| Title | Study guide for Bachelor in Psychology |
|---|---|
| | B10, Tværfaglig psykologi og formidling |
| | B10, Interdisciplinary psychology and communication |
| Elective: | Political Psychology |
| Module administrator | Tonny Elmose Andersen |
| Responsible for the elective | Steven G. Ludeke |
| Study adm. coordinator | Educational secretary Charlotte Dickmeiss |
| Date | July 6nd, 2018 |

# Content:

# 1.    About the study guide

## *Purpose of this study guide*

The study guide provides you with details of a specific module in your education, e.g. it describes what prerequisites you are expected fulfil, teaching and assignments and finally what the goal of the module is and what is expected of you in the exam.

The study guide also helps you find the resources required for the module including recommended and optional literature. Finally it contains all the practical information you will need to complete the course.

## *Structure of this study guide*

The study guide describes your activities in each week during the course.

**For each week the following is stated:**

1. Lectures in the week with a brief description of the content of each lecture, location, time etc. Students may also see the classroom schedule here: https://mitsdu.sdu.dk/skema/activity/3211201/e17
2. Group teaching and / or group work in the week together with a description of possible extra material on e-learn.
3. Literature for each lecture in the week.
4. Any homework in the separate activities in the week.

# 2.    About the module

## *Module administrator*

Tonny Elmose Andersen, Associate Professor, Ph.D. Department of Psychology, SDU
E-mail: tandersen@health.sdu.dk  phone.:+45 65502778

## *Responsible for the elective*

Steven G. Ludeke, PhD (Psychology) Associate Professor, SDU.
E-mail: StevenLudeke@gmail.com

## *Study administrative coordinator*

Charlotte Dickmeiss
Phone: 6550 3432

## Teachers

Steven Ludeke (SL), Associate Professor, SDU.
Carolin Rapp (CR), Assistant Professor, KU.
Robin Kok (RK), Assistant Professor, SDU.
Jakob Ohme (JO), Assistant Professor, SDU.
Lasse Laustsen (LL), Assistant Professor, AU.
Christian Fischer Vestergaard (CV), Head of Polls and Politics, Epinion.
Mats Joe Bordacconi (MB), PhD student, SDU.
Camilla Moresco (CM), Digital Strategist, Wibroe, Duckert & Partners.

## Module duration

Instruction for the module begins in week 35 and ends in week 50.

## Prerequisites

None

## Purpose

The purpose is to become familiar with recent perspectives and theories on the importance of psychological constructs on political behavior. Students will acquire knowledge about theories and methods on how to research the influence of psychological traits such as personality and cognition as well as emotional states such as enthusiasm, anger, anxiety on political attitudes and behaviors. Students will acquire the ability and skill to understand and critically analyze contemporary literature and political opinion formation. Students will develop a competence in applying these skills and knowledge to real world issues and professional settings.

## 3.    The module's subject area/content

- The integration of several general themes of psychological research (including personality, emotion, and evolution) to the general study of political behaviors and phenomena
- The use of those general themes to guide a detailed understanding of several specific topics in politics, including the "framing" of political issues, the development and expression of prejudice, and the shaping of ideology and of party preferences
- Advanced methodological issues and questions in the study of political psychology
- The application of political psychological theories and methods for solving real-world problems in contemporary workplaces

## Curriculum goals for the module

This study guide describes what we expect the students should be capable of when they have taken the course, i.e. the student's competences.

## Subject-specific objectives

Indhold og læringsmål for B10:

Modulet består af et udbud af emnemæssigt forskellige valgfag, der alle har psykologien i tværfagligt samarbejde som omdrejningspunkt. Formålet med modulet er at den studerende opnår indsigt i, hvordan komplekse samfundsmæssige problemstillinger ofte kræver tværfaglige og tværsektorielle løsninger. Modulet giver inden for det enkelte valgfag en introduktion til de relevante systemer samt tværfaglige og tværsektorielle sammenhænge hvori psykologien indgår i løsningen og formidlingen af relevante problemstillinger.

Ved afslutning af modulet skal den studerende være i stand til at:

- **Indhente** relevant **viden** og information til løsningen af afgrænsede problemstillinger.
- **Analysere** og **forstå** komplekse samfundsmæssige problemstillinger, herunder psykologiens rolle i det tværfaglige samarbejde.
- **Anvende** den psykologfaglige viden i analysen og udformningen af løsningsmodeller til komplekse problemstillinger.
- **Samarbejde** med medstuderende i løningen af afgrænsede praksisrelaterede problemstillinger.

**Formidle** psykologisk viden, analyser og resultater til et tværfagligt publikum.

## Teaching methods and activities

The class will include 51 hours of lectures delivered by eight different lecturers, primarily by Steven Ludeke. Students will also participate in 22 hours of presentations, and 5 hours of supervised collaborative group work preparing their final presentation.

| Education type: | Number of lessons: |
|---|---|
| Lectures/workshops | 51 |
| Group work | 5 |
| Other teaching activities – student presentations and discussions | 22 |
| Total: | 78 |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  |  |

# 4.    Week plans for lectures

Aktuelt skema kan altid findes under MitSkema:
https://mitsdu.sdu.dk/skema/activity/3211201/e17

**Module week 1 (Week 35)**

**Tue, Aug 28, 10:00-13:00, U69A, SL**
*Course Intro; Political psychology from the psychologist's seat*

We will introduce the course and then recap several of the most relevant psychological ideas for political psychology (including personality psychology, behavior genetics, and evolutionary psychology), before turning to a brief overview of how the field is typically approached by a psychologist.

