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1.1 INTRODUCTION

Although enduring in a military environment can be very demanding and stressful, most armed forces personnel adapt and adjust well to rigors of combat soldiering (Bartone, 2006). Research studies have reported that just living in a military environment can be overwhelming as it impinges on an individual’s overall functioning and tests human limits (Cotton, 2001; Moore, 2006). Yet, military research is replete with studies of combat soldiers and their strong spirit in overcoming all odds to survive in battle (Edwards, 1993; Newman, 1992). Researchers have found that preparing for combat is known to lessen stress and increase survivability during war, it is one of the most important activities in armed forces (Driskell & Olmstead, 1989; Jaiswal, 1997).

It is evident that several psychological factors are associated with combat. Since World War I, studies have focused attention on combat veterans (Cronin, 1998; Gal & Mangelsdorff, 1991; McGuire, 1990; Taylor & Alluisi, 1994; Yerkes, 1919). Physical harm involved in fighting a war manifests itself in death, disability, and destruction. It has been found that these may have psychological fallouts in form of war-psychosis, fear, apprehensions, uncertainty, and personality disorders during and after combat (Khan, 2000; Srivastava, 2006).

Despite rigorous military life which prepares for combat and culminates in soldiers’ skills, psychological factors affect cognitive and behavioral aspects of soldiers in an actual battlefield environment (Brooks, Byrne, & Hodson, 2001).
Negatively, it may create fear of death, boredom and isolation, shock, confusion, bewilderment, war-neurosis, and weariness. On the positive side, combat may bring loyalty, courage, patriotism, nationalism, morale, and leadership (Gruber, 2004, Labuc, 1991; Manning, 1991; Snow, 1984).

A glance at research in military psychology indicates that most of the studies have explored stress and combat stress reactions (Belenky, 1987; Dekaris et al., 1993; Holmes, Tariot, & Cox, 1998; Southwick et al., 1993). Many studies have been carried out on post traumatic stress disorder (Blake et al., 1990; Figley, 1985; Kulka et al., 1990; Weisenberg, Schwarzwald, & Solomon, 1991) and other problems occurring due to combat (Cronin, 1998; Gal & Mangelsdorff, 1991; Solomon, Openheimer, & Noy, 1986). Only a few studies have recorded positive outcomes due to experiencing combat (Bartone, 2005; Fontana & Rosenheck, 1998; Gal, 1987; Kishon-Barash, Midlarsky, & Johnson, 1996; Taylor, 1989).

India has fought many wars since independence and continues to experience low intensity conflict with anti-national elements in Jammu and Kashmir as well as in Manipur. However, only few studies have been done on armed forces personnel in relation to negative or positive outcome due to combat (Khan, 2000). Most studies have pertained to selection and recruitment processes. Training, task and work analysis, performance, and job satisfaction have been explored to an extent. Most of the research work is unpublished (Mitra, 1972; Narian, 1979; Parmar, 1999; Sinha, 1972).
Deployment of armed forces is increasing and duties of military personnel are becoming multifarious. This leads to increase in levels of stress and hence the area of study is crucial to the armed forces. Incidents of stress overload resulting in increased cases of suicide, homicide, fragging, and other maladaptive behavior among soldiers have been reported (Mehrotra, 2006; Misra, 2006; Singh, 2006c). Hence, it is found essential to undertake a scientific investigation to study few perceptual changes due to combat experience amongst serving armed forces personnel of Indian army.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The present research is aimed at studying stress in routine military life, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception amongst serving combat veterans. To assess these aspects, difference in perception of serving combat veterans injured in battle (CVI), serving combat veterans uninjured in battle (CVU), and other serving armed forces personnel of Indian army not initiated as yet into combat (who will be referred to as non-combat veterans (NCV)) will be found in the present study.

The present research also attempts to find difference among groups with reference to number of years of military service (0-10 years of military service and 11-20 years of military service respectively).
The present research also attempts to find difference among groups with reference to rank status (officer rank and personnel below officer rank).

1.3 **MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The study is based on following objectives:

1. To find out whether serving combat veterans injured in battle, serving combat veterans uninjured in battle, and other serving armed forces personnel not initiated as yet into combat differ with respect to stress in routine military life, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception.

