

BAK10 Seminar
Humans in Politics or Politics in Humans? – An Introduction to Political Psychology
(Peter) Luca Versteegen
September 23, 2024

The course in short: This course combines two of the most exciting things there are – politics and psychology. It will provide you with an understanding of people’s attitudes, personality, information-processing, emotions, and social background – and why that all matters to politics. Moreover, you will enhance your understanding of political psychological methods and communication, as well as skills that matter for political scientists and citizens more broadly. Welcome, everyone, to this course!

Instructor: (Peter) Luca Versteegen – please call me Luca!

Office hours: Please email me and book a 1:1 meeting if you’d like to discuss any course contents or assignments, your grades, or progress. Additionally, feel free to email me anytime if there are other things related to the course that you struggle with.

Introduction

We’re living in exciting, busy, and sometimes worrying times. Politics—the who gets what, when, and how in society—is meant to steer these times. The largest group of actors in politics are citizens, and political theory asks citizens to monitor politics, evaluate information, and punish politicians who perform poorly. But citizens are also human beings. And human beings feel, get tired, have children, get distracted, have personalities and social identities. How do these human beings participate in politics, how do they understand and feel about it? Do they even notice what’s going on?

In this course, we will discuss some of the central concepts of political psychology. We will depart from a general overview of political psychology and its methods, discuss ordinary conceptions of attitudes, and study how we may come to hold these attitudes. We then consider emotions and an individual’s personality and moral values. After that, we ask how group memberships and social identities influence people’s political behavior. Next, we take evolution into account and ask whether our very past influences the present. Finally, we talk about the (currently very polarized but sometimes nice) present. We will close by discussing research topics you and your fellow students identified as interesting.

Your participation will be assessed on a combination of oral participation, short class presentations, weekly reflection papers, and a final research paper. With this class, I hope that you learn more about the theories, methods, evidence, and unanswered questions that political psychology has to offer.

Aims

This course has three aims:

1. To develop your knowledge of and ability to critically evaluate theories of and evidence in political psychology. This includes how people's personality, attitudes, emotions, social background, and everyday life affects humans' political behavior and society.
2. To develop your ability to find, process, and evaluate information on historic and current political phenomena. Why do citizens act the way they do, what can and should they do? What information is reliable and how can different sources of information be combined?
3. To develop your reading, writing, presentation, and social skills. These skills matter for political psychologists, political scientists, and citizens in society and the work life.

Values and Course Culture

This course aims to provide an inclusive and supportive environment. I urge all participants to be respectful, friendly, and their best self. The course respects all social backgrounds and requires all participants to adhere to principles of good citizen practice. All participants—including myself—should be assessed on whether they live up to these values.

Political psychology touches various sensitive topics, and it is, therefore, crucial to remain respectful even when we dislike a fact or disagree with an opinion. Of course, we want open, critical, and sometimes controversial discussions – but all that should be respectful.

If students, for whatever reason, feel disrespected disregarded or unfairly treated by a fellow student, they should please report this to me. If they feel this way because of how I treat them or others, they should either report this to me or responsible program coordinator.

As you may have noticed, this syllabus is written in English. I decided to teach this class in English, given that a.) all course literature and most political psychology terms are in English, b.) some of the terminology used in this class change their meaning in German, and c.) English communication skills are crucial for any kind of future career. Therefore, I kindly ask you to provide all assignments, including oral participation, in English. If you feel unable to contribute in English, please talk to me and we will find a solution.

Furthermore, this course values good research and open science practices. I will try to encourage these perspectives throughout the course, such as in our discussions and the assignments (see below). Any plagiarism or unethical research conduct will be penalized.

The most important point of this class is for you to *learn*. Hence, if you feel uncomfortable, don't learn anything, are stressed or worried – please let me know.

Course Format

This course comes as 14 single meetings. I have assigned readings for each meeting. For most meetings, you will be asked to read the assigned readings and produce a reflection paper *in advance*. Please be sure to read the first two readings assigned for each session. The readings marked as “optional” are... optional (but often fun!). In each seminar, we will kick off with a 10-minute presentation by one or several students, followed by a general discussion. Depending on the session, we may add additional exercises – you don't need to worry about them, that's my task.

