

Prof.dr Juliusz Piwowarski

The University of Public and Individual Security in Kraków, POLAND

E-mail: juliuszpiwowarski@apeiron.edu.pl

Prof.dr Andrzej Wawrzusiszyn

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, POLAND

E-mail: andrzej.wawrzusiszyn@uwm.edu.pl

DOI:

Original Research Paper

Received: March 20, 2022

Accepted: April 2, 2023

A FEW PHILOSOPHICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL COMPONENTS OF SECURITY MANAGEMENT AS A PART OF SECURITY CULTURE

Abstract: *The dynamic changes of the security environment currently taking place in the global economy and politics are also seen in the evolution of management theory according to different kinds and dimensions of security culture. Management is a scientific field that draws from and intersects with other branches of science. Its effectiveness is determined by the principles of axiology and the mechanisms governing the human psyche and human behavior. The subject of interest in axiology is the concept of value, its roles in our lives and the division of values concerning specific scientific trends. Psychology additionally addresses people and studies the impact of psychological phenomena on interpersonal relations and interaction with the surrounding world. Both areas of science occupy a prominent place in the management process and security culture is often treated as a process too. Their use in management is a balance between economic and social values – and because of that – receiving security is the most important value for the existence of man. To achieve this, managers need to build a lasting value system. This study aims to inspire security managers to apply ethical and psychological knowledge more widely in their practice. Achieving certain goals without taking into account human values, needs, and behaviors seems almost impossible today. It is also an expression of the values recognized by the leaders or commanders, their beliefs, and their attitudes toward other people and themselves.*

Keywords: *management, values, needs security culture, creativity*

Introduction

The extremely fast pace of development observed in present-day *social reality*¹ raises various problems and forces managers to explore in greater depth the achievements of philosophy, particularly axiology, psychology, and *security sciences*,² understood broadly in praxeological terms,³ concerning human individuals, social groups, and entire societies. Such knowledge is not merely intended for the erudite adornment of a person's image. It should especially serve those persons who, under their duties and social functions, give orders or instructions to other individual or collective *security subjects*.⁴

Efforts should be made in this research field both in scientific and practical terms to ensure meaningful implementation of the above topics at a level that would be satisfactory from a practical and social point of view for all participants in one *social arena* or another.⁵

This prompts researchers to undertake an extensive *transdisciplinary*⁶ scientific search, as contemporary knowledge appears to be inadequate given the enormous challenges that modern people have to face in their activities. Nowadays, processes identified as broadly understood *management*, regardless of the methods used, reach back to the scientific basis and use knowledge from many relevant sources and fields of knowledge.

¹ The *social world* is a field of collective action performed in specific human groups; the reason for its emergence is the action by which *individual actors* negotiate the rules of *social interaction*, *social roles*, language, and modes of communication; in Alfred Schütz's research, the *social world* is not an objective *entity* – it is socially *constructed*; the emphasis here is on the different ways in which individuals experience *social reality*, e.g. through socialisation or spiritual experience; cf. A. Schütz, *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston 1996.

² E. Rothschild, *What is Security?*, [in:] "Daedalus", Vol. 124, No. 3, 1995, pp. 53-98 ; S. Antonsen, *Safety Culture: Theory, Method and Improvement*, Ashgate, Burlington 2009; P.J. Katzenstein, *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia University Press, New York 1989.

³ *Praxeology* – the theory of efficient human action, involves research into effective and purposeful activity of individuals; cf. H.W. Schäfer, *Habitus Analysis 2 – Praxeology and Meaning*, Springer, Bielefeld 2020.

⁴ *Security subject* – 'a security subject is a human being, treated as a social unit and also as a specific social collective involving different types of relationships and conditions'; W. Kitler, *Obrona cywilna (niemilitarna) w Polsce*, Ministry of National Defence, Warsaw 2002, p. 21.

⁵ *Social arena* – a *social construct* comprising actors operating in a given space at the same time, together with their organisations, ideas, and techniques; the primary objective of social arena research is to identify a set of actors involved in the *reality of the arena*; their activity results from their concern for the survival of their *social world*; involvement in *social arena* discourse is pragmatic in nature and reveals the intersection of interests of different actors while addressing their need for secure conditions of existence

⁶ *Institutionalizing Interdisciplinarity and Transdisciplinarity: Collaboration across Cultures and Communities*, B. Vienni-Baptista, J. Thompson-Klein (ed.), Routledge, New York 2022.

