



How Do The Main Negative Emotions Affect People's Political Decision Process? : "Fear, Anxiety And Anger"

Temel Olumsuz Duygular Kişilerin Siyasi Karar Sürecini Nasıl Etkiliyor? : "Korku, Kaygı Ve Öfke"

Kevser Hülya YURDAKUL

Doktora Öğrencisi, İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,
Siyaset Psikolojisi Ana Bilim Dalı
kevserakdemir@std.sehir.edu.tr
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6278-8396>

Araştırma & Yayın Etiği

Bu makale en az iki hakem tarafından incelenmiş,
iThenticate yazılımı ile taranmış,
araştırma yayın ve etiğine aykırılık tespit edilmemiştir.

Research & Publication Ethics

This article was reviewed by at least two referees,
a similarity report was obtained using iThenticate, and
compliance with research/publication ethics was confirmed.

CC BY-NC 4.0

Bu makale [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) altında lisanslanmıştır.

This paper is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

Copyright ©

Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,
Sakarya/TÜRKİYE

Sakarya University, Institute of Social Science,
Sakarya/TURKEY

Atıf/Citation

Yurdakul, Kevser Hülya . "Temel Olumsuz Duygular Kişilerin Siyasi Karar Sürecini Nasıl Etkiliyor? : "Korku, Kaygı Ve Öfke".
Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi 16 / 1 (Nisan 2021): 247-261 .
<https://doi.org/10.17550/akademikincelemeler.708916>

Makale Türü/Article Type: Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article
Geliş Tarihi/Date Received: 25.03.2020
Kabul Tarihi/Date Accepted: 31.01.2021
Yayın Tarihi/Date Published: 15.04.2021

ISSN: 1306-7885

E-ISSN: 2602-3016

Cilt/Volume: 16 | Sayı/Issue: 1 |
Yıl/Year: 2021 (Nisan/April)

15. yıl



Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi

How Do the Main Negative Emotions Affect People's Political Decision Process? : Fear, Anxiety and Anger

Abstract

In the post-modern era, the mobilization of previously large masses has been replaced by micro-groups dominated by new and distinct identities. As a result, the analysis and predictability of electorate behavior have decreased. The political decision-making processes of individuals have therefore been subjected to detailed analyzes. Emotions have become a significant subject of political psychology in terms of their effects on the political decision-making process of individuals. Emotions have also become an important topic in political psychology. Researches revealed that emotions have important effects on thoughts and decision-making processes. In this context, the article primarily aims to draw a rational framework on this subject by including modern “emotion” definitions and the impacts of people’s emotions on political decisions. Afterward, the article investigated the effect of negative emotions on political decision-making. In this context, anxiety, fear and anger are emphasized by using a descriptive approach. The article argues that negative emotions that are anxiety, fear, and anger, in particular, have positive contributions to the political decision-making process of individuals.

Keywords: Political Psychology, Negative, Emotions, Political Decision Making Process

Temel Olumsuz Duygular Kişilerin Siyasi Karar Sürecini Nasıl Etkiliyor? : "Korku, Kaygı ve Öfke

Öz

Önceleri var olan büyük kitlelerin mobilizasyonu post-modern dönemde yerini yeni ve birbirinden farklı kimliklerin egemen olduğu mikro gruplara bırakmıştır. Bu durum seçmen davranışlarının çözümlenmesini ve tahmin edilebilirliğini de azaltmıştır. Bireylerin siyasi karar verme süreçleri bu nedenle çeşitli başlıklar altında derin analizlere tabi tutulmuştur. Duygular da bireylerin siyasi karar verme sürecinde sahip oldukları etkiler bağlamında siyaset psikolojisinin önemli bir konusu haline gelmiştir. Yapılan araştırmalar duyguların düşünceler ve karar verme süreçleri üzerinde önemli etkileri olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu bağlamda makale öncelikle modern “duygu” tanımlarına ve duyguların kişilerin siyasi kararlarına etkisine yer vererek bu konuda rasyonel bir çerçeve çizmeyi amaçlamıştır. Sonrasında ise negatif duyguların siyasi karar verme sürecine etkisi üzerine bir inceleme gerçekleştirmiştir. Bu bağlamda betimleyici yaklaşım ile anksiyete, korku ve kızgınlık üzerinde durulmuştur. Makale anksiyete, korku ve kızgınlık gibi negatif duyguların bireylerin siyasi karar verme sürecine pozitif katkıları olduğunu savunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyaset Psikolojisi, Negative, Siyasi Karar Verme Süreci

Introduction

Emotion is a critical topic both in politics and psychology. The classical perspective has changed the perspective of emotion in the twentieth century. While emotion had been evaluated as irrational and non-scientific for a long time, in the last decades many experimental studies have proved that emotion is part of a rational decision-making process, especially on the political sides. The view that emotions are irrational and non-scientific because it is hard to calculate or measure them, has changed and the behavioral approach argued that emotions have significant effects on citizen's behaviors and political decisions. Therefore, it is true that progress in behavioral studies has brought a different and wide view to the aspects of emotion.

