

Wise Interventions (Psych 138/238)

Instructor: Greg Walton
 Room 244, Jordan Hall
 Phone: 8-4284
 Email: gwalton@stanford.edu

Website/Forum: On coursework once you have registered

Class meets: Monday and Wednesday 2:15-3:30
 Building 260, Room 113

Office Hours: By appointment

Enrollment Limit: 138: 75 students
 238: 15 students

Welcome!

This course is primarily intended for upper-year undergraduates and for graduate students, especially students with an interest in psychology and in how psychological principles can be used to make the world a better place. Preference is given to juniors, seniors, and graduate students. Freshmen and sophomores may enroll space permitting and with the consent of the instructor. No background in psychology is required. In fact, expertise in other areas may be valuable. Psychology majors or students who have taken courses in social psychology may find that they have been exposed to some of the material before but hopefully this course will cover that material in a new way.

Writing-in-the-Major Requirement

This course fulfills the Writing-in-the-Major requirement for psychology majors.

TAs

We are lucky to have six wonderful TAs for this course. They are:

Shannon Brady	stbrady@stanford.edu
Rodolfo Cortes	cortes@stanford.edu
Kyla Haimovitz	kylah@stanford.edu
Fiona Lee	fionalee@stanford.edu
Gregg Sparkman	Greggrs@stanford.edu
Sophia Zhang (Head TA)	szhangx@stanford.edu

The TA who leads your section should be your first point of contact for questions, etc. TA office hours are by appointment.

Section

Section is mandatory for undergraduates. Graduate students (including co-terms) do not attend section. For undergraduates, participation in section contributes to your final grade. In section you will review and discuss readings and lectures, form research groups, present and discuss research proposal and provide helpful, critical feedback to other students when they present their proposals.

The section times are:

Rodolfo: Mon. 1-1:50 PM 460-301	Shannon: Wed. 10-10:50 AM Educ 208
Fiona: Tues. 10-10:50 AM 260-001	Kyla: Wed. 1:15-2:05 PM 320-107
Gregg: Tues. 1:15-2:05 PM 320-106	Sophia: Wed. 6-6:50 PM 260-012

Sign up for section on Coursework after the first class. The section times are set. If you cannot make any of these, please do not take the course. The enrollment limit for each section is 18.

Please note that section will not meet the week of October 20. Instead this week you should meet with your TA as a group to discuss your grant proposal.

Readings

Readings will be posted on Coursework. A reading schedule is below. You are expected to do the readings before class. Readings are mandatory and will be on the tests.

Every week please bring a printed reading reaction to section: This ½-page (and no longer than 1 page) document should include one question you have about the readings and one thing you found interesting. Your TA will collect this and it will contribute to your section participation grade. You'll spend the first few minutes of section discussing these responses.

In addition, during the second half of the course you will receive research proposals from members of your section to be discussed in section that week. As described below, you are expected to have read these research proposals before section and be ready to critically discuss them in section.

Grades and Due Dates

Grades will be determined as follows:

	<i>% of Final Grade</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
Test 1	15%	Oct 22
Initial Grant Proposal	20%	Oct 29
Grant Review	10%	Nov 3
Final Grant Proposal	20%	Nov 21
Solutions Catalog Entry	10%	Dec 3
Test 2	15%	Dec 12
Section Participation and Presentation	10%	

****For graduate students including co-terms who do not take part in section, the Initial and Final Grant Proposals will each be worth 25%. These students will complete all other assignments.****

Tests

Test 1 covers material discussed through October 22. Test 2 covers subsequent material. That means Test 2 is not comprehensive—you will not be responsible on Test 2 for material covered in the first half of the course. For both tests, all material, from both lectures and readings, is fair game, even material covered in one context but not the other.

Test 1 is October 22. Test 2 is December 12. The dates for both tests are set. If you cannot make both tests, please do not take this course.

Grant Proposal

A primary assignment is a written proposal to conduct a wise intervention. Because science and psychology are almost always collaborative, undergraduates will complete this assignment in teams of 2 or 3. Graduate students (including co-terms) will work individually.

The grant proposal assignment functions like a paper with a first and a final draft. But the two drafts are weighted equally. While producing a strong first draft is an important skill, so is polishing and editing that draft until it reaches a very high level of quality. We expect you to put the same amount of time and effort into both drafts. The grades assigned to the two drafts are independent (i.e., one won't compensate for the other).

