

PS/PO 320 POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY

IES Abroad Vienna

DESCRIPTION:

Political psychology aims to decipher the underlying reasons for our political convictions, how we arrive at them, and how we choose to act on them. An inherently interdisciplinary field, it is thus well positioned to address political questions both of perennial relevance - e.g. what are the psychological reasons for the differences between liberals and conservatives? are our political beliefs couched in rationality or emotion? - as well as those of more recent provenance, such as how we might explain the rise of populist parties in the Western world, with case studies on Central/Eastern Europe and the US. This course examines the aforementioned in addition to the relation between various types of media and the public, acquainting students with concepts such as information bubbles, issue framing, and explicit and implicit attitudes. With the current emphasis so often placed on individual consumers and citizens, students are also asked to reflect on the difficulties faced by policymakers who must take into account the vagaries of public opinion, not to mention their own psychology.

CREDITS: 3 credits

CONTACT HOURS: 45 hours

LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION: English

INSTRUCTOR: Jennifer Ebner-Daigle, MO, MA and Scott Nelson, D.Phil.

PREREQUISITES: Introduction to Psychology

ADDITIONAL COSTS: None

METHOD OF PRESENTATION: The methodology will be based on presentations and discussions, video excerpts, case studies, course-related trips, and group work.

REQUIRED WORK AND FORM OF ASSESSMENT:

- Course Participation 10%
- Midterm Exam 20%
- Final Exam 20%
- Research Paper 25%
- Presentation 10%
- Homework 15%

Course Participation

Class attendance is mandatory, and simply being present during class meeting times is not considered in the assessment. Class participation refers to the extent to which students are involved, active, and prepared when coming to class. This includes reviewing the assigned readings *before* class meetings, preparing relevant discussion questions for the unit, and actively taking part in class discussions and activities online and during class time.

A Excellent participation

The student's contributions reflect an active reading of the assigned bibliography. Skillfully synthesizes the main ideas of the readings and raises questions about the applications and implications of the material. Demonstrates, through questions and comments, that he or she has been capable of relating the main ideas in the readings to the other information discussed in the course, and with his or her own life experience. The student makes informed judgments about the readings and other ideas discussed in class, providing evidence and reasons. He/she respectfully states his/her reactions about other classmates' opinions, and is capable of contributing to the inquiry spiral with other questions. The student gets fully involved in the completion of the class activities.



B Very good participation

The student's contributions show that the assigned materials are usually read. Most of the time the main ideas are identified, even though sometimes it seems that applications and implications of the information read were not properly reflected upon. The student is able to construct over others' contributions, but sometimes seems to interrupt the shared construction to go over tangents. He/she is respectful of others' ideas. Regularly involved in the activities but occasionally loses concentration or energy.

C Regular participation

The participant evidences a regular reading of the bibliography, but in a superficial way. He/she tries to construct over others' ideas, but commonly provides comments that indicate lack of preparation about the material. Frequently, contributions are shallow or unarticulated with the discussion in hand.

F Insufficient participation

Consistently, the participant reads in a shallow way or does not read at all. Does not participate in an informed way, and shows lack of interest in constructing over others' ideas.

Midterm Exam & Final Exam

The midterm and final exams combine the following types of questions: essay, short answer, multiple-choice, and true or false.

Research Paper & Presentation

The written assignment is an in-depth research and personal analysis on a subject matter relevant to the course topic. It comprises three parts: a literature review, a list of references, and a personal analysis based on the literature reviewed, for a total length of 2,000-2,500 words (8-10 pages). The topic must be related to political psychology but is otherwise flexible and can include topics relevant to a student's major. Students are requested to submit their research topic for approval in unit 1 of week 3. A draft version of the paper can be submitted for review up to 5 days before the final submission date. As part of the evaluation of the paper, students are asked to briefly present selected content from their written assignment during unit 2 of week 10.

