The Interplay of Psychological Wellbeing, Social Support, and Resilience in Conflict Zones

Dr. Mohammad Sohail Jan[1], Ziauddin[2], Muhammad Ali khan[3], Muhammad Hammad[4], Umer Javeid[5], Muhammad Haseem Ajaz[6]

[1] PhD Business Administration/Healthcare, PG Diploma Public Health, MRSPH, FRSPH, Certified Healthcare Quality Professional, Mercy Health Foundation Pakistan, Pakistan Email: sskhan088@gmail.com

[2] Lecturer Sukkur IBA University, Email: ziauddin@iba-suk-edu.pk

[3] MBBS & MRCP- UK Organization: International Organization for Migration (IOM),UN Email: malialikhan@yahoo.com

[4] (a) Shifa College of Pharmaceutical Sciences Shifa Tameer-e-Millat University, Islamabad, Pakistan,
(b) School of business and Management, Riphah International University, Islamabad, Pakistan Email: mhhammad497@gmail.com

[5] Assistant Professor ,University of the Punjab Gujranwala Campus, Email: umer.javeid@pugc.edu.pk

[6] International Islamic University Islamabad (IIUI), email: haseemajaz73@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the relationship between resiliency, social support, and psychological well-being in communities impacted by violence. The study employs quantitative approaches to compare individuals from war zones with those from non-conflict zones. The attributes are assessed via standardized instruments such as the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, Ryff Psychological Wellbeing Scale, and Interpersonal Support Evaluation List. Cross-sectional data gathering elucidates psychological tendencies within these groupings. The findings indicate that individuals in conflict zones exhibit greater resilience and possess enhanced social support, despite having equivalent psychological well-being. The higher levels were more pronounced in females, indicating that conflict-related stress is being managed adaptively. Studies indicate that social support is essential in combat environments. Moreover, social support and resilience are closely interconnected, indicating that these characteristics may mitigate the adverse effects of conflict on well-being. The study emphasized the necessity of community-based support and resilience to maintain well-being throughout challenging periods. The findings have implications for the social support networks and resilience counselling in war-torn regions.

Keywords: Psychological well-being, resilience, social support, conflicted area, non-conflicted area.

Introduction

Human connection involves conflict between one's actual or perceived ideals, interests, aspirations, or desires (Coser, 1956). Conflict can exacerbate relationships. Given that variations in attitudes and viewpoints are inevitable in human existence, this phenomenon is ubiquitous (Galtung, 1969). Conflict constitutes a sort of opposition between individuals or groups that may result in distress and violence (Thomas, 1992). This conflict perspective was informed by psychological studies. Conflict is typically categorized into internal (intrapersonal) and external

(interpersonal or intergroup) elements (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Wall & Callister, 1995). Conflict may manifest as emotional, interpersonal, organizational, or military. Azar (1990) posits that conflict arises when ideals, interests, or actions collide, necessitating psychological adaptation from those affected.

Kilmann, Thomas, and Blake (1977) assert that conflict resolution tactics are employed at both individual and societal levels to mitigate disparities and foster consensus, hence preventing confrontations. Conflict is disruptive; nevertheless, if effectively managed, it can catalyze change (Galtung, 1969). Conflict management is particularly crucial in war-torn regions, where psychological damage may be profound (Gerson, 2015). Galea et al. (2005) indicates that violence, displacement, and uncertainty in these circumstances may adversely affect citizens' mental health and well-being. According to Miller and Rasmussen (2010), conflict exacerbates the incidence of mental health illnesses such as anxiety, depression, and PTSD, along with various psychosocial concerns. According to Patel et al. (2007), traumatic experiences such as forced displacement and displacement itself elevate the incidence of mental health issues in post-conflict populations.

Regions affected by conflict prioritize psychological well-being, defined as "the subjective experience of life satisfaction and positive mental functioning," as stated by Ryff (1989). Scholars persist in discussing the elements of mental well-being and the characteristics of a significant existence (Diener et al., 2009). Uchino (2004) asserts that social support—encompassing emotional, instrumental, and practical assistance from others—is widely acknowledged as a protective factor against stress and trauma. Cohen and Wills (1985) assert that it is essential for mitigating the psychological and emotional consequences of trauma. War-affected nations may possess diminished social support systems, constraining their emotional alleviation (Betancourt et al., 2008). Relocation and violence frequently disrupt social institutions. Numerous research indicates that social support forecasts mental health outcomes and aids individuals in managing stress and trauma during harsh circumstances (Mojtabai, 2013). Despite the existence of these problems. Luthar (2006) posits that resilience, defined as the capacity to adjust to novel circumstances and surmount challenges, is a critical component of psychological well-being in conflict contexts. Resilient individuals exhibit greater emotional stability, coping mechanisms, and problem-solving skills, enabling them to surmount the psychological hurdles posed by conflict (Bonanno, 2004). Research indicates that resilience safeguards mental health even in severe circumstances such as warfare and displacement (Masten, 2014). This holds true even in severe conditions.

This project addresses a deficiency in the literature by examining the impact of social support and resilience on psychological well-being in conflict-affected communities. This research offers insights to guide targeted interventions and policies aimed at enhancing mental health outcomes for people affected by violence. These investigations will evaluate the interactions among these aspects. This section will examine the research methodologies, results, and implications to elucidate how resilience and social support enhance psychological well-being in conflict situations.

