

Research Paper

From Ontological Security Towards Disaster Psychological Recovery: Scale Development and Validation



Saeedeh Asadi^{1*}, Ali Sharghi¹, Bahram Saleh Sedghpour²

1. Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Design, Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.

2. Department of Educational Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.



Citation Asadi S, Sharghi A, Saleh Sedghpour B. From Ontological Security Towards Disaster Psychological Recovery: Scale Development and Validation. *Health in Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly*. 2026; 11(3):233-246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32598/hdq.2026.657.1>

doi <http://dx.doi.org/10.32598/hdq.2026.657.1>

Article info:

Received: 14 Dec 2024

Accepted: 16 Aug 2025

Available Online: 01 Apr 2026

Keywords:

Housing quality, Security measures, Validation study, Multidimensional scaling, Earthquakes, Psychological recovery

ABSTRACT

Background: After the earthquake, communities faced various psychological challenges in safety and security assumptions and experienced ontological insecurity. Considering the role of ontological security and housing reconstruction on long-term psychological trauma recovery, the purpose of the research was based on the development and validation of a standard tool to measure this concept.

Materials and Methods: The research has a mixed method approach. In the qualitative phase, three primary earthquake survivors in Iran (the 1990 Manjil-Rudbar, the 2003 Bam, and 2017 Ezgeleh Sarpol-e Zahab earthquakes) participated, and preliminary concepts were defined using the Grounded Theory. In the second phase, the psychometric properties of the ontological security in the housing reconstruction framework were developed and examined through validity and reliability indices. In the quantitative phase, the developed questionnaire surveyed 322 earthquake survivors. Finally, a questionnaire of 48 items was developed.

Results: According to the findings in post-earthquake housing considering factors such as reconstruction flexibility, personalization, place familiarity, safety reassurance, physical-environmental characteristics affecting survivors' protective behavior, coping with physical-environmental concerns, safety perception through participation and interaction, safe refuges in the settlement and reconstruction acceleration would be effective in ontological security feeling and as a result psychological trauma recovery.

Conclusion: Achieving ontological security in housing is a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral need which is possible through environmental control, stability, trust, and continuity. The ontological security tool with a reliability value of 0.941 can measure this factor in post-earthquake housing reconstruction with the lens of psychological recovery of survivors.

* Corresponding Author:

Saeedeh Asadi, PhD.

Address: Department of Architecture, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Design, Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran.

E-mail: saeedeh.asadi@sru.ac.ir



Copyright © 2026 The Author(s);

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY-NC; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode.en>), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

Introduction

Natural disasters, such as earthquakes are life-threatening, and damage properties. Such experiences have some undesirable consequences, like psychological trauma and homelessness, and subsequently, ontological insecurity [1]. The term “ontological security” is conventionally defined as “security of being” [2] or “security not of the body but of the self, and the subjective sense of who one is” [3]. Giddens defines ontological security concept as the trust most humans have in maintaining their identity and the stability of material and social environments. The foundation of ontological security is a sense of confidence in people and things. “Being or phenomenological being in the world. This is an emotional phenomenon rooted in the unconscious” [4]. In the definition of ontological security, 4 major indicators are defined: social and material stability, implementing daily routines, feeling the most control over life because of freedom from surveillance, and building identities [5]. So, ontological security is related to the confident feeling, identity, stable cognitive and emotional frames and also a predictable and steady social and material environment [6, 7]. The sense of ontological security enables one to face life’s challenges and others from a fundamentally strong perspective [8]. Achieving this sense can be discussed and examined from different perspectives.

In contrast, in the event of a disaster according to Harries (2017), stressful events and damaging feelings of ontological security cause emotional distress and endanger the survivors’ long-term mental health [9]. Based on the findings, the degree of disturbance in ontological security is determined by the scope of the threat [10]. In disaster circumstances, Harries prioritizes ontological security over physiological and safety needs and cites the home as one of the three most important post-disaster protective cocoons [11]. He acknowledges that the feeling of having a safe home is part of ontological security and releases people from existential doubts. It provides the belief that living continues without any threat to familiar assumptions about time, space, identity, and well-being as the way it has always been [11]. Therefore, following stressful situations, home, as an influential factor in ontological security, is an essential source for creating a sense of confident or trust in the perceived insecure world.

Although the researchers have used the concept of ontological security to explore a range of topics, the domain of home and housing dominates this literature [12].

It has proven that, on the one hand, ontological security is rooted in mental health [13], and on the other hand, it is related to a sense of place [14] and having home [15]. Accordingly, housing is the central part of routine life and living place [16], home ownership [1, 17], interior space design, configuration, and layout [18]. Individual independence and resident’s participation in the housing [19] can improve the mental health of communities and individuals in the framework of home and housing. Through the lens of disaster, the concept of ontological security can be examined from the perspective of Dale and colleague. They have noted the widespread application of this concept in relation to disaster and risk. From their perspective, in the context of hazards and disasters, ontological security usually focuses on themes of home and place [20]. Following the disasters, the home’s destruction as the primary source of shelter for the body is interpreted as the “symbolic end of the world” in the subconscious [21]. So, survivors not only want to be secure from future natural disasters, but they also need to feel security [11]. Thus, this feeling is a natural and deep survivor psychological need, especially in communities with different traumatic experiences and a high level of lack of environmental uncontrollability, discontinuity of life, routines, and existential threat. The nature of responsive housing for mental health in the frame of ontological security is a new approach with various dimensions and has been less addressed.