The human factor is important in this respect, as it is the people who make up the structure of any organization and the coordination of their actions that are expected to ensure that the desired goal is achieved.

This is precisely that field that entails the application of philosophy, and especially axiology (ethics) and psychology, i.e. branches of knowledge that deal with *values, morality*, the development and progress of processes studied in psychology, human traits, and the regulation of human interactions. Existing philosophical and psychological theories are used or adjusted to what is known about working with people from security management practice. Knowledge of the value system, needs, stress, conditioning, personality, teams, motivation, emotions, communication, etc. is particularly relevant. Security management takes such elements from philosophy and psychology that can enhance the effectiveness of employees or teams, improve the quality of work, etc. to shape a socially acceptable level of security.

The essence of security management

Management is a conscious, deliberate and structured process carried out following applicable law by persons with the formal, characterological and volitional competence and authority to do so and a corresponding area of responsibility. The responsibility extends to a sequence of formal and complex activities aimed at ensuring the continued proper functioning of the institution, organization, or service concerned and its stable future development based on the objectives and strategy adopted. In the practice of the civilian sector, management requires a skillful balancing and harmonization of the often conflicting interests, aspirations, expectations, and needs of different stakeholder groups.⁷

Management is a process that can be found in any organized human social collective, a method of directing the people who contribute to the achievement of the goals chosen by the collective and its leaders. It is the kind of human activity that changes with experience, and especially when the human being is seen as a *security subject*.

A security subject is “any consciously existing and intentionally acting entity (individual or collective), examined in terms of its security. (...) [We should add that] concerning the political security sector (security as it is referred to when taking a political perspective on the analysis of challenges, opportunities, risks, and threats), the basic types of

⁷ P.F. Drucker, *Zarządzanie XXI wieku – wyzwania*, Warsaw 2009, p. 126.

security subjects are *states* (*societies-nations* that are organized into *nation-states*), organizational units of states (local government bodies, for example) and international organizations (inter-state and, more recently and increasingly importantly, international non-state structures: business corporations, environmental organizations, transnational terrorist or criminal organizations, for example).⁸ A person (or group) considered an **active security subject**, as opposed to a passive one (leaving aside the issue of any claims) should be well-versed in moral and ethical principles and able to make decisions and take actions that are beneficial from the point of view of socially recognized *values*. In light of the above, Juliusz Piwowarski gave the following definition of an *active security subject*.

An active security subject is an individual (or group) entity able to make sovereign decisions regarding the selection and acceptance of particular *ideas* and a socially acceptable *axionormative system*; the subject has a strong motivation to act in accordance with its own choices and supports these actions with high aspirations (selection of life goals based on their own *higher needs*) and determination to achieve their goal, expressed in consistent acts of will.⁹

Security management encompasses actions aimed at ensuring the security of individuals, groups of people, and their possessions. Such actions must be in accordance with the law, including the constitutional principles of the rights, freedoms and duties enjoyed by human beings and citizens.¹⁰ *Security management* is constantly seeking effective methods and means to strengthen the *security of the nation-state*. At present, the political idea of the *nation*, which was introduced by Ernest Gellner, works well in *security studies*.¹¹ The *state*, together with its citizens who make up the *nation*, should still be considered as the main *security subject*. This role is mainly influenced by the phenomena, processes and events that occur both *in international security* and *in the internal security of the state*.¹² The socially expected development of *security management* and the increase in precision in this area, including *security management strategies*, is sometimes hindered by deficiencies regarding the adoption of security

⁸ *Biała Księga Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, BBN, Warsaw 2013, p. 247.

⁹ J. Piwowarski, *Transdyscyplinarna istota kultury bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku, Słupsk 2016, p. 89.

¹⁰ Act of 2 April 1997, Constitution of the Republic of Poland (Journal of Laws No 78, item 483, as amended).

¹¹ E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, New York 2009.

¹² More on this: A. Wawrzusiszyn, *Bezpieczeństwo transgraniczne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Olsztyn 2020.

measures and a proper social and environmental perspective either by the implementers or by the designers (legislature).

The pursuit of political, economic, or raw material objectives, which are the primary concern for major international actors, means that individual and social *values* and needs appear all too often to be marginalized. This situation is illustrated by several *sustainability* indicators which point to an imbalance suggesting difficulties in guaranteeing a coherent order in the social, economic and environmental contexts at the same time. This is a perceptible and noticeable problem, and its main cause is the lack of profound acceptance of the cardinal category of *social* and *human sciences*, which is and has been represented by *value*.

