



The Role of Environmental Psychology in the Post-Pandemic Context

Teles Monteiro FSC^{1*} and Cabral AM²

¹Doctor of Philosophy, Adjunct Professor, Federal University of Delta do Parnaíba, Brazil

²Doctor of Philosophy, Professor at the Department of Philosophy, State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

***Corresponding author:** Felipe Sávio Cardoso Teles Monteiro, Doctor in Philosophy (UERJ). Adjunct Professor at the Federal University of Delta do Parnaíba -UFDPAR, Brazil; Email: felipesctm@hotmail.com

Received Date: June 01, 2022; **Published Date:** June 06, 2022

Abstract

One of the most important events of life is the transition from work to retirement. It might have negative and positive effects on health mentally and physically based on the lifestyles, and leisure activities adopted by the people. After retirement, most of the properties gained through the pre-retirement area might change and even be lost such as the social role. If the transition period is hard to get through, it might result in feeling lost, ineffective, and isolated. The current paper aims to present a literature review, focusing on different studies conducted in various countries, to get a general idea of how the transition period is going with outcomes. In addition, the article provides insight into the impact of leisure on adult well-being through a mixed comparison of cross-sectional studies on the topic. The paper also highlights the importance of retirement education and planning both before and after retirement, as recent findings on older adults suggest that trends in how to spend leisure time differently than in the past are changing. Therefore, further research is needed to be conducted to understand the impact of new leisure activities on well-being in later adulthood.

Keywords: Human Behavior; Sustainable Balance; Ethics of Environmental Care

Editorial

There is a strong cognitive challenge to observe that this principle of self-binding can be combined with the principle of fair sharing, a perspective that does not tell us how all generations can cooperate with each other while a contract is no longer possible if we assume that Jonas' approach is applied here [1]. Although these are challenging times, the human potential to maintain a sense of purpose during hardship has been convincingly described Frankl VE, et al. [2].

Various experiences provide persuasive evidence that people

routinely find or impose meaning and a sense of coherence during times of uncertainty [3,4].

However, empirical studies, in times of extreme and real adversity, are scarce and those that exist need greater care, since crises differ in several critical dimensions, such as duration, number of people affected, or regional specificity.

The Covid-19 we are currently facing, which include potential infection and hospitalization, severe economic losses, widespread adverse mental health impacts, and indeterminable timeframes for the full restoration of

conventional services.

We can highlight three person-environment interactions that were violently disrupted by Covid-19 and consider their likely impact on the experience of purpose: how we engage with work, how we engage in education, and how we deal with physical problems. Notably, these domains of interaction have been central to the environmental and ecological perspectives of psychology as well as to the study of purpose in life [5-7]. As uncertainties around this biohazard continue to proliferate, we briefly highlight how Covid-19 can impact every person-environment interaction in ways that are detrimental to the maintenance, development or enactment of goals.

There are long-standing studies in Environmental Psychology, which have discussed disasters of this proportion [8,9], predicting how people will interact with these new environmental challenges, even in the midst of a disaster. It is important to recognize that, unlike other calamities, no damage to the built environment was sustained. Indeed, the schools, neighborhoods, and workplaces in which individuals cultivated their sense of purpose remain intact. The challenge, then, is to meet this moment with a rigorous research agenda designed to inform how people can feel intentional when opportunities to meaningfully engage in their daily activities are altered.

Finally, just as the fight against this pandemic is likely to change societies in profound and permanent ways, we call for an openness to change for issues that will need to incorporate further discussion of the environment. As a resource for engagement in life, we look forward to paying attention to these person-environment interactions and discovering lasting ways to help people maintain a greater sense of responsibility and environmental care.

These high-risk situations, which involve a strong social or environmental impact, must be treated in a condition that requires a maximum degree of responsibility, so that they do not entail negative effects. The effects of technological action are, in many cases, difficult to predict, it is necessary to adopt conservative principles that take all these aspects into account.

