



# PROTEMO

## Theoretical and Methodological Debates on Protective Policies and Emotions of Citizens and Non-citizens

Report

PROTEMO Publications



Funded by  
the European Union

## The PROTEMO Consortium



UNIVERSITÄT  
DES  
SAARLANDES

SDU



Institute of Psychology  
Polish Academy of Sciences



UNIVERSIDADE D  
COIMBRA

אוניברסיטת  
רייכמן  
בית ספר לאודר  
לממשל, דיפלומטיה  
ואסטרטגיה



ces  
Centre for Social Studies  
University of Coimbra



University of  
Southampton



EURICE  
EUROPEAN RESEARCH AND  
PROJECT OFFICE GMBH

## About PROTEMO

PROTEMO investigates the emotional connection between the state and individuals. The focus is on protective policies and their consequences for individuals, groups of citizens and non-citizens as well as for democracy, political participation, and mobilisation. [www.protemo.eu](http://www.protemo.eu)

Published by Centre for Social Studies (CES). September 2024.

This publication is part of WP1, led by Centre for Social Studies (CES).

Authors: Cristiano Gianolla, Pavlo Kravchuk

Contributing Authors Michaella Assouline, Moshe Mahor

To cite:

Gianolla, Cristiano, Pavlo Kravchuk. Theoretical and Methodological Debates on Protective Policies and Emotions of Citizens and Non-citizens. PROTEMO Publications, 2024.

Design: EURICE

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency (REA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgment .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
Abstract.....	5
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Description of Activities .....	5
2.1 Literature Reviews .....	6
2.1.1 Workflow description .....	6
2.1.2 Main findings of literature reviews .....	8
2.1.3 Glossary of key concepts.....	9
3 Results.....	10
3.1 Debates on theory and methods .....	10
3.1.1 Multiple Streams Framework.....	11
3.1.2 Affective Intelligence Theory .....	11
3.1.3 Critical approach through multi-layered citizenship.....	12
3.1.4 Protection and politics of belonging .....	13
3.1.5 Other debates .....	14
3.1.6 Theory implications for the empirical work (Discussion of the survey design) .....	14
3.2 Implications for the project's theoretical approach .....	15
4 Deviations Summary .....	17
5 Conclusions .....	17
6 References .....	18

## List of Tables

Table 1 Comparing formal attributes of PROTEMO literature review reports .....	6
Table 2 The geography of studies reviewed by LRR3.....	12

## List of Abbreviations

AIT	Affective Intelligence Theory
LRR1	Literature Review Report 1
LRR2	Literature Review Report 2
LRR3	Literature Review Report 3
MSF	Multiple Stream Framework
WP	Work Package

## Abstract

This report scrutinises the main theoretical and methodological debates that emerged throughout the PROTEMO project literature review process (WP1) in January-July 2024. Three literature review reports were delivered in July 2024, after an online workshop held in March 2024 and an in-person literature review workshop that occurred at Saarland University (Germany) in June 2024. The three reports focused on “Protective Policies and Affective Citizenship” (LRR1), “Emotional Needs and Emotional Entrepreneurs and Emotional Framing” (LRR2) and “Social Representations, Social Identities, Emotional Dynamics and Protection” (LRR3). The present report’s main objective is to summarise and explore June’s workshop debates, however, it frames these debates within the whole literature review process. It also includes the first version of the PROTEMO glossary of key terms, emerging from the three literature review reports. As the literature review process was guided by an interdisciplinary team, the current report also outlines geographical, cultural, epistemological and disciplinary issues, as well as how they are tackled through concepts of multi-layered and affective citizenship within PROTEMO. In the conclusion of this report, we describe the implications for the overall theoretical framework of PROTEMO, building on the Grant Agreement (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al. 2023), as well as insights from the theoretical and methodological debates around the literature reviews.

## 1 Introduction

This report summarises the debates that emerged within the Work Package 1 “Theoretical and conceptual framework” of the PROTEMO project (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al, 2023). These debates emerged over seven months (January – July 2024), during three events (project’s kick-off meeting and two workshops) and through written communication. The WP1 objective is to “consolidate the interdisciplinary theoretical framework that guides the project’s work” (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al, 2023, P. 6). WP1 included three literature review reports, aiming to contribute to the PROTEMO theoretical foundation with the basis for a proper and effective application of mixed method research. The present report aims to: a) consolidate the main concepts; b) monitor the relationship that emerges between theory and empirical research; c) inform the project’s analytical approach.

## 2 Description of Activities

To reach the objectives listed above, the report scrutinises theoretical debates that emerged during PROTEMO’s meetings and workshops in January (University of Coimbra, Portugal), March (online) and June (Saarland University) 2024. It relies on the main findings of three literature reviews and the debates that occurred during the process of drafting and internally analysing the literature reviews. Also, the report compares several dimensions of literature reviews to investigate the extent to which their findings impact the theoretical grounds and boundaries of the interdisciplinary research anticipated in PROTEMO. It provides a first draft of the project’s main conceptual outline by identifying “key concepts”. Finally, it tackles some of the issues that emerged between the theoretical approach and empirical research, namely in debates related to the international survey envisaged within the project, while deducing possible implications for PROTEMO’s theoretical framework.

The following sources were used to track and describe the theoretical debates within WP1: the project application text; PROTEMO meeting data, including notes, recordings and minutes; texts

of literature reviews, including preliminary drafts and comments by internal reviewers; the definitions of the main concepts, developed by literature review teams.

**2.1 Literature Reviews**

*2.1.1 Workflow description*

Throughout January-July 2024, three literature review reports (hereinafter also referred to as LRR) were prepared by three teams of researchers to reveal state-of-the-art research in the following topics:

1. Protective Policies and Affective Citizenship (LRR1)
2. Emotional Needs and Emotional Entrepreneurs and Emotional Framing (LRR2)
3. Social representations, social identities, emotional dynamics and protection (LRR3)

Literature reviews were designed with the overall objective of consolidating the interdisciplinary theoretical framework and concepts of the project (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et. al 2023). At this stage, consolidation was ensured mainly via continuous cross-verification of the research, its objectives, methods and results. The development of literature reviews was preceded by a live kick-off meeting on 22 January 2024 at the University of Coimbra and an online meeting of the project team on 19 March 2024. At the online meeting, the focus of LRR1 was adjusted slightly compared to the WP1 description in the Grant Agreement to avoid overlapping with LRR3<sup>1</sup>. Draft literature reviews were presented and discussed at the PROTEMO internal workshop on 14 June at Saarland University, involving both the PROTEMO team and members of the PROTEMO advisory board, Prof. Bethany Albertson and Dr. Iryna Hubeladze. After this event, a new draft of each LRR was circulated and internally peer-reviewed by a designated PROTEMO researcher. The final versions of the LRRs were delivered in July 2024.

Each literature review was developed within its own work stream, the boundaries of which were defined by a designated research team in respect to the research questions, working hypothesis and an estimated volume of the data to be processed. LRR1 conducted one systematic literature review, followed by a qualitative content analysis and one narrative review, cross-checking through a systematic search. LRR2 generated three narrative reviews focusing on sub-themes, while LRR3 conducted a systematic literature review according to a PRISMA protocol. To create a more comprehensive cross-description of LRRs, we propose comparing the formal attributes of the reviews as reflected in Table 1.

