

# **POU 44050 POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**2024-2025 (10 ECTS)**

MT: Wednesdays 2-4pm, Foster Place 2.16

HT: Wednesdays 2-4pm, Foster Place 1.16

**Lecturer:** Dr. Gizem Arikan

**Office:** 4.02 (College Green)

**Email:** [arikang@tcd.ie](mailto:arikang@tcd.ie)

**Office hours:** Thursdays 11.30am – 1.30pm or by appointment

## **Module description**

This is a year-long, 10 ECTS module that covers some of the key issues and current debates in the field of political psychology. What are the key sources of our political attitudes? Why do some people lean towards a liberal political outlook while some are disposed towards conservative political views? How malleable are political attitudes? How easily can they change over time or in response to new information? Do people make political decisions objectively, weighing all facts and information, or are other factors more influential in shaping their choices? What are the primary sources of prejudice? Is prejudice shaped more by individual differences or by the social and cultural context in which people find themselves?

We will start by surveying the history, major themes, and methods of political psychology. We will then explore how individuals form and organize their political attitudes, covering topics such as elite-based vs. bottom-up approaches and raising questions about the democratic competence of citizens. We will also examine whether and to what extent individuals process political information objectively, addressing heuristics, biases, and motivated reasoning. In the Hilary term, our focus will shift to group-based approaches to cooperation and conflict within societies. We will study theories and concepts such as conformity, obedience, authoritarianism, realistic conflict and social identity theories and discuss their implications for prejudice in contemporary societies.

## **Learning aims**

The module aims to introduce students to the fundamental concepts and key approaches in political psychology. Students will gain a thorough understanding of the major theoretical frameworks and their application to contemporary political issues. Eventually, the module aims to equip students with the skills required to discuss and evaluate the psychological factors underlying political attitudes and behaviour.

## **Learning outcomes**

On successful completion of this module students should be able to:

- describe the key approaches and methods in the field of political psychology,
- compare and critically evaluate the major approaches to attitude formation and organization,

- explain and interpret the impact of biases and heuristics on political information processing, and discuss their implications,
- analyze the underpinnings of group dynamics including obedience, ethnocentrism, xenophobia, and prejudice,
- apply the key political psychology approaches to develop well-informed arguments contemporary political debates in modern democracies.

### **Course organization**

This is a seminar course, which relies heavily on active student participation. I generally open the class meetings by providing some background on the topic, connecting it to the broader literature, making clarifications about the concepts, theories, and methods and then open up the floor for discussion. **It is therefore essential that students attend class having done the week's readings and ready to discuss them.**

The Blackboard presents detailed information of each week's class organization, reading list, and response papers.

### **Office hours and contact with students**

I will respond to your e-mails within 48 hours on weekdays during the teaching weeks and 24 hours (again, on weekdays) during the exam period. If you send an email during the weekend, do not expect to receive an immediate reply.

In case you have any questions about course content, readings, or class discussions, you can raise them during office hours.

Please note that I will **not** answer substantive questions (e.g. explain concepts, go over the readings, etc.) about course content via e-mail or during office hours. In case you have such questions, please raise them during the class.

Office hours for this term are Thursdays 11.30am – 1.30pm or by appointment. Under certain circumstances, it is possible to schedule these as online meetings, but if you wish to do so, please send me an email at least 24 hours before to set them up.

### **Assessment details**

5% Response papers and participation

45% MT essay (blog post)

50% HT essay

**Response papers.** 5% of your final mark is based on response papers and participation in class discussions and activities. To achieve the full grade, you must write a total of 8 response papers throughout the academic year AND attend and receive participation grade from 8 seminars.

- Students are expected to submit a total of 8 response papers. 4 papers should be submitted during MT and 4 of them should be submitted during HT to receive full grade.
- All response papers must receive a Pass grade to meet the requirements! If you receive an F for a paper, you may submit a replacement paper the following week.
- Each term, **at least 1 paper** must be submitted **before Reading Week** (Weeks 1-6) and **at least 1 paper after Reading Week** (Weeks 8-11).
- Students must also attend at least 4 seminars in MT and 4 seminars in HT.

Response papers will be submitted through the Blackboard system, under the assignment tab of the corresponding week. The due dates and times for the response papers are:

- **Tuesdays, 2pm of each week.**

The response paper prompts (see below under “Reading List”) ask you to critically evaluate the required readings assigned for the week. You do not need to incorporate material from optional readings or outside resources but you are welcome to do so.

Response papers must be between 400-500 words. They should not be mere summaries of the material but should be critical assessment of the readings and respond directly to the prompt. You should *clearly demonstrate that you have read the required readings*. Response papers will be graded on a Pass/Fail basis.

