

# Psychological Status of the Individual among Military Pensioners

Zinaida I. Ryabikina<sup>id</sup>, Elena R. Mironova<sup>id</sup>, Olga A. Lavrova\*<sup>id</sup>

Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russian Federation

\*Corresponding author: [lavloa@yandex.ru](mailto:lavloa@yandex.ru)

---

## Abstract

**Introduction.** The study addresses the relevance of preserving psychological resources in late adulthood to ensure continued productive engagement with the surrounding world. Methodologically, the construct of *psychological status of the individual* is justified as a framework for examining personality in terms of integrity, unity of being, and agency. Essential parameters of the psychological status of military pensioners are theoretically grounded as value-semantic, affective-cognitive, and subjective (agentic) characteristics, with agency serving as a differentiating feature that shapes the individual's interaction with existential reality. **Methods.** The research involved 96 military pensioners. Assessment instruments included the Schwartz Value Survey, Kuhl's Motivational Orientation Questionnaire, Hall's Emotional Intelligence Test, the Hardiness Survey (Russian adaptation by Leontiev & Rasskazova), the Short Index of Self-Actualization (Jones & Crandall), the Professional Demand Assessment (Kharitonova & Yasko), and the Dembo-Rubinstein Self-Perception Scale. **Results.** Three distinct types of psychological status were identified, each characterized by a unique configuration of value-semantic, affective-cognitive, and agentic features. The first type, predominant among non-working male pensioners, is marked by underdeveloped resources for self-realization, resulting in compromised agency. The second type, observed among pensioners aged 60+ and female pensioners, exhibits preserved retrospective agency, which manifests either as preoccupation with the past or as constructive utilization of prior experience to navigate current existential conditions. The third type, characteristic of employed pensioners, demonstrates well-formed psychological resources supporting active transformation of present life circumstances and sustained agentic functioning. **Discussion.** These typological distinctions highlight

the need for differentiated approaches to psychological support, emphasizing the tailoring of interventions to the individual's typology and stage of life.

## Keywords

psychological status of the individual, value-semantic characteristics; affective-cognitive characteristics, subjective (agentic) characteristics, types of status presentation

## For citation

Ryabikina, Z.I., Mironova, E.R., Lavrova, O.A. (2025). Psychological Status of the Individual among Military Pensioners. *Russian Psychological Journal*, 22(3), 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.21702/rpj.2025.3.1>

---

## Introduction

### *Rationale for the Study*

The importance of studying the later stages of the human lifespan is increasingly recognized in light of profound changes in the socio-demographic structure of contemporary society, including population aging and increased longevity. Growing attention to the psychological dimensions of late adulthood reflects a shift in conceptual perspectives: this life stage is no longer viewed solely as a period of decline, but rather as a phase of continued engagement, adaptation, and meaningful interaction with the external environment (Golovey, 2024; Strizhetskaya, 2022; Westerhof et al., 2023; Diehl et al., 2021; Ingrand et al., 2018; Martinson & Berridge, 2015; Nilsson, Bülow & Kazemi, 2015; Rowe & Kahn, 2015). As L. I. Antsiferova notes, late adulthood is marked by "new formations of a progressive nature, aimed at overcoming destructive phenomena in gerontogenesis and achieving a new level of self-realization of the individual in the world" (Antsiferova, 2000, p. 89).

Chronologically, late adulthood often coincides with the end of one's professional career and the transition into retirement. While this stage is an expected, age-normative event, it is also frequently experienced as one of the most significant psychosocial crises of aging, requiring individuals to mobilize psychological resources to maintain a sense of self amid rapidly changing life circumstances. The paths through which individuals navigate this stage are shaped by their previous life experiences and by their positions within the social structure, with its norms, rules, and customary ways of life. This distinction is particularly relevant when comparing military and civilian populations.

This theoretical and empirical study examines the personality characteristics of military pensioners—a socio-demographic group comprising citizens of the Russian Federation who have completed service in the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of Internal Affairs

(MVD), the Ministry for Civil Defence, Emergencies and Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM), the Federal Penitentiary Service (FSIN), the National Guard (Rosgvardiya), and the Federal Drug Control Service (FSKN). After leaving military service, these individuals face the challenge of establishing a new social status amid a rapid transformation of their living environment and broader social conditions. Many stable elements of their prior life reality—norms, rules, and routines that had structured daily functioning—are lost (Lavrova, 2020). Equally important are the internal psychological adjustments required to identify opportunities, develop strategies, and mobilize personal resources to build a fulfilling existence under these new circumstances.

### ***Psychological Status as an Integral Characteristic of the Individual in Specific Social Circumstances***

The choice of the main construct in this study is determined by the theoretical and methodological relevance of several fundamental methodological principles: the principle of *integrity* (Ananyev, 2000; Merlin, 1986; Vyatkin, 2011; Loginova, 2016; Panferov & Miklyaeva, 2019), the *unity of personality and being* (Rubinstein, 2000; Leontiev, 2005; Lomov, 1984; Znakov & Ryabikina, 2017), and *subjectivity* (Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, 2001; Antsiferova, 2000; Znakov, 2003; Znakov & Ryabikina, 2017; Fominykh, 2024; Holondrovich, 2018). These principles determined the selection of conceptual categories, the approach to theoretical constructs, and the orientation adopted in interpreting the collected empirical material.

The principal theoretical construct in this study is the *psychological status of the individual*, understood as an integral set of essential psychological parameters that emerge from the “individual–environment” system, retain relative stability over a certain period, determine the level of mental activity in interaction with specific external factors, and shape an individual’s capacity to transform both the surrounding reality and themselves.