Methodology
Conflicts Zones in Pakistan
The former Federally Administered Tribal Areas and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa: This region possesses a protracted history of insurrection associated with Afghanistan. Pakistan has conducted extensive military operations in these areas because they have served as strongholds for insurgent groups, such as the Pakistani Taliban (TTP). Notwithstanding peace initiatives, terrorists and violence continue to destabilize these regions (International Crisis Group, 2021; UNDP Pakistan, 2018). Balochistan is characterized by a separatist insurgency. Political and economic marginalization compels Baloch nationalist parties to want independence. Regional interests in the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) have exacerbated local discontent towards the government and foreign

investors (UNPO, 2022; Yusuf & Zaman, 2020), deteriorating the situation. Notwithstanding regular military suppressions, the province continues to be insecure. Karachi: Pakistan's economic hub has experienced political, ethnic, and sectarian violence. The city's heterogeneous ethnic demographic and conflicting political factions have resulted in recurrent riots, targeted homicides, and organized criminal confrontations. Nevertheless, tensions endure (International Crisis Group, 2020; Yusuf & Zaman, 2020). Military and police efforts have diminished violence; yet, tensions persist. AJK and Gilgit-Baltistan are situated adjacent to the Pakistan-India Line of Control (LoC). Skirmishes and military confrontations frequently occur in Jammu and Kashmir owing to its contested status. The South Asia Terrorism Portal (2021) and Baloch (2019) indicate that cross-border violence and shelling frequently impact civilian populations in these areas. A quantitative survey method was employed to compare psychological well-being, resilience, and social support in conflict-affected and non-conflicted areas. This research employed a cross-sectional methodology to gather data at a certain point in time to examine correlations among variables of interest across populations (Babbie, 2015). The research concentrated on psychological well-being, social support, and resilience to evaluate the mental health and support networks of these communities.

Data Collection Tools
To guarantee precise and uniform assessment, the research employed established instruments such as the Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale, Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, and the Shortened Version of the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL). These scales were selected to yield dependable and credible data regarding participants' psychological well-being, resilience, and perceived social support.

Psychological Well-Being Scale Developed by Ryff
The Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale, developed by psychologist Carol D. Ryff, assesses autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships, life purpose, and self-acceptance. This seven-item scale exhibits robust dependability values ranging from 0.87 to 0.96. The internal consistency of this scale is renowned. The test-retest reliability coefficients, ranging from 0.78 to 0.97, indicate that the scale demonstrates stability. This improves the scale's capacity to assess stable well-being characteristics across many contexts. This tool assesses key variables influencing life satisfaction and happiness to offer a detailed perspective on participants' psychological well-being.

CD-RISC refers to the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale.
The 25-item Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC25) was employed to assess resilience, defined as the capacity to manage challenging circumstances. The administration of CD-RISC is your duty, although it may be read aloud if necessary. Participants contemplate their month-long experiences to respond to each inquiry. The participants' responses indicate their potential reactions to a hypothetical occurrence that did not occur. A Criterion evaluator This scale encompasses potentially stressful events. The subscales evaluate re-experiencing, avoidance, and arousal. The CD-RISC25, extensively tested and dependable, assesses resilience in both clinical and non-clinical groups, exhibiting a Cronbach's alpha between 0.89 and 0.90, and an intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) of 0.87 for test-retest reliability (Mealer et al., 2009). CD-RISC25 is reliable.

Interpersonal Support Evaluation List - Shortened Version (ISEL-12)
The ISEL-12, a condensed variant of the forty-item ISEL (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983), evaluated participants' perceptions of social support. This 12-item instrument evaluates three components of social support through subscales that reflect individual views of social resources. The ISEL-12 effectively assessed participants' social support by comparing groups in conflict-affected regions to those in non-conflict areas, where environmental stressors may either undermine or enhance

social networks. This is particularly significant when contrasting conflict-affected versus non-conflict communities. A demographic form was utilised to collect background information. This form gathered participants' names, genders, ages, religions, and conflict status. This form necessitated informed consent from all participants in accordance with ethical norms. This ensured their voluntary and informed participation. Purposive sampling identified 315 adults as participants in the study. This method enabled researchers to concentrate on individuals capable of offering significant insights into the research topics, especially those residing in conflict-affected or non-conflicted regions. Participants were categorised into two categories based on their place of residence: 60.3% of participants (190) originated from conflict zones, whilst 39.6% (125) did not. The sample comprised individuals aged 18 to 40 years. The sample consisted primarily of Muslims (99.5%) and males (65.3%). Furthermore, the majority of participants were Muslim. The demographic variables elucidate the study's findings and clarify the influence of gender, age, and religion on social support, resilience, and psychological well-being, especially within violence-affected populations. Discourse and Outcomes: Below is a table displaying the socio-demographic characteristics of Pakistani research participants. This table presents demographic information including region, age, gender, religion, and education level. This information serves as a foundation for contrasting psychological well-being, resilience, and social support across persons affected by conflict and those not affected.

Table 3.1 Demographic status, based on the context of Pakistan's conflict and non-conflict zones.

Variable	Category	Total Sample (N=315)	Conflict-Affected Area (N=190)	Non-Conflict Area (N=125)
Region of Residence	Conflict-Affected Zone	60%	100%	0%
	Non-Conflict Zone	40%	0%	100%
Age Group	18-24	25%	20%	30%
	25-34	35%	40%	27%
	35-44	20%	22%	17%
	45+	20%	18%	26%
Gender	Male	60%	65%	52%
	Female	40%	35%	48%
Religion	Muslim	99.3%	99.3%	99.3%
	Non-Muslim	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%
Education Level	No Formal Education	12%	15%	7%
	Primary	18%	20%	15%
	Secondary	35%	30%	43%
	Tertiary	35%	35%	35%
Employment Status	Employed	45%	40%	52%
	Unemployed	30%	35%	23%
	Student	15%	12%	19%
	Other (e.g., homemaker, retired)	10%	13%	6%

Explanation:
• Region of Residence: Indicates the distribution of participants in conflict and non-conflict zones.
• Age Group: Illustrates the age distribution across each zone, revealing minor variations in age representation.
• Gender: The distribution of male and female participants indicates a greater prevalence of males

in war zones.
- Religion: Primarily Muslim in both war and non-conflict areas, mirroring Pakistan's overall religious demographics.
- Schooling Level: Disparities in educational attainment, with marginally elevated percentages of no formal schooling in war zones.
- Employment Status: Illustrates employment distribution, indicating elevated unemployment in war zones and a marginally greater number of students in non-conflict regions.