**Literature:**

Gian Vittorio Caprara and Michele Vecchione. (2013). Personality Approaches to Political Behavior, ch. 2 in OHPP.

Carolyn L. Funk. (2013). Genetic Foundations of Political Behavior, ch. 8 in OHPP.

Michael Bang Petersen (2015). Evolutionary Political Psychology, ch. 47 in Buss (Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology, 2nd edition).

**Optional/further readings:**

Alford J.R., C.L. Funk and J.R. Hibbing (2005). Are Political Orientations Genetically Transmitted? American Political Science Review 99 (2): 153-167.

Bouchard, T. J., & McGue, M. (2003). Genetic and environmental influences on human psychological differences. Journal of Neurobiology, 54(1), 4–45.

Credé, M., Harms, P., Niehorster, S., & Gaye-Valentine, A. (2012). An evaluation of the consequences of using short measures of the Big Five personality traits. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 102, 874–888.

Gerber, A., G.A. Huber, D. Dohert, C.M Dowling & S.E. Ha. (2010). Personality and Political Attitudes: Relationships across Issue Domains and Political Contexts. American Political Science Review 104(1): 111-133.

John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History: measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds). Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 114-158). New York: Guilford Press.

Mondak, J. J., & Halperin, K. D. (2008). A framework for the study of personality and political behaviour. British Journal of Political Science, 38(2), 335–362.

Thorisdottir, H., J.T. Jost, I. Liviatan & P.E. Shrout. (2007). Psychological Needs and Values Underlying Left-Right Political Orientations: Cross-National Evidence From Eastern and Western Europe. Public Opinion Quarterly 71(2): 175-203.

Turkheimer, E. (2000). Three laws of behavior genetics and what they mean. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9(5), 160–164.

**Wed, Aug 29, 10:00-13:00, U69A, SL**
*Ideology and sociopolitical attitudes*

Among psychologists, few political topics have attracted as much research attention as have ideology and sociopolitical attitudes. We will review current and historical conceptualizations of ideology before discussing accounts which try to explain ideological differences on the basis of underlying psychological characteristics.

**Literature:**
Feldman, Stan (2013). Political Ideology, ch. 19 in OHPP

Jost, J. T., Nosek, B. A., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Ideology: It's Resurgence in Social, Personality, and Political Psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(2), 126–136.

Hibbing, J. R., Smith, K. B., & Alford, J. R. (2014). Differences in negativity bias underlie variations in political ideology. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 37(3), 297–307. doi:10.1017/S0140525X13001192 [Main article, author response, and at a minimum the following commentaries, identified by first author, in the order that they appear: Federico; Hodson; Janoff-Bulman; Jost; Lilienfeld; Ludeke; Sedek; White. Additional worthwhile commentaries include: Brandt; Feldman; Inbar; Olivola; Petersen; Tritt]

**Optional/further readings:**

*Saucier, G. (2013). Isms dimensions: toward a more comprehensive and integrative model of belief-system components. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 104(5), 921–39.

*Feldman, S., & Johnston, C. (2013). Understanding the Determinants of Political Ideology: Implications of Structural Complexity. Political Psychology, 35(3): 337-358 doi:10.1111/pops.12055

Eibach, R. P., & Libby, L. K. (2009). Ideology of the good old days: Exaggerated perceptions of moral decline and conservative politics. Social and psychological bases of ideology and system justification, 402-423. (The entire book this is available for free at: http://bib.convdocs.org/docs/4/3872/conv_1/file1.pdf#page=421)

Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis in moral psychology. Science, 316(5827), 998–1002. doi:10.1126/science.1137651

Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political conservatism as motivated social cognition. Psychological Bulletin, 129(3), 339–375. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339

Ludeke, S. G., & Krueger, R. F. (2013). Authoritarianism as a personality trait: Evidence from a longitudinal behavior genetic study. Personality and Individual Differences, 55(5), 480–484.

Ludeke, S. G., Johnson, W., & Bouchard, T. J., Jr. (2013). Obedience to traditional authority: A heritable factor underlying authoritarianism, conservatism and religiousness. Personality and Individual Differences, 55(4), 375–380. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.03.018

Ludeke, S. G., Rasmussen, S. H. R., & DeYoung, C. G. (2017). Verbal ability drives the link between intelligence and ideology in two American community samples. Intelligence, 61, 1–6. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2016.10.006

Ludeke, S. G., Tagar, M. R., & DeYoung, C. G. (2016). Not as different as we want to be: Attitudinally consistent trait desirability leads to exaggerated associations between personality and sociopolitical attitudes. Political Psychology, 37(1), 125–135. http://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12221

Motyl, M., Iyer, R., Oishi, S., Trawalter, S. & Nosek, B.A. (2014). How ideological migration geographically segregates groups. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 51, 1–14.

Onraet, E., Van Hiel, A., Dhont, K., Hodson, G., Schittekatte, M., & Pauw, S. D. E. (2015). The association of cognitive ability with right-wing ideological attitudes and prejudice: A meta-analytic review. European Journal of Personality, (August).