The application of this scientific concept allows for the implementation of the principle of *integrity*, as it denotes the cohesive wholeness of cumulative psychological (and other) characteristics.

The concept of the *psychological status of the individual* has been theoretically substantiated and is employed by researchers primarily within an ecopsychological framework, understood as an integral characteristic of the human psyche at a given point in time, in interaction with specific environmental factors (Karabanova, 2014; Panov, 2022; Panov & Saraeva, 2011; Stuzhuk et al., 2020; Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Shoda & Mischel, 2000).

In a sense, the psychological status of the individual can be seen as a projection of a person’s social status, reflecting the position they occupy within the social system. Accordingly, it can only be interpreted within the context of the circumstances of social existence, which imply conformity to the norms, requirements, and expectations that society assigns to particular categories of social actors.

By defining the social status of a retiree as the position an elderly individual occupies within the system of social relations, society formally removes them from the list of active social actors. At the same time, within the context of the evolving paradigm of late life—which proclaims as the “age norm” the preservation of an active engagement with oneself and the world—modern society expects retirees to maintain an active role in constructing their own existence (Ryabikina, Mironova, Lavrova, 2024).

Subjectivity—a construct manifested primarily through the notion of activity, “which integrates and regulates the dynamics and functioning of the entire personal structure, serving as the design and organization of one’s own life as well as the construction of social reality”—functions as a key parameter characterizing an individual’s contribution to the state of a given human–environment system (Ryabikina et al., 2024, p. 13). Subjectivity is considered from the perspective of personal activity and initiative in life processes, serving as the basis for establishing interaction with the surrounding world and the creative transformation of one’s life space (Fominykh, 2024). A subjectivity-based approach to personality and to the study of its distinct age-related periods—including late life—enables the elucidation of human functioning as an individual actively shaping their own existence, oriented toward maintaining their psychological status and preserving themselves “as a sovereign source of activity, capable, within certain limits, of deliberately effecting changes in both the external environment and the self” (Antsiferova, 2000, p. 211).

### ***Rationale for the Essential Parameters of the Psychological Status of a Military Retiree***

The study of the *psychological status of the individual* involves identifying and describing the set of essential psychological parameters that are relevant to the context of a specific investigation and to the theoretical or applied tasks addressed by the researcher. In accordance with the principle of the unity of personality and being, it is crucial to consider the specific contexts and environmental conditions that shape the formation of these individual parameters. This underscores the need to account for the deterministic influence of factors within the military professional environment when determining the essential parameters of a *military retiree’s psychological status*.

One of the distinctive environmental factors of military service is its value-laden, moral, and ethical content. The acceptance and internalization of the value system of military service by personnel constitute a central aspect of professional socialization, whereas its rejection often results in various forms of professional maladaptation. We posit that the system of individual and personal values of military personnel, shaped under the influence of their unique environment, is largely distinctive and differs in many respects from the value systems of other social groups.

The *value-semantic sphere* of personality assumes paramount significance during the later stages of socialization. Retirement represents a critical transitional milestone in the late phase of the human life cycle and is often experienced as a developmental

crisis. Scholars describe the crisis of old age as a period characterized by transformations in values and processes of meaning-making (Antsiferova, 2001; Levasseur et al., 2020; Sobol-Kwapinska, Przepiorka, & Zimbardo, 2019). A defining feature of meaning-making involves a personalized, internalized perspective—integrated through subjective experience and fully internalized—which comprises a specific viewpoint, evaluative stance, and predisposition to perceive and interpret events in particular ways, thereby shaping the individual's interaction with the world (Abakumova, Godunov, & Gurtskoy, 2019, p. 414).

The acquisition of new life meanings determines the trajectory of an individual's subsequent life course and provides opportunities for self-realization under changing life circumstances (Abakumova, Godunov, & Gurtskoy, 2019; Pochtareva, 2017). Thus, the significance and specificity of the value-semantic sphere within a military retiree's personality are shaped by prior engagement with the military-professional environment. The influence of value orientations on the particular trajectory of late-life adaptation following the completion of a military career justifies positioning this sphere among the essential parameters constituting a military retiree's psychological status.

The demanding nature of the military-professional environment requires the development of characteristics that regulate behavior under adverse conditions and ensure the capacity to withstand deleterious environmental influences. Stressful and challenging life events, circumstances, and situations are substantially mediated by personal emotions and are primarily appraised and interpreted through an emotional lens. Human behavior in such conditions is fundamentally guided by emotional coping mechanisms.

At the same time, given the role of emotions in regulating behavior, researchers also refer to the concept of the unity of affect and intelligence (Vygotsky, 1968; Rubinstein, 2000). Within the framework of activity theory, the notion of a functional system of integrated emotional and cognitive processes was developed, through which emotions become "intelligent," and thinking is inextricably linked with the value-semantic sphere of personality (Leontiev, 2005).

Researchers emphasize the importance of affective and cognitive characteristics of the individual as resources for regulating behavior in later life, particularly during periods of critical change associated with the completion of active professional socialization (Lavrova, 2020; Sergiyenko et al., 2020; Ponomareva, 2019; Le Vigouroux et al., 2017). Taken together, these considerations support viewing affective and cognitive personality characteristics as a key parameter of the psychological status of military pensioners.