2. To find out whether serving military personnel from range 0-10 years of military service and serving military personnel from range 11-20 years of military service differ with respect to stress in routine military life, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception.

3. To find out whether military personnel from officer rank differ from personnel below officer rank (PBOR) with respect to stress in routine military life, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception.

4. To find relationship between stress and coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception amongst serving combat veterans.
1.4 IMPORTANT CONCEPTS OF THE STUDY

1.4.1 Stress

Most researchers agree that an acceptable definition of stress is likely to be satisfactory only to its author (Abbott, 2001; Cox, 1980; Hinkle, 1987; Kahn & Byosiere, 1992). Researchers have expressed that stress is a part of human life from which no human being can escape (Cooper & Dewe, 2004; Jones & Bright, 2001; Steptoe, 2000; Wong, 2006). Experience of stress varies among individuals and is inevitable at sometime or other in one’s life (Lazarus & Cohen, 1977; Taylor, 2006).

Cox (1987) defined stress as perceived phenomenon arising from a comparison between demands on an individual and one’s ability to cope. An imbalance in this mechanism gives rise to experience of stress and to stress response. Stress may be defined as a real or interpreted threat to physiological or psychological integrity of an individual that results in physiological or behavioral responses (McEwen, 2000).

Selye (1976) emphasized nonspecificity of response to stress and considered a wide variety of environmental stressors, all producing a common specific pattern of bodily reactions. After Selye’s pioneering work, several researchers have studied stress since last few decades (Aldwin, 1999; Costa & McCrae, 1993; Hockey, 1997; Lazarus & Folkman, 1991; Monat & Lazarus, 1991; Pestonjee, 1987). The perspectives of these studies can be classified in
broad terms as physiological (Cannon, 1929, 1939; Cassidy, 1999; Cohen & Herbert, 1996; Evans, Clow, & Hucklebridge, 1997; Martin, 1984; Selye, 1976, 1983), psychological (Lazarus, 1991; Wolff, 1953) and social (House, Landis, & Umberson, 1988; Levine & Scotch, 1970; Major, Zubek, Cooper, Cozzarelli, & Richards, 1997; McLean, 1974; Pearlin, 1985; Smelser, 1963).

Although concept of stress has been a source of immense interest since past six decades (Doublet, 2000), it has steadily evolved over a period of time (Cassidy, 1999). Six types of models or theories of stress have been studied (Brooks et al., 2001; MacDonough, 1991): Stimulus-oriented, response-oriented, interactional, transactional, psychosocial and catastrophic. Stimulus-oriented theories regard stress as a potential residing within stimulus properties of an organism’s environment (Cox, 1987; Godwin, 1986; Hobfoll, 1989; Holmes & Masuda, 1974). According to response-oriented theory, it is an individual’s response to environmental events that defines presence of stress. Stress is defined entirely in terms of responses resulting from stress, such as physical mobilization (Kagan & Levi, 1975; Levi, 1984, 2002; Selye, 1980), cognitive disruption (Horowitz, 1990; Horowitz & Solomon, 1975), or behavioral disorganization (Greenberg, 1996). The interactional model emphasizes reciprocal interactions between an individual’s cognitive, perceptual, and emotional functions and characteristics of external environment (Derogates, 1982; French, Caplan, & van Harrison, 1982; Godwin, 1986; House, 1974; Lazarus & Launier, 1978; McGrath,

include alterations in information processing and attentional and memory functions, which may influence performance and decision-making capacity.

In conclusion, an individual’s functioning in an environment is determined by one’s psychological needs and demands as well as physical, social and cultural environment. When environmental demands exceed resources and capacities of person, individual experiences a state of imbalance. If this is not satisfactorily resolved, it results in stress.

1.4.2 Coping Resources

Stress leads to persistent efforts by an individual to cope with it. Coping is thus a response to stress. Physical and environmental demands causing stressful taxation on person’s resources are varied in nature. Besides personality factors, ability to cope with stress distinguishes one person from another.

Lazarus (1998) defined coping as “constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding resources of a person” (p. 201).

According to Taylor (2006), coping is a dynamic process and not a one time action that an individual takes. It is a set of responses, occurring over a period of time, by which environment and person influence each other.