*Table 1 Comparing formal attributes of PROTEMO literature review reports*

<b>Category</b>	<b>LRR1</b>	<b>LRR2</b>	<b>LRR3</b>
Method	Systematic + Narrative  +in-depth analysis of the most cited articles for each field	Narrative	Systematic (PRISMA)

<sup>1</sup> The decision was taken to cover the concept of affective citizenship in LRR3 and use the LRR1 to focus more strongly on protective policies. It emerged based on a discussion of two input papers by Maor and Wenzelburger, considering the respective focus of the literature reviews in relation to the theoretical concept of the Multiple Streams Approach.

<b>Category</b>	<b>LRR1</b>	<b>LRR2</b>	<b>LRR3</b>
Structure	Two sub reviews	Three sub reviews (+3 sub reviews of the 3rd sub review)	Single review
Databases checked	Google Scholar WoS	Google Scholar WoS Scopus	WoS Scopus
Language	Not specified	English	English, French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish
Fields of study	I. 1) Welfare State Studies, 2) Law and Order, 3) Health, 4) Foreign and Security Policies, 5) Environmental Policies, 6) Migration  ii. Political Science, Policy Analysis, Social and Political Psychology	Psychology, Political Psychology and Policy Sciences  Expanding to neighbouring disciplines when relevant work was cited (Social and Cognitive Psychology, Political Science, Communication Science/Studies, Health Communication, Management, Business Studies, Health Studies and Sociology)	Psychology, Social Science, Government Law, Social Work, Family Studies, Behavioural Sciences, Arts, Humanities, Anthropology, Sociology, Geography, Religion, History, Philosophy, Urban Studies, International Relations, Political Science, Communication, Women Studies, Social Issues, Ethnic Studies, Telecommunications, Linguistics, Asian Studies, Area Studies, Development Studies, Literature, Cultural Studies, Multidisciplinary, Undefined
<b>Initial search results</b>	Over 1,514	Not specified	8,921
<b>Type of publications</b>	Peer-reviewed articles Book chapters Other papers	Academic articles Books Reports	Peer-reviewed articles

Category	LRR1	LRR2	LRR3
Final number of publications analysed	430	Over 480	73

### 2.1.2 Main findings of literature reviews

This section cites verbatim the executive summaries of each literature review to provide a concise and comprehensive description of the results of this activity, the basis for further theoretical and methodological debate.

LRR1, Authored by Katja Stempel and Georg Wenzelburger; reviewed by Peter Starke:

*This literature review examines the state of the art on two related research areas: on protective policies and on emotions related to politics as well as on political communication and policy-making. Both reviews deliver important insights into main debates in the respective strands: On protective policies, the analysis shows that the concept itself has not been used widely, whereas protection is mentioned repeatedly in articles related to specific policy areas, such as social protection, environmental protection or health protection. Hence, combining the insights from these different areas can lead to an enhanced understanding of the cross-cuttingness of protection, which will be further explored in PROTEMO. With regard to emotion in the realm of politics, scholars have extensively investigated the affective dimensions of political behaviour and political communication. However, with some exceptions, extensive empirical studies on the concrete role of emotion in the process of policy-making are missing from the academic literature. PROTEMO addresses this lack and thereby contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of policy-making in an era of multiple insecurities.*

*Finally, drawing together the results of the two parts, the review yields several important insights about possible interlinkages, namely on the target groups of protection, the origin of protection, the assessment of the need of protection, providers of protection, policy instruments providing protection, drivers of protection and the time horizon related to protection. These insights can inform a theoretical conceptualization of protective policies as well as guide the development of hypotheses on how emotions affect the policy-making process on protective policies and vice versa.*

LRR2, Authored by Tereza Capelos, Katarzyna Hamer-den Heyer and Moshe Maor; reviewed by Georg Wenzelburger:

*The literature review presented here examines research on the emotional needs of individuals, groups, and policymakers, emotional policy entrepreneurs, and emotional framing synthesising the findings of over 480 academic articles, books and reports, drawing mainly from political psychology, psychology, and policy studies, and including works from related disciplines. On emotional needs, the analysis shows that the concept of 'emotional needs' has informed research in psychology, business studies, marketing, and the health sciences, and less so in political psychology. These studies concur that the needs of safety and security, belonging, and recognition are fundamental human requirements for mental and emotional well-being, which play a key role for individual and societal stability. On emotional policy entrepreneurs, the review explores studies in the field of policy sciences which concur that emotional policy entrepreneurs employ emotional manipulation strategies, along with non-emotional strategies, to*



*achieve their policy goals. On framing experiments on protective policies, the review explores experimental studies and examines what frames were used, with what outcomes, and what was the role of emotions. The analysis finds that most of the experiments with framing did not measure emotions. When emotions were measured, they were treated as moderators or as mediators in the communication process between policies and outcomes (e.g. attitudes toward these policies).*

*This literature review will serve as an input for the internal workshop on the theoretical and conceptual foundations (T1.4). Bringing together the findings of these three parts, it highlights gaps in extant research, as well as the connections between how the emotional needs of individuals, groups and policy makers are understood and addressed, how emotional policy entrepreneurs operate in this context, and how emotional framing can be instrumental for the communication of emotional needs. These insights will inform the theoretical contribution of PROTEMO as well as provide the framework to develop hypotheses and design empirical methodologies for the studies in the project.*

LRR 3, Authored by Maria Giuseppina Cardella, Cristiano Gianolla, Miriam Jawadi, Lisete Mónico and Clara Cruz Santos; reviewed by Tereza Capelos:

*This document is the report of a systematic literature review, based on the [PRISMA](#) statement. It presents the methodological process, finding, and discussion of the systematic literature review on the intersection of four main concepts: social representations (SRs), emotional dynamics, multi-layered citizenship and security.*

*Based on the publications related to the four main concepts, we identified 4236 items in the Web of Science (WoS) and 4685 items in the Scopus databases. After filtering and removing duplicates, a total 2940 publications were screened and 73 scientific articles were analysed in detail. A keyword co-occurrence analysis was performed through [VOSviewer](#) software 1.6.10, as a content analysis. These analyses examined the state of conceptual knowledge on security SRs, as well as their emotional roots and consequences for individuals and groups of citizens and non-citizens.*

The results show three objects of the security SRs: **Ethnic Minorities, Crime and Gender Identity**. Based on these categories, the findings related to the RQs were discussed, identifying ways in which researchers can explore this field of research and contribute to the global literature.

### *2.1.3 Glossary of key concepts*

A glossary of key terms is still under development by the project team as part of the literature review process. Twenty-one terms have been identified and the drafting of their definitions exceeds this report's submission date. A dedicated document with the glossary of PROTEMO's key terms will be circulated and updated on the PROTEMO website throughout the project. The initial list of terms includes:

1. Affect
2. Categorisation
3. Citizenship, Affective (Affective Citizenship)
4. Citizenship, Multi-layered (Multi-layered Citizenship)
5. Emotion

6. Emotional Dynamics
7. Emotional Entrepreneurs
8. Emotional Framing
9. Emotional Manipulation
10. Emotional Needs
11. Emotional Policy Entrepreneurs
12. Emotions, Collective (Collective Emotions)
13. Emotions, Group-based or Vicarious (Group-based Emotions or Vicarious Emotions)
14. Emotions, Individual (Individual Emotions)
15. Framing
16. Protection
17. Protective Policy
18. (In)Security/Safety
19. Social Identities
20. Social Representations
21. Stereotype

### **3 Results**

#### **3.1 Debates on theory and methods**

The three literature reviews, as well as PROTEMO internal debates, identified multiple relevant theories and dialectical relationships. They allowed for creating an overview of the theoretical landscape in the focus areas, spotting important gaps in the existing research and choosing the most suitable approaches for further use.