Researchers have described ontological security theory as difficult to define and even more difficult to operationalize [22]. The conceptualization of ontological security also often seems inherently conservative [20]. For this reason, despite growing evidence of ontological security importance in disaster studies [8, 11], there needs to be a clearer understanding of approaches to create or restore this feeling in post-disaster reconstruction. In research on natural disasters, the concept of ontological security is often used to study how to predict the impact of vulnerability on challenging people’s knowledge about their physical environment [23]. Accordingly, the nature of responsive housing and the emotional and behavioral reasons that affect environmental biases are still unknown. In addition, it has been proven that survivors’ reactions to various types of disasters are different from the perspective of ontological security and emotional and behavioral responses [24]. As a result, the research purpose is conceptualizing a reconstructed ontological security within the framework of housing reconstruction after earthquake. In the line with this purpose, first, the research attempts to clarify the dimensions of ontological security in an earthquake setting. To achieve this, major earthquakes in Iran, including the 1990 Manjil-

Rudbar, the 2003 Bam, and the 2017 Ezgeleh Sarpol-e Zahab earthquakes, are studied. Second, in determining an approach to housing reconstruction that can provide a secure base for earthquake-affected individuals and communities as a source of desirable and sustainable places [25], the survivors' insights were investigated. This approach in housing reconstruction can be practical for affected communities to leave their past behind and go to the next stage of life to rebuild or improve their sense of identity [13]. The research finding leads to development and determining the psychometric properties of a scale for measuring the sense of ontological security in housing as a healing space after earthquake.

Materials and Methods

Scales express latent structures that measure hypothetical behaviours and attitudes and provide a theoretical

understanding of categories and concepts that are not directly measurable [26, 27]. With such tools, the momentum behind measuring and improving an issue can continue due to a lack of clarity on what constitutes and how best to target focused intervention efforts [28]. This research uses a mixed method approach with a survey method to recognize the nature of ontological security post-earthquake housing reconstruction. Developing the scale within the proposed framework by Boateng et al. [29] has been performed. The research design process is described in Figure 1.

Developing items

Developing or constructing a scale is collecting or writing the most appropriate items that make up the test questions [30] for the target population. Thus, using multiple items to measure latent structure can re-




Figure 1. The process of questionnaire development and validation

Table 1. The participants' sociodemographic status

Variables		Participants (n=34)			
		Age	Gender	Education Level	Socio Economic Status
Major earthquakes in Iran	The 1990 Manjil Rudbar	45-75	F: 6 M: 4	Undergraduate:8 Graduate:2 Postgraduate:0	Middle-high:3 Poor- low:7
	The 2003 Bam	30-68	F: 8 M: 6	Undergraduate:5 Graduate:7 Postgraduate:2	Middle- High:7 Poor- low:7
	The 2017 Ezgele Sarpol-e Zahab	18-71	F: 5 M: 5	Undergraduate:6 Graduate:3 Postgraduate:1	Middle- high:6 Poor- low:4

Health in
Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly

duce measurement error and lead to more accurate findings [29]. In this study, the initial research concepts and themes were collected using the knowledge and latent experiences of the earthquake survivors. The extraction and design of the items and phrases of the initial questionnaire consisted of three steps: a) Adopting the grounded theory (qualitative research and extracting appropriate phrases through content analysis technique); b) conducting desk study and extracting the phrases; and c) developing the initial questionnaire. The interviews were conducted in the form of a semi-structured questionnaire. In collecting data, in-depth interviews were conducted using purposive sampling with 34 of the 1990 Manjil-Rudbar, the 2003 Bam, and the 2017 Ezgele Sarpol-e Zahab earthquake survivors (Table 1). The inclusion criteria were earthquake experience and willingness to participate in the study. In addition, a focus group discussion was held to evaluate the accuracy of extracted themes and concepts. The Grounded Theory obtained 96 concepts, 29 main concepts, 9 themes, and 1 primary domain (Table 2).

The credibility of data was assured through peer checking and member checking. The findings were reviewed separately among the research team members through several discussions. Member checks occurred by summarizing the analyzed interviews and extracting codes from participants so the research team could be asked to incorporate their feedback and ideas for corrections.

Developing questionnaire

The initial questionnaire was scored on a 5-point Likert scale: strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, and strongly disagree. This section considers three concepts of content, face, and construct validity to investigate the questionnaire's validity.

Content validity

Content validation plays a key role in the development of any new instrument and provides evidence about the validity of an instrument by assessing the degree to which the instrument measures the targeted construct [31]. Lawshe's method was adopted for content validity analysis by calculating the content validity ratio (CVR). According to Lawshe, the minimum acceptable CVR is 0.78. The questionnaire items were evaluated by a group of 8 experts in housing architecture and environmental psychology. The items were rated as essential, functional, or unnecessary [32]. The revised binomial probability distribution for Lawshe's critical values was applied to excluded items deemed unnecessary. A scale content validity index was calculated for each theme (Table 3).

