Environmental Health and Preventive Medicine Post-traumatic stress disorders in the Nanai after the pollution of the Amur River: ethnocultural analysis --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Post-traumatic stress disorders in the Nanai after the pollution of the Amur River: ethnocultural analysis
Article Type:	Regular Article
Corresponding Author:	Kiyofumi Saijoh Kanazawa University JAPAN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	Kanazawa University
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Natalia Korshunova, M.D,
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Natalia Korshunova, M.D,
	Hironobu Katsuyama, M.D. PhD
	Masashi Demura, M.D. PhD
	Hideji Tanii, PhD
	Midori Katsuyama, MSc
	Sri Ratna Rahayu, M.D.
	Nikolay Anatoljevich Bogdanov, M.D.
	Lyudmila Vasilyevna Solokhina, M.D.
	Kiyofumi Saijoh
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	Subjects: Chemical pollution of the Amur River seriously damaged traditions and caused post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among the Nanai, the indigenous people living along this river. Methods: The study group was randomly selected and included 75 male and 112 female volunteers. Severity of PTSD was measured using the Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R) and Clinical-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS). The scores were compared according to demographic and ethnocultural background, clinical examination, and ethnopsychological attitude toward the Amur River. Results: Around 42% (79/187 subjects) and 36% (67) had total IES-R (Total-I) score ≥34 and CAPS (Total-C) score ≥40. The participants grouped by place of residence, relation to other nationalities, psychopathological episodes in childhood, etc., showed significant differences in not only total but also each categorical score (Intrusion, Avoidance, and Hyperarousal). However, the effects of other parameters were not obvious, and logistic regression analysis was applied to compare the PTSD group with the non-PTSD group. Middle age, "friendly" family, "having children," etc., were extracted as risk factors, while "marriage," "friendly toward other nationalities," etc., were deemed to be protective factors. However, intimacy toward the Amur River was judged to be both a risk and a protective factor from general demographic and clinicopsychological situations were as expected. However, those from ethnocultural situations and relations toward the Amur River, which are specific factors for the indigenous Nanai, are still complex and difficult to interpret.

1	Post-traumatic stress disorders in the Nanai after the pollution of the Amur River:
2	ethnocultural analysis
3	Natalia Korshunova ^a , Hironobu Katsuyama ^b , Masashi Demura ^a , Hideji Tanii ^a , Midori
4	Katsuyama ^a , Sri Ratna Rahayu ^a , Nikolay Anatoljevich Bogdanov ^c , Lyudmila Vasilyevna
5	Solokhina ^d , Kiyofumi Saijoh ^a
6	From the Department of Hygiene, Kanazawa University School of Medicine, Kanazawa,
7	Japan ^a , the Department of Public Health, Kawasaki Medical University, Kurashiki, Japan ^b ,
8	and the Department of Psychiatry and Medical Psychology ^c and Department of Public Health
9	and Healthcare system Organization ^d , Far Eastern State Medical University, Khabarovsk,
10	Russia ^c
11	Keywords; indigenous people Nanai, post-traumatic stress disorders (PTSD), Impact of Event
12	Scale-Revision (IES-R), Clinical-administered PTSD Scale (CAPS), Ethno-cultural analysis
13	
14	Correspondence:
15	Kiyofumi Saijoh, MD, PhD
16	Professor and Chairperson
17	Department of Hygiene
18	Kanazawa University School of Medicine
19	Kanazawa 920-8640, Japan
20	Tel; +81-76-265-2213
21	Fax; +81-76-423-4231
22	e-mail; <u>saijohk@med.kanazawa-u.ac.jp</u>
23	

25 Abstract

Objectives: Chemical pollution of the Amur River seriously damaged traditions and caused
post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among the Nanai, the indigenous people living along
this river.

Methods: The study group was randomly selected and included 75 male and 112 female volunteers. Severity of PTSD was measured using the Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R) and Clinical-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS). The scores were compared according to demographic and ethnocultural background, clinical examination, and ethnopsychological attitude toward the Amur River.

34 Results: Around 42% (79/187 subjects) and 36% (67) had total IES-R (Total-I) score >34 and CAPS (Total-C) score \geq 40. The participants grouped by place of residence, relation to other 35 nationalities, psychopathological episodes in childhood, etc., showed significant differences 36 in not only total but also each categorical score (Intrusion, Avoidance, and Hyperarousal). 37 However, the effects of other parameters were not obvious, and logistic regression analysis 38 39 was applied to compare the PTSD group with the non-PTSD group. Middle age, "friendly" family, "having children," etc., were extracted as risk factors, while "marriage," "friendly 40 toward other nationalities," etc., were deemed to be protective factors. However, intimacy 41 42 toward the Amur River was judged to be both a risk and a protective factor.

43 *Conclusion:* The functions of extracted factors from general demographic and
44 clinicopsychological situations were as expected. However, those from ethnocultural
45 situations and relations toward the Amur River, which are specific factors for the indigenous
46 Nanai, are still complex and difficult to interpret.

47

48 Introduction

More than two thirds of the general population may experience a significant traumatic event at some point in their lives, and therefore traumatic experiences are relatively common [1]. Mass traumatic events usually involve many people and may result in a wide range of mental and physical health consequences [2]. Personal care is required because such experiences are unusual and unique for each individual [3, 4].

Nanai is a small population of indigenous people in the Russian Far East, living along the 54 middle reaches of the Amur River valley. Their culture and language include Tungusic 55 (Ewenki), aboriginal Nivkh, as well as Chinese-Manchu elements. They have their own 56 57 independent culture and live by fishing in the Amur River and hunting in the local forest. In December 2005, an accident at a chemical factory caused the release of poisonous substances 58 into the Songhua River (Jilin, China), which polluted the Amur River in the Russian territory 59 [5]. This serious pollution of river water with benzene and nitrobenzene [6] resulted in the 60 prohibition on fishing, thus disrupting the way in which the Nanai obtain their staple food as 61 well as their traditional activities. 62

In addition, this population has always regarded the Amur River as part of their ethos, symbolic culture, and inner world. They have a shamanistic religion with great reverence for the bear and fire. They also believe that their ancestors originated from the Amur River, which is also the guide to the world of spirits after death. These characteristic beliefs have led to catastrophic effects in this case. The disaster started suddenly. However, pollutants settle to the river bed and freeze into ice, and so their toxicities had prolonged stressful effects, leading to chronic trauma, disadaptation, and powerlessness regarding the situation.

Environmental factors are potential sources of tense social situations and inducers of somatic and mental pathologies, such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Moreover, it has already been documented that manmade/technological disasters may have different and more marked consequences than natural disasters [1].

PTSD is the most commonly studied and probably the most frequent and debilitating 74 psychological disorder that occurs after traumatic events, disasters, and life-threatening events 75 [1, 3, 4]. PTSD is the only psychiatric disorder that has an etiological component, i.e., 76 77 exposure to a traumatic event. According to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) [7], the diagnosis of PTSD requires three clusters of 78 symptoms, i.e., intrusion/reexperiencing of the event, avoidance/numbness, and hyperarousal 79 80 from exposure to traumatic events. On the other hand, there is increasing evidence suggesting that PTSD is related not only to mental health impairment [8, 9] and social functioning [9-11] 81 but also to increased risk of somatic diseases [12-14] and overall mortality [15]. 82

In the present study, to detect the special characteristics of PTSD of the indigenous Nanai people after the disaster, the Impact of Event Scale-Revised (IES-R) and the Clinical-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS) were utilized to measure severity of PTSD associated with demographic and ethnocultural background, clinical examination, and ethnopsychological attitude toward the Amur River.

88 Subjects and methods

89 Subjects

90 The participants in this study were selected randomly and included 187 indigenous adult 91 Nanai volunteers over 18 years old (the age at which an individual does not require a guardian 92 according to the laws of the Russian Federation) from the general civilian population in the 8 93 villages of Nanai Regional District of Khabarovsk Regional Territory located in the Far East 94 of Russian Federation.

The field-type survey was performed by visiting the yards in residential areas of the participants during the daytime (usually from 9 am to 6 pm). The survey was carried out during winter and spring 2006 during the ecological catastrophe. Two medical doctors trained in the specifics of PTSD research conducted the interviews under the supervision of the senior interviewer. This study was conducted with all participants' written informed consent to all procedures. The questionnaires were assigned ID numbers to protect the identities of the
participants. The study design was approved by the Ethical Committee of Kanazawa
University School of Medicine (Japan) and the Ethical Committee of Far Eastern State
Medical University (Russian Federation).

104 Self-administered questionnaire

105 We used a self-administered questionnaire consisting of four sections. The first was the 106 demographic section, which contained questions regarding gender, age, place of residence, 107 education level, profession, marrital status, and housing condition. The second section consisted of questions related to ethnocultural information, i.e., native language, relation to 108 109 own and other nationalities, relation to religion, confession, forms of religious rituals (for believers), role playing of a married couple, domestic atmosphere, age hierarchy, number of 110 children, priority values, observance to national ceremonies (folk festivals, marriage, birth, 111 etc.), belief in national myths and omens, attitudes toward mental illness and suicide, and 112 preferred methods of medical treatment. The third section was related to clinical examination, 113 114 and included questions about psychopathological family history, psychopathological episodes in childhood, predominant forms of response in stressful situations, anxiety, sphere of 115 psychotraumatic situation, manifestation of work disadaptation, manifestation of social 116 disadaptation, and level of somatic health. The fourth section of the questionnaire dealt with 117 ethnopsychological questions related to the Amur River and included information about 118 inhabiting fish, water pollution, sentiment toward the Amur River, and plans for the future. 119

120

121 PTSD examinations

All participants were asked to complete written questionnaires designed according to the Russian-language certified version [16] of the Impact of Event Scale-Revision, IES-R [17] and to have an interview according to the Clinical-administered PTSD Scale (CAPS) [18, 19] for PTSD examination. All patients fulfilled Criterion A for the diagnosis of PTSD; i.e., they had experienced an event that involved threatened death or serious injury to which theyresponded with intense fear, helplessness, or horror.

128 *IES-R (Russian-language certified version)*

129 IES-R consists of 22 items based on self-reports measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 4 (not at all, rarely, sometimes, often, and always, respectively) and 130 identifies trends in prevalence of Intrusion/Reexperience (compulsion to repeat), Avoidance 131 132 of traumatic events and Hyperarousal (physiological excitability) that are included in the diagnostic criteria of PTSD in DSM-IV [7]. The first category regarding symptoms of 133 Intrusion included nightmares, intrusive feelings, images or thoughts, flashbacks. The second 134 category regarded symptoms of Avoidance including attempts to mitigate or avoid 135 experiences associated with the traumatic event and reduced reactivity. The third category 136 involved Hyperarousal to physiological symptoms of irritability to describe the following 137 areas; anger and irritability, exaggerated startle response, difficulty in concentration, 138 psychophysiological arousal due to memories, and insomnia. Participants were presented with 139 three groups of questions, Intrusion (7 items), Avoidance (8 items), and Hyperarousal (7 140 items) that can be answered by the scheme of points 0, 1, 3, and 5 for the answer "no," 141 "rarely," "sometimes," and "often," respectively. Three subscale scores were obtained by 142 summing the relevant item scores and the total score was also obtained: score range, Intrusion 143 0-28, Avoidance 0-32, Hyperarousal 0-28, and Total 0-88. Several cut-off values were 144 reported to detect symptoms indicating a risk and/or vulnerability of PTSD. The mean IES-R 145 score for PTSD was 20, and a score of \geq 20 on the IES-R was used to estimate the prevalence 146 of PTSD symptoms, with higher IES-R scores indicating more symptoms [8, 9]. The PTSD 147 148 high-risk group was also defined as those scoring 25 or higher, based on the screening results [20, 21]. Individuals with a total IES-R score over 33 have been proposed to be regarded as a 149 "probable PTSD cases" [22]. However, the score can reach near 60 after torture [23]. 150

151 *CAPS (Russian-language certified version)*

CAPS is a structured interview developed to diagnose and rate the severity of PTSD [18, 19]. 152 It is comprised of 17 items to assess frequency and intensity of core symptoms of PTSD 153 determined by DSM-IV criteria evaluated by two medical doctors trained in the specifics of 154 155 PTSD research under the supervision of the senior interviewer. The 17 items can be classified into three scales: Intrusion/Reexperience (4 items), reexperience of traumatic events in the 156 form of irritating thoughts, flashbacks, and distressing dreams; Avoidance (7 items), 157 avoidance of trauma-related thoughts and events, and restricted emotions; Hyperarousal (6 158 items), arousal such as sleep disorders, uneasiness, and hypervigilance. Participants were 159 presented with all questions that could be answered by the scheme scores for frequency and 160 161 intensity on a 5-point Likert-type scale. For answers of frequency: 0, none, 1, rarely (0% – 25% of the period), 2; sometimes (25% - 50%), 3; often (50% - 75%); and 4, always (> 162 75%). For answers of intensity: 0, no such feelings; 1, weak intensity of symptoms; 2, 163 moderate intensity; 3, high intensity; and 4, very high intensity. Estimation of severity scores 164 for each group and the total was made by summing the frequency and intensity ratings. The 165 score ranges were 0 - 16 for Intrusion, 0 - 32 for Avoidance, 0 - 28 for Hyperarousal, and 0 - 32166 136 for Total. The total score was classified as follows: subclinical, 0 - 19; mild, 20 - 39; 167 moderate, 40 - 59; severe, 60 - 79; extreme, ≥ 80 [24]. 168

169 Statistical analysis

The mean scores of each scale of IES-R and CAPS were compared between and among groups divided by demographic characteristics using Student's *t* test and one-way ANOVA with Tukey's HSD as a post hoc test. The relationships among each category of IES-R and CAPS were analyzed by factor analysis. To examine factors that made IES-R and CAPS scores high, logistic regression analysis was performed using the score and classification of self-administered questionnaire as determinants. All analyses were performed with JMP 9.0.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NY).

177 **Results**

The means of total scores of IER-S and CAPS (respectively, Total-I and Total-C) for all subjects were 31.5 ± 20.1 and 35.0 ± 16.2 , respectively (Table 1). Although scores of Total-I and Total-C were significantly correlated, they were not identical. Around 42% (79 of 187) and 36% (67) had Total-I score ≥ 34 and Total-C score ≥ 40 (Fig. 1).

To evaluate the relationships among symptoms available by these two tests, we utilized 182 principal factor analysis and three factors were extracted (Table 2). Factor 1 consisted of the 183 scores obtained by IES-R alone (Intrusion-I, Avoidance-I, and Hyperarousal-I), displaying a 184 very high total variance of 51%. Factor 2 was dependent on high scores of Avoidance and 185 Hyperarousal but not of Intrusion examined by CAPS (respectively, Avoidance-C, 186 187 Hyperarousal-C, and Intrusion-C), whereas factor 3 only included Intrusion-C. Their total variances were 19% and 15%, respectively, and were not significantly different. IES-R and 188 CAPS had different definitions even when used to estimate similar symptoms and were useful 189 for estimating PTSD. Thus, we analyze which factors of general demographic, ethnocultural, 190 and clinicopsychological situations, and relations to the Amur River affected these differences 191 192 (Tables 1 and 3 - 5).

Although all the scores of age group "18 - 29" tended to be lower than those of other age groups, the difference in Total-C between "18 - 29" and "30 - 39" alone was significant (Table 1). The averages of all IER-S and CAPS scores of "settlement residents" were very low and significantly different from those of "villagers." Excluding these two differences, dividing the groups by general demographic information did not show specific tendencies.

198 Next, we performed a comparison between groups divided according to ethnocultural 199 information (Table 3). "Inferior" feeling regarding their own nationality resulted in a 200 significantly higher Total-C than "equal" feeling. "Not tolerate" toward other nationalities 201 was usually associated with higher scores for all items compared to "friendly" and "tolerate," 202 while only very high Total-C (48.7 \pm 16.8) showed a significant difference. The data from 203 questions related to religion seemed not to be useful. For example, 120 participants answered

that they were "nonbelievers" but the number of those who expressed "religious beliefs" was 204 153. This contradiction was probably because it was prohibited to have religious beliefs 205 during the Soviet Union period. We omitted these categories from further analysis. The 206 207 groups divided according to information about family relations, such as dominant role in spouse position, age hierarchy, domestic atmosphere, and having children or not, showed no 208 obvious effects. There were also no obvious effects among the groups divided according to 209 210 attitude toward ethnic customs, such as observance of national ceremonies and belief of 211 national myths and omens, or attitudes toward mental illness and suicide. Among the groups divided by medical treatment preference, Total-C of "Western" was significantly lower than 212 213 that of "shamanism," with low Avoidance-C and Hyperarousal-C.

