

Title	Study guide for Bachelor in Psychology B10, Tværfaglig psykologi og formidling B10, Multidisciplinary psychology and communication
Elective:	Political Psychology
Module administrator	Anna Thit Johnsen
Responsible for the elective	Steven G. Ludeke
Study adm. coordinator	Educational secretary Charlotte Dickmeiss
Date	11 August 2017

Content:

1. About the study guide	2
Purpose of this study guide	2
Structure of this study guide.....	2
2. About the module.....	2
Module administrator.....	2
Responsible for the elective	2
Study administrative coordinator	2
Teachers.....	3
Module duration	3
Prerequisites	3
Purpose	3
3. The module's subject area/content	3
Curriculum goals for the module	4
Subject-specific objectives.....	4
Teaching methods and activities	4
4. Week plans for lectures.....	5
5. Exam	23
6. Re-exam	23
7. Literature	23
8. Module evaluation.....	24

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

Anna Thit Johnsen, Assistant professor, psychologist, ph.d. Department of Psychology, SDU
E-mail: atjohnsen@health.sdu.dk , phone.:+45 28255038

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.
Carolyn Rapp (CR), Assistant Professor, SDU.
Lasse Laustsen (LL), Assistant Professor, AU.
Thor Möger (TM), Head of Political Analysis, Social Democrats.
Christian Fischer Vestergaard (CV), Head of Polls and Politics, Epinion.
Mats Joe Bordacconi (MB), PhD student, SDU.

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 52 hours of lectures delivered by six different lecturers, primarily Carolin Rapp and Steven Ludeke. Students will also participate in 21 hours of presentations, and 5 hours of supervised collaborative group work preparing their final presentation.

Education type:	Number of lessons:
Lectures/workshops	52
Group work	5
Other teaching activities – student presentations and discussions	21
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)

Wed, Aug 30, 14:00-17:00, U150, 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. Doherty, 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.

Module week 2 (Week 36)

Wed, Sep 6, 14:00-17:00, 152, CR

Sources of public opinion and political behavior; or political psychology from the political scientist's seat

We continue our introduction to the field by seeing how political scientists have historically approached the topics studied in political psychology, in particular public opinion and political behavior.

Literature:

Brady, Henry E., Sidney Verba, and Kay L. Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89 (02): 271–94.

Converse, Philip E. 2008. "Theoretical Orientation." In *The American Voter Revisited*, edited by Michael S. Lewis-Beck, William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, and Herbert F. Weisberg, 19–28: University of Michigan Press.

Jennings, M. K., Laura Stoker, and Jake Bowers. 2009. "Politics across Generations: Family Transmission Reexamined." *The Journal of Politics* 71 (3): 782–99.

Optional/further readings:

Campbell, Angus. 1980. *The American voter*. Midway reprint series. Chicago, Ill. University of Chicago Press.

Crepaz, Markus M. L. 1990. "The impact of party polarization and postmaterialism on voter turnout." *European Journal of Political Research* 18 (2): 183–205.

Dalton, Russell J. 2008. "Citizenship Norms and the Expansion of Political Participation." *Political Studies* 56 (1): 76–98.

Fuchs, Dieter. 2007. "The Political Culture Paradigm", chapter 9, *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*.

Lewis-Beck, Michael S., William G. Jacoby, Helmut Norpoth, Herbert F. Weisberg, and Philip E. Converse. 2008. *The American Voter Revisited*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Module week 3 (Week 37)

Wed, Sep 13, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, 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.

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 4 (Week 38)

Wed, Sep 20, 10:00-13:00, U46, 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.

Wed, Sep 20, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, SL

Student presentation session 1

Our first presentation session on research articles, this one including those concerning ideology or political psychology in context. For all research article presentations, students must have their choice approved by the instructor via Blackboard (as discussed in first week of course). Articles may not be selected from the required reading list (i.e. that under the “Literature” heading), but students are encouraged to select articles from the optional/further reading list. The total time allotted for each presentation is 22 minutes, but students should rehearse their presentation and determine that it takes 10-15 minutes with no interruptions, as the remaining time will be filled with questions by fellow students.

Module week 5 (Week 39)

Wed, Sep 27, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, CR
Party identification and party choice

No liberal democracy 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 Ties the Party Line? Cues, Values, and Individual Differences". *Political Behavior* 27:163–82.

Neundorff, 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.

Module week 6 (Week 40)

Wed, Oct 4, 10:00-13:00, OU44 TEK PC, 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, Oct 4, 14:00-17:00, U152, SL

Student presentation session 2

Our second presentation session on research articles, this one ideally focusing on topics from the most recent two weeks of the course. For other instructions, see the text concerning the first student presentation session.

Module week 7 (Week 41)

Wed, Oct 11, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, 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 Riggie, 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 9 (Week 43) (No meetings Module Week 8)
--

Wed, Oct 25, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, 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 10 (Week 44)

Wed, Nov 1, 10:00-13:00, O95, 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 Review* 104: 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 1, 14:00-17:00, Kuben, SL

Student presentation session 3

Our third presentation session on research articles, again ideally focusing on topics from the most recent two weeks of the course. For other instructions, see the text concerning the first student presentation session.

Module Week 11 (Week 45)

Mon, Nov 6, 12:00-14:00, U27A, 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.

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

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

Mon, Nov 6, 14:00-17:00, O96, SL

Student presentation session 4

Our fourth and final presentation session on research articles, in which students are welcome to focus on any topic covered in the course. For other instructions, see the text concerning the first student presentation session.

