



Hodgetts, D. et al. (2022) Human security psychology: a linking construct for an eclectic discipline. *Review of General Psychology*. (Early Online Publication)

(doi: [10.1177/10892680221109124](https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680221109124))

This is the Author Accepted Manuscript.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/272626/>

Deposited on: 6 June 2022

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Human security psychology: A linking construct for an eclectic discipline

Darrin Hodgetts, School of Psychology, Massey University, NZ

Veronica Hopner, School of Psychology, Massey University, NZ

Stuart Carr, School of Psychology, Massey University, NZ

Daniel Bar-Tal, School of Education, Tel Aviv University, Israel

James H. Liu, School of Psychology, Massey University, NZ

Raymond Saner, Economics Department, University of Basle, Switzerland

Lichia Yiu, Centre for Socio-Eco-Nomic Development (CSEND), Switzerland

John Horgan, Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, US

Rosalind Searle, Adam Smith Business School, University of Glasgow, Scotland

Gustavo Massola, Institute of Psychology, University of São Paulo, Brazil

Moh Abdul Hakim, Department of Psychology, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Indonesia

Leo Marai, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Papua New Guinea, PNG

Pita King, School of Psychology, Massey University, NZ

Fathali Moghaddam, Department of Psychology, Georgetown University, US

Corresponding author: Darrin Hodgetts, School of Psychology, Massey University, Private Bag 102904, North Shore Mail Centre, Auckland 0745, New Zealand. Email address: v.hopner@massey.ac.nz

Key terms: Human security, assemblage, risk, general, psychology

Abstract

Since its inception as a modern and evolving discipline, psychology has been concerned with issues of human security. This think piece offers an initial conceptualization of human security as a broad security concept that encompasses a range of interrelated dimensions that have been responded to by different sub-disciplinary domains within psychology. We advance an argument for a human security psychology as a connecting focal point for general psychology that enables us to bring knowledge from across our eclectic discipline into further dialogue. This is a necessary step in understanding better the state of current thinking on the psychology of security and as a basis for informing further theory, research, and practice efforts to address issues of human (in)security. This initial effort is informed by Assemblage Theory, which offers a dynamic and contextually rich perspective on people as agentic beings entangled within evolving natural and social formations that can foster or undermine their experiences of [in]security. The article is completed with a brief agenda for advancing human security psychology.

The twenty-first century has brought significant challenges for humanity through the impacts of globalisation, technology, forced migration, climate change, population growth, colonial legacies, intractable conflicts, religious and cultural conflict, political instabilities and increasing economic and social inequalities (Bar-Tal, 2013; Caldwell & Williams, 2016; Cottam et al., 2015; Hopner et al., 2020; Marshall et al., 2007; Paris, 2001; Smith, 1999; Williams, 2013; Zinchenko, 2011). These challenges are often associated with contemporary threats of war and conflict, terrorism and transnational crime, cybercrime, human rights violations, pandemics and inadequate health care, poverty-related insecurities, pollution, as well as physical and psychological ill-health and violence (Carr et al., 2021a). Unlike any other time in history, these material and psychological threats carry both local and global implications, making crises of human security (HS) critical, manifold, and accumulative. It is important that psychology develops a joined-up or general orientation towards security concerns that often span several scales from the personal to the global.

In response, this paper draws upon Assemblage Theory (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011; DeLanda, 2006/2019; Deleuze & Guattari, 1988) to propose an orientation to HS in psychology, we have called Human Security Psychology (HSP) that brings insights together from across our eclectic discipline. Utilizing Assemblage Theory allows us to integrate insights into the personal, community, health, organizational, political, and systemic processes through which material and psychological aspects of [in]security cohere in relation to dynamic situations, such as those listed above. (Zotova & Karapetyan, 2018). This orientation enables us to extend previous efforts to understand the psychology of security (Hopner et al., 2020; Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018) and how various elements (peoples, places, systems, events and socio-material processes) come together to shape the risks and responses engaged in by

people as they seek to secure themselves and those around them. On offer is a preliminary conceptual orientation from which to engage further with the symbiotic processes, messiness and often contradictory complexities involved in HS. Assemblage Theory is an invaluable conceptual orientation towards the development of a processual understanding of the dynamic and emergent world that people occupy together as human beings and within which issues of [in]security are paramount (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000).

Our proposal is that HSP encompasses efforts within psychology to theorise, research and respond through practice to issues of insecurity in ways that enable human beings to not only feel safe and secure psychologically, but to also be safe and secure materially. Correspondingly, the five interrelated aims of this article are as follows. (1) To introduce, conceptualize and foreground the importance of the concept of human security (HS) for psychology from the perspective of Assemblage Theory. (2) To consider plurality in scholarship on issues of security in psychology, including recent calls for the development of broader and more contextualized approaches. (3) To explore how aspects of psychological theory, research and practice assemble in response to, and influence various dimensions of HS. (4) To offer a series of sub-disciplinary exemplars that showcase the broad and eclectic focus on HS in contemporary psychology on personal, community, political, environmental, and global scales. (5) To point towards future directions in HSP.

These aims reflect how different sub-disciplines of psychology contribute knowledge of and responses to HS in various ways, even when the term itself is not always used in different sub-disciplines. For example, clinical, counselling and health psychologies address insecurities in mental and physical health; work psychology is about enabling decent work and economic conditions, such as income and job security; community psychology is about promoting social ties and attachments to particular places that enable people to weather insecurities; environmental psychology is about addressing insecurities associated with climate and pollution; and political psychology is about enhancing political systems to ensure national security, particularly in times of intergroup conflict. As such, we seek to foreground the diversity of contributions within psychology to HS from the personal, to the group, organizational, community, political and environmental on local, national and global scales. This general and inclusive disciplinary perspective is necessary for readers to consider how further synergies can be made across sub-disciplinary domains.

This article is informed by current efforts to reach across our fragmentary disciplinary landscape that is comprised of various sub-disciplinary specialisms (Pickren & Teo, 2020). Our present effort is by necessity incomplete due to the sheer complexity of psychology in general and the richness of relevant material generated within different sub-disciplinary areas. However, it is important that we start formally drawing various sub-disciplinary insights together and into conversation with scholarship that engages overtly with security psychology (Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018) and the psychology of security (Hopner et al., 2020), for example. Psychologists engaged with these topics have begun to conceptualise

security psychology as a sub-disciplinary area from primarily within WEIRD (Western, Educated, Industrialised, Rich and Democratic) traditions (Henrich, Heine & Norenzayan, 2010). Correspondingly, valuable work has been done to extend knowledge of the cognitive and behavioural factors evident in individual and group efforts to meet personal security needs within specific community or national contexts (Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018; Zinchenko, 2011). More recently scholars have called for the development of broader multilevel approaches to security as a psychological, material and socio-cultural phenomenon that intertwines the fates of persons, communities, and nations (Hopner et al., 2020; Kennedy & Hallowell, 2021; Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018). As Bar-Tal (2020) proposes “security is an essential precondition of an ordered existence for an individual, a collective and a societal system”. Likewise, our own effort extends out from a focus on personal perceptions and experiences to multiple domains of HS that include psychological, natural, material and spatial elements.

Our task is complicated by how psychology exhibits a complex nexus of different theoretical, research and practice foci on various facets of HS. What is offered in this article is one amalgamating frame that draws insights from Assemblage Theory to connect insights from across various sub-disciplines. In offering an inclusive orientation towards HSP, we acknowledge recent efforts to understand psychology in general as a pluralistic discipline that features a range of perspectives, paradigmatic contradictions (epistemic, ontological, ethical, cultural), and diverse methodological approaches to documenting and understanding human experiences, behavior/practices and relationships in the world (Hodgetts et al., 2020; Pickren & Teo, 2020). We endeavor to further contribute to such pluralistic understandings that take a contextualised, material, spiritual, and emplaced orientation towards people as profoundly interconnected beings situated within boarder socio-cultural formations and natural systems (Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Guimarães, 2020; Hodgetts et al., 2020; Kaya & Kale, 2016; King & Hodgetts, 2017; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Embracing diversity in contemporary psychology is crucial if we are to continue developing a global discipline that more fully reflects the range of human psychologies (theories, methods and applications) that exist across minority and majority worlds. The formulation of HSP can benefit from embracing the psychologies, experiences and needs of diverse groups in ways that do not simply dismiss, but which transcend the individualism of WEIRD psychologies. This is important because the importation of psychologies from minority Global North into majority worlds in the Global South has stifled the sovereign development of home-grown traditions (Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Guimarães, 2020; Li, Hodgetts & Koong, 2018; Yang, 2000).

Drawing on Assemblage Theory and minoritized literatures from psychology reflects a modest move out beyond knowledge production practices in WEIRD psychology. This move requires us to articulate some of the philosophical underpinnings that guide our ontological understanding the world as a multifaceted process of emergence. Dominant practices of knowledge production in WEIRD psychology have tended to focus on the western individual by using what have been termed *reductionist*

methodologies (Chamberlain, 2000). Knowledge production has been conducted in accord with the analytic tradition of European Philosophy, which is associated with the seminal work of Locke, Berkeley and Hume, and what came to be known as classical empiricism (Guimarães, 2020; King et al., 2017). This philosophy of science was later influenced by the work of Russell, Wittgenstein, Carnap and the Vienna Circle to become known as the European analytic tradition in philosophy and logical empiricism/positivism in psychology (Lacey, 1995; Searle, 2003). From this perspective, theory and research in psychology employs reductive logical analyses to categorize, distinguish, order, and break psychological phenomenon down into base components, which are often presented in causal statistical models. Although fruitful in many respects, psychological phenomena are often reduced to that which is measurable. This orientation offers a partial picture of human psychology that tends towards a decontextualized perspective on the autonomous individual. It can obscure more relationally holistic understandings of human beings as situated, dynamic, interconnected and social agents who are shaped through relationships and interactions in the material world, including histories of intergroup conflict and subjugation (Guimarães, 2020; Hodgetts et al., 2020).