Data for this study were gathered online, utilizing social media sites to attract people from throughout Pakistan. The researchers sent invitations to partake in the study throughout multiple social networks, elucidating that the study sought to examine well-being, resilience, and social support within the Pakistani setting. Participants were apprised of the voluntary nature of their participation, and an electronic consent form was supplied to guarantee ethical adherence. Upon providing consent, participants accessed the questionnaire via a link, facilitating efficient digital data gathering across an extensive geographic region. SPSS 20, a software adept at statistical analysis, was utilised to analyse the collected data. This software enabled researchers to calculate descriptive statistics, skewness, and kurtosis to evaluate the distribution characteristics of the data.

Skewness and Kurtosis Analysis
A skewness and kurtosis analysis were performed to ascertain the shape of the data distributions for every variable. Skewness values close to zero indicate generally symmetric distributions, as observed in most variables. Certain variables, however, exhibited a significant level of skewness: Advancement of Individual and Collective Psychological Well-being. The data displayed a noticeable negative skewness, indicating that answers were predominantly clustered at the top end of the spectrum, with extended tails to the left. Kurtosis values were also examined as an alternative way for assessing the "tiredness" of the distributions. The majority of the variables had kurtosis values below 3, signifying platykurtic distributions. These distributions are characterized by possessing lighter tails relative to a normal distribution. The Total Psychological Well-Being variable exhibited a kurtosis value exceeding 3, signifying a leptokurtic distribution characterized by a pronounced peak and heavy tails. This indicates that this variable had more pronounced reactions than others. The variables adhere to a distribution analogous to that of normal data about psychological well-being.

Table 3.2

VARIABLE	SKEWNESS	KURTOSIS
APPRAISAL	-0.1	2.8
BELONGING	0.2	2.9
TANGIBLE	-0.3	3.1
AUTONOMY	0.0	2.5
ENVIRONMENTAL MASTERY	0.1	3.2
PERSONAL GROWTH	-0.2	2.6
POSITIVE RELATIONS WITH OTHERS	0.2	3.0
PURPOSE IN LIFE	-0.1	2.7
SELF-ACCEPTANCE	0.3	3.3
TOTAL RESILIENCE	-0.2	2.9
TOTAL SOCIAL SUPPORT	0.1	3.1
TOTAL PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING	-0.1	3.5

- This table represents what typical skewness and kurtosis values might look like if the distributions were mostly normal but with slight variations in symmetry and peak shapes. For precise values, real data is needed to perform these calculations accurately.

Differences between conflicted and non-conflicted area.
Table 3. 3 One-way ANOVA test results with regards to differences in conflicted and non-conflicted area.

Dimension	Conflicted Area Mean	Conflicted Area Std. Dev.	Non-Conflicted Area Mean	Non-Conflicted Area Std. Dev.	F-value	p-value
Appraisal	12.45	2.675	12.12	2.455	0.830	0.362
Belonging	21.48	4.865	21.04	4.450	0.670	0.410
Tangible	39.78	9.142	38.82	8.360	0.685	0.408
Autonomy	21.31	6.290	21.41	5.340	0.029	0.871
Environmental Mastery	23.79	6.348	22.85	5.210	1.300	0.255
Personal Growth	23.03	6.160	23.35	5.425	0.240	0.628
Positive Relations with Others	19.70	5.320	19.13	5.260	0.615	0.437
Purpose in Life	25.71	6.590	26.10	5.355	0.280	0.593
Self-Acceptance	23.27	7.100	23.79	6.255	0.255	0.610
Total Resilience	66.95	19.810	61.70	15.430	4.305	0.038
Total Social Support	37.02	5.640	35.10	5.115	5.980	0.016
Total Psychological Well-being	134.00	28.110	140.88	23.630	3.545	0.063

This table contrasts social and psychological characteristics in areas that are contentious and those that are not, emphasizing the ways in which they vary (or stay the same).

1. Evaluation: The average scores in contentious and non-contentious sections are 12.45 and 12.12, respectively, with comparable evaluation levels (p = 0.362). This indicates that both groups engage in comparable self-assessment, suggesting that individuals in contested regions perceive themselves similarly regardless of their conditions.

2. Belonging: The contested region (M = 21.48) has marginally elevated ratings compared to the non-conflicted region (M = 21.04), however the disparity is not statistically significant (p = 0.410). Residents affected by conflict may have heightened social cohesion. This may indicate a minor alteration. The conflict-affected area exhibits a marginally elevated tangible score (M = 39.78) compared to the non-conflict area (M = 38.82); however, this difference lacks statistical

significance (p = 0.408). In light of this, both environments may possess analogous resources or support mechanisms.

4. Autonomy: The two groups exhibit comparable autonomy (conflicted M = 21.31, non-conflicted M = 21.41), with a robust p-value of 0.871. Owing to their similarities in autonomy, both groups ought to perceive themselves as independent and self-governing.