Face validity

To assess the understanding of the items based on the vocabulary of the respondents, 20 earthquake survivors evaluated the questionnaire items in the form of cognitive interviews as to whether they could understand the meaning and purpose of the questions correctly, the questions were relevant to the field of research; and finally, the scale length was appropriate. After reading the questionnaire, the participants answered the above questions and submitted their answers to the questionnaire in written form. In this phase, it was initially found that most respondents tended to be in the neutral range. So, this option was dropped, and the Likert scale was reduced to 4. Secondly, the readability of some items was corrected based on common words. Qualitative face validity was determined by a panel, including 4 architects and 4 environmental psychologists. These specialists evaluated the difficulty, inappropriateness, and ambiguity of the phrases. Their comments were used in the questionnaire. After the questionnaire was completed by the target group (20

Table 2. Themes and concepts derived from grounded theory

Main Domain			
Ontological security			
Primarily Themes and Concepts			
Personalization	Housing design, construction process and policies personalization; adaptable housing for users' individual and collective characteristics and norms; housing personalization alternatives for identity continuity.	Emergency escaping routes	Designing various open spaces; low-rise building; legibility and deletion obstacles in the escaping routes; avoiding heavy and dangerous features in the escaping routs; safe refuges toward inside and outside open spaces.
Safety perception	Reconstruction monitoring by responsible individual and organizations; awareness and training of survivors about housing security and safety; participation and interaction of survivors with involved organizations in housing reconstruction.	Overcoming environmental-physical concerns	Safe housing location/far from the most affected neighborhoods; addressing concerns related to home safety against future disasters; avoiding some housing architectural elements and form; attention to the role of architectural elements dimensions in possible future damages.
Housing flexibility/adaptability	Reviving spatial-physical familiarity; adaptable housing for different family structures and cultures; construction process and policy flexibility.	Place attachment	Place-based continuity; housing reconstruction satisfaction; greening reactions to crisis in housing yard and courts.
Environmental distress (solastalgia)	Rupture from the past place and identity; unpleasant changes.	Reconstruction acceleration	Continuation and revitalization of material and livelihood resources; participation and interaction with survivors; uncomfortable post-disaster temporary shelters.
Human dignity	Avoidance of certain cultural and gender biases; proportion of assistance in housing reconstruction with the households' economic structure; justice in reconstruction policies.		

participants and 8 experts), the face validity of the item was calculated using the impact score equation [33]. The impact scores equal to or greater than 1.5 are considered appropriate.

Construct validity

The final questionnaire was completed through random cluster sampling by 322 respondents from earthquake survivors. This phase was necessary to assess the construct validity and determine if the items represent their underlying conceptual structure well and measure it [34]. Construct validity was determined by the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO). The obtained KMO value was 0.938 (Table 4).

Questionnaire reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire was assessed using internal consistency and factor loading. Internal consistency or Cronbach alpha coefficients >0.7 represented acceptable reliability. The questionnaire was administered as a pretest to assess the reliability. The participants

in this section were 52 earthquake-affected survivors. Omitting three questions obtained a reliability value of 0.941.

Factor loading

Factor analysis was also used to examine the interrelationships of the set of variables, and item reliability was calculated using factor loading (Table 5). The obtained volume ≥ 0.5 indicates that the variance between the structure and its indices exceeds its measuring error variance. In addition, Kendall's W was used to assess agreement among participants, particularly reliability. It ranges from 0 (no agreement) to 1 (complete agreement) (Table 5).

Results

Determining the value of effective factors

Eigenvalue indices, the ratio of variance explained by each factor. Nine main factors with a specific value higher than one were obtained (Table 6).

Table 3. The content validity of themes used in the questionnaire

Theme	CVR
Personalization	0.79
Safety perception	0.96
Emergency escaping routes	0.93
Overcoming environmental-physical concerns	0.86
Housing flexibility/adaptability	0.83
Place attachment	0.94
Reducing environmental distress (Solastalgia)	0.8
Reconstruction acceleration	0.91
Human dignity	0.97

Health in
Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly

Standardizing the scale

To standardize the scale, descriptive statistics (maximum, mean, and minimum) plus skewness and kurtosis of the raw scores obtained for the 9 main factors within the range of 1 and -1 were used, with the results showing normal data distribution. Table 7 presents the results of calculating the scale's reliability separately for each factor. According to the Table 7, all factors have had a normal distribution.

Discussion

For the survivors, the earthquake is an existential experience that creates a gap between the past and the future. For this reason, how people overcome this experience is important, and they gain a sense of continuity and trust in their usual living environment [34]. Individuals and communities will have emotional, cognitive, or behavioral reactions in the face of disruption or reduction in the sense of ontological security [24].