Since the 18th century, a cluster of non-English speaking continental European philosophies have emerged, which have influenced alternatives to the analytical approach. Continental philosophy is often categorized as non-analytical and is recognised as a foundation of critical theory, existentialism, phenomenology, and poststructuralism (King et al., 2017; Quinton, 1995). The core concern lies less with establishing mutually exclusive categories and developing predictive causal models of human behaviour. More emphasis is placed on how various facets of the world become entangled within human existence and take shape accordingly. Beyond testing causal models, emphasis is placed on iterative efforts to document, interpret and theorize human existence within a fundamentally interconnected world that is populated by natural and human produced features.

Despite emerging from a very different European cosmology, the continental tradition also features striking similarities with the holistic perspectives evident in many Indigenous traditions currently being articulated in psychology (Enriquez, 1993; Guimarães, 2020; Hwang, 2009; King et al., 2017; Quinton, 1995; Rao et al., 2008). These shared features relate to attempts from these different traditions to develop conceptually and relationally orientated understandings of people as entangled with phenomena in the psychological, social and material worlds they inhabit together. This results in conceptualizations of personhood that are not reduced by the mind/world dualism that has dominated analytical approaches to psychology (Liu, 2017). Instead, people are understood as interconnected and interdependent beings or emergent creations of biological inheritance, geographical/material and relational situatedness, and processes of socialisation and enculturation. Personhood is thought to be cultivated through interactions of various elements of the systems and relationships within which people are situated, grow, and are rendered (in)secure to varying degrees (Kaya & Kale, 2016; King et al., 2017).

Centralizing such understandings of the interconnected self is invaluable in developing our understandings of and responses to HS. For example, we are able to understand people as emplaced within developments of environmental [in]security such as climate change through being directly affected by global warming and changing weather patterns. People are approached as inseparable from these multifaceted, dynamic and evolving events that have been shaped through the interactions of natural climate processes and human actions. The resulting multidimensional understanding of persons is foundational to our attempt to conceptualize HSP and understand how human beings exercise agency within the context of natural and human-made restraints that also populate situations of [in]security.

Following the continental tradition, Assemblage Theory orientates us towards the dynamics of the natural and the socio-cultural in shaping threats to HS, such as weather events. What is offered is a structural orientation towards persons and groups from which to consider how people impacted by de-securitizing events respond by mitigating risks in efforts to maintain or regain some sense of security for themselves and others. This theoretical orientation allows us to weave insights from analytical and continental approaches to psychology within a broader frame for understanding the dynamics of HS. This article draws insights from theory, research and practice from analytical work in psychology, whilst being driven primarily from that continental perspective that is also associated with Assemblage Theory. Such a combination of aspects of both analytic and continental traditions has been evident throughout the history of psychology, as is reflected in Wundt's development of analytic (experimental) and continental (*Völkerpsychologie*) inspired approaches to psychology (Danziger, 1983; Hodgetts et al., 2020; Wundt, 1886). Both approaches remain evident in the epistemically plural discipline of psychology today and need to be held in dialogue. Central to the development of HSP are explorations of both the properties of different aspects of HS as well as relationships between these aspects and their entangled functions for individuals, groups, systems, and the planet as a whole.

Key dimensions of human security

HS has emerged as a broad, interdisciplinary concept that was coined by the United Nations Development Program (1994) and developed across different disciplines and regions (Black & Swatuk, 2009; Chourou, 2009; Commission on Human Security, 2003; Fukuda-Parr & Messineo, 2012; Kaldor, 2007; Najam, 2003; Othman, 2009; Poku & Sandkjaer, 2009; Sabur, 2009; United Nations Development Programme, 1994; Wun Gao, 2009). This development has contributed to broadening ideas about security in various disciplines (e.g., Security Studies, Politics, International Relations) out beyond a prior fixation on the nation state and militaristic concerns to overtly centralise the needs of human beings (Fukuda-Parr & Messineo, 2012). Whilst conceptualizations and explorations of HS remain varied (see Bajpai, 2003; Chandler, 2008; Martin & Owen, 2010; MacFarlane & Khong 2006; Paris, 2001; Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007), the shift in focus to people signals the importance of the

psychology of security (discussed below). Relatedly, some formulations adopt narrower foci on particular threats, such political violence (MacFarlane & Khong, 2006) or intergroup conflicts (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998). Conversely, others adopt a broader conceptualization that encompasses all threats to humanity (Alkrie, 2003; Commission on Human security, 2003; Glušac et al, 2001; Hampson & Penny 2007; Haq, 1994; Japan, 1999; Sen, 2000; United Nations Trust Fund for Human security, 1994). Rather than rehearse these differences of scope, this article adopts the broad position that HS underpins the protection and advancement of people within and across societies.

We adopt the stance that HS refers to a multifaceted and somewhat aspirational state whereby people experience freedom from threats, restrictions, and discrimination, to go about their daily lives with dignity and without harm. Advancements to this state with a psychological sense of security requires efforts to alleviate threats and to support people to address their needs. These efforts include those associated with economics, food and water, social structures, environmental and political conditions, interpersonal and intergroup relationships, and so forth. As such, promoting HS involves psychologically and materially orientated efforts to understand, establish and support the conditions for human beings to be secure, and to respond to situations of insecurity on personal, community, societal, and global scales.

Contributing significantly to conceptual work in this space, the landmark 1994 United Nations Report that formalised the term *Human security* proposed seven dimensions: Personal, Health, Food, Environmental, Community, Economic, Political. (1) Personal security means living free from violence; (2) Health security encompasses protection from disease and infection, alongside access to affordable health care; (3) Food security entails both physical and financial access to nutritious food; (4) Environmental security is concerned with the integrity and health of the physical environment; (5) Community security is about safe neighbourhoods, and peaceful intergroup relations; (6) Economic security centres on regular basic incomes; and (7) Political security is about ensuring basic human rights. Extending these categories of HS within psychology, Carr and colleagues (2021a) added two further dimensions; (8) National security focuses on the safety of countries from both traditional and non-traditional threats; and (9) Cybersecurity encompasses the safety of information technology, critical infrastructure, and associated digital hazards. In an age of major climate change, socio-economic disruptions, and where distinctions between domestic and foreign are becoming moot somewhat (as is highlighted by organised crime and terrorism), we also need to consider a further dimension, (10) Global security. Categorizing such dimensions is important, but this is not an exhaustive list. It must be kept open to further developments, and we need to theorize how such dimensions emerge and relate to one another as interrelated elements of HS (see next section).

It is important to explore how different dimensions of HS interact, and often work in concert in shaping situations of risk and safety. For instance, economic security can be enhanced through the provision of liveable wages that enable people to experience increased food security by being able to afford decent

food. However, this positive shift is only sustainable if global warming is curtailed ensuring that the environment within which food is produced is protected or secured. In turn, alleviating hunger and increasing access to nutritious food can enhance people's psychological and physical wellbeing. Healthier and more resilient people can then actively contribute to community service and security, which supports reductions in violence and crime. Secure communities also increase the likelihood that local inhabitants can participate in collective efforts that contribute to political stability and in turn national security. Relatedly, securing access to digital infrastructure can also enhance peoples' civic participation and open further avenues that secure their economic livelihoods. Global security is often enhanced through national and international arrangements that protect personal, economic, food, health, cyber, national, environmental, and political securities.

Recent human tragedies reveal just how these various dimensions of HS are entangled and often mutually influential. For example, interconnections between dimensions were apparent in Afghanistan in August 2021, when over 60,000 people fled from Kunduz (one of Afghanistan's largest cities) ahead of the Taliban advance. Bombing and weapons fire in parts of Afghanistan wreaked significant damage on the environment. Markets were destroyed reducing access to food and diminishing livelihoods and correspondingly economic security. Internally displaced persons moving into public parks in the capital of Kabul exacerbated a third wave of the COVID-19 pandemic, which then engulfed Afghanistan and further undermined the health of people striving to survive illnesses associated with poor sanitation from overcrowding. Personal security was severely undermined as evidenced by images of men, accused of theft, tarred, and paraded through the streets. Taliban edicts were issued to single or widowed women of particular ages requiring them to marry Taliban fighters. The collapse of the government and President Ghani's hasty exit from the country exacerbated existing points of political and national insecurity.

Interconnections between dimensions of HS are also embedded in wider ecologies of [in]security that are typically obscured. The outcomes of the Taliban advance played out in a highly Eurocentric-securitised landscape featuring long histories of foreign domination, colonial agendas, and biopolitics (Howell & Richter-Montpetit, 2019). Situations of human [in]security experienced recently in Afghanistan also emerged from histories of intergroup group and even intersocietal relations. As Gruffydd Jones (2015, p. 65) asserts military interventions in the so-called 'failed state' of Afghanistan were "irredeemably rooted in an imperial and racialized imagination". This imagination is often used to legitimise the hegemonic status of the United States and its allies and when coupled with the poorly planned withdrawal facilitated the events in Kunduz and Kabul in 2021.