Magill (1996) defined coping resources as “internal (such as knowledge) and external (such as social support) things that a person can utilize to cope with a stressful event” (p. 405). Hammer and Marting (1988) have stated coping
resources as “those resources which are inherent in individuals that enable them to handle stressors more effectively, to experience fewer or less intense symptoms upon exposure or to recover faster in stressful situation” (p. 2).

de Ridder (2000) defined coping resources as personal (e.g., self-esteem and sense of control) and social (e.g., social support) resources an individual has at one’s disposal to counter adverse effects of stress.

Coping behavior incorporates a wide array of aspects. Coleman (1971) suggested that coping is either fight or flight response and identified two classes of coping behaviour: task-oriented and defense-oriented. Task-oriented coping is aimed at meeting requirements of adjustive demands. This covers reactions like attack (e.g., aggression, resistance) and withdrawal (e.g., escape, avoidance). Defense-oriented reactions of a person are aimed at protecting oneself from psychological disorganization.

Research has shown that people who rely more on effective coping resources tend to adapt to life stressors and experience fewer psychological problems (Folkman & Lazarus, 1991; Greenglass, 1993; Ray, Lindop, & Gibson, 1988).

During past few decades, different forms of coping resources have been identified. Burke and Weir (1980) cited few of them: one may cope with stress by building work-group norms of cooperation and competition, devoting oneself fully to what one is doing, developing peer support and so on.
Gruber (2004) stated coping resources from psychosocial point of view. Psychosocial aspects of coping resources include social support, mattering and self-efficacy that buffer effects of stress. Social support is the physical and psychological comfort provided by one’s friends and family members (Antonucci, Lansford & Ajrouch, 2000; Major et al., 1997; Sarason, Sarason & Pierce, 1994). Mattering is defined as extent to which an individual considers oneself significant to others (Pearlin & LeBlanc, 2001; Rosenberg & McCullough, 1981; Schieman & Taylor, 2001). Self-efficacy is one’s belief in own capabilities to have motivation and cognitive resources needed to meet given situational demands (Bandura, Cioffi, Taylor, & Brouillard, 1988; Chan, 2002). However, few studies indicate that social support can also be a source of stress (Cohen & Syme, 1985; Morgan, 1989).

According to Taylor (2006), coping resources are termed as stress moderators since they modify how stress is experienced as well as the effects of stress. Moderators of stress experience may have an impact on stress itself, on the relation between stress and psychological responses, on the relation between stress and illness, or on the degree to which a stressful experience intrudes into other aspects of life.

In conclusion, people may use problem-focused action, social support, negotiation skills, humor, altruism and religiosity in dealing with stress (Aldwin, 2000). Researchers have stated that coping with stress involves genetic
predisposition, personality, prior experiences, social support, mattering and self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 1988; Bartone, 2006).

1.4.3 Altruism

Researchers have long been interested in altruistic dynamics within interpersonal relationships (Scheler, 1992). It has been reported that altruism is other-regarding part of human nature; people do have sentiments and sacrifice for others to whom they are not even related (Piliavin & Charng, 1990). Altruism has evolved to encompass a broad range of biological, motivational, cognitive, and social processes (Caporael, 2001; Dovidio & Penner, 2001; Eisenberg, 2000; Rushton & Sorrentino, 1981).

Aroson, Akert, and Wilson (1997) define altruism as any act performed with goal of benefiting another person. Altruism can be defined as “actions that provide benefit to others but have no obvious benefits for person who carries them out; it reflects an unselfish concern for welfare of others. Altruism can sometimes involve risk for one who helps” (Baron & Bryne, 2004, p. 389). Altruism includes any act that helps or is designed to help others, regardless of helper’s motives. It ranges over a continuum from most selfless acts of altruism to helpful acts motivated entirely by self-interest (Peplou, Sears, & Taylor, 1997).

Altruism involves relative emphasis on two factors: intentions and amount of benefit or cost to actor (Krebs, 1987). Most researchers emphasize motivational aspect of altruism and agree that altruistic behavior (a) must benefit another
person, (b) must be performed voluntarily, (c) must be performed intentionally, (d) benefit must be goal by itself, and (e) must be performed without expecting any external reward (Bar-Tal, 1986; Batson, 1998; Darley & Latane, 1970; Piliavin & Charng, 1990; Schroeder, Penner, Dovidio, & Piliavin, 1995).