The successful performance of tasks in the context of military service depends not only on the development of certain professionally important qualities of the individual, but also on the ability to construct psychological strategies and tactics for cultivating subjective qualities in oneself that support active engagement in one's own life. In the later stages of personality socialization, *subjectivity* as a complex, systemic quality continues

to play a central role (Markelova, Dunaeva, & Shutkina, 2017). When this period of life is viewed as a time of significant change, an elderly individual (pensioner) assumes the role of a subject of vital activity, actively shaping and adapting to new conditions of existence.

Accordingly, the theoretical analysis conducted allows for the identification of the following essential parameters that constitute the psychological status of military pensioners, which are shaped by professional-environmental factors and function as psychological resources during this stage of socialization:

- value-semantic characteristics of the individual;
- affective-cognitive characteristics of the individual, supporting behavioral regulation under challenging conditions;
- subjective (agentic) characteristics of the individual.

## Methods

In accordance with the study's objectives, a purposive sample was assembled comprising 96 military pensioners ranging in age from 39 to 82 years, residing in Krasnodar Krai and the Republic of Crimea.

The empirical investigation employed a battery of psychodiagnostic methods aligned with the essential parameters constituting the psychological status of military pensioners:

1. Assessment of value-related dimensions was conducted using the *Schwartz Value Survey* (SVS) by S. H. Schwartz (1992) in Russian adaptation by V. N. Karandashev (2004) and *Kuhl's Motivational Orientation Questionnaire* in Russian adaptation by A. A. Rean (2001).
2. Assessment of affective-cognitive regulators of personal behavior was performed using the *Hall's Emotional Intelligence Test* in Russian adaptation by N. P. Fetiskin et al. (2002) and the *Hardiness Survey* (Dispositional Resilience Scale) in Russian adaptation by A. G. Leontyev & E. I. Rasskazova (2006).
3. Agency characteristics were assessed using the *Short Index of Self-Actualization* (SISA) by A. L. Jones and R. E. Crandall (1986) in Russian adaptation by L. Hjeelle & D. J. Ziegler (2008), the *Professional Demand Assessment* by E. V. Kharitonova & B. A. Yasko (2009), and the *Dembo-Rubinstein Self-Perception Scale* with three temporal dimensions: "Self in the past," "Self in the present," and "Self in the future" (Sidorov, 2013).

The implementation of the principle of integrity in the study of the psychological status of military pensioners as an integral characteristic was achieved through *clustering procedures*. This approach is based on the notion that the content of clusters represents a cohesive whole, composed of interconnected homogeneous elements, each of which can be regarded as an independent unit with specific properties.

## Results

The results of the cluster analysis allow for the identification of three distinct presentations of *individual psychological status* among military pensioners (three clusters). These clusters differ in specific combinations of socio-demographic markers of the participants (age, gender, employment), as well as in the associated configurations of *value-semantic characteristics, affective-cognitive characteristics, and subjective (agentic) characteristics* of the retirees' personalities.

### Cluster 1

The socio-demographic profile of Cluster 1 is characterized by the predominance of *relatively younger, exclusively non-working male military pensioners*. Within the structure of normative ideals, respondents in this cluster exhibit the highest expression of *Conformity* (the desire to comply with social expectations), *Tradition* (respect, recognition, and adherence to traditions), and *Self-Direction*. Table 1 presents the lowest mean ranks of values at the level of normative ideals for respondents in this cluster.

**Table 1**  
*Lowest Mean Ranks of Values at the Level of Normative Ideals (Cluster 1)*

Normative Ideals	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Conformity	2.69 $\pm$ 1.341
Tradition	1.35 $\pm$ 1.348
Self-Direction	4.39 $\pm$ 1.603

At the level of motivational orientation derived from these value orientations, only *Tradition* is actualized ( $M = 3.74 \pm 0.783$ ). At the level of individual value priorities shaping behavioral patterns, respondents display a pronounced inclination toward *security, harmony, and stability* in interpersonal relationships both within society and in their immediate social environment ( $M = 2.99 \pm 0.651$ ).

Among the least salient value orientations in this cluster is a reduced striving for *power and achievement*, encompassing the pursuit of social status, prestige, control, or dominance ( $M = 6.84 \pm 1.378$ ). Correspondingly, at the behavioral level, there is a lack of motivation toward the attainment of personal success ( $M = 7.46 \pm 0.552$ ).

Respondents in this cluster are characterized by a *situational orientation*, which manifests in heightened sensitivity to various life events, emotional vulnerability, "emotional fixation" on specific situations, low self-confidence, and limited willingness to take action to change circumstances. Data on the individual scales are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**  
*Mean Group Values for Motivational Orientation Parameters (Cluster 1)*

Scales	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Control of Action under Failure	5.83 $\pm$ 3.563
Control of Action under Success	6.48 $\pm$ 3.396
Control of Action in Planning	6.30 $\pm$ 4.117

Among the characteristics of respondents in this group, a notably low level of *integral emotional intelligence* is observed. This is manifested in a limited understanding of their own emotions, emotional rigidity, an inability to self-motivate using their emotions, difficulty in understanding and empathizing with the emotions of others, and a reluctance to influence others' feelings or to use emotions to achieve personal goals. Data are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**  
*Mean Group Values of Hall's Emotional Intelligence Test Parameters (Cluster 1)*

Scales	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Emotional Intelligence (EQ)	-6.00 $\pm$ 6.481
Emotional awareness	-0.30 $\pm$ 4.269
Emotional control	0.91 $\pm$ 3.161

Scales	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Self-motivation	-1.13±3.455
Empathy	-2.78±2.812
Emotion recognition	-2.57±2.858

Another characteristic of respondents in this group is a low level of *Commitment*, one of the parameters of *hardiness*. This is manifested in a sense of being "outside of life" and an unwillingness to enjoy the present moment ( $M = 26.87 \pm 6.327$ ).

