

**Suomala J.,**

PhD (Education), Principal Lecturer (docent),  
NeuroLab, Laurea University of Applied Sciences,  
Espoo, FINLAND,  
E-mail: [jyrki.suomala@laurea.fi](mailto:jyrki.suomala@laurea.fi)  
ORCID: 0000-0001-7953-5056

## NAVIGATING PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND INFORMATION DISORDER IN WAR AND PEACE: A DECISION NEUROSCIENCE PERSPECTIVE

У цій статті досліджується психологічна безпека через прийняття рішень людиною, підкреслюється, як такі витончені загрози, як інформаційний безлад, посилений інтернетом і штучним інтелектом, підривають довіру до демократичних інститутів. Всесвітній економічний форум визначив цей безлад як значну загрозу для демократії, що вимагає розуміння його першопричин. Дослідження показують, що поведінкою людини керує оціночна мережа мозку, в якій виокремлюють сім активаторів прийняття рішень: Я, Ми, Емоції, Знання, Мета, Почуття та Диференціація, зосереджуючись на Я та Ми в контексті психологічної безпеки.

Активатор «Я» пов'язаний із самоконтинуальністю та особистою активністю, тоді як загрози ідентичності можуть призвести до незахищеності. У сьогоденішньому нестабільному кліматі ліберальні демократії стикаються з викликами, пов'язаними з мінливими нормативними рамками та зростаючою поляризацією суспільства. Активатор «Ми» підкреслює важливість соціальних відносин і культурних норм у формуванні поведінки.

Розуміння взаємодії між активаторами «Я» і «Ми» є важливим для вирішення проблеми психологічної безпеки, оскільки люди часто шукають підтвердження в середовищі, яке відчуває підтримку, але сприймає суспільні інститути як такі, що підривають їхню ідентичність, роблячи їх вразливими до маніпуляцій.

У статті запропоновано три рекомендації щодо інтеграції складнощів прийняття рішень людиною в практику кібербезпеки: (1) включи-

ти психологічний захист у кібербезпеку та національну оборону; (2) сприяти відкритій публічній дискусії про шкідливі психологічні атаки, захищаючи при цьому свободу вираження поглядів; і (3) посилити офіційну комунікацію, щоб визнати соціальний та контекстуальний вплив на прийняття рішень, а не покладатися лише на інформацію та факти.

**Ключові слова:** прийняття рішень, дефіцит інформації, мережа оцінок, нейроекономіка, активатори рішень, психологічний захист, кібербезпека.

## Introduction

**Problem statement.** The article explores psychological safety through the lens of human decision-making. When people think of national defense and war, they often envision military equipment like aircraft, ships, tanks, and drones. Well-equipped defense forces aim to protect citizens during both war and peace. However, Western democracies now face subtle threats that are more insidious. The Internet and artificial intelligence offer vast opportunities for psychological manipulation, turning human minds into a battleground for information disorders such as misinformation, disinformation, malinformation, fake news, and conspiracy theories.

While the idea that truth is the first casualty of war (Liebling & Hamill, 2008) is not new, the rise of the Internet and advances in artificial intelligence have amplified the spread of false information and messages that foster distrust in official institutions. While there is growing evidence that stable and reliable social institutions create well-being in societies (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2010, 2013), undermining trust in these institutions is an excellent tactic for hostile actors against Western democracies (Ross et al., 2022). Therefore, it is important that ensuring the security of citizens is not based solely on technology and military equipment but should also include protecting people from harmful and false information, propaganda, and fake news as essential components. This is quite a complex phenomenon, as freedom of opinion and the dissemination of information are fundamental human rights in Western countries, and there are negative historical experiences regarding their restriction (Masferrer, 2023).

It is no surprise that the World Economic Forum (2024) identifies information disorder as one of the most serious threats to democratic societies, underscoring the urgent need to understand the factors contributing to its spread in contemporary society. However, we must try to understand the decision-making mechanisms by which people choose, accept, and act in their daily lives in an information-saturated

world. In this article, I will examine human decision-making and behavior in light of recent research in neuroeconomics. In conclusion, I will consider how security authorities and other official actors in society could communicate in a way that increases trust among citizens. At the same time, I will present some ideas on how ordinary citizens can rely on accurate information and counteract the information deficits propagated by hostile actors.

