SUPPLEMENT 5

ALFRED NOBEL UNIVERSITY

STUDY PROGRAMME COUNSELLING, CORRECTION AND DEVELOPMENT WORK (Bachelor's degree)

COURSE CATALOGUE

2025–2026 academic year

Dnipro 2026

TABLE OF CONTENT

MANDATORY COURSES……	**4**
UKRAINIAN IDENTITY: HISTORY AND CULTURE……	4
UKRAINIAN IDENTITY: STYLISTICS AND LANGUAGE CULTURE / BUSINESS UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE……	7
FOREIGN LANGUAGE (ENGLISH)……	11
ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF THE CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM……	15
ANTHROPOLOGY……	18
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IN MODERN SOCIETY……	21
PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGY AND FUNDAMENTALS OF MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE……	25
FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION……	29
FUNDAMENTALS OF CIVIL PROTECTION AND OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY……	33
GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY……	37
NOBEL STUDIES: FUNDAMENTALS OF PROFESSIONAL IMAGE AND ETHICS FOR FUTURE SPECIALISTS……	43
HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY……	48
DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AND AGE PSYCHOLOGY……	52
DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY……	57
PSYCHODIAGNOSTICS. GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOP……	62
METHODS AND ORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY……	67
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY……	71
PEDAGOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY……	76
PSYCHOLOGY OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY……	80
EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY……	84
CHILD PSYCHOLOGY……	88
LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY AND METHODS OF CONDUCTING PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPERTISE……	92
SPECIAL PSYCHOLOGY. PATHOPSYCHOLOGY AND THE BASICS OF PSYCHIATRY……	96
THEORY AND PRACTICE OF SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINING……	101
THE BASICS OF PSYCHOTHERAPY. PSYCHOLOGY OF TRAUMA……	105
BASICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING……	109
ELECTIVE COURSES……	**113**
PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PERSONALITY SELF-DEVELOPMENT……	113
BASICS OF BUSINESS PSYCHOLOGY……	117
COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF A SPECIALIST……	121
INNOVATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND STARTUP PROJECT MANAGEMENT……	125
CONFLICTOLOGY……	129
SALES PSYCHOLOGY AND CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS……	133
EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION……	137
POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY……	141
THE ART OF PUBLIC SPEAKING AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH……	145
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CAREER MANAGEMENT THROUGH MENTORING AND COACHING……	149
BASICS OF COACHING TECHNOLOGIES IN THE PRACTICE OF A SPECIALIST……	153
EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT……	157
MINDFULNESS TRAINING……	161
CURRENT TRENDS IN PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY……	164
BASICS OF SEXOLOGY……	167
SELF-MANAGEMENT OF A SPECIALIST……	170
PSYCHOLOGY OF HEALTH……	174
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SELF-PERCEPTION AND LIFE SCRIPTS……	177
COMMUNICATION AND CREATIVITY TRAINING……	180
PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSONALITY……	184
LOGOTHERAPY AND EXISTENTIAL ANALYSIS……	187
GENDER PSYCHOLOGY……	191
CRISIS TELEPHONE COUNSELING……	195

TECHNIQUES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION AND PERSONAL RECOVERY IN CHALLENGING LIFE SITUATIONS…….….	199
MATHEMATICAL METHODS IN PSYCHOLOGY……....	203
ETHICS AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN PSYCHOLOGY……	207
PSYCHOLOGY OF CRISIS AND EXTREME SITUATIONS…….	211
ART THERAPY……	215
CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY……..……	219
INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES…….……..……..	222
EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP……..……..……..	227
PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP……..……	230
PRE-GRADUATION INTERNSHIP……..…….....	233
STRUCTURE OF THE COUNSELLING, CORRECTION AND DEVELOPMENT WORK STUDY PROGRAMME (BACHELOR'S DEGREE)……..……..…….	236

MANDATORY COURSES

UKRAINIAN IDENTITY: HISTORY AND CULTURE				
The course aims to develop an understanding of Ukraine's historical development and cultural heritage and their role in shaping national identity, self-identification and cultural belonging. It develops the ability to analyse historical and cultural sources, critically evaluate interpretations and stereotypes, and consider cultural context and individual differences when interpreting human experiences and behaviour.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1	3 / mandatory	Yana Halkina, PhD (Philology), Associate Professor	90 hours (16 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 60 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the relationship between national identity, self-identification and cultural belonging, using examples from Ukrainian history and contemporary life.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, concept mapping, seminar discussions	Assessed oral explanations and contributions to seminar discussions; an annotated concept map illustrating the relationship between identity, self-identification and belonging; written test (CAS)
2) Analyse selected sources concerning medieval Ukraine, Cossack heritage and the national revival, distinguishing historical evidence from later interpretations of its significance for Ukrainian identity.			Lectures, guided analysis of historical sources, comparative analysis of historical representations, seminar discussions	Assessed oral source analysis; written source-analysis and comparison assignments; analytical report; source-based questions in the written test (CAS)
3) Interpret selected Ukrainian cultural practices and artworks in their historical contexts as expressions of values, collective experiences and cultural belonging.			Lectures using visual and audiovisual materials, analysis of cultural cases, guided interpretation of artworks, seminar discussions	Assessed oral interpretation of cultural examples; written artwork interpretation; written test (CAS)
4) Critically evaluate sources addressing Ukrainian identity and mentality by examining authorship, context, evidence and possible bias, and distinguishing supported interpretations from stereotypes.			Guided inquiry, comparison of academic and media sources, media literacy workshops, structured discussions	Evidence-based contributions to discussions; written critical comparison of sources; source-based questions in the written test (CAS)
5) Apply knowledge of Ukrainian historical and cultural contexts to the analysis of introductory case scenarios involving identity, cultural belonging and interpersonal misunderstanding, taking account of individual differences and alternative explanations.			Case-based learning, small-group analysis, guided discussion of alternative interpretations, independent case analysis	Assessed oral case analysis; a written response to a case scenario with justified interpretations; case-based questions in the written test (CAS)
6) Examine how cultural assumptions may influence interpretations of other people's experiences and behaviour, and justify alternative interpretations using relevant evidence.			Guided reflection, analysis of fictional scenarios, structured discussions, peer feedback, reflective writing	Assessed arguments in seminar discussions; a reflective commentary identifying an assumption, examining its limitations and proposing an alternative interpretation (CAS)

Assessment
The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS): 35 points (35%) for seminar work: discussions, source analysis and case-based tasks – seven seminars, 5 points each; 35 points (35%) for self-directed written assignments: concept mapping, source analysis, comparative analysis, analytical reports and reflective writing – seven assignments, 5 points each; 30 points (30%) for a comprehensive written test. Assessment criteria: a) seminar work: discussions, source analysis and case-based tasks 5 points: The student demonstrates accurate knowledge of the topic, analyses historical and cultural examples, and supports interpretations with relevant evidence. Arguments are clear and well-founded. The student considers alternative explanations, distinguishes evidence from stereotypes, and takes account of cultural context and individual differences where relevant. 4 points: The student demonstrates sound knowledge of the topic and provides relevant arguments supported by historical or cultural examples. Analysis is generally accurate, although some connections or alternative interpretations are insufficiently developed. Minor inaccuracies do not affect the overall validity of the response. 3 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge of the topic, but the response is mainly descriptive. Analysis and supporting evidence are limited. Some arguments contain inaccuracies or unsupported generalisations. Additional questions are needed to clarify the student's reasoning. 1–2 points: The student demonstrates fragmentary knowledge and provides limited relevant contributions. Significant factual inaccuracies, weak reasoning or unsupported generalisations affect the response. The student has difficulty analysing sources or cases and substantiating conclusions. b) self-directed written assignments: concept mapping, source analysis, comparative analysis, analytical reports and reflective writing 5 points: The assignment fully addresses the task and is clearly structured. Historical and cultural information is accurate, relevant sources are appropriately acknowledged, and interpretations are supported by evidence. The student demonstrates analysis, comparison or critical reflection appropriate to the task and presents well-founded conclusions. Where relevant, cultural context, individual differences and alternative interpretations are considered. 4 points: The assignment addresses the main requirements and is logically organised. Relevant sources and examples support the analysis. Conclusions are generally justified, although some arguments lack depth or alternative interpretations receive limited consideration. Minor inaccuracies or omissions do not substantially affect the quality of the work. 3 points: The assignment partially addresses the task and demonstrates basic understanding. The work is predominantly descriptive, with limited analysis, comparison or reflection. Sources are used inconsistently, and some conclusions lack sufficient support. There are noticeable inaccuracies or gaps in the reasoning. 1–2 points: The assignment addresses few task requirements and lacks a clear structure. Historical or cultural information contains significant inaccuracies. Sources are insufficiently used or inadequately acknowledged. Analysis and reflection are minimal, and conclusions are unsupported or inconsistent with the material presented. For seminar work and written assignments, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task. Reflective work is assessed for the quality of reasoning and examination of assumptions; personal beliefs, national identity and disclosure of personal experiences are not assessed. c) comprehensive written test The test assesses understanding of the course concepts, interpretation and evaluation of historical and cultural sources, and application of knowledge to introductory situations involving identity and cultural belonging. The maximum score is 30 points. The criteria and allocation of points for each task are specified on the test card.

Content
Topic 1. National identity as a way of self-identification. Topic 2. Ukraine in the Middle Ages. Topic 3. The phenomenon of Cossacks in the history of Ukraine and the modern Ukrainian picture of the world. Topic 4. Ukrainian intelligentsia, its role in public life and national revival. Topic 5. Ukrainian culture in the structure of Ukrainian identity. Topic 6. Ukrainian art as a component of cultural achievement. Topic 7. Ukrainian mentality.
Literature
Compulsory reading 1. Brusakova, O. V., Hrechenko, V. A., & Maliutina, O. K. (2023). Istoriia Ukrainy [History of Ukraine]. Universytetska knyha. 386 p. 2. Bushyn, M. I., & Hurzhii, O. I. (Eds.). (2016). Istoriia Ukrainy [History of Ukraine]. Cherkasy State Technological University. 644 p. 3. Sharova, T., Kolomoiets, H., & Malechko, T. (2024). Formation of Ukrainian National Identity: Means and Value Orientations. Problems of Education, 1(100), 328–347. 4. Stepyko, M. T. (2011). Ukrainska identychnist: Fenomen i zasady formuvannia [Ukrainian Identity: The Phenomenon and Foundations of Its Formation]. National Institute for Strategic Studies. 336 p.
Recommended reading 1. Bamberg, M., Demuth, C., & Watzlawik, M. (Eds.). (2021). The Cambridge Handbook of Identity. Cambridge University Press. Selected introductory sections. 2. Vermenych, Ya. V. (2024). Ukrainsko-rosiiske pohranychchia u prostori konfliktu identychnostei v istorii ta suchasnosti [The Ukrainian-Russian Borderland in the Context of Identity Conflicts in History and the Present]. Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. 331 p. 3. Himka, J.-P. (2006). The Basic Historical Identity Formations in Ukraine: A Typology. Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 28(1/4), 483–500. 4. Hooson, D. (Ed.). (1994). Geography and National Identity. Wiley-Blackwell. 5. Udovychenko, L. (2022). Problema kulturno-natsionalnoi identychnosti ta shliakhy yii vyrishennia u novii ukrainskii shkoli [The Problem of Cultural and National Identity and Ways to Solve It in the New Ukrainian School]. Pedagogical Education: Theory and Practice. Psychology. Pedagogy, 37(1), 70–75.
Web-resources 1. Institute of History of Ukraine, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://history.org.ua/uk 2. Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://uinp.gov.ua/ 3. National Historical Library of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.nibu.kyiv.ua/

UKRAINIAN IDENTITY: STYLISTICS AND LANGUAGE CULTURE / BUSINESS UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE				
The course aims to develop accurate, clear and stylistically appropriate oral and written communication in Ukrainian in academic and professional contexts. It develops the ability to apply contemporary Ukrainian language norms, use introductory psychological terminology appropriately, prepare and edit academic and official texts, and adapt professional messages to their purpose and audience.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1	3 / mandatory	Olena Turchak, PhD, Associate Professor	90 hours (16 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 60 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Distinguish the stylistic features of official, academic and other professional texts and select language appropriate to the purpose, audience and communicative situation.			Interactive lectures, guided text analysis, comparison of text samples, discussions	Assessed text comparisons and explanations; written text-adaptation tasks; test questions (CAS)
2) Apply Ukrainian spelling, morphological, syntactic and punctuation norms when producing and editing academic and official texts.			Lectures with worked examples, practical language exercises, editing workshops, guided practice and self-directed work	Assessed editing exercises and explanations; written assignments; practical editing tasks in the comprehensive test (CAS)
3) Use introductory psychological terminology and professional vocabulary accurately and appropriately, consulting authoritative dictionaries and reference resources.			Guided dictionary searches, analysis of terminology in short professional texts, vocabulary exercises, discussion of alternative word choices	Assessed terminology exercises; a terminology-based written assignment; lexical and terminology questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
4) Prepare clearly structured official documents and short academic texts using appropriate conventions, register and source acknowledgement.			Analysis of model texts, guided drafting, practical writing workshops, peer review and revision	Written assignments involving an official document, professional correspondence and a source-based academic text; text-production tasks in the comprehensive test (CAS)
5) Deliver a structured oral presentation and participate in simulated professional exchanges, adapting terminology and			Guided speaking practice, role-plays, simulated professional discussions, short	Assessed individual contributions to simulated exchanges; an oral presentation with

explanations to specialist and non-specialist audiences.	presentations and peer feedback	multimedia support (CAS)
6) Revise professional messages using linguistic reference resources and feedback, justifying changes that improve accuracy, clarity, coherence and respectful communication.	Editing workshops, guided use of reference resources, peer review, self-editing and discussion of revisions	Assessed explanations of corrections; a revised text with an editing commentary; editing tasks in the comprehensive test (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
30 points (30%) for practical-class work: discussions, language exercises, text analysis, editing and simulated professional exchanges – six assessed task sets, 5 points each;
30 points (30%) for self-directed written assignments – six assignments, 5 points each;
10 points (10%) for an oral presentation with multimedia support;
30 points (30%) for a comprehensive written test.
Total: 100 points (100%).
The comprehensive written test is a component of CAS. There is no separately weighted final assessment (FAS). Individual contributions are assessed during group activities; attendance alone does not earn points.
The six written assignments comprise:
1. Comparison and adaptation of a short text for different purposes or audiences.
2. A terminology task using introductory psychological vocabulary and authoritative reference resources.
3. Preparation of an official document using a supplied model.
4. Preparation of professional correspondence for a simulated psychology-related situation.
5. A short source-based academic summary.
6. Revision of a professional text with a commentary explaining the corrections.

Assignment instructions, expected length, submission dates and assessment criteria are provided in advance.
Assessment criteria:
a) Practical-class work: discussions, language exercises, text analysis, editing and simulated professional exchanges
5 points: The student completes the tasks accurately, applies relevant language norms, and clearly explains linguistic or stylistic choices. Contributions are relevant and well-structured. In simulated exchanges, the student uses appropriate terminology, register and forms of address and responds effectively to the communicative situation.
4 points: The student completes most tasks correctly and provides generally sound explanations. Communication is clear and appropriate, although minor linguistic or stylistic inaccuracies occur. Some choices require further justification.
3 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but task completion is uneven. Explanations are mainly descriptive, and several errors in language use, terminology or register are present. Additional guidance is needed.
2 points: The student completes the tasks only partially and makes substantial errors. Explanations are limited, and communication is insufficiently adapted to the purpose or audience.
1 point: The student provides minimal relevant work and demonstrates major difficulties in applying language norms or completing the communicative task.
b) Self-directed written assignments
5 points: The text fully meets the task requirements, follows the conventions of the relevant genre, and is clear, coherent and appropriately structured. Vocabulary and terminology are accurate, and the register suits the intended audience. Spelling, grammar and punctuation are consistently correct,

with only isolated minor slips. Sources are acknowledged where required. Revisions are justified when an editing commentary is requested.
4 points: The text meets the main requirements and is logically structured. Genre conventions, vocabulary and terminology are generally appropriate. Minor linguistic or stylistic errors do not affect clarity. Source acknowledgement and explanations of revisions are generally adequate.
3 points: The text partially meets the requirements. Its structure and register are inconsistent, and noticeable errors occur in vocabulary, grammar, spelling or punctuation. Some terminology is imprecise. Source acknowledgement or explanations of revisions are incomplete.
2 points: The text addresses only part of the task and contains substantial structural and linguistic weaknesses. Genre conventions are inconsistently followed, terminology is frequently inaccurate, and errors sometimes obscure meaning.
1 point: The text contains minimal relevant material, does not follow the required genre or structure, and contains frequent errors that substantially hinder understanding.
c) Oral presentation with multimedia support
9–10 points: The presentation is clearly structured, accurate and appropriate to its purpose and audience. Introductory psychological concepts are explained using suitable terminology and accessible language. Speech follows Ukrainian pronunciation, stress and grammatical norms, with only isolated minor slips. Visual materials support the message, sources are acknowledged, and answers to questions are clear and relevant.
7–8 points: The presentation is informative and logically organised. Terminology, explanations and visual materials are generally appropriate. Minor linguistic inaccuracies or weaknesses in delivery do not substantially affect understanding. Responses to questions are mostly relevant.
5–6 points: The presentation communicates the main ideas but is unevenly structured or insufficiently adapted to the audience. Terminology or explanations are occasionally imprecise, and linguistic errors or excessive reliance on slides reduce clarity.
3–4 points: The presentation only partially addresses the task. Weak organisation, inaccurate terminology and frequent linguistic errors substantially limit clarity. Visual materials provide limited support, and responses to questions are incomplete.
1–2 points: The presentation contains minimal relevant content and lacks a coherent structure. Major difficulties in language use and explanation prevent effective communication.
For all coursework components, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task.
d) Comprehensive written test
The test assesses stylistic differentiation, professional vocabulary, spelling, morphology, syntax, punctuation and the preparation and editing of professional texts. The maximum score is 30 points:
10 points for closed-response questions on language norms, terminology and stylistic choices;
10 points for editing a professional text and explaining selected corrections;
10 points for producing a short official or academic text based on a specified communicative situation.
Text-editing and text-production tasks are assessed for linguistic accuracy, appropriateness of register and terminology, coherence, genre conventions and fulfilment of the communicative purpose. The criteria and allocation of points for each task are specified on the test card.