Submit to UAR

You have the opportunity to submit your grant proposal to Undergraduate Advising and Research (UAR) to receive funds to conduct your research project. *We strongly encourage you to do so*. To make this easy, the grant proposal assignment mimics the requirements of a Major Grant proposal. UAR's deadline for Major Grant proposals (budgets up to \$6,400) is March 9, 2015. Small Grant (up to \$1,500) deadlines are October 1, November 1, December 1, January 5, February 1, March 1, April 1, and May 1. The feedback you receive from your TA and fellow students should be helpful to you in improving your proposal and aid your chances of receiving UAR funding if you choose to do so.

Although we encourage you to submit to UAR, your grade on the grant proposal will not be affected by whether you do or plan to do so or do not. If you are thinking about submitting to UAR, you will need a faculty sponsor. Feel free to ask us for ideas. For more information about submitting to UAR, see http://www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/cgi-bin/drupal_ual/OO_research_opps_Grants.html#2.

Participate in SPARQshop

Students with interest in conducting their intervention will have the option of applying to enroll in SPARQshop Winter Quarter. SPARQshop is a weekly undergraduate lab in the Stanford Center for Social Psychological Answers to Real-world Questions (SPARQ), where you can receive advising for your project and present your results at an end-of-quarter forum.

Initial Grant Proposal (Due October 29)

Endowed by a generous grant from Mr. and Mrs. Do-Gooder, the Do-Good (DoG) Foundation has put out a call for proposals for psychological interventions to make the world a better place. Strangely, DoG has expressed no preference whatsoever about which social problem researchers address. It can be a big or small problem. It might involve helping people get along better, make smarter decisions, do better in school, work harder, be healthier, save the environment, or any of many other things.

Although it can provide each proposal only limited funds (max of \$1,500 for Small Grants, \$6,400 for Major Grants), DoG will fund as many (or as few) proposals as meet its standards.

There's an unlimited pot. In the best Lewinian tradition, DoG values both a richly developed theory and the application of that theory to an important social problem. You will not be evaluated on the basis of the magnitude of the problem you choose to address, but on the creativity and persuasiveness of your analysis of the psychological dynamics that underlie that problem, on the creativity and precision of your intervention to affect those dynamics, and on the rigor of the measures you use to evaluate the success of the intervention.

Your proposal must:

- Identify an important social problem (at least argue that one is important).
- Describe a psychological process that you think contributes to this problem. Critique the peer-reviewed literature about this process. Discuss how your proposed research will contribute to, expand, or challenge this literature.
- Describe an experiment, with random assignment to treatment and control conditions. What will your intervention involve, and how will it affect the psychological process you have identified? What will your control condition involve? How will you randomly assign participants to treatment and control conditions? What are your hypotheses?
- Describe how you will evaluate your intervention. What are your dependent measures? How will they be assessed? How will you analyze the data?
- Discuss what theoretical implications (for our understanding of psychological processes) and applied implications (for the solution of the problem you have identified) might be drawn from your research if your hypotheses are confirmed.
- Include a budget that identifies how you plan to spend the DoG Foundation's hard-earned money. Your budget cannot exceed \$1,500 (for Small Grant submissions) or \$6,400 (for Major Grant submissions).

For more pointers, see:

- http://www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/cgi-bin/drupal_ual/OO_research_opps_Grants.html
- http://www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/cgi-bin/drupal_ual/OO_research_opps_WritingResearchGrant.html

Your submission should be 2500 words or less (about 10 pages). This does not include the title page, budget, or reference section.

****To submit your initial grant proposal, please label the document with your names and 1 (e.g., "JSmithMJones_1"). Be sure your names are also in the document. Then email it to your TA.****

Final Grant Proposal (Due November 21)

Having received a "revise and resubmit" on your initial grant proposal, you and your collaborators decide, well, to revise and resubmit. Follow the comments from both the reviewers (your peers) and your editor (your TA) to edit and polish your proposal until it is near perfect! The length should be the same as in the initial proposal (i.e., max of 2500 words not including the title page, budget, or references). In addition, please include a brief letter to your editor describing how you revised your proposal in response to the reviews you received on the initial proposal (max of 500 words).