With regard to clinical examination, the effects of psychopathological family history were 214 ambiguous but psychopathological episodes in childhood displayed obvious effects (Table 4). 215 Although episodes of organic-type disorders, such as enuresis, night terror, sleep walking, 216 etc., alone and those with affective type disorders, such as phobias, depressive reaction, 217 218 irritability, etc., alone had no obvious effects, their combination was associated with an extremely high Total-C of 54.6 \pm 11.6 due to very high Avoidance-C and Hyperarousal-C. 219 Those who had a "balanced" response to stressful situations tended to have lower means of all 220 221 IER-S and CAPS scores than those who reported different responses. However, significant differences in Total-C were observed only against "expressive" and "self-aggressive." 222 Regardless of whether it was significant or not, those who had "no" sphere of 223 psychotraumatic situation tended to have low scores. Especially, their Avoidance-C, 224 Hyperarousal-C, and Total-C were significantly lower than those with such spheres. Although 225 significances was observed only in CAPS scores, all of the scores of "always" for anxiety 226 were higher than those of "no" or "situational." Those who manifested work disadaptation, 227 such as "underperformance" and "loss of rhythm," had higher CAPS scores than those who 228 reported "none." Especially, the mean Total-C of those who displayed "underperformance" 229

and "loss of rhythm" with "failure" reached 52.2 ± 13.5 . Their Total-I also reached 47.5 ± 25.0 . Among social disadaptation, "aggression" had high CAPS scores regardless of the presence or absence of other disadaptations. In comparison with Avoidance-C and Hyperarousal-C, these factors showed less effect on Intrusion-C. None of the scores were different due to somatic health status.

Those who thought of fish in the Amur River as "neither basic nor important food" tended to 235 236 have lower IES-R and CAPS scores and their Intrusion-I, Intrusion-C, Hyperarousal-C, and Total-C were significantly lower than those in the "basic and important food" group (Table 237 5). However, the effects of whether they really "eat" fish from the river or not were not 238 239 always obvious. Those who thought that this pollution was "not terrible" had significantly lower IES-R and CAPS scores than those who accepted it as a "disaster." The groups divided 240 by individual sentiment toward the Amur River had no significantly different scores 241 excluding Intrusion-C. 242

Logistic regression analysis was applied for the group possibly with PTSD having either 243 Total-I \ge 34 or Total-C \ge 40 (n = 110, approx. 60%) against the group possibly without PTSD 244 having Total-I < 34 and Total-C < 40 (n = 77, approx. 40%) (Table 6). As the presence of 245 anxiety and manifestation of work disadaptation seemed to have very high co-linearity with 246 PTSD judgment, they were removed from the determinants. Age groups "30 - 39" and "40 - 39" 247 49" showed greater risk than other age groups. "Villagers" were at higher risk than 248 "settlement residents," and "state house" than "own house" or "no house" groups. Higher 249 educational level seemed to be protective because the odds ratio of "secondary" over 250 "elementary" was 0.06 (P = 0.02) (Table 6) and "higher" over "elementary" 0.05 (P = 0.07) 251 (data not shown). Relations to other people was significant: "not married" was a risk 252 compared to "married" as well as "widowed/divorced" who were currently single. "Superior" 253 feeling regarding their own nationality compared to "inferior"; "friendly" feeling toward other 254 nationalities compared to other feelings; "parity" compared to alone; "spouse" compared to 255

"self"; "respect but not subordinate" compared to "subordinate"; age hierarchy; and "formal" 256 or "conflict" compared to "friendly" family relation were protective. Similarly, having "no" 257 children was protective compared to "yes." In terms of priority values, however, "health" was 258 a greater potential risk than "family" as well as "profession" and "material well-being." 259 "Public recognition" was a greater potential risk than the others. With regard to tradition, both 260 "observance of ceremonies" and "no observance of ceremonies" were risks compared to 261 "sometimes," while medical treatment preference for "shamanism" was a risk compared to 262 "traditional" and "Western" medicine. Individual attitude to mental illness to be both 263 "civilized" and "superstitious" were risks compared to "uncertain," and the existence of 264 265 psychopathological family history and episodes with "affective type" disorders in childhood were potential risks compared to the other groups. To respond to stressful situations, 266 "balanced" was a higher risk than other attitudes. Recognition that "family" and "profession," 267 but not "ecology," created psychotraumatic situations was a risk factor. "Subclinical" 268 situation in somatic health was a risk but "existence" of somatic disorder was neither a risk 269 nor protective factor. Subjects who reported thinking of fish in the Amur River as "basic and 270 important" foods and that pollution of the Amur River was a "disaster" showed high risk, but 271 "eating fish" itself was protective compared to "not eating" fish. Although thinking of the 272 Amur River as "sacred" was a potential risk factor and thinking of the Amur River as a "way 273 of life," either "source of income" or "source of food" was protective. Thinking of the Amur 274 River as a "gateway to ancestors/another world" was protective compared to thinking of the 275 Amur River as "just a river." "No plan" to move was protective. 276

277 Discussion

IES-R has been used in various epidemiological studies to assess the prevalence of PTSD [21]. CAPS is useful for estimating the frequency and intensity of individual symptoms/disorders and their impact on social and production activities of patients [25]. Both scales are commonly used [26] and seem to provide very important information regarding people with PTSD risk and/or symptoms. CAPS results were reported to match those of selfreported PTSD measures, particularly the IES, an original version of IES-R [27] produced by
Horowitz et al. [25]. IES-R is produced to be used with the DSM-IV symptomatology for
PTSD [17], and therefore IES-R and CAPS are comparable in terms of Intrusion, Avoidance,
Hyperarousal, and Total scores.

Their scores also show strong correlations and are available in PTSD research and treatment [28, 29] but are not always identical [28 - 30]. Thus, the significance and relationship of each category score and total score are not always apparent.

Factor analysis extracted 3 factors and confirmed that IES-R was different from CAPS because factor 1 only consisted of IES-R. In CAPS, Avoidance/Hyperarousal-C were raised by different background from Intrusion-C because factor 2 included Avoidance/Hyperarousal-C but not Intrusion-C and factor 3 consisted of Intrusion-C alone. These findings suggested that the differences in each category score should be considered more carefully.

The groups divided by general demographic conditions did not always show differences in either IES-R or CAPS scores, and so the effects of "settlement resident" were difficult to estimate.

When the groups were divided by ethnocultural and clinicopsychological situations as well as 298 299 relations to the Amur River, significant differences were more easily found in CAPS than in IES-R. For example, the groups divided by relation to their own nationality and relations to 300 other nationalities showed significant differences only in CAPS scores. Moreover, significant 301 differences in Total-C tended to correspond to those in Avoidance-C and Hyperarousal-C but 302 not those in Intrusion-C. The definition of each category was different between IES-R and 303 304 CAPS, which was in good accordance with the results of factor analysis. In addition, for comparison of averaged scores of divided groups, CAPS may be utilized more easily than 305 IES-R probably because the standard deviation of CAPS was narrower than that of IES-R. 306

High CAPS scores were associated with negative feelings toward both their own and other nationalities, the existence of psychopathological episodes in childhood, and extroversive reaction to stressful situations. It is natural that the existence of anxiety was associated with high CAPS scores as well as manifestation of work and social disadaptation. Especially, manifestation of work disadaptation caused not only high CAPS scores but also high IES-R scores.

It is obvious that those who felt that this pollution was not terrible had a low risk of PTSD, but the effects of intimacy toward the Amur River were not obvious. Thus, logistic regression analysis was applied to extract risk and protective factors by removing confounding factors.

The middle-aged group was at higher risk than the younger and older groups, and it is conceivable that those who had high responsibility to the society displayed higher risk. "State house" itself was a risk and was one of the reasons why "villagers" were at elevated risk because all state houses were in the village. Higher education seemed to be protective, and in fact people engaged in "education" were at lower risk than those with other professions. This pollution was caused by another nation, and so it was natural that maintaining a "friendly" attitude toward other nationalities was protective.

Experience of "marriage," and "equal" or "partner's dominance" in spouse position were 323 protective but having "friendly" family and "having children" were risk factors. These 324 findings are not surprising because having a good relationship with a partner seems to be 325 supportive, but once they had family to be protected, this situation may represent a burden. 326 When priority values were estimated, "family" was protective compared to "health" and 327 "public recognition," and a risk factor compared to "profession." It is not surprising that 328 "health" was a potential risk factor. However, with regard to sphere of psychotraumatic 329 situation, both "family" and "profession" were recognized as risk factors. These findings may 330 have been because "family" and "profession" were recognized sometimes to be the same and 331 sometimes not the same. To have "public recognition" as a priority value was recognized as 332

the highest risk factor, which may be due to the same background where the "middle-agedgroup" and some professions showed increased risk.

Relation to national customs was difficult to analyze as both "positive" and "negative" replies 335 regarding observance of national ceremonies were risk factors, "shamanism" alone was 336 extracted as a risk factor among medical preference, and superstition was not extracted. On 337 the other hand, it is conceivable that intimacy toward the Amur River was a very important 338 339 factor. Neglecting the importance of fish in the Amur River as food and the seriousness of 340 pollution, maintenance of dietary habits, and to continue living in this area were protective factors. To feel that the Amur River is "sacred" or a "gateway to ancestors/another world" 341 342 displayed different importance. "Sacred" and "way of life" were potent risk and protective factors, respectively, but "just a river" was associated with higher risk than "gateway." The 343 discrepancy in the meaning of "sacred" and "gateway" should be analyzed by changing the 344 range of determinants. 345

It is not difficult to imagine the function of extracted factors from general demographic and clinicopsychological situations, but those from ethnocultural situations and relations toward the Amur River are more difficult. Especially, the effects of sentiment toward the Amur River, which is a specific factor for indigenous Nanai people, are very complex and difficult to interpret. To improve the current situation, we are planning to perform an immediate follow-up investigation.

352

- 353 Conflict of interest
- The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

355

356 **References**

- Galea S, Nandi A, Vlahov D. The epidemiology of post-traumatic stress disorder after
 disasters. Epidemiol. Rev. 2005;27;78-91.
- Norris FH. Epidemiology of trauma: frequency and impact of different potentially
 traumatic events on different demographic groups. J. Consult. Clin. Psychol. 1992; 60:
 409-18.
- 362 3. Norris FH, Friedman MJ, Watson PJ, Byrne CM, Diaz E, Kaniasty K. 60,000 disaster
 363 victims speak: part I. An empirical review of the empirical literature, 1981–2001.
 364 Psychiatr. 2001; 65: 207–39.
- 4. Ursano RJ, Fullerton CS, Weisaeth L, Raphael B. (eds), Textbook of Disaster Psychiatry,

Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. 2007; 3-28.

- 5. U.N.E.P. The Songhua River Spill China, December 2005, Field Mission Report, 2005.
- 368 6. Zhu L, Ma B, Zhang L, Zhang L. The study of distribution and fate of nitrobenzene in a
 369 water/sediment microcosm. Chemosph. 2007; 69: 1579-85.
- 370 7. American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders.
 371 Fourth edition. Washington, DC, 1994.
- 372 8. Feinstein A, Owen J, Blair N. A hazardous profession: War, journalists and
 373 psychopathology. Am. J. Psychol. 2002; 59: 1570–5.
- 9. Hawryluck L, Gold WL, Robinson S, Pogorski S, Galea S, Styra R. SARS Control and
 Psychological Effects of Quarantine, Toronto, Canada. Emerg. Inf. Dise. 2004; 10: 1206–
 12.
- 10. North CS, Nixon SJ, Shariat S, Mallonee S, McMillen JC, Spitznagel E., et al. Psychiatric
 disorders among survivors of the Oklahoma City bombing. JAMA. 1999; 282: 755–62.
- 11. Smith MW, Schnurr PP, Rosenheck RA. Employment outcomes and PTSD symptom
- 380 severity. Ment. Hlth. Serv. Res. 2005; 7: 89–101.

- 381 12. Schnurr PP, Green BL. Understanding relationships among trauma, post-tramatic stress
 382 disorder, and health outcomes. Adv. Mind Body Med. 2004; 20: 18-29.
- 13. Magruder KM, Frueh BC, Knapp RG, Davis L, Hamner MB, Martin RH, et al. Prevalence
- of posttraumatic stress disorder in Veterans Affairs primary care clinics. Gen. Hosp.
 Psychiatr. 2005; 27: 169–79.
- 14. von Känel R, Hepp U, Buddeberg C, Keel M, Mica L, Aschbacher K, et al. Altered blood
 coagulation in patients with posttraumatic stress disorder. Psychosom. Med. 2006; 68:
 598-604.
- 389 15. Boscarino JA. Posttraumatic stress disorder and mortality among U.S. Army veterans 30
 390 years after military service. Ann. Epidemiol. 2006; 16: 248–56.
- 391 16. Tarabrina NV. Workshop on the psychology of post-traumatic stress. St. Petersburg,
 392 Russia. 2001; 272: pp 118-140, 210-227 (in Russian).
- 17. Weiss DS, Marmar CR. The Impact of Event Scale Revised. In Assessing Psychological
 Trauma and PTSD (eds. Wilson JP & Keane TM). Guilford Press. NY, NY, USA, 1997;
 pp. 399 -411.
- 18. Weathers FW, Blake DD, Krinsley KE, Haddad W, Huska JA, Keane TM. The ClinicianAdministered PTSD Scale (CAPS): Reliability and construct validity. Paper presented at
 the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy. Boston, MA,
 USA, 1992a
- 400 19. Weathers FW, Blake DD, Krinsley K, Haddad W, Huska J, Keane TM. The Clinician401 Administered PTSD Scale—Diagnostic Version (CAPS-1): Description, use, and
 402 psychometric properties. In Symposium, An update on the Clinician Administered PTSD
 403 Scales (CAPS-1 and CAPS-2), presented at the meeting of the International Society of
 404 Traumatic Stress Studies, Los Angeles, CA, USA, 1992b.

- 405 20. Asukai N, Kato H, Kawamura N, Kim Y, Yamamoto K, Kishimoto J, et al. Reliability and
- 406 validity of the Japanese-language version of the impact of event scale-revised (IES-R-J).
- 407 Four studies of different traumatic events. J. Nerv. Dis. 2002; 190: 175–82.
- 408 21. Mitani S. Comparative analysis of the Japanese version of the revised impact of event
 409 scale: a study of firefighters. Prehosp. Disast. Med. 2008; 23: s20-26.
- 22. Creamer M, Bell R, Failla S. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event ScaleRevised. Behav. Res. Ther. 2003; 41: 1489–96.
- 412 23. Amone PK. Torture against children in rebel captivity in Northern Uganda: physical and
 413 psychological effects and implications for clinical practice. Torture. 2009; 19,: 102-17.
- 414 24. Mello MF, Yeh MS, Barbosa NJ, Braga LL, Fiks JP, Mendes DD, et al. A randomized,
- double-blind, placebo-controlled trial to assess the efficacy of topiramate in the treatment
 of post-traumatic stress disorder. BMC Psychiatr. 2009; 29: 9-28.
- 417 25. Weathers FW, Keane TM, Davidson JRT. Clinician-administered PTSD Scale: A Review
 418 of the first ten years of research. Depress. Anxiet. 2001; 13: 132–56.
- 26. Elhai D, Gray J, Kashdan B, Franklin L. Which instruments are most commonly used to
 assess traumatic event exposure and posttraumatic effects? A survey of traumatic stress
- 421 professionals. J. Trauma Stress. 2005; 18: 541–5.
- 422 27. Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: A measure of subjective
 423 stress. Psychosom. Med. 1979; 41: 209–218.
- 424 28. Adkins JW, Weathers FW, McDevitt MM, Daniels JB. Psychometric properties of seven
 425 self-report measures of posttraumatic stress disorder in college students with mixed
 426 civilian trauma exposure. J. Anxiet. Disord. 2008; 22: 1393–1402.
- 29. Rasha CJ, Coffeya SF, Baschnagela JS, Drobesc DJ, Saladind MS. Psychometric
 Properties of the IES-R in Traumatized Substance Dependent Individuals with and without
- 429 PTSD. Addict. Behav. 2008; 33: 1039–47.

- 430 30. Beck JG, Grant DM, Read JP, Clapp JD, Coffey SF, Miller LM, Et al. The Impact of
- 431 Event Scale Revised: Psychometric properties in a sample of motor vehicle accident
- 432 survivors. J. Anxiet. Disord. 2008; 22: 187–98.