One of the main topics that were discussed about emotion was the effects of emotion on the decision-making and behavior of the citizens because minor and individual differences had effected big political results in the last decades. While understanding citizen behavior has gained importance on political science and political psychology, empirical studies have also increased in this field, especially based on the experiments (J. N. Druckman, 2006).

It is accepted that political behaviors and decision-making processes have been working in different ways for different country's citizens. Moreover, a country's society has started to be differentiated in itself and small groups' decisions also play important roles in political results. While specific definitions were enough to categorize types of citizens such as nationalist, secular or republican, after public polarization political scientists and political psychologists have focused on the main emotions that shape the group's identities and citizens' decisions. For instance, Turkish citizens have evaluated as belong to collective emotions as a result of political memory of its history, Netherlands' and Germany's governing parties have gained success thanks to its anti-immigration speeches because citizens' political decisions were closed to nationalist and anti-immigrant views (Erisen, 2018, 2-3). In the postmodern terms, as citizen profile has polarized, emotions of citizens and identities that drive their political decisions have also gained more importance. As Foucault and Habermas argues that identities have born with ethics and rules of the society that you feel belong it (1981). Yet, the belonging of a whole and big society has changed and group identities have fragmented as well as big social groups. Individualism has born with modernization and it spread to every segments of social groups at postmodern times. Modernism refers to enlightenment and respect for pure rationalism but it legitimize itself within the society (Elliott, 2010, 139). Moreover according to Habermas, post modernism defines as anti-modernism (1981, 3).

In contrast to the idea that emotions are irrelevant to scientific studies and have no place in politics, studies have increased on how emotions have affected people's political decisions. In that sense, this article aims to first draw a frame about what is a negative emotion and then it argues that negative emotions which are fear, anxiety, and anger have some positive effects on political decisions.

1.Methodology: Literature Review about Emotions and Role of Emotions in Politics from a Theoretical Perspective

Emotions, through our journey in life, have been an essential part of people's lives as it has nearly become inescapable and can be seen in our beliefs and actions offering strong reinforcements. As Vogel (1997) argues "Emotion apparently is not something that necessarily clouds reasoning, but rather seems to provide an essential foundation for at least some kind of reasoning".

As Demertsiz (2013, 4) refers in his book emotion is composed of five components:

"Emotion is thought to be composed of five elements: (1) activation of key body systems and action readiness towards something, (2) appraisal of situational stimuli, relational contexts and objects, (3) overt, free or inhibited, expression through facial, vocal and paralinguistic movement, (4) culturally provided linguistic labels of one or more of the first three elements, (5) socially constructed rules on which emotions should be experienced and expressed" (Thoits, 1989, 318; Gordon, 1990, 147; Sieben - Wettegren, 2010).

Researches show that emotions are not learned but innate. Tompkins (1962) (Tompkins, 1962), for example, has shown in his observation that unlearned reactions bring certain specific moves. Even though emotions are innate, it depends on cultures to decide whether emotions are repressed or expressed. There are seven main cross-cultural neutrally based emotions which are happiness, anger, fear, sadness, disgust, surprise, and contempt. Some cultures see sadness as destabilizing and feel a need to repress it while another culture sees it beneficial and be expressed. The debates on the effects of cultural differences on emotions show that the standards of social appropriateness surround the time, manner and place of certain emotional expressions.

As it is argued by many authors main facial expressions are based on seven emotions that are happiness, anger, fear, sadness, disgust, surprise, and contempt. Yet, different cultures have different acceptance and standards about which emotion should be expressed and which one is not beneficial (McDermott, 2004, 160). Another argument on emotion is the one Plutchik holds. Plutchik (1980) argues that emotions are not discrete from each other. He claims that complex emotions are actually a composition or another type of basic emotions. McDermott gives the example on this issue as "love combines joy plus acceptance" (2004, 161).

Of course, it is very hard to draw a certain line between emotions to separate them from each other totally because people may feel much emotion at the same time or some emotions are more close to each other; especially about responses of them as behavior. Because of that researchers first focus on the diversion of emotions that are depression and anxiety (Diener - A.Emmons, 1985; Plutchik, 1980; Russel, 1980; Tellegan, 1985; Watson - Tellegen., 1985). Modern psychologists and social psychologists have focused on the mood change of individuals and Albert Ax has also made a distinction between fear and anger (1953). Jervis (1976) and Stein (1988) have made analyzes over important international events and considered that threat and fear are important emotions that shape group thinking.

