*Diana Janušauskienė**
Law University of Lithuania
*Jūratė Novagrockienė**
Lithuanian Military Academy
Institute of International Relations and Political Science of the University of Vilnius

Perception of Security Issues by Lithuanian Population

This article analyses perceptions of security in Lithuania. The analysis is based on the qualitative research (in-depth interviews). In addition, data of several public opinion polls is used as a complementary source of information that allows to have a broader view and verify the qualitative data. Perceptions of security, causes of (in)security, and factors that influence the sense of security are analysed. The research focuses on the individual (micro) rather than on the state (macro) level of security.

Introduction

During the Cold War and later, security and strategy studies focused on the macro level of security. Thus, the main area of research was security of the state and the whole international system. "In the post-Cold War era the object of security is shifting away from the state to the individual or substate group"[1].

In discussing this issue, one cannot avoid the study of Barry Buzan "People, States and Fear." According to Buzan, "security has many potential referent objects. These objects of security multiply not only as the membership of the society of states increases, but also as one moves down through the state to the level of individuals, and up beyond it to the level of the international system as a whole"[2] and "the security of any one referent object or level cannot be achieved in isolation from the others".[3] Buzan admits that individual security may be analysed separately, but also notes that individual security is subordinated to "the higher-level political structures of state and international system".[4] In Buzan's view, individual security belongs to the periphery of security studies, which focus on state and international security studies.[5] However, by stating that national and international security cannot be reduced to the

[1] Snyder C.A. "Contemporary Security and Strategy" in Snyder C.A., ed., *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, London: Macmillan Press, 1999, p. 8.
[2] Buzan B. People, States and Fear. An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era. Second edition. New York, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, p. 26.
[3] *Ibidem*.
[4] *Ibidem*., p. 54.
[5] *Ibidem*.

level of individual security[6] , Buzan essentially justifies the relative independence of individual security as a separate field of research[7] .

The current critical political thought reflects the tendency to include individual security analysis into the main body of security studies. One of the proponents of this view, Kenneth Booth, emphasises that the key object of security is individuals and not states:

'Security' means the absence of threats. Emancipation is the freeing of people (as individuals and groups) from those physical human constraints which stop them carrying out what they would freely choose to do. War and the threat of war is one of those constraints, together with poverty, poor education, political oppression and so on. Security and emancipation are two sides of the same coin. Emancipation, not power or order, produces true security. Emancipation, theoretically, is security.[8]

The debate about the subject of security has been taking place along with the discussion about the relationship between old and new threats. The dimension of military security has been supplemented by the problems of ecology, social issues, poverty, as well as the dilemma between state and individual security. According to Kenneth Booth, majority of people in the world today fear their own government (its tyranny, incompetence or both of them) rather than the army of a neighbour state[9] . Therefore, individual security may be analysed as a totality of threats affecting the individual.

The dimension of individual security now is a part of the Lithuanian political agenda. A comparison of two reports about the condition and development of Lithuania's national security system (done in 1999 and 2000) shows that the latter report already reflects a change in understanding national security; "there is a move from assuring security by military means to a broader spectrum of measures assuring security – economic, social and cultural"[10] . Chapters 6 to 11 of the report name individual and societal security variables, which had not been included into the 1999 report[11] .

Clearly, the analysis of individual security has its niche in the ream of security and public policy studies, but it has not attracted much attention in Lithuania. The lack of individual security studies calls for a comprehensive empirical research about how people understand individual (micro) security and societal and state (macro) security using data from Lithuanian surveys and qualitative studies.

The importance of public opinion for public policy is demonstrated by the position of Belgium Defence Minister André Flahaut, expressed ahead of assuming the EU presidency. He decided to call a survey to clarify how many citizens of the EU member states back European integration in the field of common foreign and security policy. "Within the long construction of a common security and defence policy, public opinion is a strategic variable of the highest importance"[12] .

Relevant questions were incorporated into the 54.1 Eurobarometer questionnaire in the year 2001.

The aim of this article is to determine whether personal or nation-wide pro-

[6] *Ibidem.*

[7] *Ibidem,* p. 363.

[8] Mutimer D. "Beyond Strategy: Critical Thinking and the New Security Studies" in Snyder C.A., ed., *Contemporary Security and Strategy*, London: Macmillan Press, 1999, p. 82.

[9] Booth K. "Drįsk nežinoti: tarptautinių santykių teorija prieš ateitį." – Booth K., Smith S. (sud.) *Tarptautinių santykių teorija šiandien*, Vilnius: Algarvė, 2000, p. 329.

[10] *Report on the Situation and Development of National Security System 2001.* Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos krašto apsaugos ministerija, 2002.

[11] *Report on the Situation and Development of National Security System 1999.* Vilnius: Lietuvos Respublikos krašto apsaugos ministerija, 2000.

[12] Manigart P. Public Opinion and European Defence: Results of European Opinion Survey, http://europa.eu.int/comm/dg10/epo/eb/surveys.html - (accessed on 2002 06 02).

blems of security are more important for the Lithuanians. Thus, the research covers the analysis of threats and sources of (in)security, perceptions about what aspects of security are the most important, who is responsible for providing secure environment, and what is the role of the state in providing security for the Lithuanians.

In the first part of this article, the methodological issues of the research are discussed. In the second part, the following aspects are analysed: what are the major threats for the security of the state, and why Lithuanian people feel unsafe personally and as citizens of Lithuania. The third part of the article is devoted to the analysis of the perceived causes of insecurity. In the fourth part, the attitudes towards the role of NATO and the EU for the development of Lithuania, in general, and security of the individual and the whole society, in particular, are analysed. The last, fifth part, focuses on channels of information that are crucial for the formation of public opinion about security.