Such cascading threats to HS are not out of place in countries such as the United States (US) where unliveable wages and growing economic inequalities are driving falls in standards of living and social relations. These inequalities are aggravated by inadequate welfare supports, and barriers to healthcare and decent food for the hundreds of thousands of people now congregating in shanty towns in parks,

and on the edges of cities. The cascading effects of insecurity have been dampened somewhat by societal stability and wealth in the USA. However, increasing economic insecurity, growing income inequalities and increased deprivation within such wealthy states is exacerbating political polarization and increasing the appeal of populism (Loneragan & Blyth, 2020) and conspiracy theories (Bergman, 2018). These developments are contributing to increased societal instability. The threats to HS in these societies are also the products of interactions between various elements, including those associated with neoliberal agendas and racial, gendered, and classed hierarchies. But in these cases, the national situations have been more stable because of the continued functioning of key institutional mechanisms. However, they are *not* immune to reconfiguration and in directions that undermine HS more generally.

Human Security as a nexus of dynamic assemblages

Given that dimensions of HS are dynamic, processual, and inter-connected, there is merit in conceptualizing human security, at least provisionally from the vantage point of Assemblage Theory (Hopner et al., 2021). Assemblage Theory was introduced by Deleuze and Guattari to make sense of the processes via which any whole or entity from molecules to natural organisms, species and ecosystems take form. It was argued that similar processes of emergence appear to occur across a range of scales. This is not to say that the resulting assemblages are the same, but rather the processes through which various entities take form resonates whether an assemblage is associated with biological or socio-cultural processes. Correspondingly, both natural and socio-cultural entities and processes are considered interdependent. For example, this is evident in how increasingly severe weather events are shaped by human-induced climate changes. Mitigating changes to climate requires the rethinking of human practices associated with present political and economic systems.

Foundational to Assemblage Theory is an orientation towards the world as an emerging, or contingent ecosystem that takes shape through the dynamics of stability and instability (Anderson et al., 2012). From this perspective, the world is emergent and comprises a nexus of various assemblages or dynamic socio-material formations. These assemblages are constituted through the congregation or drawing and holding together of heterogenous human and non-human elements – including persons, institutions, technologies, places, procedures, and norms - within a recognisable and relational terrain (Anderson et al., 2012; DeLanda, 2006/2019; Deleuze & Guattari, 1988). HS is entangled within a nexus of socio-political, cultural, economic, and personal relations/assemblages within which various elements fit together and mutually influence one another.

Reflecting the entanglement of human and non-human elements within such assemblages, what are often positioned in analytical psychology as externalities or contextual factors are no longer positioned as extraneous variables. These factors can be repositioned as key elements within assembling situations of [in]security that are arranged according to social psychological processes and power structures

evident in the ongoing dynamics and intersections of economics, culture, gender, class, place, wealth, and so forth (McFarlane, 2011). These elements combine to constitute an ontology of emergence through relational processes of assemblage, dis-assemblage and re-assemblage that span the natural and socio-cultural aspects of human existence. As Sellar (2009, p.69) notes, this emergent ontology “...functions as a key strength by emphasising that all wholes are themselves the products of underlying processes and relations that can never be said to be completely or finally fixed”. This means that even if we have addressed security concerns associated with a particular flood by coordinating relief efforts and offering appropriate psychological supports, another flood may be a few months away. Disasters can reassemble, but people can also learn from previous events, anticipate, prepare for, and with the right resources mitigate particular negative consequences. Correspondingly, disaster assemblages can be conceptualized as comprising the conditional combination of sets of human and non-human elements within dynamic processes of stability and transformation, which often draw together aspects of various dimensions of HS.

The holding together and dynamic ordering or positioning of elements, entities and structures in relation to one another within such assemblages is termed *territorialization*. For our purposes, *territorialization* refers to the dynamic positioning, inter-relating and reordering of elements (personal, economic, national, cyber, and so on) within the evolving mosaic that is HS (DeLanda, 2006/2019). Various elements of HS cohere and re-assemble as situations change. Whilst a HS assemblage is open to dis-assemblage and re-assemblage in particular situations, these formations often appear to us as stable structures due to processes of territorialization and sedimentation that hold various elements in place (McGuirk et al., 2016). The contingent holding together of various elements is central to assembling through emergent connective alliances wherein “.... new connections occur and old one’s rupture” (Hillier & Abrahams, 2013, p. 20). As elements [re]order (*reterritorialized*) within *connective alliances* they come to comprise an evolving ‘geography of relations’ (Deleuze and Parnet, 1987). Ongoing processes of the *territorialization*, *deterritorialization* (removing) and *reterritorialization* (repositioning) of elements are central to the dynamic coherence, taking apart and re-construction of the different dimensions of HS. These processes are entwined, whereby “while territorialization gives dimension and consistency to an assemblage and consolidates certain relationships, deterritorialization enables the emergence of new properties through the inclusion of new components and subsequent relations” (Sellar, 2009, p. 71). From this perspective, dimensions of HS are shaped through a complex network of territorialized alliances between key elements. Further, some key elements, such as a psychological sense of security are territorialized across different dimensions as the persons concerned navigate the terrain of their everyday lives.

The COVID-19 pandemic exemplifies how when new assemblages form these often draw together elements from existing assemblages in creating new events, developments, and changes in HS (Jacobs, 2006). We can think of the emergent pandemic assemblage process using the metaphor of a snowball

that gets bigger as it rolls together various elements. For example, the pandemic emerged initially on a local scale when a human being contracted the virus and spread it to others. Through viral transmission it expanded over time into a global HS development that is comprised of *connective alliances* (network) between biological processes, persons, groups, places, supply chains, institutions, economies, political systems, and so forth. Processes of territorialisation situate such existing elements from personal, community, economic and health assemblages in relation to new emergent elements, such as lockdowns, border closures, workflow redesigns, and global scientific collaborations to create and distribute vaccines. There is empirical support for the emphasis we are placing on the centrality of the dynamic relations between different elements, including place and politics in the assemblage of the pandemic. For example, Syropoulis et al. (2021, p 738) reported that across nation states those with more harmonious relationships between groups and with other nations, and with higher levels of equality, social justice, and social security were more prepared for, and experienced better outcomes from the COVID- 19 pandemic. The rhetorical styles adopted by different countries' leaders in different nations also reflected tremendous variances in policy used to respond to the pandemic and their effectiveness. The old formula of building national solidarity was most effective in pandemic prevention (Hopner et al., 2021; Vignoles et al., 2021), but given existing cleavages and differential impacts of the pandemic, this was easier said than done in many jurisdictions (Chan et al., 2021).

Combined, pandemic elements noted above populate various efforts to secure personal, community, national, food, environmental, and economic security. Further, the dynamics of effort, assemblage and change are located in the unfolding of time in general but speed up within particular key moments. Resembling Lewin's (1947) concept of 'unfreezing moments' (Lewin, 1947), Liu et al., (2014) define a 'critical junctures' as moments of potential for substantive change in societal national assemblages. As new connective alliances between elements such as health systems, supply chains and politics gained traction across different nation states, we can also see the stubborn reproduction of inequities of access to resources, including vaccines and food to sustain people across the world. As the peak of the pandemic recedes, it is becoming apparent that while COVID-19 had the *potential* to be an historically salient critical juncture. However, it does not appear to have substantially reassembled existing national health systems in the direction of increased equity, nor the international system of trade and aid that configures health outcomes for different individuals, classes, or nations.

Whilst not always referring overtly to Assemblage Theory, sources cited just above reflect how psychologists are beginning to employ assemblage thinking to consider how key elements and processes combine (assemble), and recombine (reassemble), to shape the unfolding of the Covid-19 pandemic (Hopner et al., 2021; Montiel et al., 2021; Syropoulis et al., 2021). Empirically, such joined up thinking can orientate psychologists in a flexible manner towards the processual, agentive and socio-material complexities that are central to different dimensions of HS developments such as the pandemic, as well as to how key elements work in *collective alliance* both within and between dimensions. As the

pandemic continues to evolve as a multi-dimensional HS event, some emergent elements (e.g., lockdowns, border closures) are now being deterritorialized and this is associated with political tensions regarding where the balance should be reached between prioritising health, economic, and other dimensions of HS.

Assemblage thinking can also inform our understanding of the experiences and actions of people as they are caught up in real time and evolving situations at different scales from personal to group, nation, region, and globe. For example, Colebrook (2002) and Yulianto, Hodgetts, King and Liu (2021) have also draw upon Assemblage Theory to argue that human beings can be approached as key elements within assemblages that are shaped through various situational, social, historical and genetic assemblages. This structurally orientated theory does not lose sight of the person, but rather positions the person and the psychological centrally within emergent developments such as the pandemic in which people often respond to threats and risks with personal and collective agency. This line of reasoning is in accord with contemporary understandings of the interconnected self (Kaya & Kale, 2016; King et al., 2017), whereby people are conceptualized as agentic beings whose actions also have consequences for the very structures within which they are located (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988). These are important considerations because people, especially leaders in moments of crisis (see Haslam & Reicher, 2007) often exercise considerable agency in the face of material and psychological restraints when attempting to securitize themselves and those around them. Their efforts can also be restrained through the agentic acts of different persons, political factions, institutional practices, and material situations.

An assemblage orientation to the human self also offers a broader understanding of agency and influence between the human and non-human elements of assemblages (Hamilakis & Jones, 2017). As Sellar (2009, p. 73) proposes, “the concept of a single and fixed point of agency, unique to humans no longer holds as the human itself is constituted by the physical, social and cultural elements with which it relates”. This theoretical assertion is important when thinking about HS developments, such as pandemics, whereby a virus can be seen as exhibiting a form of agency in influencing reactions from the human beings it infects. Further, at critical junctures different elements carry agency or have a greater influence on the unfolding events, only to then fade out of prominence at other conjunctures (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011). This stance on the agency of non-human elements is not out of place in indigenous psychological thinking whereby material objects, for example, have a lifeforce of their own and agentic functions in shaping human experience, actions, ways of being, and lives (Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Guimarães, 2020; King et al., 2017).