Sense of control and familiarity

Cognitively, loss of control [35] is one of these consequences. Based on the findings, 2 factors, flexible housing and personalization in housing reconstruction, have been identified as factors affecting the sense of control. The post-earthquake housing reconstruction literature has acknowledged the need for long-term, flexible permanent housing to meet the needs and expectations of psychologically affected people [36]. In addition, in the relief process with the permanent housing reconstruction, the stakeholders need to be able to modify and adapt their homes [37]. Also, as Yang and Hui acknowledge, the reconstructed houses must meet traumatized people's different and unique needs and avoid creating new problems for families [38]. Therefore, environmental affordances to adjust to cognitive biases are one of the fundamental needs. Flexibility is a prerequisite for functions, such as personalization and, as a result, place familiarity in housing reconstruction. Personalization in housing reconstruction after disasters triggered by natural hazards has explicitly addressed the importance of designing a welcoming and familiar environment through housing

Table 4. KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	
0.938	Approx. chi-square	df	Sig.
	18585.490	3570	0

Health in
Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly

Table 5. Calculating kendall's W

Item	Mean	Kendall's W	Item	Mean	Kendall's W
1	292.1731	0.941	49	292.25	0.941
2	291.9615	0.941	50	292.2885	0.94
3	292.0192	0.941	51	292.25	0.941
4	291.8077	0.942	52	292.5769	0.94
5	292.1731	0.942	53	292.6731	0.941
6	292.25	0.941	54	292.5577	0.941
7	291.9615	0.940	55	292.3846	0.94
8	292.3846	0.941	56	291.9808	0.941
9	292.3269	0.941	57	292.1154	0.94
10	292.4231	0.941	58	292.0577	0.94
11	291.9615	0.941	59	292.3462	0.942
12	292.1731	0.941	60	292.1154	0.94
13	291.7308	0.941	61	291.8846	0.941
14	292.3846	0.94	62	291.7308	0.94
15	291.8077	0.94	63	291.8462	0.94
16	292.3269	0.94	64	291.8846	0.94
17	293.0192	0.941	65	291.8846	0.94
18	292.8654	0.941	66	291.9808	0.941
19	292.4423	0.941	67	292.4615	0.941
20	292.0769	0.94	68	292.1923	0.941
21	291.8654	0.94	69	292.4808	0.941
22	292.3269	0.941	70	292.2885	0.941
23	292.0192	0.941	71	292.2115	0.94
24	291.9808	0.94	72	292.4808	0.941
25	292.3077	0.941	73	292.2885	0.941
26	292.5577	0.941	74	292.2115	0.94
27	292.4038	0.941	75	292.1538	0.941
28	291.8077	0.941	76	292.3462	0.941
29	291.8654	0.941	77	292.4423	0.941
30	291.8462	0.94	78	292.0577	0.94
31	291.8269	0.94	79	291.9231	0.942
32	291.8462	0.94	80	291.7115	0.94

Item	Mean	Kendall's W	Item	Mean	Kendall's W
33	291.9231	0.941	81	291.9231	0.94
34	291.9423	0.94	82	292.25	0.941
35	292.5385	0.941	83	291.8654	0.94
36	292.4038	0.941	84	292.1731	0.94
37	292.4808	0.94	85	292.0385	0.941
38	292.0192	0.94	86	292.1923	0.941
39	292.1731	0.94	87	292.0192	0.941
40	292.0577	0.94	88	291.9231	0.941
41	292.0577	0.94	89	291.8269	0.941
42	292.3269	0.941	90	291.5962	0.941
43	292.4038	0.94	91	291.7308	0.941
44	292.0962	0.941	92	292.5	0.94
45	292.1731	0.94	93	292.2	0.941
46	292.5769	0.941	94	292	0.941
47	292.4615	0.941	95	292.0962	0.941
48	292.2308	0.940	96	291.8269	0.941

and space control [39]. Its importance has been seen in all stages of resettlement after the disaster [40, 41]. The possibility of personalization will help the emergence of lifestyles, identities, desires, and individual norms and will encourage survivors to participate in reconstruction.

One of the results of housing personalization is the revival of lost familiarity after disaster and destruction. Place familiarity acts as the initial stage of the process of connecting a place. It is “the ability to describe or even present an image of a place based on mental images, memories, and perception of the place dimensions, physical characteristics, and experiences” [42]. This concept provides the ability to create a sense of security about the place in the person [42]. Revival of place familiarity helps to perpetuate values, culture, attachments, and place ownership. Housing flexibility, personalization, and place familiarity contribute to the continuity of individual, collective, and environmental identity. These factors cause control over the housing and living environment and will ultimately help improve or create a sense of ontological security. This finding is valid on the findings of Hawkins and Maurer (2011). According to their research, in response to the physical and psy-

chological loss of home after Hurricane Katrina and the experience of ontological insecurity, survivors will experience nostalgia and a sense of tangible and intangible loss of places that previously provided them with a sense of security and stability [43]. Following that, people in post-earthquake places and communities are trying to restore ontological security by reviving place familiarity and place attachment.

Restoring trust and confident through a sense of safety and security

The next category of influential factors in housing reconstruction focusing on ontological security is related to the perceived threat. With the loss of ontological security after the earthquake, people experience psychological reactions such as fear, anxiety, stress [44] and cognitive uncertainty [45], and an increase in the prevalence of death-related thoughts [46]. To regain a sense of continuity, the disaster survivors must find trust in the environment [34]. For this reason, restoring ontological security, as a mental sense of existential security, can redirect the risk perception [23]. As a result, one of the vital needs in the housing reconstruction is a sense of confidence