In *security management*, praxeological *values* such as efficiency, performance, or cost-effectiveness are of paramount importance. Despite the declared willingness to adhere to ethical standards and apply psychological knowledge, the reality follows a different pattern. The use of existing norms, principles, and methodological rules provides knowledge about the nature and interpersonal relationships and enables proper communication, thus improving the process of building teams or, consequently, civil society.¹³ The ethical *value system* is considered to be the basis for the other philosophical categories (factors) and thus determines the effective management of any organization.¹⁴ It should be assumed, therefore, that effective action is not opposed to ethical behavior respecting needs, values, and character traits, nor does it contradict them, but that it is impossible to act effectively without acting ethically.

Philosophical and psychological aspects of security management

The philosophical level deals with general axiological considerations related to security, which provide the broadest conceptual grid necessary for more detailed reflection. The philosophical notions and concepts are partly concretized in philosophical sub-disciplines and then used in the specific sciences for the description and interpretation of the sections of reality they cover. Axiological research focuses on defining values, i.e. what they are, what their essence is, and whether they can be explored or classified. The category of 'value' (Latin: *valor*, French: *valeur*) comes from the verb 'to be of value' (Latin: *valere*). In everyday language, values often include mental and physical health, courage, integrity, willpower, and reliability, as

¹³ See B. Ziółkowski, *Aksjologiczne aspekty zarządzania w ewolucji zrównoważonego rozwoju*, "Zarządzanie Publiczne" 1 (21) / 2013, pp. 71-78.

¹⁴ More on this: D. H. Zakus, D. H. Malloy, A. Edwards, *Critical and Ethical Thinking in Sport Management. Philosophical Rationales and Examples of Methods*, "Sport Management Review" 2007/10.

well as a particular object, its characteristic feature or the criteria or standards by which something is judged to be more or less valuable.¹⁵

Value is a fundamental philosophical category that also has a social and motivational meaning. It denotes things that are valuable and arouses people's needs by being the goal of their ambitions. It can also be an idea, a tangible or intangible phenomenon, an object, a state, a commodity, a person or a membership in a certain social group that is evaluated positively or negatively. Values may be analyzed in a few ways:

- 1) a universal aspect with timeless relevance, including respect for every human being, integrity and compliance with the rule of law, respect for diversity or disability, and nurturing values such as truth, goodness, and beauty;
- 2) a spiritual aspect: the need for self-improvement, the cultivation of cardinal virtues and other qualities, the conviction of the existence of a timeless causal Higher Power judging human actions, the adoption of ethical and moral rules;
- 3) an intellectual aspect: specific knowledge, erudition, fine arts;
- 4) an emotional aspect comprising ideas, beliefs, pride (the righteous pride mentioned by Aristotle or the pride that supposedly precedes the fall), different versions of such serious states of engagement of **individual security subjects** as love (for the homeland, the family, individual significant persons) or, finally, rightly or unjustly incited anger;
- 5) a material aspect related to *values* that represent the material sphere, but not only financial terms (e.g. the security subject's corporeality and physical health), forms of capital;

The category of *values* may also be examined in isolated scopes of meaning or from specific perspectives, as attempted below:

- **the value of things** (resources, assets);
- **the value of financial capital;**
- **the value of aspirations** is understood as the value of future achievements, which are the 'reverse' of the *need* to reach an acceptable level of security, minimize the effects of risks, including environmental protection, and strengthen the sense of security,
- **the value of experiences** (love, trust, beauty, kindness that we experience but which is difficult to measure);

¹⁵ Vide: M. Carney, *Value(s): Building a Better World for All*, PublicAffairs, New York 2021; S. Kowalczyk, *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*, Lublin 2006, p. 129.

– **the value of universal goods:** life and the right to life, beliefs, and freedom.¹⁶

Values are therefore one of the main determinants and goals of human action and the basis for judgments, norms, and cultural patterns. What they have in common is their timelessness and their particular relationship to individual needs and social norms, for which they provide a basis and support.