In line with the Department of Political Science policy, the maximum grade you can receive for response paper and participation component is **capped at 80%**.

**Please note that late submissions for response papers will not be accepted under any circumstances.** In case you unable to submit your response paper on time, you should submit another one in the upcoming weeks.

Each student is responsible for keeping track of their participation and response paper grades.

**MT essay (blog post).** I ask you to write a blog post (2500 words EXCLUDING references), which will count towards 45% of your final mark. The deadline for this assignment is:

- **Submission deadline: 13 December 2024, 6pm**
- **Submission of blog post topic for review (required): 19 November 2024, 6pm**

Blog posts are popular tools that enable scientists to communicate their research, ideas, and arguments to a public audience in an accessible manner. Blog posts present an argument and/or analyze an event or topic critically with a less formal language and a more flexible structure and in a more personal manner, if you choose to do so. You will of course be asked to base your arguments on scientific evidence and findings, include citations and analysis of evidence.

Blogs will encourage you to work on your digital communication skills by integrating visual content to support your arguments.

You will select your own topic for the blog post, which must be submitted for review. I will provide further guidelines and specific instructions later. However, here are some initial examples to help you understand the assignment:

- [The rise of American authoritarianism](#)
- [Coronavirus responses highlight how humans are hardwired...](#)
- [Extreme weather news may not change climate change skeptics' minds](#)

Some practical guidelines from Dr. Amy Erica Smith [on writing blog posts](#) (ignore #3).

In addition:

- Your blog post should address material from at least 4 weeks of topics covered in the course.
- They should include material from required readings, but also incorporate outside research to support and enhance your points.
- The blog post should demonstrate a thorough understanding of the topics and engage with both course materials and additional sources.

**HT essay.** This essay will count towards 50% of your final grade. You will choose from one of the prompts provided below. This is a classic essay and the word count will be 3000 words (EXCLUDING references).

- **Submission deadline: 24 April 2025, 6pm**
- 1) In light of existing research in political psychology, is it feasible to create a society without systematic prejudice against minorities or marginalized groups? What are the key challenges and factors that would affect achieving this goal?
  - 2) Using the political psychology theories we have studied, what factors or interventions are most likely to address the recent rise in xenophobic, anti-immigrant, or populist sentiments in the West? Evaluate the effectiveness of these approaches based on the evidence.

You are expected to draw on material from at least 5 weeks of the Hilary Term (HT) in your essay. Additionally, you are encouraged to incorporate insights, concepts, or arguments from the Michaelmas Term (MT) to enrich your analysis. I also expect to see some additional research to provide support for your arguments.

The essay should have a clearly stated argument (a highly original one for a first class grade), discuss the evidence that supports your argument and discuss and refute the counter-arguments and counter-evidence. It is also essential that your essay is well-organized, efficiently structured, and shows evidence of a good and accurate grasp of the material. I will provide a grading rubric along with more detailed instructions throughout the semester. These will also be posted on Blackboard.

### **Late submission of MT and HT essays**

As per Department policy, all late work, unless excused in advance by the module lecturer, or justified by medical certificate or tutor's note, is penalised at a rate of 5 marks per day. Under no circumstances will work be accepted after the set work has been marked and handed back to other students, or after the end of the second lecture term. *If you need any extensions for*

*mid-term and final essay submission, you should ask these at least 48 hours before submission.*

*If you have any doubts about meeting the deadline, please request an extension in advance.* Waiting until the last minute to email a few hours before the deadline is not advisable. Plan ahead to manage your time effectively and communicate any issues early.

I cannot accommodate extension requests that are sent right before the deadline (unless in documented emergency situations) or after the deadline is past.

Make sure to save and back-up your work. Computer crashes or failure to back up your work will count as acceptable excuses for late work!

Once more, please note that **extensions and late submissions are not possible for response papers.**

### **Academic integrity**

Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly activity free from fraud and deception. Academic dishonesty, including, but not limited to, cheating on an exam or assignment, plagiarizing, representing someone else's work as your own, submitting work previously used without the informing and taking the consent of the instructor, fabricating of information or citations, etc. will not be tolerated.

It is a student's responsibility to ensure that research sources are properly acknowledged. Plagiarism comes in many forms but it is mainly seen as stealing someone else's words or ideas and passing them off as your own. The key point is to be aware that all work that is submitted by students must be work that they have completed themselves, with any material that has not been produced by the student (e.g. ideas, quotations etc.) being clearly indicated through proper referencing.

Plagiarism is often not intentional –it happens because students are not fully aware of what counts as academic dishonesty. I strongly recommend that you familiarize yourselves with academic integrity and good research and writing practices to avoid plagiarism:

- Consult the TCD Library guide at: <https://libguides.tcd.ie/academic-integrity/>
- Please read pp. 45-47 of the [College Calendar](#) for University's plagiarism policy.