Oxley, D. R., Smith, K. B., Alford, J. R., Hibbing, M. V., Miller, J. L., Scalora, M., … Hibbing, J. R. (2008). Political attitudes vary with physiological traits. Science, 321(5896), 1667–70.

**Module week 2 (Week 36)**

**Tue, Sep 4, 14:00-17:00, U67, CR**
*Political psychology in context*

Much research in psychology attempts to identify universal features of human behavior, but political psychologists often find that significant attention must be paid to the political

context in which a given behavior occurs. This class session will review primary examples of the importance of context, and review how and why context is thought to play such a significant role for understanding political behaviors. It will also introduce students to the political scientists' perspective on political psychology.

**Literature:**
Books, John, and Charles Prysby. 1988. "Studying contextual effects on political behavior. A research inventory and agenda." *American Politics Research* 16 (2): 211-38.

Freitag, Markus, and Kathrin Ackermann. 2016. "Direct Democracy and Institutional Trust: Relationships and Differences Across Personality Traits." *Political Psychology* 37 (5): 707–23.

Funder, D. C. (2008). Persons, situations and person-situation interactions. In O. P. John, R. W. Robin & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 568–580). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Newman, Benjamin J., Yamil Velez, Todd K. Hartman, and Alexa Bankert. 2015. "Are Citizens "Receiving the Treatment"? Assessing a Key Link in Contextual Theories of Public Opinion and Political Behavior." *Political Psychology* 36 (1): 123–31.


**Optional/further readings:**
Ackermann, Kathrin, and Maya Ackermann. 2015. "The Big Five in Context: Personality, Diversity and Attitudes toward Equal Opportunities for Immigrants in Switzerland." *Swiss Political Science Review* 21 (3): 396–418.


Huckfeldt, Robert, Eric Plutzer and John Sprague. 1993. "Alternative contexts of political behavior: Churches, neighborhoods, and individuals." *The Journal of Politics* 55(2): 365–381.

Rapp, Carolin, and Kathrin Ackermann. 2016. "The consequences of social intolerance on non-violent protest." *European Political Science Review* 8 (04): 567–88

Welzel, Christian, and Franziska Deutsch. 2012. "Emancipative Values and Non-Violent Protest: The Importance of Ecological Effects." *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (02): 465–79.

---

**Module week 3 (Week 37)**

**Tue, Sep 11, 9:00-12:00, U69A, RK**
*Session 1 on "bad science"*

This will be a shared session with E-Health. Description and readings to come.


**Tue, Sep 11, 14:00-17:00, U69A, CR**

*Party identification and party choice*

No liberal democracy is without competing political parties. But the role of parties in relation to voters is complex, reciprocal and multifaceted: (1) Political parties compete for voters, and they aggregate and give voice to voter preferences, but psychological dispositions influence the likelihood that you will stay loyal to your party or switch to another party. (2) Political parties also shape political identities, public opinion and political attitudes, but individual differences in psychological dispositions and political sophistication moderate the extent to which this is the case.

**Literature:**
Bakker, Bert N., Robert Klemmensen, Asbjørn S. Nørgaard, and Gijs Schumacher. 2016. "Stay Loyal or Exit the Party? How Openness to Experience and Extroversion Explain Vote Switching." *Political Psychology* 37 (3): 419–429.

Bell, E., and C. Kandler. 2015. "The Origins of Political Party Identification and its Relationship to Political Orientations." *Personality and Individual Differences* 83: 136-141.

Carsey, Thomas M., and Geoffrey C. Layman. 2006. "Changing Sides or Changing Minds? Party Identification and Policy Preferences in the American Electorate." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (2): 464–77.

Green, Donald P., and Bradley Palmquist. 1994. "How stable is party identification?" *Political Behavior* 16 (4): 437–466.

**Optional/further readings:**
Bakker, Bert N., David N. Hopmann, and Mikael Persson. 2015. "Personality traits and party identification over time." *European Journal of Political Research* 54 (2): 197–215.

Hatemi, Peter K., John R. Alford, John R. Hibbing, Nicholas G. Martin, and Lindon J. Eaves. 2008. "Is There a "Party" in Your Genes?" *Political Research Quarterly* 62 (3): 584–600.

Huddy, Leonie. 2001. "From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory." *Political Psychology* 22 (1): 127–56.

Kam, Cindy D. 2005. "Who Toes the Party Line? Cues, Values, and Individual Differences." *Political Behavior* 27:163-82.

Ludeke, S. G., and Rasmussen, S. H. R. 2018. "Different political systems suppress or facilitate the impact of intelligence on how you vote: A comparison of the U.S. and Denmark." *Intelligence*.

Neundorf, Anja, and James Adams. 2016. "The Micro-Foundations of Party Competition and Issue Ownership: The Reciprocal Effects of Citizens' Issue Salience and Party Attachments." *British Journal of Political Science* 58 (1):1–22.

**Wed, Sep 12, 9:00-12:00, U69A, RK**
Session 2 on "bad science"

This will be a shared session with E-Health. Description and readings to come.

