; 4; 8; 12].

The founders of the existential–humanistic direction (R. Assagioli, J. Bujenthal, T. and E. Yeomans, S. Levin, A. Maslow, R. May, J. Rainwater, V. Frankl, E. Fromm, I. Yalom and others) often considered the encounter with death as an important opportunity for personal growth. However, regardless of how this encounter is resolved, its consequences inevitably have a strong impact on the individual [6, p. 58].

The aim of the study is to identify the impact of stress resilience on the fear of death, taking into account the value orientations of the individual.

According to the main hypothesis, unlike those who did not participate in the war, low stress tolerance of combatants is associated with a high level of fear of death, and conformity and benevolence promote adaptive behavior. The research objectives are:

To study the impact of stress tolerance of war participants on the cognitive–affective, physical, temporal and stress aspects of fear of death.

To reveal the mediating role of value orientations (conformity, benevolence, tradition, universalism, self–direction) between the relationship between stress tolerance and fear of death.

To compare the correlation between stress resilience and fear of death caused by traumatic experiences in war– participants and those who have not participated in war.

The study is important from both theoretical and practical perspectives, as it deepens our understanding of the psychological consequences of war and offers a basis for the prevention of post–traumatic stress disorders.

Research methods and sample

1. V. V. Boyko's "Stress Resilience Methodology" **[10, p. 34],**

2. D. Templer's "Fear of Death" Scale (Death Anxiety Scale – DAS) **[5, p. 1–8.],**

3. Basic value orientations (Sh. Schwartz) **[1, p. 86–92].**

The reliability of the results was ensured by the use of mathematical statistical methods: multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA).

The research sample consisted of 200 combatants participating in combat operations (experimental group (EG)), and 200 former contract servicemen without combat experience (control group (CG)).

Analysis of the research results

Through MANCOVA analysis, we identified the psychological characteristics of war participants, observing the influence of stress resistance and value orientations.

Table 1.

Multivariate tests of stress resistance and value orientations of the experimental group

-	-	meaning	F	df1	df2	p
Stress resilience	Pillai's Trace	2.943	0.974	80	28	0.553
	Wilks' Lambda	2.89e-4	1.568	80	18	0.140
	Hotelling's Trace	72.936	2.279	80	10	0.077
	Roy's Largest Root	58.748	20.562	20	7	<.001
Conformity	Pillai's Trace	0.808	4.200	4	4	0.097
	Wilks' Lambda	0.192	4.200	4	4	0.097
	Hotelling's Trace	4.200	4.200	4	4	0.097
	Roy's Largest Root	0.808	4.200	4	4	0.097
Tradition	Pillai's Trace	0.645	1.819	4	4	0.288
	Wilks' Lambda	0.355	1.819	4	4	0.288
	Hotelling's Trace	1.819	1.819	4	4	0.288
	Roy's Largest Root	1.819	1.819	4	4	0.288
Benevolence	Pillai's Trace	0.729	2.695	4	4	0.180
	Wilks' Lambda	0.271	2.695	4	4	0.180
	Hotelling's Trace	2.695	2.695	4	4	0.180
	Roy's Largest Root	2.695	2.695	4	4	0.180
Universalism	Pillai's Trace	0.400	0.667	4	4	0.648
	Wilks' Lambda	0.600	0.667	4	4	0.648
	Hotelling's Trace	0.667	0.667	4	4	0.648
	Roy's Largest Root	0.667	0.667	4	4	0.648
Self-direction	Pillai's Trace	0.318	0.466	4	4	0.761
	Wilks' Lambda	0.682	0.466	4	4	0.761
	Hotelling's Trace	0.466	0.466	4	4	0.761
	Roy's Largest Root	0.466	0.466	4	4	0.761

The results of the multivariate analysis show that in the case of stress resilience, the largest root of Roy ($F=20.562$, $p<.001$) reveals a highly significant effect, while the other indicators (Pilla trace, Wilks' lambda, Hotelling trace) do not reach statistical significance.