**Human decision-making according to neuroeconomics: Review of recent research and publications.** Neuroeconomic studies show that human decision-making is primarily driven by the brain's valuation network (Levy & Glimcher, 2012; Suomala, 2020; Suomala & Berg, 2024; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022). This area creates the subjective value of what an individual experiences in a specific situation, whether these things are biological needs like food and warmth, or money, goods, and cultural resources (Bartra et al., 2013; Glimcher & Tymula, 2023). In a decision-making situation, the item that the individual assigns the highest value to—i.e., the one that activates the valuation network the most—will be chosen. In this way this network helps individuals synthesize optimal choices in decision-making scenarios. Moreover, evidence suggests that the activation of this network predicts both individual (E. B. Falk et al., 2010; Levy & Glimcher, 2012) and sample (E. B. Falk et al., 2011) choice behavior outside of brain research situations in real-world contexts. Even more significantly, based on the average brain activity of the neurofocus group – typically about 30 participants - it is possible to predict choice behavior at the population level (Berns & Moore, 2012; E. B. Falk et al., 2012, 2016; Knutson & Genevsky, 2018; Kühn et al., 2016). The idea of the functioning of the valuation network has been extended to encompass not only goods but also effort costs and time delays; everything an agent needs to bundle into the evaluation of a mode of action aimed at procuring a specific outcome (Hayden & Niv, 2021).

**Highlighting previously unresolved parts of the problem.** Although research demonstrates that the brain activity profile in the valuation networks reveals more about individuals' intentions to act in certain ways in the future than traditional research methods (E. B. Falk et al., 2016; Tong et al., 2020), its operational mechanism remains contentious (C. F. Camerer, 2013; Hayden & Niv, 2021; Juechems & Summerfield, 2019). While some researchers propose that the valuation network computes a scalar value related to items in choice sets according to the common currency principle (Glimcher & Tymula, 2023; Levy & Glimcher, 2012), others argue that this presents an overly simplistic view of human

decision-making mechanisms (Hayden & Heilbrunner, 2014; Hayden & Niv, 2021; Juechems & Summerfield, 2019). Many social, contextual, and other mental factors influence decision-making, raising the question of whether its mechanism can be reduced to a single dimension, as suggested by the common currency hypothesis (Hayden & Niv, 2021; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022). Here, we will not delve further into these perspectives, which are valuable in their own right, but rather emphasize that the brain operates according to the principle of meaningfulness (Suomala, 2020; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2023). We have constructed a model of human decision-making that highlights the significance of the valuation network in choice behavior and decision-making, while also acknowledging that the brain functions across multiple dimensions beyond what the common currency hypothesis suggests (Hasson et al., 2020; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022, 2023).

**The article's purpose: The valuation network with seven decision activators and their connections to the humans' vulnerability to information deficits.** The ability to experimentally measure the activity of the brain's valuation network using functional magnetic resonance imaging has opened a window into human attitudes and intentions. The core of this network consists of brain circuits in the medial prefrontal cortex and the striatum. In some studies, the precuneus has also been associated with the valuation network (Levy & Glimcher, 2012). These areas are intricately connected to other brain networks. This article aims to analyze and present the valuation network as the essential gatekeeper of people's decision-making system and suggest how this approach can help Western societies counter hostile information influence. When human factors have previously been examined from the perspective of cybersecurity experts (Kioskli et al., 2023), this paper argues that the susceptibility of ordinary citizens to information deficits should also be included in the discussion.

Based on extensive research data, we have identified seven factors that are associated with the activation of the valuation network (Suomala, 2023; Suomala & Berg, 2024).

The decision activators are Me, We, Emotion, Knowledge, Goals, Senses, and Differentiation (Suomala, 2023; Suomala & Berg, 2024). These activators affect humans both consciously and on the subliminal level. We describe these activators in more detail below.

## Seven activators of the Brain

**Me-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the factors, which strengthen human experiences of self-continuity (Sedikides et al., 2023), self-efficacy

(Bandura, 1997), and personal agency (Stollberg et al., 2015). Humans are sensitive to things, which refer to their personal experiences. So, people named Denese and Denis choose a career as a dentist more than average, likely because they have learned to connect their names to the sound of “dentist” since their childhood (Pelham & Mauricio, 2015). In the same way, the place where a person lives, her/him schooling, her/him birthday, and her/him profession are strongly related to what things s/he finds pleasant (Suomala & Berg, 2024). Individuals’ self-related things increase their sense of uniqueness and activate their valuation network.

**We-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the factors that strengthen the person’s relationships with other people and one’s social reference group (Suomala & Berg, 2024). Human decision-making is not guided solely by self-identity; rather, it is strongly influenced by other people, social and societal structures, and culture (Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022). The social norms of the reference group often have a strong impact on a person’s behavior. Descriptive is a study in which participants played an ultimatum game (Sanfey et al., 2003). Sometimes the players received fair and sometimes unfair offers regarding the amount of money (\$10) to be distributed. When the players felt they were getting a fair offer, they accepted it. On the other hand, in an unfair situation, players rejected the offer even though it was a financial disadvantage for them. A person’s self-identity is intriguingly intertwined with other people and culture, and together they are connected to our decision-making as human beings. People’s social groups affect a person’s valuation network.