It is crucial that you have closely read the assigned literature and written the reflection paper. This matters for your grade, but more importantly, it will help you and your peers learn and have fun. Think about your view, whether you believe a theory or result, what you like or dislike about a certain method, or how you would follow-up on this. If you struggle to

understand a paper, write down your question and ask it in class – very often, we struggle on similar things, and if you voice your question in class, you will most probably help many students to understand.

Attendance

You are expected to attend classes and be punctual. Always notify me in advance if you cannot attend a session. Attendance in the first session is mandatory and I have to deregister students who miss the first class. You will fail the class if you miss more than two sessions.

Assessment

You will be assessed based on four course components:

1. Reflection papers (40% of the final grade)
 - Please write a short reflection paper (max 1 page) based on the readings. In this paper, you're asked to share your spontaneous thoughts on the readings, whether they make sense, what you find intriguing, or what seems off to you. Do not summarize the papers but express your view. These papers can take several routes, such that they may combine several of the assigned (or additional) readings, connect them to current events in politics, or provide examples. Do not just list your thoughts, but try to develop *one* coherent thought per paper. You may also develop an idea for future research, challenge the evidence, or write a policy proposal based on the readings. Be creative and have fun. This paper is for you to think about the readings and shouldn't take too long to write.
 - This paper is *due at 08.00am the day before the respective class. You're asked to write one reflection paper for each session 2-12. Submit the paper via Moodle. Late submissions will be graded as fail. You may fail two of these reflection papers (i.e., if you're particularly busy in one week, you can also decide not to submit anything that week).*
2. Provocative Presentation (10% of the final grade)
 - Please prepare a short 10-minute presentation, either alone or as a group of students. This presentation is meant to be provocative, such that it generates a discussion for the rest of the class. While you may briefly summarize the literature, you should focus on one or two aspects you find intriguing. For example, you may come up with an alternative explanation to a research finding, prepare a policy proposal based on it, or develop a game. Again, be creative. At the end of the course, we will determine the most creative Provocative Presentation, and I will hand out a prize.
 - Note that “provocative” doesn't mean “aggressive” or “disrespectful.”
 - Note that you only do this presentation once.
3. Oral participation (10%)
 - Please participate in class. You may, for example, ask questions, give feedback to students' comments, presentations, or questions, or introduce new ideas. Jokes are always welcome.
 - Please see Table 1 for a grading matrix. I will grade this with broad strokes and encourage everyone to be as active as possible.
 - Note that you will be graded on each single class, and the final participation grade will be the average of all single classes.
4. Final Research Paper (40%)
 - Please write a Final Research Paper. This paper resembles a little thesis, including a research gap, research question, novel contributions, a literature review and most often a

theory section, methods, a discussion, references, and possibly an appendix. The only part missing is the results section. That is, you are asked to pretend that you've conducted an entire project, but you may skip the data collection, analysis, and results reporting.

- Unless in “real research,” you have no limits in funding, time, or human power. So think big and ask the question YOU are interested in, motivate why it matters, and be as detailed as possible in how you want to pursue it. Pretend that you found support for your hypotheses (another deviation from “real research”....).
- Please see Table 2 for a grading matrix. I will grade this with broad strokes but encourage everyone to follow these instructions.
- Write *max.* 6,000 words incl., references. Note that this can be much shorter (e.g., 4,000 words) – I won't grade you on length. If you can say it with less words, do so. However, the limit is 6,000 and should not be exceeded.
- Make sure to have a proper layout and referencing. If you write in Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, size 12, double-spaced work well. Leave 2.5 inch margins. If you use Latex, you may use templates like the ones provided by the APSR or the BJPOLS. If you use something else, that will probably be fine, too. The reading list below (using the APA-style) may help you with the reference list.
- Note that you only have to produce *one* Final Research Paper.
- In Session 13, you will be asked to give a brief presentation of your paper draft. This is a good opportunity for feedback, so try to be as prepared as possible.
- To be submitted by February 28th, 2025, 12.00am, via Moodle.