1. Methodological Remarks

Even though public opinion about entering NATO and the EU is regularly researched in Lithuania, deeper studies about perceptions of security are lacking. In general, the research of security issues began in 1991[13], when several questions on this issue were included into survey questionnaires. Yet, the first serious study on security was accomplished only in 1998[14]. The same study was repeated in 2000[15]. The research focused on public opinion about macro-level threats as well as on positive and negative effects of entering NATO. Other public opinion polls taken in 1999 and 2002 aimed to analyse why the Lithuanians do not feel secure in their country. The data of these studies allows to speak about general tendencies only. A separate qualitative research was needed. The goal of this research was to analyse perceptions of security, attitudes of different social groups towards internal and external security, and perceptions of means of security. In addition, this study aimed at comparing its results with the results of the previous public opinion surveys.

In general, 19 respondents were interviewed in face-to-face in-depth interviews. Respondents were divided into two groups. The first group included experts (politicians, state officials, and political scientists whose main area of interest was international relations). The second group of respondents was formed of ordinary people (non-experts). Respondents of different age, gender, education, and area of residence were selected to this group. As a rule, in-depth interviews with the experts lasted for one hour, while interviews with ordinary people were approximately 40 minutes long. A short description of the respondents in both groups is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

---

[13] Ališauskienė R. "National and International Security Issues in the Eyes of the Public of the Baltic Countries" in *Public Awareness Workshop on Security Issues in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia*. Palanga, 4-5 December, 1998. Vilnius, 1998, p. 17.

[14] *Opinion about Level of Public Awareness on Security Issues in the Baltic Countries.* Based on the Public Opinion in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Baltic Surveys/GALLUP. Vilnius, 1998. This survey was accomplished in March 1998. 1000 respondents were researched. The research was commissioned by the Division of Information and Press.

[15] Public Opinion about Security in Lithuania. Baltic Surveys/GALLUP, Vilnius, 2000. This research was commissioned by the Lithuanian Atlantic Treaty Association. The survey was accomplished in January 21-30, 2000. In total, 1006 respondents were researched.

Table 1. **The Description of the First Group of Respondents (Experts).**

No.	Occupation	Area of education	Gender	Age (years)
E1	Employee of State Defence System	Social sciences	Male	25
E2	Member of the Parliament	Physics	Male	65
E3	Member of the Parliament	Natural sciences	Female	53
E4	Political scientist	Social sciences	Female	25
E5	Employee of State Defence System	Social sciences	Male	29
E6	Member of Local Government	Technical sciences	Male	38
E7	Political scientist	Social sciences	Male	40
E8	Political scientist	Social sciences	Male	34

Table 2. **The Description of the Second Group of Respondents (Non-Experts).**

No.	Gender	Age (years)	Ethnic origin	Occupation	Marital status	Education	Place of residence
1	male	18	Lithuanian	student	single	Secondary	Šiauliai
2	female	27	Lithuanian	employed	married	University degree	Vilnius
3	male	25	Lithuanian	employed	single	Vocational	Vilnius
4	female	33	Lithuanian	employed	single	University degree	Vilnius
5	female	52	Lithuanian	employed	divorced	Vocational	Utena
6	female	60	Lithuanian Tatar	retired	single	University degree	Vilnius
7	male	32	Pole	employed	married	University degree	Vilnius
8	female	50	Lithuanian	employed	single	University degree	Vilnius
9	male	57	Lithuanian	employed	married	University degree	Vilnius
10	female	19	Lithuanian	employed	single	Secondary	Raseiniai
11	male	48	Lithuanian	employed	married	Secondary	Vilnius

The questionnaire was partly based on Buzan's theory about four types of social threats. Buzan distinguishes between physical threats (pain, injuries and death), economic threats (seizure or destruction of property, denial of access to work or resources), threats to human rights (imprisonment, denial of normal civil liberties), and threats to social status (demotion, public humiliation)[16]. In the research, the social dimension of security embraced issues of social protection and health care.

Summarising, the in-depth interviews examined (1) general perceptions of security, (2) sources of insecurity, (3) perceptions of what aspects of individual security are the most important – economic, social, physical, etc., (4) perceptions of external threats, (5) attitudes towards state policies ensuring internal and external security, (6) attitudes towards membership in the EU and NATO, and (7) the influence of mass media in forming attitudes about security.

The central hypothesis was that better-informed respondents (experts) had a deeper understanding of security if compared to the group of non-experts. The ex-

---

[16] Buzan (note. 4), p. 37.

perts were expected to be able to clearly identify and differentiate among security problems. It was believed that professional experience and education plays a crucial role in the formation of attitudes towards security. .... As it was already mentioned, the data of the in-depth interviews is analysed together with the data of public opinion polls. It is believed that this approach allows a deeper analysis of security.

2. Perceptions of Security and Causes of (In)security

2.1. Public Opinion Surveys

The data of two sociological surveys taken in July 1999[17] and in November 2002[18] show that the majority of Lithuanian population do not feel secure in their country. In 1999 and 2002, the respondents were asked if they feel secure in Lithuania. In 1999, 18.4 percent of respondents answered that they feel safe, 48.3 percent - partly safe, and 25.5 percent - insecure. The results of the survey of 2002 show that the number of people who feel secure does not change and makes approximately one fifth of the population. Yet, an important finding is that the number of people who feel completely insecure gradually diminishes (from 25.5 percent in 1999 to 18.5 percent in 2002) (see Table 3).

Table 3. **Sense of Security in 1999 and 2002, in percent.**

Do you feel secure in Lithuania?	1999	2002
Secure	18.4	19.9
Partly secure	48.3	55.5
Completely insecure	25.5	18.5
It is difficult to say	7.8	6.1

Survey's data of the Public Opinion and Market Research Centre Vilmorus, July 1999, and SIC Market Research, November 2002.

The other important issue researched in 1999 and 2002 was causes of security and insecurity. In 1999, the majority of the respondents mentioned corruption of state officials (34.4 percent), fear of losing a job (25.4 percent), inability of law enforcement institutions to ensure individuals' security (19.1 percent), the state's indifference towards its citizens (14.9 percent), and permanent lack of money (14.4 percent).