Content

Topic 1. Standard language as the basis of business and professional communication. Stylistic differentiation of the Ukrainian literary language
Topic 2. Features of Ukrainian orthography in professional communication and its importance for the correct preparation of official documents
Topic 3. Features of the lexical system of the Ukrainian literary language in professional communication
Topic 4. Ukrainian phraseology and its role in professional communication. Ukrainian lexicography. Word formation in business language
Topic 5. Ukrainian morphology. The role of morphological means in official documents
Topic 6. Syntactic features of professional communication
Topic 7. Features of Ukrainian punctuation in official documents

Topic 8. Features of oral professional communication
Literature
Compulsory reading 1. Plotnytska, I.M. (2026). Dilova ukrainska mova [Business Ukrainian]. 5th ed., revised and expanded. SBA Print. 260 p. 2. Turchak, O.M. (2018). Dilova ukrainska mova [Business Ukrainian]. Alfred Nobel University. 100 p.
Recommended reading 1. Babych, N.D. (Ed.). (2014). Kultura fakhovoho movlennia [Culture of Professional Speech]. 4th ed., revised and expanded. Knyhy-XXI. 556 p. 2. Schnurr, S. (2024). Exploring Professional Communication: Language in Action. 2nd ed. Routledge. 248 p.
Web-resources 1. National Commission on State Language Standards. (2026). Ukrainskyi pravopys [Ukrainian Orthography]. *Official edition*. https://mova.gov.ua/diyalnist-i-proyekti/termini/pravopys-ukrainskoi-movy 2. Ukrainian Lingua-Information Fund, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). Slovnyky Ukrainy [Dictionaries of Ukraine]. *Official resource*. https://ulif.mon.gov.ua/slovniki-ukrayini 3. Alfred Nobel University Library. (n.d.). Electronic Library. *Official resource*. https://lib.duan.edu.ua/uk/resursy/vlasni-elektronni-resursy/elektronna-byblyoteka/

FOREIGN LANGUAGE (ENGLISH)				
The course aims to develop the ability to communicate clearly and appropriately in English in everyday, academic and introductory professional contexts. It develops reading, listening, spoken interaction, presentation and writing skills, together with the ability to summarise information, explain ideas to different audiences and use language sensitively in intercultural situations. Selected activities introduce accessible psychology-related topics and vocabulary without requiring specialist professional knowledge.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
English	1, 2, 3, 4/ 56 weeks	24 / Mandatory	Olha Derbak, PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor; Nataliia Bespalova, Senior Lecturer; Paul Bradbeer, Senior Lecturer	720 hours (364 h. practical classes, 356 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes **On completion of the course, students will be able to:**			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Identify main ideas, relevant details and explicitly stated viewpoints in English texts on familiar general, academic and introductory psychology-related topics.			Guided reading, skimming and scanning exercises, vocabulary work, comparison of short texts, independent reading	Reading-comprehension tasks in achievement tests and the final test; source-based written assignments (CAS)
2) Identify main points and relevant details in clearly delivered spoken English on familiar topics, using contextual clues and note-taking strategies.			Guided listening, audio and video activities, listening for gist and detail, note-taking and pair-checking	Listening-comprehension tasks in achievement tests and the final test (CAS)
3) Apply grammatical structures and topic-related vocabulary to express information, opinions and explanations with sufficient accuracy and clarity for the communicative task.			Contextualised grammar and vocabulary practice, guided speaking and writing, error analysis, revision and feedback	Assessed spoken interaction; written assignments; contextualised language-use tasks in tests (CAS)
4) Participate in discussions and simulated every day or academic situations by asking questions, clarifying meaning, expressing and justifying opinions, and responding to others.			Pair and group work, information-gap activities, role-plays, problem-solving tasks, structured discussions	Assessed individual contributions to discussions, role-plays and problem-solving tasks (CAS)
5) Produce coherent written texts appropriate to the task, purpose and audience, including descriptions, narratives, emails, opinion essays and short reports.			Analysis of model texts, guided planning, drafting, peer review, self-editing and independent writing	Four assessed written assignments per semester; written production in the final test (CAS)
6) Deliver a structured presentation on a familiar topic, explain selected information in accessible language, and answer relevant questions.			Analysis of presentation models, guided preparation, rehearsal, short talks, individual presentations and feedback	One assessed individual presentation per semester, including responses to questions (CAS)

7) Summarise and paraphrase the main points of accessible source material for a specified audience, distinguishing source information from personal interpretation and acknowledging sources.	Guided summarising, paraphrasing exercises, comparison of source texts and summaries, short explanatory tasks	Source-based written assignments; source-based elements of presentations; summary tasks in tests (CAS)
8) Adapt language and interaction strategies to different audiences and intercultural situations by using respectful wording, checking understanding and clarifying possible misunderstandings.	Analysis of communication scenarios, role-plays, collaborative tasks, guided reflection and feedback	Assessed interaction in role-plays and discussions; audience adaptation in written assignments and presentations (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade in each semester is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
20 points (20%) for an individual presentation, including responses to questions;
20 points (20%) for spoken interaction: discussions, role-plays and problem-solving tasks – four assessed task sets, 5 points each;
20 points (20%) for written assignments – four assignments, 5 points each;
40 points (40%) for achievement tests and the final test: two achievement tests, 10 points each, and one final test, 20 points.
Total: 100 points (100%) per semester.
The final test is a component of CAS. There is no separately weighted final assessment (FAS).
Assessment tasks reflect the topics and language taught during the relevant semester. Instructions, expected text length, presentation duration, test specifications and deadlines are provided in advance. Individual contributions are assessed during pair and group activities. Attendance alone does not earn points.
The four written assignments include different text types selected from descriptions, narratives, emails, opinion essays and short reports. At least one assignment per semester involves summarising or paraphrasing an accessible source.
Peer assessment and self-assessment provide formative feedback. The lecturer awards the recorded marks using the published criteria.
Assessment criteria:
a) Individual presentation
16–20 points: The presentation fully addresses the task and has a clear introduction, logical development and conclusion. Ideas are supported with relevant information or examples. Vocabulary and grammatical structures are appropriate to the topic and audience. Speech is intelligible and generally fluent; occasional errors do not impede understanding. Visual materials support the message, sources are acknowledged where used, and answers to questions are relevant.
11–15 points: The presentation addresses the main requirements and is generally well organised. Vocabulary and grammar are sufficient to explain the main ideas. Some hesitation, repetition or inaccuracies occur, but the message remains clear. Supporting examples or responses to questions may lack detail.
6–10 points: The presentation partially addresses the task and has an uneven structure. Ideas are insufficiently developed, and vocabulary or grammatical limitations sometimes make meaning unclear. Delivery relies heavily on notes or slides. Responses to questions are limited.
1–5 points: The presentation addresses few task requirements and lacks a coherent structure. Very limited language resources, frequent breakdowns or unclear delivery substantially hinder understanding. The student has difficulty explaining the main ideas or responding to questions.
b) Spoken interaction: discussions, role-plays and problem-solving tasks
5 points: The student makes relevant contributions, explains and justifies opinions, responds appropriately to others, and helps sustain the interaction. Vocabulary and grammar are suitable for the task. The student checks understanding, clarifies meaning and uses respectful language. Errors do not impede communication.

4 points: The student participates effectively and expresses relevant ideas with some justification. Interaction is generally sustained, although occasional prompting or clarification is needed. Minor linguistic inaccuracies do not substantially affect understanding.
3 points: The student communicates basic ideas but provides limited explanation or justification. Interaction depends partly on prompting, and language errors or hesitation sometimes cause difficulty.
2 points: Contributions are brief and only partly relevant. Limited vocabulary, frequent errors and difficulty responding to others restrict the interaction.
1 point: The student produces isolated relevant words or phrases but cannot sustain the exchange, even with support.
c) Written assignments
5 points: The text fully addresses the task, follows the conventions of the required text type, and is clearly organised. Ideas are developed coherently using appropriate linking expressions. Vocabulary and grammatical structures are suitable for the purpose and audience. Errors are minor and do not impede understanding. Source information is paraphrased or summarised accurately and acknowledged where required.
4 points: The text addresses the main requirements and is generally coherent. Vocabulary, grammar and register are mostly appropriate. Some ideas lack development, and minor errors occur without substantially affecting clarity. Source use is generally appropriate where required.
3 points: The text partially addresses the task. Organisation and linking are inconsistent, ideas are insufficiently developed, and linguistic errors occasionally obscure meaning. Source-based information may be oversimplified or insufficiently distinguished from personal opinion.
2 points: The text addresses few requirements and has weak organisation. Restricted vocabulary and frequent grammatical or spelling errors make parts difficult to understand. Source use is limited or inaccurate where required.
1 point: The text contains minimal relevant material, lacks a clear structure, and contains frequent errors that substantially hinder understanding.
For presentations, spoken interaction and written assignments, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task. Pronunciation is assessed for intelligibility rather than conformity to a particular native-speaker accent.
d) Achievement tests and final test
Each achievement test carries a maximum of 10 points:
3 points for reading comprehension;
3 points for listening comprehension;
4 points for contextualised grammar and vocabulary tasks.
The final test carries a maximum of 20 points:
5 points for reading comprehension;
5 points for listening comprehension;
5 points for contextualised grammar and vocabulary tasks;
5 points for a short written text or source-based summary.
Reading and listening tasks assess understanding of main ideas, relevant details and viewpoints at the level taught during the semester. Closed-response tasks are assessed according to the answer key. Written production is assessed using the written-assignment criteria above. The allocation of points and accepted responses are specified in the test materials.

Content

Topic 1. Appearance and Style
Topic 2. Science and Technologies
Topic 3. Sport and Healthy Eating
Topic 4. Travel
Topic 5. Personal Qualities
Topic 6. Relationships, Conflicts and Problems
Topic 7. TV, News, Art and Games
Topic 8. Money, Payments, and Trade

Topic 9. The Power of Nature
Topic 10. Justice, Law, and Punishment

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Brayshaw, D., Hastings, B., Edwards, L., Bright, C., Fricker, R., Sosnowska, J. (2020). *High Note 3* (B1+/B2). Pearson.
2. Evans, V. (2020). *Round-up*. Harlow, Essex: Longman. 208 p.

Recommended reading

1. Capel, A., & Sharp, W. (2018). *Objective First*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Dooley, J., & Evans, V. (2019). *Grammarway 3*. Express Publishing.
3. Hewings, M. (2023). *Advanced Grammar in Use*. Cambridge University Press.
4. McCarthy, M. (2021). *English Vocabulary in Use*. Cambridge University Press. 309 p.
5. Murphy, R. (2019). *English Grammar in Use* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
6. Pavich, J. (2018). *Cambridge International AS Level English General Paper Coursebook* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
7. Prodromou, L. (2018). *Grammar and Vocabulary for First Certificate*. Longman.
8. Redman, S. (2018). *English Vocabulary in Use*. Cambridge University Press. 270 p.
9. Swan, M., & Walter, C. (2017). *How English Works (A Grammar Practice Book)*. Oxford University Press.
10. Vince, M., & Emmerson, P. (2019). *English Grammar and Vocabulary*. Macmillan.
11. Wyatt, R. (2012). *Check your vocabulary for IELTS*. Peter Collins Publishing.

Web-resources

1. British Council. (n.d.). LearnEnglish: Resources for Adult Learners. https://learnenglish.britishcouncil.org/
2. Cambridge English. (n.d.). Learning English: Activities for Learners. https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/learning-english/
3. BBC Learning English. (n.d.). English Language Learning Resources. https://www.bbc.co.uk/learningenglish
4. TED. (n.d.). TED Talks. Selected talks with transcripts. https://www.ted.com/talks
5. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume. Reference framework for course design and assessment. https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/cefr-companion-volume-and-its-language-versions

ANATOMY AND PHYSIOLOGY OF THE CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM				
The course aims to develop an understanding of the structure and functioning of the central nervous system and its contribution to sensation, movement, cognition, emotion and behaviour. It develops the ability to use basic neuroanatomical terminology, explain neural mechanisms, analyse introductory examples of brain-behaviour relationships, and evaluate simplified claims about brain functioning using academic sources.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1/14 weeks	4 / mandatory	Maryna Karpova, PhD	120 h. (28 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars/ practical, 78 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Identify the major structures of the brain and spinal cord on diagrams and models, describe their organisation, and use basic neuroanatomical terminology accurately.			Illustrated lectures, guided work with anatomical diagrams and models, labelling exercises, comparison of anatomical sections	Assessed identification and labelling tasks; an annotated anatomical diagram; diagram-based questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
2) Explain how the structure and properties of neurons and glial cells support neural signalling and the functioning of the central nervous system.			Lectures with worked examples, guided diagram analysis, animations, comparison tasks, short written explanations	Assessed structure–function exercises; written explanations; conceptual questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
3) Explain the basic mechanisms of resting and action potentials, synaptic transmission, excitation and inhibition, using diagrams and introductory examples.			Interactive lectures, guided interpretation of simplified graphs, process mapping, animations and problem-solving exercises	Assessed explanations of mechanisms; annotated process diagrams; graph-interpretation and short-answer questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
4) Trace simplified sensory and motor pathways and explain how receptors, neural pathways and central structures contribute to sensation and movement.			Lectures, guided pathway tracing, diagram construction, comparison of pathways, introductory case analysis	Assessed pathway-tracing tasks; a written pathway explanation; applied questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
5) Analyse introductory examples of cognition, memory, emotion and language by explaining the contribution of interacting brain structures and neural networks.			Problem-based lectures, comparison of structure–function relationships, guided case discussions, short analytical tasks	Assessed oral explanations; written analysis of an educational case; case-based questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)
6) Explain how development, experience and neuroplasticity influence nervous system functioning, and discuss the limitations of generalising from simplified examples to individual psychological functioning.			Lectures, guided reading, comparison of developmental examples, analysis of fictional cases, structured discussions	Assessed comparison tasks; a source-based analytical assignment; short-answer and case-based questions in the comprehensive test (CAS)

7) Use academic sources to evaluate a simplified claim about brain functioning and present a clear, evidence-based explanation, distinguishing established knowledge from unsupported inference.	Guided source searches, comparison of academic and popular accounts, source-evaluation exercises, peer feedback and revision	A written source-evaluation commentary; assessed explanation and discussion of conclusions (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
40 points (40%) for practical activities, discussions, anatomical identification, diagram analysis and introductory case-based tasks;
40 points (40%) for individual assignments: annotated diagrams, explanations of neural mechanisms, case analyses and source-based commentaries;
20 points (20%) for the final test.
Assessment criteria:
a) Practical activities and discussions – 40 points
31–40 points: The student accurately identifies anatomical structures, explains neural mechanisms and structure–function relationships, and uses terminology correctly. Interpretations of diagrams and introductory cases are coherent and well-founded.
21–30 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and completes most practical tasks correctly. Minor inaccuracies or omissions occur in terminology, explanations or case analysis.
11–20 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses are mainly descriptive. Identification, explanation and application contain noticeable errors and require guidance.
1–10 points: The student demonstrates fragmentary understanding, makes substantial errors and has difficulty explaining structures, mechanisms or their relationship to psychological functions.
b) Individual assignments – 40 points
31–40 points: Assignments fully address the tasks, present accurate information and clearly explain relevant relationships. Diagrams and terminology are used appropriately. Sources support the conclusions, and limitations of interpretations are recognised where relevant.
21–30 points: Assignments address the main requirements and demonstrate sound understanding. Analysis and source use are generally appropriate, with minor inaccuracies or insufficiently developed conclusions.
11–20 points: Assignments partially address the requirements. Explanations are incomplete or mainly descriptive, sources are used inconsistently, and conclusions lack sufficient justification.
1–10 points: Assignments contain substantial inaccuracies, weak analysis and poorly supported conclusions. Relevant structures and mechanisms are inadequately explained.
For practical activities and individual assignments, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task.
c) Final test – 20 points
The test assesses identification of central nervous system structures, explanation of neural mechanisms, interpretation of diagrams and application of knowledge to introductory brain–behaviour examples. The criteria and allocation of points for each task are specified on the test card.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to the Nervous System and Basic Neuroanatomical Terminology
Topic 2. Structure and Functions of Neurons and Glial Cells
Topic 3. Organisation of the Central Nervous System: Spinal Cord and Brain
Topic 4. Major Brain Structures and Functional Networks
Topic 5. Electrical Activity and Neural Signalling
Topic 6. Synaptic Transmission and Neurotransmitters
Topic 7. Sensory and Motor Systems
Topic 8. Neural Bases of Cognition, Memory, Emotion and Language
Topic 9. Development, Neuroplasticity and Functional Consequences of Central Nervous System Disorders

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Marunenko, I.M., Nevedomska, Ye.O., & Volkovska, H.I. (2019). Anatomiia, fiziolohiia, evoliutsiia nervovoi systemy [Anatomy, Physiology and Evolution of the Nervous System]. Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 184 p.

2. Boiarchuk, O. D. (2014). Anatomiia ta evoliutsiia nervovoi systemy [Anatomy and Evolution of the Nervous System]. Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. 395 p.

Recommended reading

1. Dufynets, V.A., & Shtykh, I.I. (Comps.). (2021). Anatomo-fiziolohichni osnovy nervovoi systemy [Anatomical and Physiological Foundations of the Nervous System]. Mukachevo State University. 33 p.

2. Sydorenko, P.I., Bondarenko, H.O., & Kuts, S.O. (2015). Anatomiia ta fiziolohiia liudyny [Human Anatomy and Physiology]. 5th ed., corrected. Medytsyna. 248 p.

3. Patestas, M.A., Meyer, A.J., & Gartner, L.P. (2025). A Textbook of Neuroanatomy. 3rd ed. Wiley. 576 p.

4. Mai, J.K., & Paxinos, G. (Eds.). (2012). The Human Nervous System. 3rd ed. Academic Press.

5. Ascenzi, B.M. (Ed.). (2025). From Anatomy to Function of the Central Nervous System: Clinical and Neurosurgical Applications. Academic Press.

6. Hoehn, K., Haynes, L. W., & Abbott, M. A. (2025). Marieb Human Anatomy & Physiology.

Web-resources

1. OpenStax. (n.d.). Anatomy and Physiology 2e. Open-access textbook. Selected sections on the nervous system. https://openstax.org/details/books/anatomy-and-physiology-2e

2. Society for Neuroscience. (n.d.). BrainFacts.org. Educational resources on the brain and nervous system. https://www.brainfacts.org/

3. McGovern Medical School, UTHealth Houston. (n.d.). Neuroscience Online. Open-access educational resource. https://nba.uth.tmc.edu/neuroscience/

4. Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. (n.d.). Anatomy and Evolution of the Nervous System. University repository resource. https://dspace.luguniv.edu.ua/xmlui/handle/123456789/1105

ANTHROPOLOGY				
The course aims to develop an understanding of human origins, evolutionary development and biological variation in their environmental, historical and cultural contexts. It develops the ability to interpret introductory anthropological evidence, compare explanations of human development, and critically examine claims about population differences. Particular attention is given to distinguishing biological variation from cultural identity and individual psychological characteristics.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1/14 weeks	3 / mandatory	Maryna Karpova, PhD (Pedagogy)	90 h. (14 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars/practical, 62 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the scope and principal branches of anthropology and distinguish anthropological questions from related questions in psychology, biology and history.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparison of disciplinary questions, concept mapping and seminar discussions	Assessed oral explanations; concept-mapping and comparison tasks; test questions (CAS)
2) Explain major developments in anthropological thought and identify how historical assumptions have influenced interpretations of human origins and diversity.			Lectures, comparison of historical and contemporary texts, guided source analysis and discussions	Assessed source comparisons; written analytical assignments; test questions (CAS)
3) Compare the purposes, types of evidence and limitations of selected anthropological methods, including palaeoanthropology, comparative anatomy, anthropometry and population studies.			Illustrated lectures, methodological demonstrations, guided analysis of published examples, comparison tasks	Assessed methodological exercises; written comparison of methods; source-based test questions (CAS)
4) Explain major developments in human evolution using selected fossil, archaeological and genetic evidence, distinguishing supported conclusions from hypotheses and uncertainty.			Lectures using visual materials, guided interpretation of evidence, timeline construction, comparison of explanations	Assessed evidence-analysis tasks; an annotated evolutionary timeline; source-based and short-answer test questions (CAS)
5) Analyse introductory examples of human biological variation by considering evolution, adaptation, migration and population history, without treating populations as fixed or internally uniform groups.			Problem-based lectures, guided interpretation of maps and simplified data, comparison tasks and case discussions	Assessed map and data interpretation; a written case analysis; applied test questions (CAS)
6) Distinguish biological variation, ancestry, ethnicity and cultural identity, and critically evaluate claims that infer individual psychological characteristics from appearance or group membership.			Guided comparison of concepts, analysis of fictional cases and media claims, structured discussions and reflective	Assessed case discussions; written critical commentary; case-based test questions (CAS)

	writing	
7) Summarise selected anthropological research on populations of Ukraine, acknowledging sources and explaining the historical context and limitations of the evidence.	Guided reading of Ukrainian anthropological sources, comparison of historical and contemporary interpretations, source-based writing and peer feedback	Written source-based summary; assessed explanation of findings and limitations; test questions (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
40 points (40%) for practical activities, seminar discussions, comparison tasks, interpretation of anthropological evidence and introductory case analysis;
40 points (40%) for individual assignments: concept maps, annotated timelines, methodological comparisons, source-based summaries and critical commentaries;
20 points (20%) for the final test.
Assessment criteria:
a) Practical activities and seminar discussions – 40 points
31–40 points: The student accurately explains anthropological concepts, compares relevant evidence and interpretations, and provides well-founded conclusions. Terminology is used appropriately, and limitations of evidence and population-level generalisations are recognised.
21–30 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and completes most tasks correctly. Explanations and comparisons are relevant, although some arguments lack depth or contain minor inaccuracies.
11–20 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses are mainly descriptive. Interpretation of evidence and comparison of explanations contain noticeable gaps and require guidance.
1–10 points: The student demonstrates fragmentary understanding, makes substantial conceptual errors and has difficulty interpreting evidence or justifying conclusions.
b) Individual assignments – 40 points
31–40 points: Assignments fully address the tasks and present accurate, clearly structured analysis. Relevant sources are acknowledged, evidence is distinguished from assumptions, and conclusions appropriately reflect the limitations of the material.
21–30 points: Assignments address the main requirements and demonstrate sound understanding. Sources and terminology are generally used appropriately, with minor inaccuracies or insufficiently developed conclusions.
11–20 points: Assignments partially address the requirements. Analysis is limited, sources are used inconsistently, and some conclusions are insufficiently supported or overly generalised.
1–10 points: Assignments contain substantial inaccuracies, weak analysis and poorly supported conclusions. Sources are inadequately used, and key concepts are confused.
For practical activities and individual assignments, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task.
c) Final test – 20 points
The test assesses understanding of anthropological concepts and methods, human evolution and variation, interpretation of introductory evidence, and critical evaluation of claims about population differences. The criteria and allocation of points for each task are specified on the test card.