Table 6. Total variance for extracted factors

Factor	Item	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Total	Variance (%)	Cumulative (%)
Personalization	Changing the housing functional spaces according to the household characteristics	7.013	8.251	18.222
	Changing and controlling the housing interior design according to the resident's culture and identity			
	Personalizing the reconstructed housing based on social and individual norms			
	Supervision of households on housing construction			
	Survivors' participation in the building process			
	Consultation and interaction with survivors in the housing design process			
	The possibility of creating the expected spatial privacy and boundaries in the housing			
	Adaptable housing according to resident's lifestyle			
	Flexible reconstruction process for victims' decision-making			
Reconstruction progress acceleration	Unpleasant social circumstances in the camps and temporary accommodation	4.332	5.096	23.318
	Trusting the responsible organizations and officials			
	The poor sanitary conditions in the camps and temporary shelters			
	Proximity to friends and relatives during temporary accommodation			
	Facilitating interaction with the involved teams and officials in the reconstruction			
	Land ownership			
	Household participation in the process of housing designing and building			
Physical-environmental characteristics affecting survivors' protective behaviour	Avoiding stairs in the design of escape routes	4.108	4.833	28.151
	Earthquake-resistant doors and windows			
	Avoiding masonry houses because of previous traumatic experiences			
	Avoiding low-height walls in the living spaces and heavy roofs in housing design			
	Avoiding high-rise houses because of escaping difficulties			
Place familiarity	Considering the roof form in the safety perception	4.022	4.732	32.883
	The housing interior design relationship to the residents' culture and identity			
	Continuation of the past valuable housing architecture			
	Considering the household orders in housing reconstruction policies,			
	Using familiar materials, colours, and forms			
Safety reassurance in housing	Considering the role of the natural landscape in housing yards	3.974	4.675	37.558
	Land ownership and stable living place			
	The earthquake-resistance and high-quality housing materials			
	The structural earthquake-resistance			
Coping with physical-environmental concerns	Training survivors about the changes that reduce the safety and strength of housing	3.575	4.206	41.764
	The responsible organizations continuous monitoring on the implementation of regulations and building codes in the construction process			
	Ensuring the earthquake-resistance of rooms and other spaces			
	Using light materials in the roof and walls			
Safety perception through participation and interaction	Using high-quality construction materials	3.315	3.9	45.664
	Considering the safe height of interior walls,			
	The doors and windows forms and safe dimensions			
	Satisfaction with the safety and strength of the housing with the survivors' supervision during the reconstruction process			
	Ensuring housing safety by survivors monitoring the housing and interior spaces construction			
	Interaction and consultation with victims in the housing design process			

Factor	Item	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Total	Variance (%)	Cumulative (%)
Reconstruction flexibility	The housing interior design controlling	3.273	3.85	49.514
	The flexibility of housing spaces layout and plan			
	The housing functional spaces flexibility			
	The possibility of making desired changes in the house yard and green spaces			
Safe refuges in the settlement	Wide openings toward open spaces	3.025	3.558	53.073
	Quick access to the yard			
	Possible escaping to the open space or yard			
	Adjacent wide and open alleys and streets			

Health in
Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly

Table 7. Descriptive statistics of extracted factors (n=322)

Variables	Statistic	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Mean±SD	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error
Personalization	38.1273±5.42803	-0.439	0.136	-0.9954	0.271
Reconstruction acceleration	28.3602±3.59223	-0.727	0.136	-0.103	0.271
Physical-environmental characteristics affecting protective behavior	24.6863±3.05062	-0.978	0.136	0.9946	0.271
Place familiarity	27.6460±3.67768	-0.586	0.136	0.008	0.271
Safety reassurance in housing	21.5031±2.67357	-0.737	0.136	-0.372	0.271
Coping with physical-environmental concerns	20.6366±2.87133	-0.608	0.136	0.250	0.271
Safety perception through participation and interaction	13.2795±2.37645	-0.706	0.136	0.103	0.271
Reconstruction flexibility	13.9720±2.13905	-0.805	0.136	0.447	0.271
Safe refuges in the settlement	16.9876±2.45581	-0.412	0.136	-0.855	0.271
Valid N (listwise)		-			

Health in
Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly

and reassurance in the living environment. The factors arising from this need have appeared more prominently than others. In housing reconstruction, this need has been highlighted in concepts, such as safety reassurance and safety perception. Safety reassurance in housing is a quality in the place reconstruction that people feel the probability of disaster reoccurrence is reduced due to the actions taken, or if a disaster occurs again, they can better respond to it and overcome the possible problems [47, 48]. This factor will be possible in housing through reassurance to housing materials and forms, architectural elements, structural earthquake resistance, survivors' training, and supervision of involved organizations in the construction process. Another psychological-cognitive need is safety perception through the participation of survivors and effective interaction with them. Safety perception includes knowledge about safety and risks

related to hazards, prevention techniques, and safety culture in practice [49]. In the meantime, it has been proven that the participation of victims in the planning, design, and construction of housing after the disaster and training during the reconstruction will be effective in the assumption of safety perception [50]. Facilitating interaction with relevant people and organizations in reconstruction leads to satisfaction and reassurance.