Plagiarism will lead to automatic failure and the matter will be reported to the student's tutor and the dean of the faculty; severe penalties are likely to ensue, including possible exclusion from the exam or even the College, in accordance with College policy.

**The use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools in assessments may breach academic integrity** and result in serious consequences for your academic progress, especially if the work does not reflect your own original thinking. We strongly advise against using these tools in your assessments, as they can undermine your learning and lead to violations of academic policies.

### **Disability Policy**

Students with a disability are encouraged to register with the [Disability Service](#) to seek supports where the disability could affect their ability to participate fully in all aspects of the course.

## **Mental Health**

If you have any concerns or are experiencing personal and interpersonal difficulties, you can contact the Student Counselling Services and get some support and resources to help you: [https://www.tcd.ie/Student\\_Counselling/](https://www.tcd.ie/Student_Counselling/)

## **Syllabus Modification Rights**

I reserve the right to reasonably alter the elements of the syllabus at any time. More often than not this will mean adjusting the reading list to keep pace with the course schedule, although I may add reading assignments as well.

## Lecture and Reading Schedule\*

*\*Subject to minor revisions if necessary. Please make sure to follow announcements on Blackboard!*

### Michaelmas Term

#### Week 1: Introduction. Methods overview.

*No response paper this week.*

Stone, Susanna, Kate M. Johnson, Erica Beall, Peter Meindl, Benjamin Smith and Jesse Graham. 2014. Overview: Political Psychology. *WIREs Cognitive Science* 5:373-385. doi: 10.1002/wcs.1293.

Jordan, Christian H., and Mark P. Zanna. 2005. How to Read a Journal Article in Social Psychology. (Jost and Sidanius, pp. 467-476) [Link](#)

EGAP. nd. 10 Things to Know about Reading Regression Table. [Link](#)

*Optional:*

Huddy, Leonie, et al., 2023. Introduction. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, Third edition, pp. 1-17.

#### Week 2: Personality and political attitudes – The Big Five model

*Response paper question: How effective is the Big Five model in explaining the origins of political attitudes?*

Young, Dannagal G. 2020. How Your Personality Shapes Your Politics. TED-X Talk. [Link](#)

Fatke, Matthias. 2017. Personality Traits and Political Ideology: A First Global Assessment. *Political Psychology* 38(5): 881-899.

Bakker, Bert N., Yphtach Lelkes, and Ariel Malka. 2021. Reconsidering the link between self-reported personality traits and political preferences. *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1482-1498.

*Optional:*

Aina Gallego & Sergi Pardos-Prado (2014) The Big Five Personality Traits and Attitudes towards Immigrants, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(1): 79-99.

Bakker, B.N., Schumacher, G. and Rooduijn, M., 2021. The Populist Appeal: Personality and Antiestablishment Communication. *The Journal of Politics* 83(2): 589-601.

#### Week 3: Values and religiosity

*Response paper question: Do human values and religiosity approaches provide a better explanation of political attitudes compared to the Big Five personality model?*

Schwartz, Shalom, et al. 2014. Basic Personal Values Underlie and Give Coherence to Political Values: A Cross-National Study in 15 Countries. *Political Behavior* 36(4):899-930.

Ksiazkiewicz, A., Friesen, A. 2021. The Higher Power of Religiosity Over Personality on Political Ideology. *Political Behavior* 43: 637–661.

Campbell, David E., Geoffrey C. Layman, John C. Green, and Nathanael G. Sumaktoyo. 2018. Putting Politics First: The Impact of Politics on American Religious and Secular Orientations. *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (3): 551-565.

*Optional:*

Sagiv, Lilach, and Shalom H. Schwartz. 2022. Personal values across cultures. *Annual Review of Psychology* 73(1): 517-546.

Caprara, Gian Vittorio et al. 2017. Basic Values, Ideological Self-Placement, and Voting: A Cross-Cultural Study. *Cross-Cultural Research* 51(4): 388-411.

Baro, Elena. 2022. Personal values priorities and support for populism in Europe—An analysis of personal motivations underpinning support for populist parties in Europe. *Political Psychology* 43(6): 1191-1215.

Vishkin, Allon, Pazit Ben-Nun Bloom, Gizem Arikan, and Jeremy Ginges. 2022. A motivational framework of religion: Tying together the why and the how of religion. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 52 (3): 420-434.

#### **Week 4: Cognitive style and ideology**

*Response paper question: To what extent do evidence from neuroscience and genetics suggest that political attitudes and ideology are influenced by genetic or in-built factors?*

Malka Ariel, Christopher J. Soto, Michael Inzlicht, Yptach Lelkes 2014. Do Needs for Security and Certainty Predict Cultural and Economic Conservatism? A Cross-National Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 106(6):1031-1051.