From 1999 to 2002, the key source of insecurity was the inability of law enforcement institutions to insure individuals' security (46.4 percent and 19.1 percent, correspondingly). From 1999 to 2002, fear of losing a job increased from 25.4 percent to 31.5 percent, insecuraty due to inadequate health protection - from 12.5 percent to 26.9 percent. In 2002, 30.2 percent of the respondents indicated that the

---

[17] The research was accomplished by the Public Opinion and Market Research Centre Vilmorus. In total, 1,005 15-74 years-old respondents were researched. The maximal statistical error is 3 percent.
[18] The research was accomplished by the SIC Market Research. In total, 525 15-74 year-old respondents were researched. Maximal statistical error is 4.3 percent.
[19] This issue was not included in the survey of 1999.

Government does not provide conditions to earn a living[19] (see Table 4).

Table 4. **Perceived Causes of Insecurity in Lithuania**

Causes of insecurity	1999	2002
Fear of losing a job	25.4	31.5
Inability of law enforcement institutions to insure individuals' security	19.1	46.4
The Government does not provide conditions to earn a living	-	30.2
Permanent shortages	14.4	27.5
Inadequate health protection	12.5	26.9
The majority of people do not follow moral norms and principles	7.5	21.0
Highest state officials are corrupt	34.4	17.7
Drug (narcotic) abuse is increasing	-	20.1
Mass media spreads sense of insecurity	1.5	3.0
Lithuania is not capable of securing itself from external enemies	-	1.8
Having Russia as a neighbour	-	0.7

in 1999 and 2002, in percent.

Survey's data of the Public Opinion and Market Research Centre Vilmorus, July 1999, and SIC Market Research, November 2002.

From 1999 to 2002, there was an increase in the share of the respondents who gave negative marks to the areas of individual security, which to a great degree depend on state policy. In a certain sense, poor performance of law enforcement and health protection systems could be attributed to 'structural threats'[20].

At the state (macro) level, the data of another sociological survey taken in 1998[21] shows that 95 percent of the respondents did not consider any foreign state as a threat to Lithuania's security, and 45 percent of all the respondents indicated as more important threats to the state's internal security and stability. The respondents younger than 20, those with incomplete secondary education, non-ethnic Lithuanians and city dwellers indicated external threats more frequently. People aged between 40 and 59, those with higher education, and inhabitants of major cities more often indicated internal threats.

When answering the question about major internal threats, in both 1998 and 2002 surveys, 86 percent of the respondents indicated corruption, 69 percent - ineffective border control, 64 percent each - the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant and instability in Russia, and 52 percent - Russian military transit. According to the above-mentioned Eurobarometer survey 54.1, inhabitants of EU countries indicated three key non-military threats - organised crime (77 percent), threat caused by nuclear power stations (75 percent), and terrorism (75 percent). As one can see, Lithuania's and EU populations have similar views.[22]

Lithuanian population's views about all threats did not change much between

---

[20] Buzan (note 4), 45.
[21] *Opinion about Level of Public Awareness on Security Issues in the Baltic Countries.* Based on the Public Opinion in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Baltic Surveys/GALLUP. Vilnius, 1998.
[22] Public Opinion about Security in Lithuania. Baltic Surveys/GALLUP, Vilnius, 2000. 4.

1998 and 2000, except that in 2000 the proportion of those who believed that corrup-

Threat	January 2000	March 1998
Crime and corruption	42	30
Instability in Russia	20	22
Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant	14	10
War in Chechnya	4	-
Pollution	3	1
Russian military transit	2	2
Non–democratic political regime in Belarus	1	1

tion and crime were the most important threats was 12 points higher (see Table 5).

Table 5. **What are the Most Important Threats for Lithuania, in percent.**
Public Opinion about Security in Lithuania. Baltic Surveys/GALLUP, Vilnius, 2000. 8.

Also, in 1999, the respondents believed that major problems were the fight against corruption, cutting down unemployment, curbing crime, alcoholism and narcotic abuse, and improving performance of judicial institutions. The problem of external security was directly indicated by only 0.9 percent of the respondents.

All surveys mentioned here confirm a stable tendency towards seeing internal security problems as more important than external threats.

2.2. Qualitative Research

The in-depth interviews show that there is a difference in perceptions of security among the researched experts and non-experts. The experts tend to define security as a complex concept that covers individual and state security. State security is divided into internal and external security. The internal security is defined as indivi-

dual and state security. Even though all experts agree that security is a complex

Security as a complex notion	Illustrations
Three components	"The absence of fear, shortages, and psychological discomfort. Thus, we have three dimensions" (Interview No.E1). "I see three dimensions: individual security, in a broader sense - community security, …and in the broadest sense - security of an individual in a given state" (Interview No.E2).
Two components	"I perceive security as individual security and state security" (Interview No.E3). "Security means freedom from any kind of fear, and certainty about the present situation. This is applicable to both the state and individuals" (Interview No.E5). "[I can speak about] security when I am certain about the future, physical safety, moral safety, psychological [safety], when I feel safe and when my family feels safe. Other things are important when we speak about the state - [the issue of] terrorism, no foreign invasion" (Interview No.E6). "Political science defines security as a situation of a state in respect to various threats (economic, social, political, epidemiological, etc.). In the area of international relations, security means the general situation of international relations" (Interview No.E8).
Military dimension	"War, mass destruction weapons are elements of the concept of security" (Interview No.E8)
Individual security	"You are safe not only when you feel safe physically, but rather when you have some economic and financial status" (Interview No.E3). "It is necessary to feel safe at home, on the street, to be certain about your children and your property, and in a certain sense, your future. [I see] various dimensions of security: social, economic and physical" (Interview No.E3). "State security is associated with threats to the state: economic threats, ecological threats. Personally, I care more about individual security: not to be beaten or robbed" (Interview No.E4). "Freedom from psychological discomfort" (Interview No.E1).
Individual and state security as an interactive entity	"I am safe when I live in a safe state, and when I have a job, income from that job, a place to live. Then I am safe and free" (Interview No.E3). "The state protects an individual and ensures individual security. That no stranger would come and take what belongs to an individual [and his relatives], or would use physical violence" (Interview No.E2).

notion, they use different definitions (see Table 6).