Briefly, Assemblage Theory is useful for expanding present understandings of HS and the development of HSP. This theory positions people as interconnected with various human and non-human elements of the world, including histories of intergroup and intersocietal relations (Kaya & Kale, 2016; King et al., 2017; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). From this perspective, HS and experiences of insecurity are the

agentive product of various relational influences within which people are immersed. Whilst we have theorized HS as an assemblage based on an emergent and processual ontology in this section, it is important to also consider how issues of security have been theorized, researched, and responded to at key points throughout the history of psychology. This is crucial for us to situate our assemblage-based orientation to HSP within the discipline.

The focus on security in psychology

In psychology, theorising, empirical research and practice regarding HS concerns has been eclectic, drawing on both analytical and continental philosophical traditions, and spanning humanistic, psychoanalytical, social cognitive, and critical paradigms (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Adler, 1925; Ainsworth, 1978; Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998; Bowlby, 1969; 1982; Donstov & Perelygina 2013; Goldgeier 1997; Hodgetts et al., 2020; Maslow 1942; Tajfel & Turner 1986; Schneier 2008; Zinchenko 2011; Zotova 2011). Although eclectic, scholarship in Psychology has predominantly focused on psychological security as a mental appraisal system. This system is understood to be shaped by cultural processes and ideologies that connect individual minds to the world through various attachments to other people, shared identities, and particular contexts (Bar-Tal, 1990; Dontsov, Zinchenko & Zotova, 2013; Mercer 1995; Schneier, 2008; Zinchenko, 2011). This psychological ‘sense of security’ is thought to have real world implications and can be undermined by threatening experiences and fear (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998; Donstov & Perelygina 2013; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which result in experiences of insecurity and reduced wellbeing (Munyon et al, 2020). Depending on a person’s perceived ability to act, such a sense of insecurity can both motivate actions to mitigate a threat or undermine responses (Harding et al, 2018; Lazarus, 1991).

Considerable insights into the importance of HS can be found throughout the history of our discipline and early theoretical formulations continue to influence contemporary theory, research and practice. For example, Alfred Adler’s (1925) individual psychology presents a general understanding of human beings that foregrounds the importance of secure environments (including interdependence with others, positive vocational arrangements, and amicable societal structures) for equality, cultivating well-functioning persons, and mitigating experiences (feelings) of insecurity. Abraham Maslow 1940’s humanistic psychology was influenced by Adler’s work and further identified HS in its general form as a key need. In Maslow’s (1942) view, security needs included personal, emotional, health, and financial considerations. Maslow positioned feelings of insecurity as a subjective human reaction to different situations, that can be read today as reflecting. For these seminal scholars, psychological security was seen as a sense of secure personhood that is achieved through attachments to other people, institutions, and society. Ultimately, such early perspectives invoked an ideal or aspirational world characterized by benevolence in which persons can feel as if they belong, are safe, happy, and included because their

psychological and material needs are met. Along similar lines, but from a later social cognitive perspective, social psychologists have similarly focused on issues of belonging and how people gain a sense of psychological security through attachments to, and identification with particular groups and contexts (Mercer 1995; Tajfel & Turner 1986). Derivatively, the range of situations producing intergroup anxiety/uncertainty feeding into feelings of threat, and the different types of group-based threat emerging from different situations have been extensively theorized (Stephan et al., 1999).

From a social cognitive perspective, appraisals of threats and one's ability to respond effectively are central to a person's sense of security. For example, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) argued that the experience of insecurity and fear is a psychological manifestation linked to two appraisals: The first relates to the appraisal made by the person to identify a threat (early evaluation), and the second is an appraisal of their ability to adequately deal with the threat. The focus is on psychological security as a cognitive process involving heuristically based decision-making processes that trade-off the severity and probability of any threat against the magnitude of costs and the perceived effectiveness of any countermeasures (Schneier, 2008). Such appraisals extend beyond concerns of personal security. They also relate to collective security evaluated by people, including experts, high-ranking officials, and religious, community, cultural, and political leaders. Additionally, understandings and responses to threats are not solely mediated by rational cognitive appraisals of situations. They are also shaped by emotions (particularly fear) that can motivate people to take particular actions to try and ensure some security for themselves, whilst at times undermining the security of others (Harding et al, 2018; Lazarus, 1991; Smith & Lazarus, 1993).

Further, a sense of insecurity does not depend solely on subjective psychological factors, or an evaluation of an objective material reality. In the practical world, the cues, information, and emotional states people rely upon to assess threats are often limited, shifting, and tinged by material restraints and a range of human, relational, and perceptive noise (Simon, 1990). Why is this so? For a number of reasons: First, evolving situations are often unclear and difficult to comprehend. Even the abilities of "experts" to predict future developments is constrained (Tetlock, 2009). Thus, it is difficult to draw unequivocal conclusions about a present state of affairs and/or future situations. Under these circumstances, people tend to rely on their own, or other people's, subjective appraisals of events as there is no other way to assess the dangers facing the person, group, country, or globe. Second, in many cases, populations do not hold all the information necessary to make credible evaluations of threats, and so rely on partial and often conflicting reports (this is even so for political leaders and experts) (Achen & Bartels, 2017). Third, there are often many factors affecting appraisals made by different individuals of the two issues posed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). People diverge in their material situations, beliefs, cultures, ideologies, shared narratives, feelings, experiences, and their knowledge about specific HS developments. Thus, they can differ widely in their appraisals of threats, and their abilities to cope and respond to ensure their own and others' security (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998).

Relatedly, psychological security has been approached as an achievable state realised through varying degrees of overcoming actual threats and gaining protection against adverse possibilities, which is fundamentally driven by a human need for stability, safety, and security. It has also been proposed that from childhood, each of us cultivates a personal view of the world derived from perceptions of security and danger, which is shaped through collective meaning systems. Stability is achieved through routine, often relating to secure employment, being loved, experiences of law and order, as well as cultural and national safety (Zotova 2011). Zinchenko (2011) argues that a sense of security can be usefully viewed as a psychological system that is anchored in broader group-based meaning systems, ideologies, and situations in society (Bar-Tal, 1990; Dontsov, Zinchenko & Zotova, 2013; Zinchenko, 2011). Dontsov, Zinchenko and Zotova (2013) extend this conceptualization to consider how a focus on human collective existence within various diverse groupings can illuminate how personal and collective consciousness of security is shaped by culture, history, economics, political, and inter-group relations (Dontsov & Perelygina 2013; Zinchenko 2011; Zinchenko and Zotova 2014; Zotova, 2011). People often feel (in)secure, with, or in relation to others who are similar or different to them. A key disciplinary goal identified by these psychologists is ensuring people and groups have the resources needed to develop this sense of security that enables them to flourish through being treated with dignity, fairness, and respect (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998; Zotova 2011).

As is evident in this broad focus on contextual influences on a psychological sense of security, the prominence of social cognitive perspectives in recent years has not led to the neglect of awareness of the broader material, political and inter-group contexts in which people reside, and learn to perceive the world around them. Issues of security have been further conceptualized beyond individual perceptions to encompass actual situations that often encompass material, interpersonal and intergroup elements. Of particular interest for psychologists has been how these collectivist elements are implicated within experiences of [in]security and efforts to respond to the needs of persons within situations of threat and conflict (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998; Dontsov & Perelygina 2013; Stephan et al., 1999; Zinchenko & Zotova 2014).

These considerations are also reflected in a focus on shared meaning systems (e.g., ideologies, narratives, discourses and social representations) that populate both human minds as well as embodied and institutional practices and objects in the material world (Hodgetts et al., 2020; King et al., 2017). It is also recognised that these shared meaning systems or collective psychological processes can fester divisions and increase insecurities associated with classes, ethnicities, genders, religions, sexualities, [dis]abilities, and so forth (Butler, 2003; Foucault, 1980; Fine & Asch, 1988; Hodgetts & Griffin, 2015; Moscovici; 2001). In response, psychologists have documented how the dominance of narratives of the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ poor, for example, have shaped institutional responses to poverty that have rendered people experiencing hardship more insecure (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017). This orientation foregrounds how people often make sense of various threats collectively, and in the ways that can have

very material implications for how different groups and institutions understand and respond to situations of insecurity (Zotova & Karapetyan, 2018). Work in this area also suggests that the human need for a sense of security is somewhat universal, but not equitably achievable for different groups. The absence of such security is associated with increased inequalities in the prevalence of hardship and reduced wellbeing (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017; Munyon et al, 2020).

Correspondingly, a key focus in psychology has been on the promotion of collective and national security and wellbeing by facilitating more equitable access to securitizing resources (income, shelter, food, and attachments) across the population (Kennedy & Hallowell, 2021; Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018). That is, insecurities in employment, for example, have been associated with reductions in personal, community and national security, whilst increased job security is associated with increased wellbeing (Kalleberg, 2018). Relatedly, Zotova and Karpetyan (2018, p.110) have proposed that "...fluctuations in a population's level of psychological wellbeing can act as an indicator of the psychological security of the entire society and reflect the accuracy or invalidity of many dimensions and actions by the state".

Above, we have touched on prominent efforts in psychology to understand, research and promote psychological security, including the need for a broader focused approach. We consider issues of application across various sub-disciplinary areas in more detail in the following section. For now, it is also important to acknowledge that since psychology's modern inception, some of our disciplinary activities have been less positive and have also contributed to the continued insecurity of some groups for the benefit of others. For example, Le Bon's (1895/1977) classic study of crowds in France in the late 1800s comprised an aristocratic response to perceived threats to social stability from the lower classes. This threat perception accompanied rapid urbanisation and the emergence of class politics, emancipatory slave movements, and early feminist formations. Correspondingly, Le Bon proposed that contagious hysterical emotional states submerged individuals from these groups within a mob mentality, thus reducing individual capacities for rational, 'principled judgments', and self-control. Le Bon (1896/1977, p.36) displayed classist, racist and sexist biases to argue that those affected belonged "...to inferior forms of evolution – in women, children, and savages, for instance" and contributed to efforts to ensure the security of the well-heeled at the expense of less affluent groups (Reicher, 2011).

