Emotions and Decision-Making

Shresha Das

Georgia Institute of Technology

CS 3790, Cognitive science

Dr. Keith McGreggor

November 19, 2023

The Issue

Emotions and their role in decision-making have been a matter of debate, fascination, and scrutiny across various academic fields for the past multiple years. As we navigate through our daily lives, emotions influence our cognition, our thought processes, actions, and sometimes subtly and sometimes profoundly. Since emotions and decision-making both play such a significant role, apart from knowing how they work individually, it is crucial that we learn the relationship and interdependence. Understanding the intricate relationship between emotions and decision-making has significant implications for numerous fields, including psychology, economics, marketing, and neuroscience.

The central question that this paper will review and explore is whether emotions affect our decision-making processes and how. Emotions, as we know, are complex and multifaceted. This makes it crucial to delve into the various aspects of their connection with decision-making. How do emotions influence the choices we make, and do they enhance or hinder rational decision-making? Another important thing to consider is that emotions is not just one process. It consists of a range of different feelings, thoughts, and processes. Thus, how do different emotions affect decision-making differently? To answer these questions, it is imperative to investigate the psychological, biological, and evolutionary dimensions of emotions and their influence on human judgement. In short, here are the research questions that we will review in this paper:

1. Do emotions affect the decision-making process? If so, how and why?
2. Do various emotions produce unique impacts on decision-making?

To unravel the complexities surrounding how emotions influence our choices, it becomes crucial to delve into various aspects of this connection. Understanding how different emotions impact

decision-making and whether they enhance or hinder rational choices is a key focal point. Emotions are not a singular process; they encompass a range of feelings, thoughts, and processes. Thus, exploring how diverse emotions influence decision-making becomes imperative. To start, we will look into some explanations to the research questions that we have posed. Following this, the evidence section will delve into the psychological, computational, and neurological dimensions, providing substance to the arguments presented. Finally, the conclusion will synthesize these diverse strands of evidence, offering a comprehensive understanding of the intricate relationship between emotions and decision-making. The objective is to contribute meaningful insights to the ongoing academic discourse, shedding light on the intricate interplay between these fundamental aspects of human cognition and behavior.

Alternatives

Alternative 1: Emotions have no significant impact on the decision-making process.

According to this perspective, decision are solely logical and rational. Decision-making is unaffected by emotional states. The argument suggests that emotions are fundamentally non-cognitive and do not play a role in intricate thinking or understanding. Instead, decisions are portrayed as swift, automatic processes that precede conscious thought. Evolutionary perspectives are invoked, emphasizing the historical shaping of decision-making processes by the need for survival and reproductive success. This alternative underscores the idea that early human decisions were primarily driven by rational considerations related to self-preservation, with emotions playing a subordinate role. The role of cognitive theories, such Expected Utility Theory and Prospect Theory, further reinforces the notion that rational assessments of outcomes and probabilities take precedence over emotional factors in decision-making.

Alternative 2: Emotions are integral to the decision-making process, shaping choices and judgements in fundamental ways.

This perspective highlights the unique characteristics of emotions that categorize the world into positive and negative, creating a fundamental division that simplifies decision-making. The psychological perspective emphasizes the role of emotions in information recall, judgement, and decision stability. Emotional intelligence is introduces as a factor that enhances adaptability in decision-making, allowing individuals to navigate their choices with heightened self-awareness. The biological perspective brings attention to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) and its role in producing and controlling emotions, emphasizing the transformative effect of emotions on decision-making. Social and cultural dimensions are also considered, highlighting the impact of emotions on collective decision outcomes, trust, and decision processes within different societies.

Alternative 3: Emotions with the same valence (positive or negative) produce similar effects on decision-making.

This theory posits that emotions sharing a common valence elicit consistent patterns in neural activation and cognitive responses. Positive emotions activate reward-related brain regions, fostering an optimistic perspective on potential choices, while negative emotions engage brain regions associated with threat processing, prompting a more cautious decision-making approach. The theory acknowledges potential inconsistencies and complexities, considering individual differences, past experiences, and situational context as factors that can introduce variations. The influence of valence is discussed in the context of persuasion, where positive emotions render individuals equally influenced by both strong and weak messages, while negative emotions create resistance to persuasion.