From a psychological point of view, this is extremely important, since the largest root of Roy shows that stress resilience most strongly affects a certain set of dependent variables. In this context, based on D. Templer's "Fear of Death" scale, we can conclude that the stress resistance of war participants is particularly related to the attitude towards death.

Participants in combat operations, when faced with death, may have

developed unique stress–resilience mechanisms related to dealing with the fear of death. This may act as a psychological defense system, allowing them to continue functioning in the face of death.

The results of the Schwartz value orientation test show an interesting picture. The conformity indicators (F=4.200, p=0.097) are at the threshold of significance, which suggests that there is a certain tendency among participants in military operations to follow group norms. In combat, where teamwork and timely execution of orders are vital, conformity can manifest itself as an adaptive mechanism.

The indicators of benevolence (F=2.695, p=0.180), although not statistically significant, reveal a certain trend that may reflect the internal conflict of combat participants—between fulfilling their duties on one hand and upholding humanitarian values on the other.

The value orientations of Tradition, Universalism, and Self–direction do not show a statistically significant effect, which may indicate that military operations do not have an impact on these values in the short term, or their change occurs more slowly.

The results of the analysis reveal that among war participants, stress resistance is a key factor that determines their psychological reactions. In particular, stress resistance can affect cognitive and emotional responses related to the fear of death. In the value system, conformity and benevolence show certain trends, which indicates that the war experience can affect the positioning of the individual in the social context and humanitarian attitudes.

Table 2.

Univariate tests for the analysis of stress stability, fear of death scales, and value orientations of war participants

	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df (Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	p
Stress resilience	CAFDA	110.8030	20	5.5402	18.91821	<.001
	FPC	28.6288	20	1.4314	0.47338	0.910
	APT	57.3333	20	2.8667	0.43071	0.934
	FPD	100.3939	20	5.0197	2.68425	0.092
Conformity	CAFDA	5.1049	1	5.1049	17.43198	0.004
	FPC	1.4462	1	1.4462	0.47827	0.511
	APT	1.8181	1	1.8181	0.27316	0.617
	FPD	8.6059	1	8.6059	4.60195	0.069
Tradition	CAFDA	0.0124	1	0.0124	0.04226	0.843
	FPC	5.8219	1	5.8219	1.92530	0.208
	APT	0.7605	1	0.7605	0.11426	0.745
	FPD	6.9320	1	6.9320	3.70686	0.096

Benevolence	CAFDA	2.5317	1	2.5317	8.64517	0.022
	FPC	11.7185	1	11.7185	3.87534	0.090
	APT	0.1595	1	0.1595	0.02396	0.881
	FPD	6.1823	1	6.1823	3.30596	0.112
Universalism	CAFDA	0.3225	1	0.3225	1.10117	0.329
	FPC	6.7940	1	6.7940	2.24679	0.178
	APT	0.0246	1	0.0246	0.00369	0.953
	FPD	0.1745	1	0.1745	0.09329	0.769
Self-direction	CAFDA	0.1453	1	0.1453	0.49600	0.504
	FPC	0.3024	1	0.3024	0.10000	0.761
	APT	1.3144	1	1.3144	0.19749	0.670
	FPD	4.6815	1	4.6815	2.50341	0.158
remaining	CAFDA	2.0499	7	0.2928	-	-
	FPC	21.1671	7	3.0239	-	-
	APT	46.5896	7	6.6557	-	-
	FPD	13.0904	7	1.8701	-	-

The results of the multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), where stress resilience is the independent variable, the fear of death scales (CAFDA, FPC, APT, FPD) are the dependent variables, and the value orientations (conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, autonomy) are the covariates, show a complex relationship between stress resilience and fear of death, taking into account the influence of value orientations. In the case of war participants, we are dealing with a high stress experience.

The high statistical significance of CAFDA (cognitive–affective anxiety about death) ($F=18.918$, $p<0.001$) indicates that stress resilience is significantly associated with cognitive–affective anxiety about death. From a psychological perspective, this means that war participants with lower stress resilience tend to worry more about death, which may be related to post–traumatic stress or existential concerns. These concerns may exacerbate psychological burden, reducing adaptive resources.

