

Psychological security as the foundation of personal psychological wellbeing (analytical review)

Olga Yu. Zotova^{a*}, Larisa V. Karapetyan^{b,c}

^a *Social Psychology Faculty, Liberal Arts University–University for Humanities, Ekaterinburg, Russia*

^b *Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russia*

^c *Russian EMERCOM in the Ural region, Yekaterinburg, Russia*

* Corresponding author. E-mail: oiambusheva@mail.ru

Background. Security as a socio-cultural phenomenon requires a comprehensive approach and integrates a multitude of aspects of social reality, each of which is important both for an individual and society as a whole. It has been shown that there are certain universal desires and needs which are valued by all cultures and peoples as essential to providing a high quality of life; one of such universals is the need for security. Consequently, the status of people's security in a society directly depends on the processes taking place in the society as a whole, and a craving for security and the need for it act as powerful stimulators of social changes.

Aim. A theoretical analysis of studies on psychological security as a socio-cultural phenomenon.

Method. Sources were selected according the following principles of scientific cognition: development, systematicity, and determinism.

Result and discussion. It has been shown that, on the one hand, an individual's security is the result of an effective political, economic, social, and cultural environment. On the other hand, a society's security is a combination of individual people's security. It has been proved that the strengthening of a society's psychological security is key to achieving the wellbeing of different categories of people.

It has been demonstrated that security is a dynamic process, since at every point in time we are dealing with a new type of danger. As a result, psychological security must constantly be created all over again. The latent character of security is shown by the fact that a person starts to strain after it only when an actual threat to life, health, and wellbeing emerges. What's more, the use of an interdisciplinary approach (psychological and sociological, in particular) appears to be the most fruitful, especially with regard to such latent phenomena as security and wellbeing.

It has been shown that all aspects of human behavior in all spheres of life can be interpreted in the context of both the sense of security and actual security, and in most cases it is the need for security that guides man's action. It has also been demonstrated

that people's perceptions and assessment of their state of security are psychological processes, and thus, they are exposed to individual and group differences.

Modern research has shown that, in the modern world, the link between a sense of wellbeing and sense of security is drawing increasing attention. Yet it should be noted that there is a tendency to interpret the concept of security restrictively as protection from harm and satisfaction of basic needs. In other words, the idea that psychological wellbeing and security are complementary and mutually conditioned concepts has not been dealt with so far.

Keywords: psychological security, psychological wellbeing, "ontological" security, "security theater," need for security, perception of security.

Introduction

Today's society has a level of actual security which, according to all basic parameters — from the probability of death by violence to the normal level of hygiene — is higher than it used to be. Yet, people still feel the need for more security, and are consumed with tracking down various possible dangers and threats in the social realm. International conflicts, the danger of nuclear war, and environmental threats stir up feelings of fear, uncertainty, and the senselessness of existence. When a person experiences instability in his milieu, his psychological wellbeing shrinks, and he is extremely sensitive to "future shock" (Toffler, 2002). In addition, highly industrialized societies have not succeeded in formulating an ideology "capable of satisfying man's need for meaningful existence and sense of community" (Ross & Nisbett, 1999, p. 326). In the modern world, security is no longer an abstract notion; it becomes a concrete phenomenon created by interacting individuals.

Erratic turbulences have transformed the world arena over the past decades. Among them the following ones are worth noting: globalization (Sloterdijk, 2013); the development of increasingly lethal technologies; the financial crisis of 2008; inequality of wealth (Milanovic, 2016); and the increasing lack of "common human decency" (Orwell, 2001). Wars (Broch, 1996), invasions, territorial alterations (Hogenraad, 2016, Kershaw, 2016; Hogenraad & Garagozov, 2010), demographical shifts (Jameson, 2016), terrorism, and corruption (Delumeau, 1990) are all threatening stability. As a Belgian psychologist noted, it looks as if we are entering a new historical period, as yet unnamed, without a compass (Hogenraad, 2017), but it is undeniable that the key challenge is providing security. "We are short of conceptions to understand what we have experienced" (Musil, 1990, p. 117).

One can hardly name a period in the history of Russia when a person could feel completely secure. His environment has always been fraught with lots of threats. As Russia's power and social structures and its society itself evolved, the types and the degrees of dangers and threats have undergone various changes. Therefore, in 2017 a Russian faced different threats than those of 1717 (Serov, 2013). In the opinion of O.N. Yanitsky, "there is no consent (consensus) in the Russian society with regard to basic values and purposes as well as a coordinated scenario of the future... The underlying, normative model of a society includes security, survival, preservation of the accumulated or earlier acquired" (Yanitsky, 2003, p. 20).