Alternative 4: Emotions with the same valence can produce distinct effects on decision-making due to different appraisal dimensions.

While traditional research often focuses on emotional valence, this alternative introduces appraisal theories, suggesting that even similar-valence emotions can influence decisions uniquely through different goals and appraisals. Specific emotions like anger, dear, and sadness are emphasized for their distinct appraisal dimensions (e.g., control, responsibility). The psychological impact is explored, highlighting how happy and sad moods lead to heuristic and systematic processing. Discrete emotions, such as anger, fear, and happiness, are discussed in risk assessment, economic decisions, and legal contexts, showing varied effects. Emotional intelligence is considered, emphasizing the intricate interplay of emotions, cognitive processes, and decision outcomes, stressing the need to consider emotional granularity, individual differences, and context-specific influences for a nuanced understanding of emotional impacts on decision-making.

Evidences

Alternative 1: Emotions have no significant impact on the decision-making process

Before any systematic scientific inquiry into the relationship between emotions and decision-making, philosophical perspectives often framed emotions within broader conceptual frameworks. Some philosophers argues that emotions are fundamentally non-cognitive, suggesting that they do not involve intricate thinking or understanding as they are swift and automatic, often preceding conscious thought. This historical philosophical stance posited that emotions are reactions deeply rooted in instinctual survival mechanisms, emphasizing a rational and local core underlying decision-making. Moreover, from an evolutionary standpoint,

decision-making processes were initially shaped by the need for survival and reproductive success. Evolutionary psychologists argue that early human decisions were primarily governed by rational considerations related to self-preservation, with emotional responses playing a subordinate role. This viewpoint underscores the primacy of cognitive processes in decision-making, particularly when survival instinct and logical assessments took precedence. (Laurie R. Santos, 2015)

Individual differences in emotional regulation further contribute to the argument. Notably, some individuals exhibit a high degree of emotional regulation, enabling them to compartmentalize emotions during decision-making. The diversity in emotional regulation skills underscores that emotions might not universally dictate decision outcomes, and individuals can exert cognitive control based on their unique emotional regulation capacities. Furthermore, psychological studies exploring instances where individuals, even when experiencing emotional states, demonstrate the ability to make rational decisions provide empirical support. Experimental conditions reveal that individuals can exhibit logical decision-making despite being exposed to emotionally charged stimuli (Alessandro Grecucci). This suggests that the cognitive processes governing decision-making can override emotional influences under certain circumstances.

In the realm of decision sciences, cognitive theories like Expected Utility Theory and Prospect Theory predominantly focus on rational assessments of outcomes and probabilities (Elgar). These theories, foundational in decision research, highlight the cognitive primacy in decision-making, with emotional factors considered secondary or peripheral to the rational evaluation of choices.

In conclusion, this multi-faceted evidence underscores the proposition that emotions have limited impact on decision-making. Philosophical, evolutionary, neuroscientific, individual difference,

and empirical perspectives collectively contribute to the argument that decision-making processes maintain a rational and logical core even in the presence of emotional states.

Alternative 2: Emotions are integral to the decision-making process, shaping choices and judgements in fundamental ways.

Emotions possess unique characteristics that set them apart from other cognitive processes. They categorize the world into positive and negative, creating a fundamental division that other mental functions cannot achieve. Emotions highlight the significance of something, effectively elevating or diminishing its importance, which, in the process, generates a hierarchy of potential actions. Thus, it reduces the decision-making space significantly, simplifying the decision-making process (Mordka, 2016). There are quite a lot of ways in which emotions affect decision-making.

Let us look at the psychological perspective: emotions play a significant role in information recall and judgement. People rend to remember information that aligns with their current emotional state and often based their judgements on how they feel about a subject. This emotional influence on judgement can lead to mood-congruent evaluations, where individuals in a happy mood tend to overestimate positive outcomes and underestimate negative ones, while those in a sad mood show the opposite trend. Additionally, emotions influence the strategies individuals use for information recessing. Hence, these emotional effects and influence decision-making by affecting the accessibility and evaluation of valence features in the decision situation (Schwarz, 2000). Not only that, but it has been shown that when a person exhibits consistency in decision-making, it implies that their choices are not arbitrary and are guided by some internal principles, values, or criteria. Emotional states that align with the nature of the decision contribute to decision stability and coherence across various situations (Jennifer M. George, 2016).