As a subject of late professional socialization, a military pensioner possesses a certain degree of development of subjective characteristics such as *self-actualization*, *personal maturity*, and *self-esteem* across different life periods and domains. Respondents in this group exhibit a low level of *self-actualization* ( $M = 12.35 \pm 5.749$ ), which may manifest as a lack of motivation to realize their potential, absence of personal goals, fear of failure, difficulties in decision-making, dependence on others' opinions, and a pronounced need for external approval. Across different life periods, respondents exhibit consistently low levels of *self-esteem*: *self-esteem in the past* ( $M = 5.57 \pm 1.085$ ), *self-esteem in the present* ( $M = 4.98 \pm 0.667$ ), and *self-esteem in the future* ( $M = 4.71 \pm 0.434$ ). In addition, respondents in this group demonstrate a low level of *satisfaction with the professional realization of their potential* ( $M = 6.09 \pm 2.795$ ).

## **Cluster 2**

The distinctive socio-demographic characteristics of Cluster 2 include a higher average age of respondents ( $69.86 \pm 5.47$  years) and the exclusive representation of female participants. The professional status of members in this cluster is heterogeneous, encompassing both working and non-working military pensioners.

Within the value-semantic sphere of military pensioners in Cluster 2, as in Cluster 1, discrepancies are observed between two levels of value functioning: normative ideals and personal values, which are reflected in beliefs, priorities, and actual behavioral manifestations.

A characteristic feature of the structure of normative ideals among respondents in this cluster is a low level of *Conformity*, reflecting a limited desire to comply with social expectations ( $M = 6.15 \pm 1.181$ ). At the level of values as guides to action, this value is

more strongly expressed, manifesting in real behavior as a tendency to meet social expectations ( $M = 3.03 \pm 0.653$ ). Furthermore, at the level of individual value priorities that shape behavior, respondents demonstrated a pronounced emphasis on Universalism, characterized by understanding, tolerance, and concern for the well-being of people and the world around them ( $M = 3.6 \pm 0.738$ ), and Self-Direction, expressed as independence in thinking and choosing actions ( $M = 4.56 \pm 0.622$ ).

Respondents in this group are characterized by an *activity orientation*, which manifests in their ability to act proactively in various conditions, set goals, and strive to achieve them. These characteristics are particularly pronounced in situations of success ( $M = 10.45 \pm 4.539$ ). In contrast, in situations of failure, respondents may exhibit a situational orientation, manifested as "emotional fixation" on the specific failure, low self-confidence, and a limited willingness to act to overcome the setback ( $M = 9.25 \pm 4.847$ ).

Among the features of the emotional sphere in respondents of this group, a low mean level of integral emotional intelligence—similar to that observed in Cluster 1—should be noted ( $M = 26.25 \pm 17.960$ ). This may manifest as emotional rigidity, difficulty in self-motivation through one's own emotions, limited ability to understand and emotionally empathize with others, and an unwillingness to influence the emotions of others or use emotions to achieve personal goals. At the same time, compared with Cluster 1, respondents in this group exhibit greater variability in individual scores of integral emotional intelligence. Additionally, the emotional intelligence structure of military pensioners in this cluster is characterized by a higher average level of emotion management—the ability to regulate one's own emotions and employ them to accomplish specific objectives—compared with Cluster 1 ( $M = 8.66 \pm 4.165$ ).

As in Cluster 1, respondents in Cluster 2 exhibit a low level of Commitment ( $M = 24.32 \pm 5.366$ ), one of the parameters of hardiness, which may manifest as a sense of being "outside of life" and an unwillingness to enjoy the present moment.

Analysis of the subjective (agentic) characteristics of respondents indicates an average level of *self-actualization*, reflected in certain aspirations to realize themselves and their potential ( $M = 29.98 \pm 5.271$ ). Low levels of self-assessment are typical for various periods of life, including the present (Present — Success:  $M = 5.26 \pm 1.071$ ; Present — Self-realization:  $M = 5.05 \pm 0.957$ ) and the future (Future — Success:  $M = 5.85 \pm 1.598$ ; Future — Self-realization:  $M = 5.87 \pm 1.359$ ), as well as for assessing success and self-realization in the past (Past — Success:  $M = 5.85 \pm 1.598$ ; Past — Self-realization:  $M = 5.87 \pm 1.359$ ). Respondents reported a higher level of perceived happiness in the past (Past — Happiness:  $M = 6.25 \pm 1.207$ ). The level of satisfaction with the self-realization of professional potential among respondents in this cluster is also low ( $M = 14.62 \pm 3.564$ ).

### ***Cluster 3***

The primary socio-demographic characteristic of Cluster 3 is the professional status of its respondents, as it exclusively comprises *working military pensioners*.

At the level of normative ideals, the dominant value among respondents is *Power* (encompassing social status, prestige, authority, and public recognition) ( $M = 4.00 \pm 1.106$ ). At the level of individual value priorities that guide actual behavior, respondents exhibit a pronounced orientation toward *Achievement*—the pursuit of personal success through the demonstration of competence ( $M = 6.02 \pm 0.352$ )—as well as *Stimulation*, reflecting the need for variety and maintaining a high level of activity ( $M = 6.01 \pm 0.583$ ). Additionally, values related to *Benevolence*, such as concern for the well-being of loved ones, usefulness, loyalty, honesty, and responsibility, are moderately expressed ( $M = 4.31 \pm 0.816$ ).