Ongoing social transformations can alter ordinary dangers, create new risks, and change a society's strategies. Thus, over the last decade, Russia has encountered new forms of social movements and spontaneous manifestations of different social groups, which are sure to have a great impact on the life of every person. The character of these new social groupings matches the modern stage of the development of Russian society and its evolving structure of social stratification. So, in I. Panarin's view, "reconsideration of priorities and emphases for treating problems of national security presented science and practices with the necessity to work on an entirely new aspect of this problem — the problem of psychological security" (Panarin, 2001. p. 34).

On the whole, when considering the issue of security, one's starting assumption is that its essential characteristic is its relativity. The state of security is influenced by a huge number of factors which are individualized. To make an absolute characterization of a state under consideration is impossible, as it could lead either to the exclusion of a lot of phenomena, or to taking into account a great number of phenomena which are irrelevant.

This paper provides a theoretical analysis of studies into psychological security as a socio-cultural phenomenon; identifies the purposes of security; and considers various views on the nature of security, as well as outlines the prospects for further research. The analysis we present is aimed at providing a clearer understanding of the structure, functions, and genesis of psychological security; and accentuating significant psychological factors and formative mechanisms.

In what follows, we shall analyze a variety of perspectives from which psychological security has been interpreted.

Method

Our sources were selected on the basis of the following principles of scientific cognition:

- The principle of development, on the basis of which psychological security is considered to be a phenomenon with phylo- and ontogenesis.
- The principle of systematicity, thanks to which security can be seen as a structure in itself, on the one hand, and as interconnected with many manifestations of the personality, on the other.
- The principle of determinism, which allows for taking into account the actual reasons for the formation and development of psychological security, and for the individual personality as both the subject and object of security.

Results and discussion

Psychological security: definition, features, and specifics of interpretation

Security psychology today can definitely be treated as a relatively sustainable, coherent, and holistic system of knowledge which integrates the most relevant layers of modern cognition.

Thanks to dozens of foreign (Bar-Tal, 1991; Beck, 1992; Beck, 1999; Giddens, 1984; Giddens, 1990; Giddens, 1991; Schneier, 2003; Wæver, 1995) and domestic (Baeva & Bordovskaia, 2015; Malakhov, 2013; Zhuravlyov & Tarabrina, 2012; Zotova, 2011) researchers, this field of knowledge has become an independent branch of science. The inter-disciplinary character of its subject-matter has been increasingly identified as an overall, multi-dimensional phenomenon which requires system-based and comprehensive research with the help of methods and tools adequate to its content.

That said, considering the general context of modern security psychology, most authors agree that this discipline is still under development as a science.

Arguably, scientific methods of analysis have been formulated, an internally-consistent scholarly language has been constructed, and a basic set of methodological tools for interpretation and analysis has been defined.

However, it must be noted that the discipline's own "language," its specific principles and laws, and its subject matter, are still being concretized and acquiring their categorical content, methodology, and cognitive meaning.

Psychological security is the state of an individual when he/she can satisfy his/her basic needs for self-preservation and perceive his/her own (psychological) shelteredness *in socium* (Zotova, 2011).

Very few people would deny that security, both individual and national, along with international, stands at the top of the international agenda.

Strategies associated with the provision of security are aimed at identifying and preventing threats. The purpose of security can be interpreted variously:

1. Protection of human life.
2. Protection of people from existing threats.
3. Provision of vital rights and freedoms for all people.
4. Creation of political, economic, social, and cultural conditions under which people can live knowing that their rights and freedoms are secured.

The above-mentioned approaches demonstrate that man's security is more likely to be the result of an effective political, economic, social, cultural, and natural environment than of the accomplishment of a set of ministerial directives. But this is only one side of the "coin." On the other hand, society's security is a byproduct of its members' sense of being secure.

The idea of security can be more easily applied to things than to people. Since material values are often replaceable, their safety and security can be increased by means of loss insurance. What comprises the security of individuals cannot be defined so easily. Factors affecting their security — life, health, status, wealth, freedom — are more complicated, and many of them cannot be replaced in the event of their loss. That is why the key to people's wellbeing is the strengthening of their psychological security.

It is worth mentioning that psychological security refers, to a large extent, to hypothetical constructions which are hard to measure. We cannot see "insecurity" except in the cases where people themselves talk about it. Also, we should note that the creation of psychological security is an elaborate and labor-consuming process, and then it can be destroyed by one wrong move, from one breath to the next.

Psychological security embraces conative, cognitive, and emotional constructs which make it possible to treat security as a psychological phenomenon with a standard structure. Hence security can be described as a state of inner peace, confidence, positive attitude, trust, subjective wellbeing, openness, and relaxation.