Content

Topic 1. Anthropology: Subject, Principal Branches and Relationships with Psychology and Other Sciences.
Topic 2. The Development of Anthropology: Major Approaches and Historical Assumptions.
Topic 3. Research Methods and Evidence in Anthropology: Palaeoanthropology, Comparative Anatomy, Anthropometry and Population Studies.
Topic 4. Human Origins and Major Developments in Human Evolution.

Topic 5. Debates in Human Evolution: Evidence, Competing Explanations and Uncertainty.
Topic 6. Human Biological Variation, Ancestry and Ethnicity: Historical Racial Classifications and Contemporary Scientific Perspectives.
Topic 7. Anthropological Research on Populations of Ukraine: Historical Findings, Population Diversity and Limits of Interpretation.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Ember, C.R., Ember, M., & Peregrine, P.N. (2019). Anthropology. 15th ed. Pearson.
2. Larsen, C.S. (2025). Essentials of Biological Anthropology. 6th ed. W.W. Norton & Company. 552 p.
3. Popravko, O.V. (2016). Antropolohiia: Navchalnyi posibnyk [Anthropology: A Study Guide]. Bohdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University.
4. Shook, B., Braff, L., Nelson, K., & Aguilera, K. (Eds.). (2023). Explorations: An Open Invitation to Biological Anthropology. 2nd ed. American Anthropological Association.

Recommended reading

1. Eriksen, T.H. (2023). Small Places, Large Issues: An Introduction to Social and Cultural Anthropology. 5th ed. Pluto Press.
2. Ferraro, G., & Andreatta, S. (2018). Cultural Anthropology: An Applied Perspective. 11th ed. Cengage Learning.
3. Gezon, L., & Kottak, C.P. (2014). Culture. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill.
4. Hasty, J., Lewis, D.G., & Snipes, M.M. (2022). Introduction to Anthropology. OpenStax.
5. Haviland, W.A., Prins, H.E.L., McBride, B., & Walrath, D. (2017). Cultural Anthropology: The Human Challenge. 15th ed. Cengage Learning.
6. Kottak, C.P. (2022). Mirror for Humanity: A Concise Introduction to Cultural Anthropology. 13th ed. McGraw Hill.
7. Lavenda, R.H., & Schultz, E.A. (2020). Anthropology: What Does It Mean to Be Human? 5th ed. Oxford University Press.
8. Seheda, S.P. (2001). Antropolohiia [Anthropology]. Lybid.
9. Stanford, C., Allen, J.S., & Antón, S.C. (2026). Biological Anthropology: The Natural History of Humankind. 5th ed. Pearson.

Web-resources

1. Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History. (n.d.). Human Origins Program: Educational Resources. https://humanorigins.si.edu/education
2. American Anthropological Association. (2023). Explorations: An Open Invitation to Biological Anthropology. 2nd ed. Open-access textbook. https://americananthro.pressbooks.pub/explorationsbioanth2/
3. OpenStax. (2022). Introduction to Anthropology. Open-access textbook. https://openstax.org/books/introduction-anthropology/pages/1-introduction
4. American Association of Biological Anthropologists. (n.d.). Position Statements: Human Variation, Race and Research Ethics. https://bioanth.org/position-statements/
5. Royal Anthropological Institute. (n.d.). Discover Anthropology. Educational resource. https://discoveranthropology.org.uk/

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IN MODERN SOCIETY				
The course aims to develop the ability to select and use information technologies for academic and introductory psychology-related tasks. It develops skills in finding and evaluating information, preparing digital documents and presentations, organising and checking data, and collaborating through cloud services. Particular attention is given to responsible use of artificial intelligence, source acknowledgement, privacy and secure handling of information.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1/14 weeks	3 / mandatory	Olena Lavrentieva, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	90 hours (14 h. lectures, 16 h. laboratory classes, 60 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the functions of common information systems, hardware and software, and justify the selection of digital tools for a specified academic or introductory professional task.			Illustrated lectures, software demonstrations, comparison of tools, guided problem-solving and laboratory exercises	Assessed tool-selection tasks and explanations; laboratory reports; test questions (CAS)
2) Locate, evaluate and organise psychology-related information using search tools, electronic libraries, repositories and reference-management software.			Guided searches, comparison of sources, source-evaluation exercises, laboratory work and independent practice	A documented search and source-evaluation task; an organised reference collection; laboratory reports; test questions (CAS)
3) Produce and revise structured digital documents and presentations using appropriate formatting, visual design and source acknowledgement.			Demonstrations, guided document creation, practical workshops, peer review and revision	Assessed documents and presentations; independent assignments; the digital project (CAS)
4) Organise, check and summarise a supplied synthetic or anonymised dataset using spreadsheet functions, sorting, filtering and charts, and explain the results without drawing conclusions beyond the data.			Worked examples, guided spreadsheet exercises, error-checking tasks, chart comparison and independent practice	Spreadsheet files and laboratory reports; data-checking assignments; explanations of summaries and charts (CAS)
5) Create a simple structured database or data-entry form and explain basic decisions about fields, data types, validation and access.			Database demonstrations, guided design tasks, laboratory exercises and analysis of model databases	A simple database or form; a short design explanation; test questions (CAS)
6) Collaborate on a digital task using cloud services, shared files and online communication tools, applying appropriate access settings and clear communication practices.			Small-group tasks, collaborative editing, simulated remote interaction, peer feedback and laboratory work	Assessed individual contributions to shared tasks; laboratory reports; collaborative outputs and explanations (CAS)
7) Evaluate the usefulness and limitations of AI-generated outputs and apply basic			Guided AI-output comparison, fact-checking	A critical AI-output commentary; assessed

principles of privacy, information security, copyright and academic integrity when using digital tools.	exercises, analysis of fictional privacy and security cases, discussions and independent tasks	security and access-setting tasks; scenario-based test questions; project documentation (CAS)
8) Develop and present a functional digital product or prototype for a specified learning or introductory psychology-related task, explaining the choice of tools, limitations and improvements made following feedback.	Project-based learning, guided planning, prototyping, consultation, peer review and demonstration	Assessment of the digital product or prototype, supporting documentation and oral defence (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
35 points (35%) for laboratory work – seven assessed task sets, 5 points each;
35 points (35%) for independent assignments – seven assignments, 5 points each;
20 points (20%) for testing – two achievement tests, 5 points each, and a final test, 10 points;
10 points (10%) for a digital project and its oral defence.
Assessment criteria:
a) Laboratory work – 35 points
5 points: The student independently completes the task, selects appropriate tools and produces an accurate, functional and properly organised output. The student explains the procedure, checks the result and identifies relevant limitations or risks.
4 points: The student completes the task correctly and uses the tools appropriately. Minor technical or presentation errors occur, but the output meets the main requirements and can be corrected independently.
3 points: The student completes the main operations and produces a usable output, although some errors or omissions remain. Guidance is needed for more complex elements or verification of the result.
2 points: The student completes the task partially, relies substantially on a model or detailed instructions, and makes errors that affect the output's accuracy or functionality.
1 point: Only isolated elements are completed. Significant difficulties with the software or procedure prevent production of a usable result.
b) Independent assignments – 35 points
5 points: The assignment fully meets the requirements and demonstrates independent, appropriate use of digital tools. Information and data are checked, sources are acknowledged, and the output is accurate, coherent and functional. Tool choices and limitations are explained where required.
4 points: The assignment meets the main requirements and demonstrates sound practical skills. Minor inaccuracies or weaknesses in documentation do not substantially affect the output.
3 points: The assignment partially meets the requirements. The output is usable but contains technical, structural or content-related weaknesses. Verification and explanation are limited.
2 points: The assignment is incomplete and contains substantial errors. Tool use is poorly justified, and the output requires significant revision.
1 point: The assignment contains minimal relevant work and does not demonstrate sufficient command of the required operations.
c) Digital project and oral defence – 10 points
The maximum score comprises 8 points for the digital product and supporting documentation and 2 points for its oral defence.
7–8 points for the product: The product or prototype meets the stated purpose, functions as intended and uses appropriate digital tools. Content, structure and visual presentation are coherent. Sources and any permitted AI assistance are acknowledged, and relevant privacy, access and technical limitations are addressed.
5–6 points for the product: The product meets the main requirements and is generally functional. Some features, documentation or presentation elements require improvement.

3–4 points for the product: The product is partially functional or incompletely developed. Significant weaknesses affect its usability, content or documentation.
1–2 points for the product: The product contains minimal relevant development and does not adequately fulfil its stated purpose.
2 points for the defence: The student clearly demonstrates the product, justifies tool choices and answers questions about its operation, limitations and development.
1 point for the defence: The student demonstrates the main features but provides incomplete explanations or has difficulty answering questions.
For laboratory work, independent assignments, the project product and its defence, 0 points are awarded when no assessable work is provided or the response is unrelated to the task.
d) Tests – 20 points
The tests assess understanding of information systems, software functions, information evaluation, spreadsheet and database principles, digital collaboration, information security and responsible AI use. They include closed-response questions and short task-based or scenario-based questions. The criteria and allocation of points are specified on the test card.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Information Technologies and Their Role in Modern Society.
Topic 2. Application Software for Academic and Psychology-Related Tasks.
Topic 3. Digital Transformation, Artificial Intelligence and Digital Identity.
Topic 4. Cloud Technologies: Services, Opportunities and Risks.
Topic 5. Databases: Structure, Data Types, Queries and Basic Design.
Topic 6. Word Processing: Document Structure, Formatting, Tables and Illustrations.
Topic 7. Digital Presentations: Structure, Visual Design and Delivery.
Topic 8. Spreadsheets: Formulas, Functions, Sorting, Filtering and Data Checking.
Topic 9. Spreadsheet Charts, Conditional Formatting, Data-Entry Forms and Printing.
Topic 10. Online Communication, Open Educational Resources and Remote Collaboration.
Topic 11. Electronic Libraries, Repositories, Reference Management and Information Evaluation.
Topic 12. Digital Project Development: Information Security, Privacy, Copyright and Responsible Use of AI and Cloud Services.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Kravchenko, I.V., & Mykytenko, V.I. (2022). Informatsiini tekhnolohii [Information Technologies]. Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 447 p.
2. Ryndiuk, D.V., & Peshko, V.A. (2022). Informatsiini tekhnolohii [Information Technologies]. Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 180 p.
3. Lizunov, P.P., Kara, I.D., Nedin, V.O., Zatyliuk, H.A., & Stryhun, R.L. (2025). Robota zi standartnym paketom Microsoft Office. Microsoft Word [Working with the Standard Microsoft Office Suite: Microsoft Word]. Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture. 99 p.
4. Lizunov, P.P., Kara, I.D., Andriievskyi, V.P., & Nedin, V.O. (2025). Robota zi standartnym paketom Microsoft Office. Microsoft Excel [Working with the Standard Microsoft Office Suite: Microsoft Excel]. Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture.
5. Lambert, J. (2023). Microsoft Word Step by Step (Office 2021 and Microsoft 365). Microsoft Press. 656 p.

Recommended reading

1. Hurzhii, A.M., Voznenko, L.I., Povorozniuk, N.I., & Samsonov, V.V. (2023). Osnovy informatsiinykh tekhnolohii [Fundamentals of Information Technologies]. Litera LTD. 288 p.
2. Alexander, M., & Kusleika, D. (2025). Microsoft Excel 365 Bible. 2nd ed. Wiley. 1088 p.
3. Baker, P. (2025). ChatGPT For Dummies. 2nd ed. Wiley. 352 p.
4. Lavrentieva, O.O., & Krupskyi, O.P. (2024). Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Using Information and Cognitive Technologies in the Training of Transport Specialists. Alfred Nobel University Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology, 1 (27), 185–197.

Web-resources

1. Microsoft. (n.d.). Word Help and Learning. Official tutorials and guidance on document creation, formatting and editing. https://support.microsoft.com/word

2. Microsoft. (n.d.). Excel Help and Learning. Official tutorials and guidance on formulas, functions, tables and charts. https://support.microsoft.com/excel

3. Microsoft. (n.d.). PowerPoint Help and Learning. Official tutorials and guidance on presentation design and delivery. https://support.microsoft.com/powerpoint

4. Microsoft. (n.d.). Access Help and Learning. Official tutorials and guidance on databases, tables, queries and forms. https://support.microsoft.com/access

5. Google. (n.d.). Google Workspace Learning Center. Official learning resources for Docs, Sheets, Slides, Drive and Meet. https://support.google.com/a/users/

6. Zotero. (n.d.). Zotero Documentation. Official guidance on collecting, organising and citing sources. https://www.zotero.org/support/

7. Canva. (n.d.). Canva Design School. Learning resources for presentations, infographics and visual communication. https://www.canva.com/designschool/

8. Prometheus. (n.d.). Pochatok roboty z ChatGPT [Getting Started with ChatGPT]. Online course in Ukrainian. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-free/intro-to-chatgpt/

9. Diia.Osvita. (n.d.). Kiberhihiiena dlia molodi [Cyber Hygiene for Young People]. Online educational series in Ukrainian. https://osvita.diia.gov.ua/courses/cyber-hygiene-for-youth

10. Alfred Nobel University Library. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://lib.duan.edu.ua/uk/

11. Alfred Nobel University. (n.d.). *Institutional Repository*. https://ir.duan.edu.ua/

PSYCHOPHYSIOLOGY AND FUNDAMENTALS OF MEDICAL KNOWLEDGE				
The course aims to develop an understanding of the physiological mechanisms underlying mental processes, behaviour and adaptation, and the ability to apply this knowledge when analysing every day and introductory professional situations. It develops skills in interpreting basic psychophysiological information, evaluating health-related claims, recognising situations requiring medical assistance and demonstrating basic first-aid responses in simulated settings. Particular attention is given to ethical practice, individual differences and the boundaries between psychological support and medical care.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2/14 weeks	4 / mandatory	Maryna Karpova, PhD (Pedagogy)	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 22 h. practical classes, 78 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain how neural, autonomic and endocrine mechanisms contribute to mental processes, behaviour and adaptation, using appropriate psychophysiological terminology.			Illustrated lectures, guided reading, concept mapping, structured discussions and analysis of everyday examples	Assessed explanations and concept maps; written assignments (CAS); final exam (FAS)
2) Compare the physiological mechanisms involved in sensation, perception, attention, learning and memory, and apply this knowledge to explain supplied examples of behaviour.			Lectures, demonstrations, comparative tasks, guided problem-solving and case discussions	Comparative assignments and case analyses; practical tasks (CAS); final exam (FAS)
3) Analyse the relationships between physiological arousal, emotions, stress, sleep and performance, taking account of individual differences and contextual factors.			Case-based learning, analysis of supplied data, structured discussions and independent reading	Written case analyses and data-interpretation tasks (CAS); final exam (FAS)
4) Interpret basic non-invasive psychophysiological observations and supplied recordings, identifying measurement limitations and avoiding unsupported diagnostic conclusions.			Demonstration of measurement procedures, supervised practical exercises, analysis of sample recordings and error-identification tasks	Practical reports and interpretation tasks (CAS); final exam (FAS)
5) Evaluate introductory health-related information and explain how illness, pain, injury and psychoactive substances may influence mental functioning and behaviour, identifying when medical consultation is required.			Guided source evaluation, comparison of health claims, case studies and problem-solving discussions	Source-evaluation assignments and referral decisions in case studies (CAS); final exam (FAS)
6) Demonstrate an appropriate initial response to simulated medical emergencies, including seeking professional assistance and performing basic first-aid procedures within the limits of training.			Instructor demonstrations, supervised skills practice, emergency simulations and feedback	Observed skills demonstrations using checklists (CAS); final exam (FAS)
7) Formulate evidence-informed			Guided preparation of	Written

explanations and basic health-supporting recommendations concerning sleep, stress and everyday functioning, acknowledging uncertainty, ethical considerations and professional boundaries.	psychoeducational materials, case discussions, peer feedback and revision	psychoeducational assignments and oral explanations (CAS); final exam (FAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on continuous assessment (CAS) and final assessment (FAS):
30 points (30%) for practical assignments and case analyses – six assignments, 5 points each;
20 points (20%) for independent written assignments – four assignments, 5 points each;
10 points (10%) for a practical first-aid skills demonstration;
40 points (40%) for the final exam.
Assessment criteria:
a) Practical assignments and case analyses
5 points: The student accurately explains relevant physiological mechanisms, applies them to the task and provides a coherent, evidence-informed interpretation. Individual differences, limitations and professional boundaries are appropriately considered.
4 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and applies relevant knowledge correctly. Minor inaccuracies or omissions do not substantially affect the interpretation.
3 points: The student identifies the main mechanisms and partially applies them to the task. Explanations contain inaccuracies, and conclusions require further justification.
1–2 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, makes substantial errors or provides conclusions that are insufficiently supported by the available information.
b) Independent written assignments
5 points: The assignment fully addresses the task, uses appropriate sources and presents accurate, logically organised explanations. Claims are critically considered, sources are acknowledged and recommendations remain within the stated professional boundaries.
4 points: The assignment addresses the main requirements and uses relevant sources. Minor inaccuracies or weaknesses in analysis and organisation are present.
3 points: The assignment partially addresses the task. Description predominates over analysis, and the use of evidence or acknowledgement of limitations is insufficient.
1–2 points: The assignment is incomplete, contains substantial factual errors or relies on unsupported claims. Sources are inadequately used or acknowledged.
c) Practical first-aid skills demonstration
9–10 points: The student performs the simulated response in the appropriate sequence, observes safety precautions, requests professional assistance and demonstrates the required skills accurately and independently.
7–8 points: The student completes the main actions correctly. Minor omissions occur but do not compromise essential safety.
5–6 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but requires prompting and makes errors in the sequence or execution of actions.
1–4 points: The student demonstrates limited competence, omits essential actions or makes errors that would compromise safety. Further supervised practice is required.
d) Final exam
The examination comprises written questions and applied tasks worth 30 points and a structured first-aid practical station worth 10 points.
Written component – 30 points
27–30 points: The student demonstrates accurate and comprehensive knowledge, correctly applies physiological concepts, interprets supplied information critically and provides well-supported conclusions.
21–26 points: The student demonstrates sound knowledge and appropriate application. Minor inaccuracies or omissions do not substantially affect the conclusions.
15–20 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge but makes significant errors in application

or interpretation. Conclusions are only partially justified.
1–14 points: The student demonstrates fragmented knowledge, makes substantial factual errors and provides unsupported or inappropriate conclusions.

Content

Topic 1. Psychophysiology: Subject, Methods, Ethical Principles and Relevance to Psychological Practice.
Topic 2. Neural, Autonomic and Endocrine Regulation of Mental Activity and Behaviour.
Topic 3. Psychophysiological Mechanisms of Sensation and Perception.
Topic 4. Psychophysiological Mechanisms of Attention, Learning, Memory and Executive Functions.
Topic 5. Emotions, Motivation, Physiological Arousal and Individual Differences.
Topic 6. Stress, Adaptation, Fatigue and Psychophysiological Self-Regulation.
Topic 7. Sleep, Wakefulness, Biological Rhythms and Everyday Functioning.
Topic 8. Psychophysiological Assessment: Basic Indicators, Measurement Limitations and Interpretation.
Topic 9. Fundamentals of Health and Illness: Pain, Injury, Psychoactive Substances and Changes in Mental Functioning.
Topic 10. Recognition of Medical Emergencies, Professional Boundaries and Referral for Medical Assistance.
Topic 11. Basic First Aid: Initial Assessment, Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Automated External Defibrillation and Airway Obstruction.
Topic 12. Basic First Aid for Bleeding, Injuries, Burns, Seizures and Other Common Emergencies.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Dehtiarenko-Melnyk, T.V., & Brynza, I.V. (2023). Psykhofiziolohiia [Psychophysiology]. Odesa: South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky. 273 p.
2. Kots, S.M., & Kots, V.P. (2026). Domedychna dopomoha [First Aid]. Kharkiv: H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University. 551 p.
3. McNamara, P. (2023). The Neuroscience of Sleep and Dreams. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 268 p.
4. Ovcharenko, O.Yu. (Comp.). (2023). Psykholohiia stresu ta stresovykh rozladiv [Psychology of Stress and Stress Disorders]. Kyiv: University "Ukraine". 266 p.
5. Pinel, J.P.J., & Barnes, S.J. (2022). Biopsychology. 11th ed., Global Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. 624 p.

