



**Emotions and Protective Policies
in an Age of Insecurity**

Booklet No.1

**Stakeholder Workshop
Survey Design**

Introduction to PROTEMO's Booklet Series

This booklet is part of a series of dissemination materials that includes booklets, policy briefs and thematic briefs, through which PROTEMO seeks to reach out to stakeholders at different fields of work dealing with insecurity and the provision of protection. The objective of this series is to learn from their experiences and knowledge on the emotional dynamics involved in the design and implementation of projects and policies aimed at protecting individuals on the cultural, physical, social, and political levels.

In this booklet we summarize the data collected through two focus groups with reputed stakeholders working in different areas and projects aimed to either shed light on protective policies or to design and implement projects and interventions that enhance the protection of target groups. It brings together academics, psychologists, social workers, and project managers in order to gather their views and experiences on perceptions of emotional needs, challenges to the inclusion of emotions in projects and policies, challenges to include demands for protective policies in the policymaking process, and possible tools to improve the delivery of protection to different societal groups.

Highlights

1) Current challenges to include the emotions of target groups into account in the design of projects and protective policies

- Stakeholders take emotions into account during the early stages of the designing of a project to foster a wide range of perspectives. Emotions are however seen as unreliable factors in the designing of the later phases of a project. "In later stages of projects, I would not take emotions into account, as they may bring bias to the data."
- Emotions are included in the design of projects but should be excluded from the implementation of the policy or project, as it is considered that this measure enhances the rationality of the approach. "When we are implementing the projects in civil protection, we do not take emotions into account to keep it more rational."
- Emotions are certainly considered in the design of projects. However, it is a challenge to take emotions into account in the practical delivery of civil services and in the communication with political instances. It is difficult to plan an answer that attends to the emotions of all those involved.
- It is very difficult to have access to some areas of intervention, such as the health system. In these areas partners cannot take emotions into account. "They can't look at people according to their emotions."
- The inclusion of emotional needs requires reflexive tools. Interviews, comments posted by recipients, and monitoring need to be thought together between stakeholders and target groups, respecting each individual's own time.
- Academia, which is also a source of intervention in civil society, offers incentives to academics to get promoted, to get funding, to get published, and in all these priorities, emotions are overlooked. "Emotions are kind of a second-degree consideration."

- Even when emotional needs are considered and a good relationship between stakeholders and target groups is created, the knowledge and tools designed won't be enough to give them the protection they really need, since there are barriers posed by their relationship to society. "I think dealing with the emotions and the expectations (of target groups) is really the biggest challenge we have. We are in the middle, you see: between the policies and the people and the colleagues who are angry and feel abandoned by the system. We are in the middle and we have to give responses to our team, to our beneficiaries, to our bosses and to everyone, so, for us, it is also a kind of 'emotional labour'."

2) Emotional needs to be addressed in projects and interventions

- Taking emotions into account means not only to communicate about them but to develop tools to validate them. Whereas the communication about emotions seems to be okay, the validation is not.
- Addressing emotional needs entails a process. People should be able to talk about respect, and each particular moment needs to be respected. In countries at war, for instance, there are different emotional needs for security and different emotions. There is a lot of uncertainty about the future. "We see fear, not fear of life, or death, but of the future, of what will be next."

3) Factors that shape emotional reactions to protective policies in the views of stakeholders

- Emotional reactions to protective policies hinge on the national culture, individualism, and patterns of solidarity that are determined by cultural factors.
- The manifestation of emotions depends on values that are deeply rooted in society such as openness and freedom of speech. Emotions are better manifested when there is an environment that fosters a feeling of security against criticism, to express opinions without being criticized. Some groups and countries are more tolerant than others.
- Some areas of intervention have the potential to trigger more intense emotional responses than others. "In terms of emotional reactions to policies on natural risks, generally, people feel less emotional (because they expect to be protected)."
- Older people tend to narrate more their expectations for protective policies whereas younger people tend to take more action through mobilization and demonstrations.
- The kind of support received, including primary needs and the amount of uncertainty faced by a group will influence the path taken by them and their emotions in important ways. In the case of refugees for instance, "they come from a different reality, so when they come to a new place and the help is not well organized, emotions can get more negative, for example people get more worried."
- Since security is intricately related to insecurity, preferences for protection depend on gender, age, citizenship status, perspectives about the future, and contextual factors such as wars, misinformation, and conspiracy theories.

4) Challenges faced by stakeholders in the design of projects aimed to enhance the protection of target groups

- The political and administrative process of negotiating projects and interventions can be made difficult due to a mismatch between current problems and public administrators that do not keep up with up-to-date knowledge and empirical data on an issue. "Committee researchers are outdated."
- The articulation of the main political frame is problematic as political parties tend to neither take stakeholders' contributions into account, nor are they willing to accept their contribution.
- Stakeholders are not given time to explain, communicate and include new perspectives in the agenda setting of public administration. There is a time gap between stakeholders' needs and public administrator's protocols. "I need time to talk to public services, to give protection."
- The bureaucracy of public administration is too slow, leading to emotional responses, such as frustration and anxiety.
- There is a slow political answer to enhance the protection of groups, such as migrants and refugees. "The government should adapt to new, nowadays' realities in domains like migration."
- Politics tend to have a narrow focus. Stakeholders feel the need for more interdisciplinarity in public administration teams dealing with protection in order to approach different realities and experiences. It would be beneficial "to have a multi-disciplinary team, not only from psychological but also social, legal and health domains."