According to few researchers who advocate evolutionary theory, altruism is innate (Batson, 1991; McAndrew, 2002; Preez, 1996; Pretson & deWaal, 2002; Rushton, 1991; Sober & Wilson, 1999). Other researchers call it learned social behavior that reduces fitness of altruist but increases average fitness in society. They report observational learning and modeling as determinants of altruism (Bandura, 1991; Berkowitz, 1987; Lipscomb, McAllister, & Bregman, 1985; Simon, 1990; Tyagi, 1997). According to them, altruistic models serve to (a) remind what is appropriate in a situation, (b) show how to be helpful, (c) reduce inhibitions against acting altruistically, and (d) inform about consequences of acting altruistically. Altruism can also be influenced and shaped by reinforcement contingencies; positive reinforcement promotes altruism (Moss & Page, 1972; Skinner, 1978). For other researchers, altruistic behavior emanates primarily from one’s perception of self in relation to others. This sets the domain of choice options an individual perceives as available, both empirically and morally (Monroe, 1996; Wilson, 1993). According to Rushton (1991), individuals with strongly altruistic tendencies are more empathic to feelings of others, better able to see world from their emotional and motivational perspective. Similar findings
have been reported by other researchers (Brown, Consedine, & Magai, 2005; Eisenberg, 2000; Grusec, Davidov, & Lundell, 2002; Losco, 1986; Zhou, Eisenberg, Losoya, Fabes, & Reiser, 2002). Other personal characteristics are also related to altruistic behavior (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

Certain complementary theories offer an explanation for altruism. Researchers who propound sociobiology theory of instincts and genes explain altruism in three general ways- kin selection i.e. preference towards those who share our genes (Burnstein, Crandall, & Kitayama, 1994; Euler & Weitzel, 1996; Krueger, 2003; Myers, 1983; Wang, 2002; Webster, 2003), reciprocity- people help others with an understanding that such behaviour will be reciprocated at certain point in future (Boster, Fediuk, & Kotowski., 2001; Cosmides & Tooby, 1992; Gintis, Bowles, Boyd, & Fehr, 2003; Johnson, 1990; Schroeder et al., 1995; Wedekind & Braithwaite, 2002) and ability to learn from other members of society and follow social responsibility norms (Cialdini, Baumann, & Kenrick, 1981; Forming, Allen, & Jensen, 1985; Grunberg, Maycock, & Anthony, 1985; Simon, 1990; Zarbatany, Hartmann, & Gelfand, 1985). According to other researchers, norm seems to affect behavior only under certain circumstances (Flippen, Hornstein, Siegal, & Weitzman, 1996; Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002; Vaes, Paladino, & Leyens, 2002; van Baaren, Holland, Kawakami, & van Knippenberg, 2004). According to social exchange theory of costs and
rewards of helping, much of what one does stems from ‘minmax’ strategy of our
desire to minimize our costs and maximize our rewards (Dovidio, Piliavin,
Gaertner, Schroeder, & Clark, 1991; Foa & Foa, 1975; Gueguen & De Gail, 2003;
Perlow & Weeks, 2002; Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981). It increases
likelihood of help in return and is an investment in future, social exchange being
that someone will help when one needs help. It can also relieve personal distress
of bystanders. Research evidence indicates that people are aroused and disturbed
when they see another person suffer and that they help to relieve their distress
(Clark, Ball, & Pape, 1991; Dovidio, 1984). By helping others, one can also gain
such rewards as social approval from others and increased feelings of self-worth.
Altruistic acts are doubly rewarding, in which they help both giver and recipient
of aid. Social researchers have found that several situational influences inhibit or
encourage altruistic behaviour (Batson, 1998; Batson et al., 1991; Clark et al.,
1991; Dovidio, 1984). Altruism has important implications for organizations
(Brief & Weiss, 2002; Finkelstein & Penner, 2004; Krueger, 2004; Penner, 2002;
Rioux & Penner, 2001; Wilson, 2000).

Some researchers theorize that altruism can establish or reinforce
perception of status differences between helpers and recipients and create a sense
of lower status, dependency and powerlessness among recipients (Bahr & Bahr,
To conclude, altruism refers to voluntary behaviour carried out to benefit another without anticipation of rewards from external resources and done for its own sake.