Security is a universal value and a constant in human life. It is often treated by philosophers as a substitute for happiness and a condition of existence.¹⁷ The value of the security is multi-faceted, ambiguous and heterogeneous. It is a certain social, civilizational, cultural, political, economic and ecological value but at the same time, it is a cardinal existential, moral and spiritual value. It is a utilitarian value that is used to acquire other values (life, health, happiness, etc.), which enable efficient functioning and a good, dignified life.¹⁸ In this context, security is understood as a holistic category, as man's 'highest natural good'.¹⁹ *National security*, in turn, is the most important *national value*, a need of the *society* that makes up the *nation* and its *state*, and a focus of activities carried out by the state, social groups and individuals. At the same time, in processual terms, it is a process that involves a variety of means for ensuring long-lasting, undisturbed national (state) existence and development, including protecting and defending the *state* as a political institution and protecting individual citizens and the whole of society, their wealth, and the natural environment from threats which would significantly limit their functioning or which are detrimental to goods placed under special protection.²⁰

The authors believe that it is also the protection and defense of non-citizens who are 'guests' on the territory of the *state*. Through axiological research from different research perspectives, new aspects of this multi-faceted phenomenon can be demonstrated. The axiological assumptions involve the value criteria applied in individual fields. They are assumed to be primary to cognition, and this means that axiology determines epistemology. Consequently, the researcher evaluates the research results. Security can be evaluated positively, as the

¹⁶ Ibidem, p. 52.

¹⁷ J. Świniarski, *Filozoficzne podstawy edukacji dla bezpieczeństwa...*, op. cit., p. 63.

¹⁸ J. Szmyd, *Filozofowanie użyteczne. Studia z filozofii praktycznej*, Bydgoszcz-Kraków 2003, p. 321. See also J. Szmyd, *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość refleksyjna, aksjologiczna i etyczna*, [in:] P. Tyrała (ed.), *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, Kraków 2000, pp.46-52. M.Kubiak, *Współczesna multiperspektywiczność pojęć bezpieczeństwo i zagrożenie*, [in:] J.Dębowski, E.Jarmoch, A.Świderski(ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo człowieka a proces wsparcia społecznego*, Siedlce 2007, p.33.

¹⁹ See J. Świniarski, *O naturze bezpieczeństwa. Prolegomena do zagadnień ogólnych*, Warsaw 1997, pp.55.

²⁰ W. Kitler, *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie. Uwarunkowania. System*, Warsaw 2011, p. 31.

possibility to persist, the certainty of survival, the opportunity to develop and improve freely, the conditions for satisfying basic needs (*value*) and the defense against their loss, integrity and independence, the prevention of conflicts and the possibility to defend against such conflicts and their consequences,²¹ or negatively, as *freedom from threats*. In this approach, security is a core value for prosperity, peace of mind, and undisturbed growth.

Security axiology is a category referring to the *state* as a *security subject* that orchestrates the protection of *values* through an efficiently organized and effectively functioning *national security system*.

Therefore, based on the axiology, the researcher should formulate recommendations or guidelines for those responsible for *national security*. The protection and defense of *security* are always welcomed, even when they require restrictions. The public accepts such a state of affairs because they are convinced that the matter concerns the positive value of the object for which security is provided.²²

At the same time, they assign the mission of responsibility for organizing and effectively *managing security* to public administration institutions and bodies. The requirements constantly grow and evolve. Management by values must be based on three value axes:

- economic and pragmatic values: they are necessary to maintain and connect the different organizational subsystems; they are related to efficiency, performance standards and discipline; affect activities such as planning, quality assurance, and administration;
- ethical and social values: contribute to sound relationships and honesty, respect, integrity, and loyalty;
- emotional and developmental values: they are the basis for creating new opportunities; are related to freedom, happiness, and trust and contribute to creativity, concept formation, life, self-awareness, self-confidence, a sense of influence, adaptability, and flexibility.²³

Managing security by *values* can be considered a social philosophy and management practice, as both the researcher and the practitioner focus on the most important social goods and

²¹ See J. Świniarski, *O naturze bezpieczeństwa. Prolegomena do zagadnień ogólnych...*, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

²² A. Węgrzecki, *Ontologiczne i aksjologiczne aspekty bezpieczeństwa*, [in:] I. Pabisz-Zarębska, J. Szewczyk (ed.), *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość*, Wyższa Szkoła Bezpieczeństwa Publicznego i Indywidualnego APEIRON w Krakowie, Kraków 2010, p.18.