Homework

The homework assignments are 3 shorter exercises (maximum 500 words), assigned throughout the semester. These written tasks are intended to further the student's exploration and understanding of class content through the application of theoretical knowledge to current events. An example would be taking the online IAT (Implicit Association Test) to measure one's implicit attitudes concerning groups on the political spectrum and reflecting critically upon the results.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

By the end of the course, students will be able to:

- Illustrate the interaction between the disciplines of political science and psychology, the distinction between psychological political science and political psychology, and how advances in these fields can be mutually beneficial.
- Identify the possible influences and contributions of factors such as socialization, emotion and cognition, personality, or genes on the development of ideology, political beliefs and behaviour.
- Explain the role various media outlets (social media, conventional media) play in shaping our opinions about the political realm.
- Critically assess the importance of expert views, cognitive shortcuts, and implicit attitudes in the development of our political views.
- Analyze the rise in right-wing populism in Austria within the broader post-WWII historical and political narrative.
- Apply conceptual knowledge to understand 1) individual and group behaviour (e.g. voting, activism), and 2) contemporary international affairs (e.g. elections, referendums).

ATTENDANCE POLICY:

IES Vienna requires attendance at all class sessions including field study excursions, internship meetings, scheduled rehearsals, and all tests and exams. Attendance will be taken for every class. If a student misses more than the equivalent of a week of classes without an excuse, the final grade will be reduced by one-third of a letter grade (for example, A- to B+) for every additional unexcused absence.



Excused absences are permitted only when:

- 1. a student is ill (health issues),
- 2. when class is held on a recognized religious holiday traditionally observed by the particular student, or
- 3. in the case of a grave incident affecting family members;
- 4. exceptions may be made for conflicting academic commitments, but only in writing and only well in advance of missed class time.

Any other absences are unexcused.

CONTENT:

Session	Content	Assignments
Week 1 Session 1	PART I - THE PSYCHOLOGY OF POLITICAL CONVICTIONS Introduction • What is political psychology and how is it related to other forms of psychology? What are the advantages and disadvantages of political psychology as an interdisciplinary field? Why is so much early political psychology concerned with authority and obedience? • The field of political psychology	 Huddy, L. et al. (2013). Introduction: theoretical foundations of political psychology. <i>In</i> Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology</i>. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 1 - pp. 1-19). Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? <i>In</i> James H. Kuklinski, (ed), <i>Thinking about Political Psychology</i>. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 6 – pp. 187-216).
Session 2	What is political psychology and how is it related to other forms of psychology? What are the advantages and disadvantages of political psychology as an interdisciplinary field? Why is so much early political psychology concerned with authority and obedience? O Authority and obedience Case study: Austrian Wehrmacht	 Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: would people still obey today?. American Psychologist, 64(1), 1-11. Charney, E. (2008). Genes and ideologies. Perspectives on Politics, 6(2), 299-319. Lavine, H., Lodge, M., & Freitas, K. (2005). Authoritarianism, threat, and selective exposure to information. Political Psychology, 26, 219-244.



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 2 Session 3	Differences in political opinion are enough to alienate people and even families from one another today. What are the reasons, psychological or otherwise, for such stark differences, e.g. those between liberals and conservatives? Do the reasons that underlie these differences indicate any possibility for reconciling people despite their differences? Is a reconciliation of political perspectives even desirable? In this week causes based on innate biology as well as political socialization will be explored. Biological causes of political orientation	 Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted?. American Political Science Review, 99(2), 153-167. Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2011). The big five personality traits in the political arena. Annual Review of Political Science, 14, 265-287. Recommended readings: Haidt, J. (2013). The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided By Politics And Religion. New York: Vintage Books. (Ch. 7-8, pp. 150-217)
Session 4	Differences in political opinion are enough to alienate people and even families from one another today. What are the reasons, psychological or otherwise, for such stark differences, e.g. those between liberals and conservatives? Do the reasons that underlie these differences indicate any possibility for reconciling people despite their differences? Is a reconciliation of political perspectives even desirable? In this week causes based on innate biology as well as political socialization will be explored. O Political socialization Homework 1 due	 Sears, D.O., and Brown, C. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 3 - pp. 59-95). Recommended readings: Haidt, J. (2013). The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided By Politics And Religion. New York: Vintage Books. (Ch. 7-8, pp. 150-217)