Many psychological theories, to a lesser or greater extent, address the issue of security by trying to answer these questions: What is the nature of security? What defines a hazard to man? What are the characteristics of man's behavior in risk situations?

Despite the diversity of answers to these questions, some affinity of views can be identified.

First, quite a number of authors agree that security is a dynamic process. At each point in time, we deal with a new type of danger, and as a result, psychological security must constantly be created anew.

Second, the latent character of security should be noted. We strive for it only when a threat to our life, health, or wellbeing appears. In a stable society, the issue of security is not brought up for discussion, as a rule.

Third, a healthy feeling of security is a basic sensation of a normal person. All aspects of human behavior in all spheres of life can be treated in the context of security, and most of our actions are guided by our need for security.

Each of these perspectives raises its own questions, and deals with the security phenomenon under consideration from a specific angle, identifying certain criteria, levels, and notions of security.

Within the framework of our review, we believe that scholars should focus on the following orientations toward the psychological connotations of security:

A definition of security with regard to risk perception.

Some researchers assume that the sense of security/insecurity reflects a presentiment of risk or danger, a risk or danger that can or cannot happen, and a feeling about the situation's manageability (Cong & An, 2004).

Since the middle of the 1990s the concepts of the "risk society" (Beck, 1992) and "global risk society" (Beck, 1999; Beck, 2011) have arisen in both the social sciences and international relations (see Brauch, 2011). Many disciplines have aimed at risk analysis. Although risk calculations as a function of probability — i.e., whether the event can occur in fact — belong to the field of natural sciences, people's reactions to risk situations belong to the area of psychology (Renn et al., 2007). So, Lofstedt and Frewer argued that people's reactions to dangers depend on their knowledge and experience (Lofstedt & Frewer, 1998).

U. Beck (Beck, 1992) claimed that risk increases along with technological complexity. His theory of the "risk society" posed the problem of risk in the context of the theory of modernity, focusing mainly on technical hazards and, to a lesser extent, on social actions. W. Bonß (Bonß, 1995, pp. 18–19) assumed that risks should be analyzed in the context of the social construction of uncertainties. Although uncertainties about dangers exist irrespective of man's actions, uncertainties associated with risks include intentions as well as actions. Therefore, risks often result

from decisions made under uncertainty. Since complete confidence can hardly be achieved, Llewellyn (see Brauch, 2011) states that “risk and uncertainty are integral to human behavior.” “Uncertainty arises when the future is unknown.” Consequently, risk analysis is applied to situations with indefinite results.

Based on Ronald Laing’s interpretation of ontological defenselessness, E. Giddens put forward the term *ontological security* (Giddens, 1984; Giddens, 1991), which he saw as the product of the modern era — times of uncertainty and upheavals.

Speaking about dangers/risks and trust on the basis of which “ontological” security emerges, E. Giddens singled out two models of “conditions” which define the relationships between them: pre-modern and modern. Hazards for pre-modern cultures are represented by the Physical World (diseases, the caprices of the weather), human violence, and “existential” fears, while the model of trust and security is based on family and community ties, religious cosmology, and tradition, which are treated by E. Giddens as routine practices and rituals. In the modern world, threats are modifying: ecological, wartime, and psychological risks are mostly connected with the development of industries and technologies. Hence, security is achieved with the help of “abstract systems” which establish a network of state, or super-state, institutions.

For E. Giddens, the sense of security stems from order, stability, and routine, the combination of which gives meaning to life. When a state of security is achieved, man is no longer troubled with existential matters. And vice versa: Chaos, unrest, and violence bring about threats to security, create anxiety, and nullify trust in life’s predictability.

Man in the state of ontological insecurity is characterized by obsessive over-exaggeration of risks to his personality, extreme self-analysis, and moral emptiness (Giddens, 1991). E. Giddens considers ontological security to be an emotional phenomenon entailing “the conviction that the majority of people have continuity of their own identity, that social and material world around them is changeless” (Giddens, 1990, p. 92). Ontological security is “an emotional, and not a cognitive phenomenon, and it stems from the unconscious” (Giddens, 1990, p. 92).