In its review of policies and emotions, LRR1 collects the findings of several theories that focus on the nature of emotions and their connection with the policy process, namely basic emotions approach, constructivist approach and cognitive appraisal theory. From these, other theories are derived, such as the Hot Cognition Hypothesis and Affective Intelligence Theory. LRR2 has added to this list: the Punctuated Equilibrium Theory; Narrative Policy Framework; Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF); Multiple Streams Framework (MSF); interpretative policy stream; psychological theories explaining emotional needs, identity and belonging, such as Social Identity Theory, Self-Determination Theory and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Identifying Ethnic Minorities, Crime and Gender Identity as dominant areas of study, LRR3 has focused on theories of Social Representation, Multi-layered Citizenship and Affective Citizenship.

The potential of these theories in the context of PROTEMO objectives was discussed, with special attention dedicated to the Multiple Stream Framework, Affective Intelligence Theory, multi-layered citizenship and belonging. The next section describes the flow and implications of the debates regarding those specific theories.

### *3.1.1 Multiple Streams Framework*

The team debated the possible innovation of the project introducing a stronger focus on emotions in the Multiple Streams Framework (MSF) of policy analysis. The MSF was chosen as it constitutes a strong and refined alternative to investigation based on rational choice theory. The MSF allows for analysing the policy process, considering the ambiguities that are present in politics. Moreover, the MSF provides a flexible and open structure that permits integrating different perspectives on emotions. While the MSF considered emotions only marginally or indirectly (e.g., when referring to “public mood”, “ambiguity”, “affect framing” or “bounded rationality”), PROTEMO plans to expand the MSF by introducing a sharper focus on emotions. More specifically, PROTEMO will focus on the phase of problem definition and agenda-setting, in which framing contests take place to define a political problem and the policy with which to respond. This speaks not only directly to the core idea of PROTEMO, according to which protective policies are discursively linked to insecurity, but it also opens the policy process for emotions that are key in framing processes. Furthermore, the concept of policy entrepreneurs, a core element of the MSF, allows for the inclusion of emotions in the policy analysis, as argued by Maor and Gross (2015). These issues were debated while preparing for and conducting the online workshop of 19 March. Initially, the proposal to structure all literature reviews around the MSF was made. For LRR1, the focus was on questions of citizen and non-citizen political entitlements relating to emotional protection. LRR2 concentrated on emotional needs, framing effects of political communication on emotions and emotional strategies pursued by policy entrepreneurs. LRR3 centred on multi-layered citizenship in relation to various processes within these three MSF streams: producing radical policy alternatives; stopping the resistance of interest groups; by-passing veto players.

During further debates the potential of MSF was recognised, especially considering the fact that it is an open framework to which new elements may be integrated alongside PROTEMO’s objectives. In particular, MSF theory lacks clear interpretation of policy feedback and multi-layered citizenship. As a result, MSF was incorporated in the LRR1 and LRR2 focus on policy processes and emotional policy entrepreneurs.

The application of MSF theory is a promising approach for exploring the different roles of emotions in the policy process, which is one of PROTEMO’s three research perspectives, with a focus on policymaking. Consequently, the discussions have shown that the MSF can be used as the overarching theoretical concept to analyse the role of emotions in the policy process more systematically. Therefore, tasks directly involved with the policy process will use this theoretical lens in their case studies. In contrast, the discussions have also shown that the MSF was not operationalised when analysing emotional reactions to protective policies or citizen and non-citizen emotional needs and affective citizenship. Consequently, MSF may be less fruitful as a theoretical lens for other parts of the project.

### *3.1.2 Affective Intelligence Theory*

The literature review process demonstrated the prominence of the Affective Intelligence Theory (AIT) in many of the studies reviewed. AIT posits that an individual’s emotions “help govern a reliance on political habits or, alternatively, deliberation and attention to new political information” (Marcus, MacKuen & Neuman, 2011). Thus, AIT is potentially useful for operationalising emotional reactions in the context of protective policies. PROTEMO’s team recognised the very influential role of AIT within the discipline of political psychology. However, it also debated the need to go beyond this approach, for instance when it comes to focusing on distinct emotions and the complex dynamics among them. Appraisal theories of emotions have been indicated as particularly revealing for advancing research beyond AIT.

### 3.1.3 Critical approach through multi-layered citizenship

The three LRRs, as well as the theoretical and methodological debates held during meetings in January-July 2024, have revealed several areas for applying a critical approach to avoid epistemological bias. In light of PROTEMO’s focus on multi-layered citizens, these debates point to both the project’s theoretical originality as well as the interdisciplinary challenges of fulfilling the objectives with critical awareness.

The corpus of the literature analysed is predominantly from the Global North in its language, scope of study, geographical area, methods, theories and concepts. A large share of the reviewed literature has covered the USA and EU. For example, the table below emerged from the LRR3 detailed indicators about the geographical scope of the studies included in the review.

*Table 2 The geography of studies reviewed by LRR3*

<b>Territory</b>	<b>Europe</b>	<b>North America</b>	<b>Central and South America</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>Africa</b>	<b>Oceania</b>
<b>Number of studies</b>	30 (including EU - 25)	19 (including US - 17)	12	10	3	1

*In total, 73 articles covered studies in at least 36 countries. Several studies did not specify the area or covered more than one country. Russia is categorised here as Europe, Turkey and Israel as Asia, Mexico as Central and South America (LRR3)*

On the one hand, as the project is centred on a European perspective and advances empirical research in Europe and Israel only, concerns were raised about the risk of generalising the findings to other world regions, especially the Global South. Thus, this debate indicated one limitation of the project’s epistemological perspective. On the other hand, the focus on multi-layered citizenship was introduced in order to approach and analyse the structural forms of exclusions that exist and persist in western societies. Among these exclusions are colonialism, racism, xenophobia, sexism and patriarchy. PROTEMO’s “deep dives” include research strands more keenly focused on these lines of inquiry by collaborating with migrants and refugees. Deep dives strengthen the analytical approach of the project as a whole, however the focus on multi-layered citizenship is fundamental in the analytical approach of all research activities of the project.

With PROTEMO’s aim to “re-think the relationship between emotions, protection, and democracy”, the concept of affective citizenship problematises state policy processes that define some emotions as accepted and normalised, while rejecting others. Furthermore, PROTEMO contributes to the literature by “analysing protective policies in light of the social positioning of people and their emotional relation with the state, which shapes different emotional needs” (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al, 2023). Adopting multi-layered citizen as a theoretical perspective means acknowledging that people belong to sub-, cross- and supra-state polities and are equipped with different social, economic, cultural and political power, as well as emotional needs. Therefore, “[PROTEMO] pays particular attention to social groups that do not benefit from full citizenship due to political, cultural, social, economic, religious, gender, sexuality, ability or age reasons” (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al, 2023).

Considering all the above, the research work ahead challenges PROTEMO's team to demonstrate the extent to which the Eurocentric debates on protective policies can be expanded through its critical epistemological focus. These reflections impact the central project's activities, such as the design of the project's international survey, especially regarding sociodemographic data collection, respondent sampling and the survey question framing.

Finally, the literature review process largely focused on English-language peer-reviewed articles. This may lead to losing important information, so efforts shall be proposed to explore research in other languages and other types of literature, like policy recommendations.

### *3.1.4 Protection and politics of belonging*

A critical debate emerged in relation to the entanglement of protection and belonging. This debate focused on how emotional needs differently relate to group and social cohesion, as well as how the emotional needs of individuals lead to the need for belonging. A critical approach underlines that some social groups are structurally excluded from social recognition and build senses of selves for their well-being, via challenging the social cohesion through group cohesion.