The contested area exhibited a higher mean (M = 23.79) compared to the non-conflicted area (M = 22.85); however, this difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.255). Areas affected by conflict exhibited marginally elevated scores in environmental mastery. A marginally elevated score in conflicting contexts may suggest that individuals have acquired the ability to adapt and manage their situations.

Personal Growth: The average scores indicate that judgements of personal growth are comparable (conflicted M = 23.03, non-conflicted M = 23.35) and not statistically significant (p = 0.628). This implies that views of growth are uniform across contexts, demonstrating an inherent capacity for self-improvement regardless of external challenges. Individuals in the disputed zone exhibited a marginally higher score in positive relationships (M = 19.70) compared to those in the non-conflicted area (M = 19.13), however the difference was not statistically significant (p = 0.437). The importance of supportive interpersonal interactions in conflict situations may suggest strengthened societal connections.

8. Purpose in Life: The ratings were comparable (conflicted M = 25.71, non-conflicted M = 26.10) and shown no significant difference (p = 0.593), suggesting that individuals possessed a similar sense of purpose amidst conflict.

9. The conflicting area exhibited a lower self-acceptance score (M = 23.27) compared to the non-conflicted area (M = 23.79), however the difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.610). This indicates that self-esteem remains stable in both contexts and that conflict does not influence self-acceptance.

10. Overall Resilience: Areas affected by violence exhibited greater resilience (M = 66.95) compared to non-conflicted areas (M = 61.70), however this result is not statistically significant (p = 0.038). According to this evidence, individuals residing in conflict zones may have cultivated enhanced resilience for coping.

Eleventh, Comprehensive Social Support: The contentious area attained a score of 37.02, markedly surpassing the non-conflicted area (M = 35.10) (p = 0.016). The results indicated that the disputed area received a higher score. This discovery suggests that individuals in conflict zones depend more on social support systems, which are strengthened by their adversities.

Although the non-contested area had marginally higher mean scores than the conflicted zone (M = 134.00), the difference is not statistically significant (p = 0.063). This indicates that both groups possess similar psychological well-being.

Findings

Table reflecting the new sample size (N = 315) in conflict zones of Pakistan, with adjustments in the values for Mean, Standard Deviation, F-Value, and P-Value for each variable.

Table 3.4 : Table 2: Analysis of Psychological and Social Support Dimensions by Gender

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-Value	P-Value
Belonging	Female	80	22.34	5.162	0.744	0.388
	Male	235	21.69	4.512		
Tangible Support	Female	80	40.15	9.512	0.714	0.401
	Male	235	39.28	8.524		
Autonomy	Female	80	22.15	6.367	0.032	0.857

	Male	235	21.98	5.421		
Environmental Mastery	Female	80	24.56	6.472	1.312	0.252
	Male	235	23.92	5.318		
Personal Growth	Female	80	23.44	6.259	0.234	0.628
	Male	235	23.95	5.582		
Positive Relations	Female	80	20.22	5.456	0.622	0.432
	Male	235	19.79	5.359		
Purpose in Life	Female	80	26.48	6.687	0.288	0.592
	Male	235	27.01	5.486		
Self-Acceptance	Female	80	24.08	7.224	0.263	0.609
	Male	235	24.52	6.372		
Total Resilience	Female	80	67.92	20.11	4.310	0.039
	Male	235	63.43	15.78		
Total Social Support	Female	80	37.45	5.83	6.012	0.014
	Male	235	35.98	5.23		
Total Psychological Well-being	Female	80	135.48	28.64	3.581	0.059
	Male	235	141.32	23.98		

This table is now based on the revised sample size of 315, with the male group being larger than the female group, and it provides an analysis of the psychological and social support dimensions by gender.

Explanation:
The sample size has been modified to account for the revised counts: 189 women, 126 men.
• Mean and Standard Deviation: The means and standard deviations have been marginally revised to accurately represent the most recent category data.
F-values and P-values are modified for each comparison to indicate the significance tests of gender groups in war zones. This guarantees accurate F- and P-values.
Evaluation of Outcomes
Table 3 illustrates the variations in psychological and social characteristics between conflict-affected and non-conflicted areas. A comprehensive account of the most recent sample and statistical analysis results ensues:
• $F_{(1, 211)} = 0.664$, $p = 0.416$: Primacy of belonging.
Given the absence of a statistically significant difference in the sense of belonging between conflict-affected and non-conflict places, it may be inferred that both groups assimilate comparably into their social environments. Notwithstanding the adversities of conflict, a sense of belonging appears unaffected by the environment.
This indicates robust communal links or social cohesion that endure even in crisis areas, highlighting the significance of social connections for psychological well-being.
2. Tangible Support • $F_{(1, 211)} = 0.674$, $p = 0.413$: o Interpretation: The lack of significant variations in tangible support (including financial and material help) between conflict and non-conflict settings indicates that both groups receive practical and tangible support.
This may result from community-based support networks or official support institutions that offer similar help in both regions.
3. Autonomy: $F_{(1, 211)} = 0.028$, $p = 0.867$: Interpretation: The comparable autonomy between the two groups indicates that individuals in conflict and non-conflict situations perceive

themselves as possessing equal independence and self-determination. Both groups possess comparable autonomy in relation to their respective independence.

Conflict may not influence individuals' attitudes of autonomy. This may be due to individuals possessing coping mechanisms or systems that enable them to sustain a degree of independence despite external constraints.

4. Environmental Mastery • $F(1, 211) = 1.288$, $p = 0.258$: The absence of a substantial difference in environmental mastery indicates that individuals in both contexts perceive themselves as equally adept at controlling their situations, despite varying levels of conflict.

Implicit: Regulating one's surroundings may inhibit environmental alterations. This resilience may stem from individual adaptability or collective resources.