On the one hand, psychologists have studied about explain mood change of individuals and differences between emotions that shape the moods, political psychologists have searched for the effects of emotions on the political decision-making process and voting behavior in specific. Experimental studies also foster the

literature. Lodge and Taber studied voting behavior, group identities and human emotions on rationalization voting behavior (2005, 2013). Also, there are experimental studies that focus on American society and their political decisions after 9/11 (Huddy et al., 2005). As will be mentioned in the “fear” part in detail, terror actions and political history have a direct effect on society’s political decisions.

Understanding the role of emotions in politics is a new but quickly developed field and the literature about it is growing by the time. Especially after the 2000s, many researchers have focused on the role of emotions in the political decision-making process. Brader and Marcus (2013) and Redlawsk and Pierce (2017) are the significant political psychologists that focused on the effect of the emotions in citizens voting behavior and political decision-making process. Also, Neuman, Marcus, Crigler, and MacKuen are some of the major researchers that study emotion in political thinking and behavior in contemporary times (2007).

The question “how decision making became a question for political psychology” has born after the wrong and risky political decisions in America. Kennedy administration’s mishandling of the Cuban Missile Crisis or the Nixon administration’s decision to authorize a burglary of the Watergate offices of the Democratic National Committee can be shown as the first samples of analyzing the question. I.L. Janis had studied group thinking and psychological reasons for decision making over the examples of these samples (Janis, 1982). It is seen that there are two main approaches to decision making. The first approach is the normative considerations that focus on what people should do and the second approach is the descriptive consideration that looks for what people really do (Simon, 1985). Rational choice theorists from political science make a cost and benefit calculations over what should be done in a certain case prefer to use normative consideration. Yet it is hard to do what should be doing in all cases. Because of that, psychologists and political psychologists have chosen to use descriptive approach to proof real people do not always decide according to rationality and normative standards but also there are other internal factors that affect them (Dawes, 1998; Gilovich et al., 2002; Thaler, 1994). In that sense, it would not be wrong to argue that emotions are the main internal factors that have a direct effect on peoples' thinking way about politics.

Neurophysiologic experimental studies also support the thesis about negative emotions increased attention to politics and directly affect the political decision-making process. Felicia Pratto and Oliver P. John’s experimental study (1991) about attention-grabbing power of negative social information has proved that people started to learn about politics by abandoning complacency and then start to pay attention when the world signals that something is not right (E. Marcus - B. MacKuen, 2004).

2.Role of Emotions in Decision Making Process on Politics

It is a debated topic that how individuals make political decisions in the field of political science but in fact, it is a topic of the research field of psychology that comprises citizen’s preferences, information gathering, memory and choice (Lau, 2003, 19). In that sense, it is important to separate political decision and political judgment from each other. While “political judgment involves the mapping of some ambiguous stimuli onto a perceptual system, a decision, in contrast, involves a

choice between two or more alternatives: whether to take drugs, who to marry, when to retire, which candidate to support in the election” (Lau, 2003, 20). So, it is important to understand how citizens make choices between alternatives and how they decide in politics.

As many different research methods were born with scientific developments in many fields, political scientists also started to open diverse sections to analyze polarized societies, intercommunication of pluralized social groups and identities, and complex citizen behaviors. For these reasons, political science and social psychology were harmonized and started to work together. Of course, understanding individual behavior has given priority to political analysis, but it is also a common belief that behavior is related to the environment and events. So, human behaviors should be evaluated with its context. In that sense, political psychology has offered various methods to analyze human behaviors with their contexts.

Understanding emotions is one of the hard but efficient methods of political psychology. Many studies have proven that the emotional response of individuals affects political campaigns. “Only when emotions reliably react to changes in the informational environment (i.e., to campaign news) can they encourage citizens to become engaged with their favorite candidate’s prospectus or, more interestingly, interrupt citizens’ ordinary political activity and spur information processing” (E.Marcus - B.MacKuen, 2004, 222). One of the substantial method to analyze emotional responses of messages is Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC). Even this method firstly have been used for just psychological text analysis, after a while it started to be used for understanding psychological and emotional responses of political messages. LIWC is a text analysis program to categorize words in a text according to positive-negative emotions, self-references, causal words, and 85 other language dimensions (Pennebaker et al., 2001).

For a long time, political decisions were seen only as part of a cognitive and rational thinking process, without involving emotions, as they were viewed as “irrational.” “Reason played the key role in the political heaven of ideal citizens, while emotion was denigrated as representing a major obstacle preventing citizens from engaging in rational political behavior to fulfill their civic duties.” (Erisen, 2018, 49) Citizen behavior was based on cognitive evaluations of human behavior and cost-benefit comparison before the twentieth century. Political scientists aimed to predict human behavior and ways of thinking to calculate the best results, and political psychology became a prominent field in the context of this aim. In the cognitive paradigm, reason-based decision-making was considered as “cold”, cognitive, and deliberative, on the contrary to “hot processes”, which were viewed as biases causing irrational choice behavior (Shafir et al., 1997).