****To submit your final grant proposal, please label the document with your names and 2 (e.g., “JSmithMJones_2”). Be sure your names are also in the document. Then email it to your TA.****

Presentation and Discussion of Research Proposals in Section (undergraduates only)

After establishing your research group, your group will schedule a date in section on which to discuss your research proposal. One to two groups should present each week. At least 48 hours before section, send the most recent draft of your research proposal to your TA, who will distribute it to the section. *As a member of section, it is your obligation each week to read the research proposal of each group scheduled for discussion and to come prepared to discuss their proposal (e.g., bring notes, say what you like and provide critical feedback and suggestions).*

When it is your group’s turn, you will begin the discussion with a very brief presentation (e.g., 5-minutes max). The purpose of this presentation is only to remind your section-mates of the social problem your intervention is designed to address, the psychological process you think contributes to this problem, and how you will intervene to affect the psychological process and address the problem. After presenting, you and your section leader will lead a discussion with your section about the research proposal. Be sure to take notes on the feedback and discussion, so you can use this feedback to improve your proposal.

Grant Review (Due November 3)

Science works through peer review. Therefore, after submitting your initial grant proposal, you will receive the grant proposal of another research team in your section. Working individually, your job is to review their proposal and provide helpful, constructive feedback on it. You will not assign it a grade. Instead, you will discuss its strengths and areas where you think it could be improved. Be sure to address both the theoretical insights in the proposal (e.g., What psychological process does the intervention target? How interesting or novel is this process? How might it affect the outcome?) and the methodology used to create and test the intervention (e.g., How well does the intervention target this psychological process? How will the intervention be evaluated?). Be sure to describe at least two strengths of the proposal and at least two things that could be improved about it. Structure your review so that you describe the most important or major comments first and less important, secondary comments later. Your review should be no longer than 1000 words (about 4 pages). Your comments will be provided to the research team to aid them in revising their proposal.

****To submit your grant review, please add your initials and “Review” to the file name (e.g., “JSmithMJones_1_MWilliamsReview”). Be sure your name is also in the document. Then email it to your TA and to the research team.****

In addition to providing this 1000-word review, you are welcome to return to the research group and your TA a copy of the group’s initial grant proposal with your comments and suggested changes included using “comments” and “track changes” within the document. This kind of feedback can be helpful to research teams as they revise their proposal, for instance in pointing out specific areas that are unclear, confusing, or problematic. This is not required and you can receive full credit if you complete only the 1000-word review. Your grade can only go up by submitting this annotated document. But if you, as you read the proposal, find yourself making

comments and using track changes within the grant proposal document, these can be helpful notes for you as you write your 1000-word review and helpful for the research group as they revise their proposal.

****To submit this annotated document, add your initials and “Annotated” to the file name (e.g., “JSmithMJones_1_MWilliamsAnnotated.” Email it to your TA and to the research team.****

SPARQ Solutions Catalog Entry (Due December 3)

There is enormous demand for psychological interventions. Social scientists, policymakers, practitioners, and the lay public all want to learn more about how and when a psychological approach can help address diverse problems. Now that you’ve (nearly) completed this course, you can help wise people up!

In communicating psychological research, especially interventions, to the public you must be brief, accessible, compelling, and accurate. People need to get some sense of what the intervention is and how and when it works and how they might apply the insights it represents to a problem they face. This is not easy.

To help spread the word, Stanford SPARQ (the Center for Social Psychological Answers to Real-World Questions) created the Solutions Catalog (<https://sparq.stanford.edu/solutions>). **Your assignment is to prepare an entry for the Solutions Catalog.** *Unless you request otherwise, we will share promising entries with the Solutions Catalog team. They will review entries and alert the authors of any they may include. If your entry is selected and you are interested, they will then work with you to edit your entry and, ultimately post it in the Solutions Catalog—crediting you, of course.*

To prepare your entry, first review the SPARQ Solutions Catalog. Look for entries of interventions you’ve learned about in class and get a sense of how they are written. Then pick an intervention you love that does not yet have an entry. This will probably be an intervention you learned about in class through readings or lecture; if it isn’t, run it past your TA first and make sure they think it’s appropriate. Read or reread the original research article reporting this intervention. Then prepare your entry. Your entry should include:

1. *Problem:* A brief statement of the problem the intervention addresses (\approx 1-3 sentences).
2. *Solution:* A brief summary of the solution to this problem tested (\approx 1-3 sentences).
3. *The Details:* A short description of the study, intervention, and results (\approx 100-300 words)
4. *Why This Works:* A brief description of the psychological process the intervention targets to address the problem (\approx 1-3 sentences).
5. *When This Works Best:* A description of the conditions under which the intervention will be most effective, or the groups with whom it will be most effective, either as shown empirically or as theorized (\approx 1-3 sentences).
6. *The Original Study:* The citation for the original study in APA format.
7. *In the Press:* Links to any high-quality popular press stories on the intervention.