1.4.4 Religiosity

According to Albright and Ashbrook (2001), religion is among most powerful of all social forces and has been in existence as long as there have been human beings. It is a powerful enduring institution and a critical socializing agent across cultures and societies (Sharot, 2001). However, it means different things to different people. It may vary across religious affiliations, particularly in the content of teachings about divine authority, power and God’s will (Ellison, 1991; Ellison, Jason, David, & James, 2001; Ferraro & Kelley-Moore, 2000; Pargament, Sullivan, Balzer, van Haitsma, & Raymark, 1995; Schieman, Nguyen, & Elliott, 2003).

Researchers have shown increasing interest in studying religiosity in recent times (Miller, 1999). Research studies have been examining link between religion and psychological, physical, and interpersonal functioning (Emmons & McCullough 1999; Paloutzian & Kirkpatrick, 1995; Pargament, Koenig, & Perez, 2000).

According to Argyle & Beit-Hallahmi (1975), religiosity has been defined as “a system of beliefs in a divine or superhuman power, and practices of worship or other rituals directed towards such a power” (p.1).
Pargament (1997) found religiosity to be at intersection of the sacred and a search for the significant. According to the researcher, religiosity is defined as “a process, a search for significance in ways related to the sacred” (p. 32). These definitions all recognize sacred quality of some mysterious and great power that is beyond humanity, yet related to it.

According to many researchers, studies relating to religious practices indicate that behavioral dimensions of religiosity preached almost commonly by different religions include: (a) observing prayers or worshipping God (b) performing certain specific behavior from consideration of ethical good and bad (c) observing rituals with faith that there is life beyond death or world beyond this reality (d) observing sacrifice, tolerance, forgiveness, etc. as religious values (Beit-Hallahmi & Argyle, 1997; Stark, 2002).

In conclusion, religiosity indicates degree to which an individual can be identified as religious. Religiosity refers to having faith in a power beyond oneself whereby individual seeks to satisfy emotional need and gain stability of life, and which one expresses in acts of worship and service.

1.4.5 Self-perception

Researchers have reported that an individual’s perception of self is basic system in psychological processes which depends on individual’s relation to other individuals and general social processes. It has been reported that behavior of an individual is determined by one’s self-perception (Stevens, 1996; Weitlauf, Smith,
Self-perception is concerned with qualities of oneself; it also covers personal expectations of one's own effectiveness and competence (Riding & Ravner, 2001). Bergner (1985) identified self-perception as one of the dimensions of health.

Kleinke (1978) reviewed studies of self-perception and divided them into two categories: (a) perception and interpretation of bodily states, and (b) perception and interpretation of overt behavior. Research studies in first category deal with how people learn to experience emotions, conditions under which they recognize bodily needs and ways for dealing more effectively with anxiety, depression, and pain. These research studies showed how self-perceptions of emotions, motivation, attitudes, affection, and well-being are influenced by bodily messages and label people give to them. It has been found that people use self-relaxation, relabeling, and cognitive strategies to relate to their bodies in more adaptive ways (Goldfried & Trier, 1974; Lott & Lott, 1968; Maher, 1974; Schachter, 1964; Valins & Nsibette, 1971). The second category of research studies reviewed how people form attitudes, learn to be assertive or helpless, ways in which they perceive their lives as being under internal or external control, and reactions people have to success and failure. People form attitudes by observing their behavior and making attributions about causes of these behavioral patterns. Research has shown that it is possible to influence attitudes with environmental cues, false feedback about behavior, reinforcement
of behavior, and inducement to perform behavior that are discrepant and thereby produce dissonance (Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977; Bem, 1972; Mischel, 1973; Weiner et al., 1971).

According to Bandura et al. (1977), developing self control over overt behavior and strategies for adapting to bodily reactions can provide individuals with greater sense of control over their lives. An individual’s perceptions of self-efficacy may have strong influence on success in mastering new behavior, coping with aversive experiences, and remaining persistent in face of obstacles.

Kleinke (1978) studied self-perception of internal versus external control and found that it has an effect on conformity, personal effectiveness, achievement, social activism, personal adjustment, and reactions to success and failure.