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 3 Session 5	It is uncommon for us to admit that our political choices and convictions are rooted in anything other than reasoned consideration of the various options before us. Our beliefs, however, may also be based on factors unrelated to our capacity for reason, e.g. emotions. Are emotions a hindrance, inevitable, or perhaps even desirable in politics? What is the relation between emotions and populism?	 Quattrone, G. A. and A. Tversky. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. American Political Science Review, 82, 716-736. Riker, W. H. (1995). The political psychology of rational choice theory. Political Psychology, 16(1), 23-44.
Session 6	It is uncommon for us to admit that our political choices and convictions are rooted in anything other than reasoned consideration of the various options before us. Our beliefs, however, may also be based on factors unrelated to our capacity for reason, e.g. emotions. Are emotions a hindrance, inevitable, or perhaps even desirable in politics? What is the relation between emotions and populism?	 Demertzis, N. (2014). Political emotions. <i>In</i> Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) <i>The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (Ch. 13 – pp. 223-241). Jervis, R. (1993). The drunkard's search. <i>In</i> Shanto lyengar and William James McGuire, (eds), <i>Explorations in Political Psychology</i>. Durham and London: Duke University Press. (Ch. 12 - pp. 338-360). Salmela, M. and C. von Scheve. (2017). Emotional roots of right-wing populism. <i>Social Science Information</i>, 56(4), 564-595.



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 4 Session 7	PART II - INTERPRETING POLITICAL INFORMATION How is Political Information Accessed? Creation of Information Bubbles	 Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2009). Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 2 (pp. 15-32) & Ch. 6 (pp. 109-133)
	The internet has been responsible for the proliferation of many sources of news. In both the conventional news media as well as in new forms of media, such as social media, a division has emerged between experts and laymen with an opinion. Is there a connection between political polarization and some forms of media? What constitutes expertise today? What effect have television and more recently the ready availability of several different types of online news outlets had on our ability to form opinions about politics? Populist media, social media, polarization	
Session 8	The internet has been responsible for the proliferation of many sources of news. In both the conventional news media as well as in new forms of media, such as social media, a division has emerged between experts and laymen with an opinion. Is there a connection between political polarization and some forms of media? What constitutes expertise today? What effect have television and more recently the ready availability of several different types of online news outlets had on our ability to form opinions about politics? Elitist, establishment, and conventional media	 Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. The Journal of Politics, 74(1), 174-186. Bullock, J. G. (2011). Elite influence on public opinion in an informed electorate. American Political Science Review, 105, 496-515. Recommended readings: Iyengar, S., and Hahn, K.S. (2009). Red media, blue media: evidence of ideological selectivity in media use. Journal of Communication, 59, 19-39.



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 5 Session 9	Why are political pundits so often wrong? It is often considered a virtue of democracies that its citizens are openminded. What are the advantages and drawbacks of open-mindedness? How does issue framing function and how is it related to how we produce and digest information in this day and age? How do statistical inference and psycho-logic fit into the picture? Does issue framing obscure truth or is it unavoidable? Issue framing, punditry, closed and open mindedness Homework 2 due	 Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: who can frame? The Journal of Politics, 63(4), 1041-1066. Kruglanski, A. W. and Boyatzi, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. Critical Review, 24(2), 217-232. Tetlock, P. E. (2017). Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know? Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Ch. 7 - pp. 189-215)
Session 10	Why are political pundits so often wrong? It is often considered a virtue of democracies that its citizens are openminded. What are the advantages and drawbacks of open-mindedness? How does issue framing function and how is it related to how we produce and digest information in this day and age? How do statistical inference and psycho-logic fit into the picture? Does issue framing obscure truth or is it unavoidable?	 Ballew, C.C., and Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104(46), 17948-17953. Cottam, M.L. et al. (2016). Introduction to Political Psychology. 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge. (Ch. 3, pp. 46-78). Lebow, R. N. (2010). Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Ch. 7, pp. 205-221)
Week 6	MIDTERM EXAM	