Recommended reading

1. Bear, M.F., Connors, B.W., & Paradiso, M.A. (2025). Neuroscience: Exploring the Brain. 5th ed. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning. 975 p.
2. Cacioppo, J.T., Tassinary, L.G., & Berntson, G.G. (Eds.). (2017). Handbook of Psychophysiology. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 730 p.
3. Carlson, N.R., & Birkett, M.A. (2022). Physiology of Behavior. 13th ed., Global Edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited. 728 p.
4. Chachko, S.L., & Shvaikin, S.A. (Comps.). (2025). Psykhofiziolohiia: elektronni metodychni rekomendatsii do kursu [Psychophysiology: Electronic Methodological Recommendations for the Course]. Odesa: Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University. 35 p.
5. Dehtiarenko-Melnyk, T.V., & Brynza, I.V. (2024). Psykhofiziolohiia rukhovoi diialnosti [Psychophysiology of Motor Activity]. Odesa: South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K. D. Ushynsky. 379 p.
6. Lehrer, P.M., & Woolfolk, R.L. (Eds.). (2021). Principles and Practice of Stress Management. 4th ed. New York: Guilford Press. 672 p.
7. Makarchuk, M.Yu., Kutsenko, T.V., Kravchenko, V.I., & Danylov, S.A. (2011). Psykhofiziolohiia [Psychophysiology]. Kyiv: Interservis. 328 p.
8. Marks, D.F., Murray, M., Estacio, E.V., Annunziato, R.A., Locke, A., & Treharne, G.J. (2024). Health Psychology: Theory, Research and Practice. 7th ed. London: SAGE Publications. 768 p.
9. Overchuk, V.A., Mishchuk, S.S., & Bozhenko, V.H. (Comps.). (2023). Anatomiia ta psykhofiziolohiia TsNS [Anatomy and Psychophysiology of the Central Nervous System]. Part I. Vinnytsia: Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University. 192 p.

10. World Health Organization. (2020). Doing What Matters in Times of Stress: An Illustrated Guide. Geneva: World Health Organization. 132 p.

Web-resources

1. Ministry of Health of Ukraine. (2022). Pro zatverdzhennia poriadkiv nadannia domedychnoi dopomohy osobam pry nevidkladnykh stanakh [Approval of Procedures for Providing First Aid to Persons in Emergency Conditions]. Order No. 441 of 9 March 2022. Current consolidated text. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0356-22

2. Ukrainian Red Cross Society. (n.d.). First Aid Training. Official information on first-aid training and practical skills. https://redcross.org.ua/fat/

3. British Red Cross. (n.d.). First Aid. Educational resources and first-aid learning materials. https://www.redcross.org.uk/first-aid

4. OpenStax. (n.d.). Anatomy and Physiology 2e. Open-access textbook. Selected sections on neural, autonomic and endocrine regulation. https://openstax.org/books/anatomy-and-physiology-2e/pages/1-introduction

5. World Health Organization. (n.d.). Brain Health. Official information on brain functioning and determinants of brain health across the life course. https://www.who.int/health-topics/brain-health who.int

6. World Health Organization. (2026). Stress. Questions and answers on stress, its effects on mental and physical health, individual responses and coping strategies. https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/stress

7. National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke. (n.d.). Brain Basics. Educational resources on brain functioning and sleep. https://www.ninds.nih.gov/health-information/public-education/brain-basics

8. BrainFacts.org. (n.d.). Neuroscience Core Concepts. Interactive educational resources on neural communication, information processing, learning and behaviour. https://www.brainfacts.org/coreconcepts

9. Khan Academy. (n.d.). Health and Medicine. Educational videos and practice activities. Selected units on nervous and endocrine system physiology, brain function and mental health. https://www.khanacademy.org/health-and-medicine

10. Duke University. (n.d.). Medical Neuroscience. Online course. Selected introductory materials on neural signalling, sensory systems and the neural mechanisms of behaviour. https://online.duke.edu/course/medical-neuroscience/

FOREIGN LANGUAGE FOR PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION				
The course aims to develop students' ability to communicate effectively in English in academic and professional contexts related to psychology. It develops the integrated use of reading, listening, speaking and writing, with particular attention to psychological terminology, critical engagement with sources, professional discussions, presentations and written communication. Simulated professional interactions provide opportunities to practise clear, respectful and ethically appropriate language, including clarification, paraphrasing and the communication of psychological information to different audiences.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
English	5, 6, 7, 8/ 50 weeks	16 / Mandatory	Olha Derbak, PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor; Nataliia Bespalova, Senior Lecturer	480 hours (166 h. practical classes, 314 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Use psychological terminology and appropriate grammatical structures to explain concepts and communicate information accurately in familiar academic and professional contexts.			Vocabulary and grammar workshops, contextualised language exercises, guided speaking and writing, independent practice	Assessed oral and written tasks; achievement tests (CAS); final exam (FAS)
2) Analyse selected authentic texts on psychological topics, distinguish main arguments from supporting evidence, and summarise and discuss their content with appropriate source acknowledgement.			Guided reading, text analysis, comparison of sources, summarising, discussions and independent reading	Reading-comprehension tasks, summaries, discussions and essays (CAS); final exam (FAS)
3) Interpret the main ideas and relevant details of selected professional recordings and interviews, using prediction, listening for specific information and note-taking strategies.			Guided listening, prediction exercises, repeated listening, note-taking, comparison of notes and follow-up discussions	Listening-comprehension tasks and assessed notes (CAS); final exam (FAS)
4) Conduct simulated professional conversations using active listening, clarification, paraphrasing and respectful questioning, and summarise supplied case information without making unsupported clinical claims.			Model-dialogue analysis, role-plays, guided case discussions, simulated interviews and feedback	Assessed role-plays, oral case summaries and written case responses (CAS); final exam (FAS)
5) Participate in professional discussions and collaborative tasks, substantiate a position with relevant evidence, respond to alternative views and negotiate shared conclusions.			Structured discussions, debates, small-group problem-solving, collaborative tasks and peer feedback	Discussion and case-study assessment, including individual contributions to group work (CAS); final exam (FAS)
6) Deliver a structured presentation on a psychological topic, adapt terminology and			Source searches, presentation planning, individual and small-group	Presentation and question-and-answer

explanations to the audience, acknowledge sources and respond to questions.	presentations, rehearsal and peer feedback	assessment (CAS); final exam (FAS)
7) Produce and revise coherent essays, summaries and short professional texts on psychological topics, synthesising relevant information and following appropriate conventions of style, referencing and confidentiality.	Model-text analysis, guided writing, drafting, peer review, editing and independent writing	Essays, summaries and written case responses (CAS); final exam (FAS)

Assessment

Each semester is assessed separately on a 100-point scale.
Semesters 5–7
The semester grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
20 points (20%) for participation in discussions and role-plays;
20 points (20%) for oral presentations with multimedia support;
20 points (20%) for participation in case studies;
20 points (20%) for written assignments: essays, summaries and short professional texts;
20 points (20%) for achievement tests covering reading, listening and the use of professional English.
Semester 8
The semester grade is based on continuous assessment (60%) and the final exam (40%):
20 points (20%) for participation in discussions and role-plays (CAS);
20 points (20%) for participation in case studies, including written case responses (CAS);
20 points (20%) for oral presentations with multimedia support (CAS);
40 points (40%) for the final exam (FAS).
For each CAS category worth 20 points, the mean task score on the relevant scale below is converted proportionally to a maximum of 20 points. Required tasks and deadlines are communicated at the beginning of each semester. Peer feedback supports learning; grades are awarded by the lecturer.
Assessment criteria:
a) Participation in discussions and role-plays
5 points: The student fulfils the task, communicates clearly and independently, and uses appropriate psychological terminology and varied grammatical structures. Ideas are supported with relevant arguments. The student responds appropriately to others and uses clarification and paraphrasing effectively. Minor errors do not hinder understanding.
4 points: The student fulfils the main task requirements and communicates effectively. Vocabulary and grammar are generally appropriate, although occasional inaccuracies or hesitation occur. Arguments are relevant but may lack development.
3 points: The student communicates the main message but participates inconsistently or requires prompting. Vocabulary and grammatical structures are limited, and errors sometimes hinder understanding. Arguments and responses are insufficiently developed.
1–2 points: The student provides isolated or poorly connected responses and has difficulty maintaining the interaction. Frequent language errors substantially hinder understanding. Most task requirements are not fulfilled.
b) Participation in case studies
5 points: The student accurately summarises the supplied case information, distinguishes facts from assumptions and communicates a clear, well-supported response in appropriate English. The student contributes constructively and observes confidentiality and professional boundaries.
4 points: The student communicates the main case information accurately and provides a relevant response. Minor language errors, omissions or weaknesses in justification do not substantially affect clarity.
3 points: The student communicates some relevant information but omits important details or provides limited justification. Language difficulties sometimes affect clarity, and guidance is required.
1–2 points: The student substantially misrepresents or incompletely communicates the case information. The response is poorly supported, and frequent language errors hinder understanding.

c) Oral presentations with multimedia support
9–10 points: The presentation is clearly structured, accurate and appropriate to the audience. The student explains ideas coherently, uses relevant psychological terminology, acknowledges sources and integrates effective visual support. Delivery is intelligible, and questions are answered clearly and appropriately.
7–8 points: The presentation addresses the topic effectively and is well organised. Language and terminology are generally appropriate. Minor weaknesses in delivery, visual support or responses to questions do not substantially affect communication.
5–6 points: The presentation partially addresses the topic. Organisation, explanation or visual support is inconsistent. Language errors or dependence on reading sometimes hinder communication. Responses to questions are incomplete.
1–4 points: The presentation is poorly organised or substantially incomplete. Frequent language errors and unclear explanations hinder understanding. Sources are inadequately acknowledged, and the student has difficulty responding to questions.
d) Written assignments
5 points: The text fully addresses the task, follows the required structure and presents coherent, well-supported ideas. Terminology, grammar and register are appropriate. Sources are accurately acknowledged where required. Minor errors do not affect clarity.
4 points: The text addresses the main requirements and is logically organised. Vocabulary and grammar are generally appropriate. Minor weaknesses in argumentation, referencing or language do not substantially affect understanding.
3 points: The text partially addresses the task. Organisation and argumentation are inconsistent, and source integration is limited. Language errors sometimes hinder understanding.
1–2 points: The text is substantially incomplete or poorly organised. Ideas are insufficiently developed, sources are inadequately acknowledged, and frequent language errors substantially hinder understanding.
e) Achievement tests
Achievement tests assess reading comprehension, listening comprehension, psychological terminology and grammar in context. Task-specific criteria and point allocations are provided on the test paper. The combined results are converted proportionally to a maximum of 20 points.
f) Final exam – 40 points
The final exam comprises four components:
10 points for reading comprehension and the use of psychological terminology in context;
10 points for listening comprehension;
10 points for a written communication task;
10 points for an oral component comprising a short presentation and a simulated professional interaction.
Reading and listening tasks assess understanding of main ideas, relevant details and relationships between ideas. Points are awarded for correct responses according to the marking scheme provided on the examination paper.
The written communication task is assessed using four criteria: task fulfilment and development of ideas – 3 points; organisation and coherence – 2 points; vocabulary and grammatical accuracy – 3 points; appropriate register and professional conventions, including source acknowledgement where required – 2 points.
The oral component is assessed using four criteria: task fulfilment and relevance – 3 points; psychological terminology and grammatical accuracy – 3 points; fluency and intelligibility – 2 points; interaction, clarification and responses to questions – 2 points.
For all assessment components, 0 points are awarded when no assessable response is provided or the response is unrelated to the task.

Content

Topic 1. The History of Psychology.
Topic 2. Psychology as a Science. Development of Psychological Ideas.

Topic 3. Major Schools and Approaches in Psychology.
Topic 4. Professional Roles and Responsibilities of Psychologists.
Topic 5. Psychological Well-being and Mental Health.
Topic 6. Healthy and Unhealthy Relationships.
Topic 7. Family Relationships and Communication Challenges.
Topic 8. Psychological Effects of Harmful Relationship Patterns on Individuals.
Topic 9. Stress Management. Conflict Resolution and Strategies for Strengthening Relationships.
Topic 10. Strategies for Building Healthy Connections and Maintaining Personal Boundaries.
Topic 11. Work and Organisational Psychology: Personnel Selection, Occupational Burnout and Work–Life Balance.
Topic 12. The Concept of Social Interaction and Its Role in Human Behaviour.
Topic 13. Educational and Cognitive Psychology: Thinking, Attention, Memory, and Intelligence.
Topic 14. Individual Differences: Temperament, Personality and Emotion Regulation.
Topic 15. Individual and Group Counselling and Psychotherapy: Terminology, Approaches and Professional Communication.
Topic 16. Contemporary Psychological Research and Practice: Reading, Summarising and Discussing Evidence.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Kuzyo, L.I. (2018). English for Specific Purposes: Psychology in Use. Part I. Lviv: Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 88 p.
2. LangLover. (2023). English for Psychologist: English for the Best Professionals. LangLover. 142 p.
3. Gilliland, T., & Dooley, J. (2017). Career Paths: Psychology. Student's Book with DigiBooks App. Newbury: Express Publishing. 120 p.

Recommended reading

1. Hayes, N., & Stratton, P. (2022). A Student's Dictionary of Psychology and Neuroscience. 7th ed. London: Routledge. 434 p.
2. Corsini, R. J. (1999). The Dictionary of Psychology. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel. 1156 p.
3. Seal, B. (2012). Academic Encounters Level 4: Human Behavior. Student's Book Reading and Writing. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 232 p.
4. VandenBos, G. R. (Ed.). (2015). APA Dictionary of Psychology. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 1221 p.

Web-resources

1. TED. (n.d.). TED Talks. Recorded talks for listening practice, note-taking and discussion. Selected talks on psychology and human behaviour. https://www.ted.com/talks
2. TED-Ed. (n.d.). Lessons Worth Sharing. Educational videos and learning activities. Selected lessons on psychology, cognition and mental health. https://ed.ted.com/
3. The Psychology Podcast. (n.d.). Official YouTube channel. Selected interviews for professional listening practice and critical discussion. https://www.youtube.com/@ThePsychologyPodcast

FUNDAMENTALS OF CIVIL PROTECTION AND OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY				
The course aims to provide students with fundamental knowledge and practical skills in civil protection and occupational safety, including legal regulations, risk prevention, workplace safety, and emergency response. It focuses on ensuring safe working conditions, protecting human health, and developing the ability to act effectively in normal and emergency situations. The course also promotes responsible behaviour, a safety culture, and the ability to use official information sources and communicate safety instructions clearly in educational and professional settings.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian, English	2 /14 weeks	3 / Mandatory	Oleksandr Pankov, Lecturer	90 hours (16 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 60 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the key concepts, principles and responsibilities associated with civil protection and occupational safety, distinguishing individual responsibilities from organisational duties.			Illustrated lectures, guided reading, concept mapping and structured discussions	Oral explanations, written assignments and test questions (CAS)
2) Locate relevant provisions in current Ukrainian legislation and official guidance and apply them to supplied workplace and emergency scenarios, distinguishing legal requirements from recommendations.			Guided searches of official sources, document analysis, worked examples and case discussions	Source-based assignments, case analyses and scenario-based test questions (CAS)
3) Identify physical, electrical, fire, ergonomic and psychosocial hazards in educational and psychology-related workplaces and assess their likelihood and potential consequences using a simple risk-assessment framework.			Hazard-identification exercises, analysis of workplace images and descriptions, guided risk assessment and small-group problem-solving	Hazard-identification tasks, risk-assessment records and case analyses (CAS)
4) Propose and justify proportionate measures to prevent or reduce identified risks, taking account of working conditions, available resources and the needs of different people.			Worked examples, case-based learning, preparation of preventive action plans and peer feedback	Preventive action plans, written justifications and practical assignments (CAS)
5) Use official digital information sources to verify safety messages and communicate clear, accessible instructions for a specified workplace or emergency situation.			Guided source evaluation, comparison of safety messages, preparation of brief instructions and simulated briefings	Source-evaluation tasks, written safety instructions and oral briefings (CAS)
6) Demonstrate appropriate actions in simulated emergencies, including seeking shelter, following evacuation procedures, contacting emergency services and performing selected basic first-aid procedures within the limits of training.			Instructor demonstrations, supervised practice, tabletop exercises, role-plays and emergency simulations	Observed simulation performance and practical skills demonstrations using checklists (CAS)

7) Analyse how fatigue, stress, communication and organisational conditions may contribute to unsafe behaviour, and justify decisions that support personal and collective safety within professional responsibilities.	Case analysis, structured discussions, small-group scenario tasks and guided reflection	Case-based assignments, justified decisions and discussion contributions (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS):
10 points (10%) for participation in discussions and scenario-based activities;
30 points (30%) for practical assignments: hazard identification, risk assessment and preventive action planning;
20 points (20%) for individual assignments: source analysis, preparation of safety instructions and short oral briefings;
20 points (20%) for emergency simulations and basic first-aid skills demonstrations;
20 points (20%) for tests: two achievement tests worth 5 points each and a final test worth 10 points.
For categories assessed through several tasks, the mean task score, including zero scores for unsubmitted required work, is divided by the maximum task score and multiplied by the category maximum. Tasks and deadlines are communicated at the beginning of the course.
Assessment criteria:
a) Participation in discussions and scenario-based activities
9–10 points: The student contributes relevant, well-supported ideas, accurately applies safety principles and explains decisions clearly. Contributions demonstrate awareness of personal responsibilities, organisational procedures and the needs of others.
7–8 points: The student participates regularly and provides generally accurate explanations and relevant arguments. Minor inaccuracies do not substantially affect the proposed decisions.
5–6 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but contributes inconsistently. Explanations are incomplete, and decisions require further justification or prompting.
1–4 points: Participation is limited, explanations contain substantial errors, and proposed decisions show insufficient understanding of essential safety principles.
b) Practical assignments
5 points: The student accurately identifies relevant hazards, applies the supplied risk-assessment framework and proposes feasible preventive measures. Priorities and decisions are clearly justified, with appropriate consideration of limitations and different people's needs.
4 points: The student identifies the main hazards and proposes appropriate measures. Minor omissions or inaccuracies do not substantially affect the overall assessment.
3 points: The student identifies some relevant hazards but makes errors in risk assessment or proposes measures that are only partially justified. Guidance is needed.
1–2 points: The task is substantially incomplete, important hazards are overlooked, or proposed measures are inappropriate or insufficiently supported.
c) Individual assignments
5 points: The assignment fully addresses the task, uses relevant official sources and distinguishes legal requirements from recommendations. Safety information is accurate, clearly organised and appropriate to the intended audience. Sources are acknowledged.
4 points: The assignment meets the main requirements and uses appropriate sources. Minor weaknesses in interpretation, structure or presentation do not substantially affect its usefulness.
3 points: The assignment partially meets the requirements. Source selection or interpretation is limited, and instructions require clarification.
1–2 points: The assignment is incomplete or relies on unreliable, outdated or incorrectly interpreted information. Substantial errors reduce its practical usefulness.
d) Emergency simulations and basic first-aid skills demonstrations
9–10 points: The student follows the required sequence independently, observes essential safety precautions, communicates clearly and requests appropriate assistance. Actions remain within the limits

of training and follow the scenario instructions.
7–8 points: The student completes the main actions correctly. Minor omissions occur but do not compromise essential safety.
5–6 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but requires prompting and makes errors in the sequence or execution of actions. Further supervised practice is needed.
1–4 points: The student omits essential actions, makes errors that would compromise safety or demonstrates insufficient understanding of when and how to request assistance.
e) Tests
Tests assess key concepts, interpretation of official safety information, hazard recognition, preventive measures and decisions in supplied emergency scenarios. Task-specific criteria and point allocations are provided on the test paper. The final test forms part of CAS.
For all assessment components, 0 points are awarded when no assessable response is provided, the response is unrelated to the task, or no assessment criteria are met.