Similar biases stemming from fear of the other and of disruptions to the status quo are also found in early work from experimental psychologists associated with the Eugenics movement (Guthrie, 2004). This movement lent scientific credence to the racism of this time by associating racial differences in educational performance with variables such as skin pigmentation and hair follicle thickness. Simultaneously, significant contextual factors (externalities) that impacted groups differently, including histories of slavery and associated socio-economic and educational exclusions were ignored. Research in this area contributed legitimacy to processes of dehumanisation and racialism that increased insecurities for many people of colour (Guthrie, 2004).

More contemporary examples of how our discipline can exacerbate insecurities for some groups whilst privileging others are evident in homophobic pathologizing and discrimination against LGBTQ+ communities (Hegarty, 2017); the normalizing and reification of Eurocentric and psychologizing constructions of human development, childhood, and parenting (Burman, 2016); reifying ideologies of individualism in support of neoliberal agendas that obscure the relational nature of structural poverty (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017; Klein, 2017); and the involvement of US psychologists in the ideologically driven overthrow of democratically elected governments in other sovereign nations (Herman, 1995). Relevant to these exemplars is the concept of *martial politics*, which refers to ongoing battles or conflictual situations between groups (Howell, 2018). This concept speaks to the politics of HS and our disciplines' role at key times in justifying and lending legitimacy to the subordination (insecuritizing) of impoverished, racialized, queer, disabled, and indigenous communities.

Raising these issues of power and politics in psychology is in keeping with the emphasis placed in Assemblage Theory on how these dynamic formations often emerge through structural hierarchies that feature inequities in knowledge production and resource control. These hierarchies result in some elements or persons/groups exercising more influence in the discipline and power over others (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011; McGuirk et al., 2016). In psychology some groups and nation states have exercised more power than others in theorising, researching, putting their ideas into practice, and influencing disciplinary directions (Anderson & McFarlane, 2011). Relatedly, it is important to engage in disciplinary reflexivity to develop a broader, more inclusive, and pluralistic orientation towards HSP that includes previously suppressed or ignored traditions in psychology (Allwood & Berry, 2006; Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective, 2021; Guimarães, 2020; King & Hodgetts, 2017). Considering our disciplinary biases and mistakes is also invaluable in the continued emergence of psychology as an epistemic assemblage (see next section).

As a reflection of the diverse efforts from within psychology and increased recognition of the need for plurality, we approach HSP as a multifaceted and eclectic undertaking. HSP includes a focus on a sense of [in]security as a psychological state of mind that features preceptions, experiences and feelings of safety and risk. This sense of security is further shaped by material situations that render some people more secure than others depending on the key elements in play at any one time. Put simply, HSP is comprised of the elements of psychology that relate to theorizing, researching, and addressing issues of human [in]security. This is a multifaceted undertaking that encompasses heterogeneous efforts to extend knowledge of the conditions and human actions that enable human beings to not only feel safe and secure, but to also be safe and secure. There are considerable personal, group, societal and cultural differences that must be addressed within such an undertaking. There is much to learn about how dimensions of HS morph across different locales, and how different priorities emerge for different groups as they navigate evolving situations, events, threats, and relations. To enhance the efficacy of

contributions from psychology to address issues of HS, it is important that we begin to consider key foci and contributions from various sub-disciplinary areas.

Diverse sub-disciplinary applications in human security psychology

Like other disciplines, including archaeology (Hamilakis & Jones, 2017), applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2018) and Occupational Science (Sellar, 2009), psychology can be conceptualized as an epistemic assemblage-of-assemblages (nexus of sub-disciplines) that has assembled, disassembled, and reassembled (emerge) "...from the unpredictable relations formed among scientists" (Sellar, 2009) and associated points of theoretical, methodological and practice congruencies and tensions. Each sub-discipline features dynamic foci, overlapping and varying understandings of what it is to be an individual or human being, and how psychologists document and respond to HS concerns. Rather than try and reconcile different philosophical tensions associated with, for example, epistemological tensions between positivism and social constructionism, we approach psychology as a dynamic assemblage-of-assemblages within which plurality of thought, orientation and focus for action is a strength of our science.

Conceptualising psychology as a disciplinary assemblage reflects the positioning of our discipline as a human product that is part of the world, and which does not simply produce knowledge of the world from nowhere in the Archimedean sense (Baker & McGurik, 2017). HSP related theory, research and practice emerges through contingent processes of knowledge production, methodological developments and practice applications that often morph in relation to the HS dimensions with which different sub-disciplines are engaged. Correspondingly, in engaging with HS domains and situations psychologists also contribute to the reassembling of these situations. In short, we see HSP as an emergent disciplinary undertaking that is shaped by generations of psychologists and addressing various HS concerns reworking existing elements of theory, method and practice as the discipline continues to emerge through the reterritorialize of various conjunctions between sub-disciplines (McFarlane, 2011). These processes of disciplinary emergence are overtly evident, for example, in relation to the contemporary pluralizing of psychology globally. They are also reflected in the growing diversity of HS concerns with which psychology engages. These include risk appraisals regarding exposure to traumatic events (Marshall et al 2007), issues of safety and effective responses to circumstantial hazards (Watson, et al 2011); self-preservation, shared-security and peace building (Christie & Montiel 2013; Kennedy & Hallowell, 2021), impacts of colonization on indigenous suicides and processes of self-determination (Lawson-Te Aho & Liu, 2010); initiatives to address economic and related precarities (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017; Kalleberg, 2018); and efforts to understand and limit climate change (Nielsen et al., 2021).

To recap, HSP draws together elements (theoretical, methodological and practice orientations) from different sub-disciplinary areas in-order-to better understand and address concerns related to the 10

dimensions of HS and more. This section further attends to various sub-disciplinary efforts that can be understood as contributing to a HSP that spans personal, community, institutional, national, and global scales.

Clinical psychology addresses the mental health security of individuals and groups, often through the amelioration of the impacts of various insecurities that contribute to deep intra-psychological impacts, including violence, anxiety, depression, and suicide. At least since the time of Adler (1925), work in this area reminds us about how very personal issues of HS can be and how acute they can become. Correspondingly, clinical approaches primarily address the personal and intra-psychic elements of HS that people accumulate, particularly in the aftermath of traumas and disruptions from situations of insecurity. Approaches such as psychotherapy contribute to HS and processes of re-assemblage at a personal level by strengthening a person's sense of security and helping secure their minds, emotions, and identities (Hopner et al., 2020). Such work supports changes in lives by helping people find respite, shelter, and a sense of support and attachment, belonging and safety. This is important because an insecure sense of personhood can result in what Laing (1965) termed a state of 'ontological insecurity'. This state encompasses an inability to cohere a sustainable biographical narrative, which is associated with being overwhelmed by anxiety, for example. Correspondingly, central to work stemming from psychoanalytic and humanistic traditions is the promotion of positive attachments to other people, groups, places, continuity, and routines that support wellbeing (Klein, 1927; Maxwell et al., 2021; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Zotova & Karapetyan, 2018). Such work is also extended through the reterritorializing of insights from indigenous psychologies that approach ontological security as being entwined within a person's position within familial and tribal networks, along with spiritual connections to various non-human entities that include rivers, mountains, forests, oceans, and so forth (Kaya & Kale, 2016; King et al., 2017). Such a focus also allows for further cross fertilization between clinical and indigenous psychologies and issues of environmental security/psychology and political security/psychology.

Work psychologists also consider a range of security concerns relating to organisational processes. Humanitarian work psychology, for example, focuses overtly on understanding and addressing issues of insecurity and injustice at work (Carr, 2021). Humanitarian work psychologists promote HS through advocating healthy and inclusive organisational structures, practices, and efforts to address issues of economic insecurity. These psychologists also raise awareness of inequities in health service access and delivery, for example, and work to improve service developments and equity in access and care (Searle and Rice, 2020). Another key foci lies in preventing mental and physical health insecurities by promoting decent work, job sustainability and income security as a means of address growing insecurities that accompany precarious work and unsustainable livelihoods (Carr et al, 2018; 2021b). Institutionalising living wages (economic security) is associated with spill over effects in terms of personal, health, food, community, national and political securities (Carr et al, 2021a; McWha-Hermann, et al., 2021).

Demonstrating further overlaps between sub-disciplinary areas, community psychologists have a long history of responding to the needs of communities facing upheavals that are shaped at the intersections of various domains of HS and personal and collective precarity (Jahoda et al, 1933/1971). Of particular concern are relationships between economic [in]securities and a range of subsequent community and health insecurities (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017; Simpson et al, 2022). Such efforts involve helping people navigate adverse work and welfare systems that often fail to meet their mandates to promote HS and welfare (Carr et al, 2018; 2021b; Hodgetts et al., 2021; Kalleberg, 2018). For example, a current project of several authors of this article involves working in collaboration with households experiencing in-work poverty, their trade union, and various government agencies to inform policy and service responses to economic, income, housing, food, health, and community insecurities. This effort reflects the realization that many of the decisions that shape local [in]securities are not made within the households or local communities who are directly impacted. The interaction between communities and government is an important HS nexus, but one that is dominated by the government. Challenging this power imbalance, the project draws on insights into how households respond to various insecurities to inform the refinement of policies and institutional practices administered by central government agencies. This is important given the function of social security policies (health, housing, education employment) in moderating the negative impacts of the social determinants of health (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017). That is, when such systems are well resourced and focused on meeting human needs over financial restraint, they can mitigate the impacts of adverse (insecure) living conditions on marginalized lives (Simpson et al., 2021). As Kennedy and Hallowell (2021, p. 4) note, “Reducing inequalities is one key strategy in building shared security”.