Another important fact that shows the impact of emotions on decision-making is the fact that high emotional intelligence enhances adaptability in decision-making. Emotional intelligence involves recognizing and managing one's own emotions and those of others, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of emotional cues and their impact on decision strategies. Individual with heightened emotional intelligence demonstrate a keen awareness of their own emotional states, allowing them to navigate their decision-making processes with greater self-awareness. This self-awareness enables individuals to make informed choices that align with their emotional well-being, fostering a more authentic and internally consistent decision-making approach. Simultaneously, high emotional intelligence empowers individuals to adeptly perceive the emotional landscapes of those around them. This ability is particularly advantageous in collaborative or social decision-making. Consequently, emotionally intelligent individuals can tailor their decision-making strategies to accommodate and harmonize with the emotional dynamics of the situation (Peter Salovey, 1990).

Let us look at it from the biological perspective: Studies show that the ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) plays a vital role in both producing and controlling negative emotions by interacting with various brain regions, including the amygdala, bed nucleus of the stria terminalis, hippocampus etc. (Arnsten, 2009). You might be wondering how that relates to decision making. A patient studied by A. Damasio, who underwent a ventromedial frontal cortex removal after an injury, retained physical competence and most mental faculties. However, his emotional landscape underwent significant changes, affecting decision-making, future planning, and learning from mistakes. Psychological and neuropsychological assessments revealed intact intellectual abilities, especially in memory tests using interference procedures. Nevertheless, his decision-making and behavior became solely driven by reasoning devoid of value assignment to

choices. Similar impairments in decision making and reduced emotional responsiveness were observed in other prefrontal cortex-damages patients, leading to inflexibility, difficulty in organizing task, and a lack of curiosity. Emotions not only categorize things as "positive or negative", but also prioritize and inherently involve behavioral responses (Mordka, 2016). It should be noted that this paper did not dive much into what the patient's injury was and did not discuss any other case. There is a possibility that the impairment to ability to make decisions could come from some other aspect of the injury or surgery.

Now, we look at another aspect of it that ties evolution and biology into this. This view proposes that the brain's design is centered around reward and punishment systems, allowing genes to create a complex system that facilitates adaptive and flexible behavior to enhance evolutionary successes. This theory aids in comprehending various processes in the brain, starting with sensory information processing, followed by encoding the value of rewards and punishments, culminating in decision-making and action selection guided by these value representations. These value-coding systems are distinct from purely sensory or motor systems. Emotions are closely related to these ongoing goal related states, as they play a central role in emotional experiences. Emotional states can serve as motivators, as seem in cases of frustration due to non-reward. This perspective on reward and punishment systems in the brain is particularly relevant in understanding the impact of emptions on decision making processes Emotions, rooted in the brain's reward and punishment mechanisms, okay a central role in shaping motivations, goal-oriented behaviors and the affective states that influence choices and decisions (Rolls, 2013).

Decision-making might not always be an individual task, it could also be a social task that is dependent on the surrounding environment. Social contexts significantly shape emotional experiences, and emotions often spread through social interactions. Shared emotional

experiences within a group can contribute to collective decision outcomes. The social influence of emotions highlights the interconnectedness of individual emotional states and the broader decision-making dynamics within social settings. Emotions also play a crucial role in the establishment and maintenance of trust within interpersonal relationships. Trust is foundational to collaborative decision-making, and positive emotional experiences contribute to the development of trust, fostering cooperative decision-making within groups (McAllister, 1995). Furthermore, cultural factors contribute to variations in how emotions are expressed and interpreted, influencing decision-making patterns within different societies. Cultural norms, values, and practices shape the emotional landscape, affecting individuals' decision processes. Understanding the interplay between culture and emotions provides additional insights into the complex relationship between emotional experiences and decision outcomes (Jennifer S. Lerner, 2015).