According to this position, the classic literature on social cohesion views citizens through the lens of heteronormativity and undervalues the impact of diversity in society, thus presenting a view contrary to those of the PROTEMO project. When examining emotional needs, it is crucial to consider that the security and protection of some groups can be promoted – as done historically – at the expense of the security and protection of other groups in the society. Moreover, this contraposition is possibly connected to a de-humanisation of certain political subjects, which justifies their exposure to insecurity and oppression. For this reason, “belonging” in PROTEMO is assessed from the multi-layered citizenship perspective that assumes diverse forms of affiliation and neglect within society. In other words, an individual may feel abandoned, rejected or oppressed in one context, but belonging in other contexts within the same society. This perspective provides insight in the analysis of unmet emotional needs in democratic societies. While some literature claims unmet emotional needs may lead to disillusionment with institutions and decrease political participation, there is also evidence that victims of social exclusion regenerate social cohesion and shape new political agency out of their struggle.

Investigating belonging critically brings in the framing and agency produced by the politics of belonging as “the maintenance and reproduction of the boundaries of the community of belonging” (Yuval-Davis, 2006, p. 205). Though these boundaries are built by hegemonic political powers, they are also challenged by other political actors, who construct alternative politics of belonging, reaching well beyond populist or nationalist narratives. Given that the politics of belonging is largely composed of emotional attachment and articulation of threatened belonging (Yuval-Davis, 2007), belonging becomes central to critically assessing protective policies and emotional framing by emotional policy entrepreneurs, within the domain of MSF. This line of inquiry will also dig into the provision and providers of protection, as well as the agency of political subjects, within political processes delivering protection and belonging. If distrust in the state increases trust in other social groups defined by intersectional layers shaping identity, community, networks, etc., research must further investigate this phenomenon. Specifically, research should explore how those emotional needs that are unfulfilled by the state may be addressed by expanding and valuing the agency of non-state and non-institutional (including supranational) actors. Furthermore, it is worth understanding how emotional needs of marginalised and oppressed social groups may reshape oppression into emancipation, transform anger into hope, dismiss fear and create solidarity, beyond the state. Bringing together the perspectives of emotional needs, politics of belonging and protection enriches the project,

sustaining its contribution to the current research in several scientific areas covered by PROTEMO.

### *3.1.5 Other debates*

The literature review process has manifested the existence of disciplinary differences in approaching both the literature and empirical research. PROTEMO's team is enriched by scholars of political science, political and social psychology, cultural studies and sociology; the need has emerged to reflect on the implications of these disciplinary debates on the collective work.

One specific issue was recurrently discussed throughout the internal debates: does the project focus on policies or emotions? Despite the consensus regarding the synthetic nature of the project investigating interconnections between protection and emotions, this difficulty appears regularly in the debate. Political scientists tend towards the first option, while social and political psychologists and sociologists favour the second. The conception of PROTEMO appears to bring the emotions perspective into the existing field of policy research, rather than studying emotions through the lens of policies. The project team's joint position in this regard should still be elaborated.

Also, an important question that arose was: are the policies protective only because they are framed or perceived as such by politicians, or also because they are accepted as such by citizens? The project defines protective policies as "policies that are communicated by political actors as providing safety and security to citizens, policies that are directed at what political actors perceive as emotional needs of citizens (i.e., feeling appreciated, safe, accomplished, or part of a community" (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al 2023). However, this definition alone does not include the perception of (multi-layered) citizens. Can there be policies perceived or positioned as protective by policy actors, but not accepted as protective by the citizens? And vice versa: can the policies that are not perceived or positioned as protective by policy actors be considered protective from the point of view of (multi-layered) citizens? These questions should be further investigated in the framework of a multi-layered citizenship perspective. PROTEMO promises to provide data, information and theory on these questions, defining and mapping this unexplored research field, while accounting for subjectivities in the research and policy processes.

### *3.1.6 Theory implications for the empirical work (Discussion of the survey design)*

As part of its mixed method approach, PROTEMO envisions conducting a cross-national 11 country<sup>2</sup> survey to study emotional dynamics of protective policies. The project also intends to include another form of empirical research, such as focus groups or in-depth interviews. The findings of the literature review will inform the whole empirical research of the project, including the variety of quantitative and qualitative methods proposed. However, debates on the literature review and survey design have been strongly entangled. This is partially due to the overlap of the respective project work, as well as the survey's wide range and central importance for the project. The survey is envisioned to include ten European countries and Israel, employing survey experiments and questions on: political participation, trust in political institutions and democracy; vulnerability to misinformation and disinformation. The survey will be conducted in three waves (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al, 2023). The literature review process generated a debate regarding how the survey design can meet the challenge of investigating protection and emotions in relation to multi-layered citizenship.

---

<sup>2</sup> Nine EU members (Czechia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Poland, Portugal and Sweden), UK and Israel



Collecting standard social-demographic information in a cross-national survey was recognised as potentially problematic, considering the diverse population distributions, political histories and political cultures. While PROTEMO can draw from existing international instruments, scales and batteries of questions, it should also consider to what extent these standards allow for collecting vital data. Special critical consideration is needed to ensure data are representative of social diversity and effectively capture emotion, policy and (non)citizenship information. Questions on education, income, race and ethnicity should allow different publics to provide informative responses, avoiding assumptions about populations' cultural, social and political homogeneity.

Core concepts to be measured in the survey include protective policies, emotions and emotional needs. The debate highlighted the need to investigate protection via questioning insecurities. A qualitative item could be introduced for this purpose. This led to a debate on the added value of using validated scales, as opposed to open questions. As also indicated by project consultants, qualitative responses facilitate the emergence of unpredictable data on emotions, although increasing the complexity of data analysis. At the same time, it was noted that the vast set of survey data in multiple languages would pose a challenge to ensuring that responses are collected in a reasonable timeframe. While staying predominantly quantitative, some qualitative items were proposed to collect data, for instance operationalising the Social Representation method by free invocation.

### 3.2 Implications for the project's theoretical approach

The blind spots identified in the literature reviews and debates emerging from discussions regarding the state of the art have several implications for PROTEMO's theoretical and methodological approach. Based on the summary provided in this report, we list four key aspects that may inform the future work of PROTEMO.

- a. The literature reviews and debates have identified that policy studies often treat "citizens" as a homogenous block, which obscures the differences between individuals living in a country (see, for instance, the review on framing studies in LRR3). Therefore, as indicated in Table 4 in LRR1, PROTEMO will be attentive to the target groups of protective policies (and communication) and the protection needs of different groups in society. Similarly, the work packages based on the survey need to account for the fact that emotional reactions, as well as emotional needs or feelings of insecurity, can vary among individuals depending on their position in society and the social group with which they identify. Therefore, the literature reviews strongly indicate that PROTEMO can advance existing research with its acknowledgement of the multi-layeredness of citizens, neglected in existing research. PROTEMO can use the lens of **multi-layered citizenship and the politics of belonging** to identify how protection and emotions differ between people, depending on their social positionalities and identities.
- b. As the literature reviews have shown, PROTEMO's unique contribution lies in its emphasis on the **interrelationship between protective policies (and their communication) and emotional reaction, as well as emotional needs**. What sets the project apart from existing research is studying emotions with a focus on concrete public policies that are directed towards protection, namely: penal-welfare issues (e.g., juvenile justice between rehabilitation and repression), health topics (e.g., the corona pandemic), migration policies (e.g., expulsion of immigrants) or environmental policies (e.g., climate protection measures). PROTEMO asks whether the protection offered, or claimed to be offered by these policies, is a reaction to perceived emotional needs. Furthermore, the research explores whether the communication about these policies and their adoption produces

emotional reactions by multi-layered citizens (differentiating between groups, see a.). The literature reviews have indicated that this focus can substantially advance our knowledge on policy processes. Given this general outline, the policy-related work packages should use and develop the Multiple Streams Framework to integrate emotional needs, emotions and policies into one coherent framework. This integration could refine the approach, especially with regards to the emotional policy entrepreneur (LRR2) and multi-layered citizenship perspective. This approach addresses fundamental societal issues regarding who is recognised as a citizen in policy processes, as well as whose emotional needs are met or not.