²³ Vide: S.L.Dolan, B.A.Richley, S.Garcia, T.Lingwam, *Zarządzanie przez wartości*, "CEO Magazyn Top Menedżerów", 2008.

their compatibility with the objectives. It is a type of mission influencing the plan of action to achieve a socially acceptable and properly managed level of security by ensuring compliance with the ethical criterion. It involves planning, approving, organizing, supervising and [controlling](#) activities addressing the values of the *security subject*. It is part of *security culture*²⁴ and an important factor for *managing security* in a complex *international environment*.²⁵

Values should always be at the center of all management practice. The key to understanding how complex [systems](#) work is to understand the *values* embedded in each of them. *Value systems* are powerful drivers shaping the behavior of individuals, organizations, and society as a whole, while *organizational culture* is an important part of *the second social energy stream of security culture*.²⁶

The tools for managing security by values embedded in the culture are a mission, a vision, and a strategy. A mission sets a course of action, describes the overarching purpose of activities and is the benchmark for decision-making. At the same time, it represents the body of values sought by society. A vision, on the other hand, is an image of the future created by the participants in the security management process. However, it must refer to the current state of affairs and be closely related to the here and now (the state/level of security). Its message should inspire other people.

A strategy, on the other hand, is an effective response to challenges arising from the surrounding world, i.e. the international security environment. It is a process with a series of actions taken to achieve the goals set out in the mission and the vision. A strategy is an (often a long-term) plan outlining courses of action and allocating the resources necessary to achieve defined goals for survival and development. Closely interlinked, a vision, a mission, and a strategy are important elements of managing security by values. Only a consistently set vision and mission with an adequate strategy can produce a socially acceptable state/level of security. The following moral principles are proposed for the *security management* process:

²⁴ J. Piwowarski, *Three Energy Streams of Security Culture – A Theoretical Research Model in Security Sciences*, [in:] *Security and Defence in Europe*, J. Martín Ramírez, J. Biziewski (eds.), Springer Nature Switzerland AG, Cham 2020, pp. 3-22.

²⁵ A. Wawrzusiszyn, *Security management versus educational practice*, [in:] "Security Dimensions", 2013, No 10, pp. 90-98.

²⁶ J. Piwowarski, *Three Energy Streams of Security Culture...* op. cit.

- credibility: gained primarily in the process of communication at the individual level (an employee or a manager can be credible, but a department or an organization can hardly be credible);
- trust: shaped and evident in interpersonal relationships, for example between a manager and an employee or an organization and a stakeholder; currently developed dynamically within CSR concepts;
- empowerment: granting power to employees – especially important in people management; delegating responsibility is currently a task given to managers and is often associated with high social expectations;
- adaptation: understood in terms of flexibility and adaptability mainly at the organizational level, although also increasingly listed as a personal attribute of individuals (elasticity of the individual, the ability to embrace change).²⁷

In security management, philosophical considerations correspond closely with psychological aspects.

Psychological components of security management

Modern psychology covers the following key areas:

- the behavior, adaptation, and operation of an individual that can be observed under different conditions;
- human mental processes that occur implicitly because they are internal components of the person's functioning, e.g. reasoning, dreaming, etc.²⁸

Psychological knowledge broadens horizons and allows us to see people in a nonconventional way. Through psychology, human behavior can be described, explained, predicted and guided. Such potential can be used to characterize people or to recognize different mechanisms in an individual or their relationships with other people.

The psychological perspective on security is based on needs, values, motivational contexts, and a sense of security. *Needs* in psychology are understood as dispositions to act, which are intrinsic motivation factors. They represent requirements for the continuation of

²⁷ See J. Polak, M. Chrupała-Pniak, *Psychologiczne i etyczne aspekty zarządzania organizacją biurokratyczną*, [in:] B. Kożusznik (red.), *Zastosowania psychologii w zarządzaniu*, Katowice 2010, p. 142.

²⁸ P.G. Zimbardo, R.J. Gerrig, *Psychologia i życie*, Warsaw 2009, p. 4.

human life, development and proper functioning.²⁹ They involve securing living conditions: ensuring sufficient finances, work, social peace and, more specifically, the need for 'stability, dependence, care, and freedom from fear, anxiety and chaos'.³⁰ The need for security corresponds to the instinct for self-preservation and, if unmet, is associated with feelings of fear and anxiety.³¹

Values in psychological terms are cognitive constructs, a type of belief or concept.³² Beliefs are linked to emotions; they govern the processes of evaluating and selecting actions, events, people, and oneself. As a result, they are the basis for a conscious preference for the chosen good. If such an object (person, event, course of action) is of great importance to the *security subject*, it holds more *value* than all others.³³ As with the understanding of *security* as a *need*, in the context of *values security* is seen as a category connected to the probability of being *secure* and as social (relationships with others) and internal harmony and stability.³⁴

Needs and *values* are motivation factors.³⁵ Needs as an internal factor are related to the mental-physical functioning of human beings. They impact the *subject* by stimulating action in order to reduce motivational tension. In this view, a perceived lack of *security* is a causal factor. An emerging *threat* increases the motivation to work toward restoring security.