Security through the lens of socio-constructivist approach

Wolfers (see Brauch, 2011) pointed to two sides of security: “Security, in the objective sense, measures the lack of threats to values acquired, and, in the subjective sense, it speaks about absence of fear that these values will be attacked.” From the perspective of social constructivism in international affairs (Adler, 1997; Fearon & Wendt, 2002; Risse, 2003; Wendt, 1992; Wendt, 1999), “security is seen as the result of the process of social and political interaction where social values and norms, collective identities and cultural traditions are important.” From this standpoint, security is always subjective, or “security is ‘man-made’” (Wendt, 1992). In order to achieve security, not only a lack of objective dangers but also the absence of subjective apprehension is essential. In other words, objective security is achieved when dangers associated with various threats, challenges, vulnerabilities, and risks are avoided, managed, and eliminated.

Subjective theories of security

Perceptions of security are shaped individually, and they represent subjective reflections of reality. The content of security perceptions has a wide scope. Thus, the person himself, his family, his ethnic or religious group, his nation, and the entire world can act as the object of security. Categories of security perceptions also include a lot of other factors relating to conditions that can either weaken or strengthen security.

Pioneering works in this field come from J. Der Derian (1993), B. Busan (1991), and O. Wæver (1995). These authors were at the forefront of the “postmodernist” (or “poststructuralist”) approach to the theory of international relations. They shifted focus from the analysis of “security” and “insecurity,” to the analysis of their meaning in a bit different context. As a result, the epistemological foundations of the scientific discipline called “security studies” are emphasized. Moreover, the authors do not set “security” against “threats” or “dangers”; they set it against “insecurity,” thus adding a subjective component (feelings and sensations) to the analysis of the phenomenon (Weldes et al., 1999).

In the opinion of Russian philosopher and political analyst V. Malakhov (2013), modern rhetoric about security “frames” our reality, a fact which is reflected in “the mobilization of certain perceptions” through the use of new meanings. The use of “insecurity” language results not only in the mobilization of thinking but also in the transformation of the semantic field (Huysmans, 2006. p. 24). That is why the struggle between different perceptions and visions of the problem always lies behind varying behavioral strategies and the politics of insecurity.

The perception and assessment of security are psychological processes; hence, they are subject to individual and group differences (Bar-Tal, 1991). At the level of an individual, even members of the same group can differ from each other in their security perceptions. In other words, the perceptions of security or danger within one and the same group may follow no particular pattern.

Individual distinctions in security perceptions and the security state arise due to differences in people’s experience, their ability to perceive, perceptive selectiveness, and individual ways of processing information, motivation, and knowledge, all of which influence the interrelations between the information perceived and the ability to cope with threats (Bar-Tal et al., 1997; Epstein, 1994; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Kruglanski, 1989; Lazarus et al., 1985; Nisbett & Ross, 1980). These distinctions imply that, on the one hand, people evaluate the degree of danger and threat in different ways; on the other, they differ in their evaluation of their group’s abilities to overcome and sort out difficulties (Bar-Tal et al., 1995; Jacobson & Bar-Tal, 1995). The distinctions mentioned are most clearly seen in situations of uncertainty, which, in fact, make up the majority of cases. Few situations contain genuine physical dangers, as in the cases of natural disasters, war conflicts, ecological catastrophes, etc. However, even in situations of this kind, the information received can be of indefinite character, and hence, can be assessed in different manners by different people.

Security Theater

In the light of subjective theories of security, not without interest is the concept of a “Security Theater,” which denotes a package of measures aimed at providing secu-

rity but, in fact, fails to provide it (Schneier, 2003). For that reason E. Felten (Felten, 2004) gives the definition “security theater” to the safety precautions introduced in airports after the September 11 terrorist attacks.

The fact is that sometimes the sensation of security is more important than actual security. If potential victims feel sheltered, they can avoid crippling fear even if white lies are used. In addition, potential evil-doers may abandon the idea of attacking in a place that looks heavily protected. A security theater, as a rule, imposes limitations, or makes people undergo very specific procedures which can be taken as restrictions of personal liberty and privacy rights.

Two studies carried out by a research group from Cornell University demonstrated that the security upgrade in U.S. airports following the September 11 terrorist acts led to the rise in the number of car accidents, as potential air travelers gave up the idea of traveling by air and chose overland transport, thus exposing themselves to a greater risk than an air crash fatality. The researchers found out that in 2005, changes in passengers’ flight regimes caused 242 car crash fatalities, the equivalent of “full passenger loads of four Boeing 737s.” If these people had preferred going by air, they might have avoided their sad fate.

In many cases, the obtrusive measures of a security theater create secondary negative consequences whose real cost is hard to evaluate. These after-effects are often associated with fear. For example, on seeing a lot of armed security men and thorough searches, a person may get nervous, thinking that there is a real threat at his elbow. In the context of flights, such an unreasonable fear can create a situation where some citizens give up traveling by air.