This corroborates with a Jonasian concept of the precautionary principle, as foreseen in the fear heuristic, in which prudence and responsibility assume a preponderant role in decision-making and in the orientation of technological actions. For the long-term consequences for human health and ecological balance are still uncertain manifestations.

These elements evidenced by Environmental Psychology in providing and rethinking authentic conditions of life is the central objective of Jonasian thought that refer to the

importance, value and dignity of life so that we can build dignified human realities and processes, which recognize that life, for to be life, life is worth it.

The concepts proposed by Jonas H, et al. [10-19] (heuristics of fear and the imperative of responsibility) can be important elements for decisions to be taken by groups that discuss environmental issues, no other theory in philosophy has brought principles as clear as Jonas' proposal.

Finally, environmental ethics raises a relevant question: is a voluntary justice of constraint possible at a global level, a level that can be in accordance with the well-being of all generations and allow sustainability to remain within planetary limits? We can conclude here that we need to continue our investigations in several directions. For environmental ethics combining long-term sustainability, an analysis of the qualitative change of the economic system due to the possibility of new behaviors according to the Responsibility Principle has to be conducted. At the same time, we need to know the key role played by nature's resilience through the analysis of the dynamics of ecosystem services in relation to their unreduced production (evidence of thresholds for some real big changes - climate change, erosion of biodiversity, fisheries and etc. . .) [20].

References

1. Oliveira J (2014) Understanding Hans Jonas. Petropolis: Voices.
2. Frankl VE (1963) Man's search for meaning: Revised and updated. [S.l.]: WW Publisher.
3. Heine SJ, Proulx T, Vohs KD (2006) The meaning maintenance model: On the coherence of social motivations. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev* 10(2): 88-110.
4. Sedikides C, Wildschut T, Stepha E (2018) Nostalgia shapes and potentiates the future. *The social psychology of living well* 181-199.
5. Sundstrom E (1996) Environmental Psychology 1989-1994. *Annual review of psychology* 47(1): 485-512.
6. Winkel G, Seagert S, Evans GW (2009) An ecological perspective on theory, methods, and analysis in environmental psychology: Advances and challenges. *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 29(3): 318-328.
7. Ryff CD (2014) Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom* 83(1): 10-28.
8. Brown K, Westaway E (2011) Agency, capacity, and resilience to environmental change: lessons from human

- development, well-being, and disasters. Annual review of environment and resources 36: 231-342.
9. Seagert S, Winkel GH (1990) Environmental psychology. Annual review of psychology 41(1): 441-477.
 10. Jonas H (2004) The life principle: foundations for a philosophical biology. Petropolis: Voices,2004.
 11. Jonas H (2005a) Memories. Buenos Aires: Losada.
 12. Jonas H (2005b) Power or impotence of subjectivity. Barcelona: Paidos.
 13. Jonas HO (2006) Responsibility principle: essay on an ethics for technological civilization. Rio de Janeiro: Counterpoint.
 14. Jonas H (2009) The burden and blessing of mortality. Wendell Evangelista Soares Lopes translation. Principles 16(25): 265-281.
 15. Jonas H (2010) Matter, spirit and creation: cosmological data and cosmogonic conjectures. In: Philosophical Texts. Petropolis: Voices.
 16. Jonas H (2013) Technique, medicine and ethics: on the practice of the Responsibility Principle. Sao Paulo: Paulo.
 17. Jonas H (2015) The gnostic religion: the message of the alien God and the beginnings of Christianity. Boston: Beacon Press.
 18. Jonas H (2017) Philosophic essays: from ancient belief to technological man. Sao Paulo: Paulo.
 19. Sternberg RJ (2000) Cognitive psychology. Padua: Piccin.
 20. Dua M (2016) Responsibility for Life: A Descriptive View on Hans Jonas' Ethics. Philosophy 6(4): 191-198.