433

434 Figure legend

435 Fig. 1

436 Correlation of Total-I and Total-C. (R=0.45, P<0.0001).

	Impact of Event Scale Revision (IES-R)						<u>0</u> r				Cl	inical	-Adı	minist	tere	d PTS	DS	Scale	(CA	APS)											
	No	Intrusi	ion		Avoi	danc	e	Hyper	aroi	ısal		Total			-	Intrus	ion			Avoid	ance	e	-	Hyper	aro	usal	-	Total			
gender								• *																							
female	112	12.3	\pm	7.9	12.3	±	8.6	9.2	±	7.6		33.7	\pm	22.0		6.6	\pm	4.4		13.2	\pm	8.2		16.3	±	8.0		36.0	±	16.1	
male	75	10.7	\pm	6.6	10.3	±	7.2	7.3	±	5.5		28.3	\pm	16.4		7.4	\pm	5.8		12.4	\pm	9.4		13.5	±	6.4	а	33.4	±	16.4	
age class																															
18-29	52	9.8	\pm	6.7	10.3	±	8.1	7.0	±	6.4		27.1	\pm	19.7		4.7	\pm	4.3		11.1	\pm	9.0		13.7	±	7.9		29.5	±	16.5	
30-39	52	12.0	\pm	7.9	13.0	±	8.7	9.7	±	8.2		34.7	\pm	23.0		6.9	±	4.3		14.9	±	8.6		16.5	±	7.1		38.3	±	16.3	b
40-49	37	12.7	\pm	6.7	11.9	±	7.6	7.8	±	5.2		32.4	\pm	15.5		7.0	±	4.9		13.1	±	7.9		15.8	±	6.8		35.9	±	13.8	
50-59	38	12.8	\pm	7.6	10.9	±	7.7	8.9	±	6.3		32.6	\pm	19.0		8.9	±	5.2	b	11.9	±	9.1		14.8	±	8.6		35.6	±	17.4	
≥ 60	8	11.1	\pm	10.2	10.1	±	7.8	9.6	±	9.6		30.9	\pm	26.6		11.3	±	7.0	b	13.8	±	8.5		15.5	±	4.5		40.5	±	12.3	
place of residnece																															
village	172	12.1	\pm	7.4	11.8	±	8.1	8.9	±	7.0		32.8	\pm	20.1		7.1	±	5.1		13.6	±	8.5		16.2	±	6.9		36.9	±	15.1	
settlement	15	5.7	\pm	5.1	a 7.7	±	7.1	3.2	±	2.4	а	16.7	\pm	13.4	а	4.7	±	4.0		4.1	±	5.3	а	4.0	±	4.9	а	12.8	±	12.0	а
housing																															
own haose	140	11.5	\pm	0.6	10.8	±	7.8	8.1	±	6.8		30.4	±	20.3		6.8	±	5.1		12.2	±	8.8		14.9	±	7.5		33.9	±	16.1	
state house	31	12.2	\pm	6.2	13.9	±	8.3	8.7	±	6.4		34.8	±	18.0		7.1	±	4.2		15.8	±	7.6		15.5	±	7.1		38.5	±	15.2	
no house	16	11.6	±	1.9	12.9	±	9.6	11.0	±	8.2		35.5	±	22.0		7.6	±	5.5		12.8	±	9.2		17.3	±	8.4		37.6	±	18.9	
marrital status																															
married	140	11.2	\pm	7.5	11.3	±	8.1	8.0	±	6.5		30.5	\pm	19.6		7.5	±	5.2		12.5	±	8.5		15.0	±	7.9		35.1	±	16.7	
not married	32	11.8	\pm	6.5	11.8	±	7.1	8.3	±	6.5		31.9	\pm	18.1		4.3	±	3.8	b	13.7	±	9.9		15.3	±	5.9		33.3	±	15.0	
widowed/divorce	c 15	15.1	\pm	8.6	12.3	±	10.1	12.6	±	9.7	b	39.9	\pm	27.1		6.8	±	4.3		14.3	±	8.3		16.3	±	7.7		37.3	±	14.9	
educational level																															
primary	44	12.4	\pm	7.3	12.6	±	8.1	10.0	±	7.6		35.0	\pm	21.6		6.4	±	5.0		12.4	±	9.4		15.9	±	7.7		34.7	±	16.2	
secondary	113	11.6	\pm	7.5	11.1	±	8.1	8.3	±	6.7		31.0	\pm	19.8		7.2	±	5.2		12.9	±	8.6		15.4	±	7.3		35.4	±	16.4	
higher	30	10.7	\pm	7.6	11.1	±	8.1	6.6	±	6.1		28.4	±	18.9		6.6	±	4.3		13.5	±	8.4		13.4	±	8.1		33.5	±	16.0	
profession																															
buisiness	14	11.1	\pm	8.1	10.4	±	7.7	7.1	±	5.4		28.7	±	18.3		6.4	±	4.2		10.4	±	8.5		13.9	±	6.6		30.6	±	14.3	
culture	13	10.7	\pm	6.9	11.8	±	9.1	7.3	±	6.3		29.8	±	20.3		7.3	±	3.2		9.9	±	6.3		15.4	±	6.9		32.6	±	12.4	
education	39	11.5	±	7.3	12.2	±	8.1	8.2	±	6.9		31.9	±	19.7		6.9	±	4.9		12.4	±	8.3		15.5	±	8.2		34.8	±	16.6	
fishery	13	10.4	\pm	8.6	7.1	±	6.7	6.3	±	6.5		23.8	±	18.8		4.8	±	4.1		11.7	±	8.7		12.0	±	8.6		28.5	±	19.0	
health	16	12.6	\pm	5.1	11.3	±	6.2	8.9	±	4.9		32.8	±	12.7		8.3	±	4.3		12.4	±	5.6		14.0	±	6.6		34.6	±	12.1	
industry	23	10.3	±	6.8	11.0	±	7.6	6.9	±	6.5		28.2	±	19.1		7.0	±	5.1		13.7	±	8.2		14.8	±	7.1		35.5	±	15.2	
transportation	7	8.9	±	6.6	8.1	±	8.6	7.0	±	6.9		24.0	±	21.0		7.9	±	8.2		9.7	±	9.0		9.9	±	6.8		27.4	±	19.3	
others	14	13.1	±	7.7	10.4	±	7.7	6.6	±	5.0		30.1	±	18.0		6.2	±	5.0		16.9	±	12.3		14.3	±	6.4		37.4	±	19.1	
not working	48	12.8	±	8.3	13.4	±	9.0	11.1	±	8.2		37.3	±	23.6		7.1	\pm	5.7		14.1	\pm	9.3		17.7	±	7.6		38.9	±	16.8	

Table 1 Comparison of IER-S and CAPS scores between/among groups divided acording to the demographic characteristics

The values represent the mean \pm SD. Significant difference, a; between groups (P<0.05, Students' t-test), and b; from the first group (P<0.05, one-way ANOVA with Tuckyr's HSD as a post hoc test).

		Facter 1	Facter 2	Facter 3
IES-R				
	Intrusion	0.85	-0.00	0.17
	Avoidance	0.93	-0.02	-0.12
	Hyperarousal	0.88	0.07	0.03
CAPS				
	Intrusion	-0.00	0.00	0.99
	Avoidance	-0.08	0.95	-0.07
	Hyperarousal	0.06	0.83	0.09
Eugen value		3.04	1.13	0.89
% total varian	ce	0.51	0.19	0.15

Table 2 Principal facter analysis for the scores of PTSD symptoms examined by IES-R andCAPS

The values represent after facter analysis with Varimax rotation (P<0.0001).

Table 3 Comparison of IER-S and CAPS scores between/among groups divided acording to the ethno-cultural information