Grading

- For each assignment, you can get the grades: 1 (Excellent), 2 (Good), 3 (Satisfactory), 4 (Sufficient), 5 (Insufficient/fail). I'll round the grades (e.g., 3.0-3.4 or lower will become a 3, 3.5-3.9 will become a 4). To receive the final course grade, I'll weight the rounded assignment grades. This will leave you with the final course grades: 1 (Excellent), 2 (Good), 3 (Satisfactory), 4 (Sufficient), 5 (Insufficient/fail).
- To pass the course, you must pass all the single components. That is, if you fail on one of the assignment types, you will fail the entire course.

Schedule

1. **October 9, 2024: Session 1: Introduction**

(What political psychology and this course is about)

1. Huddy, L., Sears, D.O., Levy, J.S., & Jerrit, J. (2023). Introduction: Theoretical Foundations of Political Psychology. In L. Huddy, D.O. Sears, J.S. Levy, & J. Jerrit (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 1–18. Available [here](#).
2. Delli Carpini, Michael X. (2005). “An Overview of the State of Citizens’ Knowledge about Politics.” *Annenberg School for Communication Departmental Papers*. Available [here](#).
3. Optional: Jost, J. T. (2006). The end of the end of ideology. *American Psychologist*, 61, 651–670. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.651>

For this session: In this session, we’ll have a proper introduction, discuss all contents and questions of the syllabus, schedule the Provocative Presentations, and any open questions, worries, or hopes you may have. No need to write anything for this class.

2. **October 16, 2024: Session 2: How to Study Political Psychology**

(Methods and designs)

1. Naunov, M. (2024). The Effect of Protesters’ Gender on Public Reactions to Protests and Protest Repression. *American Political Science Review*, 1–17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055424000133>
2. Reny, T. T., & Newman, B. J. (2021). The opinion-mobilizing effect of social protest against police violence: Evidence from the 2020 George Floyd protests. *American Political Science Review*, 115, 1499–1507. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055421000460>
3. Optional: Versteegen, P. L. (2024). We love, they hate: Emotions in affective polarization and how partisans may use them. *Political Psychology*. *Early view*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12955>
4. Optional: Ziblatt, D., Hilbig, H., & Bischof, D. (2023). Wealth of tongues: Why peripheral regions vote for the radical right in Germany. *American Political Science Review*, 1–17. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055423000862>

3. **October 23, 2024: Session 3: How We Think About Things**

(The origins of attitudes and whether there are any)

1. Alford, J. R., Funk, C. L., & Hibbing, J. R. (2005). Are political orientations genetically transmitted?. *American Political Science Review*, 99, 153–167. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055405051579>
2. Healy, A., & Malhotra, N. (2013). Childhood socialization and political attitudes: Evidence from a natural experiment. *The Journal of Politics*, 75, 1023–1037. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613000996>
3. Optional: Converse, P. E. (1964). The nature of belief systems in mass publics (1964). *Critical Review*, 18, 1–74. Available [here](#).

4. October 30, 2024: Session 4: But Do We Really Think?**(Information-processing and whether it works)**

1. Lau, R. R., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2001). Advantages and disadvantages of cognitive heuristics in political decision making. *American Journal of Political Science*, 951–971. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2669334>
2. Taber, C. S., & Lodge, M. (2006). Motivated skepticism in the evaluation of political beliefs. *American journal of political science*, 50, 755–769. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00214.x>
3. Optional: Groenendyk, E., & Krupnikov, Y. (2021). What motivates reasoning? A theory of goal-dependent political evaluation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65, 180–196. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12562>
4. Optional: Glinitzer, K., Gummer, T., & Wagner, M. (2021). Learning facts about migration: Politically motivated learning of polarizing information about refugees. *Political Psychology*, 42, 1053–1069. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12734>