- c. As there is a lack of research on the role of emotions and general public policy, particularly regarding protective policies, PROTEMO's main contribution cannot lie exclusively in the field of political psychology. The project probably cannot answer some of the most intricate questions on the processes producing emotional reactions that have widely been discussed in political psychology (see, for instance, the literature discussed in LRR 2, p.7, or LRR1, p. 27-31). Instead, the PROTEMO analysis explores how certain emotions are linked to the needs of multi-layered citizens and protective policies. By focusing on the policy-implications of emotions and not their psychological origins, PROTEMO can concentrate on specific categories of emotions. These categories have been identified as relevant in the reviewed literature because they relate to the notion of protection and insecurity. Furthermore, they are compatible with different approaches, like appraisal theory, AIT or constructivist approaches (see Pierce 2021 for a similar conceptualisation). At the same time, defining such key emotions that emerged from the literature reviews is challenging, as there are dozens (e.g., enthusiasm, hope, pride, anger, fear, disgust, guilt, contentment, compassion, admiration and gratitude - see LRR1, p. 27-34; LRR2, p. 10-11, 41-45; LRR3, p. 21-23). During the debates on survey design, even broader lists of emotions were proposed for measurement, such as the Geneva Emotion Wheel, containing 20 emotions structured along the axes of Control and Valence (GEW; see Scherer, 2005; Scherer, Fontaine, Sacharin, & Soriano, 2013). Additional emotions and groups of emotions may arise in particular research areas of the project. PROTEMO will remain open to including relevant categories and studying their interrelationship with protective policies and emotional needs.
- d. **Framing emerged as a fundamental category, both of policy processes and emotion research.** This points to new research streams and fundamental epistemological considerations in different directions. Firstly, it reasserts the need to investigate framing on the supply side of politics, both at the level of emotional (policy) entrepreneurs, as well as the critical assessment of the legitimised political discourse that allows them to operate. This also requires investigating the reproduction of dominant meta-narratives in which policy framing and the politics of belonging occur. Secondly, framing is fundamental to advancing research theories, objectives and methods on the demand side of politics through a bottom-up approach. Addressing society, social diversity and social conflicts through multi-layered citizenship has a potential to provide innovative insights within the research fields interpellated by PROTEMO, as well as deepen the understanding of societal and individual emotional needs. Moreover, a critical focus on emotions allows for understanding the way in which social groups actively generate politics of belonging, while also exploring social agency in disputing both meta-narratives and framing. Since only a reduced number of emotional needs have been studied in the literature, research can explore the reasons these emotional needs become visible, acknowledged and



meaningful both for scientific research and policy making. Research can also explore the extent to which different emotional needs in society emerge within contexts of emancipation struggles, where diverse subjectivities produce alternative protective frameworks to those offered by the state. This approach investigates how state meta-narratives generate exclusion and oppression. These perspectives highlight the need to generate critical pluralism in policy and emotion research for comparison, beyond the dominant meta-narrative in distinct societies. Subsequently, one must consider whether the prevailing theories in their fields require adaptations. PROTEMO is equipped with an interdisciplinary approach to the study of emotion research. This work can generate cross-fertilisation between disciplines and methodological approaches, in order to unveil the mechanisms through which the state (re)produces oppressive politics. “The PROTEMO consortium brings together researchers with different methodological expertise and theoretical perspectives that will complement each other. [...] In terms of ontological perspectives, the project unites empirical-analytical perspectives and critical post-colonial perspectives.” This potential is particularly suited to address how state-centred meta-narratives regenerate social classifications. It can also shed light on how the border and recognition of humanity is framed, in relation to social identities. A critical postcolonial approach to emotion research helps unveil the extent to which policymaking reproduces oppression and de-humanisation. The methodology adopted should dispute the exclusionary pattern of scientific reproduction, allowing for critical inquiries to explore the entanglement of social and individual emotions regarding protection and belonging. This approach promises to explore the overlaps, differences, mutual influences and distinct functions of each, while providing a more comprehensive evidence base.

#### 4 Deviations Summary

Only minor deviations emerged within the literature review process. The process was reinforced since its inception by introducing the online event that was not initially planned. As a result, an online workshop was organised in March 2024. In regard to content, the thematic focus of LRR1 changed, from “Protective Policies and Affective Citizenship” to “Protective Policies and Emotions in Policymaking”, in order to avoid overlap with LRR3. Besides this, the review of the LRRs during the months of June and July indicated that further debates were necessary. Furthermore, the possibility of a final workshop (4th online event) was considered for the end of the literature review process, in September 2024. For this reason, this report is submitted one month behind schedule.

#### 5 Conclusions

PROTEMO’s literature reviews process (WP) has been very influential in generating evidence that shall impact the theoretical framework, as well as consolidate the project’s theoretical and methodological approach. As foreseen in the project proposal, this debate needs to continue throughout the lifespan of the project. Practical application of the project’s theoretical approach faces significant challenges and needs further elaboration.

A preliminary PROTEMO Glossary containing 21 terms (such as “protective policy”, “emotion”, “multi-layered citizenship”) was developed by the project team. The conceptual framework also needs elaboration. In particular, the core concept of “protective policies” should be further developed and investigated, questioning whether protective policies even exist beyond policy actors’ framing or perception.

Several implications derive from the literature reviews and theoretical debates. First, the Multiple Stream Framework seems to be the most suitable for integrating emotional needs, emotions and policies into one coherent theoretical framework, at least for the policy-related work packages. Second, the project's approach to emotions and emotional needs is operational, focusing on their relation to the policies rather than the nature and origins of these emotions, *per se*. The existing research and theoretical basis in this field can be used to define specific lists of emotions or groups of emotions that will be operationalised in the context of protective policies and policy processes. Lastly, a systematic introduction of the multi-layered citizenship perspective may become a significant contribution of PROTEMO to current research. Despite the long tradition of a critical approach, the PROTEMO's research field may still be reflecting and reproducing social and economic inequalities between different regions and groups in society. This issue is vividly illustrated by the distribution of studies in LRR3, as well as the debate around protection and belonging. The emotional dynamics of multi-layered citizenship is a timely and relevant strand for future research to shed light on policymaking processes in the age of insecurity.