**Emotion-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the factors that strengthen the person’s positive emotions (Suomala & Berg, 2024). Emotions have an important role when a person chooses and decides. The researchers (Winkielman et al., 2005) asked participants to classify face pictures as male or female. Unbeknownst to them, they were subconsciously shown images of either neutral, happy, or angry human faces for less than 16 ms before the classification task. The group shown happy faces drank more juice and was willing to pay more for the drink than those shown neutral or angry faces. Emotional states spread effectively between people, and these emotional messages have a profound effect on how people decide

and choose. The small positive emotions subtly activate the valuation networks of the person.

**Knowledge-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the information that an individual experiences meaningful (Suomala & Berg, 2024). Knowledge is not the opposite of emotions and other activators of the valuation network, but an essential part of it. Words, pictures, scents, sounds, tastes, touch, and events activate the memory network and connect things imperceptibly by associations. People try to make sense of information (Suomala, 2020; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022) by emphasizing personally significant information at the expense of less important details. Individuals combine incoming sensory information with prior knowledge (memory) to form representations of contexts as they unfold over time (Yeshurun et al., 2021). Thus, the task of knowledge processing is not to replicate the physical world as accurately as possible through the senses, but to facilitate useful behaviors (Marken et al., 2022; Purves et al., 2015).

**Goal-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the person's current short- and long-term goals. A person seeks actively things that help her or him to achieve personal goals. Goals may be related to recurring events like – Christmas and birthdays – or infrequent events – like graduation from the profession and weddings.

The significance of goals in human decision-making has been surprisingly under-researched, with a few exceptions (Abeler et al., 2011; C. Camerer et al., 1997; Heath et al., 1999; Suomala et al., 2017). While its importance is not disputed, it is difficult to incorporate into the current experimental paradigm, which aims to identify a consistent general response applicable to all individuals in a sample for a given stimulus (Kennaway, 2020; Marken et al., 2022; Yin, 2020). If individual goals are considered, each participant should be viewed as an individual and averaged results—potentially statistically significant—may not hold as much relevance in a goal-focused analysis (Yin, 2020). It has even been suggested that human behavior is always tied to each individual's internal goals (references), and the influence of each stimulus on behavior arises from the outcome of the comparison function between the stimulus and that goal (Kennaway, 2020; Marken et al., 2022; Powers, 1973; Yin, 2020). While it is not possible to delve further into this decision-making model based on Perceptual Control Theory (Powers, 1973) here, it is safe to assume that goals play a crucial role when examining the activation of the desire network.

People are more sensitive to messages that help them achieve their current goals. For example, Strahan et al. (2002) found that messages

related to fresh spring water had a greater impact on thirsty individuals than on those who were already satisfied.

**Sense-decision activator.** These factors activate a person's senses (Suomala & Berg, 2024). Despite humans are most sensitive to visual stimuli, also hearing (Daunfeldt et al., 2016), touch (Peck & Childers, 2003), smell (Bosmans, 2006), and taste (Grabenhorst et al., 2008) have the effect of activating the people's valuation network. For example, happy faces, the movements of hand, and bouncing balls evoke the valuation network in positive ways (Suomala, 2023).

**Differentiation-decision activator.** This activator focuses on the factors, which differentiate the stimuli from other stimuli in the person's environment (Suomala & Berg, 2024). In classical case, Avis car rental had been losing to Hertz in the most important economic indicators for years. With the help of the advertising agency Doyle Dane Bernbach, they developed the slogan "We Try Harder!" (Bhui & Gershman, 2020). This slogan led to a series of advertisements emphasizing that Avis provides better service than its competitors. As humans, we are sensitive to contrasts. Comparisons can be made against competitors, as seen in the case of Avis. Alternatively, comparisons can also follow a before-and-after format, which demonstrates the positive effects of a product on its user (Suomala & Berg, 2024).

Whereas the priority of the valuation network is to accelerate decision-making which leads to an individual's choice, seven decision activators in turn affect to the valuation network. This is an evidence-based model that companies and other organizations can apply when they want to enhance the stickiness of their marketing messages, new offerings, and other information among people (Suomala & Berg, 2024).

**Presenting main material.** The valuation network is sensitive to positive stimuli, and its connection to choice is almost invariably a result of the individual experiencing positive things in their environment. In this way, the valuation network maintains an emotionally positive state and a sense of meaning by promoting choices that are beneficial for the individual. When this positive feedback loop related to the valuation network is disrupted, psychological insecurity increases, and the person begins to seek situations where the disruption of the positive feedback loop is restored. While emotions and other decision activators are important for activating the brain's valuation network in the proposed model (Suomala, 2023; Suomala & Berg, 2024), it can be posited that the Me- and We-activators are particularly relevant for understanding the relationship between psychological safety and information deficits. Therefore, the

focus will next be directed toward the Me- and We-activators and their relationship to psychological safety.

## Results and discussion

Regarding psychological safety and susceptibility to information deficits, we might consider that individuals may not always experience the support they need for their sense of self. This could suggest that their Me-decision activator is not adequately supported, leading to a diminished sense of positivity in life. If a person's identity is threatened during a certain period or in specific situations repeatedly, their sense of self becomes uncertain and unsecured (Sedikides et al., 2023) and they experience psychological insecurity.