**\*\*Fri, Sep 14, 10:00-17:00, U69A, SL**
**\*\***Emergency back-up session if Aug 28/29 sessions are cancelled. If those sessions are delivered as expected, then we will not meet at this time.*

---

**Module week 4 (Week 38)**

---

**Mon, Sep 17, 10:00-13:00, U23A, CR**
*Heuristics and Cognition*

A common theme in political psychology research concerns the ways our everyday reasoning departs from ideals of rationality. This research on limitations in our everyday cognition often focuses on the use of heuristics, and the ways these help and hurt our processing of information in the political sphere. For those hoping to shape public opinion, understanding how these heuristics work is of crucial importance.

**Literature:**
Lau, Richard R., and David P. Redlawsk. 2001. "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making." *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (4): 951-971.

Petersen, Michael B., and Lene Aarøe. 2013. "Politics in the Mind's Eye: Imagination as a Link between Social and Political Cognition." *The American Political Science Review* 107 (2): 275–93.

Petersen, Michael B., Rune Slothuus, Rune Stubager, and Lise Togeby. 2011. "Deservingness versus values in public opinion on welfare: The automaticity of the deservingness heuristic." *European Journal of Political Research* 50 (1): 24–52.

**Optional/further readings:**
Dancey, Logan, and Geoffrey Sheagley. 2013. "Heuristics Behaving Badly: Party Cues and Voter Knowledge." *American Journal of Political Science* 57 (2): 312–25.

Kam, Cindy D. 2007. "Implicit Attitudes, Explicit Choices: When Subliminal Priming Predicts Candidate Preference." *Political Behavior* 29 (3): 343–67.

Petersen, Michael Bang. 2012. "Social Welfare as Small-Scale Help: Evolutionary Psychology and the Deservingness Heuristic". *American Journal of Political Science* 56(1): 1-16.

Taber, Charles S. and Everett Young. 2013. "Political Information Processing", chapter 17, OHPP.

Thomann, Eva and Carolin Rapp. 2017. "Who deserves solidarity? Unequal treatment of immigrants in Swiss welfare policy delivery". *Policy Studies Journal* (accepted for publication).

Valentino, Nicholas A., Vincent L. Hutchings, Antoine J. Banks, and Anne K. Davis. 2008. "Is a Worried Citizen a Good Citizen? Emotions, Political Information Seeking, and Learning via the Internet." *Political Psychology* 29 (2): 247–73.

**Tue, Sep 18, 10:00-13:00, U69A, LL**
*The psychology of followership and leader preferences*

Who do we want as leaders of our societies and what kind of individuals do we see as competent in making decisions for the collective? Recent work in political and leadership psychology integrates insights from across the behavioral sciences and draw on evolutionary psychological theory to suggest that human leader and candidate preferences are rooted in an evolved psychology of followership. In this session we explore central findings from this literature showing that voters' and followers' leader preferences are highly context-sensitive and triggered by leaders' and candidates' physical appearance.

**Literature:**
Hibbing, J. R. & J. R. Alford. 2004. "Accepting Authoritative Decisions: Humans as Wary Cooperators." American Journal of Political Science, 48(1), pp. 62-76.

Laustsen, L. 2016. "Choosing the Right Candidate: Observational and Experimental Evidence that Conservatives and Liberals Prefer Powerful and Warm Candidate Personalities, Respectively." Political Behavior (online first): pp. 1-26 (26 pages).

Laustsen, L. & M. B. Petersen. (2017). "Perceived Conflict and Leader Dominance: Individual and Contextual Factors Behind Preferences for Dominant Leaders". Political Psychology (online first): pp. 1-19.

von Rueden, C, & van Vugt, M. (2015). Leadership in small-scale societies: Some implications for theory, research, and practice. The Leadership Quarterly, 26, 978–990.

Van Vugt, M. V. & B. R. Spisak. 2008. "Sex Differences in the Emergence of Leadership During Competitions Within and Between Groups." Psychological Science, 19(9), pp. 854-858.

**Optional/further readings:**
Van Vugt, M., R. Hogan & R. B. Kaiser. 2008. "Leadership, Followership, and Evolution – some lessons from the past". American Psychologist, 63(3): 182-196.

Todorov, A., A. N. Mandisodza, A. Goren & C. C. Hall. (2005). "Inferences of Competence from Faces Predict Election Outcomes". Science, 308, pp. 1623-1626.

Antonakis, J. & O. Dalgas. (2009). "Predicting Elections: Child's Play!". Science, 323.

Laustsen, L. & M. B. Petersen. (2015). "Does a competent leader make a good friend? Conflict, ideology and the psychologies of friendship and followership". Evolution and Human Behavior, 36, 286-293.

Laustsen, L., M. B. Petersen & C. A. Klofstad. (2015). "Vote Choice, Ideology, and Social Dominance Orientation Influence Preferences for Lower Pitched Voices in Political Candidates." Evolutionary Psychology, 13(3), 1-13.

Lou, S., A. Yann, T. Teodora, G. Julie, B. Nicolas & C. Coralie. (2017). "Childhood harshness predicts long-lasting leader preferences." Evolution & Human Behavior, (article in press), 1-7.

Banai, I. P., B. Banai & K. Bovan. (2016). "Vocal characteristics of presidential candidates can predict outcome of elections." Evolution & Human Behavior, 38, pp. 309-314.

Kakkar, H. & N. Sivanathan. (2017). "When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige leader". Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, (Early Edition available from: http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2017/06/06/1617711114), pp. 1-6.