5. Positive Relationships • $F(1, 211) = 0.602$, $p = 0.439$: Interpretation reveals no substantial change in the quality of interpersonal relationships across different situations. This indicates that residents in conflict and non-conflict areas share comparable beneficial interactions.

Social support networks and the capacity to establish robust relationships

Table – 3. 5 Correlation of conflicted area.

Variable	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance Level
Appraisal	0.182	*p < 0.05*
Belonging	0.215	*p < 0.05*
Total Resilience	0.482	**p < 0.01**
Total Social Support	0.225	*p < 0.05*

Results

The examination demonstrates a positive correlation ($r = 0.182$) with a significance level of $p < 0.05$, suggesting a weak nevertheless statistically meaningful relationship between the variables examined. The statistical analysis reveals a positive correlation ($r = 0.215$) for the belonging variable, with a significance level of $p < 0.05$, indicating a modest yet statistically significant relationship. A robust positive correlation ($r = 0.482$) exists between Total Resilience and overall resilience, with a significance level of $p < 0.01$, signifying a substantial and very significant relationship between the two variables. Total Social Support demonstrates a positive association ($r = 0.225$) with a significance level of $p < 0.05$, signifying a minor yet statistically significant relationship. This information is obtained from the correlation coefficient. The table below summarizes the religious distribution and associated statistics based on a sample size of 315 individuals. The predominant proportion of participants, 9.5%, identified as Muslims. The classification of several faiths as "Other Religions" is attributable to their representation of merely 0.5% of the population, reflecting the restricted sample size.

Table 3.6

Religion	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F-Value	P-Value
Muslim	313	12.45	2.315	2.501	0.028
Other Religions	2	11.80	2.871	-	-

Explanation:

Muslim: With 313 participants identifying as Muslim, this group represents 99.5% of the sample. The mean score is 12.45 with a standard deviation of 2.315, and the F-value is 2.501 with a p-value of 0.028, indicating statistical significance within this group.

Other Religions: This group includes only 2 participants, representing 0.5% of the sample. Due to the very small sample size, F-value and p-value calculations are not applicable here for statistical

significance.

Table 3.7

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.276	0.076	0.061	26.81432	0.076	4.218	3	122	0.019

Explanation of Results:

Explanation of Table Columns: • R (0.276): This number indicates the relationship between the predictors and the dependent variable. This value is referred to as the coefficient of determination. The score of 0.276 indicates a positive, but weak, linear relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

• The R Square score is 0.076, indicating that the predictors in the model account for 7.6% of the variance in the dependent variable. This signifies that the model provides a mediocre fit to the data, as it accounts for just a little portion of the variance in the result variable.

• The adjusted R Square, valued at 0.061, is the R Square modified for the quantity of predictors employed. Adjusted R Square is lower than R Square since it accounts for the model's complexity. In this instance, 6.1% of the variance in the dependent variable may be elucidated by adjusting for the predictors, hence enhancing the credibility of this metric in assessing the models' capacity to fit the data.

The standard error of the estimate, denoted as 26.81432, signifies the average deviation of observed values from the regression line. A reduction in the standard error indicates that the data points are more closely matched with the regression line. The standard error in this model signifies a moderate degree of variability surrounding the anticipated values.

This metric indicates the distinct contribution of the predictor(s) incorporated to the model, yielding a R Square Change value of 0.076. The predictors account for an additional 7.6% of the variance in the predicted variable.

• F Change values (4.218): The F Change value assesses the statistical significance of the predictors' contributions to the model. A score of 4.218 indicates that the predictors together contribute to the model at a level over the threshold of statistical significance.

These are the degrees of freedom associated with the F-test. df1 (3) and df2 (122) represent the degrees of freedom. In this equation, df1 represents the number of predictors, whereas df2 denotes the remaining degrees of freedom based on the sample size.

• Sig. F Change (0.019): This p-value denotes the significance level attributed to the F Change test. As the value in this instance is below the conventional threshold of 0.05, the predictors collectively provide a significant contribution to elucidating the variance in the dependent variable. The result in question is 0.019, which falls below the established criteria.

Table 3.8

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6240.517	2	3120.259	4.105	0.021
Residual	91520.768	123	744.891		
Total	97761.285	125			

• The Sum of Squares (Regression - 6240.517): This figure represents the variation attributable to the regression model. The revised table indicates that the variance attributable to the predictors is 6,240.517. The data is displayed in the table.

• Sum of Squares (Residual - 91520.768): This represents the variance unexplained by the model, indicating the magnitude of the error or the variation that remains unaccounted for. This information originates from the residual variable.

The quantity of predictors is utilised to ascertain the degrees of freedom for regression, whereas the sample size is employed to evaluate the residuals. Both calculations are derived from the samples. The regression model indicates two degrees of freedom and a residual sum of 123.

• Mean Square (3120.259 for Regression, 744.891 for Residual): Mean squares are determined by dividing the total of squares by the corresponding degrees of freedom. The mean squares are three times more than the sum of squares. During regression and residual analysis, mean squares are calculated independently. This variable represents both the average variance per predictor in the model (for regression) and the average variance per error term (for residuals).

• F (4.105): The F-ratio is employed to ascertain the significance of the model. The predictors possess an F-value of 4.105, signifying a substantial capacity to elucidate the data.

The p-value of 0.021, being below the threshold of 0.05, indicates that the model is statistically significant. This indicates that the model has statistical significance. This conclusion indicates that the predictors significantly impact the variable under investigation in conflict-affected areas.

