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|  |
| --- |
| **Az oktatás célja angolul** |

**Aim of the course:**

This course provides an overview on the mechanisms of ’wise’ social psychological interventions. In the first part, the most important literature background of these interventions will be presented. Then, the group will decide on a certain way one existing intervention can be extended or transformed. It is also possible to create the basis of a new intervention. The topics of the interventions are related to the Heroes Square’s and Heroic Imagination project’s already existing interventions in the field of prosocial behavior, growth mindset, prejudice reduction, social conformity, adaptive attributions, situational awareness. The goal is creating an extension or new module that can be implemented later in randomized controlled trial experiments.

**Learning outcome, competences**

knowledge:

* Students can learn about the mechanisms of the more recent wise social psychological interventions that they can use in diverse organizations and research
* Students can learn about how to design an intervention
* Students can learn about choosing and using the appropriate measures, how to follow ethical guidelines, and in the case of online interventions, they can learn the basics of using the online platforms

attitude:

* Openness to field experiments.
* Improving critical thinking

skills:

* Students can make the first steps for creating social psychological interventions

autonomy, responsibility:

* Students should apply the research skills and intervention techniques in accordance with ethical standards and corresponding to their competence level.

|  |
| --- |
| **Az oktatás tartalma angolul** |

**Topics of the course**

* The basics of social psychological interventions, and their history
* Principles of social psychological interventions
* Interventions that did not provide the expected results
* Choosing the field or topic of intervention
* Designing the background of the intervention
* Designing the online or the offline platform of the intervention
* If the date is appropriate for the target group, we can pretest the intervention

**Learning activities, learning methods**

|  |
| --- |
| **A számonkérés és értékelés rendszere angolul** |

**Learning requirements, mode of evaluation, criteria of evaluation:**

requirements

* Activity is the basis of the evaluation, it is required to understand and learn the required literature and the content of the presentations
* Report on the results, if there are any, otherwise report on what you learnt from designing the intervention

mode of evaluation: practice mark

Report about:

* You identify and describe the social or societal problem, gather and detail the relevant psychological mechanisms, critical analysis of the existing research in the given field. Description of the intervention, and precise identification of how this intervention can contribute to the existing knowledge of the given field. Description of the hyptheses, measures, dependent and intependent variables, the treatment and control conditions, and the process of randomzation, the expected way of data analysis.

criteria of evaluation:

* How deeply the student integrated the principles of wise interventions and their previous results in the report and how much it meets the above described requirements.

|  |
| --- |
| **Idegen nyelven történő indítás esetén az adott idegen nyelvű irodalom:** |

**Compulsory reading list**

* Ross & Nisbett (1991). The person and the situation: Chapter 1.\*\*\*
* Walton (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions.\*\*\*
* Lewin (1958). Group decision and social change.\*\*\*
* Hulleman & Harackiewicz (2009). Promoting interest and performance in high school science classes.\*\*\*
* Blackwell, Trzeniewski, & Dweck (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention.\*\*
* Stone, Aronson, Crain, Winslow, & Fried (1994). Inducing hypocrisy as a means of encouraging young adults to use condoms.\*\*\*
* Steele (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance.\*\*\*
* Walton & Cohen (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students.\*\*\*
* Yeager & Walton (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They’re not magic.\*\*\*

**Recommended reading list**

* Miller & Prentice (2010). Psychological levers of behavior change.\*\*
* Cohen, Garcia, Purdie-Vaughns, Apfel, & Brzustowski (2009). Recursive processes in self-affirmation: Intervening to close the minority achievement gap.\*\*\*
* McCord (1978). A thirty-year follow-up of treatment effects.\*\*
* Jaeggi, Buschkuehl, Jonides, & Perrig (2008). Improving fluid intelligence with training on working memory.\*\*
* Devine, Forscher, Austin, & Cox (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention.\*\*
* Thaler & Sunstein (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness: Introduction.\*\*
* Hanks, Just, Smith, & Wansink (2012). Healthy convenience: Nudging students toward healthier choices in the lunchroom.\*\*
* Davidai, Gilovich, & Ross (2012). Defaults, meaning, and behavior.\*\*
* Paunesku, Walton, Romero, Smith, Yeager, & Dweck (2015). Mindset interventions are a scalable treatment for academic underperformance.\*\*
* Marigold, Holmes, & Ross (2010). Fostering relationship resilience: An intervention for low self-esteem individuals.\*\*
* Yeager, Trzesniewski, & Dweck (2013). An implicit theories of personality intervention reduces adolescent aggression in response to victimization and exclusion.\*\*
* Bugental, Ellerson, Lin, Rainey, Kokotovic, & O’Hara, N. (2002). A cognitive approach to child abuse prevention.\*\*
* Bryan, Walton, Rogers, & Dweck (2011). Motivating voter turnout by invoking the self.\*\*
* Wilson & Kelling (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety.\*\*
* Sherman, Nelson, & Steele (2000). Do messages about health risks threaten the self? Increasing the acceptance of threatening health messages via self-affirmation.\*\*\*
* Hall, Zhao, & Shafir (2014). Self-affirmation among the poor: Cognitive and behavioral implications.\*\*
* Yeager et al. (2014). Breaking the cycle of mistrust: Wise interventions to provide critical feedback across the racial divide.\*\*

\*\*Interesting

\*\*\*Very interesting
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