Interstorm Interstorm Interstorm Nondance Programmal Tesl Tesl Basem 16 12.3 7.6 10.0 2.5 2.0 6.3 2.5 10.0 12.4 4.3 15.4 7.7 35.8 15.4 Interstor 2.7 10.0 8.5 7.7 6.9 22.3 19.7 0.9 5.2 15.4 8.3 15.4 7.7 35.8 10.0 18.3 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 10.0 18.5 1.4 1.5 18.5 1.4 1.5 18.5 1.4 1.5 18.5 1.4 1.5 1.5 1.4 1.5 1.5 1.4 1.4 1.5	Impact of Event Scale Revision (IES-R)														Cli	nical-	Ad	minis	tered	1 PT	SD S	Scale	e (CAP	S)					
Lative number of the set of the		No	Intru	sion	1	Avoi	dano	ce	Hype	raro	ousal	Total			Intru	sion	1		Avoic	lan	ce	ł	Iype	raro	usal	Tota	1		
Buosance 6 9.8 ± 0.8 104 ± 73 7 3 ± 70 27.5 ± 70 7.7 ± 70 27 ± 40 7.2 ± 4.8 12.2 ± 8.8 13.4 ± 17.2 + 7.3 ± 35.2 ± 16.4 Examples of the number of number o	native language																							_					
Rumanoven 120 122 + 8 7 0 a 120 + 8 2 00 - 6 8 235 - 19.9 72 - 4 9 132 - 8 8 154 + 7.7 358 + 164 4 6 9 equal 144 113 + 75 115 + 73 8 8 2 6 7 16 0 23 - 19.7 6 - 5 4 5 158 - 8 3 19.1 4 5 12 0 53 7 + 157 6 39 6 7 4 9 118 - 8 3 19.1 4 5 12 0 53 7 + 157 6 39 6 7 4 9 118 - 8 3 19.1 4 5 12 0 53 7 + 157 6 39 6 7 4 9 118 - 8 7 113 + 75 18 5 4 0 - 154 4 14 - 2 10 9 + 75 8 3 - 72 20 6 - 19.9 6 - 5 4 14 1 - 9 12 9 + 80 361 + 174 9 126 + 80 39 4 175 19 10 0 + 73 8 3 - 72 30 4 - 19.9 6 - 5 4 14 1 - 9 125 + 80 361 + 174 9 126 + 80 361 + 174 9 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 361 + 174 126 + 80 363 + 81 118 + 77 137 37 4 14 + 174 126 + 80 4 134 + 164 146 126 + 22 10.0 + 8.2 10.2 + 74 74 76 - 72 278 - 104 5 8 - 54 87 + 106 166 416 - 20 106 + 81 126 + 124 114 10 4 10 4 10 4 20 4 20 + 93 + 163 126 + 124 146 + 124 126 + 124 146 + 124 146 + 124 146 + 124 147 126 + 124 146 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 146 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 126 + 124 146 + 124 147 126 + 124 147 147 148 + 144 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 116 147 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148 148	Russian	61	9.8	±	6.8	10.4	±	7.9	7.3	±	7.0	27.5	±	20.1	6.3	±	5.2		12.2	±	8.4	1	4.7	± 7	7.2	33.2	±	15.8	
relation to avainability in the set of the	Russian/own	126	12.5	±	7.6	a 12.0	±	8.2	9.0	±	6.8	33.5	±	19.9	7.2	±	4.9		13.2	±	8.8	1	5.4	± 7	7.7	35.8	±	16.4	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	relation to own nationality																												
quai14413	inferior	28	11.6	±	7.2	10.0	±	8.5	7.7	±	6.9	29.3	±	19.7	6.9	±	5.2		15.8	±	8.3	1	9.1	± 8	3.5	41.9	±	16.9	
approx15161885.710987.111.48.83.9917.3Bindlo U1711.587.711.3828.26.631.1 \neq 0.17.04.911.888.214.531.313.313.2Bindlow U11.2.585.310.18.711.88.77.46.44.906.44.914.78.214.57.716.88.214.57.78.710.29.811.414.78.710.68.716.88.44.010.29.410.29.511.414.78.710.68.716.817.717.110.414.114.814.717.717.417	equal	144	11.3	±	7.5	11.5	±	7.8	8.2	±	6.7	31.0	±	19.8	6.7	±	4.9		12.5	±	8.7	1	4.5	± 7	7.0 1	b 33.7	±	15.7	b
relation other nationalities: relation relation other nationalities: relation relation r	superior	15	14.8	\pm	6.7	14.2	±	10.4	12.3	±	8.2	41.3	±	22.2	9.0	±	5.5		10.9	±	8.7	1	4.1	± 8	8.8	33.9	\pm	17.8	
friendly 127 11.6 4 7 11.3 8.2 4.7 11.1 2.0 14.1 2.0 4.1 4.1 4.2 $1.4.5$ $3.3.3$ $4.5.2$ $3.3.3$ $4.5.2$ $1.6.1$ 4.5 $1.1.5$ 5.8 $1.6.1$ 6.1 4.5 $1.4.1$ -7.2 $1.9.9$ 5.7 $4.8.7$ $1.9.4$ 2.0 9.4 4.3 $1.4.7$ 7.2 $1.9.9$ 5.7 $4.8.7$ $1.9.6$ $1.6.7$ $7.3.4$ $1.6.7$ $7.3.4$ $7.0.4$ 4.9 $1.4.7$ $7.2.9$ $1.6.1$ $1.7.7$ $1.6.7$ $7.3.4$ $7.0.4$ $1.6.9$ $1.3.1$ 8.3 $1.5.7$ 7.7 $1.6.9$ $1.3.1$ 8.6 $1.6.7$ $1.7.7$ $1.5.7$ $1.5.0$ $1.5.4$ $6.8.1$ $1.5.2$ $1.7.7$ $1.6.9$ $1.5.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$ $5.7.7$	relation to other nationalities	5																											
	friendly	127	11.6	±	7.7	11.3	±	8.2	8.2	±	6.7	31.1	±	20.1	7.0	±	4.9		11.8	±	8.2	1	4.5	± 7	7.3	33.3	\pm	15.2	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	tolerable	49	11.4	±	7.3	10.9	±	7.5	8.3	±	7.2	30.6	±	19.9	6.1	±	5.4		14.1	±	9.1	1	5.9	± 8	8.0	36.1	\pm	17.4	
In the definition of the probability of configures of the set of	intolerable	11	12.5	±	5.8	16.1	±	8.7	11.8	±	7.7	40.4	±	20.7	9.4	\pm	4.5		14.7	±	7.2	b 1	9.9	± 5	5.7	48.7	\pm	16.8	b,c
believer 42 11.3 # 7.0 10.6 # 8.3 8.5 # 6.4 30.5 ± 18.7 7.3 ± 5.0 10.2 # 9.5 11.4 = 7.9 28.9 ± 16.5 wholes the way of confession 20 12 ± 7.4 21 ± 7.4 21 ± 8.2 8.5 ± 7.0 32.7 ± 21.0 7 ± 4.9 ± 4.7 ± 8.2 ± 16.5 ± 6.8 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 5.1 ± 6.7 ± 1.8 × 6.4 ± 6.9 ± 1.4 ± 6.9 ± 1.4 ± 6.9 ± 1.4 ± 6.9 ± 1.4 ± 6.9 ± 1.4 ± 6.4 \pm	relation to religion																												
ubeliever 120 121 1 1 2 2 1 <th1< th=""> 1 1 <</th1<>	believer	42	11.3	±	7.0	10.6	±	8.3	8.5	±	6.4	30.5	±	18.7	7.3	±	5.0		10.2	±	9.5		11.4	± ′	7.9	28.9	\pm	16.5	
abeist2510 2 7.4 7.6 7.8 27.8 27.8 27.8 5.6 5.6 5.6 5.6 8.4 6.9 6.3 6.3 $6.7.7$ 7.7	unbeliever	120	12.1	±	7.4	12.1	±	8.2	8.5	±	7.0	32.7	±	20.4	7.0	±	4.9		14.7	±	8.2	b	16.9	± ′	7.1 1	b 38.6	±	15.5	b
the way of confession is a finite orbit of constant o	atheist	25	10.0	±	8.5	10.2	±	7.4	7.6	±	7.3	27.8	±	21.0	5.6	±	5.4		8.4	±	6.9	с	13.4	± (6.3	c 27.3	\pm	13.7	с
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	the way of confession																												
$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{orb}{r} & 11 \mbox$	traditional	110	12.0	±	7.2	11.3	±	7.6	7.9	±	7.9	31.3	±	19.0	7.3	±	5.0		13.1	±	8.8		15.7	± ′	7.5	36.1	±	16.1	
other 41 0.5 8.1 11.1 4 8.5 8.3 30.3 \pm 2.0 5.4 4.7 b 10.8 7.6 14.4 \pm 4.4 30.6 \pm 14.2 min soul 133 11.8 7.5 11.8 7.8 14.4 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.8 1.6 4.8 1.9 7.1 1.4 1.0 1.0 8.8 1.0 4.4 2.8 4.9 5.6 5.7 1.4 7.5 1.6.4 8.4 9.4 1.8 7.5 1.6.4 8.4 9.2 2.2 2.9 2.0 2.9 2.0 2.9 2.0 2.9 2.0 1.	orthodoxy	36	11.7	±	7.4	12.6	±	9.2	9.5	±	9.5	33.8	±	21.5	7.5	±	5.0		14.4	±	9.3		14.5	± 3	8.8	36.3	\pm	18.1	
expression of gredigious belief for the form of the f	other	41	10.5	±	8.1	11.1	±	8.5	8.8	±	8.8	30.3	±	22.0	54	±	47	b	10.8	±	7.6		144	± (54	30.6	±	14.2	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	expression of greligious beli	ef	10.0		0.1			0.0	0.0		0.0	00.0			0		,	C	10.0		1.0					2010		1	
in soult153118-72118 $= 81$ $84 = 66$ 319 = 106 $6.8 = 49$ $124 + 82$ $16.4 + 6.8 = 375 = 14.9 = 14.9$ on1111.4 = 11.411.411.411.0 $= 88$ 11.0 = 4### $384 + 28.5$ $4.9 = 5.6$ $5.7 = 1.0 = 1.9 + 9.2 = 2.2.9 = 2.6.6 = 2.0 $	rituals	23	95	+	64	0.0	+	74	76	+	72	26.0	+	184	8.8	+	52		5 /	+	71		93	+ 5	83	23 5	+	15.6	
$ \begin{array}{c} 111111111111111111111111111111111111$	in soul	153	11.8	- +	7)	9.0 11 8	+	7. 1 Q 1	9.0 8.4	+	6.6	31.0	+	19.4	6.8	- +	<u> </u>). 4 1/1/	+	7.1 Q 7	h	164	- (+ (5.5 5 8 1	25.5 h 375	- +	14 9	h
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	no	11	11.0	+	11 /	13.0	+	0.1	11.0	+	0.0 #####	38.4	+	19.0 28.5	0.0 1 Q	+	т.) 5.6	h	14.4		0.2	с С	10.4	± (a_{1}	-220	+	20.6	c
bells and the inspace point of the inspace point o	dominant role in spouse post	ition	17.7	-	11.7	15.0	-	0.0	11.0	-	11111111	50.4	-	20.5	т.)	-	5.0	0	/.1	-	9.0	C	10.7	± ,	.2	. 22.)	-	20.0	C
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	solf	17	11 8	+	75	133	+	85	80	+	66	34.0	+	20.4	81	+	52		147	+	72	1	68	+ 7	7 2	30.6	+	1/1 5	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	bortnor	-+/ 25	11.0	-	7.J 5 0	13.5		0.5	0.9		0.0	22.6	-	20. 4 10.7	0.1 7 1	-	J.Z		12.7	-	0.0	1	5.0		·.2 75	26.1		14.5	
equal total picable61 13 \pm 6.310.06.07.46.07.46.07.27.47.43.46.03.41.5 \pm 3.410.3 \pm 3.7 \pm 13.7age harmshy respect but not subordinat171 11.6 \pm 7.511.6 \pm 8.8 \pm 7.131.5 \pm 20.56.8 \pm 4.7 \pm 3.8bd3.8 \pm 7.53.7 \pm 3.7 \pm 1.7respect but not subordinat10 12.97.08.4 \pm 8.3 \pm 7.131.5 \pm 20.56.8 \pm 4.91.2 \pm 9.21.7 \pm 9.4 \pm 9.21.2 \pm 1.2 \pm \pm 1.2 \pm 1.21.2 \pm 1.21.2 \pm 1.2 <td< td=""><td></td><td>23 69</td><td>11.4</td><td></td><td>J.0 05</td><td>12.0</td><td>±</td><td>0.<i>5</i></td><td>9.0</td><td>±</td><td>1.0</td><td>20.0</td><td>- -</td><td>19.7</td><td>7.1</td><td>±</td><td>4.5</td><td></td><td>10.0</td><td>±</td><td>0.0</td><td>1</td><td>2.9</td><td>± /</td><td>'.J D 1</td><td>20.1</td><td>±</td><td>10.5</td><td></td></td<>		23 69	11.4		J.0 05	12.0	±	0. <i>5</i>	9.0	±	1.0	20.0	- -	19.7	7.1	±	4.5		10.0	±	0.0	1	2.9	± /	'.J D 1	20.1	±	10.5	
The appreame 4/120 for 11.6 ± 7.5 if 1.6 ± 8.2 8.3 ± 7.1 31.5 ± 20.5 if 4.7 ± 5.8 bd 15.8 ± 6.7 if 5.1 ± 6.2 3.3.7 ± 15.7 if 6.0 ± 5.9 if 7.1 ± 6.2 ± 7.5 34.7 ± 16.0 if 7.1 ± 6.4 if 7.5 ± 5.8 ± 6.1 ± 7.5 if 7.5 ± 7.	equal	47	11.3	±	8.J	10.0	±	8.0 7.5	/.4	±	0.9	20.7	±	20.9	1.5	±	3.4	1. 1	10.0	±	9.4	1	J.0	± 0	5.4 5.2	32.2	±	10.5	
respect but not subordinate 10 12.9 + 7.0 + 1.6 + 8.2 + 8.3 + 7.1 + 31.5 = 20.5 + 6.8 + 4.9 + 12.6 = 8.6 + 15.3 = 7.5 + 3.4.7 + 16.0 + 10 12.9 + 7.0 + 8.4 + 6.3 + 9.3 + 4.6 + 30.6 + 15.8 + 10.2 + 5.2 + 12.4 = 9.2 + 12.7 + 9.0 + 35.3 + 19.3 + 10.0 + 10.1 + 17.8 + 10.0 + 10.1 + 17.8 + 10.0 + 10.1 + 17.8 + 10.0 + 10.1 + 17.8 + 10.0		4/	12.0	±	0./	11.3	±	1.5	8.8	±	0./	32.1	±	18.9	4./	±	3.8	o,a	13.8	±	8.7	1	5.1	± C	0.2	33.1	±	13.7	
The probability of the subordinal of 11 is $= 7.3$ if $1.6 = 8.2$ is $= 7.1$ if 3.15 ± 20.3 is 8.5 ± 4.9 if $2.6 = 8.6$ is $1.5 = 7.3$ is -7.5 is 4.7 ± 16.0 is ubordinate in 12.9 = 7.0 is $3.5 \pm 1.9.3$ is $1.9.3$ indifferent if $1.2.9 \pm 7.6$ if 1.5 ± 5.5 if 4.7 ± 5.6 is 9.0 ± 4.9 is $2.5 \pm 12.4 \pm 9.2$ if 2.7 ± 9.0 is $3.5 \pm 1.9.3$ is $1.9.3$ indifferent if 1.5 ± 5.5 if 1.7 ± 7.5 is 9.0 ± 4.9 is $2.5 \pm 12.4 \pm 9.2$ if 2.7 ± 9.0 is $3.5 \pm 1.9.3$ is $1.9.3$ is $1.9.3$ is $1.9.3 \pm 10.3$ is	age nierarchy	171	11 (75	11.0		0.7	0.7		71	21.5		20.5	()		4.0		12 (0 (1	5 2			247		160	
Subordinate 10 12 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.4 9.2 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.4 9.2 12.4 12.7 11.4 12.3 12.4 12.7 11.4 12.3 12.4 12.3 12.4 11.9 15.0 13.1 15.0 13.0 8.6 12.4 11.6 12.4 8.3 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.4 12.3 12.4 12.3	respect but not subordinal	10	11.0	±	7.5	11.0	±	8.2	8.3	±	/.1	31.5	±	20.5	0.8	±	4.9		12.0	±	8.0	1	5.5	± /	·.5	34.7	±	10.0	
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{indifferent} & 6 & 11.5 \\ \text{omestic atomosphere} \\ \text{friendly} & (113 & 11.7 \\ \text{e} & 7.6 \\ \text{indifferend} \\ \text{formal} & 7 & 10.4 \\ \text{e} & 9.3 \\ \text{o} & 7.4 \\ \text{e} & 6.3 \\ \text{o} & 9.3 \\ \text{f} & 7.3 \\ \text{e} &$	subordinate	10	12.9	±	/.0	8.4	±	6.3	9.3	±	4.6	30.6	±	15.8	10.2	±	5.2		12.4	±	9.2	1	2.1	± 5	<i>9</i> .0	35.3	±	19.3	
domestic atomosphere friendly 113 11.7 + 7.6 11.3 + 8.3 7.9 + 6.7 $30.9 + 20.2$ 7.3 + 5.3 11.3 + 8.0 14.1 + 7.8 $32.7 + 15.7$ formal 7 10.4 + 9.3 7.4 + 6.3 6.9 + 7.5 24.7 + 22.0 $3.4 = 3.9$ 20.4 + 11.9 b 15.0 + 9.0 $38.9 + 20.5$ children 0 31 11.2 ± 5.9 11.0 ± 6.0 7.5 ± 5.4 29.7 ± 14.9 4.3 ± 3.2 12.3 ± 9.2 15.1 ± 5.5 31.6 ± 13.7 21 156 11.7 ± 7.7 11.6 ± 8.5 8.6 ± 7.1 31.9 ± 21.0 7.4 ± 5.1 a 13.0 ± 8.6 15.2 ± 7.9 33.6 ± 16.7 priority values family 67 12.4 ± 8.3 12.3 ± 8.4 9.2 ± 7.9 34.0 ± 22.3 6.5 ± 4.3 10.7 ± 8.1 14.0 ± 8.3 31.1 ± 16.5 priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 22.5 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 22.5 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 22.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $12.9 + 7.5 - 24.7 \pm 2.5 + 7.5 - 35.6 \pm 16.7$ priority values $10.7 \pm 8.1 - 10.5 \pm 7.7 - 35.6 \pm 16.7 + 7.5 \pm 7.7 - 7.5 + 7.$	indifferent	6	11.5	±	5.5	14./	±	5.6	9.0	±	4.9	35.2	±	14.9	6.0	±	5.9		19.8	±	10.0	1	6.8	± 3	0.1	42.7	±	17.8	
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{In rendy} & 113 11.7 \pm 7.6 & 11.3 \pm 8.3 & 7.9 \pm 6.7 & 30.9 \pm 20.2 & 7.3 \pm 5.3 & 11.3 \pm 8.0 & 14.1 \pm 7.8 & 32.7 \pm 15.7 \\ \text{formal} & 7 10.4 \pm 9.3 & 7.4 \pm 6.3 & 6.9 \pm 7.5 & 24.7 \pm 22.0 & 3.4 \pm 3.9 & 20.4 \pm 11.9 & b 15.0 \pm 9.0 & 38.9 \pm 20.5 \\ \text{children} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	domestic atomosphere							- -				• • •		• • •							0.0			_		~~ -			