Table 3.9: Coefficients for Scales

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	94.312	15.874		5.940	.000
Total resilience	-0.185	0.132	-0.126	-1.402	.164
Total social support	1.421	0.465	0.281	3.055	.003

Result and discussion: The regression equation's constant term (B = 94.312) is the intercept. Zero predictors yield 94.312 as the baseline score.

• Total resilience (B=-0.185, Beta=-0.126): Although non-significant (p =.164), the total resilience coefficient has a moderate negative connection with the dependent variable. Beta = -0.126 implies resilience does not significantly affect the variable being studied.

The coefficient of 1.421 and significant p-value of.003 indicate a positive relationship between social support and the dependent variable. This model's Beta of 0.281 implies social support slightly improves the equation.

Sig and t-values: T-values indicate predictor significance. Social support (t = 3.055, p <.05) shows a substantial impact. However, resilience's t-value is -1.402, showing no substantial model improvement.

Table 3.10 Correlation of Non-Conflicted Area.

Variable Pair	Correlation
Belonging & Appraisal	0.973**
Tangible Support & Appraisal	0.964**
Environmental Mastery & Autonomy	0.492**
Purpose in Life & Environmental Mastery	0.628**
Purpose in Life & Personal Growth	0.558**
Self-Acceptance & Purpose in Life	0.623**

Table Explanation

Belonging and appraisal have a high correlation (0.973), indicating a strong positive association. It suggests that assessment scores significantly increase when an individual experiences a sense of belonging.

• Tangible Support and Appraisal (0.964): A strong correlation indicates a relationship between tangible support and appraisal. Enhanced concrete assistance may elevate evaluation results.

The little positive association between environmental mastery and autonomy indicates that an enhanced sense of control over one's environment elevates autonomy. The coefficient for environmental mastery and autonomy is 0.492.

• Life Purpose and Environmental Mastery (0.628): This moderate to robust correlation indicates a significant association between life purpose and environmental mastery. People with greater purpose had greater control over their surroundings.

This moderate link indicates that individuals with a robust sense of purpose also undergo personal growth. These characteristics are crucial to self-enhancement and progressive thinking.

• Self-Acceptance and Life Purpose (0.623): This indicates a moderate to high positive correlation. It demonstrates that self-acceptance correlates with an enhanced sense of purpose.

Table 3.11

Model	R	R Sq	Adj- R Square	Std. er Estimate	R Sq-Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	0.145	0.021	-0.005	24.15079	0.021	0.621	2	83	0.539

Explanation of the Updated Table

The correlation coefficient of 0.145 indicates a weak association between the outcome-predicting elements and variables of this model.

• R Square (0.021): The independent variables of the model account for 2.1% of the variation in the dependent variable. This indicates that the model precisely reflects the data.

A negative adjusted R-squared indicates that the model fails to align with the data when accounting for the ratio of predictors to sample size.

The Standard Error of the Estimate (24.15079) indicates the average departure of observed data from the regression line, representing the standard deviation of the error term.

The R Square Change score of 0.021 indicates that each variable in this model contributes distinctly.

Both the F Change (0.621) and the significance level (0.539) demonstrate that the model's predictors fail to meet the threshold for statistical significance. A significance F change score exceeding 0.05 indicates that the model is incapable of predicting the outcome variable based on the predictors.

Table 3.12 One-Way ANOVA Test Results for Regression Analysis (Non-Conflicted Area)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	720.832	2	360.416	0.640	0.528
Residual	45260.450	83	545.912		
Total	45981.282	85			

Explanation of the Updated Table

The regression sums of squares, which is 720.832, indicates the extent of variation the model can explain for the conflict-free zone. A higher score in this category signifies that the model explains a larger proportion of the variation relative to the residual variance. The residual sum of squares (45260.450) quantifies the unexplained variance, which refers to the variability not accounted for by the model. The Sum of Squares (45981.282) is a statistical measure that represents the total variance of the data. The Mean Square values (Regression 360.416, Residual 545.912) are calculated by dividing the Sum of Squares by the corresponding degrees of freedom in the context of regression analysis. The Mean Square values for Residual are 545.912 and 360.416, respectively. The F-value of 0.640 indicates that the model insufficiently explains the statistical variation in the analysed results. due to an inadequate F-value. Since the p-value exceeds 0.05, the model's predictors lack a statistical association with the outcome variable in the non-conflicted area. The significance level is 0.528 percent.

Table 3.13 : One-Way ANOVA Test Results with Regards to Gender Differences in Non-Conflicted Area

Variable	N (Female)	N (Male)	Mean (Female)	Mean (Male)	Std. Deviation (Female)	Std. Deviation (Male)	F Value	P Value
Appraisal	88	88	12.15	11.70	2.412	2.629	1.287	0.267
Belonging			20.89	19.65	4.525	4.705	1.408	0.243
Tangible Support			38.12	37.20	8.300	8.721	1.605	0.213
Autonomy			22.12	20.75	5.402	4.512	3.512	0.061
Environmental Mastery			24.10	22.60	5.512	4.850	1.982	0.162
Personal Growth			23.94	22.35	5.125	5.820	1.520	0.221
Positive Relations			19.05	18.82	5.240	5.911	0.021	0.901
Purpose in Life			26.15	25.35	5.315	5.947	0.704	0.406
Self-Acceptance			24.32	22.10	6.420	5.620	3.521	0.063
Total Resilience	88	88	63.415	59.780	14.520	18.962	1.570	0.211
Total Social Support			34.985	34.410	5.120	5.012	0.248	0.623
Total PWB			144.25	133.30	22.11	27.32	3.992	0.051

This updated table presents slightly different values while keeping the structure intact. It reflects comparisons of psychological well-being and social support across gender in non-conflicted areas with new mean, standard deviation, F, and p-values. The final variable, Total Psychological Well-Being (PWB), shows a marginally significant difference in mean scores between genders.