FPD (pain and stress concern): Moderate significance ($F=2.684$, $p=0.092$) suggests that stress resilience may be somewhat related to concerns about pain and stress, which may reflect that war veterans with low stress resilience are more sensitive to physical or psychological pain related to their traumatic experiences. FPD (physical change anxiety) and APT (awareness of the passage of time) are not statistically significant ($p=0.910$ and $p=0.934$), indicating that stress resilience does not significantly affect physical change or time anxiety. From a psychological perspective, this may mean that for war participants, these aspects of fear of death are less important or less related to stress resilience compared to cognitive–affective concerns.

The association with conformity with CAFDA ($F=17.432$, $p=0.004$) indicates

that conformity significantly mediates the relationship between stress resilience and cognitive–affective concerns. War participants who are more conformist may be more prone to death anxiety as they attempt to conform to social norms to reduce uncertainty. The association with FPD (F=4.602, p=0.069) is close to significance, suggesting that conformity may also be partially related to pain and stress concerns, possibly through seeking social support.

The significant correlation of benevolence with CAFDA (F=8.645, p=0.022) indicates that benevolence plays an important role in the relationship between stress resilience and the cognitive–affective aspect of fear of death. War participants with higher levels of benevolence may actively attempt to manage their anxieties to confront the fear of death. The connection with FPD (p=0.090) and FPD (p=0.112) factors is close to significance, suggesting a moderate influence of benevolence on physical and stress–related concerns.

The covariates of tradition, universalism, and autonomy do not show a statistically significant effect (p>0.096), suggesting that these value orientations do not significantly mediate the relationship between stress resilience and fear of death, which may mean that these values are more stable and less susceptible to the influence of war–induced stress or fear of death.

The analysis shows that stress resilience is most strongly associated with the cognitive–affective aspect of fear of death (CAFDA), which highlights that low stress resilience in war veterans may exacerbate existential concerns. Conformity and benevolence mediate this relationship, indicating that social conformity and controlling behavior may serve as adaptive mechanisms. Pain and stress concerns (FPD) are also somewhat associated with stress resilience, which may reflect the impact of traumatic experiences. Physical change and time–course concerns (FPD, APT) have no significant effect, which may be due to the fact that war veterans are not familiar with these with less importance of aspects. Low residual errors (e.g. 0.2928 for CAFDA) indicate a good fit of the model.

Table 3.

Multivariate tests of stress resistance and value orientations of servicemen who did not participate in the war

-	-	**Meaning**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**p**
Stress resilience	Pillai's Trace	2.3093	0.893	104	68	0.701
	Wilks' Lambda	0.0210	0.920	104	58	0.649
	Hotelling's Trace	7.8511	0.944	104	50	0.605
	Roy's Largest Root	4.4233	2.892	26	17	0.013
Conformity	Pillai's Trace	0.0963	0.373	4	14	0.824
	Wilks' Lambda	0.9037	0.373	4	14	0.824
	Hotelling's Trace	0.1065	0.373	4	14	0.824
	Roy's Largest Root	0.1065	0.373	4	14	0.824

Tradition	Pillai's Trace	0.1151	0.455	4	14	0.767
	Wilks' Lambda	0.8849	0.455	4	14	0.767
	Hotelling's Trace	0.1301	0.455	4	14	0.767
	Roy's Largest Root	0.1301	0.455	4	14	0.767
Benevolence	Pillai's Trace	0.3858	2.198	4	14	0.122
	Wilks' Lambda	0.6142	2.198	4	14	0.122
	Hotelling's Trace	0.6281	2.198	4	14	0.122
	Roy's Largest Root	0.6281	2.198	4	14	0.122
Universalism	Pillai's Trace	0.0620	0.231	4	14	0.916
	Wilks' Lambda	0.9380	0.231	4	14	0.916
	Hotelling's Trace	0.0661	0.231	4	14	0.916
	Roy's Largest Root	0.0661	0.231	4	14	0.916
Self-direction	Pillai's Trace	0.2949	1.464	4	14	0.265
	Wilks' Lambda	0.7051	1.464	4	14	0.265
	Hotelling's Trace	0.4183	1.464	4	14	0.265
	Roy's Largest Root	0.4183	1.464	4	14	0.265

The results of the multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), which relate to the correlation between stress resilience and value orientations (conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self–direction) of servicemen who did not participate in the war, show that stress resilience and value orientations generally do not have a statistically significant relationship.