Content

Topic 1. Legal and Regulatory Framework of Occupational Safety in Ukraine
Topic 2. Occupational Safety Management Systems
Topic 3. Working Conditions and Risk Assessment
Topic 4. Psychology of Safety. Occupational Injuries and Professional Diseases
Topic 5. Electrical Safety and Prevention of Occupational Hazards
Topic 6. Legal and Regulatory Framework of Civil Protection
Topic 7. Fire Safety and Emergency Prevention
Topic 8. First Aid and Emergency Response
Topic 9. Safety Measures in Emergency Situations (air raids, chemical hazards, radiation threats)
Topic 10. Civil Protection in Wartime and Crisis Conditions (actions of personnel, safety procedures, behavioral strategies)

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bielikov, A.S., Korotaiev, V.M., Shalomov, V.A., Podkopaiev, S.V., Suhak, A.O., Pylypenko, O.V., Nazha, P.M., Kharchenko, V.V., Dziuban, O.V., & Papirnyk, R.B. (2024). Tsyvilnyi zakhyst [Civil Protection]. A. S. Bielikov (Ed.). Dnipro: Zhurfond. 516 p.
2. Holinko, V.I. (2025). Okhorona pratsi [Occupational Safety]. Dnipro: Dnipro University of Technology. 283 p.
3. Levchenko, O.H., Polukarov, O.I., Polukarov, Yu.O., Zemlianska, O.V., & Kashtanov, S.F. (2026). Okhorona pratsi ta tsyvilnyi zakhyst [Occupational Safety and Civil Protection]. 2nd ed., expanded. Kyiv: Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Politekhnika Publishing House. 459 p.

Recommended reading

1. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. (2023). Occupational Safety and Health in Europe: State and Trends 2023. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
2. International Labour Organization. (2009). Guidelines on Occupational Safety and Health Management Systems: ILO-OSH 2001. 2nd ed. Geneva: International Labour Office.
3. International Labour Organization. (2019). Safety and Health at the Heart of the Future of Work: Building on 100 Years of Experience. Geneva: International Labour Office.
4. International Organization for Standardization. (2018). ISO 45001:2018. Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems – Requirements with Guidance for Use. Geneva: ISO.
5. International Organization for Standardization. (2021). ISO 45003:2021. Occupational Health and Safety Management – Psychological Health and Safety at Work – Guidelines for Managing Psychosocial Risks. Geneva: ISO.
6. Kachynska, N. F., Zemlianska, O. V., Arlamov, O. Yu., Kovtun, A. I., & Demchuk, H. V. (Comps.). (2021). Okhorona pratsi ta tsyvilnyi zakhyst. Laboratornyi praktykum [Occupational Safety and Civil Protection: Laboratory Practicum]. Kyiv: Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 113 p.
7. World Health Organization, & International Labour Organization. (2022). Mental Health at Work: Policy Brief. Geneva: World Health Organization and International Labour Organization. 20 p.
8. World Health Organization. (2022). WHO Guidelines on Mental Health at Work. Geneva: World Health Organization. 134 p.

Web-resources

1. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. (n.d.). Official website. Resources on risk assessment, ergonomics and psychosocial risks. https://osha.europa.eu/

2. International Labour Organization. (n.d.). Official website. Occupational safety and health standards, guidance and learning resources. https://www.ilo.org/

3. Ministry of Health of Ukraine. (2022). Pro zatverdzhennia poriadkiv nadannia domedychnoi dopomohy osobam pry nevidkladnykh stanakh [Approval of Procedures for Providing First Aid to Persons in Emergency Conditions]. Order No. 441 of 9 March 2022. Current consolidated text. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0356-22

4. State Emergency Service of Ukraine. (n.d.). Official website. Civil protection information, emergency warnings and safety guidance. https://dsns.gov.ua/

5. State Labour Service of Ukraine. (n.d.). Official website. Occupational safety information and explanations of workplace responsibilities. https://dsp.gov.ua/

6. Ukrainian Red Cross Society. (n.d.). First Aid Training. Official information on first-aid learning and practical skills. https://redcross.org.ua/fat/

7. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1992). Pro okhoronu pratsi [On Occupational Safety]. Law of Ukraine. Current consolidated text. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2694-12

8. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2012). Kodeks tsyvilnoho zakhystu Ukrainy [Civil Protection Code of Ukraine]. Current consolidated text. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/5403-17

9. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2022). Pro systemu hromadskoho zdorovia [On the Public Health System]. Law of Ukraine. Current consolidated text. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2573-20

10. World Health Organization. (2022). WHO Guidelines on Mental Health at Work. Publication and supporting information. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240053052

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY

The course aims to develop a systematic understanding of psychology as a science and of the principal concepts, theories and methods used to explain mental processes, personality and human activity. It develops the ability to compare psychological explanations, analyse cognitive, emotional, motivational and volitional phenomena, and interpret individual differences with reference to scientific evidence and context. Particular attention is given to critical evaluation of psychological information, introductory research skills, ethical reasoning and the clear communication of reasoned conclusions.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	1, 2	10 / Mandatory **Term paper:** 1 ECTS credit **Total:** 11 ECTS credits	Alina Yudina, Ph.D (Psychology)	**330 hours in total:** 56 h. lectures, 56 h. seminars/practical classes, 218 h. self-directed learning. **Term paper:** 30 hours, included in self-directed learning.

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain the subject, principal concepts and fields of psychology, distinguish scientific psychological knowledge from everyday assumptions, and compare major theoretical approaches.	Illustrated and problem-based lectures, concept mapping, guided reading, comparison of theories and seminar discussions	Concept maps, comparative assignments, oral explanations and tests (CAS); final exam (FAS)
2) Explain the relationship between the brain, mental activity and behaviour, and compare scientific accounts of the emergence of the psyche, consciousness and unconscious processes, acknowledging the limitations of different explanations.	Lectures, analysis of diagrams and research examples, guided comparison of explanations and structured discussions	Written explanations, comparative tasks and tests (CAS); final exam (FAS)
3) Compare theories of personality and analyse how temperament, character, abilities and contextual factors may contribute to individual differences, avoiding deterministic explanations and unsupported labels.	Lectures, comparative tables, analysis of fictional cases, small-group discussions and guided reflection	Theory-comparison assignments, case analyses and justified oral responses (CAS); final exam (FAS)
4) Analyse human activity in terms of goals, motives, actions and self-regulation, and use relevant theories to explain motivational, emotional and volitional processes in supplied situations.	Problem-based lectures, case discussions, analysis of everyday and learning situations, collaborative problem-solving	Case analyses, practical assignments and written explanations (CAS); final exam (FAS)
5) Explain and differentiate sensation, perception, attention, memory and imagination, and apply relevant concepts to interpret demonstrations, everyday examples and supplied findings.	Lectures, supervised demonstrations, practical exercises, comparison of explanations and analysis of supplied data	Practical reports, interpretation tasks and tests (CAS); final exam (FAS)

6) Compare psychological accounts of thinking and intelligence, explain the relationship between thinking and speech, and analyse supplied examples of reasoning and problem-solving.	Problem-based lectures, guided problem-solving, analysis of verbal explanations, comparative tasks and seminar discussions	Problem-solving analyses, comparative assignments and oral explanations (CAS); final exam (FAS)
7) Locate and critically evaluate academic sources on a general psychological topic, distinguishing theoretical claims from empirical findings and identifying limitations in the evidence.	Guided literature searches, source-evaluation workshops, structured reading, comparison of research reports, supervised term paper preparation and individual consultation	Source analyses and literature-based assignments (CAS); final exam (FAS); term paper and oral defence (separate FAS)
8) Formulate a focused introductory research question, distinguish common psychological research methods and justify a feasible approach to investigating the question under supervision.	Analysis of model studies, guided research planning, practical workshops, individual consultation, supervised term paper preparation and peer feedback	Research-planning tasks and methodological justifications (CAS); final exam (FAS); term paper and oral defence (separate FAS)
9) Interpret psychological findings presented in academic sources or supplied datasets, distinguish description, association and causal explanation, and formulate conclusions proportionate to the available evidence.	Worked examples, guided interpretation of tables and research summaries, error-identification tasks, case discussions and supervised analysis of evidence for the term paper	Interpretation assignments, critical commentaries and tests (CAS); final exam (FAS); term paper and oral defence (separate FAS)
10) Present a coherent psychological argument orally and in writing, acknowledge sources, respond to alternative interpretations and apply introductory ethical principles when discussing cases or planning research.	Structured discussions, academic writing workshops, short presentations, ethical case analysis, peer review, revision and term paper presentation rehearsal	Written assignments, presentations, discussion contributions and ethical case analyses (CAS); final exam (FAS); term paper and oral defence (separate FAS)
Assessment (Semesters 1–2)		
Each semester is assessed separately on a 100-point scale. The term paper is assessed separately and receives an independently recorded grade. Semester 1 The semester grade is based on 100% continuous assessment (CAS): 20 points (20%) for participation in seminars and evidence-based discussions; 30 points (30%) for practical assignments and psychological case analyses; 20 points (20%) for independent literature-based assignments; 30 points (30%) for tests: two achievement tests worth 5 points each and a final test worth 20 points. Semester 2 The semester grade is based on continuous assessment (60%) and the final exam (40%): 20 points (20%) for participation in seminars and evidence-based discussions (CAS); 20 points (20%) for practical assignments and interpretation of psychological findings (CAS); 20 points (20%) for independent literature-based and research-planning assignments (CAS);		

40 points (40%) for the final exam (FAS).
For each CAS category assessed through several tasks, the mean task score, including zero scores for unsubmitted required work, is divided by the maximum task score and multiplied by the category maximum. Required tasks and deadlines are communicated at the beginning of each semester. Work assessed as part of the term paper is not counted again towards semester CAS.
Assessment criteria:
a) Participation in seminars and evidence-based discussions
5 points: The student accurately explains psychological concepts, compares relevant interpretations and supports a clear position with appropriate evidence. Contributions are coherent, responsive and respectful, and acknowledge the limitations of the explanations discussed.
4 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding, uses psychological terminology appropriately and provides relevant arguments. Minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some explanations do not substantially affect the response.
3 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but provides mainly descriptive or partially justified responses. Participation is inconsistent, and prompting is needed to clarify concepts or support conclusions.
1–2 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, makes substantial conceptual errors or provides opinions without relevant psychological justification.
b) Practical assignments and psychological case analyses
5 points: The student accurately identifies relevant psychological phenomena and applies appropriate concepts to the task. The analysis considers contextual factors and alternative explanations, and conclusions are proportionate to the available information.
4 points: The student identifies the main phenomena and applies relevant concepts correctly. Minor omissions or inaccuracies occur, but the analysis and conclusions are generally justified.
3 points: The student identifies some relevant phenomena but applies concepts inconsistently. The analysis is mainly descriptive, and conclusions are only partially supported.
1–2 points: The task is substantially incomplete or contains significant errors. Concepts are applied incorrectly, and conclusions rely on unsupported assumptions or labels.
c) Independent literature-based and research-planning assignments
5 points: The assignment fully addresses the task, uses relevant academic sources and distinguishes theoretical claims from empirical findings. The student compares evidence, acknowledges limitations and formulates justified conclusions. Where research planning is required, the proposed approach is feasible, ethically appropriate and consistent with the research question.
4 points: The assignment meets the main requirements and uses appropriate sources. Analysis and methodological reasoning are generally sound, although some comparisons, limitations or conclusions require further development.
3 points: The assignment partially addresses the task. Description predominates over analysis, source evaluation is limited, or the proposed research approach requires substantial clarification.
1–2 points: The assignment is incomplete, relies on inappropriate sources or contains substantial conceptual or methodological errors. Conclusions are poorly justified, and academic conventions are inadequately followed.
d) Tests – Semester 1
Tests assess understanding of psychological concepts and theories, application to supplied situations and interpretation of evidence. Task-specific criteria and point allocations are provided on the test paper. The final test forms part of CAS.
e) Final exam – Semester 2
The final written examination is assessed on a 40-point scale:
10 points for theoretical questions and tests assessing psychological concepts and distinctions between approaches;
15 points for analysis of a supplied psychological situation;
15 points for interpretation and critical evaluation of psychological findings.

The examination assesses knowledge developed across both semesters, with particular attention to the integration of concepts and Semester 2 content.
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive and accurate understanding, applies concepts appropriately, considers alternative explanations and interprets evidence critically. Conclusions are coherent and well supported.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and completes most tasks correctly. Minor conceptual inaccuracies, omissions or weaknesses in justification occur.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in application or interpretation. Responses are partially complete, and conclusions require stronger justification.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, makes substantial conceptual errors and has difficulty applying knowledge or drawing supported conclusions.
Task-specific criteria and point allocations are provided on the examination paper.
For all semester assessment components, 0 points are awarded when no assessable response is provided, the response is unrelated to the task, or no assessment criteria are met.

Assessment of the Term Paper

The term paper and oral defence constitute a separate final assessment (FAS), assessed on a 100-point scale:
70 points (70%) for the written term paper;
30 points (30%) for the oral defence.
The written term paper is assessed according to the clarity and relevance of the research problem, accuracy of psychological concepts, quality of theoretical analysis and source evaluation, appropriateness of the methodological approach, interpretation of evidence, justification of conclusions, acknowledgement of limitations, academic writing, referencing and compliance with academic integrity requirements.
The oral defence is assessed according to the clarity and logic of the presentation, ability to justify research decisions and conclusions, provide reasoned answers to questions, use appropriate psychological terminology and reflect on the limitations of the work.
The term paper assesses learning outcomes 7–10 and applies relevant subject-specific knowledge from learning outcomes 1–6 according to the approved topic.
Assessment criteria:
90–100 points: The term paper demonstrates an excellent level of achievement for an introductory research assignment. The research problem is clearly formulated and relevant; theoretical analysis is systematic and considers alternative explanations; methodological decisions are appropriate; evidence is accurately interpreted; and conclusions are logically justified. The student presents the work clearly, provides well-reasoned answers to questions and recognises its limitations.
75–89 points: The term paper demonstrates a good level of achievement. The theoretical and methodological foundations are generally sound, and the analysis and conclusions are appropriate. The student presents and defends the work competently, although some aspects lack depth, precision or sufficient justification.
60–74 points: The term paper demonstrates a satisfactory level of achievement. The research problem and theoretical foundations are presented, but source evaluation, methodological justification, interpretation of evidence or argumentation are limited. During the defence, the student demonstrates a general understanding but has difficulty explaining particular decisions or conclusions.
1–59 points: The term paper demonstrates substantial deficiencies in conceptual accuracy, theoretical analysis, methodology, interpretation of evidence, conclusions or academic writing. During the defence, the student demonstrates limited understanding and substantial difficulty justifying decisions or answering questions.
0 points: No assessable work is provided for the relevant component, or no assessment criteria are met. Academic integrity violations are addressed in accordance with institutional procedures.

Content
Semester 1 Topic 1. Development of Psychological Thought and the Current State of Psychological Science Topic 2. Psyche and Brain. Emergence and Development of the Psyche in Phylogenesis Topic 3. Unconscious Mental Phenomena Topic 4. Consciousness as the Highest Level of Mental Reflection Topic 5. Psychology of Personality Topic 6. Individual Psychological Characteristics of Personality Topic 7. General Psychological Theory of Activity Topic 8. Motivation and Motivational Theories Topic 9. Psychology of Emotions and Emotional Processes Topic 10. Psychology of Will and Volitional Regulation **Semester 2** Topic 11. Sensation and Sensory Processes Topic 12. Psychology of Perception Topic 13. Psychology of Attention Topic 14. Psychology of Memory Topic 15. Psychology of Imagination Topic 16. Psychology of Thinking and Theories of Thinking Topic 17. Psychology of Intelligence Topic 18. Thinking and Speech
Literature
Compulsory reading 1. Ciccarelli, S.K., & White, J.N. (2025). Psychology. 7th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson. 896 p. 2. Feldman, R.S. (2024). Understanding Psychology. 16th ed., International Student Edition. New York: McGraw Hill. 784 p. 3. Myers, D.G., DeWall, C.N., & Gruber, J. (2024). Psychology. 14th ed. New York: Worth Publishers. 928 p. 4. Phelps, E.A., Berkman, E.T., & Gazzaniga, M.S. (2022). Psychological Science. 7th ed., International Edition. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 643 p. 5. Poiasok, T.B., Bespartochna, O.I., Kvasnyk, O.V., & Shapolova, V.V. (2023). Zahalna psykholohiia [General Psychology]. Kharkiv: FOP Brovin O. V. 396 p. 6. Savchyn, M.V. (2025). Zahalna psykholohiia [General Psychology]. 5th ed., unchanged reprint. Kyiv: Akademiia. 352 p.
Recommended reading 1. Butuzova, L.P., Dmytriieva, S.M., & Maksymets, S.M. (Comps.). (2023). Robochyi zoshyt z psykholohii [Workbook on Psychology]. Zhytomyr: Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University Publishing House. 136 p. 2. Eysenck, M.W., & Keane, M.T. (2020). Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook. 8th ed. Hove: Psychology Press. 980 p. 3. Hayes, N., & Stratton, P. (2022). A Student's Dictionary of Psychology and Neuroscience. 7th ed. London: Routledge. 434 p. 4. Kearns, T., & Lee, D. (2015). General Psychology: An Introduction. University System of Georgia, GALILEO Open Learning Materials. 5. Maksymenko, S.D. (2002). Rozvytok psykhiky v ontohenezi. Tom 1: Teoretyko-metodolohichni problemy henetychnoi psykholohii [Development of the Psyche in Ontogenesis. Volume 1: Theoretical and Methodological Problems of Genetic Psychology]. Kyiv: Forum. 320 p. 6. Tsilmak, O.M. (Ed.). (2024). Psykholohiia emotsii ta pochuttiv [Psychology of Emotions and Feelings]. Odesa: Helvetyka. 420 p. 7. Yudina, A.V. (2021). Model motyvatsii uspikhu v pratsivnykiv vyrobnychykh kolektyviv: zmist ta analiz komponentiv [A Model of Motivation for Success among Employees of Production Teams: Content and Analysis of Components]. Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia. Seriia "Pedahohika i psykholohiia", 2(22), 146–153. 8. Yudina, A.V. (2022). Pidvyshchennia motyvatsii uspikhu u pratsivnykiv vyrobnychykh kolektyviv v umovakh psykholohichnoho treninhu [Increasing Motivation for Success among Employees of Production

Teams through Psychological Training]. Visnyk Universytetu imeni Alfreda Nobelia. Seriia “Pedahohika i psykholohiia”, 1(23), 59–66.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (n.d.). APA Dictionary of Psychology. https://dictionary.apa.org/
2. BrainFacts.org. (n.d.). 3D Brain. https://www.brainfacts.org/3d-brain/
3. Crash Course. (n.d.). Psychology. Educational video series. https://thecrashcourse.com/topic/psychology/
4. Noba Project. (n.d.). Psychology. https://nobaproject.com/textbooks/psychology
5. PsyToolkit. (n.d.). Experiment Library. https://www.psytoolkit.org/library/
6. University of Glasgow. (n.d.). The Illusions Index. https://www.illusionsindex.org/
7. Yale University. (n.d.). Introduction to Psychology. Online course. https://online.yale.edu/courses/introduction-psychology