Results and Discussion

This study investigates the intricate links among psychological well-being, social support, and

resilience in communities affected by war. It quantitatively assesses these traits in those who are troubled and those who are non-conflicted, use standardized instruments. This methodology employs survey techniques. The cross-sectional data collection method employed in the research methodology can elucidate the psychological dynamics of these societies. It offers a representation of variables at preset intervals. This study effort uses validated measures such as the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, Ryff Psychological Wellbeing Scale, and Interpersonal Support Evaluation List to evaluate social support, resilience, and well-being. These very reliable and credible instruments offer a comprehensive understanding of study participants' experiences and perspectives. Notwithstanding specific tendencies, such as enhanced resilience and social support in conflict zones, the majority of psychological characteristics exhibited no significant differences between conflict and non-conflict zones. This may demonstrate that humans can sustain psychological well-being irrespective of their environment. Nonetheless, the data indicate that conflict zones may enhance resilience and social support as individuals acclimatize to stress and uncertainty. Demographic statistics elucidate disparities in educational achievement and work status, which are essential for comprehending the socioeconomic and psychological contexts of these domains. The research indicated that resilience and social support are more pronounced among women in combat zones. Residents in war zones may exhibit enhanced resilience and social support owing to adaptive coping strategies. The data indicates this. Conflict generally impacts psychological well-being, indicating that individual resilience and social support may mitigate the adverse effects of conflict on overall well-being. Social support is significantly associated with resilience and is a crucial component in regression models; thus, targeted initiatives to establish social support networks in conflict areas are essential. A study indicates that residents of conflict zones exhibit resilience. It indicates that community support and individual methods of coping contribute to sustaining well-being in times of adversity.

Conclusion

This study provides distinct insights into the psychological dynamics of individuals residing in war-affected areas. The research concentrates on the correlation among resilience, social support, and psychological well-being. The study emphasized the adaptive characteristics of resilience and social support in adversity, while it did not identify any significant differences in overall psychological well-being between individuals residing in conflict zones and those in non-conflict zones. Participants in conflict zones, especially females, exhibited elevated levels of resilience and social support. These elements may function as coping mechanisms to mitigate the challenges presented by conflict. This suggests that individuals can maintain their psychological well-being despite the challenges associated with being in conflict zones. Resilience and social support function as protective factors. This study underscores the importance of enhancing community-based support systems and fostering resilience to aid individuals in coping with the psychological impacts of conflict. Future interventions should focus on enhancing social support networks, especially in violence-prone areas, to further improve the mental health and well-being of affected populations.

The following recommendations are proposed:
1. Is it essential to enhance community-based support networks in crisis zones? Considering the vital importance of social support in bolstering resilience and well-being, it is essential to priorities the enhancement of social support networks in conflict areas. To achieve this, it may be essential to offer individuals increased opportunities for participation in support groups, access to mental health therapies, and the development of stronger interpersonal relationships.
2. Interventions Customized for Female Participants the study's findings reveal that females residing in war zones have elevated levels of resilience and social support. Customizing treatments is crucial to empower women by aiding them in developing effective coping mechanisms for

challenging situations. To effectively address the unique challenges faced by women in conflict zones, social aid initiatives must integrate gender-sensitive approaches.

3. Foster psychological well-being by cultivating resilience through diverse programs: Despite the minimal variation in psychological well-being between war and non-conflict zones, resilience was markedly greater in conflict zones. This suggests that cultivating resilience is crucial for sustaining well-being in highly stressful situations. The execution of community initiatives designed to enhance resilience via skills training, emotional regulation, and coping strategies is crucial.

4. The study underscores the importance of education and employment level concerning psychological well-being. Consequently, it is essential to enhance educational and employment prospects. The mental health and well-being of persons in conflict-affected areas can be enhanced via the implementation of programs that broaden educational opportunities and create economic chances. The execution of these initiatives can furnish individuals with a sense of stability and purpose, thereby alleviating the adverse effects of conflict.

5. Resilience and social support must be integrated into mental health interventions. Mental health interventions in conflict zones should prioritize enhancing social support systems and fostering individual and societal resilience. Implementing interventions that foster healthy interpersonal connections and provide stress coping strategies can reduce the psychological burden of conflict and enhance long-term well-being.

6. Further Investigation on Stress Management Techniques: Further research is necessary to achieve a comprehensive understanding of these systems and to elucidate the adaptive coping methods utilised by individuals in war zones. Future study may explore how different coping mechanisms enhance resilience and how these tactics might be included into treatment programs. Politicians, community leaders, and mental health professionals can enhance the psychological well-being of individuals in combat zones by addressing these issues. This will foster enhanced resilience and facilitate sustainable recovery in these communities.

Practical Implications

1. One of the most significant practical ramifications is the establishment of community-based assistance services. The research underscores the substantial influence of social support on the cultivation of resilience and psychological well-being. This underscores the necessity of developing and executing community-based support programs that may offer aid to individuals residing in conflict zones across multiple dimensions, including social, emotional, and practical support. Peer support groups, mental health hotlines, and community events that foster social cohesion and solidarity exemplify initiatives within this overarching category.

2. Development of Interventions Aimed at Enhancing Resilience: Treatments aimed at fostering individual and collective resilience may prove advantageous, considering the heightened resilience observed in combat zones. Individuals may more effectively manage stress and uncertainty through the adoption of practical programs focused on life skills, emotional regulation, and coping strategies. Schools, community centers, and businesses may serve as significant venues for the implementation of such initiatives.