According to some researchers, self-perception has important implication for stress and personality and has a protective buffering function (Rector & Roger, 1997; Roger, 1999).

To summarize, it can be said that self-perception is a source of self awareness and is an important factor in understanding human behavior.

1.5 **SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Combat experience is a unique opportunity and an acid test for culminating skills and military training that has been imparted cumulatively over the years to serving armed forces personnel. The present study investigates
serving combat veterans on certain aspects such as stress, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception in comparison with serving armed forces personnel not initiated as yet into combat.

The present study also examines difference in sub-groups based on number of years of military service and rank status. Thus, the study may provide informative data on various aspects of different groups of military personnel.

Data of this study would be very valuable for military experts and senior officers in armed forces for improving design and planning in military training and building higher resilience levels. Input provided by present study will also have immense potential and a wide range of application in any organization that deals with human resources working under stress and pressure of time and space.

This study will provide fundamental information about the experience and perceptions of serving combat veterans. Findings of this study may provide guidelines for selection and recruitment of personnel in armed forces as well as in other organizations. It may also give direction in imparting training and development to improve individual and collective skills to cope with intensely stressful situations and survive in an extremely difficult and demanding environment.
Limitations of study

The study does not consider intensity, multiplicity, and duration of combat experience of serving combat veterans. Further research could include these aspects.

Armed forces personnel with recent exposure to combat experience are posted in ‘live’ combat zone in Jammu and Kashmir as well as Manipur. However, this study is conducted in Pune city where the research has been carried out. The sample has not been taken from a ‘live’ combat zone which is a limitation of the study.

Like in most studies, methodology of data collection with exclusive use of self-report inventories has been a limiting factor in present study. Besides, rigorous controls exercised for getting precise results have placed a few restrictions in selection of the sample. These are:

a) Study has been limited to serving armed forces personnel posted in military cantonment of Pune city only.

b) Study includes only serving armed forces personnel and does not include retired armed forces personnel.

c) Study includes only those serving armed forces personnel who have less than 20 years of military service. Serving armed forces personnel with more than 20 years of military service have not been considered for present study despite the
fact that they have plenty of combat experience, especially in higher ranks in 
officer cadre.

d) Study does not include females although they are also serving in armed 
forces.

e) Study is limited to serving armed forces personnel from army only and 
does not include serving personnel from navy or air force.

Besides, research on other variables like leadership, morale, and 
motivation is also important but present research has focused only on stress, 
coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception amongst serving 
combat veterans.

1.6 **SUMMARY**

A large number of studies of human behaviour emanated after world wars 
and to that extent, psychology as a subject owes a great deal to military combat 
for its growth and development (Cronin, 1998; Khan, 2000).

Study of perceptual and behavioural changes, both positive and negative, 
in military personnel as a result of a large number of men having experienced 
combat has been a challenging issue for military researchers (Bartone, 1989; 

In present study, three major aspects are taken into consideration. Firstly, 
to study whether perception and experience of serving combat veterans injured in
battle, serving combat veterans uninjured in battle, and other serving armed forces personnel not initiated as yet into combat differ on certain important psychological aspects. Secondly, to also find out whether perception and experience of serving military personnel differ over number of years of military service (0-10 years and 11-20 years of military service respectively). Thirdly, to find out whether perception and experience of serving military personnel differ over rank status (officer rank and personnel below officer rank). The chapter defines important psychological concepts studied in present research. Scope and limitations of study have already been stated.

It is seen that military personnel dedicate their youthful life in service to the nation. A sizeable portion of these individuals experience combat with enemies of the nation during their military service, due to which perceptual as well as behavioural changes, both positive and negative, are likely to occur. These changes due to combat have a substantial significance to psychological research and an immense value to the nation they defend. Findings of this study may give an insight and help in better understanding perceptual and behavioral changes due to combat in serving combat veterans related to aspects of stress, coping resources, altruism, religiosity, and self-perception. Present study may also give certain information related to differences in psychological condition of serving armed forces personnel as a result of combat experience including injury in combat, number of years of military service, and rank status. Study may give
substantial information about serving combat veterans as well as information about other serving armed forces personnel not initiated as yet into combat from different categories. Knowledge of how serving combat veterans cope under severe condition of stress has important implications in psychological research and will be very useful in future not only for military personnel but also for general population by large.