Security and psychological wellbeing

Security and psychological wellbeing are concepts comprising hosts of factors, and the first of them is subjectivity. These concepts belong to those constructs which, like other beliefs and feelings, are embedded in the human mind. This means that particular people or group members (for instance, ethnic groups and national representatives) perceive security and wellbeing through the lens of their personal experience, or from the perspective of their group and its systems. Thus, security and wellbeing represent a psychological experience which, in most cases, can be measured by questioning whether people feel secure/insecure, balanced/imbanced, etc. Security and wellbeing cannot be assessed objectively. We can deal here only with the subjective estimates of those who are assessed.

“The subjective” is what people feel and sense. The subjective factor involves both cognitive and emotional aspects. The interrelations between the cognitive and emotional components of security testify to the fact that, at the level of cognition, satisfaction is accompanied by a sense of inner serenity, whereas cognitive dissatisfaction is felt as being in danger and jeopardized.

When at risk, people often make decisions on the basis of their own subjective judgments. Consequently, their reactions depend on how they perceive this or that situation (Huang et al., 2007).

The next factor which ties together security and wellbeing as socio-psychological phenomena is identity. In this context, the perception of security and subjective wellbeing can affect social beliefs, and serve as a factor determining social action. In this case, perceptions contribute to a feeling of uniqueness and social identity,

as well as differentiation from other peoples. These perceptions become the lens through which whole societies see the world. Perceptions of security and subjective wellbeing are stored in the cognitive repertoire of society's members, and appear in different social products such as books and films; they are pronounced via media (newspapers, television, or radio) and are presented in public institutions (schools, colleges, universities, etc.). They are often part of the social agenda and the focus of public debate since they are connected with the current issues and challenges facing the society.

Security and psychological wellbeing are closely tied up with the factor of personal control over a situation. M. Kreuter and V. Strecher found that people are likely to assess a situation as less dangerous if, as they suggest, they can gain control over it (Kreuter & Strecher, 1995). This often occurs in drivers who demonstrate over-exaggerated confidence associated with control over their vehicle, and in people with high levels of professionalism and competence (Slovic et al., 1976). Hence, it is most likely that highly qualified people can overestimate their ability to control a situation since they do not consider it dangerous.

Security and psychological wellbeing are concepts consisting of a host of objective and subjective factors. The opportunity to study and measure them is an important source of information for a society. Security and wellbeing studies deal with the following subjects:

- Internal and external security factors;
- Economic, ecological, and social security;
- Threats to cultural and public security;
- Shelteredness of cultural diversity, etc.

Human wellbeing is basically defined by three fundamental factors: material wellbeing, health, and security. The pace of modern life, a growing complexity of social systems and relationships, as E. Giddens (Giddens, 1990) and U. Beck (Beck, 1992) emphasized, and the increasing number of unintended consequences of social actions are essential considerations for the study of psychological security, which can also develop and change with time. A great portion of the current concepts and theories of psychological security provides a comparatively narrow insight in how psychological security evolves, grows, wanes, or even collapses.

Research on psychological wellbeing is quite topical in our country where a security deficit exists. Interestingly, public opinion polls with regard to the perception of security were conducted by the Public Opinion Fund (Public Opinion Fund, 2013) in 2013. Surveys focused on security in Russia have not been carried out since then. The results of the poll showed that 50% of the Russian people did not feel secure. The respondents within this half spoke about their defenselessness, and about the indifference of authorities towards them, which made them feel abashed and insulted.

The following responses are worth mentioning: "Our leaders don't want us, nobody takes care of us;" "Our state has no need of us;" "negligent attitude to people;" "no discipline, no one is responsible for us;" "The people in power sit on their hands." Many repined at the absence of stability and confidence in future: "I don't know what will happen tomorrow;" "little hope for the future;" "Nobody knows what will come;" "Disorder rules in the country, no stability;" "troubled times;"

“We live in a country where anything can happen.” Some of the respondents felt jeopardized due to social defenselessness, describing this state of things quite definitely: “What security are you talking about? I’m mother of a large family and they don’t provide me with a flat;” “small pension, shortage of money all the time;” “social defenselessness of citizens;” “no hospitals, no doctors.”

One way or another, the sense of defenselessness in our country is widespread, and people feel they suffer from a lack of attention. It is no coincidence that when listing the values they considered most important for Russia, the respondents put “security” second only to “family,” and the difference between these rankings was not significant. The vast majority of the respondents considered these two notions the most meaningful ones.