Jost, John T., and David M. Amodio. 2012. Political ideology as motivated social cognition: Behavioral and neuroscientific evidence. *Motivation and Emotion* 36: 55-64.

Ksiazkiewicz, Aleksander, Steven Ludeke, and Robert Krueger. 2016. The role of cognitive style in the link between genes and political ideology. *Political Psychology* 37(6): 761-776.

#### **Week 5: Group foundations of political attitudes**

*Response paper question: Are group-based political attitudes consistent with the normative ideal of democratic citizenship?*

Huddy, Leonie. 2018. The Group Foundations of Democratic Political Behavior. *Critical Review* 30(1-2): 71-86.

White, Ismail K., Chryl N. Laird, and Troy D. Allen. 2014. Selling Out?: The Politics of Navigating Conflicts between Racial Group Interest and Self-interest. *American Political Science Review* 108(4):783-800.

Egan, Patrick J. 2020. “Identity as dependent variable: How Americans shift their identities to align with their politics” *American Journal of Political Science* 64(3): 699-716.

*Optional*



Huddy, Leonie. 2013. "Group Identity and Political Cohesion." In David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Chapter 15: 511-58).

Klein, Ezra. 2020. What polarization data from 9 countries reveals about the US. *Vox*. [Link](#)

Mason, Lilliana. 2015. "'I Disrespectfully Agree': The Differential Effects of Partisan Sorting on Social and Issue Polarization." *American Journal of Political Science* 59:128–45.

Dias, Nicholas, and Yphtach Lelkes. 2021. The Nature of Affective Polarization: Disentangling Policy Disagreement from Partisan Identity. *American Journal of Political Science* 66(3): 775-790.

Banda, Kevin K., and John Cluverius. 2018. Elite Polarization, Party Extremity, and Affective Polarization. *Electoral Studies* 56: 90-101.

Gidron, Noam, James Adams, and Will Horne. 2020. *American Affective Polarization in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge Elements in Political Psychology, pp. 40-74.

McCoy, Jennifer, Tahmina Rahman, and Murat Somer. 2018. Polarization and the Global Crisis of Democracy: Common Patterns, Dynamics, and Pernicious Consequences for Democratic Polities. *American Behavioral Scientist* 62(1) 16–42.

## **Week 6: Structure, consistency, and rationality in political attitudes -Should we care?**

**Response paper question:** *Do the personality/values/group-based approaches we have covered so far challenge the argument(s) that citizens are democratically incompetent?*

Achen, Christopher H. and Larry Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton University Press, chapter 2. (Also see this [link](#) for an interview with the book's authors)

Chong D. and K.J. Mullinix. 2022. Rational Choice and Information Processing. In: Osborne D, Sibley CG, eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Political Psychology*. Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology. Cambridge University Press; 2022:118-138.

### *Optional*

Converse, Philip E. 1960. The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics. (Jost and Sidanius, Reading 10)

## **Week 7: Reading week. No class.**

## **Week 8: Heuristics and emotions**

*Response paper question: Do heuristics and emotions generally lead people to make accurate decisions or result in systematic errors and biases?*

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

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): 247-273.

Coaston, Jane. 2020. "How anxiety and crises changes political behavior," Interview with Bethany Albertson and Shana Gadarian. [Link](#)

Pfattheicher, Stefan, Laila Nockur, Robert Bohm, Claudia Sassenrath, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2020. "The Emotional Path to Action: Empathy Promotes Physical Distancing and Wearing of Face Masks During the COVID-19 Pandemic." *Psychological Science*. 31(11): 1363-1373.

### *Optional*

Lupia, Arthur. 1994. "Shortcuts Versus Encyclopedias: Information and Voting Behavior in California Insurance Reform Elections." *American Political Science Review* 88:63-76.

Dancey, Logan and Geoffrey Sheagley. 2013. "Heuristics Behaving Badly: Party Cues and Voter Knowledge." *American Journal of Political Science* 57(2): 312-325.

Banks, Antoine J., Ismail K. White, and Brian D. McKenzie. 2019. "Black Politics: How Anger Influences the Political Actions Blacks Pursue to Reduce Racial Inequality," *Political Behavior* 41: 917- 943.

Gutierrez, Angela, Angela X. Ocampo, Matt A. Barreto, and Gary Segura. 2019. "Somos Más: How Racial Threat and Anger Mobilized Latino Voters in the Trump Era." *Political Research Quarterly* 72(4): 960-975.

Gadarian, Shana Kushner and Bethany Albertson. 2014. "Anxiety, Immigration, and the Search for Information." *Political Psychology* 35(2): 133-64.