5. November 06, 2024: Session 5: What About Feelings?**(Emotions and other sentiments)**

1. Webster, S. W., & Albertson, B. (2022). Emotion and politics: Noncognitive psychological biases in public opinion. *Annual review of political science*, 25, 401–418. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051120-105353>
2. Phillips, J. B., & Plutzer, E. (2023). Reassessing the effects of emotions on turnout. *The Journal of Politics*, 85, 1094–1106. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/723816>
3. Optional: Vasilopoulos, P., Marcus, G. E., Valentino, N. A., & Foucault, M. (2019). Fear, anger, and voting for the far right: Evidence from the November 13, 2015 Paris terror attacks. *Political Psychology*, 40, 679–704. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12513>
4. Optional: Sohlberg, J., Esaiasson, P., & Martinsson, J. (2019). The changing political impact of compassion-evoking pictures: The case of the drowned toddler Alan Kurdi. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45, 2275–2288. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1538773>

6. November 13, 2024: Session 6: Individuals and What They Care About**(Personality and morality)**

1. Fatke, M. (2017). Personality traits and political ideology: A first global assessment. *Political Psychology*, 38, 881–899. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12347>
2. Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96, 1029–1046. doi: [10.1037/a0015141](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141)
3. Optional: Bakker, B. N., Schumacher, G., Gothreau, C., & Arceneaux, K. (2020). Conservatives and liberals have similar physiological responses to threats. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 613–621. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0823-z>
4. Optional: Carney, D. R., Jost, J. T., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2008). The secret lives of liberals and conservatives: Personality profiles, interaction styles, and the things they leave behind. *Political Psychology*, 29, 807–840. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00668.x>

7. November 20, 2024: Session 7: Beyond the Individual – the Hard Groups
(The social background of humans)

1. Blumer, H. (1958). Race prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3-7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388607>
2. Naurin, E., Stolle, D., & Markstedt, E. (2023). The effect of pregnancy on engagement with politics. Toward a model of the political consequences of the earliest stages of parenthood. *American Political Science Review*, 117, 311–317. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055422000430>
3. Optional: Trump, K. S. (2018). Income inequality influences perceptions of legitimate income differences. *British Journal of Political Science*, 48, 929–952. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123416000326>
4. Optional: Weeks, A.C. (2024/in prep.). The political consequences of the mental load. *Working paper*. Available [here](#).
5. Optional: Banducci, S., Elder, L., Greene, S., & Stevens, D. (2016). Parenthood and the polarisation of political attitudes in Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 55, 745–766. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12160>
6. Optional: Take an Implicit Association Test: <https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/takeatest.html>

For this session: Find one article from any realm of political psychology that you really like. For example, search in Google Scholar or look at the literature cited in the readings so far. Prepare a few sentences (i.e., two sentences) for why we all should read this paper. Everyone will briefly present their suggestion in class, and we will vote on three papers to read. Everyone will read these papers for Session 12, and we'll do the same stuff as for the other classes, but with the literature you suggested. Topics that this course has not covered are, for example: intersectionality, cross-cultural differences, physiological measures of political behavior, person-environment interactions, media and elite effects (i.e., the supply side), political participation, and social movements. Any suggestions are welcome.

8. November 27, 2024: Session 8: Beyond the Individual – the Soft Groups
(Social and political identities)

1. Huddy, L. (2001). From social to political identity: A critical examination of social identity theory. *Political Psychology*, 22, 127–156. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00230>
2. Mason, L. (2015). “I disrespectfully agree”: The differential effects of partisan sorting on social and issue polarization. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59, 128–145. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12089>
3. Optional: Szczepanski, R. (2024). Who are the Cosmopolitans? How perceived social sorting and social identities relate to European and national identities. *Comparative Political Studies*, 57(7), 1210–1239. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/00104140231194054>

9. December 4, 2024: Session 9: Beyond Now – What Happened Before Us
(Evolution and evolutionary explanations to political behavior)

1. Petersen, M. (2024). The Evolutionary Approach to Political Psychology. In L. Huddy, D.O. Sears, J.S. Levy, & J. Jerrit (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 248–279. Preprint available on OSF: <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/372cr>