Some tips:

1. Cut academic and technical jargon. Write so your grandparents can understand. In fact, why not write a first draft over Thanksgiving Break and share your draft with your friends and family and see if they understand it and then make revisions? (Maybe an intervention to reduce over-eating?)
2. Be pithy and accessible, not comprehensive. Your goal is not to rewrite the journal article reporting the intervention. Instead, you want to communicate the main points accessibly to non-experts.

Additional Resources to Help You Learn and Succeed

SPARQ Solutions Catalog

In addition to lecture, section, readings, and office hours, you may find it helpful as we proceed through the course to review entries for interventions you are learning about in class in the SPARQ Solutions Catalog (<https://sparq.stanford.edu/solutions>).

Hume Writing Center

This is a Writing-in-the-Major (WIM) class. The Hume Center for Writing & Speaking works with Stanford students taking WIM classes and any course that includes writing assignments. In free one-to-one sessions, trained writing consultants help students brainstorm and get started on assignments; learn strategies for revising, editing, and proofreading; and improve organization, flow, and argumentation. Hume also has digital media consultants who work with students to develop strategies to improve visual and multimodal communication in media such as research posters and PowerPoint and oral communication tutors to help students prepare or refine a presentation. Students can make an appointment with a lecturer or advanced graduate student consultant or drop in to meet with an undergraduate peer tutor. For further information, to see hours and locations, or to schedule an appointment, visit the Hume website at: <http://hume.stanford.edu>.

How To Write Better

This 1-page document from SPARQshop provides some tips about how to make your writing more powerful and more persuasive. Available on Coursework.

Late Policy

Without an adequate excuse, late assignments will be penalized 1/3 of a grade point each day (a perfect assignment 1 day late receives an A-; 2 days late a B+, etc.).

Course Schedule

	<u>In Class</u>	<u>In Section</u>
Sept 22	<i>Introductions</i>	No Section
Sept 24	<i>Introduction to Social Psychology, Methodological Quandaries</i>	
Sept 29	<i>Some Classic Interventions</i>	Reading reactions;
Oct 1	<i>Improving Skills and Abilities I: Intelligence and Self-Regulation (via Skype)</i>	Design an Intervention!
Oct 6	<i>Improving Skills and Abilities II: Contact Theory and Getting Along With Others Who Are Different From You</i>	Reading reactions; Establish research groups and set topics.
Oct 8	<i>Changing Self-Views I: Self-Efficacy, Theories of Intelligence, and School Success</i>	
Oct 13	<i>Changing Self-Views II: Control and Health, Theories of Self-Regulation</i>	Reading reactions;
Oct 15	<i>Changing Self-Views III: Theories of Personality, Self-Esteem and Relationships</i>	Meet with research group, plan intervention
Oct 20	<i>Changing Self-Views IV: Identity, Conflict and Emotional Appraisal</i>	No section. Meet with your TA as a research group instead.
Oct 22	Test 1	
Oct 27	<i>Changing the Situation I: Priming and Channel Factors (aka Nudges)</i>	Reading reactions;
Oct 29	<i>Changing the Situation II: Meaning and Construal</i> Initial Grant Proposal Due. Email to TA by midnight.	Research groups present research proposal.
Nov 3	<i>Co-Opting the Social Animal I: Social Identity Processes in the Service of Hard Work, Happiness, Health, and Other Public Goods</i> Grant Review Due. Email to TA and research group by midnight.	Reading reactions; Research groups present research proposal.
Nov 5	<i>Co-Opting the Social Animal II: Social Norms, Perception and Misperception, and the Role of Gatekeepers: Implications for the Environment, Health, Crime, Bullying and Intergroup Relations.</i>	
Nov 7	Receive reviews on initial grant proposal	
Nov 10	<i>Coping with Psychological Threat I: Cognitive Dissonance and Applications to Health and Politics</i>	Reading reactions; Research groups present research proposal.
Nov 12	<i>Coping with Psychological Threat II: Self-Affirmation and Implications for Health and Partisanship</i>	
Nov 17	<i>Coping with Psychological Threat III: Stereotype Threat Theory, Laboratory Research, and an Early Intervention</i>	Reading reactions; Research groups present research proposal.
Nov 19	<i>Coping with Psychological Threat IV: Stereotype Threat Intervention Field Experiments and Implications</i>	
Nov 21	Final Grant Proposal Due! Email to TA by midnight	
Nov 27	Happy Thanksgiving/Turkey Tom Due Date!	
Dec 1	<i>Guest Lecture: Professor Ali Crum*</i>	Last section! Fun activity.
Dec 3	<i>Wrap-up and a Difficult Problem</i> SPARQ Solutions Catalog Entry Due! Email to TA by midnight.	
Dec 12	Test 2 (same length as Test 1, 12:15-3:15 pm)	No section