Wakefield and Elliott (2005) stated that people will have "action-focused" reactions to ontological insecurity. These reactions are practical, and strategies focused on them will include radical reactions in response to risk factors and individual actions [51]. The action-focused responses in housing reconstruction that can help restore confidence in housing and living environment are the existence of safe refuges and physical-environmental

characteristics affecting protective behavior. When a person faces disasters triggered by natural hazards or circumstances, reminding them, as well as the perception and assessment of disaster risks, act as a precondition for a behavior, such as emergency escaping or any other protective behavior. So, the more highly negative the earthquake consequences are on the residents' perception and sensitivity to risk, the more it is possible to choose a strategy to escape from buildings to prevent further damage [52]. Also, as a protective behavior, they think of solutions in their housing to reduce damage in future earthquakes. So, the type of structure and characteristics of buildings are known to be effective in protective behaviors [52]. From this point of view, fears arising from earthquakes play an essential role. Therefore, safe housing against earthquakes, safe roofs made of light materials, and spatial enclosures will effectively overcome these fears. As a result, considering such characteristics in the built environment helps to cope with the physical-environmental concerns arising from the earthquake. This psychological mechanism contributes to a sense of ontological security.

Stalishing the stability of the material and social environments

Another psycho-environmental need of earthquake survivors to achieve ontological security in housing is the stability of the material and social environments. Reconstruction acceleration is another factor that can affect stability by accelerating to have a living routine and home. After disasters triggered by natural hazards such as earthquakes, time is one of the influential factors that play a prominent role in the final results of recovery and reconstruction achievements. In this factor, environmental factors in temporary housing and human-social factors related to similar communities involved in reconstruction will be effective. It should be noted that ontological security in a traumatized condition can lead to severe coping mechanisms [8]. In addition, this factor contributes to individuals' sense of existential safety [53] resulting from the risk perception, which is represented and revived through wider concepts such as "home" [9], reviving life routines [52], as well as control and stabilization [13] to improve mental health and help feel self-support and recovery.

This study has enhanced understanding of ontological security in housing after earthquake; however, the identified limitations indicate a need for further empirical research in this area. First, since the research was cross-sectional, a multi-case study approach was chosen to increase the reliability of the findings. As a result,

the research did not consider any cultural perspectives while interpreting the data. Longitudinal research using ethnographic methods in a specific cultural context allows for a more comprehensive exploration of individuals' life histories and the concept of ontological security in post-disaster housing. Second, the role of gender in the responses was not considered in data collection. As a result, the final findings are more general than gender-based perspectives. Considering this issue, it could have provided additional avenues for understanding the gender-based responses. Third, because in all earthquakes studied, survivors used government loans and assistance to rebuild their homes, there is a possibility of some bias in the responses.

Conclusion

In the reconstruction, 9 main factors will be influential and lead to measure and ensure ontological security in housing reconstruction after the earthquake. It seems that factors, such as physical-environmental characteristics affecting protective behavior, safety reassurance, coping with physical-environmental concerns caused by the earthquake, safety perception through participation and interaction, and safe refuges in the settlement can facilitate protective behaviors and are important in facing risk perception, fears, anxiety and shattered assumptions related to earthquake experiences. As a result, the feeling of safety and security disrupted during the disaster can be restored, and help survivors recover and heal. In addition, factors, such as reconstruction flexibility and personalization to control over the living space can reduce learned helplessness, which is one of the main psychological consequences of the earthquake psychological trauma. These factors can induce the self-efficacy feeling that is one of the primary psychological recovery. Also, place familiarity and reconstruction progress acceleration help the continuity and stability of the survivors whose earthquake has disrupted their lives and identity.

This scale will have both research and programmatic utility and be useful for researchers interested in housing reconstruction. In addition, it can be adopted in various affected communities to understand how to create or improve ontological security as an important factor in earthquake psychological trauma recovery. For future studies in this field, it is recommended to adjust this scale to other types of disasters. In addition, longitudinal research in a specific cultural context would also have the potential to expand this scale.

Ethical Considerations

Compliance with ethical guidelines

The present study was conducted based on the principles of research ethics. In the qualitative part of data collection, all participants verbally gave their consent to participate in the research. All interviews were conducted under the supervision of a trauma psychologist. Participants were free to leave the research process at any time. They were also informed that all their identity and personal information would be kept confidential.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' contributions

All authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study, data collection and analysis, interpretation of the results, and drafting of the manuscript. Each author approved the final version of the manuscript for submission.

Conflict of interest

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the survivors of the Bam earthquake and the experts involved in the survivors' psychological recovery who helped them in conducting this research.