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">NOBEL STUDIES: FUNDAMENTALS OF PROFESSIONAL IMAGE AND ETHICS FOR FUTURE SPECIALISTS</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">The course aims to develop practical skills in ethical professional self-presentation, respectful communication and collaborative interaction. Through communication exercises, role-plays, guided ethical case analysis and a self-presentation project, students learn to communicate their current experience and competence boundaries accurately, respond appropriately to introductory ethical dilemmas, and use feedback to improve their professional communication.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Language of teaching</td><td>Semester / Duration</td><td>ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)</td><td>Course Coordinator</td><td>Student workload</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ukrainian</td><td>1</td><td>3 / mandatory</td><td>Hanna Voshkolup, PhD in Pedagogy</td><td>90 hours (6 hours of lectures, 24 hours of practical classes, 60 hours of self-directed learning)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Learning outcomes
On completion of the course, students will be able to:</td><td>Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities</td><td>Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">1) Use the concepts of professional image, reputation and professional identity to analyse examples of psychologists’ self-presentation and identify accurate, misleading or stereotypical messages.</td><td>Brief interactive lectures, guided analysis of fictional professional profiles, comparison exercises and structured small-group discussions requiring students to justify their interpretations.</td><td>Analysis of sample professional profiles, assessed for accurate use of concepts and identification of accurate, misleading or stereotypical messages; final case-based test (CAS)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">2) Prepare and deliver a brief professional introduction that accurately communicates student status, relevant experience, interests and competence boundaries.</td><td>Model analysis, guided drafting, paired rehearsal, short presentations and feedback followed by revision.</td><td>Professional introduction and revised written profile, assessed within the self-presentation project (CAS)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">3) Use active listening, clarification, respectful questioning and context-appropriate verbal and non-verbal communication in simulated professional interactions.</td><td>Communication exercises, paired role-plays, structured observation, feedback and repeated practice.</td><td>Individual performance in communication exercises and role-plays, assessed using an observation checklist covering active listening, clarification, respectful questioning and context-appropriate verbal and non-verbal communication; final case-based test assessing the selection and justification of communication strategies (CAS)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">4) Identify ethical concerns in introductory professional scenarios and justify an appropriate response using relevant ethical principles and recognising when guidance is needed.</td><td>Guided work with ethical codes, scenario-based exercises, ethical dilemma role-plays</td><td>Practical ethical case assignments, assessed for identification of ethical concerns, appropriateness and justification of the proposed response, and recognition of</td></tr>
</table>

	and structured discussions comparing possible responses.	situations requiring guidance; final case-based test (CAS)
5) Collaborate on a professional communication task, fulfil an agreed role and provide specific, respectful feedback that supports improvement.	Small-group practical tasks, collaborative preparation of communication materials, peer observation and structured feedback.	Individual contribution to the collaborative task and feedback provided to peers, assessed for relevance, specificity and respectful communication (CAS)
6) Develop and revise a professional profile and accompanying visual materials for a specified audience, avoiding misleading claims, discriminatory messages and breaches of confidentiality.	Profile-writing workshops, analysis of sample materials, project work, consultation and peer review.	Initial and revised project materials, accompanied by a brief explanation of audience adaptation, ethical choices and changes made in response to feedback (CAS)
7) Evaluate their performance using explicit criteria and feedback, demonstrate improvements in a repeated task and formulate realistic further development goals.	Guided self-assessment, feedback analysis, reflective debriefing and repeated communication practice.	Comparison of initial and revised performance, supported by a reflective commentary and specific development goals within the self-presentation project (CAS)
Assessment		
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. 100 points for work in the first semester: 20 points for analysis of professional profiles and ethical cases; 20 points for communication exercises and role-plays; 20 points for the final case-based test; 10 points for the collaborative communication task and peer feedback; 30 points for the professional self-presentation project and reflective commentary. Assessment criteria: a) analysis of professional profiles and ethical cases 16–20 points: The student accurately distinguishes professional image, reputation and professional identity, identifies accurate, misleading or stereotypical messages in professional profiles, and recognises ethical concerns in introductory scenarios. Proposed responses are appropriate and clearly justified using relevant ethical principles, with recognition of competence boundaries and situations requiring guidance. 11–15 points: The student correctly applies most concepts, identifies the main concerns and proposes generally appropriate responses. Analysis and justification contain minor inaccuracies or lack detail. 6–10 points: The student demonstrates a basic understanding of the concepts and identifies some concerns. Analysis is mainly descriptive, and proposed responses are only partly justified or show limited recognition of competence boundaries. 1–5 points: The student demonstrates limited understanding of the concepts, overlooks significant concerns and proposes responses that are inappropriate or insufficiently justified. 0 points: Assignments are not submitted or do not demonstrate achievement of the expected learning outcomes. b) communication exercises and role-plays 16–20 points: The student consistently demonstrates active listening, clarification, respectful		

questioning and context-appropriate verbal and non-verbal communication. Performance respects competence boundaries, and repeated tasks demonstrate clear improvements based on feedback.
11–15 points: The student demonstrates most required communication skills and responds appropriately in simulated interactions. Minor difficulties occur in clarity, responsiveness or non-verbal communication. Feedback is generally applied to subsequent performance.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic communication skills, but their application is inconsistent. Difficulties occur in listening, clarification or questioning, and improvement following feedback is limited.
1–5 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in maintaining clear, respectful and context-appropriate communication. Required skills are rarely demonstrated, and feedback leads to little observable improvement.
0 points: The student does not complete the activities or does not demonstrate achievement of the expected learning outcomes.
c) final case-based test
16–20 points: The student demonstrates accurate understanding of key course concepts, correctly identifies misleading self-presentation and ethical concerns, and selects appropriate communication strategies. Responses are clearly justified and recognise competence boundaries and the need for guidance where appropriate.
11–15 points: The student demonstrates good understanding of course concepts and provides generally appropriate responses to the scenarios. Minor errors or incomplete justifications occur.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates partial understanding of course concepts. Responses are partly correct but contain gaps in identifying concerns, selecting communication strategies or justifying decisions.
1–5 points: The student demonstrates minimal understanding of course concepts. Responses contain substantial errors, and proposed decisions are poorly justified or disregard relevant ethical concerns.
0 points: The test is not completed or no response earns credit.
d) collaborative communication task and peer feedback
9–10 points: The student fulfils the agreed role, makes a relevant and clearly identifiable contribution to the group task, cooperates respectfully and provides specific, constructive feedback that supports improvement.
6–8 points: The student fulfils most responsibilities, contributes appropriately and provides generally useful and respectful feedback, although some comments lack specificity.
3–5 points: The student fulfils some responsibilities and makes a limited contribution. Feedback is mainly general and provides limited guidance for improvement.
1–2 points: The student fulfils few responsibilities, makes a minimal contribution and provides little relevant or useful feedback.
0 points: No assessable individual contribution or peer feedback is provided.
e) professional self-presentation project and reflective commentary
25–30 points: The student delivers a clear professional introduction and produces a coherent written profile with relevant visual materials adapted to the specified audience. Student status, experience, interests and competence boundaries are communicated accurately. Materials avoid misleading claims, discriminatory messages and breaches of confidentiality. Revisions meaningfully address feedback, and the reflective commentary uses explicit criteria to explain improvements and formulate realistic development goals.
18–24 points: The project accurately communicates the main information and is generally appropriate for the audience. Minor limitations occur in clarity, structure or visual communication. Revisions address most relevant feedback, and the commentary identifies improvements and appropriate development goals.
10–17 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains gaps in clarity, audience adaptation or communication of experience and competence boundaries. Revisions are limited, and the commentary provides mainly descriptive self-assessment and general development goals.
1–9 points: The project is substantially incomplete or poorly structured. Important information is

unclear or misleading, ethical considerations are insufficiently addressed, and revisions show little use of feedback. Self-assessment and development goals are minimal or unrealistic.
0 points: The project is not submitted or does not demonstrate achievement of the expected learning outcomes.

Content

Topic 1. Professional Image, Reputation and Professional Identity: Key Concepts and Social Perceptions
Topic 2. Developing a Professional Identity: Student Status, Experience and Competence Boundaries
Topic 3. Visual Self-Presentation: Appearance, Visual Materials and Respect for Diversity
Topic 4. Professional Communication: Active Listening, Verbal and Non-Verbal Interaction, Teamwork and Feedback
Topic 5. Professional Self-Presentation and Personal Branding: Audience, Written Profiles, Digital Communication and Reflective Improvement
Topic 6. Foundations of Professional Ethics in Psychology: Ethical Principles, Confidentiality and Introductory Dilemmas

Literature

Compulsory literature

1. Abolina, T. H., Rohozha, M. M., Vasylkevych, Ya. Z., Zabolotna, V. O., Kotsur, V. P., & Ryk, S.M. (2016). *Profesiina i prykladna etyka* [Professional and applied ethics] (V. P. Kotsur, Ed.). Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi: Preprynt. 314 p.

2. Barna, N. V. (2008). *Imidzhelohiia* [Imageology] (V.M. Bebyk, Ed.). Kyiv: Universytet 'Ukraina'. 217 p.

3. Bondarenko, I. S. (2014). *Imidzholohiia: psykholohiia imidzhu* [Imageology: Psychology of image]. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University. 122 p.

4. Hargie, O. (2022). *Skilled interpersonal communication: Research, theory and practice* (7th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge. 662 p. ISBN 978-1-0320-2185-0.

5. Knapp, S. J., & Fingerhut, R. (2023). *Practical ethics for psychologists: A positive approach* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 342 p. ISBN 978-1-4338-4249-8.

6. Koltunovych, T. A. (2007). *Etychnyi kodeks psykholoha* [The psychologist's code of ethics]. Chernivtsi: Ruta. 232 p.

7. Kravchenko, V. P., & Zadorozhnia, L. M. (2022). *Etyka profesiinykh komunikatsii* [Ethics of professional communication]. Kropyvnytskyi: Central Ukrainian National Technical University. 174 p.

Recommended reading

1. Balla, E. Yu., & Votkanych, M. I. (2023). *Osnovy imidzhelohii* [Fundamentals of imageology]. Uzhhorod. 52 p.

2. Bolotova, V. O., Liashenko, N. O., & Ahalarova, K. A. (2021). *Imidzholohiia* [Imageology]. Kharkiv: National Technical University 'Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute'. 150 p.

3. Bondarenko, I. S. (2016). Imidzholohiia v systemi humanitarnykh znan: sotsialnokomunikatsiinyi pidkhid [Imageology in the system of humanities: A social communication approach]. *Derzhava ta rehiony. Seriia: Sotsialni komunikatsii* [State and Regions. Series: Social Communications], 2(26), 92–95.

4. Bralatan, V. P., Hutsalenko, L. V., & Zdyrko, N. H. (2011). *Profesiina etyka* [Professional ethics]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 252 p.

5. Davydova, O. V. (2020). Empirychne doslidzhennia vzaiemozviazku stereotypnoho obrazu profesii psykholoh iz proiavom refleksii u studentiv psykholohiv [An empirical study of the relationship between the stereotypical image of the psychology profession and reflection among psychology students]. *Visnyk pisliadyplomnoi osvity. Seriia: Sotsialni ta povedinkovi nauky* [Bulletin of Postgraduate Education. Series: Social and Behavioral Sciences], 14(43), 51–67.

6. Hrynchuk, O. I., & Nazariichuk, N. Yu. (2019). Imidzh maibutnoho psykholoha: osoblyvosti uiavlen studentskoi molodi [The image of a future psychologist: Characteristics of university students' perceptions]. *Zbirnyk naukovykh prats: psykholohiia* [Collection of Scientific Papers: Psychology], 23, 26–35.

7. Hrynchuk, O. I., & Petruk, N. Yu. (2021). Imidzh maibutnoho psykholoha yak chynnyk samoaktualizatsii v umovakh navchalnoi diialnosti [The image of a future psychologist as a factor in self-actualisation within learning activities]. *Habitus*, 30, 231–237.

8. Karpenko, K. I., & Deineka, V. V. (2024). *Profesiina etyka vyshchoi shkoly* [Professional ethics in higher education]. Kharkiv: Kharkiv National Medical University. 72 p.

9. Labrecque, L. I., Markos, E., & Milne, G. R. (2011). Online personal branding: Processes, challenges,

and implications. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 25*(1), 37–50.

10. Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*(1), 34–47.

11. Lolenko, K. M. (2022). Profesiinyi brend psykholoha: sutnist, etapy ta umovy rozvytku [A psychologist's professional brand: Essence, stages and conditions of development]. *Orhanizatsiina psykholohiia. Ekonomichna psykholohiia* [Organizational Psychology. Economic Psychology], 2(26), 91–98.

12. Lolenko, K. M. (2022). Komponenty profesiinoho brendu psykholoha v myrnyi chas ta v umovakh viiny [Components of a psychologist's professional brand in peacetime and wartime]. *Orhanizatsiina psykholohiia. Ekonomichna psykholohiia* [Organizational Psychology. Economic Psychology], 3–4(27), 55–63.

13. Lyhomyna, T. A. (2018). Imidzh praktychnoho psykholoha: teoretychnyi ekskurs [The image of a practising psychologist: A theoretical overview]. *Humanitarnyi visnyk DVNZ "Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Hryhoriia Skovorody"*, 37(4), I(23), 66–74. Thematic issue: *Mizhnarodni Chelpanivski psykholoho-pedahohichni chytannia* [International Chelpanov Psychological and Pedagogical Readings]. Kyiv: Hnozys.

14. Lyhomyna, T. A. (2019). Kryterii formuvannia profesiinoho imidzhu praktychnoho psykholoha yak sotsialno-psykholohichnoho fenomena [Criteria for the formation of a practising psychologist's professional image as a socio-psychological phenomenon]. *Teoriia i praktyka suchasnoi psykholohii* [Theory and Practice of Modern Psychology], 5(1), 147–151.

15. Lyhomyna, T. A. (2020). Empirychne doslidzhennia kohnityvno-motyvatsiinykh ta otsinnykh kharakterystyk profesiinoho imidzhu praktychnykh psykholohiv [An empirical study of the cognitive, motivational and evaluative characteristics of practising psychologists' professional image]. *Habitus*, 14, 250–254.

16. Novik, L. O. (2015). Psykholohichni skladovi imidzhu psykholoha [Psychological components of a psychologist's image]. *Psykholohiia: realnist i perspektyvy* [Psychology: Reality and Perspectives], 4, 173–176.

17. Starynska, N. V. (2015). *Osoblyvosti samoaktualizatsii maibutnikh psykholohiv u protsesi profesiinoi pidhotovky: monohrafiia* [Characteristics of future psychologists' self-actualisation during professional training: Monograph]. Kyiv: Interservis. 178 p.

18. Voloshko, L. (2016). Osobystisno-profesiinyi imidzh maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnoi sfery yak naukova katehoriia profesiinoi pedahohiky [The personal and professional image of future specialists in socionomic professions as a scientific category of vocational pedagogy]. *Molod i rynok* [Youth and Market], 1, 103–107.

19. Voshkolup, H. (2021). Chynnyky formuvannia profesiinoho imidzhu suchasnoho psykholoha [Factors in the formation of a contemporary psychologist's professional image]. *Acta Paedagogica Volynienses*, 3, 212–218.

20. Witkower, Z., & Tracy, J. L. (2019). A facial-action imposter: How head tilt influences perceptions of dominance from a neutral face. *Psychological Science, 30*(6), 893–906.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct* (2002, amended effective June 1, 2010, and January 1, 2017). https://www.apa.org/ethics/code

2. European Federation of Psychologists' Associations. (2025). *Meta-Code of Ethics*. https://www.efpa.eu/resource/meta-code-of-ethics/

3. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. (2021). *Etychnyi kodeks psykholoha* [Psychologist's code of ethics]. https://npa-ua.org/pub/files/66d3a42494d2acd8.pdf

4. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Rekomendatsii etychnoi komisii NPA shchodo povedinky psykholohiv u tsyfrovomu seredovyshchi* [Recommendations of the NPA Ethics Committee on psychologists' conduct in the digital environment]. https://npa-ua.org/pub/files/3bdc4606b55c24d1.pdf

HISTORY OF PSYCHOLOGY

The course aims to develop students' understanding of the historical development of psychological thought and psychology as a scientific discipline. Through the analysis of selected historical texts, comparison of psychological schools, contextual interpretation of theories and evidence-based discussion, students learn to explain changes in psychology's subject matter and methods, examine contributions to Ukrainian and international psychology, and assess the significance and limitations of historical ideas for contemporary psychological knowledge.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2	4 / mandatory	Nataliia Hrysenko, PhD, Associate Professor	120 hours: 42 hours of contact teaching and 78 hours of self-directed learning

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main stages in the development of psychological thought and the emergence of psychology as an independent scientific discipline, using relevant concepts and an accurate chronological framework	Interactive lectures, guided reading, chronological mapping, concept clarification and seminar discussions connecting intellectual developments across historical periods	Chronological and conceptual tasks completed during seminars; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)
2) Compare major psychological schools in terms of their subject matter, assumptions, concepts, research methods and explanations of psychological phenomena	Comparative analysis, small-group tasks, structured comparison tables and discussions using a common psychological phenomenon to examine different theoretical explanations	Comparative analytical assignments; contributions to structured seminar discussions; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)
3) Analyse selected primary and secondary sources, identify the author's argument and supporting evidence, and distinguish the original position from later interpretations	Guided source analysis, annotated reading, comparison of original excerpts with textbook accounts, source evaluation exercises and feedback on written interpretations	Written source-analysis assignments; source-based presentation; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)
4) Explain how philosophical, scientific, sociocultural and institutional contexts influenced the development of psychological ideas, including selected contributions to psychology in Ukraine	Contextual lectures, analysis of historical cases, work with biographical and institutional materials, small-group discussions and preparation of a source-based presentation	Contextual analysis tasks; source-based presentation; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)
5) Evaluate the contributions and limitations of selected historical theories and studies, distinguishing historical significance from current empirical support and examining relevant ethical concerns	Guided evaluation of historical studies, evidence-based debates, comparison with contemporary scholarly accounts and discussion of ethical issues in their historical context	Critical analytical assignments; reasoned contributions to seminar discussions; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)

6) Present a coherent historical argument in oral and written forms, support conclusions with appropriately referenced sources, respond constructively to alternative interpretations and identify improvements following feedback	Short presentations, structured academic discussion, peer feedback, guided revision and reflective commentary	Source-based presentation and reflective commentary; individual contributions to discussions; final integrative historical analysis (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester.
100 points for work in the second semester:
20 points for participation in seminars, discussions, chronological and contextual analysis tasks;
20 points for comparative and source-analysis assignments;
20 points for a source-based presentation and reflective commentary;
40 points for the final integrative historical analysis.
Assessment criteria:
a) participation in seminars, discussions, chronological and contextual analysis tasks
16–20 points: The student consistently makes relevant and well-reasoned contributions, accurately uses historical and psychological concepts, places ideas and developments within an appropriate chronological framework, and explains connections between theories and their historical contexts. Contributions respond constructively to alternative interpretations and are supported by assigned readings.
11–15 points: The student regularly contributes to learning activities and demonstrates a good understanding of the main developments and concepts. Chronological and contextual explanations are generally accurate, although some contributions lack detail or sufficient supporting evidence.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates a basic understanding of the material. Contributions are mainly descriptive, with gaps in chronology, conceptual accuracy or explanation of historical context.
1–5 points: Contributions are limited and demonstrate substantial difficulties in identifying historical developments, using relevant concepts or supporting interpretations.
0 points: No assessable contribution or completed task is provided.
b) comparative and source-analysis assignments
16–20 points: The student accurately compares psychological schools using explicit criteria and provides a clear, well-supported interpretation of selected sources. Assignments identify the author's argument, distinguish primary evidence from later interpretation, and evaluate contributions, limitations and relevant ethical concerns. Sources are appropriately acknowledged.
11–15 points: Assignments demonstrate generally accurate comparison and source interpretation. The student identifies the main arguments and provides relevant supporting evidence, although some explanations or evaluations lack depth or precision.
6–10 points: Assignments meet basic requirements but contain gaps in comparison, contextual interpretation or source evaluation. Conclusions are partly supported, and distinctions between original arguments and later interpretations are not consistently maintained.
1–5 points: Assignments are substantially incomplete or contain significant inaccuracies. Comparison is superficial, source interpretation is weak, and conclusions lack adequate support.
0 points: Assignments are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
c) source-based presentation and reflective commentary
16–20 points: The presentation develops a clear historical argument, accurately explains the selected topic in context and integrates relevant primary and secondary sources. Conclusions are well supported, references are provided, and responses to questions demonstrate understanding. The reflective commentary identifies specific strengths, limitations and improvements arising from feedback.
11–15 points: The presentation is coherent, generally accurate and supported by relevant sources. Minor limitations occur in contextual analysis, argumentation or responses to questions. The commentary identifies appropriate improvements, although some observations remain general.

