

Emotional Dynamics in Social Representations of Multi-Layered Citizenship, Protection, and Security: A Systematic Literature Review

INPLASY202480137

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.8.0137

Received: 31 August 2024

Published: 31 August 2024

Mónico, LS; Cardella, GM; Jawadi, M; Santos, CC; Gianolla, C.

Corresponding author:

Lisete Mónico

lisete.monico@fpce.uc.pt

Author Affiliation:

University of Coimbra.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**Support** - PROTEMO (GA 101132433).**Review Stage at time of this submission** - Completed but not published.**Conflicts of interest** - None declared.**INPLASY registration number:** INPLASY202480137**Amendments** - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 31 August 2024 and was last updated on 31 August 2024.**INTRODUCTION**

Review question / Objective The aim of this Systematic Review is to outline the current state of the art about emotional dynamics of social representations related to the perception of multi-layered citizenship, protection, and security. Additionally, it aims to investigate the emotional roots of protective policies and their emotional consequences for individuals, groups of citizens and non-citizens, as well as for democracy, political participation, and mobilization.

Four research questions (RQs) were defined in this Systematic Literature Review:

RQ1: What different objects are mobilised in the social representations related to security or protection?

RQ2: What are the emotional dynamics generated by social representations related to protection and security?

RQ3: What are the dimensions of multi-layered citizenship related to social representations of protection and security?

RQ4: How are social representations of protection and security affected by social identities?.

Rationale Our focus is on the emotional dynamics of social representations, particularly how individuals, groups, and society as a whole construct and transform meanings based on pre-existing knowledge and daily experiences (Abric, 2003; Arruda, 2010; de Rosa et al., 2021; Hooks, 1981; Jodelet, 2003; Moscovici, 1979; Serrano, 2013). We specifically examine perceptions of protection and security by both citizens and non-citizens in relation to the diversity of social groups and identities present in society. This perspective highlights an understudied aspect of how social groups perceive and respond to public policies and their communication.

“By protective policies, we mean policies that are communicated by political actors as providing safety and security to citizens” (Albertson & Gadarian 2015, cit in Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al., 2023, p. 1). These policies are directed at what political actors perceive as the emotional needs of citizens. Importantly, these needs are not strictly

exogenous to the political process but may be elicited by political actors. For instance, emotional entrepreneurs (actors who exploit emotions to influence the political agenda and decision-making processes) may generate fear, only to respond with protective policies (Maor & Gross, 2015).

Although it seems evident that emotions play a significant role in politics, influencing both the creation and communication of protective policies, in-depth and comparative research on the role of emotions in the policy process remains limited. This may be due to the traditional perception of emotions as inferior to reason and thus often dismissed. Furthermore, ordinary people judge policies based on their perceived meaning, where emotions and affect play an important role. Nonetheless, the mainstream scholarship on protective policies does not explain if and how “multi-layered citizens (defined as citizens and non-citizens who are differently positioned in political, cultural, social and economic terms; Yuval-Davis, 1999) respond with different emotions to protective policies. This is problematic, as emotions such as pride, hope, fear, anxiety, anger, hatred or disgust are crucial for constructing or breaking ties between both citizens, non-citizens and their political representatives” (Wenzelburger, Carbone, et al., 2023, p. 2).

The emotional antecedents and consequences of protective policies have scarcely been studied as a research topic over time, across countries, and within different policy domains. Moreover, there is limited research on the perceptions, diverse needs, and emotions related to protection and security among different social groups. As denounced by feminists and proponents of affective citizenship, this limited research is due to a long-lasting rationalist tradition in state and citizenship studies that tends to relegate emotions to the 'female', non-political individual, on private and intimate levels (Ahmed, 2014; Pateman, 1988).

Condition being studied The procedure followed in this systematic literature review starts with the identification of peer-reviewed articles through a search query within two repositories.

Metadata searched were: Title, abstract, and relevant keywords of the publications. While reading titles, abstracts, and keywords (the full article will be read when relevant information is needed), two team members selected articles based on eligibility criteria discussed with the other three team members. Initially, the two reviewers blindly examined 5% of all articles. Once a 90% agreement, based on the consistency of the article content with our research questions, was reached on these titles, they initiated independent reviews. Reasons for article exclusion will be described in

the PRISMA flow diagram (Moher et al., 2009) and, as a result of the chosen filtering process, a final dataset will be composed of a number of selected articles.

Exclusion criteria: Studies that do not focus on social representations related to the perception of multi-layered citizenship;

Studies published in a language different from those described in the inclusion criteria (English, Portuguese, French, Spanish, and Italian); Books, book chapters, conference proceedings, and thesis; Documents published in fields other than social and political sciences (e.g. business, healthcare, management...).

METHODS

Search strategy The search strategy uses Boolean operators 'AND' or 'OR' to articulate the four main keywords: “Social Representations”, “Emotions”, “Multi-layered citizenship”, and “Protection” or “Security”. Other inclusionary criteria were research area, language, and type of document.