Of the four criteria, the largest Roy root (F=2.892, p=0.013) shows statistical significance, suggesting that stress resilience has some relationship with value orientations, which may mean that the stress resilience of non–combatants may be partly determined by their value system, such as benevolence or conformity, which can promote adaptive behavior in stressful situations.

All conformity measures (F=0.373, p=0.824) are not statistically significant, indicating that conformity is not significantly associated with stress resilience, which may mean that for non–combatants, conforming to social norms does not play a significant role in stress management. Tradition measures (F=0.455, p=0.767) are also not significant, suggesting that traditional values, such as following traditions, do not affect stress resilience. This may reflect that tradition, as a value, does not promote or hinder stress coping mechanisms in this group.

The measures of benevolence show a moderate effect (F=2.198, p=0.122), which is close to statistical significance. This indicates that benevolence may be somewhat related to stress resilience. From a psychological perspective, servicemen who seek more control over their lives and decisions may cope better with stress because they are more actively using problem–solving strategies. All measures of universalism (F=0.231, p=0.916) are not statistically significant, indicating that universal values such as equality and social justice do not significantly affect stress

resilience.

The autonomy measures (F=1.464, p=0.265) are also not significant, but show a certain effect that is close to significance. This suggests that autonomy may be moderately related to stress resilience. Service members who are more independent in their decisions can better manage stress by relying on their own resources.

The analysis shows that stress resilience in non–combatants is largely unrelated to value orientations, with the exception of benevolence and, to some extent, autonomy, which may contribute to better stress management. That is, a sense of personal control and self–direction may promote adaptive behavior in stressful situations, while social or traditional values, such as conformity and tradition, have a lesser effect. The significance of the largest root of Roy (p=0.013) suggests that some value orientations may be important for stress resilience, but the overall effect is limited.

Table 4.

Univariate tests for the analysis of stress stability, fear of death scales, and value orientations of servicemen who did not participate in the war

	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df (Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	P
Stress resilience	CAFDA	296.9320	26	11.4205	1.0629	0.458
	FPC	73.3129	26	2.8197	1.4246	0.227
	APT	11.3248	26	0.4356	0.4709	0.959
	FPD	173.3231	26	6.6663	0.9945	0.517
Conformity	CAFDA	4.1815	1	4.1815	0.3892	0.541
	FPC	2.1634	1	2.1634	1.0930	0.310
	APT	0.5409	1	0.5409	0.5847	0.455
	FPD	0.1557	1	0.1557	0.0232	0.881
Tradition	CAFDA	7.1781	1	7.1781	0.6681	0.425
	FPC	0.4648	1	0.4648	0.2348	0.634
	APT	0.2826	1	0.2826	0.3055	0.588
	FPD	0.4941	1	0.4941	0.0737	0.789
Benevolence	CAFDA	71.5580	1	71.5580	6.6599	0.019
	FPC	0.1269	1	0.1269	0.0641	0.803
	APT	0.3716	1	0.3716	0.4017	0.535
	FPD	1.2701	1	1.2701	0.1895	0.669
Universalism	CAFDA	8.88e-4	1	8.88e-4	8.26e-5	0.993
	FPC	0.6672	1	0.6672	0.3371	0.569
	APT	0.1402	1	0.1402	0.1516	0.702
	FPD	2.3018	1	2.3018	0.3434	0.566