6–10 points: The presentation meets basic requirements but is mainly descriptive or contains gaps in structure, contextual explanation or use of sources. Responses to questions and reflection on feedback are limited.
1–5 points: The presentation is poorly structured, substantially incomplete or contains significant inaccuracies. Sources are insufficiently integrated, conclusions are weakly supported, and reflection provides little evidence of learning from feedback.
0 points: The presentation and commentary are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
d) final integrative historical analysis
The task requires students to analyse a selected psychological problem, concept or study through at least two historical approaches. Students establish the relevant chronology, compare assumptions and methods, interpret supplied source excerpts, explain contextual influences, and formulate a justified conclusion about historical contributions and limitations.
31–40 points: The student produces an accurate, coherent and well-supported analysis that integrates chronology, theoretical comparison, source interpretation and historical context. The conclusion distinguishes historical significance from current empirical support and addresses relevant methodological or ethical limitations.
21–30 points: The student provides a generally accurate and logically structured analysis. The main approaches and contextual influences are explained appropriately, although some comparisons, source interpretations or conclusions require greater depth or precision.
11–20 points: The student demonstrates a basic understanding of the selected problem and approaches. Analysis is partly accurate but remains descriptive, incomplete or insufficiently supported by the supplied sources. Connections between historical context, assumptions and methods are limited.
1–10 points: The student demonstrates limited understanding of the selected problem. Analysis contains substantial chronological or conceptual errors, sources are misinterpreted or insufficiently used, and conclusions are poorly justified.
0 points: The task is not completed or no response earns credit.

Content

Topic 1. History of Psychology as a Field of Study: Subject Matter, Sources, Methods and Periodisation
Topic 2. Early Psychological Thought: Ancient Traditions, Medieval Scholarship and Renaissance Ideas
Topic 3. Psychological Ideas in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: Mind–Body Relations, Rationalism, Empiricism and Associationism
Topic 4. The Emergence of Scientific Psychology in the Nineteenth Century: Physiology, Psychophysics and Experimental Research
Topic 5. Early Psychological Schools: Wundt's Programme, Structuralism, Functionalism and Gestalt Psychology
Topic 6. Behaviourism and the Development of Learning Theories
Topic 7. Psychoanalytic, Humanistic and Existential Traditions: Historical Development and Key Debates
Topic 8. The Cognitive Turn and the Development of Contemporary Psychological Approaches
Topic 9. Psychological Thought and Scientific Institutions in Ukraine: Selected Figures, Schools and Historical Contexts
Topic 10. Psychology in Historical Perspective: Scientific Evidence, Ethics, Diversity and the Interpretation of Disciplinary Legacies

Literature

Compulsory literature

1. Borysiuk, A. S., Bezarova, H. I., & Zorii, N. I. (2026). *Istoriia psykholohii* [History of psychology]. Bukovinian State Medical University.
2. Henley, T. B. (2024). *Hergenhahn's an introduction to the history of psychology* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
3. Kovalchuk, Z. Ya. (2026). *Istoriia psykholohii* [History of psychology]. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs.

4. Woody, W. D., & Viney, W. (2024). *A history of psychology: The emergence of science and applications* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Recommended reading

1. Danyliuk, I. V. (2002). *Istoriia psykholohii v Ukraini. Zakhidni rehiony (ostannia chvert XIX – persha polovyna XX stolittia)* [History of psychology in Ukraine. Western regions (the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century)]. Lybid.

2. Horina, O. T. (Comp.). (2024). *Istoriia psykholohii* [History of Psychology]. Dnipro State University of Internal Affairs.

3. Pickren, W. E., & Rutherford, A. (2010). *A history of modern psychology in context*. John Wiley & Sons.

4. Romenets, V. A. (2005). *Istoriia psykholohii: Starodavnii svit. Seredni viky. Vidrodzhennia* [History of psychology: The ancient world. The Middle Ages. The Renaissance]. Lybid.

5. Romenets, V. A., & Manokha, I. P. (2017). *Istoriia psykholohii XX stolittia* [History of twentieth-century psychology] (3rd ed.).

6. Sternberg, R. J., & Pickren, W. E. (Eds.). (2019). *The Cambridge handbook of the intellectual history of psychology*. Cambridge University Press.

7. Tokareva, N. M. (2022). *Istoriia psykholohii: vid vytokiv do epokhy Prosvitnytstva* [History of psychology: From its origins to the Enlightenment].

Web-resources

1. Bloom, P. (n.d.). *Foundations: Freud* [Video lecture]. In *Introduction to psychology* (PSYC 110, Lecture 3). Open Yale Courses, Yale University. https://oyc.yale.edu/psychology/psyc-110/lecture-3

2. Bloom, P. (n.d.). *Foundations: Skinner* [Video lecture]. In *Introduction to psychology* (PSYC 110, Lecture 4). Open Yale Courses, Yale University. https://oyc.yale.edu/psychology/psyc-110/lecture-4

3. Crash Course. (2014). *Intro to psychology: Crash Course Psychology #1* [Video]. https://thecrashcourse.com/courses/intro-to-psychology-crash-course-psychology-1/

DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY AND AGE PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological development across the lifespan and their ability to analyse developmental changes in relation to biological, psychological, sociocultural and historical influences. Through the comparison of developmental theories, interpretation of research findings and analysis of age-related cases, students learn to explain continuity and change in cognitive, emotional, social and personality development, recognise individual developmental variability, and formulate evidence-informed recommendations appropriate to a person's developmental circumstances.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3–4	8 / mandatory	Nataliia Hrysenko, PhD, Associate Professor	240 hours: 70 hours of contact teaching and 170 hours of self-directed learning
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS; final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain the main principles of lifespan development, including continuity and change, multidirectionality, plasticity and the interaction of biological and environmental influences.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, concept mapping and structured discussions using examples from different periods of life.	Conceptual assignments and individual contributions to seminar discussions (CAS); written examination tasks (FAS)
2) Compare major developmental theories in terms of their assumptions, proposed mechanisms of change, research evidence and limitations.			Comparative analysis of psychodynamic, cognitive-developmental, learning, sociocultural, ecological and lifespan approaches; structured comparison tables; theory-based discussions.	Comparative analytical assignments (CAS); examination questions requiring comparison and justified interpretation (FAS)
3) Analyse patterns of cognitive, emotional, social and personality development from infancy to late adulthood, taking account of individual variability and the limitations of fixed age boundaries.			Age-period workshops, analysis of developmental profiles, guided interpretation of examples and comparison of developmental processes across periods of life.	Age-related case analyses and seminar tasks (CAS); integrative developmental case analysis in the final examination (FAS)
4) Interpret findings from developmental research, distinguish age-related changes from cohort and contextual influences, and identify the strengths, limitations and ethical requirements of common research designs.			Guided analysis of research reports, comparison of cross-sectional, longitudinal and sequential designs, interpretation of supplied data and discussion of research ethics.	Research-analysis assignments (CAS); written examination tasks on research design, interpretation and ethics (FAS)
5) Explain how relationships, family circumstances, education, culture and major life events influence developmental pathways, identifying			Ecological mapping, analysis of contextualised cases, small-group discussions and comparison of alternative	Contextual case analyses and the developmental analysis project (CAS); integrative developmental

relevant risk and protective factors.	developmental explanations.	case analysis in the final examination (FAS)
6) Formulate and justify developmentally appropriate recommendations for communication, learning and psychosocial support, recognising the limits of the available information and situations requiring further assessment or specialist guidance.	Case-based learning, structured problem-solving, simulated consultations and discussion of alternative recommendations with feedback.	Written recommendations within case assignments and the developmental analysis project (CAS); case-based examination tasks (FAS)
7) Communicate a coherent developmental analysis in oral and written forms, use appropriately referenced sources, avoid age-based stereotypes and revise conclusions in response to evidence and feedback.	Short presentations, academic discussion, peer review, guided revision and reflective commentary.	Developmental analysis project, presentation and reflective commentary (CAS); written justification and oral defence of examination responses (FAS)

Assessment

Assessment is organised separately for the third and fourth semesters. In the third semester, the course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS). In the fourth semester, the course concludes with a Final Exam, with the grade combining continuous assessment (CAS) and final assessment (FAS).
Each semester is assessed on a 100-point scale.
Semester 3 – Final Test
100 points for continuous assessment (CAS):
30 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
30 points for comparative, research-analysis and developmental case assignments;
40 points for an integrative developmental analysis of infancy, childhood or adolescence.
The integrative developmental analysis forms part of CAS. Students apply relevant theories, interpret supplied case materials, consider individual and contextual variability, and formulate justified conclusions and developmentally appropriate recommendations.
Semester 4 – Final Exam
Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:
20 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
20 points for comparative, research-analysis and developmental case assignments;
20 points for a developmental analysis project, presentation and reflective commentary.
Final assessment (FAS) – 40 points:
30 points for written examination tasks;
10 points for an oral defence and clarification of written responses.
The developmental analysis project examines a selected developmental process or transition across at least two periods of life. Students integrate scholarly sources, compare theoretical explanations, analyse contextual influences and formulate justified implications for communication, learning or psychosocial support. The project uses published evidence or supplied fictional or anonymised materials.
The final examination assesses achievement of the course learning outcomes across both semesters. Written tasks include theoretical comparison, interpretation of a developmental research scenario and an integrative developmental case analysis. The oral component assesses the student's ability to explain reasoning, respond to follow-up questions and recognise the limitations of proposed interpretations.
Each assessed task is assigned to one assessment component. Work assessed in the third semester is not awarded CAS points again in the fourth semester.
Assessment criteria:
a) seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions – 30 points in Semester 3; 20 points in Semester 4

25–30 points / 16–20 points: The student accurately applies developmental concepts, explains connections between developmental processes and relevant contexts, and supports contributions with appropriate evidence. Completed tasks demonstrate understanding of developmental variability, and discussion contributions respond constructively to alternative interpretations.
18–24 points / 11–15 points: The student demonstrates a good understanding of the main concepts and completes most tasks accurately. Contributions are relevant and generally supported, although some explanations lack depth or sufficient attention to individual and contextual differences.
10–17 points / 6–10 points: The student demonstrates a basic understanding of the material. Tasks and contributions are mainly descriptive, with gaps in conceptual accuracy, supporting evidence or consideration of developmental variability.
1–9 points / 1–5 points: Tasks are substantially incomplete or contain significant conceptual errors. Contributions provide limited relevant analysis and rely on unsupported generalisations about age or development.
0 points: No assessable seminar work or contribution is provided.
b) comparative, research-analysis and developmental case assignments – 30 points in Semester 3; 20 points in Semester 4
25–30 points / 16–20 points: Assignments accurately compare theoretical explanations, interpret research findings within the limits of the design, and analyse cases using relevant developmental evidence. The student distinguishes observations from assumptions, considers alternative explanations, identifies ethical issues and proposes appropriate, well-justified recommendations.
18–24 points / 11–15 points: Assignments demonstrate generally accurate theoretical comparison, research interpretation and case analysis. Recommendations are relevant, although some contextual influences, limitations or alternative explanations require fuller consideration.
10–17 points / 6–10 points: Assignments meet basic requirements but contain gaps in reasoning or application of developmental concepts. Interpretation is partly accurate, and recommendations are general or insufficiently justified.
1–9 points / 1–5 points: Assignments demonstrate limited understanding, substantial inaccuracies or weak connections between evidence, interpretation and recommendations.
0 points: Assignments are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
c) integrative developmental analysis — 40 points in Semester 3
31–40 points: The student provides an accurate, coherent and well-supported analysis of a case concerning infancy, childhood or adolescence. Relevant theories are appropriately applied, observations are distinguished from assumptions, and individual and contextual influences are considered. Conclusions and recommendations follow from the evidence and recognise the limits of the information provided.
21–30 points: The analysis is generally accurate and logically structured. Relevant developmental concepts are applied appropriately, although some explanations, contextual factors or recommendations require greater depth or justification.
11–20 points: The analysis demonstrates basic understanding but remains partly descriptive or incomplete. Connections between theory, case information and recommendations are limited, and alternative explanations are insufficiently considered.
1–10 points: The analysis contains substantial conceptual errors, unsupported assumptions or recommendations that do not follow from the case information.
0 points: The task is not completed or provides no assessable evidence of the required skills.
d) developmental analysis project, presentation and reflective commentary – 20 points in Semester 4
16–20 points: The project presents a coherent, accurate and well-supported developmental analysis. It meaningfully compares periods of life, integrates relevant theoretical and empirical sources, considers individual and contextual variability, and avoids age-based stereotypes. Recommendations follow from the analysis. The presentation is clear, and the reflective commentary explains specific revisions made following feedback.
11–15 points: The project is generally accurate, coherent and supported by relevant sources. Comparisons and recommendations are appropriate, although some analysis lacks depth or precision.

Reflection identifies relevant improvements.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but remains mainly descriptive. Connections between theory, evidence and recommendations are limited, and reflection on feedback is general.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete, poorly structured or contains significant inaccuracies. Sources are insufficiently integrated, conclusions are weakly justified, and revisions show little use of feedback.
0 points: The project is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required skills.
e) written examination tasks – 30 points in Semester 4
25–30 points: The student accurately explains and compares developmental concepts, interprets research scenarios appropriately and provides a coherent case analysis. Responses distinguish evidence from assumptions, consider developmental and contextual variability, recognise ethical concerns and justify recommendations within the limits of the information provided.
18–24 points: Responses demonstrate good understanding and generally appropriate application. Minor inaccuracies or limitations occur in theoretical comparison, interpretation of research or justification of recommendations.
10–17 points: Responses demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in analysis, research interpretation or application to the case. Conclusions are partly supported, and recommendations require greater specificity or justification.
1–9 points: Responses demonstrate limited understanding, substantial conceptual errors or unsupported conclusions. Developmental and contextual information is insufficiently considered.
0 points: The written examination is not completed or no response earns credit.
f) oral defence and clarification of written responses – 10 points in Semester 4
9–10 points: The student clearly explains the reasoning behind written responses, accurately uses developmental concepts, responds convincingly to follow-up questions and recognises relevant uncertainties and limitations.
6–8 points: The student explains most responses accurately and answers follow-up questions appropriately, with minor gaps in precision or justification.
3–5 points: The student provides basic explanations but has difficulties defending interpretations, considering alternatives or identifying limitations.
1–2 points: Explanations are fragmentary or substantially inaccurate, and the student demonstrates limited ability to justify written responses.
0 points: The student does not complete the oral component or provides no assessable response.

Content

Semester 3

Topic 1. Developmental Psychology and Age Psychology: Subject Matter, Key Concepts and the Lifespan Perspective

Topic 2. Theories of Psychological Development: Psychodynamic, Cognitive-Developmental, Learning, Sociocultural and Ecological Approaches

Topic 3. Research Methods and Ethics in Developmental Psychology: Cross-Sectional, Longitudinal and Sequential Designs; Age, Cohort and Context

Topic 4. Biological Foundations, Prenatal Development and the Transition to Infancy

Topic 5. Infancy and Toddlerhood: Perception, Cognition, Language, Attachment and Early Self-Regulation

Topic 6. Early Childhood: Play, Thinking, Emotional Development and Social Relationships

Topic 7. Middle Childhood: Learning, Self-Concept, Peer Relationships and Social Understanding

Topic 8. Adolescence: Pubertal Change, Identity, Autonomy, Relationships and Developmental Variability

Semester 4

Topic 9. Emerging and Early Adulthood: Identity Exploration, Education, Work and Close Relationships

Topic 10. Middle Adulthood: Cognitive Development, Generativity, Relationships and Changing Social Roles

Topic 11. Late Adulthood: Cognitive and Socioemotional Development, Adaptation and Meaningful Participation
Topic 12. Cognitive Development Across the Lifespan: Attention, Memory, Reasoning, Learning and Expertise
Topic 13. Emotional, Personality and Social Development Across the Lifespan: Continuity, Change and Relationships
Topic 14. Development in Context: Family, Education, Culture, Inequality, Disability and Historical Change
Topic 15. Developmental Transitions and Major Life Events: Stress, Loss, Displacement, Risk, Protection and Resilience
Topic 16. Developmentally Appropriate Communication and Psychosocial Support: Evidence, Ethical Boundaries and the Prevention of Age-Based Stereotypes

Literature

Compulsory literature

1. Feldman, R. S. (2024). *Development across the life span* (10th ed.). Pearson. xxiv, 751 p.
2. Santrock, J. W. (2026). *Life-span development*. McGraw Hill. 816 p.
3. Savchyn, M. V., & Vasylenko, L. P. (2024). *Vikova psykholohiia* [Age psychology] (6th ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Akademiia. 384 p.

Recommended reading

1. Baker, A. E., & McMakin, D. L. (2024). Sleep and neuroaffective development from early to late adolescence. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 6*, 323–350.
2. Choudhury, S., Pi-Sunyer, B. P., & Blakemore, S.-J. (2023). A neuroecosocial perspective on adolescent development. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 285–307.
3. Cox, S. R. (2024). Neurocognitive aging. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 6*, 505–527.
4. Growney, C. M., Carstensen, L. L., & English, T. (2025). Momentary savoring in daily life in an adult life-span sample. *Emotion, 25*(1), 93–101.
5. Masten, A. S. (2025). *Ordinary magic: Resilience in development* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press. 448 p.
6. Monk, C. S., & Hardi, F. A. (2023). Poverty, brain development, and mental health: Progress, challenges, and paths forward. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 309–330.
7. Sirin, S. R., Brauer, S. Z., & Tugberk, R. C. (2024). Reframing adolescent identity: A global perspective for the digital age. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 6*, 301–322.
8. UNICEF. (2024). *Sytuatsiinyi analiz stanovyshcha ditei v Ukraini: 2024 [Situation analysis of children in Ukraine: 2024]*. Kyiv: UNICEF. 106 p.
9. Vandell, D. L., & Gülseven, Z. (2023). The Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development (SECCYD): Studying development from infancy to adulthood. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 5*, 331–354.