2. Petersen, M., Aarøe, L., Jensen, N. H., & Curry, O. (2014). Social welfare and the psychology of food sharing: Short-term hunger increases support for social welfare. *Political Psychology*, *35*, 757–773. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12062>
3. Optional: Tybur, J. M., Inbar, Y., Aarøe, L., Barclay, P., Barlow, F. K., De Barra, M., ... & Žeželj, I. (2016). Parasite stress and pathogen avoidance relate to distinct dimensions of political ideology across 30 nations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*, 12408–12413. Doi: <https://www.pnas.org/doi/abs/10.1073/pnas.1607398113>

10. December 11, 2024: Session 10: The Present: Bad?

(Psychological) polarization and how to reduce it)

1. Iyengar, S., Leikes, Y., Levendusky, M., Malhotra, N., & Westwood, S. J. (2019). The origins and consequences of affective polarization in the United States. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *22*, 129–146. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051117-073034>
2. Röllicke, L. (2023). Polarisation, identity and affect-conceptualising affective polarisation in multi-party systems. *Electoral Studies*, *85*, 102655. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2023.102655>
3. Optional: Levendusky, M. S. (2018). Americans, not partisans: Can priming American national identity reduce affective polarization?. *The Journal of Politics*, *80*, 59–70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/693987>
4. Optional: Broockman, D. E., Kalla, J. L., & Westwood, S. J. (2023). Does affective polarization undermine democratic norms or accountability? Maybe not. *American Journal of Political Science*, *67*, 808–828. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12719>
5. Optional: Kubin, E., Puryear, C., Schein, C., & Gray, K. (2021). Personal experiences bridge moral and political divides better than facts. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*, e2008389118. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2008389118>

11. January 08, 2024: Session 11: The Present: Good?

(Prosocial behaviors)

1. Pfattheicher, S., Nielsen, Y. A., & Thielmann, I. (2022). Prosocial behavior and altruism: A review of concepts and definitions. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *44*, 124–129. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsy.2021.08.021>
2. Van Bavel, J. J., Baicker, K., Boggio, P. S., Capraro, V., Cichocka, A., Cikara, M., ... & Willer, R. (2020). Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *4*, 460–471. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z>
3. Optional: Chudy, J., Piston, S., & Shipper, J. (2019). Guilt by association: White collective guilt in American politics. *The Journal of Politics*, *81*, 968–981. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1086/703207>
4. Optional: Pfattheicher, S., Nockur, L., Böhm, R., Sassenrath, C., & Petersen, M. B. (2020). The emotional path to action: Empathy promotes physical distancing and wearing of face masks during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychological Science*, *31*, 1363–1373. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620964422>

12. January 15, 2024: Session 12: Surprise!

(Your literature)

1. Reading 1
2. Reading 2
3. Reading 3

13. January 22, 2024: Session 13: Presentations

(Presentations)

- There are no readings assigned for this class. Please prepare a short presentation of your final paper draft.

14. January 29, 2024: Session 14: Extra session (if needed)

(Presentations)

- This class serves as a bonus class if needed

Table 1.*Grading Matrix Classroom Participation*

Comes to class prepared; contributes readily to the conversation but doesn't dominate it; makes thoughtful contributions that advance the conversation; shows interest in and respect for others' views; participates actively in small groups.	1 Excellent
Comes to class prepared and makes thoughtful comments when called upon; contributes occasionally without prompting; shows interest in and respect for others' views; participates actively in small groups. This score may also be appropriate to an active participant whose contributions are less developed or cogent than those of a 9-10 but still advance the conversation.	2 Good
Comes to class prepared, but does not voluntarily contribute to discussions and gives only minimal answers when called upon. Nevertheless, these students show interest in the discussion, listen attentively, and take notes. Students in this category may be shy or introverted. The instructor may choose to give such students an 8 if they participate fully in small group discussions or if they make progress in overcoming shyness as the course progresses.	3 Satisfactory
Participates in discussion, but sometimes in a problematic way. Such students may talk too much, make rambling or tangential contributions, continually interrupt the instructor with digressive questions, bluff their way when unprepared, or otherwise dominate discussions, not acknowledging cues of annoyance from instructor or students. Students in this category often profit from a conference with the instructor.	4 Sufficient
Students in this range often seem on the margins of the class and may have a negative effect on the participation of others. Students receiving a 5 often don't participate because they haven't read the material or done the homework. Students receiving a 4 may be actually disruptive, radiating negative energy via hostile or bored body language, or be overtly rude.	5 Insufficient