Wed, Nov 8, 14:00 – 17:00, Kuben, CR ***National Identity, Nationalism, and Patriotism***

Over two sessions 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:

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:

Dekker, Henk, Darina Malová, and Sander Hoogendoorn. 2003. "Nationalism and Its Explanations." *Political Psychology* 24 (2): 345–376.

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.

Module Week 12 (Week 46)

Mon, Nov 13, 14:00 – 17:00, O96, CR
Populism

In recent years, the issue of populism has often been linked to national identities, patriotism and, in particular, nationalism. In this session, we explore the relationship between these concepts as well as alternative origins of populist attitudes.

Literature:

Akkerman, Agnes, Cas Mudde and Andrej Zaslove. 2014. "How populist are the people? Measuring populist attitudes in voters." *Comparative Political Studies* 47(9): 1324–1353.

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.

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

Optional/further readings:

Aslanidis, Paris. 2016. "Is Populism an Ideology? A Refutation and a New Perspective." *Political Studies* 64 (1_suppl): 88–104.

Jagers, J. A., and Stefaan Walgrave. 2007. "Populism as political communication style: An empirical study of political parties' discourse in Belgium." *European Journal of Political Research* 46 (3): 319–45.

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.

Wed, Nov 15, 14:00 – 17:00, Kuben, CR

Framing public opinion

Political attitudes and orientation are not only related to dispositions. Elites continuously try to set the agenda and frame issues in order to mold public opinion and influence political attitudes. But in a liberal democracy no one has a monopoly of communication flows. How do elite frames work? What is the effect of frames when counter-frames are also presented? And how do evolved heuristics and personality traits moderate framing effects?

We begin to address these topics in the present session, before spending two additional sessions extending these ideas and seeing how they are applied in real-world contexts.

Literature:

Valentino, Nicholas A. and Yioryos Nardis. 2013. "Political Communication: Form and Consequence of the Information Environment", ch. 18 in OHPP

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Public Opinion in Competitive Democracies". *American Political Science Review* 101 (4): 637–55.

Leeper, Thomas J. and Rune Slothuus. 2017. "Can Citizens Be Framed? How Information, Not Emphasis, Changes Opinions". Working Paper.

<https://s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/tjl-sharing/assets/CanCitizensBeFramed.pdf>

Valentino, Nicholas A., Vincent L. Hutchings, and Ismail K. White. 2002. "Cues That Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes during Campaigns." *The American Political Science Review* 96 (1): 75–90.

Optional/further readings:

Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a Responsive Chord: How Political Ads Motivate and Persuade Voters by Appealing to Emotions." *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 388–405.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10 (1): 103–26.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2010. "Dynamic Public Opinion: Communication Effects over Time." *American Political Science Review* 104 (04): 663–80.

Entman, Robert M. 1989. "How the media affect what people think: An information processing approach." *The Journal of Politics* 51(2): 347–370.

Fraile, Marta, and Shanto Iyengar. 2014. "Not All News Sources Are Equally Informative." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 19 (3): 275–94.

Nelson, Thomas E., Zoe M. Oxley, and Rosalee A. Clawson. 1997. "Toward a Psychology of Framing Effects." *Political Behavior* 19 (3): 221–246.

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

Module Week 13 (Week 47)

Mon, Nov 20, 13:00 – 17:00, O99, TM and SL

Electoral strategies in a Danish context

Politics is a high-stake game. Political elites and their spin-doctors carefully plan political communication to cater to and to shape public opinion. Framing is used to evoke positive emotions towards one's own party and policy and negative emotions towards ones adversaries. Voter segments are targeted with the purpose of increasing support.

Thor Möger is head of the Social Democratic party's political section. He is responsible for analysis and communication strategies. How do he and his staff work? What types of analyses do they use? How do they try to target audiences and how do they work to get their political messages out and create the effects they hope for? What is their focus in their communication: cognitive strategies aimed at persuasion, emotional appeals, or what?

Literature:

Baines, Paul. (2011). "Political public relations and election campaigning." In Stromback, Jesper, and Spiro Kioussis, eds. *Political public relations: Principles and applications*. Taylor & Francis, pp. 115-137.

Wed, Nov 22, 14:00 – 16:00, Kuben, MB

An introduction to political polling

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 vælgerne 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 2017, fra <http://erikgahner.dk/2015/blev-meningsmaalingernevalgets-taber/>

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

Module Week 14 (Week 48)

Mon, Nov 27, 13:00 – 17:00, O99, 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:

**Piece on U.S. 2016 election. (Note that because there are 5 months between the session and the writing of the Study Guide, we will wait until October to select from the pieces which will have appeared by that time on this very recent event.)*

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

Wed, Nov 29, 14:00 – 17:00, Kuben, CR

Heuristics and Cognition

We continue our sessions on framing and priming by focusing on heuristics and how they form public opinion.

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.

Wed, Nov 29, 17:00 – 18:00, Kuben, SL & CR

Introduction of final activity

We will introduce the final activity that students will develop over the next two weeks – namely, the development (in groups of three) a campaign strategy for a Danish political party. Students will receive an information packet on the Danish political landscape and will receive an outline of the goals and procedures for the assignment.

Module Week 14 (Week 49)

Mon, Dec 4, 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.

Module Week 15 (Week 50)

Mon, Dec 11, 9:00 – 18:00, U48, SL

Presentation of final campaign strategies

Students must have submitted a one-page overview of their presentation by noon on Sunday, December 10th. One December 11th, 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 in 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 complete 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, the first presentation must involve a competent presentation of the main findings and methods of a research article approved by the instructor (SL). 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 General 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.