## 6 References

- Abreu, R., Gonzalez, K., Capielo Rosario, C., Lindley, L., & Lockett, G. (2021). "What American Dream Is This?": The Effect of Trump's Presidency on Immigrant Latinx Transgender People. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 68, 657–669
- Abric, J. (2003). *Méthodes d'étude des représentations sociales*. Éres.
- Abric, J. C. (2001). *Prácticas sociales y representaciones sociales*. Coyoacán
- Abu-Lughod, L. (2002). Do Muslim women really need saving? Anthropological reflections on cultural relativism and its others. *American Anthropologist*, 104(3), 783-790. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.2002.104.3.783>
- Ahmed, S. (2014). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh University Press
- Akyuz, K., Akbas, H., & Onat, I. (2023). Evaluating the impact of Syrian refugees on fear of crime in Turkey. *European Journal of Criminology*, 20(2), 468–485
- Albertson, B. & Gadarian, S. A. (2015). *Anxious Politics Democratic Citizenship in a Threatening World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Ali, A. (2019). The Campus as Crucible: A Critical Race Analysis of Campus Climate in the Experiences of American Muslim Undergraduates. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education*, 121
- Allen, V. L., & Wilder, D. A. (1975). Categorization, belief similarity, and intergroup discrimination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32(6), 971–977. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.32.6.971>
- Amin-Khan, T. (2012). New Orientalism, Securitisation and the Western media's incendiary racism. *Third World Quarterly*, 33(9), 1595–1610. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2012.720831>
- Anastasio, P., Bachman, B., Gaertner, S., & Dovidio, J. (1997). Categorization, recategorization, and common group identity. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life*, Blackwell
- Andsager, J. L. 2000. How Interest Groups Attempt to Shape Public Opinion with Competing News Frames. *J & MC Quarterly*, 77(3), 577-592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900007700308>

- Arruda, A. (2010). Teoría de representaciones sociales y teorías de género. In N. Blazquez Graf, F. Flores Palacios, & M. Ríos Everardo (Eds.), *Investigación feminista: Epistemología, metodología y representaciones sociales*
- Augoustinos, M., & Every, D. (2007). The language of “race” and prejudice: A discourse of denial, reason, and liberal-practical politics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*
- Bakker, B. N., Schumacher, G. & Rooduijn, M. (2021). Hot Politics? Affective Responses to Political Rhetoric. *American Political Science Review*, 115(1), 150-164. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055420000519>
- Barth, F. (1999). Boundaries and connections. In A. Cohen (Ed.), *Signifying Identities*. Routledge
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–529.
- Béland, Daniel (2024). “Framing, Inequality, and the Politics of Insecurity during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Canada and in the United States”, in: Starke, Peter/Elbek, Laust Lund/Wenzelburger, Georg (eds.). *Unequal insecurity*. Routledge
- Bhatia, M. (2015) “Turning Asylum Seekers into ‘Dangerous Criminals’: Experiences of the Criminal Justice System of those Seeking Sanctuary”, *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 4(3), pp. 97-111. <https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v4i3.245>
- Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*
- Bilgin, P. (2010). The ‘Western-centrism’ of security studies: ‘Blind spot’ or constitutive practice? *Security Dialogue*, 41(6), 615-622.
- Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(1), 27–52. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420030103>
- Bini, E. (2003). *Fonti fotografiche e storia delle donne: La rappresentazione delle donne nere nelle fotografie coloniali italiane*. Paper presented at the Società Italiana per lo Studio della Storia Contemporanea (SISSCO) Conference, Lecce
- Birkvad, S. R. (2019). Immigrant meanings of citizenship: Mobility, stability, and recognition. *Citizenship Studies*, 23(8), 798-814
- Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34(Volume 34, 2008), 153–179. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608>
- Boholm, Å. (2003). The cultural nature of risk: Can there be an anthropology of uncertainty? *Ethnos*, 68(2), 159-178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0014184032000097722>
- Bonansinga, D. (2022). Insecurity narratives and implicit emotional appeals in French competing populisms. *Innovation The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 35(1), 86-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13511610.2021.1964349>
- Borah, P., & Irom, B. (2021). To donate or not to donate: Visual framing of the Rohingya refugees, attitude towards refugees and donation intentions. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(4), 4381-4405. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feab023>
- Brader, T. (2011). The political relevance of emotions: “Reassessing” revisited. *Political Psychology*, 32(2),337-346.
- Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora: Contesting identities*. Routledge
- Brah, A., & Phoenix, A. (2004). *Ain’t I a woman? Revisiting intersectionality*. Routledge
- Brantner, C., Lobinger, K., & Wetzstein, I. (2011). Effects of visual framing on emotional responses and evaluations of news stories about the Gaza Conflict 2009. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 88(3), 523-540.

- Brewer, M. B. (2001). Ingroup identification and intergroup conflict: When does ingroup love become outgroup hate? In R. Ashmore, L. Jussim, & D. Wilder (Eds.), *Social identity, intergroup conflict, and conflict reduction*, Oxford University Press
- Brewer, P. R. (2001). Value Words and Lizard Brains: Do Citizens Deliberate About Appeals to Their Core Values? *Political Psychology*, 22(1), 45-64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12111>
- Brown, R. J., & Turner, J. C. (1979). The criss-cross categorization effect in intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, 18(4), 371-383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1979.tb00907.x>
- Brown, R., & Williams, J. (1984). Group Identification: The Same Thing to All People? *Human Relations*, 37(7), 547-564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678403700704>
- Brubaker, R. (2010). Migration, Membership, and the Modern Nation-State: Internal and External Dimensions of the Politics of Belonging. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 41(1), 61-78. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40785026>
- Butler, E. A. (2017). Emotions are temporal interpersonal systems
- Cantú-Martínez, P. C. (2023). Women's perception of urban insecurity in the Monterrey metropolitan area during COVID-19. *Revista Criminalidad*, 65, 71-85
- Chen, Y., Li, L., Ybarra, O., & Zhao, Y. (2020). Symbolic threat affects negative self-conscious emotions. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 14, e12.
- Clifford, S. (2019). How emotional frames moralize and polarize political attitudes. *Political psychology*, 40(1), 75-91.
- Condor, S. (1988). 'Race stereotypes' and racist discourse. *Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse*, 8(1-2), 69-90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1988.8.1-2.69>
- Conway, T., & Foster, M. (2003). Social protection: Defining the field of action and policy. *Development Policy Review*, 20 (5), 541-567.
- Cresswell, C., Whitehead, K., & Durrheim, K. (2014). The anatomy of 'race trouble' in online interactions. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*
- Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2007). Multiple social categorization. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 39, pp. 163-254). Elsevier Academic Press
- Cunningham, W. A., Dunfield, K. A., & Stillman, P. E. (2013). Emotional states from affective dynamics. *Emotion Review*, 5, 344-355
- de Rosa, A. S., Bocci, E., Bonito, M., & Salvati, M. (2021). Twitter as social media arena for polarized social representations about the (im)migration: The controversial discourse in the Italian and international political frame. *Migration Studies*
- de Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, 13(1), 51-62. <https://doi.org/10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science and Business.
- Di Gregorio, M., & Merolli, J. L. (2016). Introduction: Affective citizenship and the politics of identity, control, resistance. *Citizenship Studies*, 20(8), 933-942. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2016.1229193>
- Doise, W., & Palmonari, G. (1986). (Eds.). *L'étude des représentations sociales*. Delachaux et Niestlé.
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N. R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A. S. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(4), 872.