Societies that succeed in achieving a higher level of subjective wellbeing among their citizens depend heavily on government policies. One reason in favor of using public opinion polls to measure wellbeing resides in the fact that people highly evaluate them. Thus, E. Diener found that college students appreciate subjective wellbeing higher than values such as income, health, and even love (Diener, 2000; Diener et al., 1998). By keeping a close watch on the level of wellbeing and identifying the reasons for its fluctuations, one can do a lot for the growth of citizen satisfaction.

For example, according to the European Social Survey, when respondents within a country give high scores to values such as a good state of physical and mental health, they are likely to assess other aspects of subjective wellbeing highly as well (for instance, Switzerland), and vice versa. However, this is not always the case. In Hungary, for example, the respondents give low scores to their state of general health while they estimate their social wellbeing rather highly (European Social Survey, 2015). In Russia, the average score for physical and mental health is much lower than estimates of other aspects of subjective wellbeing.

A. Maslow (1954), and later C. Ryff and C. Keyes (1995), as well as R. Ryan and E. Deci (2000), argued that there are universal human needs, and that satisfying them will contribute towards wellbeing. From the perspective of sociology, R. Veenhoven and J. Ehrhardt (1995) stated that some societies have a higher quality of life because they have features which are universal and desirable for the majority of people. On the other hand, anthropologist R. Edgerton (1992) claimed that there are “sick societies” that do not produce happiness and health. The common idea here is that every culture and every people have universal desires and needs which they believe will guarantee a high quality of life.

Modern psychology is seeking to find integrative psychological characteristics and, in this light, as A.L. Zhuravlyov and N.V. Tarabrina argue, psychological security can be defined as “an integrative characteristic of the subject which reflects the degree of satisfaction of his need for security and which can be evaluated by the intensity that the experience of psychological wellbeing/ill-being has for the individual” (Zhuravlyov & Tarabrina, 2012, p. 9). The theoretical and empirical study of the phenomenon of psychological wellbeing shows that it can be categorized by integrative characteristics which are closely linked with the negative affectivity the subject exhibits.

The architecture of psychological wellbeing is, to a greater extent, defined and conditioned by a migrating configuration of binary relations, since, in this framework, the consistency of perception simultaneously brings together the whole collection of diverse and contradictory features and bonds of the object or phenom-

enon. That is, it is the consistency of the perception of wellbeing that acts as the prerequisite, and the basis upon which the construct necessary for normal functioning of a personality and its psychological security rests.

Over the last few decades the notion of wellbeing has come into general academic use, providing theoretical foundations for insights into health (World Health Organization, 1978). In its essence, a good level of wellbeing implies extending the sphere of physical health to include not only physical aspects but also psychological and social ones (Axford, 2009). Besides, the inclusion of such a parameter as wellbeing creates a conceptual space of interaction between both subjective and objective estimates (Rees et al., 2009).

Conclusion

In conclusion, it would be reasonable to underline a few key tendencies of the development of security psychology. These trends are tied up with changes in the life of society as a whole: with the growth of uncertainty and the materialization of new types of threats and dangers.

First, security as a socio-cultural phenomenon requires a comprehensive approach and integrates a multitude of aspects of social reality, each of which is important both for an individual and society as a whole.

Second, taking into consideration academic discourses dedicated to psychological wellbeing, greater attention is being paid to the interrelation between wellbeing and security. Yet, one should note the tendency for restrictive interpretations of the concept of security. Therefore, the bond between wellbeing and security has not been regarded as mutually reinforcing and interdependent so far.

Third, fluctuations in a population's level of psychological wellbeing can act as an indicator of the psychological security of the entire society, and reflect the accuracy or invalidity of many decisions and actions by the state.

Fourth, the use of an interdisciplinary approach (psychological and sociological, in particular) appears to be the most fruitful, especially with regard to such latent phenomena as security and wellbeing.

Over the past decades there has been a change of priorities in the development of global society. Research on subjective indicators which are more and more often referred to as valid measurements is evoking considerable interest. Moreover, the quality of objective conditions is being estimated with the help of subjective indicators. Hence, examination of security through the lens of psychology can be seen as a tool for creating wellbeing not only for a single individual, but also for the society as a whole.

Acknowledgements

This article was supported with a grant from the Russian Science Foundation (project № 16-18-00032).