HS is entangled with politics. On the one hand, psychology and psychological processes are seen by political psychologists to be embedded within and produced by political institutions, organizations, leaders, and the state. On the other, politics, politicians, governing institutions, and the state are understood from a psychological perspective. Through this bi-directional analysis combining bottom-up and top-down processes, political psychology touches on many aspects of HS (Carr et al., 2021a; Hopner et al., 2020). Research in political psychology reveals how distinct terrorist events, such as the 9-11 attacks in the US, for example, have had distinct and accumulative effects on personal, cyber, community, national, and political security over the last two decades (Brown et al., 2009). The impacts of 9-11 have exerted bottom-up effects on emotional climate, including heightened anxiety and fear (Huddy & Feldman, 2011; Choi et al., 2021), creating acceptance of laws to reduce privacy and restrict freedoms. These measures (emergent elements) have polarized different groups in the US citizenry, breaking down a shared sense of national community, for example, into “red” (Republican) and “blue” (Democrat) factions (Jacobson, 2010). Ongoing hostilities between these factions have exacerbated issues of national insecurity, increased violence and mistrust, and eventually leading to a near insurrection with the U. S Capitol Riot on January 6, 2021. Conversely, the American led invasions of

Afghanistan and Iraq in response to 9-11 have further compromised every dimension of HS for Afghans and Iraqis. The near collapse of these states has required the re-assembling of HS in these nations. Political psychology traces the historical trajectories of these security assemblages and seeks to develop effective responses as a means of promoting HS (Liu, in press).

Moving to arguably the broadest scale, whilst also grappling with complex local concerns, environmental psychology overlaps with activities within clinical, organizational, community and political psychologies. Environmental psychology is concerned with human development and actions within natural and built settings. It explores complex interconnections between natural and socio-cultural elements of environmental security (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988; Anderson et al., 2012; Delanda, 2006/2019). Relatedly, prominent organizations within our discipline, including the American Psychological Association (2008), have identified the most prominent insecurities on a global scale as climate change and associated environmental crises and disruptions (Nielsen et al., 2021). These crises have resulted from the activities of human beings, spurred on by unsustainable business practices and resource exploitation that have local and global consequences. For example, improper mining conditions in Brazil have impacts at both local and global levels in terms of environmental degradation. Locally vulnerable populations in this emerging economy can become entrapped within exploitative and insecure work conditions and engaged in environmentally destructive work that also displaces local communities. Coelho, Cordeiro and Massola (2020) have shown that these processes are related to increases in violent crime, insecure housing, and detrimental economic conditions. Also evident is a psychological transformation towards a fatalistic (insecure) perspective about the place of local people in society. Involuntary disruptions to place-based attachments and routines, in particular, contribute to reduced ontological security and wellbeing (Helly, Efrat & Josef, 2021). In the work of environmental psychologists to theorize, document and address such HS concerns, we can see resonances between personal or clinical considerations, processes of community disruption, indecent work, intergroup conflicts, politics, environmental degradation, and climate change.

Moving forward

We have proposed HSP as a key disciplinary focal point in general psychology that combines insights from across the discipline to theorize and explore the multiple and interrelated dimensions of HS, which enable or undermine the abilities of human beings to feel and be secure. This article lays out a multifaceted and multilevel orientation towards HS concerns in psychology that extends out beyond personal perceptions to encompass both human and non-human elements related to the securitizing of persons, groups, communities, institutions, systems, and the globe (Bar-Tal, 2020; Hopner et al., 2020; Kennedy & Hallowell, 2021; Zotova & Karpetyan, 2018). It has been important to also consider some of the diversity of our disciplinary perspectives on this topic in the past and into the present in order to

inform how we might develop HSP into the future. We contend that all the traditions included above offer useful insights into aspects of the puzzle that is HS. Embracing disciplinary pluralism is crucial if we are to combine our efforts programmatically or at least enhance cross sub-disciplinary dialogues to further contribute to people achieving a sustainable sense of security that can underpin their dignity and flourishing (Bar-Tal & Jacobson, 1998; Zotova 2011). It can enhance the scope of our efforts to know, document and address the HS needs of different people and groups. This is important because like other academic disciplines (Pennybrook, 2018), the contemporary psychology was assembled around WEIRD knowledge frames and is increasingly accepting the limits of such frames. We are opening further to theory, methods, and practices from other traditions, including psychologies of the interconnected self (Guimarães, 2020; Hodgetts et al., 2020; King & Hodgetts, 2017; Liu, 2017). As such, we present an initial formulation of HSP as a diverse and evolving undertaking that encompasses human and non-human elements, and dynamic relationships between these parts.

The primacy of collective processes in realizing aspirations for security means more attention to group and intergroup psychologies, and issues of diversity and precarity (Moghaddam, 2022). Work in this area also requires the further development of eclectic approaches to engage with the dynamics of global socio-political trends (Bar-Tal, 2020; Moghaddam, 2019), increased wealth concentration, and the plight of people facing socio-economic insecurities (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2017). Such an orientation is reflected in the emphasis we have placed in this article on understanding people as socio-economically and culturally immersed or interconnected beings. People make meaning of their situations (psychology) through various cognitive processes as well as by drawing on collective narratives and meaning structures that are open to manipulation and which often differ between social groups. As such, HSP engages both with personal understandings and reactions to situations of [in]security as well as recognizing the needs for changes to insecure material circumstances, many of which reside beyond the control of individuals.

Assemblage Theory has provided one orientation towards bringing together various elements of HSP that respond through theory, research, and practice to HS concerns as a means of offering a general lay-of-the-land. This theory orientates us towards how HS and our disciplinary responses are composed, re-composed over time, and are rearticulated through the dynamic emergence of situations that cohere within and impact human lives (McFarlane, 2011). Informed by this theoretical perspective, we see several main components to our proposal for HSP. (1) Since its inception psychology has addressed issues of [in]security and, rightly, continues to promote HS. (2) A focus on this topic area is appropriate for general psychology because concerns about HS are universal insofar as issues of personal safety, health, food, community, economic, political, environmental, cyber, national, and global security are material and impact everyone. (3) A focus on psychological states and how people experience, make sense of, and behave within particular situations of [in]security should remain central to HSP. (4) HSP needs to be inclusive of different foci and paradigms within the discipline and be aware of how these

develop knowledge and responses to HS. (5) There is utility in approaching HSP as an epistemic assemblage of sub-disciplinary assemblages. (6) Situations and experiences of [in]security are not shared equitably both within and across societies.

HSP needs to continue to produce knowledge and practices that helps persons and groups secure themselves. Such knowledge production can involve documenting the unfolding of HS situations such as the present pandemic (Hopner, et al., 2021). It can also involve looking at past situations of insecurity to extrapolate insights that enable us to anticipate and mitigate related events in the future. Of central concern is how such situations emerged through dynamic relations between various interconnected elements that influence the composition, stability, functioning and consequences of HS assemblages over time (Delana, 2006). Relations between elements can be explored in terms of strength and character of connective alliances, reciprocal influences, tensions, routines of influence, and so forth (Sellar, 2009). This orientation requires us to recognise that our own disciplinary assemblages are entangled with, are influenced by, and influence the HS assemblages with which psychologists engage.

To develop HSP further we plan to embark on two interrelated strands of work. The first involves efforts to further theorize, document and understand different dimensions of HS and how these emerge within particular situations and implicate particular persons, groups, and institutions. The second involves embracing the praxis orientation of psychology as a discipline because HS is too important a topic to be reduced to an academic spectator sport. Foundational to these efforts is identifying the processes through which various constituent relational features and elements (e.g., material living conditions, institutional practices, and inter-group relations) shape the sense of security experienced by different persons and groups (Muller, 2015). This is important because whilst human [in]security concerns may manifest locally (as in the case of people in Afghan cities facing food and economic insecurities) the insecurities people face are organized through complex interrelations that often spanning a range of scales (personal to global). Central is a big picture orientation towards processuality, dynamism and uncertainty in HS situations and our disciplinary responses (Baker & McQuirk, 2017). It requires psychologists to explore how different human and non-human elements are related to one another through *connective alliances* (Hillier & Abrahams, 2013) and which elements and interconnections can be addressed when rendering effective assistance in particular situations. Psychology features a long history of rendering such assistance.

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M.A (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London, England: Routledge.
- Achen, C. & Bartels, L. M. (2017). *Democracy for Realists*. Princeton University Press.

- Adler, A. (1925). *The practice and theory of individual psychology* (1st ed.). London, England: Routledge.
- Ainsworth, M., Blehar, M.C., Waters, E., & Wall, S.N (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Alkire, S. (2003). *A conceptual framework for Human security*. (Working Paper 2). Oxford: Centre for Research on Inequality, Human security and Ethnicity, CRISE.
- Anderson, B., Kearnes, M., McFarlane, C., & Swanton, D. (2012). On assemblages and geography. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 2(2), 171-189.
- Anderson, B., & McFarlane, C. (2011). Assemblage and geography. *Area*, 43(2), 124-127.
- American Psychological Association (2008). *Society's grand challenges: Insights from Psychological Science*. Downloaded on March 7th 2016. Available at: <http://www.apa.org/research/action/gc-climate-change.pdf>
- Bajpai, K. (2003). The idea of human security. *International Studies*, 40(3), 195-228.
- Baker, T., & McGuirk, P. (2017). Assemblage thinking as methodology: Commitments and practices for critical policy research. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5, 425-442.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1990). Causes and consequences of delegitimization: Models of conflict and ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social issues*, 46(1), 65-81.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2013). *Intractable conflicts: Socio-psychological foundations and dynamics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2020). Creating fear and insecurity for political goals. *International Perspectives in Psychology, Practice, Consultation*, 9, 5–17. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ipp0000113>
- Bar-Tal, D., & Jacobson, D (1998). A psychological perspective on security. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 47(1), 59-71.
- Black, D. R., & Swatuk, L. A. (2009). Human security in North America: A Canadian perspective. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1087-1096). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Bowlby, J. 1969/ 1982. "Attachment and loss: Volume 1. *Attachment*. New York: Basics.
- Brown, N.R., Lee, P.J., Krslak, M., Conrad, F.G., GB Hansen, T., Havelka, J., & Reddon, J.R. (2009). Living in history: How war, terrorism, and natural disaster affect the organization of autobiographical memory. *Psychological Science*, 20(4), 399-405.
- Burman, E. (2016). *Deconstructing developmental psychology*. London, UK: Routledge.