The era in which we live contains many uncertainties. Liberal democracy faces significant pressures worldwide at the same time as people's value communities (family, religion, institutions) are changing, and many societal and ecological threats undermine individuals' experience. Declining social cohesion and increasing polarization erode democratic foundations, fostering unrest (Stollberg et al., 2015).

Moreover, three key challenges increase psychological insecurity. First, states struggle to ensure citizen safety amid the blurred lines between internal and external threats. Second, declining social cohesion and increasing polarization between citizens fosters unrest and instability. Finally, state actions that citizens experience unjustly weaken the foundations of liberal democracy (Van Vark, 2021). These challenges not only impact individuals' psychological security but also affect security organizations, such as the armed forces and police. When the surrounding society begins to appear uncertain and chaotic from the individual's perspective, misinformation, disinformation, malinformation, fake news, and conspiracy theories start to seem like appealing alternatives. In uncertain situations, people easily seek clear solutions to reduce the burden on their identity (Bilewicz et al., 2019; Marchlewska et al., 2018).

When identity and personal agency are threatened in ordinary contexts, people try to restore a coherent sense of self by seeking situations where their identity is supported – in other words, where their We-decision activator is supported (Stollberg et al., 2015). Many studies suggest that other individuals, social groups, and cultural norms significantly influence our behavior and our relationship with the self (Churchland, 2006; Ma et al., 2014). Our social and cultural environment is intricately linked to various aspects of our mind, including beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. If a person

feels that their sense of self is threatened (Me-decision activator) and that they are not receiving approval or being heard in the originally important social groups (We-decision activator), they will begin to seek support from places where their identity is reinforced, and a sense of belonging is strengthened. Such a person may become vulnerable to information deficits in our time. In other words, the activation of the valuation network is hindered by negative aspects of the surrounding environment. They may perceive societal institutions as eroding their identity while simultaneously looking for psychological safety. Hostile entities exploit this vulnerability, offering misguided support to those feeling marginalized in Western democracies.

Although uncertain and contradictory information spreads rapidly in society through the Internet and social media platforms, people also differ in how much uncertainty they can tolerate (Bilewicz et al., 2019; Staszak et al., 2022). While there is no complete certainty about the reasons for differences in tolerance for uncertainty and the need to control clear information flows, models based on the brain's valuation network proposed by neuroeconomics (Falk et al., 2016; Glimcher & Tymula, 2023; Knutson & Genevsky, 2018; Levy & Glimcher, 2012) provide clues about which direction to take in addressing this issue. When this model has proven suitable for promoting health communication (Falk et al., 2016), charity (Knutson & Genevsky, 2018), and sales (Berns & Moore, 2012; Genevsky et al., 2017; Suomala & Berg, 2024), it could also be assumed to work when examining people's decision-making in an unstable information environment.

The human valuation network is a general area in the brain that accelerates decision-making, so it is plausible that it also functions when a person decides to start following misinformation and conspiracy theories. In this case, factors related to identity (Me-decision activator) and sociality (We-decision activator) play a central role in this process. The central question is how societal actors, citizen groups, and individual citizens can learn to operate in our time in a way that minimizes their exposure to information deficits and allows them to base their decisions on accurate information as much as possible. Next, the article will examine this question and preliminarily offer some proposed solutions.

**Initial recommendation 1:** Psychological defense as part of civil crisis management, cybersecurity, and national defense. While Sweden's Psychological Defence Agency with 70 persons aims to protect citizens and societal organizations from false information, Russia's state run 'Social Design Agency,' with thousands of employees (Stiller, 2024), and Internet

Research Agency (Ross et al., 2022) works to increase uncertainty and distrust in traditional institutions in Western countries, making them internally weaker and their populations more polarized. A Russian military textbook calls this phenomenon “information-psychological warfare” and it is intended to erode the morale and psychological spirit of an enemy population. As a central aspect of a broader war against the West, it is waged online through relentless waves of fake, real, and misrepresented news, facilitated by a cultivated network of both aware and unwitting shills (Garner, 2024). For example, the 2016 U.S. presidential election involved Russian-sponsored posts reaching 126 million Americans on Facebook (Garner, 2024) demonstrating that (cyber)security is not just about technology, but primarily about the fact that human minds are the battleground for information influence in Western countries.