Table 6. **Perceptions of Security. Expert Opinions.**

The experts mentioned various dimensions of individual and state security. An important issue was interrelations between these two dimensions. The military dimension was mentioned by one expert only. Yet, other respondents mentioned this topic when they talked about external security and the Lithuanian Army.

As a rule, the non-experts used a more narrow definition of security. They tended to mention just one or several aspects of security. In general, this group of the respondents focused on the issue of individual security and stressed physical and economic security:

"I understand [security] as my inviolability and my freedom. Of course, the most important is physical safety" (Interview No.4).

"Security means not to be beaten in the evening" (Interview No.3).

"In general, security means that you can walk on the street in the morning, night or evening and feel safe" (Interview No.5).

"Physical security, that you are not exterminated" (Interview No.10).

"Being certain about myself, about my health and life" (Interview No.1).

"Safety on the street, safety in a global sense… if you have a job, social protection, guaranteed medical care" (Interview No.6).

"In a broader sense, it is physical safety in social, moral, and psychological sense" (Interview No.2).

Psychological security is the third dimension mentioned by the respondents:

"It is conviction that there are no threats… neither psychological nor physical" (Interview No.7).

"Peaceful situation, with no extraordinary events" (Interview No.9).

Security is associated with various things. The most important dimensions are physical, economic and psychological safety. In addition, several respondents mentioned stability, health, comfort, and certainty about the future.
.... Even though respondents of both groups tend to explain security according to their personal experience, perceptions of the experts rest on their professional experience and

knowledge. The experts distinguish between individual and state security, and speak

Dimensions	Illustrations
Physical safety	"I do not think that the general situation in the country is bad, I feel safe in my district" (Interview No.E5) "[I do not feel safe when I think about] kidnapping, murders, and robberies…especially of older people" (Interview No.E2). "Everything depends on what kind of street we are talking about. If it in is the city, town or village. An individual feels safer in a small town. In a big city, [it is safer] on central streets" (Interview No.E6). "Let us imagine, I drive 20 kilometres out of Vilnius, and there appear various possibilities to become a victim, or other kinds of disasters can happen" (Interview No.E4). "Safety on the street depends on a particular place and city. For example, it is difficult to feel safe in Kaunas" (Interview No.E4).
Economic safety	"[I feel safe when] I have a permanent job and incomes" (Interview No.E3). "The economic advancement would definitely increase the sense of safety" (Interview No. 8).
Social safety	"State officials are the most protected … They are safe because they will not be fired… People who work in joint stock companies and other [private] companies are not safe" (Interview No. E2). "[Security] partly depends on personal health" (Interview No.E2).
Psychologial comfort	"When I watch television and read newspapers, I feel threatened in Lithuania" (Interview No.E2). "Mass media forms an opinion that everything is wrong, yet, the reality is not so bad" (Interview No.E6). "Psychological discomfort is great. Our state does not look good, and I do not want to live here"(Interview No.E1).
Certainty about the future	"Only a few are certain about their future and about the future of their children" (Interview No.E6). "An individual is unsafe because he does not know what will be tomorrow, he is not certain about his future" (Interview No.E3).
State security	"External threat exists. If we speak about Russia or Belarus, we can not say that they have a consolidated democracy and democratic governments" (Interview No.E2).

about the international dimension. The non-experts are oriented more towards their personal life and experience (see Tables 7 and 7A).

Table 7. **What Does it Mean to be Safe? Expert Opinions.**

In the opinions of the experts, both individual experience and knowledge

about the general situation in the country are closely related. It is obvious that in

Dimensions	Illustrations
Physical safety	"I go to work and come back and I should feel safe then. My parents, my relatives and friends should feel safe when they walk out or do various things" (Interview No.2). "You should walk and know that nobody would attack you and that nobody follows you" (Interview No.3). "To walk in peace not thinking about somebody attacking you or robbing you" (Interview No.8).
Good health	"I feel safe when all my relatives are in good health" (Interview No.5).
Economic safety	"It means that I have a job and home" (Interview No. 9).
Social safety	"When you have a job, social protection, and guaranteed heath care" (Interview No.6).
Psychological comfort	"To feel safe personally means to have a comfort, and not thinking about what could happen. I think psychological comfort is more important than real threats" (Interview No.7). "I associate security with stability" (Interview No.1).
Certainty about the future	"It is safe when you are certain about everything… and about the future" (Interview No.8).
Absence of external threats	"[It is safe] when there are no external threats" (Interview No.9).

comparison with non-experts, the experts more often say that they personally feel safe. The experts evaluate their individual safety more positively.

Table 7A. **Do You Personally Feel Safe? Non-Expert Opinions.**

The most visible difference between the opinions of experts and non-experts is that the experts think about individual security as their personal experience and as a general problem in the society. In addition, they take into consideration the external security. Meanwhile, the vast majority of non-experts do not mention external security as a factor, which influences their sense of security. One of the possible conclusions is that non-experts do not perceive external threats as real.

Similarly to the results of public opinion polls, the in-depth interviews show that internal problems of security dominate. Physical insecurity (threat of crimes), the possibility to lose a job and lack of social protection are the most important threats for people.

2.3. Causes of (In)Security

The definition of security is incomplete without mentioning causes of security. When speaking about perceived causes of insecurity, the researched experts differentiate between several social groups - educated people or professionals, retired people, unemployed people. The experts think that social status defines the perception of security:

"Professionals will find jobs everywhere… They really feel secure" (Interview No.E1).