contricts676711 (2.3 ± 7.8) 9.4 ± 7.2 33.3 ± 19.9 6.6 ± 4.3 14.7 ± 8.8 b17.1 ± 6.6 b88.4 ± 16.2 603111.2 ± 5.9 11.0 ± 6.0 7.5 ± 5.4 24.7 ± 22.0 3.4 ± 3.9 20.4 ± 11.9 b15.0 ± 9.0 38.9 ± 20.5 03111.2 ± 5.9 11.0 ± 6.0 7.5 ± 5.4 29.7 ± 14.9 43 ± 3.2 12.3 ± 9.2 15.1 ± 5.5 31.6 ± 13.7 2115611.7 \pm 7.711.6 ± 8.5 8.6 ± 7.1 31.9 ± 21.0 7.4 ± 5.1 a13.0 ± 8.6 15.2 ± 7.9 35.6 ± 16.7 priority values12.9 ± 8.1 9.7 ± 8.4 9.2 ± 7.9 34.0 ± 22.3 6.5 ± 4.3 10.7 ± 8.1 14.0 ± 8.3 31.1 ± 16.5 profession229.7 ± 6.1 9.7 ± 8.4 9.2 ± 7.9 34.0 ± 22.3 6.5 ± 4.3 10.7 ± 8.1 14.0 ± 8.3 31.1 ± 16.5 material well-being489.6 ± 6.0 10.1 ± 8.8 7.2 ± 6.5 26.9 ± 19.6 6.7 ± 5.2 14.3 ± 9.5 15.8 ± 7.7 36.7 ± 17.9 public recognition1010.6 ± 1.7 7.011.6 ± 8.3 9.3 ± 8.0 33.2 ± 21.9 6.2 ± 5.2 13.1 ± 9.4 15.4 ± 7.3 34.8 ± 17.7 sometrimes6510.2 ± 7.0 11.9 ± 8.5 7.9 ± 6.7 30.8 ± 19.9 7.3 ± 4.9 13.0 ± 8.8 15.2 ± 7.7 35.5 ± 16.6 sometrimes6510.2 ± 7.0 11.9 ± 8.5 29.4 ± 1.3 13.8 ± 9.6 <td< td=""><td>friendly</td><td>113</td><td>11.7</td><td>±</td><td>7.6</td><td>11.3</td><td>±</td><td>8.3</td><td>7.9</td><td>±</td><td>6.7</td><td>30.9</td><td>±</td><td>20.2</td><td>7.3</td><td>±</td><td>5.3</td><td></td><td>11.3</td><td>±</td><td>8.0</td><td></td><td>4.1</td><td>±́,</td><td>/.8</td><td>32.7</td><td>±</td><td>15.7</td><td></td></td<>	friendly	113	11.7	±	7.6	11.3	±	8.3	7.9	±	6.7	30.9	±	20.2	7.3	±	5.3		11.3	±	8.0		4.1	±́,	/.8	32.7	±	15.7	
formal7 10.4 ± 9.37.4 ± 6.36.9 ± 7.524.7 ± 22.03.4 ± 3.920.4 ± 11.9b 15.0 ± 9.038.9 ± 20.5031 11.2 ± 5.911.0 ± 6.07.5 ± 5.429.7 ± 14.94.3 ± 3.212.3 ± 9.215.1 ± 5.531.6 ± 13.7≥1156 11.7 ± 7.711.6 ± 8.58.6 ± 7.131.9 ± 21.07.4 ± 5.1a 13.0 ± 8.615.2 ± 7.935.6 ± 16.7family67 12.4 ± 8.312.3 ± 8.49.2 ± 7.934.0 ± 22.36.5 ± 4.310.7 ± 8.114.0 ± 8.331.1 ± 16.5profession22.97 ± 6.19.7 ± 8.45.5 ± 4.624.9 ± 15.98.1 ± 6.211.8 ± 8.712.4 ± 8.310.7 ± 8.114.0 ± 8.331.1 ± 16.5matrial well-being48.9.6 ± 6.010.1 ± 8.87.2 ± 6.526.9 ± 19.66.7 ± 5.214.3 ± 8.717.0 ± 6.938.1 ± 15.1material well-being10.6 ± 2.10 ± 10.811.7 ± 7.211.6 ± 8.39.5 ± 5.233.2 ± 21.96.2 ± 5.213.1 ± 9.415.4 ± 7.334.8 ± 17.7sometimes65 10.7 ± 7.310.9 ± 8.57.2 ± 6.128.8 ± 19.66.2 ± 4.614.2 ± 8.416.1 ± 6.736.5 ± 13.8positive65 10.7 ± 7.311.9 ± 7.68.8 ± 6.532.8 ± 18.98.2 ± 5.011.2 ± 8.214.1 ± 8.433.6 ± 17.3preferential method of medical treatmentsuperstritious49 11.5 ± 8.112.2 ± 7.59.9 ± 7.337.7 ± 0.75.7 ± 5.212.4 ± 8.416.1 ± 6.736.5 ± 13.8preferential method of medical treatmentsuperstritious49 11	conflicts	67	11.6	±	7.1	12.3	±	7.8	9.4	±	7.2	33.3	±	19.9	6.6	±	4.5		14.7	±	8.8	b 1	7.1	± 6	5.6 I	b 38.4	±	16.2	
children 0 31 11.2 ± 5.9 11.0 ± 6.0 7.5 ± 5.4 29.7 ± 14.9 4.3 ± 3.2 12.3 ± 9.2 15.1 ± 5.5 31.6 ± 13.7 ± 7.1 15.5 ± 16.4 ± 14.0 ± 8.3 31.1 ± 16.5 ± 17.9 ± 17.0 ± 6.9 ± 7.9 34.0 ± 22.3 6.5 ± 4.3 10.7 ± 8.1 14.0 ± 8.3 31.1 ± 16.5 ± 17.0 ± 6.9 ± 15.9 ± 18.4 ± 6.2 ± 11.8 ± 7.2 ± 13.5 ± 5.5 33.3 ± 12.9 ± 18.4 ± 0.1 ± 8.4 ± 12.9 ± 6.4 ± 12.6 ± 6.6 9.4 ± 5.7 34.6 ± 16.4 ± 6.8 ± 5.0 ± 14.3 ± 8.7 17.0 ± 6.9 38.1 ± 15.1 ± 15.1 ± 15.1 ± 16.5 ± 17.2 ± 0.8 ± 17.7 ± 7.2 ± 0.1 ± 8.8 7.2 ± 6.5 ± 2.4 ± 14.4 ± 8.4 ± 7.7 34.8 ± 17.7 ± 7.2 ± 0.5 ± 16.6 ± 2.2 ± 7.9 ± 0.7 ± 16.9 ± 1	formal	7	10.4	±	9.3	7.4	±	6.3	6.9	±	7.5	24.7	±	22.0	3.4	±	3.9		20.4	±	11.9	b 1	5.0	± 9	9.0	38.9	±	20.5	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	children																												
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	0	31	11.2	±	5.9	11.0	±	6.0	7.5	±	5.4	29.7	±	14.9	4.3	±	3.2		12.3	±	9.2	1	5.1	± 5	5.5	31.6	±	13.7	
priority values family 67 12.4 \pm 8.3 12.3 \pm 8.4 9.2 \pm 7.9 34.0 \pm 22.3 6.5 \pm 4.3 10.7 \pm 8.1 14.0 \pm 8.3 31.1 \pm 16.5 profession 22 9.7 \pm 6.1 9.7 \pm 8.4 5.5 \pm 4.6 24.9 \pm 15.9 8.1 \pm 6.2 11.8 \pm 7.2 13.5 \pm 5.5 33.3 \pm 12.9 health 40 12.7 \pm 6.4 12.6 \pm 6.6 9.4 \pm 5.7 34.6 16.4 6.8 \pm 5.0 14.3 \pm 8.7 17.0 \pm 6.9 38.1 \pm 15.1 material well-being 48 9.6 \pm 6.0 10.1 \pm 8.8 7.2 \pm 6.5 26.9 \pm 19.6 6.7 \pm 5.2 14.3 \pm 9.5 15.8 \pm 7.7 36.7 \pm 17.9 public recognition 10 16.2 \pm 10.8 11.7 \pm 7.2 11.6 \pm 8.3 9.5 \pm 23.7 8.8 \pm 5.4 17.2 \pm 9.1 16.9 \pm 6.2 42.9 \pm 12.0 observance to national ceremonies negative 57 12.2 \pm 8.1 11.6 \pm 8.3 9.3 \pm 8.0 33.2 \pm 21.9 6.2 \pm 5.2 13.1 \pm 9.4 15.4 \pm 7.3 34.8 \pm 17.7 sometimes 65 10.7 \pm 7.0 11.9 \pm 7.6 8.8 \pm 6.5 32.8 \pm 18.9 8.2 \pm 5.0 11.2 \pm 8.4 16.1 \pm 6.7 36.5 \pm 13.8 positive 65 12.0 \pm 7.0 11.9 \pm 7.6 8.8 \pm 6.5 32.8 \pm 18.9 8.2 \pm 5.0 11.2 \pm 8.4 16.1 \pm 6.7 36.5 \pm 13.8 positive 49 11.5 \pm 8.1 12.2 \pm 7.5 9.9 \pm 7.3 33.7 \pm 20.7 5.7 \pm 5.2 12.4 \pm 8.4 15.1 \pm 7.2 33.3 \pm 15.2 preferential method of medical treatment sharmanism 44 11.9 \pm 7.1 12.8 \pm 7.7 9.3 \pm 7.0 34.0 \pm 19.1 7.5 \pm 4.5 17.2 \pm 9.0 17.7 \pm 7.3 42.4 \pm 16.4 traditional 59 11.9 \pm 6.3 11.3 \pm 7.4 7.8 \pm 6.1 31.0 \pm 17.3 7.7 \pm 5.0 12.3 \pm 7.7 15.5 \pm 7.6 30.6 \pm 16.3 b attitude to mental illness civilized 117 11.7 \pm 7.2 11.7 \pm 8.0 8.2 \pm 6.8 31.7 \pm 19.5 7.3 \pm 5.0 12.5 \pm 8.8 14.6 \pm 7.8 34.4 \pm 16.7 material 4.1 \pm 8.4 15.3 \pm 7.7 33.5 \pm 15.6 \pm 17.1 33.5 \pm 15.6 \pm 17.1 33.5 \pm 15.6 \pm 17.3 33.5 \pm 15.2 \pm 17.9 \pm 15.1 \pm 7.7 33.5 \pm 15.4 \pm 7.7 33.5 \pm 16.6 30.6 \pm 16.3 b attitude to mental illness civilized 117 11.7 \pm 7.2 11.7 \pm 8.0 8.2 \pm 6.8 31.7 \pm 7.7 3.4 \pm 9.1 12.5 \pm 8.8 14.6 \pm 7.8 34.4 \pm 16.7 material 8.8 14.0 \pm 7.8 34.4 \pm 16.7 material 8.8 10.0 14.4 \pm 9.2 9.1 \pm 7.7 34.4 \pm 9.2 9.1 \pm 7.7 35.5 \pm 14.6 \pm 8.8 10.7 \pm 7.7 35.5 \pm 15.6 \pm 11.0 \pm 8	≥ 1	156	11.7	±	7.7	11.6	±	8.5	8.6	±	7.1	31.9	±	21.0	7.4	±	5.1	a	13.0	±	8.6	1	5.2	± 7	7.9	35.6	±	16.7	
family6712.4 \pm 8.112.3 \pm 8.49.2 \pm 7.934.0 \pm 22.36.5 \pm 4.310.7 \pm 8.114.0 \pm 8.331.1 \pm 15.2profession229.7 \pm 6.412.6 \pm 6.69.4 \pm 5.734.6 \pm 16.46.8 \pm 5.211.8 \pm 7.213.5 \pm 5.533.3 \pm 12.9health4012.7 \pm 6.412.6 \pm 6.69.4 \pm 5.734.6 \pm 16.46.8 \pm 5.211.4 \pm 9.515.8 \pm 7.736.7 \pm 17.9public recognition1010.2 \pm 10.81.7 \pm 7.2 \pm 11.6 \pm 8.339.5 \pm 22.78.8 \pm 5.413.1 \pm 9.4 \pm 7.736.7 \pm 17.9observance to national ceremoniesmetrice 57 10.9 \pm 8.2 \pm 22.113.1 \pm 9.415.4 \pm 7.334.8 \pm 17.7positev6512.0 \pm 7.011.9 \pm 7.68.8 \pm 6.2 \pm 4.614.2 \pm 8.416.1 \pm 6.7 35.5 \pm 16.6 \pm 7.735.5 \pm 16.6superstitious4911.5 \pm 8.112.2 \pm <td>priority values</td> <td></td>	priority values																												
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	family	67	12.4	±	8.3	12.3	±	8.4	9.2	±	7.9	34.0	±	22.3	6.5	±	4.3		10.7	±	8.1	1	4.0	± 8	3.3	31.1	±	16.5	
health4012.7 \pm 6.412.6 \pm 6.6 9.4 ± 5.7 34.6 ± 16.4 6.8 ± 5.0 14.3 ± 8.7 17.0 ± 6.9 38.1 ± 15.1 material well-being489.6 \pm 6.010.1 \pm 8.8 7.2 ± 6.5 26.9 ± 19.6 6.7 ± 5.2 14.3 ± 9.5 15.8 ± 7.7 36.7 ± 17.9 public recognition1010.2 \pm 10.8 11.7 ± 7.2 11.6 ± 8.3 39.5 ± 23.7 8.8 ± 5.4 17.2 ± 9.1 16.9 ± 6.2 42.9 ± 12.0 observance to national ceremoniesnegative 57 12.2 ± 8.1 11.6 ± 8.3 9.3 ± 8.0 33.2 ± 21.9 6.2 ± 5.2 13.1 ± 9.4 15.4 ± 7.3 34.8 ± 17.7 sometimes 65 12.0 ± 7.0 11.9 ± 7.6 8.8 ± 6.5 32.8 ± 18.9 8.2 ± 5.0 11.2 ± 8.2 14.1 ± 8.4 33.6 ± 17.3 brief of national myths and omens p 1.5 ± 8.1 12.2 ± 7.5 9.9 ± 7.3 33.7 ± 20.7 5.7 ± 5.2 12.4 ± 8.4 15.1 ± 7.2 33.3 ± 15.2 preferential method of medical treatmentsharmanism 44 11.9 ± 7.1 12.8 ± 7.7 9.3 ± 7.0 34.0 ± 19.1 7.5 ± 4.5 17.2 ± 9.0 17.7 ± 7.3 42.4 ± 16.4 wester 84 11.3 ± 8.3 10.9 ± 8.8 8.4 ± 7.4 30.6 ± 22.4 6.1 ± 5.2 11.0 ± 8.5 13.5 ± 7.6 b wester 84 11.3 ± 8.3 10.9 ± 8.8 8.4 ± 7.4 $36.6 \pm 12.7 \pm 7.4$ 36.6 ± 16.4 16.7 ± 5.2 11.0 ± 8.5 13.5 ± 7.6 b wester 84	profession	22	9.7	\pm	6.1	9.7	±	8.4	5.5	±	4.6	24.9	±	15.9	8.1	±	6.2		11.8	±	7.2	1	3.5	± 5	5.5	33.3	±	12.9	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	health	40	12.7	±	6.4	12.6	±	6.6	9.4	±	5.7	34.6	±	16.4	6.8	±	5.0		14.3	±	8.7	1	7.0	±€	5.9	38.1	\pm	15.1	
public recognition1016.2 \pm 10.7 \pm 7.211.6 \pm 8.339.5 \pm 23.78.8 \pm 5.417.2 \pm 9.116.9 \pm 6.242.9 \pm 12.0observance to national ceremoniesnegative5712.2 \pm 8.111.6 \pm 8.39.3 \pm 8.033.2 \pm 21.96.2 \pm 5.213.1 \pm 9.415.4 \pm 7.334.8 \pm 17.7sometimes6510.7 \pm 7.011.9 \pm 7.68.8 \pm 6.532.8 \pm 18.98.2 \pm 5.011.2 \pm 8.116.4 \pm 33.6 \pm 17.3brief of national myths and omenspragmatical13811.7 \pm 7.211.2 \pm 8.37.9 \pm 6.730.8 \pm 19.97.3 \pm 4.913.0 \pm 8.815.2 \pm 7.735.5 \pm 16.6superstitious4911.5 \pm 8.112.2 \pm 7.79.3 \pm 7.034.0 \pm 17.2 \pm 9.017.7 \pm 7.332.4 \pm 16.4 \pm 3.3 \pm 16.6 \pm 16.6 \pm 17.3 \pm 4.913.0 \pm 8.415.1 \pm 2.733.3 \pm 15.2preferential method of medical treatmentsuperstitional \pm 41.1	material well-being	48	9.6	±	6.0	10.1	±	8.8	7.2	±	6.5	26.9	±	19.6	6.7	±	5.2		14.3	±	9.5	1	5.8	± 7	7.7	36.7	\pm	17.9	
observance to national ceremonies negative 57 12.2 ± 8.1 11.6 ± 8.3 9.3 ± 8.0 33.2 ± 21.9 6.2 ± 5.2 13.1 ± 9.4 15.4 ± 7.3 34.8 ± 17.7 sometimes $65 10.7 \pm 7.3$ 10.9 ± 8.5 7.2 ± 6.1 28.8 ± 19.6 6.2 ± 4.6 14.2 ± 8.4 16.1 ± 6.7 36.5 ± 13.8 positeve $65 12.0 \pm 7.0$ 11.9 ± 7.6 8.8 ± 6.5 32.8 ± 18.9 8.2 ± 5.0 11.2 ± 8.2 14.1 ± 8.4 33.6 ± 17.3 brief of national myths and omens preferential method of medical treatment $8.1 12.2 \pm 7.7$ 9.9 ± 7.3 33.7 ± 20.7 5.7 ± 5.2 12.4 ± 8.4 15.1 ± 7.2 33.3 ± 15.2 preferential method of medical treatment sammanism $44 11.9 \pm 7.1$ 12.8 ± 7.7 9.3 ± 7.0 34.0 ± 19.1 7.5 ± 4.5 17.2 ± 9.0 17.7 ± 7.3 42.4 ± 16.4 traditional $59 11.9 \pm 6.3$ 11.3 ± 7.4 7.8 ± 6.1 31.0 ± 17.3 7.7 ± 5.0 12.3 ± 7.7 $b3.6 \pm 14.0$ Western $84 11.3 \pm 8.3$ 10.9 ± 8.8 8.4 ± 7.7 $8.6 \pm 31.7 \pm 19.5$ 7.3 ± 5.0 12.5 ± 8.8 14.6 ± 7.8 <	public recognition	10	16.2	±	10.8	11.7	±	7.2	11.6	±	8.3	39.5	±	23.7	8.8	±	5.4		17.2	±	9.1	1	6.9	±€	5.2	42.9	\pm	12.0	
negative5712.2 \pm 8.111.6 \pm 8.39.3 \pm 8.033.2 \pm 21.96.2 \pm 5.213.1 \pm 9.4 \pm \pm 3.4.8 \pm 17.7sometimes6510.7 \pm 7.310.9 \pm 8.57.2 \pm 6.128.8 \pm 19.66.2 \pm 4.614.2 \pm 8.416.1 \pm 6.736.5 \pm 13.8brief of national myths and omenspragmatical13811.7 \pm 7.211.2 \pm 8.37.9 \pm 6.730.8 \pm 19.97.3 \pm 4.913.0 \pm 8.815.2 \pm 7.735.5 \pm 16.6superstitious4911.5 \pm 8.112.2 \pm 7.59.9 \pm 7.333.7 \pm 20.7 5.7 \pm 5.212.4 \pm 8.415.1 \pm 7.233.3 \pm 15.2preferential method of medical treatmentsamanism4411.9 \pm 7.112.8 \pm 7.79.3 \pm 7.034.0 \pm 11.2 \pm 9.017.7 \pm 7.342.4 \pm 16.4western8411.3 \pm 8.310.9 \pm 8.84.730.6 \pm 2.211.0 \pm 8.513.5 \pm 7.6 \pm 30.6 \pm 14.0western8411.	observance to national cerem	nonies	5																										
sometimes $65\ 10.7\ \pm\ 7.3$ $10.9\ \pm\ 8.5$ $7.2\ \pm\ 6.1$ $28.8\ \pm\ 19.6$ $6.2\ \pm\ 4.6$ $14.2\ \pm\ 8.4$ $16.1\ \pm\ 6.7$ $36.5\ \pm\ 13.8$ positive $65\ 12.0\ \pm\ 7.0$ $11.9\ \pm\ 7.6$ $8.8\ \pm\ 6.5$ $32.8\ \pm\ 18.9$ $8.2\ \pm\ 5.0$ $11.2\ \pm\ 8.2$ $14.1\ \pm\ 8.4$ $33.6\ \pm\ 17.3$ brief of national myths and omenspragmatical $138\ 11.7\ \pm\ 7.2$ $11.2\ \pm\ 8.3$ $7.9\ \pm\ 6.7$ $30.8\ \pm\ 19.9$ $7.3\ \pm\ 4.9$ $13.0\ \pm\ 8.2$ $14.1\ \pm\ 8.4$ $33.6\ \pm\ 17.3$ brief of national myths and omens $49\ 11.5\ \pm\ 7.2$ $11.2\ \pm\ 8.3$ $7.9\ \pm\ 6.7$ $30.8\ \pm\ 19.9$ $7.3\ \pm\ 4.9$ $13.0\ \pm\ 8.8$ $15.2\ \pm\ 7.7$ $35.5\ \pm\ 16.6$ superstitious $49\ 11.5\ \pm\ 8.1$ $12.2\ \pm\ 7.7$ $9.3\ \pm\ 7.7$ $9.3\ \pm\ 7.0$ $34.0\ \pm\ 19.1$ $7.5\ \pm\ 4.5$ $17.2\ \pm\ 9.0$ $17.7\ \pm\ 7.3$ $42.4\ \pm\ 16.4$ superstitious $49\ 11.9\ \pm\ 6.3$ $11.3\ \pm\ 7.7$ $9.3\ \pm\ 7.0$ $34.0\ \pm\ 19.1$ $7.5\ \pm\ 4.5$ $17.2\ \pm\ 9.0$ $17.7\ \pm\ 7.3$ $42.4\ \pm\ 16.4$ wether $84\ 11.3\ \pm\ 8.3$ $10.9\ \pm\ 8.8$ $8.4\ \pm\ 7.4$ $30.6\ \pm\ 22.4$ $6.1\ \pm\ 5.2$ $11.0\ \pm\ 8.5\ \pm\ 5.6\ \pm\ 7.1$ $35.6\ \pm\ 14.0$ Weter $84\ 11.3\ \pm\ 8.3$ $10.9\ \pm\ 8.8$ $8.4\ \pm\ 7.4$ $30.6\ \pm\ 22.4$ $6.1\ \pm\ 5.2$ $11.0\ \pm\ 8.5\ \pm\ 5.7\ 5.7\ 5.6\ \pm\ 7.6\ \pm\ 30.6\ \pm\ 16.3\ \pm\ 5.2$ uncertain $84\ 11.3\ \pm\ 8.7\ 9.7\ 7.4\ 7.6\ 4.6\ 7.8\ 34.9\ \pm\ 17.9\ 7.3\ \pm\ 5.5\ 14.2\ \pm\ 8.4\ 16.7\ 5.5\ 5.1\ 4.2\ \pm\ 8.4\ 16.7\ 5.5\ 5.5\ 14.2\ \pm\ 8.4\ 16.7\ 5.5\ 5.5\ 14.2\ \pm\ 8.4\ 16.5\ \pm\ 5.7\ 5.5\ 14.6\ \pm\$	negative	57	12.2	±	8.1	11.6	±	8.3	9.3	±	8.0	33.2	±	21.9	6.2	±	5.2		13.1	±	9.4	1	5.4	± 7	7.3	34.8	\pm	17.7	