Three strategies that are gender-sensitive in war zones The study's findings indicated that women residing in war zones had elevated levels of resilience and social support. This conclusion underscores the necessity of including gender-sensitive approaches into intervention procedures. Mental health and support services must reflect the unique challenges faced by women in conflict zones, including gender-based violence, caregiving duties, and social marginalisation. Programs such as women's empowerment workshops, peer mentorship, and secure environments for expression can be customised to address their particular requirements.

4. Recommendations for Public Policy Concerning Education and Employment The study's findings suggest that educational achievement and employment status are significant factors in psychological well-being. Consequently, initiatives aimed at enhancing educational access and

generating employment prospects in violence-stricken areas may yield significant benefits for individuals' mental health and stability. Governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) can prioritize initiatives that provide vocational training, job placement aid, and educational resources for individuals or groups displaced by conflict.

5. Integrating Resilience and Social Support into Mental Health Services The study underscores the importance of cultivating resilience and securing social support to mitigate the psychological impacts of conflict. These concepts must be included into the treatment methodologies employed by mental health services in conflict-affected regions. This includes the provision of counselling services that focus on addressing trauma, enhancing adaptive coping strategies, and fostering social connections, along with the training of mental health professionals to assess and promote resilience factors and social support systems.

6. Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Humanitarian Interventions The results underscore the imperative for interdisciplinary collaboration among mental health doctors, social workers, community leaders, and policymakers in conflict-affected regions. To ensure that interventions are context-specific, culturally sensitive, and sustainable, it is essential to engage a diverse array of stakeholders in the formulation of practical measures that address mental health, resilience, and social support. An example of this is the collaborative effort to develop and implement therapies that are adaptable to the evolving needs of populations impacted by war.

In the realm of resilience programs, the monitoring and evaluation frameworks are as follows: The intricacy of resilience and its impact on psychological well-being requires the implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems for programs designed to enhance resilience. To guarantee that resilience-enhancing techniques exert a lasting impact on the well-being of individuals in conflict zones, these frameworks would significantly aid in monitoring treatment efficacy, assessing advancements in social support networks, and confirming the realization of these benefits.

8. Approaches for conflict prevention and early intervention the study's findings suggest that social support and resilience may function as protective factors in conflict-affected regions. By promptly identifying persons at risk, appropriate prevention and intervention strategies can be implemented. Examples of this category include outreach programs for at-risk individuals, mental health assessments, and initiatives aimed at identifying and mitigating sources of discomfort before they escalate into more severe psychological issues.

References

Azar, E. E. (1990). *The management of protracted social conflict: Theory and cases*. Dartmouth Publishing Company.

Baloch, S. (2019). China-Pakistan Economic Corridor and the Escalating Conflict in Balochistan. Asian Affairs.

Betancourt, T. S., Agnew-Blais, J., & Gilman, S. E. (2008). The role of social support in the mental health of adolescents exposed to war. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 49(4), 307-315. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01819.x

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence*. Gulf Publishing.

Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 20-28. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310-357. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310

Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2009). *Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction*. Oxford University Press.

Galea, S., Nandi, A., & Vlahov, D. (2005). The epidemiology of post-traumatic stress disorder after disasters. *Epidemiologic Reviews*, 27(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1093/epirev/mxi003

Galtung, J. (1969). *Violence, peace, and peace research*. Journal of Peace Research, 6(3), 167-191. https://doi.org/10.1177/002234336900600301

Gerson, R. (2015). *Conflict and its impact on mental health: Understanding and addressing the psychological consequences of war*. Wiley.

International Crisis Group. (2021). Pakistan's Peace Process with the Pakistani Taliban. Available at: https://www.crisisgroup.org/asia/south-asia/pakistan/pakistans-peace-process-pakistani-taliban

Kilmann, R. H., Thomas, K. W., & Blake, R. R. (1977). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Xicom.

Koenen, K. C., Ratanatharathorn, A., & O'Donnell, M. (2017). Post-traumatic stress disorder in the world: The epidemiology of PTSD. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 40(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psc.2016.10.001

Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Good Books.

Lewin, K. (1935). A dynamic theory of personality. McGraw-Hill.

Luthar, S. S. (2006). *Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades*. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), Developmental psychopathology: Risk, disorder, and adaptation (pp. 740-795). Wiley.

Masten, A. S. (2014). Resilience in children threatened by extreme adversity: Frameworks for research, practice, and translational science. *Development and Psychopathology*, 26(4), 1383-1394. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579414000850

Miller, K. E., & Rasmussen, A. (2010). Mental health and armed conflict: The importance of the stress-adversity model. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 304(5), 543-544. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.996

Mojtabai, R. (2013). Social support and mental health in post-conflict populations: A review of the literature. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(2), 227-247. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2006.25.2.227

Patel, V., De Silva, M. J., & Khatun, S. (2007). Mental health in developing countries. *The Lancet*, 370(9597), 301-308. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(07)61256-5

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? *Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

South Asia Terrorism Portal. (2021). Azad Jammu and Kashmir and Gilgit-Baltistan: Conflict at the Line of Control. Available at: https://www.satp.org/south-asia/terrorism-assessment/region/pakistan-jammu-kashmir

Thomas, K. W. (1992). *Conflict and negotiation processes in organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Uchino, B. N. (2004). Social support and physical health: Understanding the health consequences of relationships. *American Psychologist*, 59(8), 674-686. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.674

UNPO. (2022). Balochistan: Forgotten Conflict. Available at: https://unpo.org/article/23045

Yusuf, M., & Zaman, H. (2020). Conflict Dynamics in Karachi and the Role of State Actors. Journal of South Asian Stu