The belief which argues emotion is irrational and irrelevant from political science as a scientific dogma has come from Aristotle who did not evaluate emotion as a part of the cognitive decision-making process, saying emotions rhetorically manipulate the behavior and decisions of others. After intensifying studies about political psychology, the acceptance that says emotion is irrational has changed. Many authors started to serve emotional expresses and state affect the process of thinking, cognitive processing and behaviors; moreover, they express those emotions can play a major role in voting behavior as well. (Campbell et al., 1960). The researches about emotion also took the attention of neuroscientists; not just political scientists.

So, all researchers who work on the subject showed that the interaction of cognition and emotion shape the individual behavior and it motivated a new perspective on decision making in politics (Damasio, 1994).

It is proved that emotions are effected on decision making process but the question is how politicians can touch the emotions of voters? Especially at last terms social media studies has tried to prove the link between emotions and voting attitudes. Especially Twitter is a well known social media platform that people can easily express their political opinions and emotions thought to political messages. Mostly after 2010, the literature has turned to read voters' emotions over Twitter. For example, "An Investigation of Influentials and the Role of Sentiment in Political Communication on Twitter during Election Periods" analyzes how Twitter is used for political communication during election periods with a specific focus on characteristics and communication behavior of influential accounts over 2011 Germany elections (Dang-Xuan, Stieglitz, Wladarsch, & Neuberger). The author tested the hypotheses regarding the relationship between sentiment in terms of emotionality and appraisals occurring in tweets and their quantity and speed of dissemination. Another key is "Sentiment, emotion, purpose, and style in electoral tweets" article (Mohammad et al., 2015). The article annotate a set of 2012 US presidential election tweets for a number of attributes pertaining to sentiment, emotion, purpose, and style by crowdsourcing. The article is very important because it shows through an analysis of these annotations that purpose, even though correlated with emotions, is significantly different.

Eun-Ju Lee and Soo Youn Oh argue that emotional tweets of political candidates take more attention and it find more positive response over lovers of the candidate (Lee - Oh, 2012). The study shows how public opinion is shaped by emotional tweets of candidates. On that sense, it promotes the thesis to support its argument about necessity of understanding voters' emotional situation and reactions for politicians. Also the work which is "Understanding the emotional act of voting" support the thesis by saying to understand voting behaviour, voters' emotions and their interaction with electoral arrangements should be considered (Bruter - Harrison, 2017). Twitter is a significant social media platform to understand voter's emotions and politicians should get more vote if they use some technological assumptions to categorize voters' emotions and give messages according to these results. Also analyses of emotional reactions of voters to politicians can give true predictions of the election.

3. Conceptualizing Emotions

The studies that focus on the role of emotion in political decisions first categorized emotions and emotional responses as negative and positive (Fishbein - Ajzen, 1975). For instance, citizens first give basic emotional responses to political candidates as liking or disliking them. It is also explained with the "valance approach" that asserts that political decision picks the way through the answer to the question "How do I feel about it?" (Erisen, 2018, 51). Individuals are not just objects of the pros and cons of a decision. The decision-making process is not as simple as making a checklist that measures its positive and negative results. The process also includes the emotions and political judgment and preferences mostly shaped by liking or disliking the political decision according to feeling thermometer ratings (Sniderma et al., 1991). Therefore, the valance approach conceptualizes emotion as positive or negative over the like or dislike a decision to categorize its affect.

The second categorization is appraisal theory that evaluates emotion as discrete (Roseman, 1991). Appraisal theory says each emotion should study separately because the reflection of emotions is different from each other; being sad, afraid or angry are different from each other. Appraisal theory has primarily been used in investigating political consequences. Researchers first focused on two negative main emotions which are fear and anger that affect the political consequences (Valentino et al., 2008).

The third theory is neural process theories that are close to the negative-positive valance approach. Yet according to this theory, emotions are not categorized as just negative or positive; also the level of emotion from low to high is important in this category. The affective intelligence model also has two dimensions to categorize emotion. According to this theory, individuals have two types of emotional system which are effortful and disposition-based processing. In that sense disposition system refers to using emotions as a new guide to search the topics which citizens are enthusiastic about. In political decisions, people are more tend to behave according to their political habits, without making critical considerations about parties or candidates (Rolls, 2000).

Yet, on the surveillance system, emotions are used as a tool to find answers to citizen's questions. Individuals are more tended to seek more information about political candidates or polemical political topics (Erisen, 2018, 53). According to the affective intelligence model, three main emotions drive citizen's political decision-making process which are enthusiasm, anxiety, and anger.