### **Week 9: Motivated reasoning**

*Response paper question: On the basis of evidence provided in these papers, do you think it is possible for citizens to overcome motivated reasoning effects? If yes, how? If no, why not?*

Rogers, Paul. 2017. Why It is So Hard to Admit You're Wrong. NY Times. [Link](#)

Aronson, Elliot and Carol Tavris. 2020. The role of cognitive dissonance in the pandemic. *The Atlantic*. [Link](#)

Taber, Charles S. and Milton Lodge. 2006. "Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs." *American Journal of Political Science* 50: 755-769. 2.

Nyhan, Brendan, and Jason Reifler. "When corrections fail: The persistence of political misperceptions." *Political Behavior* 32, no. 2 (2010): 303-330.

Pick one of the pairs of articles:

*Pair 1:*

Dickerson, Bradley T., and Heather L. Ondercin. 2017. Conditional Motivated Reasoning: How the Local Economy Moderates Partisan Motivations in Economic Perceptions. *Political Research Quarterly* 70(1): 194-208.

Bisgaard, Martin. 2015. Bias Will Find a Way: Economic Perceptions, Attributions of Blame, and Partisan-Motivated Reasoning during Crisis. *The Journal of Politics* 77(3): 849-860.

*Pair 2:*

Rudman, Laurie A., Meghan C. McLean, and Martin Bunzl. 2013. When Truth Is Personally Inconvenient, Attitudes Change: The Impact of Extreme Weather on Implicit Support for Green Politicians and Explicit Climate-Change Beliefs. *Psychological Science* 24(11): 2290-2296.

Marquart-Pyatt, Sandra T., Aaron M. McCright, Thomas Dietz, Riley E. Dunlap. 2014. Politics Eclipses Climate Extremes for Climate Change Perceptions. *Global Environmental Change* 29: 246-257.

*Optional:*

Fischle, Mark. 2000. "Mass Response to the Lewinsky Scandal: Motivated Reasoning or Bayesian Updating?" *Political Psychology* 21(1): 135-159.

Schaffner, Brian F., and Cameron Roche. 2017. "Misinformation and motivated reasoning: Responses to economic news in a politicized environment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 81: 86-110.

Iyengar, Shanto., and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use." *Journal of Communication* 59: 19-39.

## **Week 10: Misinformation and fake news**

*Response paper question: Based on empirical evidence presented in the required readings, where would you prioritize your efforts to combat misinformation and the spread of fake news, and what strategies would you implement?*

Osmundsen, Mathias, Alexander Bor, Peter Bjerregaard Vahlstrup, Anja Bechmann, and Michael Bang Petersen. 2021. Partisan Polarization Is the Primary Psychological Motivation behind Political Fake News Sharing on Twitter. *American Political Science Review* 115(3): 999-1015.

Pennycook, Gordon and David G. Rand. 2019. Lazy, not Biased: Susceptibility to Partisan Fake News is Better Explained by Lack of Reasoning than by Motivated Reasoning. *Cognition* 188: 39-50.

*Optional:*

Vosoughi, Soroush, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. The Spread of True and False News Online. *Science* 359 (6830): 1146-1151.

- Brief discussion of findings can be found [here](#)

Pennycook, Gordon, Tyrone Cannon, and David G. Rand. 2018. Prior Exposure Increases Perceived Accuracy of Fake News. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 147(12): 1865.

- Short blog post about the article can be found [here](#)

Pennycook, Gordon, Jonathon McPhetres, Bence Bago, and David G. Rand. 2022. Beliefs about COVID-19 in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States: A novel test of

political polarization and motivated reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 48(5): 750-765.

- **Submission of blog post topic for review (required): 19 November 2024, 6pm**

### **Week 11: Media effects and persuasion**

*Response paper question: Is it possible to persuade a climate, vaccine, or science skeptic through the use of agenda-setting or framing strategies?*

Iyengar, Shanto, Mark D. Peters, and Donald R. Kinder. 1982, "Experimental Demonstrations of the "Not-So-Minimal" Consequences of Television News Programs." *American Political Science Review* 76(4): 848-58.

Nelson, Thomas E., Rosalee A. Clawson, and Zoe M. Oxley. 1997. "Media Framing of a Civil Liberties Conflict and its Effect on Tolerance." *American Political Science Review* 91(3): 567-583.

Bertolotti, M., Catellani, P., & Nelson, T. 2021. Framing Messages on the Economic Impact of Climate Change Policies: Effects on Climate Believers and Climate Skeptics. *Environmental Communication* 15(6): 715–730.

Albertson, Bethany, and Joshua William Busby. 2015. "Hearts or minds? Identifying persuasive messages on climate change." *Research & Politics* 2 (1): 1-9.