References

- Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the Middle Ground. Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 319–363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066197003003003>

- Axford, N. (2009). Child well-being through different lenses: why concept matters. *Child and Family Social Work*, 14(3), 372–83. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2009.00611.x>
- Baeva, I.A. & Bordovskaia, N.V. (2015). The psychological safety of the educational environment and the psychological well-being of Russian secondary school pupils and teachers. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, 8(1), 86–99. <https://doi.org/10.11621/pir.2015.0108>
- Bar-Tal, D. (1991). Contents and origins of the Israelis' beliefs about security. *International Journal of Group Tensions*, 21, 237–76.
- Bar-Tal, D., Jacobson, D., & Freund, T. (1995). Security feelings among Jewish settlers in the occupied territories: A study of communal and personal antecedents. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 39, 353–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002795039002007>
- Bar-Tal, Y., Kishon-Rabin, L., & Tabak, N. (1997). The effect of need and ability to achieve cognitive structuring on cognitive structuring. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(6), 1158–1176. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.6.1158>
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society. Toward a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Beck, U. (1999) *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2011). *Living in and Coping with World Risk Society*. In H.G. Brauch, O.Ü. Spring, C. Mesjasz, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, & J. Birkmann (Eds.). *Coping with Global Environmental Change, Disasters and Security: Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities, and Risks*, 11–17. New York: Springer.
- Bonß, W. (1995). *Vom Risiko: Unsicherheit und Ungewißheit in der Moderne* [About Risk: Insecurity and Uncertainties in Modernity]. Hamburg: Hamburger.
- Brauch, H.G. (2011). *Concepts of Security Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks*. In H.G. Brauch, O.Ü. Spring, C. Mesjasz, J. Grin, P. Kameri-Mbote, B. Chourou, P. Dunay, & J. Birkmann (Eds.). *Coping with Global Environmental Change, Disasters and Security: Threats, Challenges, Vulnerabilities and Risks*, 61–106. New York: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-17776-7_2
- Broch, H. (1996). *The sleepwalkers*. New York: Vintage.
- Busan, B. (1991). *People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Cong, Z.H. & An, L. (2004). Developing of Security Questionnaire and its Reliability and Validity. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 18, 97–99.
- Delumeau, J. (1990). *Sin and Fear: The Emergence of the Western Guilt Culture, 13th-18th Centuries*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Der Derian, J. (1993). *The Value of Security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche and Baudrillard*. In D. Campbell and M. Dillon (Eds.). *The Political Subject of Violence*, 94–113. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being. The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55, 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.34>
- Diener, E., Sapyta, J., & Suh, E. (1998). Subjective well-being is essential to well-being. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 33–37. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0901_3
- Edgerton, R.B. (1992). *Sick Societies: Challenging the Myth of Primitive Harmony*. New York: Free Press.
- Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and psycho-dynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 49, 709–724. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.49.8.709>
- European Social Survey (2015). *Measuring and Reporting on Europeans' Wellbeing: Findings from the European Social Survey*. London: ESS ERIC.
- Fearon, J.D. & Wendt, A. (2002). *Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View*. In W. Carlsnaes, B. Simmons, T. Risse (Eds.). *Handbook of International Relations*, 52–72. London: Sage.
- Felten, E. (2004). Security Theater. *Freedom to Tinker*. Retrieved from: <http://freedom-to-tinker.com/2004/07/09/security-theater/>

- Fiske, S.T. & Taylor S.E. (1991). *Social Cognition*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Giddens A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hogenraad, R. & Garagozov, R.R. (2010). Words of swords in the Caucasus: About a leading indicator of conflicts. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 16(1), 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10781910903479594>
- Hogenraad, R. (2016). Deaf Sentences Over Ukraine: Mysticism Versus Ethics. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 31(4), 725–745. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqv021>
- Hogenraad, R. (2017). Smoke and mirrors: Tracing ambiguity in texts. *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, 33(2), 297–315. <https://doi.org/10.1093/llc/fqx044>
- Huang, D., Rau, P. P., & Salvendy, G. (2007). *A survey of factors influencing people's perception of information security*. In J. Jacko (Ed.). *Human-Computer Interaction, Part IV*. Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-73111-5_100
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The Politics of Insecurity: Fear, Migration, and Asylum in the EU*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Jacobson, D. & Bar-Tal, D. (1995). Structure of security beliefs among Israeli students. *Political Psychology*, 16, 567–590. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3792227>
- Jameson, F. (2016). *Raymond Chandler: The Detections of Totality*. London: Verso
- Kershaw, I. (2016). *To Hell and Back: Europe, 1914-1949*. London: Penguin.
- Kreuter, M.W. & Strecher, V. (1995). Changing inaccurate perceptions of health risk: Results from a randomised trial. *Health Psychology*, 14, 55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-6133.14.1.56>
- Kruglanski, A.W. (1989). *Lay epistemics and human knowledge: Cognitive and motivational bases*. New York: Plenum. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0924-4>
- Lazarus, R., DeLongis, A., Folkman, S., & Gruen, R. (1985). Stress and adaptational outcomes. *American Psychologist*, 40, 770–779. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.40.7.770>
- Lofstedt, R. & Frewer, L. (1998). *Risk and Modern Society*. London: Earthscan.
- Malakhov, V. (2013). Tehnika bezopasnosti: politika straha kak instrument upravleniya [Occupational Safety and Health: Policy of Fear as Instrument of Management]. *Otechestvennye zapiski [Home Proceedings]*, 2(53). Retrieved from: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2013/2/tehnika-bezopasnosti-politika-straha-kak-instrument-upravleniya>
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global Inequality: A New Approach for the Age of Globalization*. Hardcover. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674969797>
- Musil, R. (1990). *Precision and Soul: Essays and Addresses*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Nisbett, R. & Ross, L. (1980). *Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Orwell, G. (2001). *The Road to Wigan Pier*. London: Penguin.
- Panarin, I.N. (2001). *Informacionnye vojny i Rossija [Information Wars and Russia]* In Vneshnepoliticheskaja informacija i sovremennaja diplomatija [Foreign-policy Information and Modern Diplomacy], 34–42. Moscow: Biznes-press.
- Public Opinion Fund (2013). Deficit bezopasnosti [Security Deficit]. *Otechestvennye zapiski [Home Proceedings]*, 2(53). Retrieved from: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2013/2/deficit-bezopasnosti>
- Rees, G., Bradshaw, J., Goswami, H., & Keung, A. (2009). *Understanding Children's Well-being: a National Survey of Young People's Well-being*. London: Children's Society.