Anxiety and anger can be evaluated as negative feelings but according to limited studies that were made in that field, when people feel angry they are more open to learning (Johnston, Lavine, & Woodson, 2015). Enthusiasm, anxiety, and anger lead to having critical thinking and political judgment. "Judgment style depends on whether an emotional response represents a confirmation or a violation of one's partisan expectancies" (Johnston et al., 2015, 487). Even there is no certain proof to explain whether negative emotions lead citizens to dislike a political party or candidate, citizens who dislike a party or candidate become more angry or anxious about them.

In the many experimental studies, it is argued that positive emotions such as pride, hope or enthusiasm can motivate participation and they encourage participants to take more risk (Brader, 2005). Comparing with sadness, enthusiasm cause more risk-taking, hope and pride also strengthen the confidence in political decisions (Gross et al, 2009). While positive emotions motivate politicians and give a more optimistic perspective for the supporters, negative feelings may result in a more critical perspective on politics. Yet, according to Ladd and Lenz "the direction of cause-effect ran from the political candidate toward the emotion rather than from the emotion toward the political candidate, suggesting that voters feel anxious about candidates they dislike rather than dislike candidates because they make them feel anxious" (Erisen, 2018, 54).

The next section will analyze the role of negative emotions such as anxiety, fear, and anger which are considered to have positive effects on voters in the political decision-making process by using a descriptive approach.

3.1. Anxiety

To understand the role of positive and negative emotions on political decisions, each emotion should be analyzed. Starting with negative emotions, anxiety will be explained first. Anxiety is described with feeling uneasy, discomfort and afraid. Anxiety and fear are intermixing terms but anxiety is more closed to feel worried and discontent; while fear is a reaction against danger or suspect of danger (Lerner et al., 2003). Anxiety generally emerges when individuals face an unexpected situation but when an individual finds a clear response or explanation towards unfamiliar information or an environment, she/he feels relaxed (Marcus, 2002). Anxiety also may ensure rational outcomes on the political decision-making process of individuals. According to experimental studies, citizens who feel anxiety toward a political party or a leader they support are more tended to collect information about them and they also are more likely to have a critical judgment based on resolution policies of the party and personality of the leader (Brader, 2006). On the subject of political participation "anxiety increases the likelihood of participation in less-threatening activities, such as paying attention to news or seeking information about the subject, whereas anger promotes participation in risk-involving activities, such as joining social movements" (Erisen, 2018, 60).

Anxiety, fear, and anger were detected as main implements that drive individuals' political thinking process (Vasilopoulos et al., 2018). Anxiety is born when individuals face an unfamiliar situation feeling discomfort, uneasy and afraid until they find an answer or a solution to the unfamiliar situation (Capelos, 2013, 41).

Usually, anxiety drives voters to search for more information about the thing that does not sound familiar to them. Even though voters have a party identity or believe in a charismatic leader, anxiety may result in a questioning toward their political decisions. So, voters' first expectation is to feel safe with their political decisions. For this reason, political parties and leaders should answer all questions of voters clearly and keep them away from being "unfamiliar" to voters.

Last political psychology and social psychology studies show that a leader's personality and appearance has a big impact on citizens (Nai, 2019). Charismatic leaders with their good, young and energetic appearance have more advantages on competence (Blais, 2011) and these qualifications ensure positive feelings toward the candidates. Yet, even party identification is a strong connector between citizens and the political parties, it is shown that when party members feel anxious about an issue or a leader, their party identifications get weakened and they lose the reliability. To maintain reliability they run getting more information to find a solution to the problem. Yet, getting more information process sometimes may result in more complication and citizens may become more ambivalent (Groenendyk, 2016). "Anxiety works cooperatively with learning to shift attention to political matters and to diminish reliance on habit in voting decisions" (E.Marcus - B.MacKuen, 2004, 216).

3.2.Fear

The other emotion that directly affects voters' political decision-making process is fear. Even fear is listed under negative feelings, it can be useful to reach an efficient political decision-making process. Unknown things may lead to fear and people are tended to feel safe when they find an answer to the "unknown". Citizens may use fear to carry one's point or fight with the reason that leads to fear but both of that foster the cognitive thinking process and come in useful to have a political decision.

It is also proven that feeling fear may foster the cognitive process by getting more information because afraid people focus diminishing the risk factor that threatened them; not on other things around them. Fear leads people to get more information about the cause of the threat and this process feeds the cognitive performance (Gonzalez-Bailon et al., 2012).

Uncertainty is the main reason that leads people to fear. Uncertain, unknown and unusual things make people feel threatened, under-danger and this causes an unhealthy decision-making process. Afraid people generally behave in two ways: fight or flight; "Flight refers to an action that gets one away from the cause of the emotion, whereas fight makes people take action against the cause itself. Thus, while the behavioral outcome of fear can involve a decision of either fight or flight, both aim to remove the cause of the uncertainty" (Erisen, 2018, 56). For instance, after the 9/11 terror attack, according to the surveys, American citizens who feel threatened and afraid are less likely to take more risk and they are not closed to support aggressive actions; in the other hand, citizens who feel threatened but not afraid are tended to support America's hot military actions (Huddy et al., 2005).