positive65 12.0 ± 7.0 11.9 ± 7.6 8.8 ± 6.5 32.8 ± 18.9 8.2 ± 5.0 11.2 ± 8.2 14.1 ± 8.4 33.6 ± 17.3 brief of national myths and omenspragmatical $138 11.7 \pm 7.2$ 11.2 ± 8.3 7.9 ± 6.7 30.8 ± 19.9 7.3 ± 4.9 13.0 ± 8.8 15.2 ± 7.7 35.5 ± 16.6 superstitious $49 11.5 \pm 8.1$ 12.2 ± 7.5 9.9 ± 7.3 33.7 ± 20.7 5.7 ± 5.2 12.4 ± 8.4 15.1 ± 7.2 33.3 ± 15.2 preferential method of medical treatmentsharmanism $44 11.9 \pm 7.1$ 12.8 ± 7.7 9.3 ± 7.0 34.0 ± 19.1 7.5 ± 4.5 17.2 ± 9.0 17.7 ± 7.3 42.4 ± 16.4 traditional $59 11.9 \pm 6.3$ 11.3 ± 7.4 7.8 ± 6.1 31.0 ± 17.3 7.7 ± 5.0 $12.3 \pm 7.7 b$ 15.6 ± 7.1 35.6 ± 14.0 Western $84 11.3 \pm 8.3$ 10.9 ± 8.8 8.4 ± 7.4 30.6 ± 22.4 6.1 ± 5.2 $11.0 \pm 8.5 b$ $13.5 \pm 7.6 b$ $30.6 \pm 16.3 b$ attitude to mental illnesscivilized $117 11.7 \pm 7.2$ 11.7 ± 8.0 8.2 ± 6.8 31.7 ± 19.5 7.3 ± 5.0 12.5 ± 8.8 14.6 ± 7.8 34.4 ± 16.7 mystical $12 13.5 \pm 6.7$ 11.8 ± 6.7 9.7 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.2 ± 8.4 15.5 ± 5.7 35.9 ± 15.6 uncertain $43 11.0 \pm 8.0$ 11.4 ± 9.2 9.1 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.6 ± 7.3 33.5 ± 15.7 attitude to suicidewithout the possibility $152 11.3 \pm 7.1$ <t< td=""><td>sometimes</td><td>65</td><td>10.7</td><td>±</td><td>7.3</td><td>10.9</td><td>±</td><td>8.5</td><td>7.2</td><td>±</td><td>6.1</td><td>28.8</td><td>±</td><td>19.6</td><td>6.2</td><td>±</td><td>4.6</td><td></td><td>14.2</td><td>±</td><td>8.4</td><td>1</td><td>6.1</td><td>± 6</td><td>5.7</td><td>36.5</td><td>±</td><td>13.8</td><td></td></t<>	sometimes	65	10.7	±	7.3	10.9	±	8.5	7.2	±	6.1	28.8	±	19.6	6.2	±	4.6		14.2	±	8.4	1	6.1	± 6	5.7	36.5	±	13.8	
brief of national myths and omens pragmatical 138 11.7 \pm 7.2 11.2 \pm 8.3 7.9 \pm 6.7 30.8 \pm 19.9 7.3 \pm 4.9 13.0 \pm 8.8 15.2 \pm 7.7 35.5 \pm 16.6 superstitious 49 11.5 \pm 8.1 12.2 \pm 7.5 9.9 \pm 7.3 33.7 \pm 20.7 5.7 \pm 5.2 12.4 \pm 8.4 15.1 \pm 7.2 33.3 \pm 15.2 preferential method of medical treatment sharmanism 44 11.9 \pm 7.1 12.8 \pm 7.7 9.3 \pm 7.0 34.0 \pm 19.1 7.5 \pm 4.5 17.2 \pm 9.0 17.7 \pm 7.3 42.4 \pm 16.4 traditional 59 11.9 \pm 6.3 11.3 \pm 7.4 7.8 \pm 6.1 31.0 \pm 17.3 7.7 \pm 5.0 12.3 \pm 7.7 b 15.6 \pm 7.1 35.6 \pm 14.0 Western 84 11.3 \pm 8.3 10.9 \pm 8.8 8.4 \pm 7.4 30.6 \pm 22.4 6.1 \pm 5.2 11.0 \pm 8.5 b 13.5 \pm 7.6 b 30.6 \pm 16.3 b attitude to mental illness civilized 117 11.7 \pm 7.2 11.7 \pm 8.0 8.2 \pm 6.8 31.7 \pm 19.5 7.3 \pm 5.0 12.5 \pm 8.8 14.6 \pm 7.8 34.4 \pm 16.7 mystical 12 13.5 \pm 6.7 11.8 \pm 6.7 9.7 \pm 7.4 7.0 \pm 7.7 28.1 \pm 22.5 6.2 \pm 5.5 14.2 \pm 8.4 15.5 \pm 5.7 35.9 \pm 15.6 uncertain 43 11.0 \pm 8.0 11.4 \pm 9.2 9.1 \pm 7.0 31.4 \pm 21.9 5.9 \pm 4.5 14.6 \pm 8.6 16.9 \pm 7.4 37.4 \pm 15.5 attitude to suicide without the possibility 152 11.3 \pm 7.1 11.3 \pm 7.9 8.0 \pm 6.4 30.5 \pm 18.8 6.8 \pm 4.8 12.1 \pm 8.5 14.6 \pm 7.3 33.5 \pm 15.7 intractableness 12 12.2 \pm 9.4 11.8 \pm 8.7 9.3 \pm 8.2 33.3 \pm 24.5 7.3 \pm 5.5 15.8 \pm 8.6 19.9 \pm 6.9 \pm 43.0 \pm 14.9 with the possibility 23 13.8 \pm 8.6 12.7 \pm 9.5 10.6 \pm 9.0 37.2 \pm 25.4 7.8 \pm 6.1 16.1 \pm 9.3 16.7 \pm 8.2 40.6 \pm 18.2	positeve	65	12.0	±	7.0	11.9	±	7.6	8.8	±	6.5	32.8	±	18.9	8.2	±	5.0		11.2	±	8.2	1	4.1	± 8	3.4	33.6	\pm	17.3	
pragmatical13811.7 \pm 7.211.2 \pm 8.37.9 \pm 6.730.8 \pm 19.97.3 \pm 4.913.0 \pm 8.815.2 \pm 7.735.5 \pm 16.6supersitious4911.5 \pm 8.112.2 \pm 7.59.9 \pm 7.333.7 \pm 20.75.7 \pm 5.212.4 \pm 8.415.1 \pm 7.233.3 \pm 15.2preferential method of medical treatmentsharmanism4411.9 \pm 7.112.8 \pm 7.79.3 \pm 7.034.0 \pm 19.17.5 \pm 4.517.2 \pm 9.017.7 \pm 7.342.4 \pm 16.4traditional5911.9 \pm 6.311.3 \pm 7.47.8 \pm 6.131.0 \pm 17.7 \pm 5.012.3 \pm 7.7b15.6 \pm 7.135.6 \pm 14.0Western8411.3 \pm 8.310.9 \pm 8.8 $4 \pm$ 7.430.6 \pm 22.46.1 \pm 5.012.3 \pm 7.7b15.6 \pm 7.6b30.6 \pm 16.3 battitude to mental illnessicivilized11711.7 \pm 7.211.7 \pm 8.08.2 \pm 6.831.7 \pm 19.57.3 \pm 5.012.5 \pm 8.814.6 \pm 7.834.4 \pm 16.7mystical1213.5 \pm 6.711.8 \pm 6.79.7 \pm 7.0 \pm 7.728.1 \pm 22.55.514.2 \pm 8.415.5 \pm 5.735.9 \pm 15.6uncertain43<	brief of national myths and o	omens																											
program100101<	pragmatical	138	117	±	72	11.2	±	83	79	±	67	30.8	±	199	73	±	49		13.0	±	88	1	52	± 7	77	35 5	\pm	16.6	
$\begin{array}{c} \text{big} \text{functions} & \text{find} = 161, \text{find} = 162, \text{find}$	superstitious	49	11.7	+	81	12.2	+	75	99	+	73	33.7	+	20.7	57	+	5.2		12.4	+	84	1	51	+ 7	12	333	+	15.2	
sharmanism $44\ 11.9 \pm 7.1\ 12.8 \pm 7.7\ 9.3 \pm 7.0\ 34.0 \pm 19.1\ 7.7 \pm 5.0\ 12.3 \pm 7.7\ b\ 15.6 \pm 7.1\ 35.6 \pm 14.0$ Western $84\ 11.3 \pm 8.3\ 10.9 \pm 8.8\ 8.4 \pm 7.4\ 30.6 \pm 22.4\ 6.1 \pm 5.2\ 11.0 \pm 8.5\ b\ 13.5 \pm 7.6\ b\ 30.6 \pm 16.3\ b$ attitude to mental illness civilized $117\ 11.7 \pm 7.2\ 11.7 \pm 8.0\ 8.2 \pm 6.8\ 31.7 \pm 19.5\ 7.3 \pm 5.0\ 12.5 \pm 8.8\ 14.6 \pm 7.8\ 34.4 \pm 16.7$ mystical $12\ 13.5 \pm 6.7\ 11.8 \pm 6.7\ 9.7 \pm 6.8\ 34.9 \pm 17.9\ 7.8 \pm 6.5\ 8.8 \pm 8.0\ 13.7 \pm 7.1\ 30.2 \pm 15.1\ 1.5 \pm 8.7\ 9.7 \pm 7.4\ 7.0 \pm 7.7\ 28.1 \pm 22.5\ 6.2 \pm 5.5\ 14.2 \pm 8.4\ 15.5 \pm 5.7\ 35.9 \pm 15.6\ 10.9 \pm 15.6\ 10.9 \pm 7.4\ 37.4 \pm 15.5\ 11.5 \pm 8.7\ 9.7 \pm 7.4\ 7.0 \pm 7.7\ 28.1 \pm 21.9\ 5.9 \pm 4.5\ 14.6 \pm 8.6\ 16.9 \pm 7.4\ 37.4 \pm 15.5\ 15.7\ 33.5 \pm 15.7\ 33.5 $	preferential method of medic	cal tre	atme	nt	0.1	12.2	_	7.0	.,	_	1.0	55.1	_	20.7	0.7	_	0.2		12.1	_	0.1	-	0.1	_ ,		55.5	_	10.2	
statilitional5911.9 \pm 7.112.6 \pm 7.7 \pm 7.6 \pm 7.7 \pm 7.3 \pm 7.7 \pm 7.7 \pm 7.3 \pm 7.7 \pm 7.77.	sharmanism		11 0		71	12.8	+	77	03	+	7.0	34.0	+	101	75	+	15		172	+	9.0	1	77	+ 7	13	12 1	+	167	
Harmonal $35 + 11.9 \pm 0.3$ 11.3 ± 7.4 7.3 ± 0.1 31.0 ± 11.3 7.7 ± 5.0 12.3 ± 7.7 $0 + 15.0 \pm 7.1$ 35.0 ± 14.0 Western $84 + 11.3 \pm 8.3$ 10.9 ± 8.8 8.4 ± 7.4 30.6 ± 22.4 6.1 ± 5.2 11.0 ± 8.5 $b + 35.6 \pm 7.6$ $b + 30.6 \pm 16.3$ attitude to mental illness $117 + 7.2$ 11.7 ± 8.0 8.2 ± 6.8 31.7 ± 19.5 7.3 ± 5.0 12.5 ± 8.8 14.6 ± 7.8 34.4 ± 16.7 mystical $12 + 13.5 \pm 6.7$ 11.8 ± 6.7 9.7 ± 6.8 34.9 ± 17.9 7.8 ± 6.5 8.8 ± 8.0 13.7 ± 7.1 30.2 ± 15.1 negative $15 + 11.5 \pm 8.7$ 9.7 ± 7.4 7.0 ± 7.7 28.1 ± 22.5 6.2 ± 5.5 14.2 ± 8.4 15.5 ± 5.7 35.9 ± 15.6 uncertain $43 + 10.0 \pm 8.0$ 11.4 ± 9.2 9.1 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.6 ± 8.6 16.9 ± 7.4 37.4 ± 15.5 attitude to suicide $152 + 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.3 ± 7.9 8.0 ± 6.4 30.5 ± 18.8 6.8 ± 4.8 12.1 ± 8.5 14.6 ± 7.3 33.5 ± 15.7 attitude to suicide $152 + 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.8 ± 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 43.0 ± 14.9 with the possibility $23 + 13.8 \pm 8.6$ 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2	traditional	50	11.7		63	12.0		7.1	7.5		6.1	31.0		17.1	7.5 7 7	- -	т.J 5 0		17.2	- -	7.0 7.7	h 1	5.6	+ 7	7.1	35.6		1/10	
Western $34 + 11.5 \pm 8.5 + 10.5 \pm 8.3 + 10.5 \pm 8.3 + 10.5 \pm 7.4 + 30.5 \pm 22.4 + 10.5 \pm 10.5 \pm 7.5 + 10.5 \pm 10.5 \pm$	Western	27 84	11.9		83	10.0		/. 1 8 8	7.0 8.1	- -	7 /	30.6		17.3	6.1		5.0		12.5		85	b 1	3.0	± 7	7.1	55.0 530.6		16.3	h
attribute to mental milesscivilized $117 \ 11.7 \pm 7.2$ 11.7 ± 8.0 8.2 ± 6.8 31.7 ± 19.5 7.3 ± 5.0 12.5 ± 8.8 14.6 ± 7.8 34.4 ± 16.7 mystical $12 \ 13.5 \pm 6.7$ 11.8 ± 6.7 9.7 ± 6.8 34.9 ± 17.9 7.8 ± 6.5 8.8 ± 8.0 13.7 ± 7.1 30.2 ± 15.1 negative $15 \ 11.5 \pm 8.7$ 9.7 ± 7.4 7.0 ± 7.7 28.1 ± 22.5 6.2 ± 5.5 14.2 ± 8.4 15.5 ± 5.7 35.9 ± 15.6 uncertain $43 \ 11.0 \pm 8.0$ 11.4 ± 9.2 9.1 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.6 ± 8.6 16.9 ± 7.4 37.4 ± 15.5 attitude to suicidewithout the possibilityapprove as a way out of $12 \ 12.2 \pm 9.4$ 11.8 ± 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 $b \ 43.0 \pm 14.9$ with the possibility $23 \ 13.8 \pm 8.6$ 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2	attitude to mental illness	04	11.5	-	0.5	10.9	-	0.0	0.4	-	/.+	30.0	-	22.4	0.1	-	5.2		11.0	-	0.5	0 1	5.5	± /	.0 1	0 50.0	-	10.5	U
cryinzed 17711.7 ± 7.2 11.7 ± 6.0 8.2 ± 6.8 51.7 ± 19.5 7.3 ± 5.0 12.3 ± 6.8 14.6 ± 7.8 54.4 ± 16.7 mystical $12 \ 13.5 \pm 6.7$ 11.8 ± 6.7 9.7 ± 6.8 34.9 ± 17.9 7.8 ± 6.5 8.8 ± 8.0 13.7 ± 7.1 30.2 ± 15.1 negative $15 \ 11.5 \pm 8.7$ 9.7 ± 7.4 7.0 ± 7.7 28.1 ± 22.5 6.2 ± 5.5 14.2 ± 8.4 15.5 ± 5.7 35.9 ± 15.6 uncertain $43 \ 11.0 \pm 8.0$ 11.4 ± 9.2 9.1 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.6 ± 8.6 16.9 ± 7.4 37.4 ± 15.5 attitude to suicidewithout the possibility $152 \ 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.3 ± 7.9 8.0 ± 6.4 30.5 ± 18.8 6.8 ± 4.8 12.1 ± 8.5 14.6 ± 7.3 33.5 ± 15.7 attitude to suicidewithout the possibility $12 \ 12.2 \pm 9.4$ 11.8 ± 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 43.0 ± 14.9 with the possibility $23 \ 13.8 \pm 8.6$ 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2	civilized	117	117	1	7 7	117	_ L	80	Qn	+	68	217	Т	10.5	7 7	Т	5.0		125	_L	οo	1	16	_ ~	7 0	211	Т	167	
Inystical $12\ 13.5 \pm 6.7$ 11.8 ± 6.7 9.7 ± 6.8 34.9 ± 17.9 7.8 ± 6.5 8.8 ± 8.0 13.7 ± 7.1 30.2 ± 13.1 negative $15\ 11.5 \pm 8.7$ 9.7 ± 7.4 7.0 ± 7.7 28.1 ± 22.5 6.2 ± 5.5 14.2 ± 8.4 15.5 ± 5.7 35.9 ± 15.6 uncertain $43\ 11.0 \pm 8.0$ 11.4 ± 9.2 9.1 ± 7.0 31.4 ± 21.9 5.9 ± 4.5 14.6 ± 8.6 16.9 ± 7.4 37.4 ± 15.5 attitude to suicidewithout the possibility $152\ 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.3 ± 7.9 8.0 ± 6.4 30.5 ± 18.8 6.8 ± 4.8 12.1 ± 8.5 14.6 ± 7.3 33.5 ± 15.7 attitude to suicidewithout the possibility $152\ 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.8 ± 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 43.0 ± 14.9 with the possibility $23\ 13.8 \pm 8.6$ 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2		11/	11./	±	1.2	11./	±	8.0 6.7	0.Z	±	0.0	24.0	±	19.5	7.5	±	5.0		12.3	±	0.0	1	4.0	± /	'.0 7 1	20.2	±	10./	
negative15 11.5 \pm 8.79.7 \pm 7.47.0 \pm 7.47.0 \pm 7.128.1 \pm 22.56.2 \pm 5.514.2 \pm 8.415.5 \pm 5.735.9 \pm 15.6uncertain43 11.0 \pm 8.011.4 \pm 9.29.1 \pm 7.031.4 \pm 21.95.9 \pm 4.514.6 \pm 8.616.9 \pm 7.437.4 \pm 15.5attitude to suicidewithout the possibility152 11.3 \pm 7.111.3 \pm 7.98.0 \pm 6.430.5 \pm 18.86.8 \pm 4.812.1 \pm 8.514.6 \pm 7.333.5 \pm 15.7intractableness12 12.2 \pm 9.411.8 \pm 8.79.3 \pm 8.233.3 \pm 24.57.3 \pm 5.515.8 \pm 8.619.9 \pm 6.9 \pm 43.0 \pm 14.9with the possibility23 13.8 \pm 8.612.7 \pm 9.510.6 \pm 9.037.2 \pm 25.47.8 \pm 6.116.1 \pm 9.316.7 \pm 8.240.6 \pm 18.2	mystical	12	13.3	±	0./ 0.7	11.8	±	0./ 7./	9./ ㅋ^	± ,	0.8 77	34.9	±	17.9	/.8	±	0.3		0.0 142	± ,	0.U	1	3.1 55	± /	'.l	30.2	± ,	13.1	
uncertain 45 11.0 \pm 8.0 11.4 \pm 9.2 9.1 \pm 7.0 31.4 \pm 21.9 5.9 \pm 4.5 14.6 \pm 8.6 16.9 \pm 7.4 37.4 \pm 15.5 attitude to suicide without the possibility approve as a way out of 152 11.3 \pm 7.1 11.3 \pm 7.9 8.0 \pm 6.4 30.5 \pm 18.8 6.8 \pm 4.8 12.1 \pm 8.5 14.6 \pm 7.3 33.5 \pm 15.7 with the possibility 12 12.2 \pm 9.4 11.8 \pm 8.7 9.3 \pm 8.2 33.3 \pm 24.5 7.3 \pm 5.5 15.8 \pm 8.6 19.9 \pm 6.9 b 43.0 \pm 14.9 with the possibility 23 13.8 \pm 8.6 12.7 \pm 9.5 10.6 \pm 9.0 37.2 \pm 25.4 7.8 \pm 6.1 16.1 \pm 9.3 16.7 \pm 8.2 40.6 \pm 18.2	negative	15	11.5	±	ð./	9./	±	/.4	/.0	±	1.1	28.1	±	22.3	6.2	± ,	5.5 1		14.2	±	ð.4	1	3.3	± 2)./ 7 /	55.9	±	13.0	
attrude to suicide without the possibility approve as a way out of $152 \ 11.3 \pm 7.1$ 11.3 ± 7.9 8.0 ± 6.4 30.5 ± 18.8 6.8 ± 4.8 12.1 ± 8.5 14.6 ± 7.3 33.5 ± 15.7 intractableness with the possibility $12 \ 12.2 \pm 9.4$ 11.8 ± 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 $b \ 43.0 \pm 14.9$ with the possibility $23 \ 13.8 \pm 8.6$ 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2	uncertain	43	11.0	±	8.0	11.4	±	9.2	9.1	±	/.0	51.4	±	21.9	5.9	±	4.5		14.6	±	8.6	1	0.9	±,	.4	5/.4	±	15.5	
without the possibility approve as a way out of intractableness 152 11.3 \neq 7.9 8.0 \pm 6.4 30.5 \pm 18.8 6.8 ± 4.8 12.1 \pm 8.6 \pm 15.7 intractableness 12 12.2 \pm 9.4 11.8 \pm 8.7 9.3 ± 8.2 33.3 ± 24.5 7.3 ± 5.5 15.8 ± 8.6 19.9 ± 6.9 b 43.0 ± 14.9 with the possibility 23 13.8 ± 8.6 12.7 ± 9.5 10.6 ± 9.0 37.2 ± 25.4 7.8 ± 6.1 16.1 ± 9.3 16.7 ± 8.2 40.6 ± 18.2	attitude to suicide	1	11 -		- -			न ०	0.0		<i>с</i> .	<u> </u>		10.0			4.0		10 1		0.5			-		<u>-</u>		1	
intractableness $12\ 12.2\ \pm\ 9.4$ $11.8\ \pm\ 8.7$ $9.3\ \pm\ 8.2$ $33.3\ \pm\ 24.5$ $7.3\ \pm\ 5.5$ $15.8\ \pm\ 8.6$ $19.9\ \pm\ 6.9\ b\ 43.0\ \pm\ 14.9$ with the possibility $23\ 13.8\ \pm\ 8.6$ $12.7\ \pm\ 9.5$ $10.6\ \pm\ 9.0$ $37.2\ \pm\ 25.4$ $7.8\ \pm\ 6.1$ $16.1\ \pm\ 9.3$ $16.7\ \pm\ 8.2$ $40.6\ \pm\ 18.2$	without the possibility approve as a way out of	152	11.3	±	7.1	11.3	±	7.9	8.0	±	6.4	30.5	±	18.8	6.8	±	4.8		12.1	±	8.5	1	4.6	± 7	.3	33.5	±	15.7	
with the possibility 23 13.8 \pm 8.6 12.7 \pm 9.5 10.6 \pm 9.0 37.2 \pm 25.4 7.8 \pm 6.1 16.1 \pm 9.3 16.7 \pm 8.2 40.6 \pm 18.2	intractableness	12	12.2	±	9.4	11.8	±	8.7	9.3	±	8.2	33.3	±	24.5	7.3	±	5.5		15.8	±	8.6	1	9.9	± 6	5.9 1	b 43.0	±	14.9	
	with the possiblity	23	13.8	±	8.6	12.7	±	9.5	10.6	±	9.0	37.2	±	25.4	7.8	±	6.1		16.1	±	9.3	1	6.7	± 8	3.2	40.6	±	18.2	