- Renn, O., Schweizer, P.J., Dreyer, M., & Klinke, A. (2007). *Risiko. Über den gesellschaftlichen Umgang mit Risiko [On Public Attitude to Risk]*. München: Oekonom.
- Risse, T. (2003). *Social Constructivism and European Integration*. In T. Diez, A. Wiener (Eds.). *European Integration Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ross, L. & Nisbett, P. (1999). *Chelovek i situacija. Perspektivy social'noj psihologii [Man and Situation. Prospects of Social Psychology]*. Moscow: Aspekt Press.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
- Ryff, C.D. & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 719–727. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719>
- Schneier, B. (2003). *Beyond Fear: Thinking Sensibly about Security in an Uncertain World*. New York: Copernicus Books.
- Serov, D. (2013). Bezopasnost' russkogo cheloveka v nachale XVIII veka [Security of the Russian Man in early XVIII century]. *Otechestvennye zapiski [Home Proceedings]*, 2(53). Retrieved from: <http://www.strana-oz.ru/2013/2/bezopasnost-russkogo-cheloveka-v-nachale-xviii-veka>
- Sloterdijk, P. (2013). *In the world interior of capital: Towards a philosophical theory of globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Slovic, P., Fischhoff, B., & Lichtenstein, S. (1976). *Cognitive processes and social risk taking*. In J.S. Carroll & J.W. Payne (Eds.). *Cognitive and Social Behavior*, 165–184. Potomac, MD: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Toffler, A. (2002). *Shok budushhego [Future Shock]*. Moscow: AST.
- Veenhoven, R. & Ehrhardt, J. (1995). The cross-national pattern of happiness: Test of predictions implied in three theories of happiness. *Social Indicators Research*, 34(1), 33–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01078967>
- Wæver, O. (1995). *Securitization and desecuritization*. In R. Lipschutz (Eds.). *On Security* (pp. 46–86). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weldes, J., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H., & Duvall, R. (1999). *Constructing Insecurity* In Jutta Weldes, Mark Laffey, Hugh Gusterson and Raymond Duvall (Eds.). *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*, 1–34. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 46 (2), 391–425. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764>
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612183>
- World Health Organization (1978). *Declaration of Alma Alta*. Geneva: WHO.
- Yanitsky, O.N. (2003). Sociologija riska: kljuचेvye idei [Sociology of Risk: Key Ideas]. *Mir Rossii [The World of Russia]*, 1, 3–35.
- Zhuravlyov, A.L. & Tarabrina, N.V. (2012). *Vmesto predisloviya [Instead of Introduction]* In A.L. Zhuravlyov, N.V. Tarabrina (Eds.). *Problemy psihologicheskoy bezopasnosti [Problems of Psychological Security]*. Moscow: The Russian Academy of Sciences, Psychology Institute.
- Zotova, O.Yu. (2011). *Bezopasnost' lichnosti kak social'no-psihologicheskij fenomen [Personality Security as a Socio-psychological Phenomenon]*. Yekaterinburg: Liberal Arts University-University for Humanities.

Original manuscript received October 20, 2017

Revised manuscript accepted May 23, 2018

First published online June 30, 2018