Note. My wife is due with our second child on November 27. Professor Alia Crum is tentatively scheduled to guest lecture on December 1. However, if the baby comes earlier or later this may change. If so, we will post an announcement on Coursework so you know what to read for class. **Please monitor Coursework so you do the appropriate reading for each class.** Thanks for your flexibility!

Reading Schedule

Reading Key

- * Moderately important reading – read over once and get the main point.
- ** Important reading – read carefully, be sure you understand what was done, found, and concluded.
- *** Most important reading – read carefully and reflectively, contains important ideas and insights central to course.

Reading tip: Read older papers first. Sometimes more recent papers refer to prior papers and, when this is the case, you'll know what they're talking about.

September 22 – Introductions

No readings

September 24 – Introduction to Social Psychology, Methodological Quandaries

- Campbell (1969). Reforms as experiments.**
- Ross & Nisbett (1991). The person and the situation: Chapter 1.***
- Miller & Prentice (2010). Psychological levers of behavior change.**

September 29 – Some Classic Interventions

- Barnett (2011). Effectiveness of early educational intervention.*
- Lewin (1958). Group decision and social change.***
- McCord (1978). A thirty-year follow-up of treatment effects.*
- Walton (2014). The new science of wise psychological interventions.**

October 1 – Improving Skills and Abilities I: Intelligence and Self-Regulation

- Diamond & Lee (2011). Interventions shown to aid executive function development in children 4 to 12 years old.**
- Jaeggi, Buschkuhl, Jonides, & Perrig (2008). Improving fluid intelligence with training on working memory.**
- Sternberg (2008). Increasing fluid intelligence is possible after all.*

October 6 – Improving Skills and Abilities II: Contact Theory and Getting Along With Others Who Are Different From You

- Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, & Tropp (2008). With a little help from my cross-group friend: Reducing anxiety in intergroup contexts through cross-group friendship.**

October 8 – Changing Self-Views I: Self-Efficacy, Theories of Intelligence, and School Success

Blackwell, Trzeniewski, & Dweck (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention.**

Wilson, Damiani, & Shelton (2002). Improving the academic performance of college students with brief attributional interventions.*

October 13 – Changing Self-Views II: Control and Health, Theories of Self-Regulation

Langer & Rodin (1976). The effects of choice and enhanced personal responsibility for the aged: A field experiment in an institutional setting.**

Schultz (1976). Effects of control and predictability on the physical and psychological well-being of the institutionalized aged.*

October 15 – Changing Self-Views III: Theories of Personality, Self-Esteem and Relationships

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.***

October 20 – Changing Self-Views IV: Identity, Conflict and Emotional Appraisal

Bryan, Walton, Rogers, & Dweck (2011). Motivating voter turnout by invoking the self.**

Finkel, Slotter, Luchies, Walton, & Gross (2013). A brief intervention to promote conflict-reappraisal preserves marital quality over one year.**

Jamieson, Mendes, Blackstock, & Schmader (2010). Turning the knots in your stomach into bows: Reappraising arousal improves performance on the GRE.**

October 22 – Test 1

No readings

October 27 – Changing the Situation in Subtle Ways I: Priming and Channel Factors (aka Nudges)

Anderson (2008). The urge to end it all.*

Dal Cin, MacDonald, Fong, Zanna, & Elton-Marshall (2006). Remembering the message: The use of a reminder cue to increase condom use following a safer sex intervention.**

Duhigg (2008). Warning: Habits may be good for you.*

Hanks, Just, Smith, & Wansink (2012). Healthy convenience: Nudging students toward healthier choices in the lunchroom.**