*Optional:*

Lenz, Gabriel S. 2009. "Learning and opinion change, not priming: Reconsidering the priming hypothesis." *American Journal of Political Science* 53 (4): 821–837.

Druckman, James N. 2001. "On the Limits of Framing Effects: Who Can Frame?" *Journal of Politics* 63(4): 1041-66.

James, Erin K., Scott E. Bokemper, Alan S. Gerber, Saad B. Omer, Gregory A. Huber. 2021. Persuasive messaging to increase COVID-19 vaccine uptake intentions. *Vaccine* 39(9): 7158-7165.

Kimberly Gross. 2008. Framing persuasive appeals: Episodic and thematic framing, emotional response, and policy opinion. *Political Psychology* 29(2):169–192.

Nabi, Robin L., Abel Gustafson, and Risa Jensen. 2018. "Framing climate change: Exploring the role of emotion in generating advocacy behavior." *Science Communication* 40(4): 442-468.

### **Week 12: Review and discussion of blog post assignments**

- **Essay submission deadline: 13 December 2024, 6pm**

## Hilary Term

### Week 1. Perspectives on prejudice. Implicit and explicit bias.

*Response paper question: Take at least three tests on the [Project Implicit web page](#) then provide a critical assessment of the method: Do you think it is a useful approach to make people aware of their biases? Why or why not?*

Kinder, Donald. 2023. Prejudice and Politics. In Huddy et al., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, Third Edition, pp. 987-1015.

Holland, Kitty. 2020. Traveller Poverty, Work, and Discrimination Focus of EU Report. *The Irish Times*. [Link](#)

Bridges, Khiara M. Implicit Bias and Racial Disparities in Health Care. *Human Rights Magazine* 43(3). [Online](#)

Adida, Claire L., David D. Laitin, and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2010. "Identifying barriers to Muslim integration in France." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107(52): 22384-22390.

Pérez, Efrén O. 2013. Implicit Attitudes: Meaning, Measurement, and Synergy with Political Science. *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 1(2): 275-297.

#### *Optional*

Darley, John. 1992. Social Organization for the Production of Evil. (Jost and Sidanius, Reading 21)

Houghton, David Patrick. 2015. *Political Psychology: Situations, Individuals and Cases*, Second edition, chapter 1.

Barron, Kai, Ruth Ditlmann, Stefan Gehrig, and Sebastian Schweighofer-Kodritsch. 2024. Explicit and Implicit Belief-based Gender Discrimination: A Hiring Experiment. *Management Science*. Online. [Link](#)

Hangartner, Dominik, Daniel Kopp, and Michael Siegenthaler. 2021. "Monitoring hiring discrimination through online recruitment platforms." *Nature* 589(7843): 572-576.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., Smoak, N., & Gaertner, S. L. (2008). The Nature of Contemporary Racial Prejudice: Insight from Implicit and Explicit Measures of Attitudes. In R. E. Petty, R. H. Fazio, & P. Briñol (Eds.), *Attitudes: Insights from the New Implicit Measures*. Psychology Press, pp. 165-192.

### Week 2: Conformity and obedience

*Response paper question: What does research on conformity and obedience tell us about the capability of humans to engage in evil acts?*

Watch: Obedience, Produced by Stanley Milgram. [Link](#)

Watch: Asch Conformity experiment. [Link](#)

Asch, Solomon. 1955. "Opinions and Social Pressure." *Scientific American* 193: 31 – 35.

Houghton, David Patrick. 2015. *Political Psychology...* Chapters 4 and 5.

Fiske, Susan T., Lasana T. Harris, and Amy J.C. Cuddy. 2004. Why do Ordinary People Torture Enemy Prisoners. *Science* 306(5701): 1482-1483.

### **Week 3: Social norms and elite influence**

*Response paper question: To what extent are political elites responsible for the recent rise in xenophobic and anti-immigrant sentiments in the West?*

Dinas, Elias, Sergi Martínez, and Vicente Valentim. 2024. "Social norm change, political symbols, and expression of stigmatized preferences." *The Journal of Politics* 86(2): 488-506.

Giani, Marco, & Méon, Pierre-Guillaume. 2021. Global Racist Contagion Following Donald Trump's Election. *British Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 1332-1339.

Newman, Benjamin, Jennifer L. Merolla, Sono Shah, Danielle Casarez Lemi, Loren Collingwood, and S. Karthick Ramakrishnan. 2021. The Trump Effect: An Experimental Investigation of the Emboldening Effect of Racially Inflammatory Elite Communication. *British Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 1138-1159.

Arababah, Ala, William Marble, Salma Mousa, and Alexandra Siegel. 2019. Can Exposure to Celebrities Reduce Prejudice? The Effect of Mohamed Salah on Islamophobic Behaviors and Attitudes. *American Political Science Review* 115(4): 1111-1128.