It is hard to separate emotions with certain lines from each other. Especially the same group of emotions such as negative or positive has links among them. George E. Marcus from Williams College and Michael B. MacKuen from the University of Missouri have built a different correlation between anxiety and fear (2004). According to them, anxiety is an answer against the fear that foster attention and worry to collect more information during electoral campaigns and political learning process.

3.3. Anger

While fear and anxiety can be used as a thinking mechanism to collect more information against unknown and unusual things, anger can be used to mobilize citizens around specific groups and identities against the "other". It is a usual tactic for politicians to build a party identity over the differences from the other. People are more likely to dislike differences and that may lead to anger in some debates. So, politicians may seem like talented magicians to convert negative feelings as successful tactics to have political support.

Anger is mostly born when something happens people dislike. When people face with usual and known but disliked or threatening stimuli, the disposition system produces anger. According to studies angry people are first tended to feel "revenge" which fosters a strong idea of the "other" (Frijda, 1986). According to cognitive studies angry people tend to be mobilized against the others to strengthen their own positions (Huddy et al., 2007). Therefore, angry citizens are more likely to mobilize around their party identification. Feeling angry fosters partisan habits and political participation (Valentino et al., 2011).

According to Huddy, Feldman, and Cassese angry citizens are also more likely to support military actions and they are more tended to renounce their civil liberties. For instance, after the 9-11 terror attack, American citizens have started to support military actions against Iraq much more than before. Anger is a very significant variable that affects the rate of presidential approval by citizens during America's military operations in Iraq (Huddy et al., 2007).

Support for military actions or presidential approval are positive outcomes of anger on the citizens for political parties, but it is argued that the anger of citizens under economic risks have negative outcomes for governments (Conover - Feldman, 1986). Political leaders who have moral disapprobation and political parties who are known with an economic unsuccessfulness are in a disadvantaged situation for citizens because both of them lead to negative feelings on the citizens (M.R. Steenbergen and C. Ellis Context, 2006). American National Election Study (ANES) surveys have shown that American citizens were angry and afraid during the Reagan period related to the economic crisis and also during the Clinton governing because of moral scandals. It is understood that anger and fear are different emotions that lead to different outcomes. Anger has born when citizens face an unexpected situation while fear has shown when citizens face an unfamiliar situation (Demertzis, 2013, 45).

Conclusion

The academic view to the emotions has changed by the time and especially in the last decades it very well has understood that people are complements with their thinking and emotions. The false belief that was argued as emotions are irrational and separated from the cognitive decision-making process has been refuted. The course of events of the society also supported to discover new methods to analyze the polarized structure of society. While society has changed form and got more complicated, it was getting difficult to estimate citizen's political behaviors. In that sense, emotions have been used as a trustable guideline to look at deeply citizens' political decision-making processes and their political behaviors. Psychological and social psychological studies also fostered the link between political thinking and the role of emotions to explain citizen's behaviors and they present a surprise result. The emotions that accepted as "negative" because of their behavioral results on humans' moods on daily life that are anxiety, fear, and anger have positive effects on political decision-making processes.

Most people use these negative emotions as a mechanism to reach an efficient information gathering process and this process helps to provide a safety political discussion (E.Marcus - B.MacKuen, 2004, 215). Studies about the cognitive psychology show that negative events enhance attention and emotional responses are important to design attention according to the event. People tend to think about politics more when they feel something is getting wrong (Derrberry, 1991). Anxiety, fear and anger are also well known negative feelings when something is getting wrong. When people feeling uneasy, discomfort and afraid, anxiety can be occurred. Feeling anxiety toward a political party or politician motivates citizens to collect more information to solve the problem that leads to feeling anxiety. (Brader, 2006). Anxiety is also increases tendency to gathering attention for news and information about the topic. (Erisen, 2018, p. 60). Anxiety works for having a critical mind on political topics and serve to learning studies. It is important to diminish recitative voting behavior (E.Marcus - B.MacKuen, 2004, 216).

The fear is another examined negative feeling in the article. People mostly feel fear if they face something is "unknown". People need to find an answer and response against the "unknown" thing and this process foster cognitive thinking. It is proved that fear may be useful for getting more information about the fear object because afraid people mostly first focus on the diminish risk factor that feared them (Gonzalez-Bailon et al., 2012).