- Druckman, J. N. & McDermott, R. (2008). Emotion and the Framing of Risky Choice. *Political Behavior*, 30(3), 297-321. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11109-008-9056-y>
- Farr, R., & Moscovici, S. (Eds.). (1984). *Social Representations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. *Human Relations*, 7(2), 117-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675400700202>
- Fiske, S. T., & Morling, B. A. (1996). Categorization. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 94-98). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fortier, A.-M. (2010). Proximity by design? Affective citizenship and the management of unease. *Citizenship Studies*, 14(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020903466258>
- Fortier, A.-M. (2017). Acts of affective citizenship? Possibilities and limitations. *Citizenship Studies*. Advance online publication, 1-8.
- Fowler, E. F., & Ridout, T. N. (2013, February). Negative, angry, and ubiquitous: Political advertising in 2012. In *The Forum* (Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 51-61). De Gruyter.
- Frijda, N. (1988). The Laws of Emotion. *American Psychologist*, 43(5), 349-358. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.43.5.349>
- Gadarian, S. A. & Brader, T. (2023). Emotion and Political Psychology. In L. Huddy, D. O. Sears, J. S. Levy & J. Jerit (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (pp. 191-247). 3rd edn. New York: Oxford University Press
- Gadarian, S. K. (2014). Scary pictures: How terrorism imagery affects voter evaluations. *Political Communication*, 31(2), 282-302.
- Giametta, C. (2017). *The sexual politics of asylum: Sexual orientation and gender identity in the UK asylum system*. Routledge
- Gilbert, M. (2014). How we feel: Understanding everyday collective emotion ascription. [in:] C. von Scheve, M. Salmela, *Collective emotions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 17-31.
- Giorgi, S. (2017). The mind and heart of resonance: The role of cognition and emotions in frame effectiveness. *Journal of Management Studies*, 54(5), 711-738
- Giuliani, G., & Lombardi-Diop, C. (2013). *Bianco e nero: Storia dell'identità razziale degli italiani*. Le Monnier
- Gros, F. (2019 [2013]). *The Security Principle: From Serenity to Regulation*. Verso Books
- Gross, K. & D'Ambrosio, L. (2004). Framing Emotional Response. *Political Psychology*, 25(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00354.x>
- Gross, K. (2008). Framing Persuasive Appeals: Episodic and Thematic Framing, Emotional Response, and Policy Opinion. *Political Psychology*, 29(2), 169-192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00622.x>
- Gross, K., & Wronski, J. (2021). Helping the homeless: The role of empathy, race and deservingness in motivating policy support and charitable giving. *Political Behavior*, 43(2), 585-613.
- Gruffydd Jones, B. (2016). *Definitions and categories: Epistemologies of race and critique*
- Hamilton, J. T. (2013). *Security: Politics, humanity, and the philology of care*. Princeton University Press
- Hankivsky, O., Grace, D., Hunting, G., et al. (2014). An intersectionality-based policy analysis framework: Critical reflections on a methodology for advancing equity. *International Journal for Equity in Health*
- Hogg, M. A. (1996). Social identity. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 88-89). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.



- Hollenstein, T., & Lanteigne, D. (2014). Models and methods of emotional concordance
- Hooks, B. (1981). *Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism*. South End Press
- Howell, A., & Richter-Montpetit, M. (2020). Is securitization theory racist? Civilizationism, methodological whiteness, and antiblack thought in the Copenhagen School. *Security Dialogue*, 51(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010619862921>
- Huddy, L., & Gunthorsdottir, A. H. (2000). The persuasive effects of emotive visual imagery: Superficial manipulation or the product of passionate reason? *Political Psychology*, 21(4), 745–778.
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Routledge
- Imhoff, R., Wohl, M. J., & Erb, H. P. (2013). When the past is far from dead: How ongoing consequences of genocides committed by the ingroup impact collective guilt. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(1), 74–91.
- Iyer, A., & Leach, C. W. (2008). Emotion in inter-group relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 19(1), 86–125.
- Jamieson, L. (2002). Theorising identity, nationality and citizenship: Implications for European citizenship identity. *Sociologia*, 34(6), 507–532
- Jasper, J. M. (2018). *The Emotions of Protest*. University of Chicago Press
- Jensen, C., & Wenzelburger, G. (2020). *Reforming the Welfare State*. London: Routledge
- Jodelet, D. (1986). La representación social: Fenómenos, concepto y teoría. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Psicología social II. Pensamiento y vida social. Psicología social y problemas sociales* (pp. 469–494). Ediciones Paidós.
- Jodelet, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Les représentations sociales*. PUF.
- Joppke, C. (2007). *Transformation of citizenship: Status, rights, identity*. American University of Paris, France. Version of record first published: 30 May 2007
- Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (1988). Out-group homogeneity: Judgments of variability at the individual and group levels. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 778–788. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.778>
- Kanyangara, P., Rimé, B., Philippot, P., & Yzerbyt, V. (2007). Collective rituals, emotional climate and intergroup perception: Participation in “Gacaca” tribunals and assimilation of the Rwandan genocide. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(2), 387–403.
- Keltner, D., & Gross, J. J. (1999). Functional accounts of emotions. *Cognition & Emotion*, 13(5), 467–480
- Kingdon, J. W., & Stano, E. (1984). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (Vol. 45, pp. 165–169). Boston: Little, Brown.
- Könönen, J. (2017). Differential inclusion of non-citizens in a universalistic welfare state. *Citizenship Studies*, 22(1), 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2017.1380602>
- Krulichová, E., Kupka, P., & Walach, V. (2024). Does Location Matter? Fear of Crime and its Determinants in Disadvantaged and More Affluent Neighborhoods in Czechia. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 30(1), 157–180
- Kuppens, P., & Verduyn, P. (2015). Looking at emotion regulation through the window of emotion dynamics. *Psychological Inquiry*
- Kuppens, P., & Verduyn, P. (2017). Emotion dynamics. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 17, 22–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.06.004>
- Kuppens, P., & Verduyn, P. (Eds.). (2015). Affect dynamics [Special section]. *Emotion Review*

- Kuppens, P., Oravecz, Z., & Tuerlinckx, F. (2010). Feelings change: Accounting for individual differences in the temporal dynamics of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*
- Lecheler, S., & de Vreese, C. H. (2019). *News framing effects: Theory and practice*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315208077>
- Lecheler, S., Schuck, A. R., & de Vreese, C. H. (2013). Dealing with feelings: Positive and negative discrete emotions as mediators of news framing effects. *Communications-The European Journal of Communication Research*, 38(2), 189-209. <https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2013-0011>
- Leonardelli, G. J., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2010). Optimal distinctiveness theory: A framework for social identity, social cognition, and intergroup relations. In M. P. Zanna & J. M. Olson (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 43, pp. 63–113). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(10\)43002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(10)43002-6)
- Lerner & Keltner, (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice. *Cognition & Emotion*, 14(4), 473-493. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999300402763>
- Lipsitz, K. (2018). Playing with emotions: The effect of moral appeals in elite rhetoric. *Political Behavior*, 40(1), 57-78.
- Logan, T., & Walker, R. (2019). The Impact of Stalking-Related Fear and Gender on Personal Safety Outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 36(13-14), 7465-7487
- Lutz, H., Herrera Vivar, M. T., & Supik, L. (Eds.). (2011). *Framing intersectionality: Debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies*. Routledge
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(4), 602.
- Maor, M. & Capelos, T. (2023). "Symposium: Affect and emotions in policy dynamics". *Policy Sciences*. 56: 439 – 448. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-023-09512-7>
- Marcus, G. E., MacKuen, M., & Neuman, W. R. (2011). Parsimony and complexity: Developing and testing theories of affective intelligence. *Political Psychology*, 32(2), 323–336. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41262898>
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class*
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396
- McHugo, G. J., Lanzetta, J. T., Sullivan, D. G., Masters, R. D., & Englis, B. G. (1985). Emotional reactions to a political leader's expressive displays. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 49(6), 1513.
- Mesquita, B., & Boiger, M. (2014). *Emotions in context: A sociodynamic model of emotions*. Emotion Review
- Meyer, D. G. (2008). *Intuition: Its powers and perils*. Yale University Press.
- Mookherjee, M. (2005). Affective citizenship: feminism, postcolonialism and the politics of recognition. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 8(1), 31–50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369823042000335830>
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P.C., Scherer, K. R. & Frijda, N. H. (2013). Appraisal Theories of Emotion: State of the Art and Future Development. *Emotion Review*, 5(2), 119-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073912468165>
- Moscovici, S. (1979). *El psicoanálisis, su imagen y su público*. Editorial Huemul S.A.
- Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18(3), 211–250. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420180303>