The values represent the mean \pm SD. Significant difference, a; between groups (P<0.05, Students' t-test), and b; from the first group, c; from the second group, and d; from the third group (P<0.05, one-way ANOVA with Tucky's HSD as a post hoc test).

	No Intrusion		Avoidance	Hvne	erarou	sal	Total	_	Intrusion		Avoidan	re	Hyperarous	sal	Total		
psychonathological famil	ly history		Troladice	пур	ruiou	Jui	Totul		inti ubion		Troituin		iijpeiurou	541	10141		
none	125 114 +	73	11.0 + 7	77 82	+	68	30.7 + 19.4		70 +	52	124 +	84	157 + 7	7 2	35.1	+ 15.8	
Vac	$123 11.4 \pm 24 12.7 \pm $	83	11.0 ± 1	1.7 0.2	 	0.0 Q /	36.4 ± 24.6	5	$7.0 \pm 5.7 \pm$	<u>э.г</u> Л Л	$12.4 \pm 16.4 \pm$	10.4	15.7 ± 7	7.2 7.7	37.0	± 15.0 ± 16.7	
alaahalism	$24 12.7 \pm 28 11.6 \pm 1$	0.J 7 5	13.3 ± 10	2.1 10.4		0.4 6 7	30.4 ± 24.0 21.2 \pm 19.0))	$3.7 \pm 7.2 \pm$	4.4	$10.4 \pm 12.1 \pm$	10.4 9.2	$13.0 \pm 12.2 \pm 9$	/./ >/	27.5	± 10.7 ± 17.2	
accononisin	$30 11.0 \pm$	7.5 .a	11.0 ± 0	5.1 /.9	T	0.2	51.5 ± 10.2	,	1.3 ±	4.0	$12.1 \pm$	0.5	13.2 ± 0	5.4	52.0	± 17.3	
psychopathological episc		u 7 7	11.2	01 0 1		7 0	21.2 ± 20.7	7	6.9	4.0	12.2	9.6	141 - 7	7 2	22.1	156	
	$13/11.7 \pm 22.11.6 \pm$	1.1 6 A	11.2 ± 0	0.1 0.2		1.0	31.2 ± 20.1	, ,	$0.8 \pm 7.5 \pm$	4.9	$12.2 \pm 12.5 \pm$	8.0 7.1	$14.1 \pm 16.6 \pm 700$	/. <i>L</i> 7 1	22.1	± 15.0	
organic type	$22 11.0 \pm$	0.4	12.9 ± 9	9.2 9.4	± '	0.0	33.9 ± 20.2	<u></u>	$7.5 \pm 7.2 \pm$	5.0	$13.5 \pm 12.4 \pm$	7.1	10.0 ± 17.1	1.1	37.0	± 13.1	
affective type	$20 9.9 \pm 0.14.5 \pm 0.14.5$	/.1	11.3 ± 12.0	/.9 /./	±	b.2	28.9 ± 17.3	-	$7.3 \pm 7.2 \pm$	5.8	$12.4 \pm$	9.0	$1/.1 \pm$	1.1	36.8	± 18.2	1 1
both	8 14.5 ±	6.0	12.8 ± 6	5.3 10.5	±	8.5	$3/.8 \pm 1/.3$)	$1.3 \pm$	5.5	$22.9 \pm$	8./ b,c,d	$24.5 \pm$	1.2	b, 54.6	± 11.6	b,c,d
predominant forms of res	sponse in stress	tul si	tuations				• • • • • • • •								• • •		
balanced	$33 9.8 \pm$	6.8	8.7 ± 6	6.8 6.3	±	5.3	24.8 ± 16.0)	$6.9 \pm$	5.3	8.8 ±	9.1	10.2 ± 7	7.4	25.9	± 16.3	
autistic	$22\ 11.1\ \pm$	8.1	12.3 ± 8	8.0 8.5	±	8.0	31.9 ± 22.8	3	$7.3 \pm$	5.4	$14.5 \pm$	10.4	14.7 ± 8	3.8	36.5	± 20.2	
expressive	$60\ 11.9\ \pm$	8.3	11.9 ± 9	9.1 8.1	±	6.7	31.8 ± 21.7	7	$7.2 \pm$	4.8	$12.2 \pm$	7.5	16.5 ± 6	5.5	b 35.9	± 14.0	b
self-aggressive	72 12.4 \pm	6.7	12.2 ± 7	7.6 9.7	±	7.2	34.3 ± 19.2	2	$6.5 \pm$	5.0	$14.8 \pm$	8.4 b	16.5 ± 7	7.1	b 37.8	± 15.5	b
sphere of psycho-trauma	tic situation																
family	72 13.3 \pm	7.3	13.2 ± 8	3.9 10.3	±	7.0	36.8 ± 20.7	7	$6.6 \pm$	4.5	$14.5 \pm$	7.9	17.4 ± 7	7.3	38.4	± 14.2	
profession	$43 \hspace{0.15cm} 10.0 \hspace{0.15cm} \pm \hspace{0.15cm}$	6.7	10.0 ± 7	7.4 6.7	±	6.2	26.8 ± 18.0)	$6.0 \pm$	5.5	$14.0 \pm$	8.3	16.5 ± 5	5.6	36.4	± 14.3	
both	11 11.9 \pm	9.1	12.8 ± 9	9.1 9.0	±	9.8	33.7 ± 26.7	7	7.7 ±	5.4	$15.6 \pm$	7.1	18.2 ± 7	7.7	e 41.5	± 16.9	
ecology	38 12.5 \pm	8.0	10.5 ± 7	7.3 8.6	±	7.0	31.7 ± 19.7	7	$9.2 \pm$	4.9 c	$11.2 \pm$	9.2	13.4 ± 6	5.9	33.9	± 16.5	
none	23 7.6 \pm	5.5 1	$b 9.9 \pm 6$	5.9 5.1	±	4.0	$b 22.6 \pm 14.9$) b	5.7 ±	4.9 d	1 7.1 ±	9.4 b,c,d,	$e 7.1 \pm 6$	5.6	b, 19.9	± 17.1	b,c,d,e
presence of anxiety																	
absent	$26\ 10.4\ \pm$	7.1	9.9 ± 7	7.2 7.2	±	6.5	27.5 ± 19.0)	$5.0 \pm$	4.9	$10.5 \pm$	12.0	11.5 ± 8	3.2	26.9	± 20.3	
situational	$123 \ 11.3 \ \pm$	7.0	11.6 ± 7	7.6 8.2	±	6.5	31.1 ± 18.7	7	$6.9 \pm$	4.8	$12.7 \pm$	7.6	15.1 ± 6	5.5	34.7	± 13.7	
always	$38\ 13.4\ \pm$	8.8	12.2 ± 10	0.2 10.0	±	8.2	35.7 ± 24.0	5	$8.3 \pm$	5.5 b) 14.9 ±	9.1	18.0 ± 9	9.1	b 41.2	± 18.4	b
manifestation of work di	sadaptation																
none	$110^{1}11.3 \pm$	7.4	11.3 ± 7	7.8 8.3	±	6.7	30.9 ± 19.4	ł	6.4 ±	4.9	$9.9 \pm$	7.7	12.6 ± 7	7.1	28.9	± 14.3	
underperformance	$15 \ 9.8 \pm$	7.3	11.4 ± 10).9 6.9	±	7.1	28.1 ± 24.4	1	8.1 ±	4.8	$15.7 \pm$	8.1	20.0 ± 8	3.8	b 43.7	± 16.7	b
loss of rhythm	$23 94 \pm$	5.5	87 ± 4	19 64	±	47	$24.6 \pm 13^{\circ}$	7	$54 \pm$	4 0	$164 \pm$	88 b	195 ± 4	52	b 41 3	± 14.9	b
both	$18 \ 12 \ 3 \ \pm$	79	13.9 ± 10^{-10})5 73	±	67	33.6 ± 22.4	5	72 ±	48	$164 \pm$	71 b	15.8 ± 3	7 1	39.4	± 13.5	-
both+failure	$11 175 \pm$	88 ($d 157 \pm 8$	89 144	±	94	d 47.5 \pm 25.0	b ($11.9 \pm$	69 h	$d 198 \pm$	86 b	205 ± 4	18	b 52.2	± 13.5	h
others	10 158 +	6.4	10.7 + 4	5.7 11.4	+	7.0	$37.9 + 14^{-4}$	5	85 +	3.8	190 +	9.8 b	190 + 4	59	46.5	+ 14.9	h
manifestation of social d	isadaptation	0.1	10.7 – 0	.,	_	/.0	57.9 - 11.		0.0 -	5.0	19.0 -	9.0 0	17.0 – 1	.,	10.0	- 11.9	U
none	69 11 6 +	73	10.8 + 7	77 63	+	0.8	$30.5 + 18^{\circ}$	7	68 +	48	88 +	75	112 + 6	57	26.8	+ 14 1	
loss of interest (i)	16 107 +	7.0	93 + 6	59 61	+	1.5	27.0 + 18.0	5	$5.0 \pm 5.4 +$	5.0	$12.3 \pm$	9.5	11.2 ± 0.12	7.0	30.3	+ 19.2	
aggression (a)	30 94 +	5.8	10.1 + 6	5.5 65	+	1.2	27.0 ± 10.0 $26.8 \pm 17^{\circ}$		$3.1 \pm 8.5 +$	5.0	$12.9 \pm 13.9 \pm$	83	$12.7 \pm 187 + 4$	53	b 41.0	+ 14.7	h
antisocial behavior	$14 148 \pm$	9.0 8 /	16.1 ± 0.1	20 0.3		2.5	20.0 ± 17.1	1	$6.9 \pm 6.8 \pm$	5.) 6.0	$13.9 \pm 17.6 \pm$	0.5	10.7 ± 3 17.2 ± 3	7.0	<i>1</i> 1.0	+ 17.7	U
mysticism (m)	$6 107 \pm$	0. 1 5.8	10.3 ± 6	5.7 7.2 5.5 5.5	 	2.3	43.7 ± 24.3	r 2	$5.0 \pm$	0.0 1 1	$17.0 \pm 13.5 \pm$	2.0	$17.2 \pm 13.3 \pm $	17	31.0	± 17.3 ± 70	
inysticisiii (iii)	$0 10.7 \pm 20 10.2 \pm 10.2$	5.0 0.2	11.7 ± 0 12.1 ± 10).5 5.5	 	2.3	31.0 ± 13.0 20.0 ± 24.2))	$3.0 \pm 7.6 \pm$	4.1	$13.3 \pm 14.4 \pm$	5.5 80 h	13.3 ± 2	+./ >7	51.0	± 1.9	h
i+m	$20\ 10.5\ \pm$	0.5	12.1 ± 10).1 /.4).1 0 1		1./	30.0 ± 24.2	<u>_</u> 1	$7.0 \pm$	4.0	$14.4 \pm 15.6 \pm$		10.0 ± 0) ./	0 40.0 h 200	± 13.2	U
17111	$11 15.0 \pm 7 16.7 \pm$	9.3	11.1 ± 5	9.4 0.2		2.3 7 4	33.0 ± 24.4	+ 7	$4.1 \pm 5.2 \pm$	3.0 2.6	$13.0 \pm 19.4 \pm$	0.0	19.2 ± 0	0.0 0 5	U 30.9	± 14.0	
	$/ 10./ \pm$	0.0 (7	$1/.0 \pm 9$	9.0 0.4	± .	2.4	$44.7 \pm 10.$	/ ```	$3.3 \pm 0.7 \pm$	2.0	$18.4 \pm$	/.4	19.7 ± 3	5.5 - 7	0 45.4	± /.9	1
I+a+m	$14 \ 13.5 \ \pm$	0./	11.8 ± 8	5.5 /.3	±	1.9	34.3 ± 20.0)	8./ ±	5.4	$19.0 \pm$	ð./ D	18.9 ± 3	0.7	D 46.6	± 14.4	D
somatic nealth	01 11 5	7.0	111	10 05		- 1	21.2			4.0	10.0	0.0	140 . (22.5	1.100	
neartny	$91 11.5 \pm$	/.ð	11.1 ± 7	1.9 8.5	±	/.1	31.2 ± 20.8	5	0.4 ±	4.8	$12.3 \pm$	ð.ð	14.8 ± 8	5.0	55.5	± 16.9	
subclinical	$80 12.1 \pm$	/.1	11.8 ± 8	8.6 8.5	±	/.0	32.4 ± 20.0)	/.6 ±	5.4	$14.0 \pm$	8.8	15.9 ± 7	/.0	5/.4	± 15.4	
disorder	$16 \ 10.1 \ \pm$	6.9	11.8 ± 6	<u>)./ /.6</u>	±	5.1	29.4 ± 16.8	5	6.3 ±	4.3	$10.6 \pm$	1.2	13.9 ± 7	1.2	30.7	± 15.4	- 1