5) Tools to better integrate emotions and perceptions in the agenda setting and implementation of protective policies

- One crucial tool would be channels to foster dialogue, such as a real place or an online forum, through which citizens and non-citizens can give feedback on the making of protective policies.
- Community groups should improve the communication on their perspectives and bridge the gap between different groups, such as refugees and natives.
- Different groups dealing with an issue from recipients of public services, to nurses, the administration, doctors, the cleaning and cooking team, psychologists and social workers, etc. should be able to communicate information and feedback on the policymaking process. "We need to hear all these professionals to improve politics."
- Policies would deliver more protection and work better if they were built bottom-up, which would allow them to take the actual reality of target groups into account. "Politicians need to take into account some actors, some social workers that know the realities and the people who are the main benefactors of these policies."
- Consultations of civil society actors during the policymaking process are very important. The inter-country differences in regulation and the organisation of policy consultations show that policymakers "may get a more biased perspective on how the policy is working, and in that case, more mistakes can happen" if the number of consultants is (already at an institutional level) limited.
- More qualitative data, including case studies and direct testimonies are needed to convey the emotions of target groups to policy makers, besides the general overview provided by quantitative data.

- Though some emotional needs are taken into account in the initial design of protective policies, they tend to be lost during the intervention and implementation process. “As actors working in the field, I think we should be more involved in policymaking, not only in the local area, the ‘micro area’.”

6) Key Messages

- Though emotions can enrich the initial design of a project and foster varied perspectives, they are still seen as secondary factors or even unreliable indicators which might bias the data in later stages of a project. In contrast, empirical data and other aspects continue to be understood as more rational and more potent to deliver a successful project or intervention.
- Functioning as a mediator between policymakers and those groups addressed by a project is in itself emotional labour for stakeholders.
- Evaluations of the emotional needs of target publics are difficult to be validated and are therefore insufficiently considered during the implementation of projects as well as in necessary negotiations with political bodies.
- It is difficult to work with emotional needs for protection in project implementation, as they are bound to specific (national) cultures, values and societal norms. On top of that, every individual and group have their own emotional responses and needs which are contingent on contextual factors and personal characteristics, such as gender, citizenship status or individual character.
- More generally, the slow operation of bureaucracies, not being taken seriously, not listening to many different people and not taking the time for deep engagement are listed as central impediments for a successful interaction between policymakers and administrations on the one hand and stakeholder on the other.

- The key tool to better integrate emotions and perceptions of protection into the process of public policymaking is communication and dialogue. All kinds of professionals and social groups should be given a voice in order to communicate and listen to each other's perspectives and feedback; being built bottom-up, not top-down.

7) Summary - Policy Area of Participants

Stakeholders participating in PROTEMO's Online Workshop mainly work in academia and social projects. Academics ranged from social workers, sociologists and social psychologists to political scientists with expertise in survey design, public policymaking and international politics. When considering non-academic stakeholders, workshop participants were largely working in projects dealing with housing, health, anti-discrimination and immigration policies. Such a diversity of participants is crucial for the success of PROTEMO's stakeholder workshop as well as for the meaningfulness of its output. Generally speaking, the more diverse participants are, the more comprehensive will be their input. Homogeneity in stakeholders, on the other hand, prevents us from learning from different sources, thereby taking into account different perspectives. During the workshop, the aforementioned group of stakeholders allowed us to engage in a way that is extensive in scope and depth.

Participants

Alexander Hartland	Saarland University
Ana Goulart	Fundação AMI
Ana Paula Caetano	University of Coimbra/ Lusófona University
Bethany Albertson	University of Texas at Austin
Djamila Jabra	Saarland University
Paulo Pereira	Fundação AMI
Romana Careja	University of the Azores
Shana Gadarian	Syracuse University
Sofia Pereira	University of the Azores
Theofilos Gkinopoulos	Jagiellonian University in Krakow

PROTEMO Consortium

Alegria Ullrich	(USAAR)
Beatriz Carbone	(USAAR)
Donatella Bonansinga	(US)
Georg Wenzelburger	(USAAR)
Katarzyna Hamer	(IPPAN)
Katja Stempel	(USAAR)
Marta Penczek	(IPPAN)
Maya von Thenen	(USAAR)
Miriam Jawadi	(CES)
Moshe Maor	(RUNI)
Pavlo Kravchuk	(CES)
Sandra Türk	(EURICE)
Tereza Capelos	(US)



Funded by
the European Union

www.protemo.eu



@PROTEMO_EU



protemo-project