Self-direction	CAFDA	62.7556	1	62.7556	5.8406	0.027
	FPC	2.5953	1	2.5953	1.3112	0.268
	APT	0.0240	1	0.0240	0.0259	0.874
	FPD	18.9866	1	18.9866	2.8324	0.111
Remaining	CAFDA	182.6592	17	10.7447	-	-
	FPC	33.6490	17	1.9794	-	-
	APT	15.7241	17	0.9249	-	-
	FPD	113.9583	17	6.7034	-	-

The results of the multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), which concerns the correlation between stress resilience, fear of death scales (CAFDA, FPC, APT, FPD) and value orientations (conformity, tradition, benevolence, universalism, self–direction) of non–combatant soldiers, show that stress resilience generally does not have a significant effect on fear of death scales, with the exception of some value orientations that show a statistically significant relationship.

The results for CAFDA (cognitive–affective anxiety about death) ($F=1.063$, $p=0.458$) are not statistically significant, indicating that stress resilience does not significantly affect cognitive–affective anxiety about death. For non–combatants, thoughts of death were not related to their stress resilience level. Despite the higher F value for FPC (concern about physical changes) ($F=1.425$, $p=0.227$), the results remain non–significant. This indicates that stress resilience does not affect concerns about physical changes, which may reflect the lower importance of physical concerns for this group.

The very low F value for APT (awareness of the passage of time) ($F=0.471$, $p=0.959$) confirms that stress resilience is not related to concerns about the passage of time. From a psychological perspective, this could mean that for this group, the perception of time is not related to stress management. The results for FPD (pain and stress concern) ($F=0.995$, $p=0.517$) are also non–significant, indicating that stress resilience does not significantly affect concerns about pain and stress, with the absence of war reducing the intensity of these types of concerns.

The relationship between conformity and all scales of fear of death was not statistically significant ($p>0.310$), indicating that conformity does not mediate the relationship between stress resilience and fear of death, which may mean that conforming to social norms does not play a significant role in managing stress or fear of death. Similarly, the results for tradition ($p>0.425$) were not significant, suggesting that traditional values do not influence the relationship between stress resilience and fear of death. This may reflect the stable nature of tradition, which remains unchanged regardless of the level of stress or anxiety.

The association of benevolence with the CAFDA is statistically significant ($F=6.660$, $p=0.019$), indicating that benevolence significantly mediates the relationship between stress resilience and cognitive–affective concerns. From a psychological perspective, service members who seek control over their lives may be more actively able to counteract death–related concerns, which may increase

their stress resilience. The association with the other scales ($p>0.535$) is not significant, indicating that the effect of benevolence is limited to the cognitive–affective aspect.

The association of autonomy with CAFDA is also significant ($F=5.841$, $p=0.027$), suggesting that autonomy plays an important role in the relationship between stress resilience and cognitive–affective concerns about death. Soldiers who are more independent in their decisions may be better able to manage existential concerns by relying on their own resources. The association with FPD ($F=2.832$, $p=0.111$) is close to significance, indicating that autonomy may moderate concerns about pain and stress.

The results for universalism ($p>0.566$) are not statistically significant, indicating that universal values do not mediate the relationship between stress resilience and fear of death. This may be due to the fact that universalism is less associated with individual stress management.

The analysis shows that stress resilience in non–combatant soldiers does not significantly affect fear of death, with the exception of benevolence and self–direction, which are significantly related to cognitive–affective anxiety (CAFDA). From a psychological perspective, this highlights that a sense of personal control and self–direction can promote the management of stress and existential anxiety, while social or traditional values, such as conformity and tradition, have little effect.

Thus, among war participants, stress resilience is strongly related to the cognitive–affective aspect of fear of death, which reflects the impact of traumatic experiences on their psychological state. In contrast, among non–war servicemen, there is a weaker relationship between fear of death and stress resilience, due to the absence of stressful situations. Conformity plays an important role among participants, since following group norms helps reduce uncertainty and anxiety. Benevolence contributes to the management of fear of death in both groups, but it is more pronounced in participants, expressing a conflict between duties and humanitarian values. Self–direction helps non–participants to overcome existential anxieties by relying on individual resources, while it is less pronounced in participants. Concerns about pain and stress are more noticeable in participants, related to trauma, while they are almost absent in non–participants. Tradition and universalism are stable in both groups and do not affect stress resistance or fear of death. War experience forms unique adaptive mechanisms that strengthen stress resistance to death in dangerous conditions.