By contrast, *values* open individuals up to the world as sovereign *security subjects* and enable them to recognize the order that underlies *security culture* in wider, not just social, *reality*. When a *security subject* (an individual, a group, a *nation*, a *state*) experiences security, a highly desirable *value*, the result is action, reinforced by the dedication to achieving it, or sometimes even struggle in defense of one's *security* or that of the group with which one identifies. If *security needs* are satisfied and the individual is benefitting from the *value of security*, they experience a state of satisfaction and contentment, understood as a sense of security.³⁶ The

²⁹ T. Mądrzycki, *Osobowość jako system tworzący i realizujący plany*, Gdańsk 1996, p. 27.

³⁰ A. Maslow, *Motywacja i osobowość*, Warsaw 1990, p. 76.

³¹ S. Siek, *Struktura osobowości*, Warsaw 1986, p. 126.

³² P. Brzozowski, *Uniwersalność struktury wartości: Koncepcja Shaloma H. Schwartza*, [in:] "Roczniki psychologiczne", 2002/5, p. 28.

³³ P. K. Oleś, *Z badań nad wartościami i wartościowaniem: niektóre kwestie metodologiczne*, [in:] „Roczniki Psychologiczne”, 2002/5, p. 54.

³⁴ S. H. Schwartz, *Basic Human Values: An Overview*, p.1.: <http://segrdid2.fmag.unict.it/Allegati/convegno%207-8-10-05/Schwartzpaper.pdf>, accessed: 10 March 2022.

³⁵ T. E. Cooke, R. Haniffa *The impact of culture and governance on corporate social reporting*, [in:] "Journal of Accounting and Public Policy", 2005; Issue 24(5), p. 391-430.

³⁶ R. Klamut, *Bezpieczeństwo jako pojęcie psychologiczne*, [in:] "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Rzeszowskiej. Ekonomia i Nauki Humanistyczne" Issue 19 (4/2012), pp. 45-46.

feeling of *security* is, therefore, an important aspect in the psychological view of *security*. It is a state of serenity and stability, a feeling of being free of threats, and a belief that one has sufficient resources for subjective action. It is also a state of satisfaction or happiness derived from living at an acceptable *level of security*. The feeling of *security* is important for the effective functioning of the *personal security subject* and for the end result of the motivational process aimed at achieving individual *security*.³⁷

Psychological knowledge and skills are the undisputed foundation of *security management*, i.e. building and motivating teams, resolving tensions and conflicts, and recognizing social needs. The possibilities offered by psychological resources provide everything that can help improve the effectiveness of managers, the efficiency of teams and employees, or the quality of work.

Existing theories from auxiliary sciences should be used, or they should be matched to what is known from *security management* practice and how *security culture* is built and practiced. *Security management* employs a variety of psychological theories that are relevant to the image of people and the behavior adopted toward them.

One frequently approached the subject of research and discussion is the issue of creativity, which should be understood as the intentional process of generating and developing new, original ideas and implementing them to satisfy needs or solve problems. Creativity has become one of the factors of production, an intangible resource that to some extent can and should be managed. Innovation, originality, and, therefore, creativity, and seeing it as a key organizational resource and a basis for innovation, have resulted in these concepts becoming permanently embedded in the creative style in *security management*.³⁸

Building creative teams has become a priority for *security management* in today's rapidly changing *security environment*. A creative, effective and efficient team is a high-energy social organization that delivers outputs determined by the qualifications and skills of the manager and the experience of the individual team members. The strength of such a team comes from the flow of social energy within the team, the creative use of the motivational tension that arises within it when a goal is set and specific tasks associated with it are assigned.

³⁷ Ibidem, pp. 46-48.

³⁸ A.Zorska, M.Mołęda-Zdziech, B.Jung (ed.), *Kreatywność i innowacyjność w erze cyfrowej. Twórcza destrukcja 2*, Warsaw 2014.