- Butler, J. (2003). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. In C.R. McCann & S.K. Kim (Eds.), *Feminist local and global theory perspectives reader* (pp. 415-427). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Caldwell, D., & Williams, R.E. (2016). *Seeking security in an insecure world*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Carr, S. C. (2021). Humanitarian work and organisational psychology. *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Psychology*. Oxford, UK: OUP.
- Carr, S. C., Hopner, V., Hakim, M. A., Hodgetts, D. J., Chamberlain, K., Nelson, N., ... & Jones, H. (2021a). Scaling the security staircase. *Political Psychology*42(4),575-595. doi.org/10.1111/pops.12715.
- Carr, S. C., Young-Hauser, A., Hodgetts, D., Schmidt, W., Moran, L., Haar, J., Parker, J., Arrowsmith, J., Jones, H., & Alefaio-Tuglia, S. (2021b). Research update: How decent wages transform qualities of living - by affording escape from working poverty trap. *Journal of Sustainability Science*, 3, 1-15.
- Carr, S. C., Maleka, M., Meyer, I., Barry, M.L., & Harr, J., et al. (2018). How can wages sustain a living? By getting ahead of the curve. *Sustainability Science*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0560-7>.
- Chamberlain, K. (2000). Methodolatry and qualitative health research. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 5(3), 285–296.
- Chan, H., Wang, X., Zuo, S.- J., Chiu, C.P.- Y., Liu, L., Yiu, D.W., & Hong, Y.Y. (2021). War against COVID-19: How is national identification linked with the adoption of disease- preventive behaviors in China and the United States? *Political Psychology*, 42(5), 767 – 793.
- Chandler, D. (2008). Review essay: Human security: The dog that didn't bark. *Security Dialogue*, 39(4), 427-438.
- Choi, S. Y., Liu, J. H., Mari, S., & Garber, I. E. (2021). Content analysis of living historical memory around the world: Terrorization of the Anglosphere, and national foundations of hope in developing societies. *Memory Studies*, 1750698021995974.
- Chourou, B. (2009). Human security in the Arab world: A perspective from the Maghreb. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1021-1035). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Christie, D. J., & Montiel, C.J. (2013). Contributions of psychology to war and peace. *American Psychologist*, 68(7), 502-513.
- Coelho, P. S., Cordeiro, M. P., & Massola, G. M. (2020). Effects of female political participation on insecurity in a mining area. *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 9(1), 18-35.

- Colebrook, C (2002). *Understanding Deleuze*. Allen and Unwin, Sydney.
- Commission on Human security. (2003). *Human security now*. United Nations Publications.
- Cottam, M. L., Mastors, T.P., & Dietz-Uhler, B. (2015). *Introduction to political psychology*. Routledge.
- Danziger, K. (1983), Origins and basic principles of Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie*. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 22: 303-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1983.tb00597.x>
- Decolonial Psychology Editorial Collective (2021). General Psychology Otherwise: A Decolonial Articulation. *Review of General Psychology*, 25(4), 339-353.
- DeLanda, M. (2006). Deleuzian social ontology and assemblage theory. In M. Fugslang & B. Meler (Eds.). *Deleuze and the Social*, (pp. 250-266). Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- DeLanda, M. (2019). *A new philosophy of society: Assemblage theory and social complexity*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (1987). *Dialogues* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dontsov, A., & Pereyagina, E.B. (2013). Tense situations and the significance of stability for psychological security. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, 6(2), 4-15.
- Dontsov, A., Zinchenko, Y.P., Zotova, O.U. (2013). Notions of security as a component of students' attitude towards money." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 86: 98-103.
- Enriquez, V. G. (1993). Developing a Filipino psychology. In U. Kim & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *Indigenous psychologies: Research and experience in cultural context* (pp. 152–169). Sage Publications, Inc
- Fine, M., & Asch, A. (1988). Disability beyond stigma: Social interaction, discrimination, and activism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 44(1), 3-21.
- Foucault, M. (1963/1994). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., & Messineo, C. (2012). Human security: A critical review of the literature. *Centre for Research on Peace and Development (CRPD) Working Paper*, 11.

- Glušac, L., Gajin, S., Dimitrijević, V., Račić, O., Đerić, V., Papić, T., ... & Ignjatijef, M. (2001). International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. (2001). *The Responsibility To Protect*.
- Goldgeier, J. M (1997). Psychology and security. *Security Studies*, 6(4), 137-166.
- Guthrie, R. (2004). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology* (2nd Ed.). Boston: Person.
- Guimarães, D. S. (2020). *Dialogical multiplication: Principles for an indigenous psychology*. Nature Springer.
- Haggerty, K. D., & Ericson, R. V. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.
- Hamilakis, Y., & Jones, A. (2017). Archaeology and Assemblage. *Cambridge Archaeology*, 27, 77-84.
- Hampson, F. O., & Penny, C. K. (2007). Human security. In T.G.Weiss and S.Daws (Eds). *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* (pp. 539-537). Oxford: Oxford University.
- Harding, J., Pauszek, J., Parks, S., & Pollard, N. (2018). Alliances, assemblages, and affects: Three moments of building collective working-class literacies. *CCC*, 70(1), 6-29.
- Haslam, S. A., & Reicher, S. (2007). Identity entrepreneurship and the consequences of identity failure: The dynamics of leadership in the BBC Prison Study. *Social psychology quarterly*, 70(2), 125-147.
- Haq, M. (1994). *New imperatives of human security*. Rajiv Gandhi Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Hegarty, P. (2017). *A Recent History of Lesbian and Gay Psychology: From Homophobia to LGBT*. Routledge: London.
- Helly, H., Efrat, E., & Yosef, J. (2021). Spatial routinization and a 'secure base' in displacement processes: Understanding place attachment through the security-exploratory cycle and urban ontological security frameworks. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 75. Doi.org/10.1016/j.envp.2021.101612.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61-63.
- Herman, E. (1995). *The romance of American psychology: Political culture in the age of experts*. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Hillier, J., & Abrahams, G. (2013). Deleuze and Guattari: Jean Hillier in Conversation with Gareth Abrahams. *Exploring foundations for planning theory*. Association of European Schools of Planning: AESOP.

- Hodgetts, D., & Griffin, C. (2015). The place of class: Considerations for Psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, 25 (2), 147-166.
- Hodgetts, D., Michie, E., King, P., & Groot, S. (2022). Everyday injustices of serving time in a penal welfare system in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Psychology in Global Perspective*, 8 (1), 60 – 78.
- Hodgetts, D., & Stolte, O. (2017). *Urban poverty and health inequalities: A relational approach*. London, England: Routledge.
- Hodgetts, D., Stolte, O., Sonn, C., Drew, N., Nikora,., & Carr S (2020). *Social psychology and everyday life (2nd Ed.)*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Hodgetts, D., Rua, M., Groot, S., Hopner, V., Drew, N., King, P., & Blake, D. (2021). Relational ethics meets principled practice in community research engagements to understand and address homelessness. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22586>.
- Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D., Carr, S., Ball, R., Nelson, N., & Chamberlain, K. (2020). Introduction to the special section on the psychology of security. *International Perspectives in Psychology*, 9(1), 1-4.
- Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D., Carr, S., Nelson, N., Chamberlain, K & Ball, R. (2021). Assembling the Psycurity Accord in response to the early COVID-19 outbreak in Aotearoa New Zealand. In I. Strasser & M. Dege (Eds.), *The psychology of global crises and crisis politics: Intervention, resistance, decolonization*. *Palgrave Studies in the Theory and History of Psychology* (pp. 19-42). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Howell, A. (2018). Forget “militarization”: race, disability and the “martial politics” of the police and of the university. *International Journal of Feminist Politics*, 20(2), 117-136.
- Huddy, L., & Feldman, S. (2011). Americans respond politically to 9/11: Understanding the impact of the terrorist attacks and their aftermath. *American Psychologist*, 66(6), 455.
- Hwang, K. K. (2009). The development of indigenous counseling in contemporary Confucian communities. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 37(7), 930-943.
- Jacobs, J. (2006). A Geography of big things. *Cultural Geography*, 13, 1-17.
- Jacobson, G. C. (2010). Perception, memory, and partisan polarization on the Iraq War. *Political Science Quarterly*, 125(1), 31-56.
- Jahoda, M., Lazarsfeld, P., & Zeisel, M. (1933/1971). *Marienthal: A sociography of an unemployed community*. London, UK: Tavistock.
- Japan (1999). *Overview of Human security*. Bluebook 2000.