## Module week 5 (Week 39)

### Mon, Sep 24, 10:00-13:00, U23A, CR
*National Identity, Nationalism, Patriotism, and Populism*

We will explore how national identity, nationalism, patriotism and populism shape the contemporary political landscape. We will explore the psychological foundations of these tendencies, review existing research on their importance and societal implications, before turning to modern attempts to curb these influences by professionals working in various fields.

**Literature:**
Bakker, Bert N., Matthijs Rooduijn, and Gijs Schumacher. 2016. "The psychological roots of populist voting: Evidence from the United States, the Netherlands and Germany." *European Journal of Political Research* 55 (2): 302–20.

Huddy, Leonie, and Nadia Khatib. 2007. "American Patriotism, National Identity, and Political Involvement." *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 63–77.

Kosterman, Rick, and Seymour Feshbach. 1989. "Toward a Measure of Patriotic and Nationalistic Attitudes." *Political Psychology* 10 (2): 257–74.

Mummendey, Amélie, Andreas Klink, and Rupert Brown. 2001. "Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40 (2): 159–72.

**Optional/further readings:**

Dunn, Kris. 2015. "Preference for radical right-wing populist parties among exclusive-nationalists and authoritarians." *Party Politics* 21 (3): 367–80.

Green, Eva G. T., Oriane Sarrasin, Nicole Fasel, and Christian Staerklé. 2011. "Nationalism and patriotism as predictors of immigration attitudes in Switzerland: A municipality-level analysis." *Swiss Political Science Review* 17 (4): 369–93.

Miller, David, and Sundas Ali. 2014. "Testing the national identity argument." *European Political Science Review* 6 (02): 237–59.

Osborne, Danny, Petar Milojev, and Chris G. Sibley. 2017. "Authoritarianism and National Identity: Examining the Longitudinal Effects of SDO and RWA on Nationalism and Patriotism." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 31 (7): 1-14.

Parker, C. S. 2010. "Symbolic versus Blind Patriotism: Distinction without Difference?" *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (1): 97–114.

Reeskens, Tim, and Matthew Wright. 2013. "Host-country patriotism among European immigrants: a comparative study of its individual and societal roots." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 37 (14): 2493–2511.

Spruyt, Bram, Gil Keppens and Filip Van Droogenbroeck. 2016. "Who Supports Populism and What Attracts People to It?" *Political Research Quarterly* 69(2): 335–346.

**Tue, Sep 25, 14:00-17:00, U69A, CR**
*Political tolerance*

Politics involves competition among groups. We have already looked specifically at political parties and prejudice that involves distinguishing 'us' from 'them'. But democratic politics also presumes political tolerance, i.e. groups you dislike should also enjoy civil liberties and political rights. We examine how group prejudices and personal predispositions influence political tolerance, and we inspect the role of cognition, emotions and threat in tolerance judgment.

**Literature:**

Freitag, Markus, and Carolin Rapp. 2014. "The Personal Foundations of Political Tolerance towards Immigrants." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41 (3): 351–373.

Kuklinski, James H., Ellen Riggle, Victor Ottati, Norbert Schwarz, and Robert S. Wyer. 1991. "The Cognitive and Affective Bases of Political Tolerance Judgments." *American Journal of Political Science* 35 (1): 1-27.

Marcus, George E., John L. Sullivan, Elizabeth Theiss-Morse, and Daniel Stevens. 2005. "The Emotional Foundation of Political Cognition: The Impact of Extrinsic Anxiety on the Formation of Political Tolerance Judgments." *Political Psychology* 26 (6): 949–63.

**Optional/further readings:**
Brader, Ted, Nicholas A. Valentino, and Elizabeth Suhay. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat." *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (4): 959–978.

Gibson, James L., and Amanda Gouws. 2000. "Social Identities and Political Intolerance: Linkages within the South African Mass Public." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2): 278–92.

Petersen, Michael, Rune Slothuus, Rune Stubager, and Lise Togeby. 2011. "Freedom for All? The Strength and Limits of Political Tolerance." *British Journal of Political Science* 41 (3): 581–97.

Sniderman, Paul M., Philip E. Tetlock, James M. Glaser, Donald P. Green, and Michael Hout. 1989. "Principled tolerance and the American mass public." *British Journal of Political Science* 19 (1): 25–45.

Sullivan, John L., George E. Marcus, Stanley Feldman, and James E. Piereson. 1981. "The Sources of Political Tolerance: A Multivariate Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 75 (01): 92–106.


**Module week 7 (Week 41) (No activities Week 40)**


**Tue, Oct 9, 10:00 – 13:00, U69A, JO**
*Framing public opinion*

Session description and readings still to come.


**Module Week 9 (Week 43) (No meetings Module Week 8)**


**Wed, Oct 24, 10:00 – 13:00, U69A, CV and SL**
*Political polling from the practitioner's seat*

Political polling is a major influence on contemporary political debate and activity, and the effective practice of polling is based on many of the many of the assessment issues considered during the psychology curriculum. Christian Vestergaard (head of "Polls and Politics" at Epinion) will discuss the effective contemporary practice of political polling, and share his thoughts on polling's role in the political landscape.

**Literature:**

Graefe A, Armstrong J., Cuzan A. (2017). Assessing the 2016 U. S. Presidential Election Popular Vote Forecasts. The 2016 Presidential Election: The Causes and Consequences of a Political Earthquake, p 137. Obtain at: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/83282/1/MPRA_paper_83282.pdf

Mellon, J., & Prosser, C. (2017). Missing Nonvoters and Misweighted Samples: Explaining the 2015 Great British Polling Miss. Public Opinion Quarterly, nfx015.