#### *Optional*

Chua, John, Vicente Valentim, Elias Dinas, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2023. How Mainstream Politicians Erode Norms: Evidence from Two Survey Experiments. Working paper. <https://osf.io/preprints/osf/mjbnf>

Feinberg, A., Branton, R. and Martinez-Ebers, V. 2022. The Trump Effect: How 2016 Campaign Rallies Explain Spikes in Hate. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55(2): 257-265.

Weaver, Michael. 2019. "Judge Lynch" in the Court of Public Opinion: Publicity and the De-legitimation of Lynching. *American Political Science Review* 113(2): 293-310.

Haslam, Alexander S., Stephen D. Reicher, and Jay J. Van Bavel. 2019. Rethinking the Nature of Cruelty: The Role of Identity Leadership in the Stanford Prison Experiment. *American Psychologist* 74(7): 809-822.

### **Week 4: Authoritarianism and threat**

*Response paper question: How useful is the theory and concept of authoritarianism in explaining prejudice?*

Feldman, Stanley. 2003. Enforcing Conformity: A Theory of Authoritarianism. *Political Psychology* 24(1): 41-74.

Hetherington, Marc, and Elizabeth Suhay. 2011. Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans' support for the war on terror." *American Journal of Political Science* 55 (3): 546-560.

Watch: "The price of certainty", NYTimes. [Link](#)

### *Optional*

Hartman, Todd K., Thomas VA Stocks, Ryan McKay, Jilly Gibson-Miller, Liat Levita, Anton P. Martinez, Liam Mason et al. 2021. The Authoritarian Dynamic during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Effects on Nationalism and Anti-immigrant Sentiment. *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 12(7): 1274-1285.

Kinvall, Catarina. 2014. Fear, Insecurity, and the (Re)Emergence of the Far Right in Europe. In Nesbitt-Larking, Paul, Catarina Kinnvall, Tereza Capelos, and Henk Dekker. *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 316-335.

Osborne, Danny, Thomas H. Costello, John Duckitt, and Chris G. Sibley. 2023. "The psychological causes and societal consequences of authoritarianism." *Nature Reviews: Psychology* 2 (4): 220-232.

### **Week 5: Social dominance orientation**

*Response paper question: What distinguishes Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) from authoritarianism in terms of explaining why people hold prejudiced attitudes?*

PBS. 2003. Race, the Power of an Illusion: Interview with Beverly Daniel Tatum. [Link](#)

Sidanius, Jim and Felicia Pratto. 1999. Social Dominance Theory: A New Synthesis. In John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius (Eds.), *Political Psychology: Key Readings*. Psychology Press, pp. 315–332.

Duckitt, John. 2006. Differential Effects of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation on Outgroup Attitudes and Their Mediation by Threat from and Competitiveness to Outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32 (5): 684-696.

Sibley, C. G., Wilson, M. S., & Duckitt, J. (2007). Antecedents of Men's Hostile and Benevolent Sexism: The Dual Roles of Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33(2): 160–172.

### *Optional*

Marshburn, C. K., Reinkensmeyer, B. A., & Knowles, E. D. 2022. Dominance motivated delusions: Whites with high social dominance orientation perceive equal amounts of institutional racism between Blacks and Whites. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. Online First. [Link](#)

Golec de Zavala, Agnieszka, Rita Guerra, and Cláudia Simão. 2017. The Relationship Between the Brexit Vote and Individual Predictors of Prejudice: Collective Narcissism, Right Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation. *Frontiers in Psychology* 8: 2023.

Van Assche, Jasper, Kristof Dhont, and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2019. The Social-Psychological Bases of Far-Right Support in Europe and the United States. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 29(5): 385-401.

### **Week 6: Threat sensitivity and behavioral immune system**

*Response paper question. How useful are the threat sensitivity and BIS o approaches presented in explaining and addressing prejudice?*

Aaroe, Lene., Michael Bang Petersen, and Kevin Arceneaux. 2017. The Behavioral Immune System Shapes Political Intuitions: Why and How Individual Differences in Disgust Sensitivity Underlie Opposition to Immigration. *American Political Science Review* 111(2): 277-294.

Mustafaj, M., Madrigal, G., Roden, J., & Ploger, G. (2022). Physiological Threat Sensitivity Predicts Anti-Immigrant Attitudes. *Politics and the Life Sciences* 41(1): 15-27.

Van Leeuwen, F. et al., 2022. Disgust Sensitivity Relates to Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbian Women Across 31 Nations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 26(3): 629-651.