**Initial recommendation 2:** We need a public discussion on how to combat harmful psychological attacks through information deficits without compromising citizens’ freedom of expression. Unfortunately, Western countries do not take seriously enough the war that is currently being waged for people’s minds. It is indicative that the British government first hindered the release of a condemning report on Russian interference. Once the report was released, the government did little to act on the findings. In the same vein, the Biden administration is reducing its efforts to head off Russian disinformation (Garner 2024). Decision-makers in Western countries are reluctant to intervene in the actions of social media giants due to fears of restricting free discourse in the name of democracy. Additionally, some political parties and individual politicians know how to exploit the chaotic information environment and leverage people’s suspicions and fears regarding traditional institutions. We have had negative experiences of how restricting freedom of speech has led societies into chaos. At the same time, we should also boldly discuss how we can counteract the instillation of distrust among citizens, which is sown by hostile entities through information deficits. We need open public discourse on this issue, and we should also learn to distinguish between harmful information deficits and genuine critical public discussion.

**Initial recommendation 3:** Official communication based on the understanding of human decision-making mechanisms. Traditional models of human decision-making (Barry & Howard, 1990; Luce & Raiffa, 1989; Samuelson, 1938) assume that individuals are driven by explicit reasoning across all available options, viewing decisions as a matter of selecting the best option from those presented (Kőszegi, 2010). Additionally, these models contend that people respond solely to the characteristics of

the options available, independent of their physical and social contexts. However, current neuroeconomic models (Falk & Scholz, 2018; Suomala, 2020; Suomala & Kauttonen, 2022, 2023) emphasize that decision-making is influenced by multiple factors, including various social and contextual elements. The valuation network compiles these factors and subsequently supports human behavior in decision-making.

The problem is that authorities and other official actors in society assume that people's decision-making is based solely on information and facts (Goldenberg, 2016, 2021), operating according to traditional decision-making models. For example, when a group of individuals opposes vaccinations for their children, authorities typically respond by providing more information, often unconsciously perceiving them as somewhat uninformed and in need of additional facts (Goldenberg, 2021). However, the adoption of false information is often not about a lack of information, as even well-educated individuals are susceptible to misinformation (Goldenberg, 2021). This type of communication unfortunately causes often the backfire effect on the target group, and the message does not get through (Nyhan et al., 2014; Sharot et al., 2023; Sharot & Garrett, 2016). For this reason, authorities should better understand how individuals make holistic decisions that they find personally meaningful. When making decisions, a person does not only process facts; they evaluate the situation based on criteria of meaning, where self and group decision activators play a crucial role. To counter this, Canadian researcher Maya J. Goldenberg (Goldenberg, 2021) advocates for deeper dialogue between authorities and citizens. While democratic institutions can disseminate security-enhancing information, understanding the decision-making processes linked to personal values, identity, and social belonging is essential to combat the misinformation propagated by hostile actors.

## Conclusions

This article examines the critical intersection of psychological safety, decision-making, and the growing impact of harmful information. By exploring the brain's valuation network, we gain insights into how personal and social factors shape decisions, especially in the face of misinformation, disinformation, and societal uncertainty. The seven decision activators—Me, We, Emotion, Knowledge, Goals, Senses, and Differentiation—demonstrate how these influences guide our choices. Understanding these activators offers effective strategies to counter hostile information influence and restore psychological security.

The findings highlight the importance of security authorities and governments understanding how decisions are shaped by personal meaning and social contexts. This knowledge can improve public communication and help restore trust undermined by hostile actors.

The following recommendations address these challenges: First, psychological defense should be integrated into national security strategies, acknowledging the role of information-psychological warfare in destabilizing democratic institutions. This requires not only technological defenses but also efforts to protect citizens' psychological safety. Second, governments must foster open public discussion on how to tackle harmful psychological attacks while safeguarding freedom of expression. This includes distinguishing between genuine debate and malicious misinformation, particularly in the context of increasing disinformation campaigns. Finally, authorities should move beyond fact-based communication models and adopt a deeper understanding of human decision-making, incorporating identity, social context, and personal goals. This approach can strengthen counter-misinformation efforts and improve citizen engagement.

**Prospects for further research.** The conceptual model presented in this article, highlighting the central role of the valuation network and the significance of the me-decision activator and we-decision activator as individuals are exposed to information deficits, is supported by several previous studies. However, the model should be tested in the future among those who believe in fake news, conspiracy theories, and other forms of misinformation on the Internet. This should be investigated in the future by both interviewing individuals and studying their brain activation in different information environments. Additionally, it is important to train authorities responsible for citizen safety so that they learn to consider the holistic and meaningful decision-making mechanisms of individuals.

**Declaration on conflict of interest.** The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest regarding the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

**Acknowledgment.** The research conducted in this paper was triggered by the project 'Collaborative, Multi-modal and Agile Professional Cybersecurity Training Program for a Skilled Workforce In the European Digital Single Market and Industries' (CyberSecPro) project'. This project has received funding from the European Union's Digital Europe Programme (DEP) under grant agreement No 101083594. Special thanks to the partners who participated in these projects and their contributions.