The dominant type of orientation among respondents in this group, *Action Orientation*, implies active engagement both in conditions where active behavior is necessary for problem-solving and when all current needs are satisfied ( $M = 14.30 \pm 2.105$ ); readiness to be active, including in situations of failure ( $M = 14.15 \pm 2.870$ ); and readiness to quickly shift to another goal ( $M = 14.30 \pm 2.922$ ).

Among the features of the emotional sphere of respondents in this group, it should be noted that they exhibit an average level of integral emotional intelligence, which reflects an average development of most of its components—self-motivation, the ability to motivate oneself through one's own emotions, empathy, and the willingness to influence others' emotions and use them to achieve personal goals—combined with a high level of emotion control (the ability to regulate one's own emotions and employ them to accomplish specific objectives). The data are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4**  
*Mean Group Values of Hall's Emotional Intelligence Test Parameters (Cluster 3)*

Scales	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Emotional Intelligence (EQ)	60.75 $\pm$ 13.090
Emotional awareness	13.65 $\pm$ 2.777
Emotional control	15.25 $\pm$ 1.164
Self-motivation	12.70 $\pm$ 3.585
Empathy	10.60 $\pm$ 4.418
Emotion recognition	8.55 $\pm$ 5.356

Among the distinctive features of respondents in Cluster 3 is the average level of all hardness parameters (Commitment, Control, Challenge). Data are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5**  
*Mean Group Values of Hardiness Survey Parameters (Cluster 3)*

Scales	$M(\bar{x}) \pm \sigma$
Commitment	39.10 $\pm$ 4.667
Control	39.65 $\pm$ 4.146
Challenge	17.40 $\pm$ 2.062
Hardiness	96.15 $\pm$ 7.422

The subjective characteristics of respondents in Cluster 3 are marked by higher levels of development, including greater self-actualization ( $M = 46.4 \pm 6.253$ ) and higher average self-esteem across all life periods for all assessed parameters: Success, Self-Realization, and Happiness. Data are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6**  
*Mean Group Values of Self-Esteem Parameters (Cluster 3)*

Scales	$M \pm \sigma$
Past — Success	7.35 $\pm$ 1.927
Past — Self-realization	7.55 $\pm$ 1.638
Past — Happiness	7.85 $\pm$ 1.387
Present — Success	5.25 $\pm$ 0.716
Present — Self-realization	6.55 $\pm$ 1.276

Scales	$M \pm \sigma$
Present – Happiness	$8.05 \pm 1.234$
Future – Success	$4.90 \pm 0.553$
Future – Self-realization	$5.20 \pm 0.696$
Future – Happiness	$7.65 \pm 1.424$

Among the indicators of professional demand, both the assessment of professional performance ( $M = 1.424 \pm 3.567$ ) and self-evaluation, reflecting awareness of one's importance as a professional ( $M = 18.80 \pm 2.668$ ), correspond to an average level.

## Discussion

Based on the present study of military retirees' personalities, the relevance of the theoretical construct of *psychological status of the individual* has been substantiated, as it enables the implementation of the methodological principles of integrity (Ananyev, 2000; Merlin, 1986; Vyatkin, 2011; Loginova, 2016; Panferov & Miklyaeva, 2019), the unity of personality and its being (Rubinstein, 2000; Leontiev, 2005; Lomov, 1984; Znakov & Ryabikina, 2017), and subjectivity (Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, 2001; Antsiferova, 2000; Znakov, 2003; Znakov & Ryabikina, 2017; Fominykh, 2024; Holondrovich, 2018).

Within this study, the *psychological status of the individual* is conceptualized as an integral set of essential psychological parameters that emerge from the *individual–environment* system, retain relative stability over time, determine the level of mental activity in interaction with specific external factors, and shape an individual's capacity to transform both the surrounding reality and themselves. The significance of examining the psyche within the *individual–environment* framework was emphasized by A. N. Leontiev and B. F. Lomov, who defined the psyche as a subsystem within the organization of the integral individual, enabling the establishment of necessary relationships with the environment at both psychological and social levels, while remaining inextricably linked to the biological level of this organization (Leontiev, 2005; Lomov, 1984).

The consonance between an individual's psychological characteristics and the conditions of their environment (their circumstances of being) is particularly emphasized

within the ecopsychological framework, which considers the psyche not only as an inherent attribute of the person but also as a product of the broader *person–environment* system, encompassing both natural and social contexts (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Shoda & Mischel, 2000; Panov, 2022; Panov & Saraeva, 2011).

We identified and described the essential parameters of military retirees' psychological status—parameters shaped, on the one hand, by the specific trajectories of prior life stages, namely the prolonged influence of professional and environmental factors encountered during military service, and, on the other hand, by the factors that determine their activity as subjects interacting with new external conditions after completing active professional duty.

The psychological status of military retirees encompasses *value-semantic characteristics of the individual* (Pochtareva, 2017; Martinson & Berridge, 2015), *affective-cognitive characteristics of the individual*, supporting behavioral regulation under challenging conditions (Sergiyenko et al., 2020; West & Glynnos, 2016; Veenstra, Daatland & Aartsen, 2021; Blöchl, Nestler & Weiss, 2021), and *subjective (agentic) characteristics of the individual* (Antsiferova, 2001).