### **Week 7: Reading Week. No class.**

### **Week 8: Intergroup conflict: Realistic conflict theory (RCT)**

*Response paper question: To what extent is the realistic conflict theory successful in explaining anti-immigrant sentiment in the West?*

Watch: 5-Minute History Lesson: Robber's Cave Experiment. [Link](#)

(SKIM) Sherif, Muzafer. 1967. *Group Conflict and Co-operation: Their Social Psychology*. London and New York: Taylor and Francis, Chapters 4 and 5.

Hainmueller, Jens, and Michael J. Hiscox. 2010. Attitudes toward Highly-skilled and Low-skilled Immigration: Evidence from a Survey Experiment. *American Political Science Review* 104(1): 61-84.

Hopkins Daniel J., Yotam Margalit, and Omer Solodoch. 2024. Personal Economic Shocks and Public Opposition to Unauthorized Immigration. *British Journal of Political Science* 54(3):928-936.

#### *Optional*

Gerber, Alan S., Huber, Gregory A., Biggers, Daniel R. and Hendry, David J. 2017 Self Interest, Beliefs, and Policy Opinions: Understanding How Economic Beliefs Affect Immigration Policy Preferences. *Political Research Quarterly* 70(1):155-171.

Crosbie, Judith. 2018. Irish Anti-Immigrant Attitudes Growing, Report shows. *The Irish Times*. 26 June. [Link](#)

Abend, Lisa. 2022. As Winter Descends, Europe Cools on Ukrainian Refugees. *Time*, 21 November. [Link](#)

McGinnity, Frances, and Gillian Kingston. 2017. An Irish Welcome? Changing Irish Attitudes to Immigrants and Immigration: The Role of Recession and Immigration. *The Economic and Social Review* 48(3): 253-279.

### **Week 9: Intergroup conflict: Social identity theory (SIT)**

*Response paper question: What are the major advantages of SIT over RCT in explaining intergroup conflicts?*



Tajfel, Henri and John C. Turner. 1981. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In John T. Jost and Jim Sidanius (Eds.), *Political Psychology: Key Readings*. Psychology Press, pp.367-389.

Sniderman, Paul M., Louk Hagendoorn, and Markus Prior. 2004. Predisposing Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities. *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 35-49.

Valentino, Nicholas, et al. 2019. Economic and Cultural Drivers of Immigrant Support Worldwide. *British Journal of Political Science* 49(4): 1201-1226.

### *Optional*

Gusciute, Egle, Peter Mühlau, and Richard Layte. 2021. One Hundred Thousand Welcomes? Economic Threat and Anti-Immigration Sentiment in Ireland. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*: 1-22.

Fanning, Brian. 2021. Rise of Ireland's far right relies on abandoned social conservatives. *The Irish Times*. [Link](#)

Drazanova, Lenka and Andrew Geddes. 2022. Europeans welcome Ukrainian refugees but governments need to show they can manage. [Link](#)

## **Week 10: Cultural and economic drivers of populist support**

*Response paper question: When analysing support for populist parties or leaders, do Social Identity Theory (SIT) or Rational Choice Theory (RCT) offer a more compelling framework?*

Inglehart, Ronald F., and Pippa Norris. 2016. "Trump, Brexit, and the rise of populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash." *Harvard Kennedy School Research Working Paper Series*. [Link](#)

Gabor, Scheiring, et al. 2024. The Populist Backlash Against Globalization: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. *British Journal of Political Science* 54(3):892-916.

Dickson, Zachary P., Sara B. Hobolt, Catherine E. De Vries, and Simone Cremaschi. 2024. Public Service Delivery and Support for the Populist Right. Working Paper. [Link](#)

Rhodes-Purdy, Matthew, Rachel Navarre, and Stephen M. Utych. 2021. Populist Psychology: Economics, Culture, and Emotions. *The Journal of Politics* 83(4): 1559-1572.

Carreras, Miguel, Yasemin Irepoglu Carreras, and Shaun Bowler. 2019. Long-term Economic Distress, Cultural backlash, and Support for Brexit. *Comparative Political Studies* 52(9): 1396-1424.

## **Week 11: Status threat and reactionary politics**

*Response paper question: Can status threat theory provide a better understanding of populist support than other frameworks, such as economic or cultural explanations?*

Parker, Christopher Sebastian, and Howard Lavine. 2024. "Status threat: The core of reactionary politics." *Political Psychology*. Online First. [Link](#)

Mutz, Diana C. "Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote." 2018. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(19): 4330-4339.

Gidengil, Elisabeth, and Dietlind Stolle. 2021. "Beyond the gender gap: the role of gender identity." *The Journal of Politics* 83(4): 1818-1822.

Vescio, Theresa K., and Nathaniel EC Schermerhorn. 2021. "Hegemonic masculinity predicts 2016 and 2020 voting and candidate evaluations." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 118(2): e2020589118.

**Week 12: Review and discussion of final essays**