In summation, the complex interplay between emotions and decision-making encompasses psychological, biological, and social dimensions. Emotions, distinct in their categorization of the worlds into positive and negative, fundamentally shape decision processes by simplifying the intricate decision landscape. From a psychological standpoint, emotions influence information recall, judgment, and decision stability. Emotional intelligence enhances adaptability, allowing individuals to navigate decisions with heightened self-awareness and social acuity. Biological perspectives, particularly involving the vmPFC, highlight the transformative affect of emotions on decision-making, emphasizing the intricate balance between reason and emotional responsiveness. Evolutionary insights reveal emotions as motivators shaping goal-oriented behaviors, while the social dimension underscores their roles in collective decision outcomes and trust within interpersonal relationships. Cultural factors introduce variations, influencing

decision-making patterns across societies. In essence, emotions are not peripheral but central to decision-making, permeating cognitive, biological, and social realms, and understanding this intricate relationship is essential for a comprehensive grasp of human behavior and decision dynamics.

Alternative 3: Emotions with the same valence (positive or negative) produce similar effects on decision-making.

According to this theory, emotions play a profound role on the intricacies of decision-making, while being categorized according to their valence. They elicit consistent patterns in both neural activation and cognitive responses. Extensive research in this field has illustrated that emotions that share a common valence often engage comparable neural mechanisms, therevy exterting parallel impacts on decision making and outcomes. Positive emotions, such as joy or excitement, have been shown to trigger and activate reward – related brain regions, fostering an optimistic perspective on potential choices (Fredrickson, 2004). On the other hand, negative emotions, such as fear or sadness, can trigger brain regions that are associated with threat processing, which influences a more cautious approach to decision-making. We see that the impact of valence extends beyond neural activation to encompass information processing. Emotions categorized under the same valence guide individuals through predictable patterns. As discussed above, positive emotions typically promote heuristic processing, relying on existing knowledge with reduced emphasis on details, while negative emotions induce more systematic processing, which focuses on intricacies and minimizing reliance on pre-existing knowledge (Bless H. C., 1996).

In the realm of persuasion, emotions with the same valence exhibit analogous effects on responses to persuasive messages. Positive emotions render individuals equally influenced by both strong and weak messages, while negative emotions create resistance to persuasion,

indicating a consistency in how emotions shape receptivity to external influences (Amanda D. Angie, 2011).

While there is substantial evidence supporting this alterative that emotions with the same valence yield similar effects on decision-making, it is important to understand and acknowledge certain inconsistencies and complexities within this framework. One major thing to consider is that not every person reacts identically to a positive or negative emotions, and diverse factors such as personality, past experiences and situational context can introduce considerable variations. Moreover, this valence-based alternative could oversimplify the intricate nature of emotions and their impact on decision-making. Emotions are, as discussed, multifaceted, and concentrating them solely on their positivity or negativity overlooks the nuances within each category. Joy and contentment, for example, can be classified as positive emotions, but they can lead to different decision-making patterns, challenging the idea of a uniform impact based solely on valence.

Cognitive appraisal theories of emotion further propose that individual personality differences in how emotions are appraised can lead to divergent effects on decision-making, even though they can be categorized under the same valence. For example, two individuals experiencing the same positive emotion may appraise the situation differently, resulting in distinct cognitive and behavioral outcomes. Furthermore, the impact of emotions on decision-making is not static and can change over time. The temporal dynamics of emotions, including their duration and intensity, can influence the persistence of their effects on decision processes. A brief and intense emotional experience may have different consequences compared to a prolonged and milder emotional state (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985).

In summary, the theory posits that emotions, categorized by their valence, wield a profound influence on decision-making, eliciting consistent patterns in neural activation and cognitive

responses. Extensive research underscored that emotions sharing a common valence often engage comparable neural mechanisms, exerting parallel impacts on decision outcomes. Positive emotions like joy or excitement activate reward-related brain regions, fostering an optimistic perspective on choices, while negative emotions, such as fear or sadness, engage brain regions associated with threat processing, prompting a more cautious decision-making approach. The influence of valence extends beyond neural activation to encompass information processing and play a role in decision making when it comes to persuasive messages. However, it is important to note the loopholes and inconsistencies in this theory. The valence-based model may oversimplify many complex frameworks, and this is what we will discuss in the next section.

Alternative 4: Emotions with the same valence can produce distinct effects on decision-making due to different appraisal dimensions.