In this study, *subjective (agentic) characteristics* serve as the central focus for examining personality. They function as a key parameter of the psychological status of the individual, capturing the ways in which a person positions themselves in relation to the current external environment. This perspective aligns with the understanding of subjectivity as a complex systemic quality that becomes particularly significant in the later stages of personality socialization (Markelova, Dunaeva, Shutkina, 2017).

The theoretical grounding of the parameters of an individual's psychological status, exemplified by military pensioners, informed the approach to its empirical investigation. Three distinct types of psychological status were identified, each defined by a characteristic configuration of key parameters and associated with a specific socio-demographic profile.

The first type, most prominently represented among non-working male military pensioners, is characterized by a constellation of features reflecting an orientation toward stability and security at the level of value regulation, low emotional competence, emotional vulnerability, dependency, and limited readiness to confront challenging life situations. A defining aspect of this type is a diminished sense of subjectivity, manifested as reduced personal agency and limited willingness to engage in intentional change. Collectively, these features indicate that individuals exhibiting this type of psychological status possess underdeveloped personal resources for self-realization under altered life circumstances. Consequently, this configuration allows for the anticipation of unfavorable trajectories of subjectivity, including its potential suppression under the negative influence of environmental factors.

The second type of psychological status is predominantly represented among older (60+) and female military pensioners. It is characterized by a paradoxical structure within the value-semantic sphere: on one hand, there is a rejection of conformity at the level of values and an individually salient emphasis on independent thinking and action; on

the other hand, behavioral tendencies reflect compliance with social expectations. This type is further distinguished by emotional competence primarily expressed through effective emotion regulation, an average level of development of subjective (agentic) characteristics, and a predominant orientation toward the past, reflecting *positive retrospective subjectivity*. Such a configuration can shape specific patterns of interaction with a transformed external environment. For a "subject of the past," past life events—and the self in earlier periods—are often evaluated more positively than the present, which may create a risk of becoming "stuck" in established behavioral patterns that may prove maladaptive in changed conditions. Conversely, preserved positive retrospective subjectivity—the capacity to constructively analyze past experiences and relate them to current circumstances—may enable the individual to draw on psychological resources to maintain identity continuity, generate new meanings, and seek novel domains and opportunities for self-realization within the context of current existential reality.

The third type of psychological status, most prominently represented among working military pensioners, is characterized by activity-oriented value patterns (motivation for achievement, a need for engagement, and an overall action orientation), a high level of emotional competence, particularly in emotion regulation, and a well-developed system of subjective (agentic) characteristics, including features of professional subjectivity (*preserved subjectivity*). This type of psychological status predicts a favorable trajectory for the realization of subjectivity, as the established personal resources of these individuals support proactive engagement with and transformation of the actual conditions of their present existential reality.

### **Conclusion**

The scientific novelty of the present study lies in the operationalization of the concept of *psychological status of the individual* in accordance with the methodological principles of integrity, the unity of personality and its being, and subjectivity. Theoretically, the study substantiates the identification of core parameters of psychological status in military pensioners, taking into account both the influences of prior socialization and the determinants of the current external environment at a specific life stage. Empirically, the investigation of these essential personality parameters, coupled with the application of multidimensional statistical analyses, enabled the differentiation of typological manifestations of psychological status among military retirees.

The results obtained align with contemporary perspectives on the diversity of being and trajectories of personal development in the later stages of the life course (Nikiforov, Vodopyanova, Hoffman, 2018; Severin, 2020; Charles & Arockiam, 2020a, 2020b) and extend existing conceptualizations by elucidating the differentiation of strategies and pathways for the realization of subjectivity. They underscore the necessity of adjusting approaches to the actualization of subjectivity in accordance with typological variations in the psychological status of individuals.

This study provides a solid foundation for further theoretical and empirical investigations into the psychological status of the individual, its core parameters, and their manifestation across diverse social groups and specific contextual conditions of existence.

## References

Abakumova, I. V., Godunov, M. V., & Gurtskoy, D. A. (2019). Meaning choice as a psychological problem. *Bulletin of Udmurt University. Series Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy*, 29(4), 413–429. <https://doi.org/10.35634/2412-9550-2019-29-4-413-420> (in Russ.).

Abulkhanova-Slavskaya, K. A. (2001). *The problem of defining the subject in psychology: The subject of action, interaction, and cognition (psychological, philosophical, sociocultural aspects)*. MODEK. (in Russ.).

Ananyev, B. G. (2000). Psychology of personality. Moscow. (in Russ.).

Antsiferova, L. I. (2000). Psychological content of the phenomenon of the subject and the boundaries of the subject-activity approach. In *The Problem of the Subject in Psychological Science*, 27–42. IPRAN. (in Russ.).

Antsiferova, L. I. (2001). Psychology of aging: Personality development features in late adulthood. *Psychological Journal*, 22(3), 86–99. (in Russ.).

Blöchl, M., Nestler, S. and Weiss, D. (2021) A limit of the subjective age bias: Feeling younger to a certain degree, but no more, is beneficial for life satisfaction. *Psychology and Aging*, 36(3), 360–372.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA.

Charles, S., & Arockiam, K. (2020a). Perceived social support and quality of life of pensioners. *Journal of Xi'an University of Architecture & Technology*, 12(3), 1153–1165.

Charles, S., & Arockiam, K. (2020b). Psychological well-being and quality of life of pensioners. *Studies in Indian Place Names*, 40(3), 4958–4965.