"Older people, especially those close to the retirement age, are not able to change their qualification and show initiative, [therefore their feel unsafe]" (Interview No.E2).

"Security of retired people is the most problematic" (Interview No.E2).

In addition, the experts stressed the importance of people's mentality and the way of thinking. The non-experts did not mention this issue.

"People do not develop themselves. Mid-aged people do not learn foreign languages and computing. Education and enlightenment, when you work and study simultaneously, is perceived as something not needed. Yet, this individual development would contribute to professional growth" (Interview No.E1).

The non-experts mentioned several causes of insecurity. Yet, only a few could rationally diferentiate between real threats and imagined threats. As one of the respondents, a psychologist, said:

"This is not a question about real security, but rather about perception and the sense of security. It is possible that in a certain situation there is a real threat, however, a person does not realise it and still feels safe. Alternatively, a person could be safe in reality, however, s/he could have various threats. For example, it is possible to form an image that a city is safe despite the fact that the crime rate is higher there than in other cities. Still, there could be a sense of security. Another city could be really safe, yet people could be afraid" (Interview No.7).

In general, only one cause of insecurity was perceived as hypothetical and hardly probable. External threats to the state, e.g. a possibility to be attacked by foreign states, was not treated seriously:

"Recently, I can not see [such a threat]. Only if the global war started. I do not think that someone could attack Lithuania… But nobody is protected from terro-

Dimensions	Illustrations
Economic security	"If you have hands and legs, you can find [a job], yet, there is no clear guarantee" (Interview No.E6). "An individual really feels unsafe… even if he lives in a safe state… he does not know what will be in the future… if he has no job and no income" (Interview No.E4). "The younger generation just after finishing their education, has problems in finding jobs" (Interview No.E2). "Major threats are associated with social stability, economic stability, and narrowing possibilities. They could be found only abroad" (Interview No.E1).
Social security	"A person could hardly live on his pension if he had no relatives. These people are really unsafe. Even in respect to health care they are not safe" (Interview No.E2). "Very often an individual takes a job for a minimal salary, has no guarantees, receives a salary 'in an envelope'. He does not think about the consequences when he will be retired, how big his pension will be" (Interview No.E4).
Security from various epidemics	"We should speak about security in a broader sense. Growing drug abuse, and – AIDS… This becomes an important problem for the state and the individual" (Interview No.3).

rism" (Interview No.5).

Dimensions	Illustrations
Economic security	"The majority of young people leave Lithuania because they do not feel safe. They cannot earn their living" (Interview No.3). "The most important, I think, is the possibility to lose a job. [You are not sure] how your boss will treat you" (Interview No.8).
Psychologial security	"Psychological security I imagine [is important] at work. When you are forced not to do what you like or what you are able to do. You are psychologically affected and they want to prove that at any moment you will not be able to do your job properly and you can lose your job not because of the fact that you are not able to do it" (Interview No.2).
Physical security	"I do not walk at nights because I feel afraid. I want to live a long life. Someone could ask you for something, and if you refuse… Of course it would be better if you die at once" (Interview No.5). "It is important to come home and not find the door open" (Interview No.4). "Crime and drugs come together" (Interview No.1).
Social security	"I want to live to retire. If I live to that age luckily, I will say that I lived safely in Lithuania" (Interview No.5). "One boss directly tells me that he will fire me… He is not the only one" (Interview No.8). "I think that I can get no job, no social guarantees, I can get ill" (Interview No.2).

Major sources of insecurity are summarised in Tables 8 and 8A.

Table 8. **Causes of Insecurity. Expert Opinions.**
Table 8 A. **Causes of Insecurity. Non-Expert Opinions.**

Summarising, it could be said that the experts use a broader definition of causes of insecurity. They point out that global problems as well as every-day life problems in Lithuania influence the sense of security and the real situation in the state. The non-experts mention state problems too; however, the key problem is their personal experiences. When compared with the data of public opinion polls, the same problems are pointed out as the most important: social guarantees, employment, and physical safety. Both public opinion polls and the qualitative research show that the issues of internal security are much more important than the external ones.

3. Means to Ensure Security

The respondents were asked to elaborate on what guarantees their security, both individual and state. The respondents listed various ways to protect security. However, an important finding was that experts and non-experts gave priority to

different factors responsible for security. The non-experts stressed the importance of the state and the Government, while the experts emphasised the role of the individual

Actors	Illustrations
Individual	"[An individual] should himself create a safe environment. The second factor would be state policy" (Interview No.E3). "An individual himself could do a lot to secure himself. Firstly, in the professional area. When a lower social class is concerned, they need more education and understanding that the state does not create security. Everything depends on them, if they are able to earn their living and to resist the actions of the state which sometimes are not legal. They are safe if they protect their rights" (Interview No.E1). "A lot of people say that the state should regulate the relations between the employee and the employer. Yet, when the state starts to interfere, both sides lose. If the state's requirements for an employer are too high, the labour market starts 'limping'. Then competition among companies decreases" (Interview No.E2). "It is a common business of an individual and the state" (Interview No.E7).
State	"Isolation is one of the most negative factors for state security. We will be safe only when we are in a certain alliance" (Interview No.E3). "Security is safeguarded if the state participates actively in various international organisations… organisations associated with security. Of course, cultural and scientific interaction is important" (Interview No.E2).

himself/herself. According to the experts, the role of an individual is crucial when we speak about individual safety (see Tables 9 and 9A).

Dimensions	Illustrations
Individual security	"The state should create better conditions. This is security because an individual should be certain about his income, he should not be afraid that he will lose a job and have problems because of that" (Interview No.1).
State security	"Firstly, the Government should ensure external safety, secondly the Special Investigation Service should care about it. The police [should care] about [safety on] the streets. Then, decent business [is important], not Mafia" (Interview No.9).