Research on how emotions impact decision-making has traditionally centered on the emotional valence (Emotional valence describes the extent to which an emotion is positive or negative (Francesca M.M. Citron, 2014)), assuming that all negative or positive emotions play similar roles in influencing various decision-making stages. However, appraisal theories of emotions suggest that even emotions with the same valence may affect decision-making distinctively due to the activation of distinct goals, which, in turn, influence subsequent decisions (Luigi Leone, 2005). Different categories of emotions, such as anger, fear, and sadness have different appraisal dimensions that differentiate them, like control, responsibility, and certainty. These dimensions play a significant role in influencing judgement and decision-making processes across various emotions (Amanda D. Angie, 2011).

As a direct consequence of the psychological impacts we discussed earlier, when people are in happy mood, they tend to adopt a heuristic approach, relying on existing knowledge and paying

little attention to details. In contrast, when in a sad mood, they tend to employ a systematic strategy, focusing on details and disregarding pre-existing knowledge (Bless, et al., 1996). This explains why we take sudden and unexpected decisions based on our feelings and moods. These distinctions in processing styles have been observed across various domains, such as persuasive messages and stereotype usage. Emotions appear to tailor our thought processes to meet the demands of the current situation. Thus, a direct consequence of tailoring our thought processes is tailoring our decision-making capabilities (Schwarz, 2000).

When we look at discrete emotions ("discrete emotions are considered to be short-lived, intense phenomena that usually have clear cognitive content that is accessible to the person experiencing the motion (Clore, 1994)"), anger has been in the spotlight. Described as one of the most frequently experienced emotions, it has a unique attention-focusing property for the individual making it an influential emotion. As discussed earlier, anger encourages individuals to focus on the current environment more than past experiences, which leads to a lapse in judgement. Apart from anger, fear and happiness are the other two discrete emotions that stand out. Numerous studies have shown that they have distinct effects on decision-making processes. Lerner and Keltner discuss a series of studies that investigate how different emotions, specifically fear and anger, influence individuals' judgements and decision related to risk in their paper titled "Fear, Anger, and Risk." In the studies describes, participants were induced to experience emotions such as fear and anger, and then their judgements and choices involving risk were assessed. These experiments aimed to determine how these specific emotions affect people's perceptions of risk and whether certain appraisal tendencies mediate the impact of emotions on judgement and choices. The research findings suggest that fearful individuals tend to make relatively pessimistic judgements and choices when it comes to risk and that happy and angry individuals

consistently make relatively optimistic judgements and choices regarding risk. Additionally, the studies examined the role of specific appraisal tendencies, such as those related to certainty and control, in mediating the impact of emotions on risk-related judgements (Lerner & Keltner, 2001).

In the case of happiness, it often results in a tendency to estimate a higher probability of positive events when compared to negative ones. It has also been found that happiness influences a person to choose the safe option more frequently than sadness. Sadness, on the other hand, is linked to feelings of loss and leads to a more detailed a thoughtful processing of cognitive tasks. This could be to avoid thinking about the emotion-eliciting situation, which influences people to engage in effortful and meticulous judgement, possibly as a way to avoid contemplating the situation too much (Amanda D. Angie, 2011). Anger, in contrast, often triggers heuristic processing in judgements.

These emotional states not only influence risk assessment and decision-making, but they also affect persuasive messages. Happiness causes individuals to get equally influenced by strong and weak messages, whereas sadness causes them to get persuaded by strong messages. Getting persuaded differently depending on the emotion being felt at that moment is directly linked to decision-making as getting persuaded influences the type of decision the individual would make (Amanda D. Angie, 2011). Furthermore, anticipation of negative emotions can motivate individuals to evaluate behaviors in an adaptive manner, leading them to choose actions that reduce or prevent negative outcomes (Luigi Leone, 2005).

In economic contexts, emotions like sadness and disgust can influence decisions related to buying and selling. The “endowment effect,” where people tend to overvalue objects they possess, is reversed or eliminated by specific emotions. For example, individuals influenced by

sadness may decrease selling prices and those in the disgust condition ay reduce both choice and sell prices, counteracting the typical endowment effect (Amanda D. Angie, 2011).

As we discussed earlier, sadness induces uncertainty and promotes thorough information processing. Fear leads individuals to seek more information and make more informed decisions. In contrast, anger is associated with shallower, heuristic information processing, potentially limiting attention to detail and certainty in decision-making.