The configuration of a task-oriented human team should depend on the personnel available at a given place and time, the potential of knowledge, skills, experience (*human capital*), social competencies (*social capital* of the team), creative awareness, and the abilities of the team leader. The level of team autonomy depends on the maturity and effectiveness of the team members. As the total power of the team is all that matters, a sufficient number of people must be included. Above ten to twelve people, there will be a high degree of diversity, but the team will not be able to communicate dynamically, thus risking uncontrollable energy drops. A team of less than four people may lack the necessary diversity and will lower the activity dynamics, leading to a reduction in the team's creative potential.³⁹

A team becomes effective when it has a creative leader. They are the supervisor who oversees the performance of the team, defines the strategic objectives, sets the criteria for evaluating ideas, provides the necessary resources and controls the execution of tasks. The main activities of the manager include clarifying specific tasks by:

- establishing a system for pooling requests and ideas for new solutions;
- ensuring that the requests and ideas are objectively assessed against the adopted criteria;
- assessing the advisability of starting certain tasks;
- evaluating financial or implementation feasibility.⁴⁰

For managers, the priority is to motivate team members to complete tasks, to direct employee commitment towards their tasks, to create opportunities and to trigger specific behaviors. In order to cope with the challenges and tasks connected with interpersonal relations, a manager should have certain knowledge, skills, and specific character traits:

- intangible (workplace atmosphere, a sense of trust, effective communication, recognition) and tangible employee motivation (clear career paths, financial incentives, adequate training);
- resourceful conflict resolution and the use of conflicts for further development;
- effective execution of own ideas,
- efficient handling of conflict situations; and

³⁹

D.

Jagoda-Sobalak,

Modelorganizacjikreatywnej/www.ptzp.org.pl/files/konferencje/kzz/artyk_pdf_2017/T1/t1_046.pdf, accessed: 15 November 2022.

⁴⁰ X. Zhang, K. M. Bartol, *Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation and creative process engagement*, "Academy of Management Journal" Vol. 53, 2010, pp. 107-128.

- using social competence, intelligence, creativity, and problem-solving skills.

Ensuring that those in power have sufficient quantitative and qualitative resources (labor, wages, distribution of wealth, freedom of speech, reliable information) is an important factor in social order and peace. The essence of nurturing healthy social functioning is to create conditions for meeting the *need for security*, where *security* is considered as a **value**. It is an **instrumental value**, i.e. one that allows the *security subject* to achieve all other *values* without difficulty.

Conclusions

Due to the (external and internal) dynamics in the *security environment*, it is important to be observant, recognize change, accept it and create customized security management models taking into account specific features and variability. The issue of management based on social needs calls in the first instance for the affirmation of ethical and moral principles. The implementation of the axiological and psychological category in the security management process demonstrates, among other things, that sustainability principles are being put into practice.

Through the application of philosophy and psychology, security management becomes clearer and its direction is no longer expressed only in terms of objectives. It is an expression of the values held by the managers, their inner convictions, and their attitude towards people and themselves. It demonstrates the priorities of managers, the things that are particularly relevant to them.⁴¹

Management by values is becoming a useful integrator not only across disciplines but also across social sciences. The knowledge of the various psychological mechanisms, combined with the knowledge of the workforce and technical expertise, can help deliver better results. A manager who is not familiar with psychological principles may be able to take charge, but because they work with people, this aspect of knowledge is particularly necessary for them. Just as IT knowledge is required to deal with computer science, philosophical and psychological knowledge, i.e. what modern science knows about human beings and their functioning, is essential for security management.

⁴¹ *Filozofia a zarządzanie*, T. Oleksyn (ed.), Warsaw 2013, pp. 44-45.

References

- Brzozowski P., *Uniwersalność struktury wartości: Koncepcja Shaloma H. Schwartza*, "Roczniki psychologiczne" 2002/5.
- Dolan S.L., Richley B.A., Garcia S., Lingwam T., *Zarządzanie przez wartości*, "CEO Magazyn Top Menedżerów", 2008, wrzesień.
- Drucker P.F., *Zarządzanie XXI wieku – wyzwania*, Warszawa 2009.
- Glen A., *Podstawy poznawcze badań bezpieczeństwa narodowego*, "Zeszyty Naukowe AON" nr 2(83) 2011.
- Kitler W., *Bezpieczeństwo narodowe RP. Podstawowe kategorie. Uwarunkowania. System*, Warszawa 2011.
- Klamut R., *Bezpieczeństwo jako pojęcie psychologiczne*, "Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Rzeszowskiej. Ekonomia i Nauki Humanistyczne" z. 19 (4/2012).
- Kowalczyk S., *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*, Lublin 2006.
- Krzyżanowski L.J., *O podstawach kierowania organizacjami inaczej: paradygmaty, filozofia, dylematy*, Warszawa 1999.
- Kubiak M., *Współczesna multiperspektywiczność pojęć "bezpieczeństwo" i "zagrożenie"*, [w:] J. Dębowski, E. Jarmoch, A. Świdorski (red.), *Bezpieczeństwo człowieka a proces wsparcia społecznego*, Siedlce 2007.
- Łagocki W. (red.), *Filozofia. Leksykon PWN*, Warszawa 2000.
- Maslow A., *Motywacja i osobowość*, Warszawa 1990.
- Mądrzycki T., *Osobowość jako system tworzący i realizujący plany*, Gdańsk 1996.
- Olechnicki K., Załęcki P., *Słownik socjologiczny*, Toruń 1997.
- Oleksyn T. (red.), *Filozofia a zarządzanie*, Warszawa 2013.
- Oleś P.K., *Z badań nad wartościami i wartościowaniem: niektóre kwestie metodologiczne*, „Roczniki Psychologiczne” 2002/5.
- Polak J., Chrupała-Pniak M., *Psychologiczne i etyczne aspekty zarządzania organizacją biurokratyczną*, [w:] B. Kozusznik (red.), *Zastosowania psychologii w zarządzaniu*, Katowice 2010.
- Siek S., *Struktura osobowości*, Warszawa 1986.
- Sułkowski Ł., *Epistemologia w naukach o zarządzaniu*, Warszawa 2005.