Table 9. **What Should Be Done in Order to Ensure People's Security in Lithuania? Expert Opinions.**
Table 9A. **What Should Be Done in Order to Ensure People's Security in Lithuania? Non-Expert Opinions.**

As it was already mentioned, ordinary people expect all kinds of guarantees form the state. The experts outline the role of an individual, the community, and the state. In addition, they point to a negative influence of state interference into the social sphere. Liberally oriented respondents say that the state should create necessa-

ry conditions for e individuals to make choices.

.... Both

Means of ensuring security	Illustrations
In the social sphere, the state can change its policies, undertake reforms, and expand social guarantees	"Via taxes, the state redistributes a part of the value-added to perform its functions and compensate the disproportion created by market and capital, e.g. to give all the inhabitants, regardless of their social status and wealth, access to education" (Interview No.E8). "If the state wants to guarantee security, it must put the legal basis and the laws into order. The state is responsible and can do a lot in guaranteeing internal security" (Interview No.E4). "In principle, and not only in Lithuania, the state cannot guarantee full security" (Interview No.E7).
Undertake social reforms in the area of physical security	"The government's powers are not small in ensuring, first of all, the institutional basis to create security" (Interview No.E4).
In the area of state security	"We are now trying to have contacts with these structures – NATO and the EU"(Interview No.E3). "We can look for defence from these dangers only in collective security and defence structures" (Interview No.2). "Nowadays the world is too much interconnected. The EU could be the guarantor of security of both kinds" (Interview No. E4).

groups of the respondents point to very concrete methods how to ensure security (see Tables 10 and 10A).

Means of ensuring security	Illustrations
In the social area, the state can change its policies, undertake reforms, and expand social guarantees	"Possibly, something depends on an individual too, but today, if you work in a state organisation, everything depends on the state and on the leadership" (Interview No.1). "To reform, to provide more funds" (Interview No.1). "The state can provide social security, as in other states - but not in Lithuania - so that people need not starve. So that a pensioner could live a worthy life, so that a new-born child has future guarantees of education and would be able to create a family even without having the money to pay for it all himself" (Interview No.2). "The social area is the state's responsibility. No one can ensure social security by himself, without external security" (Interview No.2).
Undertake social reforms in the area of physical security	"If these social reforms are carried out appropriately, then street crime would go down and security would be guaranteed. At least minimal security" (Interview No.1).
In the area of state security	"[To integrate] into Western structures. There are more stable [social] systems there… As far as integration into the West is concerned, the state's chief function should be to take care of all negotiations while reflecting Lithuania's interests" (Interview No.9).

Table 10. **What Is the Role of the State in Ensuring Security? Expert Opinions.**
Table 10A. **What is the Role of the State in Ensuring Security? Non-Expert Opinions.**

Expert and non-expert opinions do not differ much when it comes to the evaluation of the role of the state. First, internal and external policies are seen as separate. In the area of internal policy, the non-experts turn their attention to the most insecure areas and confidently indicate the means of improvement: appropriate policy, adequate financing, and development of reforms. Secondly, the experts and the non-experts have similar opinions about the integration into NATO and the EU. Basically, the non-experts positively value Lithuania's Western orientation. But the experts' evaluation is more sceptical:

"In this regard, the society's expectations are above the mark" (Interview No.E1).
"On the one hand, what the EU would bring to us – economic security and personal security, greater security of ownership. NATO membership – this is collective defence […] Although I am half-sceptical about EU membership" (Interview No.E2).

In evaluating the individual's capacity to ensure his own security, the non-

Means of ensuring security	Illustrations
Physical security can be guaranteed by avoiding dangerous situations or by undertaking defensive measures (training, weapons)	"We can't just all buy rifles and pistols to ensure our physical security. Again one must deal with this issue at several levels. In terms of physical security, an individual alone can do little. It more depends on the community, on the collective" (Interview No.E2).
Social security may be guaranteed via political activity	"If you have property, you must buy insurance. If you want a wise policy, you must go to elections and vote. If you don't like what the politicians are doing, join an organisation - go and do it yourself" (Interview No.E7). "From the point of view of professional security, trade unions show little activity" (Interview No.E4).
The role of the state	"The role of the state is very important. According to the principle of subsidiarity - what a single human being cannot do, the state can do" (Interview No.E7).

experts gave a wide range of answers, which partly coincided with the experts' opinion (see Tables 11 and 11A).

Means of ensuring security	Illustrations
Physical security can be ensured by avoiding dangerous situations or by taking defensive measures (training, weapons)	"One must do this minimum to secure his own security…One can train…Don't go to some places" (Interview No.1). "Don't deal with the bad guys, the Mafiosi" (Interview No.9).
One can ensure social security by being politically active	"Somehow politically… be more active during the elections" (Interview No.1).
You can ensure the state's security by entering the military service	"Go to the Army...Ladies may go to voluntary service… There are some professions, for example, nurses" (Interview No.1).
You can ensure psychological security by educating yourself	"Express your normal opinion and educate those who don't know. This is the function of education. Special broadcasting should be done on public television and radio, questioning those who know and are educated but not just people from the street" (Interview No.9).

Table 11. **What Is the Role of the Individual in Ensuring his/her Security? Expert Opinions.**
Table 11 A. **What Is the Role of the Individual in Ensuring his/her Security? Non-Expert Opinions.**

Non-experts do not underestimate individual's capacities to ensure individual security. Although they give priority to the state in the areas where only the state can guarantee certain policy, they also adequately estimate individuals' abilities. The experts believe that an individual in Lithuania can do much more to ensure his/her own security.