In legal context, such as a capital trail, emotional states can significantly impact juror decision-making. Angry jurors may process information less deeply, potentially leading to overconfidence in their sentencing decisions. In contrast, sad or fearful jurors may pay more attention to details and exhibit less certainty regarding their sentencing choices (Narina Nuñez, 2015). This highlights the role of emotions in shaping the cognitive processes involved in legal decision-making. To further support this perspective, we consider the work of Daniel Goleman, a renowned psychologist who introduced the concept of emotional intelligence. Goleman argues that individuals with high emotional intelligence are better equipped to understand and manage their emotions, leading to more effective decision-making (Goleman, 1995). This aligns with the idea that emotions with the idea that emotions with the same valence can produce distinct effects based on individual differences in emotional regulation and intelligence.

Moreover, Lisa Feldman Barrett's work challenges conventional perspectives on discrete emotions. Barrett introduces the theory of constructed emotion, suggesting that emotions are not rigid categories but rather emergent experiences influenced by individual and cultural context (Forgas, 1995). This viewpoint adds complexity to the understanding that emotions, even when sharing the same valence, can be highly subjective a context dependent, thereby entering unique influences on decision-making.

To summarize, this extended exploration offers a more thorough investigation into how emotions with identical valence can yield distinct effects on decision-making due to varying appraisal dimension. Through the integration of insights from diverse researchers, this analysis underscores the intricate interplay between emotions, cognitive processes, and decision outcomes. The incorporation of factors like emotional granularity, individual differences, and context-specific influences enhances the comprehension of the multifaceted nature of emotional impacts on decision-making across a range of situations.

Conclusion

After a meticulous examination of the evidence supporting divergent perspectives, it becomes clear that alternative two and alternative four provide a comprehensive answer to our research questions. Together stating: Emotions are integral to the decision-making process, shaping choices and judgements in fundamental ways and emotions with the same valence can produce distinct effects on decision-making due to different appraisal dimensions, present the most compelling responses to the question of how distinct emotions influence decision-making.

Alternative two delves into the significant role emotions play in the decision-making process, offering a thorough exploration of their impact across psychological, biological, and social dimensions. The alternative not only emphasizes the unique characteristics of emotions but also highlights their pervasive influence on information recall, judgement, and decision stability. A noteworthy addition is the consideration of emotional intelligence, suggesting that heightened awareness of one’s emotions enhances adaptability, contributing a nuanced layer to the overall argument.

On the other hand, alternative four contributes to the synthesis by introducing the concept of appraisal dimensions, challenging the conventional notion that emotions of the same valence produce uniform effects. This alternative recognizes the inherent complexity within emotions, proposing that even emotions sharing the same valence may activate distinct goals, subsequently influencing decisions in diverse ways. The inclusion of studies examining risk-related judgements, economic decision, and the psychological impacts of discrete emotions enriches the understanding, emphasizing the diverse nuanced effects of emotions on decision-making.

The synthesis of alternative two and four crafts a more detailed and comprehensive response to the research question. Emotions emerge as integral contributors to decision-making, affecting various dimensions such as information recall, judgement, and decision stability. However, this nuanced approach recognizes that the effects of emotions are not universally uniform, even within the same valence, due to distinct appraisal dimensions. For instance alternative two discusses how emotional intelligence enhances decision-making adaptability, stressing the important of self-awareness and social acuity I the process. Meanwhile, alternative four presents a sophisticated layer introducing the concept of appraisal dimensions, suggesting that different emotions, even if they share the same valence, may activate unique goals, resulting in diverse impacts on decision outcomes.

The synthesis provides a nuanced perspective that goes beyond a simplistic dichotomy, acknowledging that emotional influences on decision processes are multifaceted and context-dependent. While alternative two highlights the overall significance of emotions, alternative four introduces a layer of sophistication by recognizing the diversity of effects within emotions of the same valence. Furthermore, this synthesis encourages an appreciation of the richness and diversity of emotional influences on decision processes. It recognizes that while emotions play a

crucial role in shaping decisions, the outcomes are complex and varied. Thus, the amalgamation of alternative two and alternative four provides a detailed and nuanced understanding, capturing the intricate interplay between emotions and decision outcomes in a more elaborate manner.