## References

- Abeler, J., Falk, A., Goette, L., & Huffman, D. (2011). *American Economic Review*, 101(2), 470–492.
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. (2010). The Role of Institutions in Growth and Development. *Review of Economics and Institutions*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.5202/rei.v1i2.14>
- Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2013). Economics versus Politics: Pitfalls of Policy Advice. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27(2), 173–192. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.2.173>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Barry, T. E., & Howard, D. J. (1990). A Review and Critique of the Hierarchy of Effects in Advertising. *International Journal of Advertising*, 9(2), 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.1990.11107138>
- Bartra, O., McGuire, J. T., & Kable, J. W. (2013). The valuation system: A coordinate-based meta-analysis of BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *NeuroImage*, 76, 412–427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2013.02.063>
- Berns, G. S., & Moore, S. E. (2012). A neural predictor of cultural popularity. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 22(1), 154–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2011.05.001>
- Bhui, R., & Gershman, S. J. (2020). Paradoxical effects of persuasive messages. *Decision*, 7(4), 239–258. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dec0000123>
- Bilewicz, M., Witkowska, M., Pantazi, M., Gkinopoulos, T., & Klein, O. (2019). Traumatic rift: How conspiracy beliefs undermine cohesion after societal trauma? *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 15(1), 82–93. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v15i1.1699>
- Bosmans, A. (2006). Scents and Sensibility: When Do (In)Congruent Ambient Scents Influence Product Evaluations? *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3), 32–43. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.70.3.32>
- Camerer, C., Babcock, L., Loewenstein, G., & Thaler, R. (1997). Labor Supply of New York City Cabdrivers: One Day at a Time. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(2), 407–441. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555244>
- Camerer, C. F. (2013). A Review Essay about *Foundations of Neuro economic Analysis* by Paul Glimcher. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 51(4), 1155–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.51.4.1155>
- Churchland, P. S. (2006). *Neurophilosophy: Toward a unified science of the mind-brain*. London : MIT Press.
- Daunfeldt, S.-O., Rudholm, N., & Sporre, H. (2016). Effects of Brand-Fit Music on Consumer Behavior: A Field Experiment. *HUI Working Paper*, 121.
- Falk, E. B., Berkman, E. T., & Lieberman, M. D. (2012). From Neural Responses to Population Behavior: Neural Focus Group Predicts Population-Level Media Effects. *Psychological Science*, 23(5), 439–445. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611434964>
- Falk, E. B., Berkman, E. T., Mann, T., Harrison, B., & Lieberman, M. D. (2010). Predicting Persuasion-Induced Behavior Change from the Brain. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30(25), 8421–8424. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0063-10.2010>
- Falk, E. B., Berkman, E. T., Whalen, D., & Lieberman, M. D. (2011). Neural activity during health messaging predicts reductions in smoking above and beyond self-report. *Health Psychology*, 30(2), 2. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022259>

Falk, E. B., O'Donnell, M. B., Tompson, S., Gonzalez, R., Dal Cin, S., Strecher, V., Cummings, K. M., & An, L. (2016). Functional brain imaging predicts public health campaign success. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *11*(2), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsv108>

Falk, E., & Scholz, C. (2018). Persuasion, Influence, and Value: Perspectives from Communication and Social Neuroscience. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *69*(1), 329–356. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-122216-011821>

Genevsky, A., Yoon, C., & Knutson, B. (2017). When Brain Beats Behavior: Neuroforecasting Crowdfunding Outcomes. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, *37*(36), 8625–8634. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1633-16.2017>

Glimcher, P. W., & Tymula, A. A. (2023). Expected subjective value theory (ESVT): A representation of decision under risk and certainty. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *207*, 110–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.12.013>

Goldenberg, M. J. (2016). Public Misunderstanding of Science? Reframing the Problem of Vaccine Hesitancy. *Perspectives on Science*, *24*(5), 552–581. [https://doi.org/10.1162/POSC\\_a\\_00223](https://doi.org/10.1162/POSC_a_00223)

Goldenberg, M. J. (2021). *Vaccine hesitancy: Public trust, expertise, and the war on science*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Grabenhorst, F., Rolls, E. T., & Bilderbeck, A. (2008). How Cognition Modulates Affective Responses to Taste and Flavor: Top-down Influences on the Orbitofrontal and Pregenual Cingulate Cortices. *Cerebral Cortex*, *18*(7), 1549–1559. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhm185>

Hasson, U., Nastase, S. A., & Goldstein, A. (2020). Direct Fit to Nature: An Evolutionary Perspective on Biological and Artificial Neural Networks. *Neuron*, *105*(3), 416–434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2019.12.002>

Hayden, B. Y., & Heilbronner, S. R. (2014). All that glitters is not reward signal. *Nature Neuroscience*, *17*(9), 1142–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn.3795>

Hayden, B. Y., & Niv, Y. (2021). The case against economic values in the orbitofrontal cortex (or anywhere else in the brain). *Behavioral Neuroscience*, *135*(2), 192–201. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bne0000448>