The search operationalised a number of synonyms or related terms for each query keyword as follows: Within Title, Abstract, and Keywords: “Social representation*” OR “perception*” OR “representation*” OR “central nucleus” OR “stereotype” OR “common sense*” OR “représentation sociale” OR “social image*” AND “emotion*” OR “affect*” OR “sentiment*” OR “feel*” OR “passion*” OR “pride” OR “hope” OR “fear” OR “anxiety” OR “anger” OR “hatred” OR “disgust” AND “multi-layered citizen*” OR “multilayered citizen*” OR “affective citizen*” OR “Intersection*” OR “vulnerab*” OR “minorit*” OR “transnational*” OR “oppress*” OR “westerncentri*” OR “western-centri*” OR “eurocentric*” OR “nation state” OR “welfare” OR “*citizen*” OR “social identit*” AND “securit*” OR “protect*” OR “safe*”.

Participant or population General Population – Multi-layered citizenship.

Intervention Emotional dynamics generated by social representations of protection and security.

Comparator Citizens/Non-Citizens; Social categories.

Study designs to be included Any study design can be included in this systematic literature review.

Eligibility criteria The PICO framework was included as the inclusion criteria. The PICO framework is widely adopted in structuring clinical

inquiries due to its ability to encompass all essential components needed for a specific question. PICO represents:

- 1) Population or patient group or problem;
- 2) Intervention or exposure;
- 3) Comparison or control;
- 4) Outcome.

Additionally, studies were included if also met the following criteria:

- 1) Type of publication: Articles, review articles, and early access publications in WoS, as well as articles and review articles in Scopus;
- 2) Language: English, French, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish;
- 3) Research areas: WoS (Psychology, Social Science - other topics, 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) and Scopus (Social Science; Psychology; Arts and Humanities; Multidisciplinary; Undefined).

Information sources Web of Science and Scopus were searched to identify potential studies. An extensive literature search was completed in March 2024 (with no limits applied for year of publication).

Main outcome(s) This systematic literature review is a qualitative research method that not only highlights the state of conceptual knowledge about the social representations of protection/security/safety and their emotional roots and consequences for individuals and groups of citizens and non-citizens, but also allows knowledge production and a rigorous way of defining indicators to ground the construction of theories, instruments, and public policy implications.

Additional outcome(s) Not applicable.

Data management Using the search strategies, two members of the review team identify the titles, abstracts, and relevant keywords of the selected articles. While reading the titles, abstracts, and keywords (if it is not possible to extrapolate the relevant information from the abstract, the complete article will be read), the two team members will select the articles according to the eligibility criteria. If there are differences between the two reviewers, a third reviewer will be called. Initially, the two reviewers will blindly review 5% of all articles. Once 90% agreement is reached on

these titles, they will proceed with an independent review.

The reasons for excluding articles will be described in the PRISMA flow diagram (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, & Altman, 2009): Identification (records identified from Scopus and WoS databases); Screening (records screened; reports sought for retrieval; records assessed for eligibility, including records excluded); Included (studies included in the systematic literature review).

Once the final sample of articles that will be part of the systematic review has been defined, the information coding phase will begin which will include: a) The research identification data (e.g., participants; author, year, country; intervention and measures; main results), b) The results found (based on the research questions), and c) The final evaluation of the study.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis The PRISMA checklist will be used (Galvão, Pansani, & Harrad, 2015).

Strategy of data synthesis Once the studies are selected, two researchers will initiate the process of data extraction. This process will have two levels of analysis:

1) Descriptive data: Authors, Year of publication, Title of the article; Aims; Participants; Type of study design/methodology. This will result in a table documenting all the included studies/documents. It will also identify to which research question the documents will contribute.

2) Analytic Data: Based on the research questions of the present systematic literature review that the article in question helps answer, researchers will summarise collected data, main results, and conclusions of the study.

Finally, all data will be reviewed through a critical approach, analysing the quality of the studies/documents included in the analysis.

Subgroup analysis No subgroup analysis will be conducted.

Sensitivity analysis Not applicable.

Language restriction English; French; Italian; Portuguese; Spanish.

Country(ies) involved This systematic literature review is being conducted in Portugal, with the authors coming from Portugal and Italy.

Other relevant information The review will result in a report initially shared on the PROTEMO project platform for internal review by team members. This will subsequently lead to the production of an

article to be submitted to a journal in this scientific field. The findings may also be disseminated through oral presentations at conferences.

Keywords Social Representations; Security; Multi-layered citizenship; Social Identity; Emotions.

Dissemination plans The results will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal and presented at PROTEMO meetings, conferences, and other academic contexts.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Lisete S. Mónico - Author 1 conceptualised the review scope and query, supervised, and finalised the work and the article text. She is the responsible researcher for the corresponding task and deliverable within the PROTEMO project.

Email: lisete.monico@fpce.uc.pt

Author 2 - Giuseppina Maria Cardella - Author 2 executed the review query, collected the data, filtered, and categorised the data supervising the implementation of the PRISMA checklist. She co-drafted the article text.

Email: mariucardella@usal.es

Author 3 - Miriam Jawadi - Author 3 executed the review query, collected the data, filtered, and categorised the data implementing the PRISMA checklist. She co-drafted the article text.

Email: mirijawatube98@gmail.com

Author 4 - Clara Santos - Author 4 conceptualised the review execution, supervised the work, and critically reviewed and complemented the article text.

Email: clarasantos@fpce.uc.pt

Author 5 - Cristiano Gianolla - Author 5 conceptualised the review scope and query, supervised the work, and critically reviewed and complemented the article text.

Email: cgianolla@ces.uc.pt