 Table 4 Comparison of IER-S and CAPS scores between/among groups divided acording to the information about clinical examination

 Impact of Event Scale Revision (IES-R)
 Clinical-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS)

The values represent the mean \pm SD. Significant difference, a; between groups (P<0.05, Students' t-test), and b; from the first group, c; from the second group, d; from the third group, and e; from the fourth group. (P<0.05, one-way ANOVA with Tuckyr's HSD as a post hoc test).

			Impact of Event Scale Revision (IES-R)								Clinical-Administered PTSD Scale (CAPS)														
	No	Intrus	ion		Avoi	dance	Нуре	erar	ousal	Tota		_	Intru	sion	1	Avoid	ance		Нур	erar	ousal	Tota	1		
As a food, fish caught in the	Amur	River	is																						
basic and important	60	13.8	±	7.5	13.1	± 8.8	9.7	±	7.2	36.5	± 21.2	2	8.2	± 5.6		13.9	±	9.1	16.7	±	6.2	38.7	±	15.4	
not basic but important	95	11.1	±	6.9	11.0	± 7.4	7.9	±	6.3	30.0	± 18.2	2	6.6	± 4.8		12.7	± 8	8.4	15.2	, ±	8.0	34.5	±	16.2	,
neither basic nor importan	a 32	9.3	±	8.1	b 10.0	± 8.5	7.5	±	7.8	26.8	± 21.8	3	5.5	± 4.0	b	11.5	± 8	8.9	12.2	, ±	7.5	b 29.2	±	16.3	b
Fish inhabiting the Amur Riv	ver is s	serious	ly s	uffer	ed																				
no	21	13.2	\pm	8.7	11.3	± 9.0	10.2	\pm	7.7	34.8	± 23.8	3	6.9	± 4.5		13.0	±	9.9	15.9	±	6.7	35.9	\pm	18.1	
yes	166	11.4	\pm	7.3	11.5	± 8.0	8.2	\pm	6.8	31.1	± 19.6	5	6.9	± 5.1		12.8	± 8	8.6	15.1	±	7.6	34.8	\pm	16.0)
After the pollution, do you ea	at fish	in the	Am	nur R	iver?																				
no	56	11.3	\pm	8.0	11.9	± 8.7	8.7	\pm	7.9	31.9	± 22.3	3	8.0	± 5.7		11.6	± 10	0.2	12.8	, ±	8.1	32.4	\pm	19.7	
yes	102	11.3	\pm	7.2	10.6	± 7.7	7.7	±	6.1	29.6	± 18.7	7	6.2	± 4.9		13.0	±΄	7.8	15.7	±	7.1	b 35.0	±	14.6)
in the future, yes	29	13.5	\pm	7.1	13.8	± 8.1	10.5	\pm	7.2	37.9	± 19.5	5	7.3	± 3.4		14.7	± 8	8.4	17.7	±	6.9	b 39.8	\pm	13.7	
Water pollution in the Amur	River	is																							
disaster	172	12.1	\pm	7.4	11.9	± 8.2	8.7	\pm	7.0	32.7	± 20.1	1	7.1	± 5.0		13.6	± 8	8.6	15.8	, ±	7.3	36.5	\pm	15.6	,
not terrible	15	6.3	\pm	5.2	a 6.9	± 5.3	a 4.7	\pm	4.6	a 17.9	± 13.7	7 a	4.3	± 4.1	а	4.8	± :	5.0	a 8.1	±	6.6	a 17.2	\pm	11.9	a
The Amur River for me is																									
sacred (s)	16	13.6	\pm	6.2	14.4	± 8.8	10.2	\pm	7.6	38.3	± 18.7	7	9.6	± 5.4		12.9	±	9.9	13.4	±	9.1	35.8	\pm	20.2	, ,
gateway to the ancester																									
/another world (g)	26	9.7	±	7.2	11.2	± 8.1	9.0	±	7.3	29.9	± 21.2	2	5.3	± 4.2		11.8	± 8	8.2	13.4	±	7.2	30.5	\pm	17.1	
way of life (w)	56	12.2	±	7.4	12.0	± 8.6	8.5	±	6.5	32.7	± 20.8	3	6.7	± 5.3		14.3	± 8	8.1	15.9	±	6.0	36.9	\pm	13.1	
just the river	62	10.3	\pm	7.4	11.0	± 7.8	7.5	±	6.8	28.7	± 19.6	5	5.6	± 4.1		12.4	±	9.1	16.3	±	8.1	34.3	\pm	16.5	
s+g	6	17.3	±	10.2	11.5	± 6.9	12.3	±	10.2	41.2	± 25.2	2	10.5	± 5.0		14.0	±΄	7.4	14.3	±	9.2	38.8	±	18.5	1
s+w	4	13.5	\pm	9.3	11.3	± 8.2	7.0	±	7.7	31.8	± 24.1	1	8.5	\pm 8.1		14.0	± 1'	7.4	15.0	±	6.1	37.5	±	30.0)
g+w	9	11.4	\pm	4.6	8.4	± 6.5	6.8	±	4.7	26.7	± 11.7	7	9.8	± 5.1		11.3	± (6.4	13.0	±	7.2	34.1	±	13.0)
s+g+w	8	15.3	±	8.5	10.3	± 9.1	9.3	±	6.6	34.8	± 21.9)	11.4	± 4.0	c,	10.4	± 8	8.7	13.9	±	10.5	35.6	±	19.8	,
Movement																									
planning	16	12.2	±	7.9	14.0	± 8.1	9.4	\pm	8.3	35.6	± 22.2	2	3.9	± 4.1		14.6	±	9.6	16.4	±	6.9	34.9	\pm	14.9	1
not planning	171	11.6	±	7.4	11.3	± 8.1	8.3	±	6.8	31.2	± 19.9)	7.2	± 5.0	а	12.7	± 8	8.6	15.1	±	7.6	34.9	±	16.4	ŀ

Table 5 Comparizon of IER-S and CAPS scores between/among groups divided acording to the ethno-psychological questions

The values represent the mean \pm SD. Significant difference, a; between groups (P<0.05, Students' t-test), and b; from the first group, c; from the second group, and e; from the fourth group (P<0.05, one-wav ANOVA with Tuckv's HSD as a post hoc test).

Table 6. Logistic regression analysis exploring risk and protective factor against PTSD

	reference	conparizon	odds	Р	95% Cl	[
age class	18-29	30-39	148.36	0.00	7.53 -	10075.55
	18-29	40-49	136.49	0.01	2.75 -	20391.67
	30-39	50-59	0.03	0.02	0.00 -	0.65
	30-39	≥60	0.00	0.02	0.00 -	0.27
	40-49	50-59	0.03	0.04	0.00 -	0.88
	40-49	≥60	0.00	0.02	0.00 -	0.22
place of residence	village	settlement	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.04
housing	state house	own house	0.03	0.01	0.00 -	0.52
	state house	no house	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.09
marrital status	not married	married	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	not married	divorced/widowed	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
education	primary	secondary	0.06	0.02	0.00 -	0.63
profession	buisiness	education	0.01	0.03	0.00 -	0.59
-	buisiness	not working	0.01	0.04	0.00 -	0.83
	culture	education	0.03	0.04	0.00 -	0.79
	industry	education	0.01	0.01	0.00 -	0.40
	civil service	education	0.01	0.02	0.00 -	0.47
relation to own nationalities	inferior	superior	0.01	0.05	0.00 -	0.99
relation to other nationalities	intolerable	friendly	0.01	0.03	0.00 -	0.61
relation to other nationalities	tolerable	friendly	0.01	0.00	0.00 -	0.17
dominant role in	self	equal	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
spouse position	self	partner	0.01	0.00	0.00 -	0.20
spouse position	self	others	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.06
	partner	equal	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.09
age hierarchy	subordinate	respect but not subordinate	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.05
family relation	friendly	formal	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	friendly	conflict	0.03	0.00	0.00 -	0.32
	conflict	formal	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
children	ves	no	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.06
priority values	health	family	0.02	0.00	0.00 -	0.29
Priority (unless	health	profession	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	health	material well-being	0.04	0.01	0.00 -	0.48
	material well-being	profession	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	family	profession	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	public recognition	family	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	public recognition	profession	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	public recognition	health	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.06
	public recognition	material well-being	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
observance to national ceremonies	positive	sometimes	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.11
	negative	sumetimes	0.02	0.00	0.00 -	0.25
preferential medical method	shamanism	traditional	0.03	0.01	0.00 -	0.51
P	shamanism	Western	0.01	0.00	0.00 -	0.20
Atitude to mental illness	civilized	uncertain	0.03	0.00	0.00 -	0.34
	superstitious	uncertain	0.01	0.03	0.00 -	0.65
nsychonathological family history	ves	no	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.02
psychopathological failing instory	ves	alcoholism	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.01
nsychonathological enisodes in childhood	organic type	none	68.67	0.01	2.27 -	5015.01
psychopathological episodes in enhanood	affective type	organic type	0.01	0.01	0.00 -	0.31
	both	none	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	both	organic type	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
form of response in stress situation	balanced	expressive	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.07
is in orresponse in stress situation	balanced	self-aggression	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.02
	balanced	autistic	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.10
sphere of psycho-traumatic situation	family	identify difficult	0.00	0.02	0.00 -	0.10
~por or poyono er aumane steadton	profession	identify difficult	0.01	0.02	0.00 -	0.47
	hoth	ecology	0.01	0.01	0.00 -	0.5 4 0.83
	both	identify difficult		0.04	0.00 -	0.03
somatic health	healthy	subclinical	0.00 QG 21	0.01	6 1 / -	3611 97
fish in the Amur River is food	hasic and important	not basic but important	0.04	0.00	0.00 -	0.05
and in the callul active 15 look	not hasic but improtant	neither basic nor important	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.05 0 63
	not ousle out improtuitt	mention subre not important	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00

eat fish in the Amur River after water pollution	no
pollution in the AmurRiver is	di
the Amur River for me is	sa

movemnet

pollution	no	eating	0.06	0.04	0.00 -	0.92
	disaster	not always	0.01	0.00	0.00 -	0.15
	sacred (s)	gateway (g)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.03
	sacred (s)	way of life (w)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.06
	sacred (s)	just the river (j)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.18
	sacred (s)	g+w	0.00	0.04	0.00 -	0.71
	sacred (s)	s+g+w	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.04
	gateway (g)	just the river (j)	28.91	0.04	1.01 -	1714.87
	s+g	gateway (g)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	s+g	way of life (w)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	s+g	s+w	0.00	0.01	0.00 -	0.04
	s+g	g+w	0.00	0.01	0.00 -	0.04
	s+g	s+g+w	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.00
	s+g	just the river (j)	0.00	0.00	0.00 -	0.01
	planning	not planning	0.02	0.03	0.00 -	0.64

InterplantingInterplanting0.020.030.00-0.00The group with either ≥ 34 Total-I or ≥ 40 Total-C (n=110, approx. 60%) was compared against the group having < 34 Total-I and < 40 Total-C (n=77, approx. 40%).No factor was extracted form gender, native language, superstition, attitude to suicide, and fish in the Amur was polluted.

Figure



Figure 1