**Wed, Oct 24, 14:00 – 17:00, U69A, SL**
*Student presentations on outside readings, Session 1*

As will be introduced in the first class sessions, students will select non-assigned research articles in the first month of class. (See instructions posted on Blackboard for how students will select and "claim" their article.) The instructor will (according to the procedures described on Blackboard) either approve the article selected or tell a student they must find an alternative. The articles should be (a) original research articles (not research reviews), (b) concerning the topics covered in this course, (c) not from the assigned readings (though may be from the "recommended" readings), and (d) should be readily understandable by the student. This does not mean, for example, that the student necessarily must avoid presenting articles that involve complex statistics that are beyond the students' understanding. However, it does mean the student should be able to describe the findings and how they were obtained in ordinary language, even if they cannot understand the details of the statistical method. Students are **strongly** encouraged to read the article they select before selecting it to ensure they feel they are able to understand the core ideas well.

The presentations will involve students using PowerPoint (or some similar alternative) to teach the core findings of the article to the class in 15-20 minutes. After this presentation, each presenter will then receive comments from two student "opponents" (who, as described on Blackboard, will have signed up as opponents in advance). The first opponent will concern themselves with the scientific content of the presentation, both exploring whether the ideas from the article were communicated accurately and the opponent's own evaluation of the article's idea. The second will concern themselves with the style of the presentation: Were the ideas communicated effectively in the presentation? What worked and what did not? After the two student opponents have spoken, fellow classmates are encouraged to make comments and ask questions.

As an alternative to the standard, single-presenter format, students will also be allowed to present in pairs (on a pair of related articles) if they so choose. Such sessions will almost certainly require more work from each presenter than would a single-presenter session, as both students will need to be familiar with both articles. However, the option may be useful for those who find solo-presentations unnerving or unpleasant. Double-presenter sessions will take twice the time as single-presenter sessions.

As noted on Blackboard, presenters must provide a polished version of their slides to the instructor and their opponents 24 hours prior to their presentation. The instructor will indicate before class whether the slides are adequate to be presented upon. The opponents must, in advance of the presentation, (a) read the article to be presented and (b) review the

slides of the presenter. Other students are not expected to read the article or review slides in advance of the presentation.

Students must complete their roles in these presentations to be allowed to move to the final exam.

---

**Module Week 10 (Week 44)**

---

**Tue, Oct 30, 10:00 – 12:00, U145, MB**
*Political polling from the academic's seat*

Opinion polls have received a lot of public attention in the past year. Especially in the limelight of their failure to predict the outcome of the 2016 American Presidential Election, 2016 United Kingdom European Union membership referendum (Brexit) and 2015 Danish European Union opt-out referendum. Many have expressed genuine distrust in opinion polls and some have argued that they should be banned. But where does the problem lie? Is the way we conduct, analyze or report them and how do they influence the electorate?

In this lecture we will focus the increased use of opinion polls in the Danish National Elections. We will look at the development in use of polls in the media. We will cover how to conduct, interpret and report the results from opinion polls. Finally we will analyze how polls might affect people political preferences and discuss what the future holds for opinion polls.

**Literature:**
Bhatti, Y-f & Pedersen, R.T (2016). News Reporting of Opinion Polls: Journalism and Statistical Noise. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, vol 28(1): 129-141.

Dahlgaard, J. O., Hansen, J. H., Hansen, K. M., & Larsen, M. V. (2015). Hvordan påvirkes vælgerne af meningsmålinger? Effekten af meningsmålinger på danskernes stemmeadfærd og sympati for partierne. Politica, 47(1), 5-23.

Dahlgaard, J. O., Hjort, F, Larsen, M. V. & Olsen, A. L. (2017). Meningsmålinger under valgkampen. In Oprør Fra Udkanten (pp. 367-384). Djøf/Jurist-og Økonomforbundet.

**Optional/further reading:**
Andersen, A. L., & Jensen, T. (2014). Exit polls and voter turnout. Journal of Theoretical Politics, 26(1), 117–134.

Hopmann, D. N. (2008). Politisk information og politiske holdninger: Hvordan vælgernes partipræference influeres af meningsmålinger. Statsvetenskaplig
Tidskrift, 110(2), 161–83.

Larsen, E. G., & Straubinger, S. G. (2012). Mediernes formidling af meningsmålinger: Indholdsanalyse af folke-tingsvalg, 2005-2011. Politik, 15(3), 54-63.

Larsen, E. G. (2015, 19. juni). Blev meningsmålingerne valgets taber? Hentet 1. august l 2017, fra http://erikgahner.dk/2015/blev-meningsmaalingernevalgets-taber/

Larsen, M. V (2016). Gennemsnit af meningsmålinger forudsiger valgresultatet. Hentet 1. august l 2017, fra http://cvap.polsci.ku.dk/publikationer/arbejdspapirer/2016/Vin_s__gennemsnit_af_mening sm_linger_forudsiger_valgresultat-final.pdf

**Wed, Oct 31, 10:00 – 13:00, U69A, CM & SL**
*Attitude formation during new times of communication*

How do you change attitudes in the contemporary world? The toolkit for this challenge is not specific to the political world, but instead shared by those advertising commercial products and services. Camilla Moresco, Digital Strategist at Wilbroe, Duckert & Partners, will give us insight on how the communication industry works, not only with political campaigns but also in the broader marketing context, providing examples from recent campaigns as well as how these campaigns can be targeted to particular groups.