Note: Adapted from Bean, J.C. & Peterson, D. 1998. Grading classroom participation. *New Directions of Teaching and Learning*, 74, 33–40. Available [here](#).

Please note that I treat all students as individuals, knowing that people and backgrounds express different personalities, strengths, and weaknesses – I'll try to account for that as much as possible.

Table 2.
Grading Matrix Final Paper.

Paper Element (Weight)	Aspects	1 Excellent	2 Good	3 Satisfactory	4 Sufficient	5 Insufficient
Research idea/Topic (0.20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The paper presents an original research question or problem (RQ) - The RQ displays insight and skill to translate relevant issues into well-formulated and researchable interesting/ creative/ innovative questions - The RQ is formulated in a clear manner - It is made clear how the research contributes to previous research <i>and/or</i> how the research addresses a real-life problem highly relevant to political science and/or society 	Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and very developed	Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and developed	Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity	Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped	Incomplete
Title and abstract (0.10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Title is fully explanatory and specific without further elaboration - Title has no abbreviations - Abstract provides an accurate summary of research topic and question - Abstract provides insight into method and results - Abstract provides a clear answer to the research question - Abstract can be understood on its own - Abstract is at max 150 words long 	Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and very developed	Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and developed	Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity	Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped	Incomplete
Introduction (Literature review/theory) (0.20)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides a clear review of the literature that is relevant to the research question - identifies a gap in the current literature - makes clear what the RQ is and why this problem needs to be addressed 	Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and	Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and developed	Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity	Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped	Incomplete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides a novel theoretical argument or justifies why existing theory needs to be tested - avoids unnecessary detours of unrelated literature 	very developed				
Method (Research design/operationalizations, ethics, sample) (0.30)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provides a clear, concise and complete description of the methods and procedures used in the research - avoids unnecessary detail that is not relevant to the outcome of the research. - provides detailed information on the research design, power analysis, respondents, equipment, materials, variables, in sufficient detail to allow others to replicate the research - discusses ethical aspects as far as necessary - considers open science practices - shows that there is a well justified method and design that fully reflects the state of the literature, and is able to correctly answer the research question - clearly describes how the data will be analyzed - shows awareness of ethical aspects of the research, and how to cope with them 	Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and very developed	Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and developed	Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity	Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped	Incomplete
Discussion (conclusions, limitations, implications, future research) (0.10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - summarizes the aim, design, and findings of the paper - raises strengths and limitations of this research - discusses avenues for future research - raises methodological, theoretical and/or practical implications 	Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and very developed.	Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and developed	Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity	Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped	Incomplete

<p>Editing (e.g., readability, referencing) (0.10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The whole paper shows rigorous editing to high academic standards - It follows <u>APSA</u> or <u>APA</u>-style formatting (double-spaced, 12-point Times New Roman font, 2,54 cm (1-inch) margins on all sides, page numbers, proper headings, etc.). - Follows APSA or APA style citations - Includes a formatted “References” section - This is a high-quality document, an engrossing read, a powerfully expressed and persuasive argument. Argumentation quality and consistency across sections is excellent. Consistently cohesive structure - Follows the rules of standard English for usage, spelling of commonly used words, capitalization, and punctuation 	<p>Meets all descriptors at very high level; extremely clear and hardly any errors.</p>	<p>Meets most descriptors at high level; clear and some errors</p>	<p>Meets some descriptors; uneven; some lapses in clarity. Still needs editing</p>	<p>Meets few descriptors; often unclear or undeveloped. Needs major revisions.</p>	<p>Incomplete / cannot be compensated</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	---