Diehl, M., Wettstein, M., Spuling, S. M., & Wurm, S. (2021). Age-related change in self-perceptions of aging: Longitudinal trajectories and predictors of change. *Psychology and Aging*, 36(3), 344–359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000578>

Fetiskin, N. P., Kozlova, V. V., & Manuilov, G. M. (2002). Socio-psychological diagnostics of personality and small group development. Institute of Psychotherapy Publishing. (in Russ.).

Fominykh, E. S. (2024). Psychological indicators of subjectivity of life position. *Russian Psychological Journal*, 21(1), 254-266. (In Russ.)

Golovey, L. A. (2024). Developmental psychology and differential psychology at St. Petersburg State University (25 years since the founding of the department). *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Series 16: Psychology. Pedagogy*, 1, 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.21638/sbpu16.2024.101> (in Russ.).

Hjelle, L., & Ziegler, D. (2008). *Personality Theories*. Piter. (in Russ.).

Ingrand, I., Paccalin, M., Liuu, E., Gil, R., & Ingrand, P. (2018). Positive perception of aging is a key predictor of quality-of life in aging people. *PLoS One*, 13(10), e0204044. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0204044>

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY, PERSONALITY PSYCHOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

---

Jones, A., & Crandall, R. (1986). Validation of a short index of self-actualization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12(1), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167286121006>

Karabanova, O. A. (2014). Social situation of development as overcoming the "person–environment" dichotomy. *Psychological Research*, 7(36). (in Russ.).

Karandashev, V. N. (2004). *Schwartz's methodology for studying personal values: Concept and methodological guide*. Rech. (in Russ.).

Kharitonova, E. V., & Yas'ko, B. A. (2009). *Questionnaire "Professional Demand of the Person" (PDP)*. Kuban State University. (in Russ.).

Kholondovich, E. N. (2018). *Personality, agent of activity, agent of life. Psychology of the Human as a Subject of Cognition, Communication, and Activity*. Institute of Psychology, Russian Academy of Sciences. (in Russ.).

Lavrova, O. A. (2020). Characteristics of the emotional sphere of retired military personnel as determinants of their adaptive readiness to change in social status. *South-Russian Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(2), 111–125. (in Russ.).

Le Vigouroux, S., Pavani, J., Dauvier, B., Kop, J., & Congard, A. (2017). Reactive or proactive? Age differences in the use of affective regulation strategies. *Psychology and Aging*, 32(7), 621–627. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000194>

Leontyev, A. N. (2005). *Activity. Consciousness. Personality*. Akademiya. (in Russ.).

Leontyev, D. A., Rasskazova, E. I. (2006). *Hardiness Survey*. Smysl. (in Russ.).

Levasseur, L., Shipp, A. J., Fried, Y., Rousseau, D. M., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2020). New perspectives on time perspective and temporal focus. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(3), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2414>

Loginova, N. A. (2016). Whole human as a problem in Russian psychology. *Perm University Herald. Series Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology*, 2(26), 61–70. <https://doi.org/10.17072/2078-7898/2016-2-61-70> (in Russ.).

Lomov, B. F. (1984). *Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology*. Nauka. (in Russ.).

Markelova, T. V., Dunaeva, N. I., & Shutkina, Zh. A. (2017). Subjectivity as a personality trait of older adults during adaptation in the post-work period. *Problems of Contemporary Pedagogical Education*, (55-11), 253–260. (in Russ.).

Martinson, M., & Berridge, C. (2015). Successful aging and its discontents: A systematic review of the social gerontology literature. *The Gerontologist*, 55(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/gnu037>

Merlin, V. S. (1986). *Outline of an integral study of individuality*. Pedagogika. (in Russ.).

Nikiforov, G. S., Vodopianova, N. E., & Gofman, O. O. (2018). Psychological support before and after retirement: A theoretical review. *Organizational Psychology*, 8(3), 86–103. (in Russ.).

Nilsson, H., Bülow, P. H., & Kazemi, A. (2015). Mindful sustainable aging: Advancing a comprehensive approach to the challenges and opportunities of old age. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 11(3), 494–508. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v11i3.949>

Panferov, V. N., & Miklyaeva, A. V. (2019). The principle of wholeness in the integration of psychological knowledge. *Psichologicheskiy zhurnal*, 40(2), 5–14. (in Russ.).

Panov, V. I. (2022). Ecopsychological approach to psyche development: Stages, prerequisites, constructs. *Theoretical and Experimental Psychology*, 3(15), 100–117. <https://doi.org/10.24412/2073-08612022-3-100-117> (in Russ.).

Panov, V. I., & Saraeva, N. M. (2011). Psychological status of a person in a region of ecological disadvantage: The result of interaction of the components of the "Human–Living Environment" system (on the example of the child population of Zabaykalsky Krai). *Uchenye zapiski Zabaikalsky State University. Series: Pedagogical Sciences*, 5. (in Russ.).

Pochtaryova, E. Yu. (2017). Value-meaning sphere of personality: Essence, determinants, mechanisms of development. *Perm University Herald. Series «Philosophy. Psychology. Sociology»*, 4, 563–575. <https://doi.org/10.17072/2078-7898/2017-4-563-575> (in Russ.).

Ponomareva, E. Yu. (2019). Essential characteristics of the nature of emotional intelligence. *Gumanitarnye nauki*, 3, 102–106. (in Russ.).

Rean, A. A. (2001). *Practical psychodiagnostics of personality*. SPbSU Publishing. (in Russ.).

Rowe, J. W., & Kahn, R. L. (2015). Successful aging 2.0: Conceptual expansions for the 21st century. *The Journals of Gerontology: Series B*, 70(4), 593–596. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbv025>

Rubinshtein, S. L. (2000). *Problems of general psychology*. Piter. (in Russ.).