References

Alessandro Grecucci, A. G. (n.d.). Emotional Regulation and Decision Making. Cognitive Approaches. Retrieved from https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/47856959/grecucci_sanfey_chapter_HOER_Gross-libre.pdf?1470567280=&response-content-disposition=inline%3B+filename%3DEmotion_Regulation_and_Decision_Making.pdf&Expires=1700170043&Signature=Zw3wSPKxxHFEqF1fkURfsNomLwSnV

Amanda D. Angie, S. C. (2011). The influence of discrete emotions on judgement and decision-making: A meta-analytic review. Cognition and Emotion, 1393-1422.

Arnsten, A. F. (2009). Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function. Nat Rev Neurosci, 410-422. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2907136/#:~:text=The%20prefrontal%20cortex%20(PFC)%20intelligently,brain%20regions%20(BOX%201).

Bless, H. C. (1996). Mood and the use of scripts: Does a happy mood really lead to mindlessness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 665-679. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-06401-003

Bless, H., Clore, G. L., Schwarz, N., Golisano, V., Rabe, C., & Wölk, M. (1996). Mood and the Use of Scripts: Does a Happy Mood Really Lead to Mindlessness? Journal of personality and social psychology, 665-679. Retrieved from https://web.s.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=d5eeebab-8fe2-4aa8-82fe-a8faee3b176b%40redis

Clore, G. L. (1994). Handbook of social cognition: Basic processes. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence ErlbaumAssociates, Inc.

Companies are spying on job candidates online. (2022). Retrieved from Economist: https://www.economist.com/britain/2022/03/12/companies-are-spying-on-job-candidates-online

Elgar, E. (n.d.). The Handbook of Economic Methodology. Edgar Elgar publishing. Retrieved from https://philarchive.org/archive/MONEUT

Forgas, J. P. (1995). Mood and judgment: The affect infusion model (AIM). Psychological Bulletin, 39–66. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1995-17403-001

Francesca M.M. Citron, M. A. (2014). Emotional valence and arousal affect reading in an interactive way: Neuroimaging evidence for an approach-withdrawal framework. Neuropsychologia, 79-89. Retrieved from https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4098114/#:~:text=Emotional%20valence%20describes%20the%20extent,1997%3B%20Russell%2C%202003).

Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions. Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences, 1367-1377. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4142140

Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional Intelligence. Bantam Books, Inc. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1995-98387-000

Jennifer M. George, E. D. (2016). Affect, emotion, and decision making. organizational behavior and human decision processes, 47-55. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S074959781630365X?casa_token=dKMvQIoxNh4AAAAA:nhxSqV71ysqT5h8P-rW1SBxuNxbvbWpb34qRzDrMxnnrvHMtkcleM0-7Ew8Ss4i-b09uec8kXIg

Jennifer S. Lerner, Y. L. (2015). Emotion and Decision Making. Annual Review of Psychology, 799-823. Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043

Laurie R. Santos, A. G. (2015). The Evolutionary Roots of Human Decision Making. Annual Review of Psychology, 321-347. Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/full/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015310

Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, Anger, and Risk. Journal of personality and social psychology, 146-159. Retrieved from https://web.p.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=9c572303-18aa-4766-959b-edece80279e4%40redis

Luigi Leone, M. P. (2005). Emotions and decision making: Regulatory focusmoderates the influence of anticipated emotions onaction evaluations. COGNITION AND EMOTION, 1175-1198. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/02699930500203203?needAccess=true

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect and cognition based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of management journal, 24-59. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/256727

Mordka, C. (2016). What are Emotions? Structure and Function of Emotions. Studia Humana (Rzeszów), 29-44. Retrieved from https://web.s.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=c7936f6b-6bbf-4509-a33a-520efed64e05%40redis

Narina Nuñez, K. S. (2015). Negative Emotions Felt During Trial: the Effect of Fear, Anger, and Sadness on Juror Decision Making. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 200-209. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/acp.3094

Peter Salovey, J. D. (1990). Emotional Intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG

Rolls, E. T. (2013). Emotion and decision-making explained.

Scheff, T., & Alexander, G. M. (2015). What Are Emotions? A Physical Theory. Review of general psychology, 458-464. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1037/gpr0000058

Schwarz, N. (2000). Emotion, cognition, and decision making. Cognition and Emotion, 433-440. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/026999300402745?needAccess=true

Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 813–838. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1985-19287-001

MIND, An Introduction to Cognitive Science, Paul Thagard, MIT Press, 2nd edition, 2005