- Kaldor, M. (2007) *Human security: Reflections on globalization and intervention*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Kalleberg, A. (2018). *Precarious Lives: Job insecurity and wellbeing in rich democracies*. Medford, MA: Polity.
- Kaya, H., & Kale, S. (2016). African indigenous institutions and contemporary global security. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 46, 114-122.
- Kennedy, K., & Hallowell, B. (2021). Peace building in practice: Creating shared security at all levels. *Behavior and Social Issues*. Doi.org/10.1007/s42822-021-00052-4.
- King, P., & Hodgetts, D. (2017). Gathering a few thoughts on ‘Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 161-165.
- King, P., Hodgetts, D., Rua, M., & Morgan, M. (2017). Disrupting being on an industrial scale: Towards a theorization of Māori ways-of-being. *Theory & Psychology*, 27, 725-740.
- Klein, E. (2017). The World Bank on mind, behaviour and society. *Development and Change*, 48(3), 481-501.
- Klein, M. (1927). Symposium on child analysis. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 8, 339-370.
- Laing, R. (1965). *The divided self*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lacey, A. (1995). Empiricism. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to philosophy* (pp. 226–229). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. Oxford University Press.
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Lawson-Te Aho, K., & Liu, J. H. (2010). Indigenous suicide and colonization: The legacy of violence and the necessity of self-determination. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence (IJCV)*, 4(1), 124-133.
- Le Bon, G. (1896/1977). *The Crowd: A study of the popular mind*. Whitefish, Mont: Kessinger.
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. In T. Newcomb, & E. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology* (pp. 330–344). Henry Holt.
- Li, W., Hodgetts, D., Koong, H. (2018). *Asia-Pacific perspectives on inter-cultural psychology*. London, England: Routledge.
- Liu, J.H. (2017). Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy: For actioning psychology as a human science. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 137-149. DOI: 10.1111/ajsp.12168

- Liu, J.H. (in press). *Collective remembering and the making of political culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, J.H., Fisher Onar, N., & Woodward, M. (2014). Symbologies, technologies, and identities: Critical Junctures Theory and the multi-layered Nation-State. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 43, 2-12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.08.012>
- MacFarlane, S.N., & Y. F.Khong, Y.K. 2006. *Human security and the UN: A critical history*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- MacFarlane, C. (2009). Translocal assemblages: Space, power and social movements. *Geoforum*, 40, 561-567.
- MacFarlane, C. (2011). The city as assemblage: Dwelling and urban space. *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, 29, 649-671.
- Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological review*, 98(2), 224-253.
- McGurik, P., Mee, K., & Ruming, K. (2016). Assembling Urban Regeneration? Resourcing Critical Generative Accounts of Urban Regeneration through Assemblage. *Geographical Compass*, 109, 128-141.
- McWha-Hermann, I., Searle, R. H., & Carr, S. C. (2021). Striving for more: Work and Organizational Psychology (WOP) and living wages. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 30(6), 771-776.
- Marshall, R. D., Bryant, R.A., Amsel, L., Suh, E. J., Cook, J.M., & Neria, Y. (2007). The psychology of ongoing threat: Relative risk appraisal, The September 11 Attacks, and terrorism-related fears. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 304-316.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). The instinctoid nature of basic needs. *Journal of personality*.
- Martin, M., & Owen, T. (2010). The second generation of human security: lessons from the UN and EU experience. *International Affairs*, 86(1), 211-224.
- Maslow, A. H (1942). The dynamics of psychological security-insecurity. *Journal of Personality* 10(4), 331-344.
- Maxwell, A., Reay, R., Huber, A., Hawkins, E., Woolnough, E., & McNahon, C. (2021). Parent and practitioner perspectives on circle of security parenting (COS-P): A qualitative study. *Infant Mental Health*, 42, 452-468.
- Mercer, J. (1995). Anarchy and identity. *International organization*, 49(2), 229-252.

- Mika, C. (2015). “Thereness”: Implications of Heidegger’s “presence” for Māori. *AlterNative (Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga)*, 11(1), 3–13.
- Moghaddam, F. (2019). *Threat to democracy: The appeal of authoritarianism in an age of uncertainty*. Washington D.C.: APA Press.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (2022). *Rethinking Psychology: From societies to cells*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Montiel, C.J. , Uyheng, J., & Dela Paz, E. (2021). The language of pandemic leaderships: Mapping political rhetoric during the COVID- 19 outbreak. *Political Psychology* , 42(5), 747 – 766 .
- Moscovici, S. (2001). *Social representations: Essays in social psychology*. New York: NYU Press.
- Müller, M. (2015). Assemblages and Actor Networks: Rethinking socio-material power, politics and space. *Geography Compass* 9 (1), 27–41, 10.1111/gec3.12192.
- Munyon, T., Lyons, M., Carnes, A., & Zettler, I. (2020). All about the money? Exploring antecedents and consequences for a brief measure of perceived financial security. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 25(1), 159-175.
- Najam, A. (2003). The human dimensions of environmental insecurity: Some insights from South Asia. *Environmental change and security project report*, 9, 59-74.
- Nielsen, K. S., Clayton, S., Stern, P. C., Dietz, T., Capstick, S., & Whitmarsh, L. (2021). How psychology can help limit climate change. *American Psychologist*, 76(1), 130–144.
- Othman, Z. (2009). Human security concepts, approaches and debates in Southeast Asia. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1037-1047). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Paris, R. (2001). Human security: Paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security* 26(2), 87-102.
- Pennycook, A. (2018). Applied linguistics as epistemic assemblage. *AILA Review*, 34, 113-134.
- Pickren, W., & Teo, T. (2020). A new scholarly imaginary for general psychology. *Review of General Psychology*, 24(1), 3-5.
- Poku, N. K., & Sandkjaer, B. (2009). Human security in sub-Saharan Africa. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1049-1062). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Quinton, A. (1995). Continental philosophy. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to philosophy* (pp. 161–163). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rao, K., Paranjpe, A. C., & Dalal, A. K. (2008). *Handbook of Indian psychology*. Cambridge University Press India/Foundation Books.
- Reicher, S. (2011). Mass action and mundane reality: An argument for putting crowd analysis at the centre of the social sciences. *Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, 6, 433-449.

- Sabur, A. A. (2009). Theoretical perspective on human security: A South Asian view. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1003-1011). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Schneier, B. (2008). The psychology of security. *International Conference on Cryptology in Africa*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg: 50-79.
- Sellar, B. (2009). Assemblage theory, occupational science, and the complexity of human agency. *Journal of Occupational Science*, 16, 67-74.
- Sen, A. (2000). Why human security?. In *international symposium on human security, Tokyo* (Vol. 28).
- Searle, J. R. (2003). Contemporary philosophy in the United States. In N. Bunnin & E. Tsui (Eds.), *The Blackwell companion to philosophy* (2nd ed., pp. 1–22). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Searle, R. H., & Rice, C. (2020). "Making an impact in healthcare contexts: Insights from a mixed-methods study of professional misconduct." *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*: 1-12.
- Simon, H. A. (1990). Bounded rationality. In *Utility and probability* (pp. 15-18). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Simpson, J., Albani, B., Bell, Z., Bambra, C., & Brown, H. (2022). Effects of social security policy reforms on mental health and inequalities: A systematic review of observational studies in high-income countries. *Social Science & Medicine*, doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.113717.
- Smith, S. (1999). The increasing insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing security in the last twenty years. *Contemporary Security Policy* 20(3), 72-101.
- Smith, C. A., & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Appraisal components, core relational themes, and the emotions. *Cognition & emotion*, 7(3-4), 233-269.
- Stephan, W.G., Stephan, C.W., & Gudykunst, W.B. (1999). Anxiety in intergroup relations: A comparison of anxiety/uncertainty management theory and integrated threat theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(4), 613-628.
- Syropoulos, S., Puschett, E., & Leidner, B. (2021). Positive and Negative Peace as Predictors of Pandemic Preparedness: Evidence from a Micro-and Macro-Level Investigation During the Onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Political psychology*, 42(5), 729-745.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy, A. (2007). *Human security: Concepts and implications* (Vol. 51). Routledge.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 234-289). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Tetlock, P. E. (2009). *Expert Political Judgment*. Princeton University Press.

- United Nations Development Programme (1994). *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- United Nations Trust Fund for Human security. (1994). *Human security in theory and practice*. New York, NY: United Nations.
- Vignoles, V. L., Jaser, Z., Taylor, F., & Ntontis, E. (2021). Harnessing shared identities to mobilize resilient responses to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Political psychology*, 42(5), 817-826.
- Watson, P. J., Brymer, M.J., & Bonanno, G.A. (2011). Post-disaster psychological intervention since 9/11. *American Psychologist* 66(6), 482-494.
- Williams, P. D. (Ed). 2013. *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2nd Edition). Oxon: Routledge.
- Wundt, W. (1866). uber Ziele und Wege der Volkerpsychologie. *Philosophische Studien*, 4, 1-27.
- Wun'Gaeo, S. (2009). Environment as an element of human security in Southeast Asia: case study on the Thai tsunami. In *Facing Global Environmental Change* (pp. 1131-1142). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Yang, K. S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(3), 241-263.
- Yulianto, J. E., Hodgetts, D., King, P., & Liu, J. H. (2021). The assemblage of inter-ethnic marriages in Indonesia. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2587>
- Zinchenko, Y.P. (2011). Security psychology as a social systemic phenomenon. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art* 4(1), 307-315.
- Zotova, O. Y (2011). Need for safety in different social and economic groups. *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, 4(1), 335-347.
- Zotova, O., & Karapetyan, L. (2018). Psychological Wellbeing and Personality Mental Health. *KnE Life Sciences*, 982-992. TO
- Zinchenko, Y. P., & Zotova, O.Y. (2014). Security in the worldview of Russians.” *Psychology in Russia: State of the Art*, 7(1), 50-61.