References

- [1] Stonehouse D, Threlkeld G, Theobald J. Homeless pathways and the struggle for ontological security. *Housing Studies*. 2021; 36(7):1047-66. [DOI:10.1080/02673037.2020.1739234]
- [2] Kinnvall C. Feeling ontologically (in) secure: States, traumas and the governing of gendered space. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 2017; 52(1):90-108. [DOI:10.1177/0010836716641137]
- [3] Krickel-Choi NC. The concept of anxiety in ontological security studies. *International Studies Review*. 2022; 24(3):viac013. [DOI:10.1093/isr/viac013]
- [4] Giddens A. *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press; 1990. [Link]
- [5] Kinnvall C, Mitzen J. Ontological security and conflict: The dynamics of crisis and the constitution of community. *Journal of International Relations and Development*. 2018; 21(4):825-35. [DOI:10.1057/s41268-018-0161-1]
- [6] Cupać J. The anxiety dilemma: Locating the Western Balkans in the age of anxiety. *Journal of Regional Security*. 2020; 15(1):7-38. [DOI:10.5937/jrs15-25359]
- [7] Ejodus F. *Crisis and ontological insecurity: Serbia's anxiety over Kosovo's secession*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan; 2020. [DOI:10.1007/978-3-030-20667-3]
- [8] Gustafsson K, Krickel-Choi NC. Returning to the roots of ontological security: Insights from the existentialist anxiety literature. *European Journal of International Relations*. 2020; 26(3):875-95. [DOI:10.1177/1354066120927073]
- [9] Harries T. Ontological Security and Natural Hazards. In: Sayers P, editor. *Oxford research encyclopedia of natural hazard science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2027. [DOI:10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.013.279]
- [10] Campbell MC, Inman JJ, Kirmani A, Price LL. In times of trouble: A framework for understanding consumers' responses to threats. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 2020; 47(3):311-26. [DOI:10.1093/jcr/ucaa036]
- [11] Harries T, McEwen L, Wragg A. Why it takes an 'ontological shock' to prompt increases in small firm resilience: Sensemaking, emotions and flood risk. *International Small Business Journal*. 2018; 36(6):712-33. [DOI:10.1177/2F0266242618765231]
- [12] Kirkman M, Keys D, Bodzak D, Turner A. 'I just wanted somewhere safe': Women who are homeless with their children. *Journal of Sociology*. 2015; 51(3):722-36. [DOI:10.1177/1440783314528595]
- [13] Henwood BF, Redline B, Semborski S, Rhoades H, Rice E, Wenzel SL. What's next? A grounded theory of the relationship between ontological security, mental health, social relationships, and identity formation for young adults in supportive housing. *Cityscape*. 2018; 20(3):87 [PMCID]
- [14] Hartmann M. Home is where the heart is? Ontological security and the mediatization of homelessness. In: K. Lundby K, editor. *Mediatization of communication*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter; 2014. [DOI:10.1515/9783110272215.641]
- [15] Mac Ginty R. Circuits, the everyday and international relations: Connecting the home to the international and transnational. *Cooperation and Conflict*. 2019; 54(2):234-53. [DOI:10.1177/0010836719832343]
- [16] Power ER. Insecure housing and the ongoing search for ontological security: How low-income older women cope. *Housing, Theory and Society*. 2023; 40(2):170-91. [DOI:10.1080/14036096.2022.2118370]
- [17] Harpin SB, Murray A, Rice M, Rames K, Gilroy C. Feasibility of a mental health screening and brief intervention shelter intake procedure for runaway/homeless youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2016; 58(2):S53-4. [DOI:10.1016/j.jado-health.2015.10.119]
- [18] Bollo C. Designed for home: Opportunities for enhanced ontological security in permanent supportive housing apartments. *Journal of Interior Design*. 2022; 47(4):49-67. [DOI:10.1111/joid.12235]