Szmyd J., *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość refleksyjna, aksjologiczna i etyczna*, [w:] P. Tyrała (red.), *Zarządzanie bezpieczeństwem*, Kraków 2000.

Szmyd J., *Filozofowanie użyteczne. Studia z filozofii praktycznej*, Bydgoszcz-Kraków 2003.

Świniarski J., *O naturze bezpieczeństwa. Prolegomena do zagadnień ogólnych*, Warszawa-Pruszków 1997.

Świniarski J., *Rodzaje wiedzy o bezpieczeństwie*, [w:] idem, *Filozoficzne podstawy edukacji dla bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa 1999.

Walczak W., *Cele i funkcje zarządzania w teoriach naukowych a praktyka – próba diagnozy źródeł występujących rozbieżności*, "E-mentor" 2012, nr 2 (44).

Wawrzusiszyn A., *Bezpieczeństwo transgraniczne Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*, Olsztyn 2020.

Wawrzusiszyn A., *Security management versus educational practice*, "Security Dimensions and Socio-Legal Studies" 2013, No 10, s. 90-98.

Węgrzecki A., *Ontologiczne i aksjologiczne aspekty bezpieczeństwa*, [w:] I. Pabisz-Zarębska, J. Szewczyk (red.), *Bezpieczeństwo jako wartość*, Kraków 2010.

Wróblewski R., *Wprowadzenie do nauk o bezpieczeństwie*, Siedlce 2017.

Zakus D.H., Malloy D.H., Edwards A., *Critical and Ethical Thinking in Sport Management. Philosophical Rationales and Examples of Methods*, "Sport Management Review" 2007/10.

Zhang X., Bartol K.M., *Linking empowering leadership and employee creativity: The influence of psychological empowerment, intrinsic motivation and creative process engagement*, "Academy of Management Journal" Vol. 53, 2010.

Zimbardo P.G., Gerrig R.J., *Psychologia i życie*, Warszawa 2009.

Ziółkowski B., *Aksjologiczne aspekty zarządzania w ewolucji zrównoważonego rozwoju*, "Zarządzanie Publiczne" 1 (21) / 2013.

Zorska A., Mołęda-Zdziech M., Jung B. (red.), *Kreatywność i innowacyjność w erze cyfrowej. Twórcza destrukcja 2*, Warszawa 2014.

Żukowska J., *Znaczenie aksjologii w tworzeniu nowego paradygmatu ekonomii*, "Kwartalnik nauk o przedsiębiorstwie" 2016/4.

Legal documents

Ustawa z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 r. Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej (Dz. U. Nr 78, poz. 483 z późn. zm.).

Internet sources

Golczyk P., *Budowanie zespołów kreatywnych*, Marketing Management Blog

<http://golczyk.com/budowanie-kreatywnych-zespolow/>

Jagoda-Sobalak D, *Model organizacji kreatywnej*,

http://www.ptzp.org.pl/files/konferencje/kzz/artyk_pdf_2017/T1/t1_046.pdf

Schwartz S.H., *Basic Human Values: An Overview*,

<http://segrdid2.fmag.unict.it/Allegati/convegno%207-8-10-05/Schwartzpaper.pdf>

D. Zohar, I. Marshall, *Spiritual Capital: Wealth We Can Live By*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco 2004.