Anger also a negative feeling that may result with positive consequences for politicians. As it is argued in the article, angry people first tend to feel revenge that also result with creation of the “other” and creation of “other” also strength their party identification by mobilizing them around their party identification against other. That’s mean feeling anger against “other” foster partisan attitudes and political participation (Valentino et al., 2011). To strength their own positions people who feel anger also tended to collect more information that proof the rightness of their political positions. Also as it is seen on the sample of America’s Iraq invasion after 9/11, citizens who feel anger are more tended to support military actions and they more vulnerable to disclaim from their civil liberties (Huddy et al., 2007). Of course the activator effects of anger is mostly related with belonging a group identity. Even people who create the group do not have a personal anger toward a certain situation, group identity may force them to feel anger because groups are not just the sum of individuals and have a specific atmospheres (Houghton, 2018, 224.). Crisis that lead anger of citizens are methods to “legitimize hostility” for politicians and they use anger of people to gain support for their own policies. Those who cause the crisis try to hold their opponents responsible for the war. By doing so, they support themselves both inside and outside and prevent the support that can be given to their enemies. According to Lebow, crisis that were occurred in Fashoda (1898), Korea (1950), China-India (1962) and Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) are all examples of how politicians use anger of citizens (Lebow, 1981, 25).

In the light of these pieces of information, different definitions of emotions, the role of emotions in the political decision-making process and in particular main negative emotions’ positive effects on political decision-making processes have been discussed in this article.

References

- Ax, A. "The Physiological Differentiation between Fear and Anger in Humans". *Psychosomatic Medicine* 15/5 (1953), 433-42.
- Blais, A. vd. *Political Leaders in Democratic Elections*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2013.
- Brader, T. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions". *American Journal of Political Science* 49/2, (2005). 388-405.
- Brader, T. "Affective Intelligence and Beyond: Next Steps in Research on Emotion in Politics". *Political Communication Report*, (2006), 1-6.
- Brader, T., Marcus, G. E. "Emotion and Political Psychology". *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, Ed. L. Huddy vd. 165-204. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 2013.
- Bruter, M. vd. "Understanding the emotional act of voting". *Nat Hum Behaviour* 1, (2017).
- Capelos, Tereza. "Understanding Anxiety and Aversion: The Origins and Consequences of Affectivity in Political Campaigns", *Emotions in Politics: The Affect Dimension in Political Tension*, ed. Nicolas Demertzis, 39-59, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Campbell, A. vd. *The American Voter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, (1960).
- Conover, P. vd. "Candidates, Issues and Voters: The Role of Inferences in the Perception of Political Candidates", *the Journal of Politics*, 45/4, (1983), 810-839.
- Damasio, A. R. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain*. New York: Putnam, 1994.
- Dang-Xuan, L. vd. "An Investigation of Influentials and the Role of Sentiment in Political Communication on Twitter during Election Periods", *Information Communication and Society*, 16/5, (2013), 795-825.
- Dawes, R. M. *Behavioral Decision Making and Judgment*. Boston: McGraw-Hill, 1998.
- Demertzis, N. *Emotions in Politics: The Affect Dimension in Political Tension*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Derrberry, D. "The Immediate Effects of Positive and Negative Feedback Signals". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61/2, (1991), 267-278.
- Diener, E. vd. "The Independence of Positive and Negative Affect". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47/5, (1985), 1105-1117.
- Elliott, A. *The Routledge Companion to Social Theory*, Routledge, New York, 2010.
- Erisen, C. *Political Behavior and the Emotional Citizen*. London: Macmillan Publishers, 2018.
- Fishbein, M. vd. *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An introduction to Theory and Research*. Boston: Addison-Wesley, 1975.
- Frijda, N. *The Emotions*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

- Gonzalez-Bailon vd. "Emotions Public Opinion and US Presidential Approval Rates 5-Year Analysis of Online Political Discussions". *Human Communication Research*, 38/2, (2012), 121–143.
- Gordon, S. "Social Structural Affects on Emotions". *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions*, ed. Th. Kemper, New York: State University of New York Press, 1990.
- Groenendyk, E. "The anxious and ambivalent partisan: The effect of incidental anxiety on partisan motivated recall and ambivalence". *Public Opinion*, 80/2, (2016), 460–479.
- Gross, K. vd. "Confidence in Government and Emotional Responses to Terrorism after September 11, 2001". *American Politics Research*, 37/1, (2009), 107–128.
- Habermas, J. "Modernity versus Postmodernity." *New German Critique*, 22, (1981), 3-14.
- Houghton, David Patrick. *Siyaset Psikolojisi: Durumlar, Bireyler, Olaylar*, İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Yay., 2018.
- Huddy, L. vd. "On the Distinct Political Effects of Anxiety and Anger", *The Affect Effect: Dynamics of Emotion in Political Thinking and Behavior*, ed. George Marcus vd. 432-461. Chicago: Chicago University Press, (2007).
- Huddy, L. vd. "Threat, Anxiety, and Support of Antiterrorism Policies". *American Journal of Political Science*, 49/3, (2005), 593–608.
- Druckman, J. vd. "The growth and development of experimental research political science". *American Political Science Review* 100, (2006), 627–636.
- Janis, I. *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1982.
- Jervis, R. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Johnston, C. vd. "Emotion and political judgment: Expectancy violation and affective intelligence". *Political Research Quarterly*, 68/3, (2015), 474–492.
- Kahneman, D. vd. *Heuristics and Biases: The Psychology of Intuitive Judgment*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Lau, R. L. "Models of Decision-Making". *Political Psychology*, Ed. Sears vd. 19-60. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Lee, E.J. vd. "To Personalize or Depersonalize? When and How Politicians' Personalized Tweets Affect the Public's Reactions". *Journal of Communication*, 62/6 (2012), 932–949.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. *Between Peace and War: The Nature of International Crisis*, Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press, 1981.
- Lerner, J. S. vd. "Emotion and Perceived Risks of Terrorism: A National Field Experiment". *Psychological Science*, 14, (2003), 144–150.