Heath, C., Larrick, R. P., & Wu, G. (1999). Goals as Reference Points. *Cognitive Psychology*, *38*(1), 79–109. <https://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.1998.0708>

Juechems, K., & Summerfield, C. (2019). Where Does Value Come From? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *23*(10), 836–850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.07.012>

Kennaway, R. (2020). When causation does not imply correlation. In *The Interdisciplinary Handbook of Perceptual Control Theory* (pp. 49–72). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818948-1.00004-6>

Kioskli, K., Mouratidis, H., & Polemi, N. (2023). *Bringing humans at the core of cybersecurity: Challenges and future research directions*. 14th International Conference on Applied Human Factors and Ergonomics (AHFE 2023). <https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1003722>

Knutson, B., & Genevsky, A. (2018). Neuroforecasting Aggregate Choice. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *27*(2), 110–115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417737877>

Köszegi, B. (2010). Utility from anticipation and personal equilibrium. *Economic Theory*, *44*(3), 415–444. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00199-009-0465-x>

- Kühn, S., Strelow, E., & Gallinat, J. (2016). Multiple “buy buttons” in the brain: Forecasting chocolate sales at point-of-sale based on functional brain activation using fMRI. *NeuroImage*, *136*, 122–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2016.05.021>
- Levy, D. J., & Glimcher, P. W. (2012). The root of all value: A neural common currency for choice. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, *22*(6), 1027–1038. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2012.06.001>
- Liebling, A. J., & Hamill, P. (2008). *World War II writings* (1. print). Library of America.
- Luce, R. D., & Raiffa, H. (1989). *Games and decisions: Introduction and critical survey*. Dover Publications.
- Ma, Y., Bang, D., Wang, C., Allen, M., Frith, C., Roepstorff, A., & Han, S. (2014). Sociocultural patterning of neural activity during self-reflection. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *9*(1), 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss103>
- Marchlewska, M., Cichońka, A., & Kossowska, M. (2018). Addicted to answers: Need for cognitive closure and the endorsement of conspiracy beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(2), 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2308>
- Marken, R., Kennaway, R., & Gulrez, T. (2022). Behavioral illusions: The Snark is a Boojum. *Theory & Psychology*, *32*(3), 491–514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211070271>
- Masferrer, A. (2023). The Decline of Freedom of Expression and Social Vulnerability in Western democracy. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, *36*(4), 1443–1475. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-09990-1>
- Nyhan, B., Reifler, J., Richey, S., & Freed, G. L. (2014). Effective Messages in Vaccine Promotion: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics*, *133*(4), e835–e842. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2013-2365>
- Peck, J., & Childers, T. L. (2003). To have and to Hold: The Influence of Haptic Information on Product Judgments. *Journal of Marketing*, *67*(2), 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.2.35.18612>
- Pelham, B., & Mauricio, C. (2015). When Tex and Tess Carpenter Build Houses in Texas: Moderators of Implicit Egotism. *Self and Identity*, *14*(6), 692–723. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2015.1070745>
- Powers, W. T. (1973). Feedback: Beyond Behaviorism: Stimulus-response laws are wholly predictable within a control-system model of behavioral organization. *Science*, *179*(4071), 351–356. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.179.4071.351>
- Purves, D., Morgenstern, Y., & Wojtach, W. T. (2015). Perception and Reality: Why a Wholly Empirical Paradigm is Needed to Understand Vision. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, *9*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2015.00156>
- Ross, A. R. N., Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2022). Russian Meddling in U.S. Elections: How News of Disinformation’s Impact Can Affect Trust in Electoral Outcomes and Satisfaction with Democracy. *Mass Communication and Society*, *25*(6), 786–811. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2022.2119871>
- Samuelson, P. A. (1938). A Note on the Pure Theory of Consumer’s Behaviour. *Economica*, *5*(17), 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2548836>
- Sanfey, A. G., Rilling, J. K., Aronson, J. A., Nystrom, L. E., & Cohen, J. D. (2003). The Neural Basis of Economic Decision-Making in the Ultimatum Game. *Science*, *300*(5626), 1755–1758. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1082976>