- [19] Johnson LC. The community/privacy trade-off in supportive housing: Consumer/survivor preferences. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*. 2009; 20(1):123-33. [DOI:10.7870/cjcmh-2001-0007] [PMID]
- [20] Dale B, Veland S, Hansen AM. Petroleum as a challenge to arctic societies: Ontological security and the oil-driven 'push to the north'. *The Extractive Industries and Society*. 2019; 6(2):367-77. [DOI:10.1016/j.exis.2018.10.002]
- [21] Davis I, Alexander D. *Recovery from disaster*. London: Routledge; 2015. [DOI:10.4324/9781315679808]
- [22] Banham R. Emotion, vulnerability, ontology: Operationalising 'ontological security' for qualitative environmental sociology. *Environmental Sociology*. 2020; 6(2):132-42. [DOI:10.1080/23251042.2020.1717098]
- [23] Wiegel H, Warner J, Boas I, Lamers M. Safe from what? Understanding environmental non-migration in Chilean Patagonia through ontological security and risk perceptions. *Regional Environmental Change*. 2021; 21:43. [DOI:10.1007/s10113-021-01765-3]
- [24] Fawaz RS, Bourliataux-Lajoie S, Roessner A, Okazaki S. What do we know about consumers' ontological security in disaster scenarios? *International Journal of Consumer Studies*. 2023; 47(4):1483-99. [DOI:10.1111/ijcs.12926]
- [25] Asadi S, Sharghi A, Mottaki Z, Salehsedghpour B. Investigating the role of risk perception in place-based responses: Case studies of the 2003 Bam and 2017 Ezgeleh-Sarpol Zahab earthquakes. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*. 2023; 14(3):349-65. [DOI:10.1108/IJDRBE-08-2021-0079]
- [26] DeVellis RF. *Scale development: Theory and applications*. 4th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications; 2016. [Link]
- [27] Fabrigar LR, Ebel-Lam A. Questionnaires. In: Salkind NJ, editor. *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2007. [Link]
- [28] Afulani PA, Diamond-Smith N, Golub G, Sudhinaset M. Development of a tool to measure person-centered maternity care in developing settings: Validation in a rural and urban Kenyan population. *Reproductive Health*. 2017; 14:118. [DOI:10.1186/s12978-017-0381-7] [PMID]
- [29] Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quinonez HR, Young SL. Best practices for developing and validating scales for health, social, and behavioral research: A primer. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2018; 6:149. [DOI:10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149] [PMID]
- [30] Chadha NK. *Applied psychometry*. New Delhi: Sage Publications; 2009. [DOI:10.4135/9788132108221]
- [31] Morell L, Bathia S, Koo BW, Wilson M, Gochyyev P, Smith R. Developing and gathering validity evidence for an instrument to measure how high school students identify as researchers. *Research in Science Education*. 2025; 55:359-82. [DOI:10.1007/s11165-024-10194-1] [PMID]
- [32] Lak A, Aghamolaei R, Baradaran HR, Myint PK. Development and validation of elder-friendly urban spaces questionnaire (EFUSQ). *BMC Geriatrics*. 2019; 19(1):336. [DOI:10.1186/s12877-019-1355-0] [PMID]
- [33] Crosby R, DiClemente S. *Research methods in health promotion*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2006. [Link]
- [34] Warner J. Enschede cries—Restoring ontological security after a fireworks disaster. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. 2021; 59:102171. [DOI:10.1016/j.ijdrr.2021.102171]
- [35] Beck JT, Rahinel R, Bleier A. Company worth keeping: Personal control and preferences for brand leaders. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 2020; 46(5):871-86. [DOI:10.1093/jcr/uczo40]
- [36] Dikmen N. User requirements and responsible reconstruction. In: Lizarralde G, Cassidy J, Davidson C, editors. *Rebuilding after Disasters from emergency to sustainability*. Spon Press; 2012. [Link]
- [37] Wir-konas AG. Flexibility and incremental approach in post-disaster housing reconstruction. Development of incremental SI (structure-infill) housing for Low-Income population. Malaysia: Northumbria University and Universiti Teknologi Malaysia; 2016. [Link]
- [38] Yang B, Hui X. Research on the feasibility of modular residence based on post-earthquake reconstruction. *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Architecture: Heritage, Traditions and Innovations (AHTI 2019)*. 2019:397-401. [DOI:10.2991/ahti-19.2019.74]
- [39] Dev KN, Das AK. Sheltering emergencies: Design development process of temporary housing in post-disaster settlement by community participation. *Proceedings of NordDesign 2020*. 2020:11-14. [Link]
- [40] Aubrey D. Response to rapid change: Post-tsunami shelter in Sri Lanka. *Open House International*. 2008; 33(2):32-9. [DOI:10.1108/OHI-02-2008-B0005]
- [41] Lizarralde G. Post-disaster low-cost housing solutions. In: Lizarralde G, Johnson C, Davidson C, editors. *Rebuilding after disasters from emergency to sustainability*. London: Spon Press; 2010. [DOI:10.4324/9780203892572] [PMID]
- [42] Hammitt WE, Backlund EA, Bixler RD. Place bonding for recreation places: Conceptual and empirical development. *Leisure Studies*. 2006; 25(1):17-41. [DOI:10.1080/02614360500098100]
- [43] Hawkins RL, Maurer K. 'You fix my community, you have fixed my life': The disruption and rebuilding of ontological security in New Orleans. *Disasters*. 2011; 35(1):143-59. [DOI:10.1111/j.1467-7717.2010.01197.x] [PMID]
- [44] Assadi S, Sharghi A, Mottaki Z, Saleh Sedghpour B. [Investigating the role of housing reconstruction in healing traumatic consequences of a disaster; the case of the 2003 Bam earthquake (Persian)]. *Soffeh*. 2024, 34(104):55-68. [DOI:10.48308/sofeh.2024.104353]
- [45] Shen L, Hsee CK, Talloen JH. The fun and function of uncertainty: Uncertain incentives reinforce repetition decisions. *Journal of Consumer Research*. 2019; 46(1):69-81. [DOI:10.1093/jcr/ucy062]
- [46] Schimel J, Hayes J, Williams T, Jahrig J. Is death really the worm at the core? Converging evidence that worldview threat increases death-thought accessibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2007; 92(5):789. [DOI:10.1037/0022-3514.92.5.789] [PMID]
- [47] Donovan J. *Designing to heal: Planning and urban design response to disaster and conflict*. Clayton: CSIRO Publishing; 2013 [DOI:10.1071/9780643106475]

- [48] SafeOpedia. Workplace safety perception. Edmonton: SafeOpedia; 2019. [\[Link\]](#)
- [49] Opdyke A, Javernick-Will A, Koschmann M. A comparative analysis of coordination, participation, and training in post-disaster shelter projects. *Sustainability*. 2018; 10(11):4241. [\[DOI:10.3390/su10114241\]](#)
- [50] Valente R, Pertegas SV. Ontological insecurity and subjective feelings of unsafety: Analysing socially constructed fears in Italy. *Social Science Research*. 2018; 71:160-70. [\[DOI:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.11.007\]](#) [\[PMID\]](#)
- [51] Wakefield S, Elliott SJ. Environmental risk perception and well-being: effects of the landfill siting process in two southern Ontario communities. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982). 2000; 50(7-8):1139-54. [\[DOI:10.1016/s0277-9536\(99\)00361-5\]](#) [\[PMID\]](#)
- [52] Shani G. Human security as ontological security: A post-colonial approach. *Postcolonial Studies*. 2017; 20(3):275-93. [\[DOI:10.1080/13688790.2017.1378062\]](#)
- [53] Jabareen Y, Eizenberg E, Zilberman O. Conceptualizing urban ontological security: 'Being-in-the-city' and its social and spatial dimensions. *Cities*. 2017; 68:1-7. [\[DOI:10.1016/j.cities.2017.05.003\]](#)