- Lodge, M. vd. "The Primacy of Affect for Political Candidate Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis". *Political Psychology*, 26/5 (2005), 455-482.
- Lodge, M., - Taber, *The Rationalizing Voter*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Marcus, G. E. *The Sentimental Citizen. Emotion in Democratic Politics*, University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.
- Marcus, G.E. vd. "Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns." *Political Psychology*, ed. John T. Tost vd. 215-235, New York and Hove: Psychology Press, 2004.
- McDermott, R. *Political Psychology in International Relations*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 2004.
- Mohammad, S. M. vd. "Sentiment, Emotion, Purpose, and Style in Electoral Tweets". *Information Processing and Management*, (2015), 480-499.
- Nai, Alessandro. vd. "The Personality of Populists: Provocateurs, Charismatic Leaders, or Drunken Dinner Guests?". *West European Politics*, 42/7 (2019).
- Neuman, W. vd. "Theorizing Affect's Effects", *The Affect Effect: Dynamics of Emotion in Political Thinking and Behavior*, ed. George Marcus vd. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2007.
- Pennebaker, Francis. vd. "Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count: LIWC 2001". Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Publishers, 2001.
- Plutchik, R. *Emotion: A Psychoevolutionary Synthesis*. New York: Harper and Row, 1980.
- Pratto, F. vd. "Automatic Vigilance: The Attention-grabbing Power of Negative Social Information". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61/3 (1991), 380-91.
- Redlawsk, D. vd. "Emotions and Voting", *Handbook of Electoral Behaviour*, ed. Arzheimer, 406-432, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing, 2017.
- Rolls, E. "On the brain and emotion". *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 23/2 (Oct. 2000), 219-228.
- Roseman, I. J. "Appraisal determinants of discrete emotions." *Cognition and Emotion* 5/3 (1991), 161-200.
- Russel, J. "A Circumplex Model of Affect". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 39/6 (Dec. 1980), 1161-78.
- Shafir, E. vd. "Reason-based choice". *Cognition* 49/1-2 (1997), 11-36.
- Sieben, B. – Wettegren. *Emotionalizing Organizations and Organizing Emotions*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Simon, H. A. "Human nature in politics: The dialogue of psychology with political science". *The American Political Science Review* 79/2 (Jun. 1985), 293-304.
- Sniderman, P. vd. *Reasoning and choice: Explorations in political psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Steenbergen, Marco R. - Ellis, Christopher. "Fear and Loathing in American Elections. Context, Traits, and Negative Candidate Affect", *Feeling Politics. Emotion in Political Information Processing.*, ed. Redlawsk, 109-133, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Stein, J. "Building politics into psychology: The misperception of threat". *Political Psychology* 9/2 (Jun. 1988), 245-271.
- Tellegan, A. "Structures of Mood and Personality and Their Relevance to Assessing Anxiety, with an Emphasis on Self-Report". *Anxiety and the Anxiety Disorders*, ed. Tuma vd. Hillsdale, 681-706, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1985.
- Thaler, R. *Quasi-rational economics*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1994.
- Thoits, P. A. "The Sociology of Emotions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15 (1989), 317-342.
- Tompkins, S. *Affect, Imagery, Consciousness*. New York: Spring, 1962.
- Turner, J. H. – Stets. *The Sociology of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Valentino, N. A. vd. "Election night's alright for fighting: The role of emotions in political participation". *Journal of Politics* 73/1 (2011), 156-170.
- Valentino, N. vd. "Is a worried citizen a good citizen? Emotions, political information seeking, and learning via internet". *Political Psychology* 29/2 (2008), 247-273.
- Vasilopoulos, P. vd. "Fear, Anger, and Voting for the Far Right: Evidence From the November 13, 2015 Paris Terror Attacks", *Political Psychology*, 40/4, (2018), 679-704.
- Vogel, G. "Scientists Probe Feelings behind Decision Making". *Science* 275/5304, (1997), 1269.
- Watson, D. vd. "Toward a Consensual Structure of Mood". *Psychological Bulletin* 98/2, (1985), 219-35.