**Literature:**

Hansen, Kasper M., and Karina Kosiara-Pedersen. "Cyber-campaigning in Denmark: Application and effects of candidate campaigning." Journal of Information Technology & Politics 11.2 (2014): 206-219.

Bond, R.M., Farris, C.J., Jones, J.J., Kramer, A.D.I., Marlow, C., Settle, J.E. and Fowler, J.H. (2012). A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization. Nature 489: 295-298.

**Wed, Oct 31, 14:00 – 17:00, U69A, SL**
*Student presentations on outside readings, Session 2*

See description of assignment under the Session 1 presentations description.

---

**Module Week 11 (Week 45)**

---

**Wed, Nov 7, 10:00-14:00, U69A, SL**
*Prejudice*

Evolutionary psychology has provided new reasons for both hope and concern when it comes to prejudice. Some research within this framework suggests that categories such as race can be made less psychologically salient (and thus less likely to be the basis for prejudice and discrimination). This same research highlights the "coalitional" nature of human social thinking, suggesting that humans frequently and perhaps ineluctably attend to cues of "us" and "them," highlighting the challenge of eliminating prejudice and discrimination.

**Literature:**
Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2009). A dual-process motivational model of ideology, politics, and prejudice. Psychological Inquiry, 20(2-3), 98-109.

Kam, C. D., & Kinder, D. R. (2012). Ethnocentrism as a Short-Term Force in the 2008 American Presidential Election. American Journal of Political Science,56(2), 326-340

Kinder, Donald R. (2013). Prejudice and Politics, ch. 25. In OHPP

**Optional/further readings:**
Kurzban, R., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2001). Can race be erased? Coalitional computation and social categorization. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 98(26), 15387–92. http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.251541498

Neuberg, S. L., & DeScioli, P. (2016). Prejudices: Managing perceived threats to group life. Ch. 28 in Buss (Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology, 2nd edition).

Sibley, Chris G., and John Duckitt. (2008). Personality and Prejudice: A Meta-Analysis and Theoretical Review. Personality and Social Psychology Review 12: 248-79.

**Wed, Nov 8, 14:00 – 17:00, U69A, SL**
*Student presentations on outside readings, Session 3*

See description of assignment under the Session 1 presentations description.

---

**Module Week 12 (Week 46)**

---

**Wed, Nov 14, 10:00-13:00, U69A, SL**
*Political Engagement & Participation*

Parties benefit when their voters participate in the political process, and democracies in general benefit when citizens are politically engaged. But individuals differ widely in their level of interest and involvement in the political realm. What do we know about those who participate and those who don't, and what situational factors tend to increase such participation?

**Literature:**
Marcus, George E., and Michael MacKuen. (1993). Anxiety, Enthusiasm, and the Vote: The Emotional Underpinnings of Learning and Involvement During Presidential Campaigns. American Political Science Review 87(3): 672-685.

Klemmensen, Robert, Peter K Hatemi, Sara Binzer Hobolt, Inge Petersen, Axel Skytthe & Asbjørn S Nørgaard. (2012). The genetics of political participation, civic duty, and political efficacy across cultures: Denmark and the United States. Journal of Theoretical Politics 24(3): 409-427

Mondak JJ, Hibbing MV, Canach D et al. (2010) Personality and civic engagement: an integrative framework for the study of trait effects on political behavior. American Political Science Review104: 85–110.

Dawes, Chris, David Cesarini, Sven Oskarsson, James Fowler, Magnus Johannesson, and Patrik KE Magnusson (2014). The Relationship Between Genes, Psychological Traits, and Political Participation, American Journal of Political Science, DOI: 10.1111/ajps.12100.

**Optional/further readings:**
Kam, C. D., and C. L. Palmer. (2008). Reconsidering the effects of education on political participation. Journal of Politics 70 (3):612-31.

Fowler, J. H., Baker, L. A., & Dawes, C. T. (2008). Genetic variation in political participation. American Political Science Review, 102(02), 233-248.

Fowler, J. &. Kam, C.D. (2007). Beyond the self: Altruism, social identity and political participation. Journal of Politics 69: 813–827.

**Wed, Nov 14, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, SL**
*Student presentation session 4*

See description of assignment under the Session 1 presentations description.

---

**Module Week 13 (Week 47)**

---

**Wed, Nov 21, 10:00-13:00, U69A, SL**
*Elites*

The personality profiles of political leaders influence how they do their job in some but not all respects. But elite personalities are hard to ascertain. We examine the methods. We also study how the personality traits of political elites differ from the average voter, and we discuss if and when elite personality traits influence their behavior and when role expectations and situations are more important behavioral determinants. We'll also take advantage of a recent study allowing a unique look at the personality of Danish MPs.

**Literature:**
Winter, D. G. (2013). Personality Profiles of Political Elites, ch. 14 in OHPP

Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Consiglio, C., Picconi, L., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2003). Personalities of politicians and voters: unique and synergistic relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 84: 849–856.