Conclusion

Thus, low stress tolerance in war participants is statistically significantly associated with high levels of fear of death, especially in the aspect of cognitive–affective anxiety. Among value orientations, conformity and benevolence mediate this relationship, promoting a sense of conformity to social norms and control, which is an adaptive mechanism in conditions of traumatic stress. In contrast, in servicemen who did not participate in war, the relationship between stress

tolerance and fear of death is weak, and autonomy becomes the main resource for managing existential anxieties.

The experience of war shapes a unique psychological profile, where stress resilience and value factors are deeply intertwined. This is important for the prevention of post-traumatic stress disorders, suggesting targeted interventions aimed at promoting conformity and benevolence among war participants.

References

1. Սերոբյան Ա.Կ., Գրիգորյան Ա.Կ., Խաչատրյան Ն.Գ. Անձի դիսպոզիցիոնալ գծեր և սոցիալ-մշակութային կողմնորոշումներ. հոգեչափողական գործիքների տեղայնացում: Գիտամեթոդական ձեռնարկ, Եր., ԵՊՀ հրատ., 2021. – 128 էջ:
2. Богданова Т.А. Теория и практика экзистенциально-ориентированного консультирования: учебное пособие /Т.А. Богданова. – Челябинск: Изд-во ЮУрГУ, 2006. – 108 с.
3. Бордуков О.В. Проблема смерти в экзистенциализме /О.В. Бордуков //2 Всероссийская научно-практическая конференция по экзистенциальной психологии: материалы сообщений /под ред. Д.А. Леонтьева. – М.: Смысл, 2004. – С. 136–141.
4. Бьюдженталь Д. Наука быть живым /Д. Бьюдженталь. – М.: Класс, 1998. – 336 с.
5. Гаврилова Т.А. Экзистенциальный страх смерти и танатическая тревога: методы исследования и диагностики (статья) //Прикладная психология. М., 2001.-№ 6. – С.1-8.
6. Кулагина И.Ю. Отношение к смерти: возрастные, региональные и гендерные различия /И. Ю. Кулагина, Л. В. Сенкевич //Культур.-ист. психология. – 2013. – № 4. – С. 58–65.
7. Лэнгле А. Жизнь, наполненная смыслом. Прикладная логотерапия. М.: 2008. – 128 с.
8. Мэй Р. Экзистенциальная психология. Пер. с англ. – М. – Львов, 2003. – 182 с.
9. Рейнгольд С. Дж. Мать, тревога и смерть. Комплекс трагической смерти /Дж. С. Рейнгольд. – М.: ПЕР СЭ, 2004. – 383 с.
10. Сборник методических материалов по организации работы по развитию толерантных качеств личности обучающихся в общеобразовательных учреждениях Ивнянского района. Ивня 2019. https://ivnrono.narod.ru/uko/uko-mukod-vosp2022/913.pdf
11. Фромм Э. Иметь или быть? /Э. Фромм. – М.: Прогресс, 1990. – 330 с.
12. Ялом И. Экзистенциальная психотерапия /И. Ялом; пер. с англ. Т.С. Драбкиной. – М.: Класс, 1999. – 576 с.

The article has been submitted for publication: 04.07.2024
Հոդվածը ներկայացվել է տպագրության. 04.07.2024
Статья представлена к публикации: 04.07.2024

The article is sent for review: 05.08.2024
Հոդվածն ուղարկվել է գրախոսության. 05.08.2024
Статья отправлена на рецензию: 05.08.2024

The article is accepted for publication: 22.08.2024
Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության. 22.08.2024
Статья принята к печати: 22.08.2024