Ryabikina, Z. I., Mironova, E. R., Lavrova, O. A. (2024). Peculiarities of manifestation of the agency characteristics in the later stages of a person's life cycle (on example of military pensioners). *Theoretical and experimental psychology*, 17(1), 9–25. <https://doi.org/10.11621/TEP-24-01> (in Russ.).

Ryabikina, Z. I., Ozhigova, L. N., Guseynov, A. Sh., & Shipovskaya, V. V. (2023). Subjective-existential approach to personality study: Methodology and development. *South-Russian Journal of Social Sciences*, 25(2), 6–27. (in Russ.).

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60281-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6)

Sergiyenko, Ye. A., Khlevnaya, Ye. A., Kiselyova, T. S., Nikitina, A. A., & Osipenko, Ye. I. (2020). The role of emotional intelligence in coping with difficult life situations. *Vestnik of Kostroma State University. Series: Pedagogy. Psychology. Sociokinetics*, 26(4), 120–128. <https://doi.org/10.34216/2073-1426-2020-26-4-120-128> (in Russ.).

Severin, A. V. (2020). *Social-psychological adaptation of older adults to a changing world: Psychological problems of the elderly and ways of addressing them*. Alternativa. (in Russ.).

Shoda, Y., & Mischel, W. (2000). Reconciling contextualism with the core assumptions of personality psychology. *European Journal of Personality*, 14(5), 407–428. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984\(20000910\)14:5<407::AID-PER382>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984(20000910)14:5<407::AID-PER382>3.0.CO;2-3)

Sidorov, K. R. (2013). Dembo-Rubinstein technique and its modification. *Bulletin of Udmurt University. Series: Philosophy. Psychology. Pedagogy*, (1). (in Russ.).

Sobol-Kwapinska, M., Przepiorka, A., & Zimbardo, P. (2019). The structure of time perspective: Age-related differences in Poland. *Time & Society*, 28(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0961463X16656851>

Strizhetskaya, O. Yu. (2022). The origins of the Leningrad (Saint Petersburg) school of aging psychology in the works of B. G. Ananyev and M. D. Aleksandrova. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Series 16: Psychology. Pedagogy*, (1), 46–54. (in Russ.).

Stuzhuk, A. S., Sorokin, D. V., Abakarova, D. S., & Adzhiev, K. S. (2020). Determining the psychological status of patients by type of illness perception during a pandemic. *Bulletin of Medical Science*, 4, 10–12. (in Russ.).

Veenstra, M., Daatland, S. O., & Aartsen, M. (2021). The role of subjective age in sustaining wellbeing and health in the second half of life. *Ageing & Society*, 41(11), 2446–2466. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X20000484>

Vyatkin, B. A. (Ed.) (2011). Psychology of integral individuality: Perm school: Anthology of scientific works. Smysl. (in Russ.).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1968). On two directions in understanding the nature of emotions in foreign psychology at the beginning of the 20th century. *Voprosy Psichologii*, 2, 157–159. (in Russ.).

West, K., & Glynn, J. (2016). "Death talk", "loss talk" and identification in the process of ageing. *Ageing & Society*, 36(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X14001039>

Westerhof, G. J., Nehrkorn-Bailey, A. M., Tseng, H.-Y., Brothers, A., Siebert, J. S., Wurm, S., Wahl, H. W., & Diehl, M. (2023). Longitudinal effects of subjective aging on health and longevity: An updated meta-analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, 38(3), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000737>

Znakov, V. V. (2003). Psychology of the subject as a methodology for understanding human existence. *Psychological Journal*, 24, 95–106. (in Russ.).

Znakov, V. V., Ryabikina, Z. I. (2017). *Psychology of human existence*. Smysl. (in Russ.).

Received: October 29, 2024

Revised: January 13, 2025

Accepted: August 14, 2025

## Author Contributions

**Zinaida I. Ryabikina** — conceptualization of the study, formulation of research objectives, development of the methodological framework, interpretation of findings, scientific supervision, and oversight of the research process.

**Elena R. Mironova** — development of the manuscript structure, research design, theoretical analysis of the research problem, literature review, presentation of results, scientific editing and refinement of the manuscript, and formulation of conclusions.

**Olga A. Lavrova** — management of Russian and international literature sources, data collection, data preparation for analysis, statistical processing of empirical data, drafting the abstract, keywords, and main statements, writing the manuscript, interpretation of results, formulation of conclusions, and preparation of the reference list.

## Author Details

**Zinaida I. Ryabikina** — Dr. Sci. (Psychology), Professor of the Department of Personality Psychology and General Psychology, Faculty of Management and Psychology, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russian Federation, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7396-0115>; e-mail: [z.ryabikina@yandex.ru](mailto:z.ryabikina@yandex.ru)

**Elena R. Mironova** — Cand. Sci. (Psychology), Associate Professor at the Department of HR Management and Organizational Psychology, Faculty of Management and Psychology, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russian Federation; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8424-7942>; e-mail: [jelenamironova@rambler.ru](mailto:jelenamironova@rambler.ru)

**Olga A. Lavrova** — applicant for Cand. Sci. (Psychology) at the Department of Personality Psychology and General Psychology, Faculty of Management and Psychology, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russian Federation; ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7341-3653>; e-mail: [lavloa@yandex.ru](mailto:lavloa@yandex.ru)

## Conflict of Interest Information

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.