- Sedikides, C., Hong, E. K., & Wildschut, T. (2023). Self-Continuity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 74*(1), 333–361. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-032420-032236>
- Sharot, T., & Garrett, N. (2016). Forming Beliefs: Why Valence Matters. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20*(1), 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.11.002>
- Sharot, T., Rollwage, M., Sunstein, C. R., & Fleming, S. M. (2023). Why and When Beliefs Change. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 18*(1), 142–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916221082967>
- Staszak, S., Maciejowska, J., Urjasz, W., Misiuro, T., & Cudo, A. (2022). The Relationship between the Need for Closure and Coronavirus Fear: The Mediating Effect of Beliefs in Conspiracy Theories about COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(22), 14789. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192214789>
- Stiller, R. (2024). *Keneen sinä luotat? (From Finnish to English: Who do you trust?)*. YLE (Finnish Broadcasting Company).
- Stollberg, J., Fritsche, I., & BÄcker, A. (2015). Striving for group agency: Threat to personal control increases the attractiveness of agentic groups. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00649>
- Strahan, E. J., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2002). Subliminal priming and persuasion: Striking while the iron is hot. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38*(6), 556–568. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(02\)00502-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00502-4)
- Suomala, J. (2020). The Consumer Contextual Decision-Making Model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 570430. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570430>
- Suomala, J. (2023). *Ostavat Aivot (in English The Buying Brain)*. BasamBooks.
- Suomala, J., & Berg, P. (2024). Brain's Valuation Networks and Consumer Neuroscience Methods in the Fuzzy Front-End of the Innovation Process. In L. Moutinho & M. Cerf (Eds.), *Biometrics and Neuroscience Research in Business and Management* (pp. 207–222). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110708509-011>
- Suomala, J., Hlushchuk, Y., Kauttonen, J., Heinonen, J., Palokangas, L., & Numminen, J. (2017). Distributed brain networks reflect salary offer in accordance with the prospect theory's value function. *Journal of Neuroscience, Psychology, and Economics, 10*(4), 167–180. <https://doi.org/10.1037/npe0000083>
- Suomala, J., & Kauttonen, J. (2022). Human's Intuitive Mental Models as a Source of Realistic Artificial Intelligence and Engineering. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 873289. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.873289>
- Suomala, J., & Kauttonen, J. (2023). Computational meaningfulness as the source of beneficial cognitive biases. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, 1189704. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1189704>
- Tong, L. C., Acikalin, M. Y., Genevsky, A., Shiv, B., & Knutson, B. (2020). Brain activity forecasts video engagement in an internet attention market. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117*(12), 6936–6941. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1905178117>
- Van Vark, A. (2021). Under Pressure: Security and Stability Related Challenges for Liberal Democracy in North-western Europe. *Democracy and Security, 17*(3), 296–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17419166.2021.1920930>
- Winkielman, P., Berridge, K. C., & Wilbarger, J. L. (2005). Unconscious Affective Reactions to Masked Happy Versus Angry Faces Influence Consumption Behavior

and Judgments of Value. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(1), 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271309>

World Economic Forum. (2024). *The global risks report 2024* (19th ed.). Retrieved from: [https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_The\\_Global\\_Risks\\_Report\\_2024.pdf](https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_The_Global_Risks_Report_2024.pdf) Insight

Yeshurun, Y., Nguyen, M., & Hasson, U. (2021). The default mode network: Where the idiosyncratic self meets the shared social world. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 22(3), 181–192. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-00420-w>

Yin, H. (2020). Chapter 3—The crisis in neuroscience. In W. Mansell (Ed.), *The Interdisciplinary Handbook of Perceptual Control Theory* (pp. 23–48). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818948-1.00003-4>

## Abstract

**Suomala, J.**

PhD (Education), Principal Lecturer (docent),  
NeuroLab, Laurea University of Applied Sciences,  
Espoo, FINLAND,  
E-mail: [jyrki.suomala@laurea.fi](mailto:jyrki.suomala@laurea.fi)

## NAVIGATING PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY AND INFORMATION DISORDER IN WAR AND PEACE: A DECISION NEUROSCIENCE PERSPECTIVE

This article explores psychological safety through human decision-making, emphasizing how subtle threats like information disorder, amplified by the Internet and AI, erode trust in democratic institutions. The World Economic Forum identifies this disorder as a significant threat to democracies, necessitating an understanding of its root causes. Research shows that human behavior is driven by the brain's valuation network, with seven decision activators identified: Me, We, Emotion, Knowledge, Goal, Senses, and Differentiation, focusing on Me and We concerning psychological safety.

The Me activator relates to self-continuity and personal agency, while threats to identity can lead to insecurity. In today's uncertain climate, liberal democracies face challenges from shifting normative frameworks and growing societal polarization. The We activator highlights the importance of social relationships and cultural norms in influencing behavior.

Understanding the interplay between Me and We activators is essential for addressing psychological safety, as individuals often seek validation in environments that feel supportive yet perceive societal institutions as undermining their identity, leaving them vulnerable to manipulation.

The article proposes three recommendations for integrating human decision-making complexities into cybersecurity practices: (1) incorporate psychological defense into cybersecurity and national defense; (2) foster open public discourse on harmful psychological attacks while protecting freedom of expression; and (3) enhance official communication to acknowledge the social and contextual influences on decision-making, rather than relying solely on information and facts.

**Key words:** *decision-making, information deficit, valuation network, neuroeconomics, decision-activators, psychological defense, cybersecurity.*

---

Отримано – 17 вересня 2024  
Received – September 17, 2024

Рецензовано – 22 вересня 2024  
Revision – September 22, 2024

Прийнято – 26 вересня 2024  
Accepted – September 26, 2024