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 7 Session 11	PART III - THE PSYCHOLOGY OF GROUP ACTION Individual and collective action Social media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, etc.) have been heralded as harbingers of a bright future in intercommunication. While intercommunication has indeed been accelerated, it is not necessarily the case that the content of this communication has been improved. Nor, for that matter, is it clear whether the purpose of online political activity, which could be termed "hashtag activism", is meant to foster mass action – be it in the form of voter mobilization or protest – raise awareness, or signal to oneself or others that one is at least doing something about perceived problems in society. Hashtag activism	 Bode, L., Hanna, A., Yang, J., & Shah, D. V. (2015). Candidate networks, citizen clusters, and political expression: strategic hashtag use in the 2010 midterms. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 659(1), 149-165. Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag activism: the promise and risk of 'attention'. In Douglas M. Walls and Stephanie Vie, (eds), Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, Pedagogies, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado, (Ch. 1 - pp. 17-36). Recommended readings: Carr, D. (2012). Hashtag activism, and its limits. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/business/med ia/hashtag-activism-and-its-limits.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 Fang, J. (2015). In defense of hashtag activism. Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs, 2(1), 138-141.
Session 12	Individual and collective action • Social media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, etc.) have been heralded as harbingers of a bright future in intercommunication. While intercommunication has indeed been accelerated, it is not necessarily the case that the content of this communication has been improved. Nor, for that matter, is it clear whether the purpose of online political activity, which could be termed "hashtag activism", is meant to foster mass action – be it in the form of voter mobilization or protest – raise awareness, or signal to oneself or others that one is at least doing something about perceived problems in society. • Protesting • Voting	 Dekker, H. (2014). Voting and not voting: the principal explanations. <i>In</i> Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) <i>The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (Ch. 12 – pp. 204-219). Gibson, R. K. (2015). Party change, social media and the rise of 'citizen-initiated' campaigning. <i>Party Politics</i>, <i>21</i>(2), 183-197. Recommended readings: Carr, D. (2012). Hashtag activism, and its limits. <i>The New York Times</i>. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/business/med ia/hashtag-activism-and-its-limits.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0 Fang, J. (2015). In defense of hashtag activism. <i>Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs</i>, <i>2</i>(1), 138-141.



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 8 Session 13	Recent political trends in Europe and the United States have forced social scientists and reporters alike to profoundly revise their comprehension of politics and its direction in this day and age. Making use of the concepts studied in the previous weeks, what can we say about developments in Central/Eastern Europe and the US? We consider recent political events as well as historical references, including Austria's Nazi past. Understanding atypical political outcomes Central/Eastern Europe Brexit Homework 3 due	 Manoschek, W. (2017). The Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ)—an Austrian and a European phenomenon? In Anton Pelinka (ed): Austria in the European Union. New York, Routledge. (Ch. 7, pp. 144-160) Manoschek, W. (2002). FPÖ, ÖVP, and Austria's Nazi past. In Ruth Wodak & Anton Pelinka (eds): The Haider Phenomenon. New York: Routledge. (Ch. 1, pp. 3-16) Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 2, p.32-64; Ch. 11, pp. 368-405). Petsinis, V. (2015). The 'new' far right in Hungary: a political psychologist's perspective. Journal of Contemporary European Studies, 23(2), 272-287.
Session 14	Recent political trends in Europe and the United States have forced social scientists and reporters alike to profoundly revise their comprehension of politics and its direction in this day and age. Making use of the concepts studied in the previous weeks, what can we say about developments in Central/Eastern Europe and the US? We consider recent political events as well as historical references, including Austria's Nazi past. Trump	 Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism. New York: Cambridge University Press. (Ch. 10, pp. 331-367). Oliver, J. E., & Rahn, W. M. (2016). Rise of the Trumpenvolk: populism in the 2016 election. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 667(1), 189-206.