4. External Security

At times external security is called the true or hard security linked to military and defence issues. But the experts interviewed did not draw a clear line between external and internal security. External security conditions both internal security and

the security of individuals. This is the major difference in the evaluation between the

Types of threats	Illustrations
Potential threats	"Every state did face, is facing, and will face threats. And especially our state, which connects the East and the West, as I say, it is located on a pathway" (Interview No.E3). "I think that these threats exist. And the neighbours are menacing, Russia, Belarus and others. And terrorism is possible" (Interview No.E7). "Non-democratic tendencies in neighbouring Eastern states will always have threat [potential] to Lithuania, first of all because of the processes that are taking place there" (Interview No.E5).
Economic threats	"I can see economic threats. Meaning, that foreign capital can destroy some companies in Lithuania producing similar products. Big corporations do this especially. They [come] not only from the East, but also from the West" (Interview No.E2). "Speaking about real threats to the statehood, this is the loss of economic and partly political sovereignty because of globalisation" (Interview No.E8).
Threats from Russia	Many people speak about Russia as a potential external threat to Lithuania, but it is impossible to predict how things will turn out in the future. "I don't see a potential threat here. [Russia is] not [a threat] as an actor, but [a threat] structurally - [it is causing] soft security threats. Narcotics contraband, Kaliningrad district, AIDS, social instability – such factors emanate threat, but not actions by Russia as an actor in the international arena and the like" (Interview No.E4).

experts and non-experts.

However, the opinions of the experts and non-experts often compare on potential external threats (a certain lack of confidence is noticed among ordinary people when talking about external threats) (see Tables 12 and 12A).

Table 12. **Perceptions of External Threats. Expert Opinions.**

The experts clearly see external threats; they name them precisely not limiting themselves to military aspects only. In fact, they emphasise that currently a military

invasion is unlikely. Therefore, external economic, social, and criminal threats crea-

Types of threats	Illustrations
There are no threats / it is difficult to say	"It is difficult to answer about global issues to every individual. Because in everyday life we do not understand such threat, unless it becomes evident. But making prognosis just like this - [it is] difficult … I wouldn't think that threats to us are very acute at the moment … And from the side of Russia, the threat is not so acute." (Interview No.1) "So far I can't imagine such threats. Neither could America imagine such invasions costing so many lives less than a year ago." (Interview No.2) "Lithuania has no threats, lest it accidentally gets caught into [conflicts], because we are neither the East, nor the West - just a place between the roads" (Interview No.4).
Threat from Belarus	"The most depressing situation is from the outside, the most dangerous [thing] is stagnation in Belarus. Everything is calm there; everybody gets his/her piece and doesn't worry about anything. And people tired from all murky transformations may wish a choice like in Belarus. This could be the biggest threat. People […] idealise Soviet times, it appears to them that [life] was so good back then. But let them remember, was it really so good. I remember myself - it wasn't so ideal" (Interview No.9).
Threat from Russia	"In case of a major invasion. But where from might it come? Everybody understands that [it might come] from Russia, maybe from Belarus" (Interview No.9).

ted by the process of globalisation are becoming far more important. Just like non-experts, politicians, civil servants, and political scientists distrustfully evaluate Belarus and Russia because of the nature of their regimes and economic-social instability.

Table 12 A. **Perceptions of External Threats. Non-Expert Opinions.**

In one of the interviews with the experts, a respondent even indicates some threat posed by Belarus in relation to the general internal situation of Lithuania. However, the experts do not discard the possibility of terrorist acts against Lithuania. Although some of them say that this threat is not important for Lithuania which is a small state, they emphasise that this phenomenon is hard to predict and describe.

Public opinion polls indicate that Lithuanians do not see real external threats to their country. But Russia and Belarus are considered as a potential source of threat. This opinion is corroborated in responses to the questions about potential benefits for Lithuania becoming a member of the EU and NATO.

The 1998 and 2000 public opinion surveys aimed to clarify how Lithuania's residents assess Lithuania's membership in NATO. In respondents' opinion, Lithuania's membership in NATO would guarantee the progress of the Lithuanian Army and Lithuania's security. According to sociological surveys, in 1988, 66 percent of respondents shared that opinion, while in 2000, 51 percent were of this opinion. Importantly, 53 percent of the respondents in 1998 and 41 percent of the respondents in 2002 pointed out that Lithuania would become more attractive to foreign investment. While 50 percent and 37 percent correspondingly said that the possibilities of

financial support would increase after Lithuania joins NATO.

One of the important tendencies is that a lot of people think that Lithuania's membership in NATO have a negatively affect its relationships with Russia and Belarus. In 1998, 44 percent of the respondents who had an opinion about that issue said that Lithuania's membership would negatively affect its relations with Russia, and 36 percent - relations with Belarus. In 2000, 53 percent of the respondents thought about the negative effect on relations with Russia, and 50 percent - with Belarus.

.... T h e data of the qualitative research supports the results of public opinion polls. In gene-

	Illustrations
The EU	"When Lithuania joins the EU, we'll leave the so called Soviet isolation for ever" (Interview No.3). "Membership in the EU will give us economic security from unexpected winds and crises… This is true of the security of our borders because the EU has common requirements. The security from narcotics will be higher because of the Interpol and Europol. In the EU, individual security will be higher, and the ecological security too…I have in mind health as well"(Interview No.2). "In the EU, the choice is bigger; job and possibilities are different, market is different. I do not even speak about the material support, the financial support that we could get from them. There are some disadvantages too" (Interview No.5). "Membership in the EU, if we speak about hard and soft security, which is hard to define, means economic security" (Interview No.7). "To my mind, we expect too much from the EU and NATO. We think that if we join NATO, one aspect of security will be guaranteed, while if we join the EU, the other aspect is guaranteed, economic and social welfare. Yet, the sense of insecurity of individuals and society will not disappear after joining the EU" (Interview No.1).
NATO	"In a larger sense, security is directly related to NATO. It is one of the most important guarantees of our statehood and the final establishment of independence… It influences our economy. I mean the investment" (Interview No.3). "Advantages are obvious: the collective security system means judicial responsibilities to defend Lithuania in case of aggression against it. Each person in Lithuania feels protected at least from external threats" (Interview No.5). "Article No.5 says that the invasion of one country means the invasion of all NATO" (Interview No.7).