Caprara, G. V., & Zimbardo, P. (2004). Personalizing politics: A congruency model of political preference. American Psychologist 59: 581–594

Nørgaard, A. S., & Klemmensen, R. (2018). The personalities of Danish MPs: Trait-and aspect-level differences. Journal of personality.

**Optional:**
Caprara, G. , Francescato, D. , Mebane, M. , Sorace, R. & Vecchione, M. (2010). Personality foundations of ideological divide: A comparison of women members of parliament and women voters in Italy. Political Psychology 31: 739-762.

Druckman, J. N., Peterson, E., & Slothuus, R. (2013). How elite partisan polarization affects public opinion formation. American Political Science Review 107(01): 57-79.

Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R. & Gerhardt, M. (2002). "Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review." Journal of Applied Psychology 87: 765-780.

Linde, Jone & Barbara Vis (2016). Do Politicians Take Risks Like the Rest of Us? An Experimental Test of Prospect Theory Under MPs. *Political Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/pops.12335

Slothuus, Rune (2010) When Can Political Parties Lead Public Opinion? Evidence from a Natural Experiment, Political Communication, 27(2): 158-177.

Slothuus, R., & De Vreese, C. H. (2010). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and issue framing effects. The Journal of Politics 72(03): 630-645

Winter, D. G. (2011). Philosopher-king or polarizing politician? A personality profile of Barack Obama. *Political Psychology*, *32*, 1059–1081

**Wed, Nov 21, 14:00-17:00, U69A, SL**
*Student presentation session 5*

---

**Module Week 14 (Week 48)**

**\*\*Mon, Nov 26, 10:00-17:00, U23A, SL**
\*\**Back-up session. If we do not have cancellations earlier in the semester then we will not meet at this time.*

**Wed, Nov 28, 10:00 – 15:00, U69A, SL**
*Supervised group work preparing final presentations*

Before this session students will have read the information packet and begun to research the political party of their focus. Students will work in small groups with the supervision and assistance of the instructor, developing their campaign strategy. See Blackboard and description of final exam for more details.

| Module Week 15 (Week 50) |
| --- |

**Wed, Dec 12, 10:00 – 17:00, U69A, SL**
*Presentation of final campaign strategies*

Students must have submitted a one-page overview of their presentation by noon on Monday, December 10th. On December 12th, students will present (in their three person groups) a rehearsed, 20-25 minute presentation on their strategy for their party. These strategies should:
(a) be written towards the average level of understanding of political psychology in the room,
(b) make use of relevant ideas from both political science as psychology as relevant,
(c) discuss how each component of their strategy has a basis in prior research,
(d) where the strategy is tailored both to the party's general circumstances and the particular circumstances of the election as highlighted in the introductory materials handed out before Week 13, and
(e) discuss how a psychologist can make particular contributions to effectively implementing the strategy in question.
Each presentation will be followed by 15-20 minutes discussion by fellow students and feedback from the teacher.

# 5. Exam

Grading for this course is pass/fail, based on attendance and completion of basic requirements. Students must perform their role within the two presentations and attend at least 80% of all class hours to pass the course. The presentations must have the features described in the Study Guide to be considered completed. Namely, for the the first presentation, students must competently present of the main findings and methods of a research article approved by the instructor (SL), and must serve as a pre-designated "opponent" for two further presentations. The second presentation must involve a campaign strategy for an assigned Danish political party, where that campaign strategy identifies its basis in prior research findings, applies those findings reasonably to a party in the particular political context highlighted in the assignment, does so at a level appropriate to the knowledge of fellow students, makes use of knowledge from both political science and psychology, and highlights how a psychologist can make a particular contribution to implementing the campaign strategy.

# 6. Re-exam

For the re-exam, students will have 48 hours from the start-time of the assignment to provide a written electoral strategy for a political party. The goals and core components of the written version of the assignment are quite similar to those for the major presentation

from the course. However, because the student will be assigned a new party and/or a new political situation in which to develop their strategy, the student would be not be able to simply present the ideas they or someone else previously developed during the original presentations, but instead will need to develop a new strategy particularly for this assignment.

# 7.    Literature

**OBS: Be aware of the copyright rules. You will find them on Blackboard under Generel Info, Psykologi SDU → Information til alle: https://e-learn.sdu.dk/bbcswebdav/pid-4317726-dt-content-rid-6104988_3/orgs/faglig_vejleder_Psykologi/Ophavsret-A4-DANSK_002.pdf**

Literature: We will use chapters from two books in addition to a collection of academic journal articles and chapters. One book (HEP) is available in the library, with one copy on the semester loan shelf (semester-låns-hylden) and one copy available for check-out. The second book (OHPP) can be accessed as an e-book with downloadable individual chapters via the library. In this way we can keep your cost at a minimum, namely 0.

Books:
1) The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology, 2nd edition, edited by Leonie Huddyie, David O. Sears & Jack S. Levy. Oxford University Press: 2013. Referred to as OHPP.

2) Buss, David M. (2015). *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology (2nd ed).* John Wiley & Sons. Referred to as HEP.

# 8.    Module evaluation

All modules on the bachelor in psychology get continuously evaluated. The evaluation is anonymous and not mandatory but we strongly recommend all students to take part in this work. The purpose of the evaluation is to improve the education quality and the education will among other things be adjusted according to these evaluations.