Thaler & Sunstein (2008). Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness: Introduction.**

October 29 – Changing the Situation in Subtle Ways II: Meaning and Construal

- Davidai, Gilovich, & Ross (2012). Defaults, meaning, and behavior.**
 Hulleman & Harackiewicz (2009). Promoting interest and performance in high school science classes.**

November 3 – Co-Opting the Social Animal I: Social Identity Processes in the Service of Hard Work, Happiness, Health, and Other Public Goods

- Berger & Rand (2008). Shifting signals to help health: Using identity signaling to reduce risky health behaviors.*
 Coch & French (1948). Overcoming resistance to change.**
 Miller, Brickman, & Bolen (1975). Attribution versus persuasion as a means for modifying behavior.**

November 5 – Co-Opting the Social Animal II: Social Norms. Perception and Misperception, and the Role of Gatekeepers: Implications for the Environment, Health, Crime, Bullying and Intergroup Relations.

- Goldstein, Cialdini, & Griskevicius (2008). A room with a viewpoint: Using social norms to motivate environmental conservation in hotels.**
 Keizer, Lindenberg, & Steg (2008). The spreading of disorder.**
 Strahan, LaFrance, Wilson, Ethier, Spencer, & Zanna (2008). Victoria's dirty secret: How sociocultural norms influence adolescent girls and women.*
 Wilson & Kelling (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety.**

November 10 – Coping with Psychological Threat I: Cognitive Dissonance and Applications to Health and Politics

- Axson & Cooper (1985). Cognitive dissonance and psychotherapy. The role of effort justification in inducing weight loss.**
 Brannon & Walton (2013). Improving attitudes by enacting interests: How intergroup contact can spark interest in an outgroup's culture and reduce prejudice.**
 Stone, Aronson, Crain, Winslow, & Fried (1994). Inducing hypocrisy as a means of encouraging young adults to use condoms.**

November 12 – Coping with Psychological Threat II: Self-Affirmation and Implications for Health and Partisanship

- Sherman, Nelson, & Steele (2000). Do messages about health risks threaten the self? Increasing the acceptance of threatening health messages via self-affirmation.***
 Stinson, Logel, Shepherd, & Zanna (2011). Rewriting the self-fulfilling prophecy of social rejection: Self-affirmation improves relational security and social behavior up to 2 months later.**

Optional (not specifically on the test, but an excellent short and up to date review for those interested in the use of self-affirmation to promote health)

Ehret & Sherman (in press). Public policy and health: A self-affirmation perspective.

November 17 – Coping with Psychological Threat III: Stereotype Threat Theory, Laboratory Research, and an Early Intervention

Steele (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance.***

November 19 – Coping with Psychological Threat IV: Stereotype Threat Intervention Field Experiments and Implications

Cohen, Garcia, Purdie-Vaughns, Apfel, & Brzustowski (2009). Recursive processes in self-affirmation: Intervening to close the minority achievement gap.***

Walton & Cohen (2011). A brief social-belonging intervention improves academic and health outcomes of minority students.*** (***No need to read past p. 22***)

December 1 – Professor Alia Crum Guest Lecture: Mindsets, Health and Stress

Crum & Langer (2007). Mind-set matters: Exercise and the placebo effect.**

Crum, Salovey, & Achor (2013). Rethinking stress: The role of mindsets in determining the stress response.*

Crum, Salovey, Rothstein, & Achor (in prep). Rethinking stress: Changing mindsets to harness the enhancing effects of stress.**

December 5 – Wrap-Up and a Difficult Problem

Paunesku, Walton, Romero, Smith, Yeager, & Dweck (under review). Mindset interventions are a scalable treatment for academic underperformance.**

Yeager & Walton (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They're not magic.***

Optional Additional Readings

The articles below are fascinating and relevant to how to scale psychological interventions. Read them for your interest only (they won't be on the test). The Gawande article, from the New Yorker, describes how The Cheesecake Factory ensures high quality in all its restaurant, and how those lessons may be imported to raise quality in medicine (e.g., ICUs). You can also read the piece thinking about lessons for other contexts, including especially education.

Evans & Clarke (2011). Disseminating orphan innovations.

Gawande (2012). Big med.

Robinson (2010). Stealth interventions for obesity prevention and control. Motivating behavior change.