ral, expert opinions about the role of the EU and NATO in securing Lithuania's security are rather sceptical, while the opinions of non-experts are more positive (see

	Illustrations
EU	"The EU - this is economic security, I'd think…you'd be sure about jobs. When there are many jobs, there is no feeling of insecurity" (Interview No.1). "Connections, possibilities for people to interact. Just a simple case - to go or to come back. Give yourself social guarantees, to earn something somewhere" (Interview No.4). "Theoretically security should increase. [Insecurity would only be if there is] intervention from the outside. And local problems, this is not [the case], they should be solved by us" (Interview No.6). "Joining the EU and especially NATO, according to me, would bring certain psychological confidence for investors or people who might be willing to come to Lithuania from elsewhere" (Interview No.7). "People would have more jobs. There are strong connections with the increase in security as well. More investment is likely [to come] after joining NATO. And the EU - this is a bigger market for Lithuanian producers" (Interview No.8).
NATO	"Military [security]… [Local people] would think that there is something that defends them. Lithuanian people do not yet trust the Lithuanian Army to such an extent" (Interview No.1). "NATO needs developed states and, no doubt, politically stable, democratic [states], and stable democracy cannot be ensured without a strong economy, and a strong economy can be achieved via the EU" (Interview No.1). "After joining NATO, security would definitely improve because there would be some security of the state, so that other states would stand on the side of Lithuania in the case of aggression and would defend it" (Interview No.3). "So that nobody attacks our homeland and a person feels more secure" (Interview No.8). "NATO is the only panacea, there are no alternatives. There is one stereotypical mode, there is no choice" (Interview No.9).

Tables13 and 13A).

Table 13. **The Role of the EU and NATO in Ensuring Lithuania's Security. Expert Opinions.**
Table 13A. **The Role of the EU and NATO in Ensuring Lithuania's Security. Non- Expert Opinions.**

Evaluating the role of the EU and NATO, the experts see very many aspects of security – from military to individual. Meanwhile, the non-experts essentially link Lithuania's membership in NATO with military security, membership in the EU – with growth in economic well-being. But they do not indicate a possible negative impact of the membership. To a certain extent, the claim of expert No.1 that Lithuanian people expect too much from the EU and NATO has been proven.

Sources	Illustrations
Radio	"When driving I listen to the radio" (Interview No.E3 and No.E7).
Television	"I watch 'Panorama', when I have time" (Interview No.E7).
Local newspapers (sceptical opinion)	"Our newspapers are the yellow press" (Interview No.E1, No.E2 and No.E5). "There are no normal newspapers in Lithuania. The major newspaper is the so - called 'tabloid" (Interview No. 7).
Professional activity, foreign press	"International meetings, conferences, foreign press, Internet [is important]" (Interview No.E2). "[I use] official information" (Interview No.E5). "Scientific studies" (Interview No.E7).
Talks with close relatives and colleagues	"[I receive information] from my old friends, colleagues" (Interview No.E2).
Personal experiences	"[I form my opinion on the basis of] my personal experience" (Interview No.E2, No.E7 and No.E5).

5. Sources of Information

Sources	Illustrations
Radio	"[I receive information] from the public radio" (Interview No.9).
Television	"In addition, I read newspapers and watch television, listen to the radio" (Interview No.5).
Newspapers	"[I receive information] from newspapers" (Interview No.9).
Parents	"Parents influence [....] to a certain extent" (Interview No.1).
Colleagues, close relatives	"[I receive information] from the talks with close relatives and colleagues" (Interview No.2). "From communication with people" (Interview No.9).
Personal experience	"[I form my opinion on the basis of] my personal experience or on what happened to my friends and close relatives" (Interview No.2). "Personal experience is [important]. What I saw, what I heard from my friends, neighbours, colleagues " (Interview No.5).

Toward the end of interviews, the respondents were asked to indicate information sources that shaped their opinion about security. The essential difference between the two reference groups is that the majority of the experts do not read or negatively evaluate Lithuanian newspapers and partly other mass media (see Tables 14 and 14A).

Table 14. **Sources of Information. Expert Opinions.**
Table 14A. **Sources of Information. Non-Expert Opinions.**

It is obvious that the profession and the life style of the experts form their

opinions. Then non-experts use easily accessible sources of information: Lithuanian mass media, television and radio. Importantly, mass media is treated critically quite often. Some of the respondents say that they do not always believe the information provided by mass media. On the other hand, the experts say that they use foreign mass media and trust it more than the local one. In addition, they use official data of various institutions and the Internet. An important source of information is direct participation in conferences, international forums. The experts say that they get a lot of information at work, in private talks with colleagues.

Conclusions

The data of the qualitative research on security delineate the same tendencies as the data of public opinion polls. The general tendency is that ordinary people rarely identify any real external threats. Yet, they especially stress the internal sources of insecurity – the growing rate of crimes, drug addiction, anxiety about the future and the job, and the insufficient health care system.

Ordinary people think of individual rather than state security. Individual security is much more important for them. Contrary to that position, experts point out that all three levels of security are inseparable and treat individual security as an important measure of state security.

Perceptions of ordinary people and experts about the role of the state and the individual in safeguarding the individual security are different. According to the experts, an individual could do a lot in the spheres of social, economic and physical security. The role of the state is limited to guaranteeing external security, fighting corruption and organised crime, and developing laws and institutions responsible for security. Contrary to the position of the experts, ordinary people tend to ascribe all the responsibility for safeguarding security to the state.

Experts pay more attention to ext-ernal threats to security. They point to the threats coming from the instability of neighbouring regimes in Russia and Belarus, and the threat of economic subordination. Nevertheless, membership in NATO and the EU is perceived to be the most important guarantee of security.

As this research shows, the micro security analysis can provide an interesting perspective, which can contribute to general security studies.