- Moscovici, S. (1998). The history and actuality of social representations. In U. Flick (Ed.). *The psychology of the social* (pp. 209-247). Cambridge University Press.
- Ortony, A. (2022). Are All “Basic Emotions” Emotions? A Problem for the (Basic) Emotions Construct. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17(1), 41-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620985415>
- Panwar, N. L., Kaushik, S. C., & Kothari, S. (2011). Role of renewable energy sources in environmental protection: A review. *Renewable and sustainable energy reviews*, 15(3), 1513-1524
- Parrot, W. G. (1996). Emotional experience. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 198-203). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Parsons, Craig. 2007. *How to Map Arguments in Political Science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Peoples, C., & Vaughan-Williams, N. (2020). *Critical security studies: An introduction*. Routledge
- Pierce, J.J. (2021) Emotions and the policy process: enthusiasm, anger and fear, *Policy & Politics*, vol 49, no 4, 595–614, <https://doi.org/10.1332/030557321X16304447582668>
- Rabbie, J. M., & Horwitz, M. (1969). Arousal of ingroup-outgroup bias by a chance win or loss. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 13(3), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028284>
- Rateau, P., Moliner, P., Guimelli, C., & Abric, J.-C. (2012). Social Representation Theory. In P.A.M. Van Lange, A.W. Kruglanski, and E.T. Higgins (Eds), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, Vol. 2 (pp. 477-497). Sage.
- Ray, D. G., Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (2014). Intergroup emotion: self-categorization, emotion, and the regulation of intergroup conflict. *Collective emotions: Perspectives from psychology, philosophy, and sociology*, 235-249.
- Ryan, T. J., & Krupnikov, Y. (2021). Split feelings: understanding implicit and explicit political persuasion. *American Political Science Review*, 115(4), 1424-1441.
- Sammut, G., Andreouli, E., Gaskell, G., & Valsiner, J. (Eds.). (2016), *The Cambridge handbook of social representations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scherer, K. R. (2005). What are emotions? And how can they be measured? *Social Science Information*, 44(4), 695-729. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018405058216>
- Scherer, K.R., Shuman, V., Fontaine, J.R.J, & Soriano, C. (2013). The GRID meets the Wheel: Assessing emotional feeling via self-report. In Johnny R.J. Fontaine, Klaus R. Scherer & C. Soriano (Eds.), *Components of Emotional Meaning: A sourcebook* (pp. 281-298). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Scheufele, D. A., & Iyengar, S. (2014). The state of framing research: A call for new directions. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication* (pp. 619–632). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.013.47>
- Schmidt-Atzert, L., Peper, M. & Stemmler, G. (2014). *Emotionspsychologie: Ein Lehrbuch* (2nd edn.). Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer.
- Serrano, S. E. (2013). The potential of social representations theory (SRT) for gender equitable research. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*.
- Shearer, J. E. (2002). *The concept of protection: A dimensional analysis and critique of a theory of protection*. Routledge.
- Shih, M. J., Pittinsky, T. L., & Ho, G. C. (2012). Stereotype boost: Positive outcomes from the activation of positive stereotypes. In M. Inzlicht & T. Schmader (Eds.), *Stereotype threat: Theory, process, and application* (pp. 141–156). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.



- Sironi, E., & Bonazzi, L. (2016). Direct Victimization Experiences and Fear of Crime: A Gender Perspective. *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*.
- Smith, C. A. & Lazarus, R. S. (1993). "Appraisal Components, core relational themes, and the emotions". *Cognition & Emotion*, 7(3), 233-269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699939308409189>
- Song, G., Liu, L., He, S., Cai, L., & Xu, C. (2020). Safety perceptions among African migrants in Guangzhou and Foshan, China. *Cities*.
- Stampnitzky, L., & Mattson, G. (2015). *Sociology: Security and insecurities*. In P. Bourbeau (Ed.), *Security: Dialogue across disciplines* (pp. 71-92). Cambridge University Press.
- Stangor, C. G. (1996). Stereotyping. In A. S. R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Psychology* (pp. 628-633). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Stapleton, C. E., & Dawkins, R. (2022). Catching my anger: How political elites create angrier citizens. *Political Research Quarterly*, 75(3), 754-765.
- Starke, Peter/Elbek, Laust Lund/Wenzelburger, Georg. (2024). (eds.). *Unequal insecurity: Welfare, Crime and Social Inequality*. Routledge.
- Stasiulis, D., & Bakan, A. B. (1997). Negotiating Citizenship: The Case of Foreign Domestic Workers in Canada. *Feminist Review*, 57(1), 112-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/014177897339687>
- Subašić, E., Reynolds, K. J., & Turner, J. C. (2008). The political solidarity model of social change: Dynamics of self-categorization in intergroup power relations. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.
- Sullivan, G. B. (2015). Collective emotions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 9(8), 383-393.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Nelson Hall.
- Tajfel, H., & Wilkes, A. L. (1963). Classification and quantitative judgement. *British Journal of Psychology*, 54(2), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1963.tb00865.x>
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), *Advances in group processes: Theory and research* (Vol. 2). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Turner, J. H., & Stets, J. E. (2005). *The Sociology of Emotions*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819612>
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*, 211(4481), 453-458. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7455683>
- Uddin, N. (2024). Impact of Crime and Insecurity on Citizen Trust in Public Institutions: Evidence from Bangladesh. *International Journal of Public Administration*.
- Valentino, N. A., Beckman, M. N., & Buhr, T. A. (2001). A spiral of cynicism for some: The contingent effects of campaign news frames on participation and confidence in government. *Political Communication*, 18(4), 347-367. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600152647083>
- Van Dommelen, A., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Gonsalkorale, K., & Brewer, M. (2015). Construing multiple ingroups: Assessing social identity inclusiveness and structure in ethnic and religious minority group members. *European Journal of Social Psychology*.

- Verduyn, P., Delaveau, P., Rotgé, J. Y., Fossati, P., & Van Mechelen, I. (2015). Determinants of emotion duration and underlying psychological and neural mechanisms.
- Wæver, O. (1995). "Securitization and Desecuritization." In R. Lipschutz (Ed.) *On Security* (pp. 46-86). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waugh, C. E., Shing, E. Z., & Avery, B. M. (2015). Temporal dynamics of emotional processing in the brain. *Emotion Review*.
- Wenzelburger, G., Carbone, B., et al. (2023). PROTEMO - Emotional dynamics of protective policies in an age of insecurity, Project Proposal to the European Commission Horizon Europe Framework Programme (HORIZON), Call HORIZON-CL2-2023-DEMOCRACY-01-04.
- Wohl, M. J., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical perpetrator groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(2), 288.
- Young, D. G. and Miller, J. M. (2023). Political Communication. In: Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., Levy, J. S., and Jerit, J. (Eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.555-600.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). The 'multi-layered citizen': Citizenship in the age of 'glocalization'.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40(3), 197-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313220600769331>
- Yuval-Davis, N. (2007). Intersectionality, citizenship and contemporary politics of belonging. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 10(4), 561-574. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230701660220>
- Zahariadis, N. (2003). *Ambiguity and choice in public policy: Political decision making in modern democracies*. Georgetown University Press.
- Zahnow, R., Zhang, M., & Corcoran, J. (2021). The Girl on the Bus: Familiar Faces in Daily Travel and Their Implications for Crime Protection. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 111(5), 1367-1384. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2020.1828026>
- Zedner, L. (2009). *Security*. Routledge.