Session	Content	Assignments
Week 9 Session 15	PART IV - POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY IN DEMOCRACY • Much of the concern thus far has been with political psychology as it applies to individuals and citizens as a group. What has been left untouched is how policymakers might begin to wade through the various aforementioned difficulties engendered by democratic society, technological advancements, and our proclivity to make decisions based on emotion. This week we will examine the application of political psychology to two leaders as well as the potential points of conflict between policymakers and the intelligence that is necessary for them to competently carry out their tasks, but which also can undermine their confidence and decision-making capabilities. • Political Psychology of Leaders - Case studies: Bill Clinton; Jörg Haider	 Betz, H. G. (2017). Haider's revolution or the future has just begun. <i>In</i> Anton Pelinka (ed): <i>Austria in the European Union</i>, New York: Routledge. (Ch. 6, pp. 119-143) Bunzl, J. (2002). Who the Hell is Jörg Haider?. <i>In</i> Ruth Wodak & Anton Pelinka (eds): <i>The Haider Phenomenon</i>, New York: Routledge. (Ch. 4, pp. 61-66). Cottam, M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Mastors, E. M., & Preston, T. (2004). <i>Introduction to Political Psychology</i>. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (Ch. 5, pp. 97-123)



Session	Content	Assignments
Session 16	Much of the concern thus far has been with political psychology as it applies to individuals and citizens as a group. What has been left untouched is how policymakers might begin to wade through the various aforementioned difficulties engendered by democratic society, technological advancements, and our proclivity to make decisions based on emotion. This week we will examine the application of political psychology to two leaders as well as the potential points of conflict between policymakers and the intelligence that is necessary for them to competently carry out their tasks, but which also can undermine their confidence and decision-making capabilities.	Jervis, R. (2010). Why intelligence and policymakers clash. Political Science Quarterly, 125, 185-204.
Week 10 Session 17	This course began by defining the discipline of political psychology as a hybrid of psychology and political science. This week we will revisit this topic as well as the concepts studied throughout the course, and relate them to broader questions in the study of politics. The Field of Political Psychology: A Review	 Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political science from itself. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology. 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 21 – pp. 755-793).
Session 18	This course began by defining the discipline of political psychology as a hybrid of psychology and political science. This week we will revisit this topic as well as the concepts studied throughout the course, and relate them to broader questions in the study of politics. Student Presentations due	 Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political science from itself. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology. 1st edition. New York: Oxford University Press. (Ch. 21 – pp. 755-793).
Week 11	FINAL EXAM	



REQUIRED READINGS:

- Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted?. American Political Science Review, 99(2), 153-167.
- Arceneaux, K., Johnson, M., & Murphy, C. (2012). Polarized political communication, oppositional media hostility, and selective exposure. *The Journal of Politics*, 74(1), 174-186.
- Ballew, C.C., and Todorov, A. (2007). Predicting political elections from rapid and unreflective face judgments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(46), 17948-17953.
- Betz, H. G. (2017). Haider's revolution or the future has just begun. In Anton Pelinka (ed): *Austria in the European Union*. New York: Routledge.
- Bode, L., Hanna, A., Yang, J., & Shah, D. V. (2015). Candidate networks, citizen clusters, and political expression: strategic hashtag use in the 2010 midterms. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 659(1), 149-165.
- Bullock, J. G. (2011). Elite influence on public opinion in an informed electorate. *American Political Science Review, 105,* 496-515.
- Bunzl, J. (2002). Who the Hell is Jörg Haider?. In Ruth Wodak & Anton Pelinka (eds): *The Haider Phenomenon*. New York: Routledge.
- Burger, J. M. (2009). Replicating Milgram: would people still obey today? American Psychologist, 64(1), 1-11.
- Charney, E. (2008). Genes and ideologies. *Perspectives on Politics*, 6(2), 299-319.
- Cottam, M., Dietz-Uhler, B., Mastors, E. M., & Preston, T. (2004). Introduction to Political Psychology. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cottam, M.L., Mastor, E., Preston, T., & Dietz, B. (2016). *Introduction to Political Psychology.* 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Dadas, C. (2017). Hashtag activism: the promise and risk of 'attention'. In Douglas M. Walls and Stephanie Vie, (eds), Social Writing/Social Media: Publics, Presentations, Pedagogies, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and University Press of Colorado
- Dekker, H. (2014). Voting and not voting: the principal explanations. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Demertzis, N. (2014). Political emotions. In Paul Nesbitt-Larking et al., (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Druckman, J. N. (2001). On the limits of framing effects: who can frame? The Journal of Politics, 63(4), 1041-1066.
- Hetherington, M. J., & Weiler, J. D. (2009). Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerber, A. S., Huber, G. A., Doherty, D., & Dowling, C. M. (2011). The big five personality traits in the political arena. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 265-287.
- Gibson, R. K. (2015). Party change, social media and the rise of 'citizen-initiated' campaigning. Party Politics, 21(2), 183-197.
- Huddy, L. et al. (2013). Introduction: theoretical foundations of political psychology. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology.* 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, R. (1993). The drunkard's search. In Shanto Iyengar and William James McGuire, (eds), *Explorations in Political Psychology*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Jervis, R. (2010). Why intelligence and policymakers clash. Political Science Quarterly, 125, 185-204.
- Krosnick, J. A. (2002). Is political psychology sufficiently psychological? In James H. Kuklinski, (ed), *Thinking about Political Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W. and Boyatzi, L. M. (2012). The psychology of closed and open mindedness, rationality, and democracy. *Critical Review, 24*(2), 217-232.
- Lane, R. E. (2003). Rescuing political science from itself. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. 1st Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lavine, H., Lodge, M., & Freitas, K. (2005). Authoritarianism, threat, and selective exposure to information. *Political Psychology*, *26*, 219-244.
- Lebow, R. N. (2010). Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Manoschek, W. (2002). FPÖ, ÖVP, and Austria's Nazi past. In Ruth Wodak & Anton Pelinka (eds): The Haider Phenomenon, New York: Routledge.



- Manoschek, W. (2017). The Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ)—an Austrian and a European phenomenon? In Anton Pelinka (ed): Austria in the European Union. New York: Routledge.
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Quattrone, G. A. and A. Tversky. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. American
 Political Science Review, 82, 716-736.
- Petsinis, V. (2015). The 'new' far right in Hungary: a political psychologist's perspective. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 23(2), 272-287.
- Riker, W. H. (1995). The political psychology of rational choice theory. *Political Psychology*, 16(1), 23-44.
- Salmela, M. and C. von Scheve. (2017). Emotional roots of right-wing populism. Social Science Information, 56(4), 564-595.
- Sears, D.O., and Brown, C. (2003). Childhood and adult political development. In Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy, (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tetlock, P. E. (2017). Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know? Princeton: Princeton University Press.

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

- Carr, D. (2012). *Hashtag activism, and its limits*. The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/26/business/media/hashtag-activism-and-its-limits.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Fang, J. (2015). In defense of hashtag activism. *Journal of Critical Scholarship on Higher Education and Student Affairs, 2*(1), 138-141.
- Haidt, J. (2013). The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided By Politics And Religion. New York: Vintage Books.
- Iyengar, S., and Hahn, K.S. (2009). Red media, blue media: evidence of ideological selectivity in media use. *Journal of Communication*, *59*, 19-39.

INSTRUCTOR BIOGRAPHIES:

Jennifer Ebner-Daigle has been teaching at the undergraduate level for nearly 20 years in the areas of developmental psychology, social psychology, and education. Recently, her research interests have centered on the academic performance differentials between Turkish minority children and Austrian native children. Jennifer is a native of Québec, Canada; she has resided in Austria since 2001.

Originally from Calgary, Alberta, Canada, Scott Nelson is a scholar and writer who has been living and working in Vienna since 2008. He has published works on political ethics and a variety of thinkers including Raymond Aron, Max Weber, Erasmus, Karl Marx, and Karl Popper. His doctoral dissertation in History was published in Spring 2019 by Peter Lang publishers with the title "Tragedy and History: The German Influence on Raymond Aron's Political Thought". He is currently working on his next project as a co-author on a book discussing Cicero and modern politics.