Web-resources

1. Annual Review of Developmental Psychology. URL: https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/devpsych
2. Harvard University. A Guide to the Developmental Environment. URL: https://developingchild.harvard.edu/resource-guides/a-guide-to-developmental-environments/
3. Stanford University. Life-span Development Laboratory: Publications. URL: https://lifespan.stanford.edu/publications
4. UNICEF Ukraine. Resursy dlia batkiv [Resources for parents]. URL: https://www.unicef.org/ukraine/parenting-hub
5. Volunteer All-Ukrainian Public Centre. Batkivstvo bez stresu [Parenting without stress]. URL: https://parents.nostress.org.ua/
6. World Health Organization. Ageing and Health. URL: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/ageing-and-health

DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of individual psychological differences and their ability to analyse variation in personality, temperament, character, cognitive abilities, motivation, emotion and self-regulation. Students compare theoretical explanations, examine biological and environmental influences, and critically interpret evidence about individual and group differences. Through guided assessment exercises, research analysis and case-based learning, they develop skills in interpreting psychological profiles and formulating evidence-informed recommendations for communication, learning and professional activity, while recognising measurement limitations, contextual influences and ethical boundaries.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3	5 / Mandatory	Inesa Harkusha, PhD (Social Communications), Associate Professor	150 h. (28 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars/practical, 108 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1. Explain and compare major approaches to individual differences in personality, temperament, character and cognitive abilities, distinguishing dimensional models from categorical typologies.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative tables, concept mapping and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks, topic-based quizzes and the individual analytical project (CAS); test questions and theoretical comparison (FAS).
2. Explain how biological, genetic, developmental and environmental influences contribute to individual differences, recognising the limitations of deterministic explanations.			Guided analysis of research findings, comparison of alternative explanations and discussion of gene–environment interplay and developmental change.	Research-analysis and case assignments, seminar tasks and quizzes (CAS); theoretical comparison and case analysis (FAS).
3. Select and use appropriate assessment materials in supervised learning exercises, explain their purpose, and evaluate basic evidence concerning reliability, validity, norms and fairness.			Demonstration of assessment procedures, guided scoring exercises, analysis of instrument documentation and comparison of self-report, observer-report and performance-based measures.	Practical assessment assignments and the individual analytical project (CAS); test questions and an assessment-based case analysis (FAS).
4. Interpret supplied psychological profiles and research findings, distinguish observations from inferences, and formulate conclusions that acknowledge measurement uncertainty and contextual limitations.			Case-based learning, interpretation of supplied scores and profiles, guided analysis of research reports and structured problem-solving.	Practical assignments, case analyses and the individual analytical project (CAS); integrated case analysis (FAS).
5. Critically evaluate evidence about sex, gender, age and cultural differences, distinguishing group-level findings from			Critical reading, comparison of distributions and effect sizes using supplied	Seminar tasks, research-analysis assignments and quizzes (CAS); theoretical

conclusions about individuals and avoiding stereotyping.	examples, small-group discussions and analysis of culturally contextualised cases.	comparison and integrated case analysis (FAS).
6. Formulate and justify recommendations for communication, learning, self-regulation and professional activity that take account of individual characteristics and situational demands.	Applied case analysis, structured problem-solving, simulated feedback conversations and project-based learning.	Practical case assignments and the individual analytical project (CAS); applied recommendations within the integrated case analysis (FAS).
7. Communicate a coherent psychological analysis in oral and written forms, use appropriately referenced sources, and demonstrate ethical judgement concerning consent, confidentiality, non-discrimination and the limits of assessment.	Short presentations, peer review, discussion of ethical dilemmas, guided revision and reflective commentary.	Individual analytical project, presentation and reflection; seminar and practical assignments (CAS); ethical reasoning and written justification within examination tasks (FAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and combines continuous assessment throughout the semester (CAS – 60 points) with a Final Exam (FAS – 40 points).
Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:
20 points for an individual analytical project, presentation and reflective commentary;
20 points for practical assessment exercises, research-analysis assignments and psychological case analyses;
10 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
10 points for topic-based quizzes.
Final assessment (FAS) – 40 points:
10 points for test questions;
10 points for a structured theoretical comparison;
20 points for an integrated assessment-based case analysis and justified practical recommendations.
The individual analytical project examines a selected individual-difference construct or model and its application to a defined educational, interpersonal or professional situation. Students compare theoretical explanations, evaluate relevant evidence and assessment approaches, and formulate conclusions that recognise contextual and measurement limitations. The project includes a short presentation and a reflective commentary explaining how feedback informed the final submission.
Practical assignments use published research, instrument documentation, supplied datasets and fictional or anonymised case materials. Students practise scoring and interpretation under lecturer guidance. Personal disclosure or participation in personality testing is not required; equivalent work with supplied materials is available. Assessment instruments are used in accordance with their access and licensing conditions.
The Final Exam assesses achievement of the course learning outcomes. The integrated case requires students to interpret supplied information, evaluate the appropriateness and limitations of an assessment approach, consider contextual influences and ethical issues, and justify practical recommendations. It does not require the diagnosis of mental disorders.
Each assessed task is assigned to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice.
Assessment criteria:
a) Individual analytical project, presentation and reflective commentary – 20 points
16–20 points: The project accurately explains the selected construct or model, critically integrates relevant theoretical and empirical sources, and evaluates assessment approaches with attention to reliability, validity and contextual appropriateness. Conclusions and recommendations are coherent and

justified. The presentation is clear, and reflection identifies specific revisions made in response to feedback.
11–15 points: The project demonstrates a good understanding of the selected topic and generally appropriate use of evidence. Analysis and recommendations are relevant, although some limitations or alternative explanations require fuller consideration. The presentation is coherent, and reflection identifies relevant improvements.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but remains mainly descriptive. Evaluation of evidence or assessment methods is limited, and recommendations are only partly justified. Reflection on feedback is general.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete or contains significant conceptual errors. Sources are insufficiently integrated, conclusions are weakly supported, and the presentation or reflection provides limited evidence of understanding.
0 points: The project is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.
b) Practical assessment exercises, research-analysis assignments and psychological case analyses — 20 points
16–20 points: The student follows the supplied procedures accurately, interprets findings appropriately and distinguishes evidence from assumptions. Analysis considers measurement quality, situational influences, alternative explanations and ethical requirements. Recommendations follow logically from the available information.
11–15 points: Assignments are generally accurate and appropriately reasoned. Minor errors or omissions occur in scoring, interpretation, consideration of limitations or justification of recommendations.
6–10 points: Assignments demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in scoring, research interpretation or application to the case. Conclusions are partly supported, and limitations are insufficiently considered.
1–5 points: Assignments contain substantial errors, unsupported interpretations or inappropriate generalisations. Connections between evidence, conclusions and recommendations are weak.
0 points: Assignments are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
c) Seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions — 10 points
9–10 points: Completed tasks and contributions demonstrate accurate understanding, appropriate use of evidence and constructive engagement with alternative interpretations. The student recognises individual variability and avoids unsupported generalisations.
6–8 points: Tasks and contributions are relevant and generally accurate, although some explanations lack depth or sufficient supporting evidence.
3–5 points: Tasks and contributions demonstrate basic understanding but remain descriptive or contain gaps in reasoning.
1–2 points: Submitted work is fragmentary or substantially inaccurate and provides limited relevant analysis.
0 points: No assessable seminar work or contribution is provided.
d) Topic-based quizzes – 10 points
Points are awarded for correct answers according to the published answer key. Quiz results are aggregated and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
e) Final examination: test questions – 10 points
Points are awarded for correct answers according to the examination answer key. The total is converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Final examination: structured theoretical comparison – 10 points
9–10 points: The response accurately compares the specified approaches or constructs, explains their assumptions and supporting evidence, and identifies relevant limitations and implications.
6–8 points: The comparison is generally accurate and appropriately structured, with minor omissions or insufficiently developed evaluation.

3–5 points: The response demonstrates basic knowledge but provides a mainly descriptive or incomplete comparison.
1–2 points: The response contains substantial conceptual errors or provides little relevant comparison.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.
g) Final examination: integrated assessment-based case analysis and recommendations – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately interprets the supplied information, evaluates the assessment approach, distinguishes observations from inferences and considers relevant individual and contextual influences. Conclusions acknowledge uncertainty, recommendations are justified, and ethical boundaries are clearly recognised.
11–15 points: The analysis is generally accurate and coherent. Recommendations are relevant, although some measurement limitations, contextual influences or alternative explanations require fuller consideration.
6–10 points: The analysis demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in interpretation or justification. Recommendations are general, and ethical or measurement limitations are only partly addressed.
1–5 points: The analysis contains significant errors, unsupported conclusions or recommendations that do not follow from the case information.
0 points: The task is not completed or provides no assessable evidence of the required skills.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Differential Psychology
Topic 2. Personality and the Structure of Individuality
Topic 3. Research Methods and Assessment of Individual Differences
Topic 4. Biological and Environmental Influences on Individual Differences
Topic 5. Temperament and Individual Behaviour
Topic 6. Character and Personality Traits
Topic 7. Intelligence and Cognitive Abilities
Topic 8. Creativity and Giftedness
Topic 9. Individual Differences in Cognition and Cognitive Styles
Topic 10. Individual Differences in Motivation and Emotional Regulation
Topic 11. Stability and Change in Individual Differences Across the Lifespan
Topic 12. Sex and Gender Differences
Topic 13. Culture and Individual Differences
Topic 14. Individual Differences in Learning and Professional Activity

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Funder, D. C. (2024). The personality puzzle (9th ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 712 p.
2. Larsen, R. J., Buss, D. M., Song, J., Jeronimus, B., van den Berg, S., & Sagoe, D. (2025). Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature (4th ed.). McGraw Hill. 780 p.
3. Maksymenko, S. D. (Ed.). (2024). Dyferentsiina psykholohiia [Differential psychology] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo Liudmyla. 571 p.

Recommended reading

1. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2025). Self- and observer reports of personality. Annual Review of Psychology, 76, 771–795.
2. Bleidorn, W. (2024). Toward a theory of lifespan personality trait development. Annual Review of Developmental Psychology, 6, 455–478.
3. Korenieva, Yu. P., Mukhina, L. M., & Chuhuieva, I. Ye. (2023). Dyferentsiina psykholohiia: metodychni vkazivky dlia samostiinoi roboty studentiv [Differential psychology: Guidelines for independent student work]. Mykolaiv: Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding. 90 p.
4. Medianova, O. V. (Comp.). (2023). Dyferentsialna psykholohiia: elektronni metodychni rekomendatsii do praktychnykh zaniat ta samostiinoi roboty [Differential psychology: Electronic methodological recommendations for practical classes and independent work]. Odesa: Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University. 35 p.
5. Minkov, M., & Schachner, M. (2024). Relationships between Big Five personality traits and individual-level cultural components. Personality and Individual Differences, 226, Article 112691.

6. Musek, J. (2024). Personality psychology: A new perspective. Cham: Springer. xiv, 404 p.

Web-resources

1. International Cognitive Ability Resource. Cognitive assessment materials, item types and psychometric information. URL: https://www.icar-project.org/
2. International Personality Item Pool. Personality scales, scoring instructions and interpretation guidance. URL: https://www.ipip.ori.org/
3. Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. HEXACO Personality Inventory-Revised: Questionnaires and scoring keys. URL: https://hexaco.org/hexaco-inventory

PSYCHODIAGNOSTICS. GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY WORKSHOP				
The course aims to develop students' ability to plan and conduct basic psychological assessment under lecturer guidance, evaluate assessment instruments, interpret findings and communicate justified conclusions. Building on General Psychology, the workshop applies knowledge of cognitive processes, personality, motivation and emotion to practical assessment tasks. Particular attention is paid to the quality of measurement, integration of information from different sources, ethical decision-making and the responsible use of assessment findings in psychological support.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3–4	9 / Mandatory	Iryna Yavorska	270 hours: 70 hours of contact teaching and 200 hours of self-directed learning
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain the purposes, stages and limitations of psychological assessment and distinguish assessment questions, psychological constructs, methods and instruments.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, analysis of assessment requests and structured discussions.	Instrument-appraisal assignments, practical tasks and topic-based quizzes (CAS); examination questions and case analysis (FAS)
2) Evaluate the suitability of assessment instruments using evidence concerning reliability, validity, norms, accessibility and cultural and linguistic appropriateness.			Guided analysis of instrument manuals, comparison of assessment approaches and critical discussion of research findings.	Instrument-appraisal assignments and assessment portfolio (CAS); examination questions and justification of instrument selection within the case analysis (FAS)
3) Develop a basic assessment plan that addresses a defined question and combines appropriate interview, observation, self-report or performance-based methods.			Case-based learning, assessment-planning workshops, simulated interviews and comparison of alternative assessment plans.	Practical assignments and assessment portfolio (CAS); integrated case analysis (FAS)
4) Demonstrate standardised administration and accurate scoring of selected assessment procedures under lecturer guidance, documenting relevant conditions and procedural limitations.			Demonstration, supervised practice, structured observation, scoring exercises and corrective feedback.	Observed practical exercises and assessment protocols (CAS); practical examination station (FAS)
5) Interpret assessment findings using appropriate reference information, recognise uncertainty and integrate results from different sources without making unsupported diagnostic conclusions.			Guided interpretation of scores and profiles, analysis of supplied datasets and discussion of consistent and conflicting findings.	Scoring and interpretation assignments and assessment portfolio (CAS); practical examination station and integrated case analysis (FAS)

6) Prepare a clear psychological assessment report and communicate findings and proportionate recommendations in an understandable and respectful manner.	Report-writing workshops, simulated feedback conversations, peer review and guided revision.	Assessment portfolio, written reports and feedback simulations (CAS); written case analysis and explanation of results at the practical examination station (FAS)
7) Apply ethical principles concerning informed consent, confidentiality, test security, non-discrimination and professional competence, and identify circumstances requiring consultation or referral.	Analysis of ethical dilemmas, supervised practice, reflective discussion and review of professional guidance.	Practical assignments, instrument appraisals and reflective portfolio commentary (CAS); ethical reasoning within examination questions, the practical station and case analysis (FAS)

Assessment

Assessment is organised separately for the third and fourth semesters. Each semester is assessed on a 100-point scale.

In the third semester, the course concludes with a Final Test. The semester grade is based entirely on accumulated continuous assessment points (CAS), without a separate final examination.

In the fourth semester, the course concludes with a Final Exam. The semester grade combines continuous assessment (CAS – 60 points) and final assessment (FAS – 40 points).

Semester 3 – **Final Test**

100 points for continuous assessment (CAS):

40 points for an assessment portfolio covering assessment planning, foundational procedures and cognitive processes;

30 points for practical assessment exercises, observed administration, scoring and interpretation assignments;

20 points for critical appraisals of assessment instruments;

10 points for topic-based quizzes.

The portfolio includes an assessment plan, justification of selected methods, completed protocols, a report on supplied findings and reflective commentary. Students receive formative feedback before final submission.

Semester 4 – **Final Exam**

Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:

20 points for an assessment portfolio covering personality, motivation, emotional functioning and the integration of assessment findings, including a report, feedback demonstration and reflective commentary;

20 points for practical assessment exercises, observed administration, scoring and interpretation assignments;

10 points for critical appraisals of assessment instruments;

10 points for topic-based quizzes.

Final assessment (FAS) – 40 points:

10 points for examination questions;

20 points for a practical examination task;

10 points for an integrated written case analysis.

The fourth-semester portfolio develops the skills acquired in the third semester through new assessment tasks and case materials. Work assessed in the third semester is not awarded points again in the fourth semester. The portfolios do not duplicate the General Psychology term paper.

Practical assignments use lecturer-approved instruments, fictional or anonymised cases and supplied datasets. Students practise administration, scoring and interpretation under lecturer guidance.

Participation in personal psychological testing is voluntary, and equivalent assignments using supplied materials are available.
The Final Exam assesses theoretical understanding, practical assessment skills, interpretation of findings and ethical judgement across the course. The practical task requires students to demonstrate a selected procedure, complete or check scoring and explain interpretation limits. The written case analysis requires an assessment plan, integration of supplied findings and justified recommendations.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice.

Assessment criteria

a) assessment portfolio – 40 points in Semester 3; 20 points in Semester 4

31–40 points / 16–20 points: The student presents a coherent assessment plan and justifies method selection using relevant evidence. Protocols and reports are accurate and clearly structured. Interpretation integrates findings, recognises uncertainty and supports appropriate recommendations. Reflection explains specific revisions following feedback. In Semester 4, the feedback demonstration communicates findings clearly and respectfully.

21–30 points / 11–15 points: The portfolio demonstrates a good understanding of assessment procedures and generally accurate interpretation. Method selection and recommendations are appropriate, although some limitations or alternative explanations require fuller consideration. Reflection identifies relevant improvements.

11–20 points / 6–10 points: The portfolio meets basic requirements but contains gaps in planning, documentation or interpretation. Recommendations are general or only partly supported. Reflection remains mainly descriptive.

1–10 points / 1–5 points: The portfolio is substantially incomplete or contains significant procedural or interpretative errors. Conclusions are weakly supported, and the use of feedback is limited.

0 points: The portfolio is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.

b) practical assessment exercises – 30 points in Semester 3; 20 points in Semester 4

25–30 points / 16–20 points: The student follows assessment procedures accurately, communicates instructions clearly, records relevant observations and completes scoring correctly. Interpretation acknowledges procedural limitations, and ethical requirements are consistently observed.

18–24 points / 11–15 points: Administration, recording and scoring are generally accurate, with minor errors or omissions. The student explains findings appropriately and responds constructively to corrective feedback.

10–17 points / 6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic procedural skills but makes errors in administration, recording or scoring. Interpretation requires substantial guidance.

1–9 points / 1–5 points: Significant procedural errors, incomplete records or inaccurate scoring compromise the interpretation of results.

0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.

c) critical appraisals of assessment instruments – 20 points in Semester 3; 10 points in Semester 4

16–20 points / 9–10 points: The student accurately identifies the instruments' purposes, target populations and administration requirements. Appraisals critically consider reliability, validity, norms, accessibility and cultural and linguistic appropriateness. Conclusions about proposed uses are well justified.

11–15 points / 6–8 points: Appraisals are generally accurate and supported by relevant sources, although some limitations require fuller consideration.

6–10 points / 3–5 points: Appraisals identify the instruments' main characteristics but provide limited evaluation of measurement quality or suitability.

1–5 points / 1–2 points: Appraisals are fragmentary, substantially inaccurate or insufficiently supported.

0 points: No assessable appraisal work is submitted.

d) topic-based quizzes – 10 points in each semester

Quiz results are aggregated separately for each semester and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points. Points are awarded for correct answers according to the published marking scheme. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

e) final examination questions – 10 points in Semester 4
Points are awarded according to the examination marking scheme for accurate answers concerning assessment principles, instrument selection, measurement quality, interpretation and ethics. The maximum score is 10 points.
f) practical examination task – 20 points in Semester 4
16–20 points: The student accurately demonstrates the selected procedure, provides clear instructions, records relevant information and completes or checks scoring correctly. Procedural errors are recognised, interpretation is justified, and explanations acknowledge uncertainty and ethical boundaries.
11–15 points: Performance is generally accurate and appropriately explained. Minor errors occur without substantially compromising the assessment process or interpretation.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic procedural competence but makes errors in administration, recording, scoring or explanation of findings.
1–5 points: Significant procedural or interpretative errors compromise the assessment. Explanations are fragmentary or unsupported.
0 points: The task is not completed or provides no assessable evidence of the required skills.
g) integrated written case analysis – 10 points in Semester 4
9–10 points: The assessment plan addresses the stated question, method selection is justified and findings are accurately integrated. Conclusions distinguish evidence from assumptions, recognise limitations and support proportionate recommendations. The student identifies when further assessment, consultation or referral is required.
6–8 points: The analysis is generally accurate and coherent, with minor gaps in justification, integration of findings or consideration of limitations.
3–5 points: The analysis demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in assessment planning, interpretation or recommendations.
1–2 points: The analysis contains substantial errors, unsupported conclusions or inappropriate recommendations.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.

Content

Semester 3
Topic 1. Introduction to Psychodiagnostics and Psychological Assessment
Topic 2. Ethical Principles and Professional Responsibilities in Assessment
Topic 3. Assessment Questions and Planning
Topic 4. Reliability and Validity of Assessment Instruments
Topic 5. Standardisation and Test Norms
Topic 6. Interview and Observation in Psychological Assessment
Topic 7. Assessment Procedures and Documentation
Topic 8. Assessment of Attention and Perception
Topic 9. Assessment of Memory and Thinking
Semester 4
Topic 10. Assessment of Intelligence and Cognitive Abilities
Topic 11. Assessment of Temperament and Personality
Topic 12. Assessment of Motivation and Interests
Topic 13. Assessment of Emotional States and Self-Regulation
Topic 14. Selecting Instruments for Different Ages and Contexts
Topic 15. Digital Assessment and Data Protection
Topic 16. Integrating and Interpreting Assessment Findings
Topic 17. Writing Integrated Psychological Assessment Reports
Topic 18. Communicating Results and Formulating Recommendations

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Chumak, O. O., & Tovstukha, O. M. (2024). Psykhodiahnostyka [Psychodiagnostics]. Poltava: Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. 121 p.

2. Cohen, R. J., Schneider, W. J., & Tobin, R. M. (2025). Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement. New York: McGraw Hill. 736 p.

3. Hays, D. G. (2023). Assessment in counseling: Procedures and practices (7th ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association. 528 p.

Recommended reading

1. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2025). Self- and observer reports of personality. Annual Review of Psychology, 76, 771–795.

2. Funder, D. C. (2024). The personality puzzle (9th ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 712 p.

3. Hudyma, O. V. (Comp.). (2025). Psykhodiahnostyka [Psychodiagnostics]. Kamianets-Podilskyi: Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University. 200 p.

4. Tkachuk, I. I., Prorok, N. V., Lunchenko, N. V., Horlenko, V. M., Ostrova, V. D., & Sosnovenko, N. V. (2024). Zastosuvannia diahnostychnykh minimumiv v diialnosti pratsivnykiv psykholohichnoi sluzhby [Application of diagnostic minimums in the work of psychological service professionals] (V. H. Panok, Ed.; 2nd ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Ukrainian Scientific and Methodological Centre of Applied Psychology and Social Work. 100 p.

Web-resources

1. International Cognitive Ability Resource. Cognitive assessment materials and psychometric information. URL: https://www.icar-project.org/

2. International Personality Item Pool. Personality scales and scoring guidance. URL: https://www.ipip.ori.org/

3. Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. HEXACO Personality Inventory–Revised: Assessment materials and scoring keys. URL: https://hexaco.org/hexaco-inventory

4. PsyToolkit. Cognitive task demonstrations and documentation. URL: https://www.psytoolkit.org/experiment-library/

METHODS AND ORGANIZATION OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH IN PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological research and their ability to formulate research questions, critically evaluate scientific evidence and prepare a coherent research proposal. Students learn to search and synthesise academic literature, define psychological constructs, select appropriate research approaches and plan sampling, data collection and analysis. Particular attention is paid to research ethics, academic integrity, transparent documentation and the responsible communication of findings.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4	4.5 / Mandatory	Ivan Batrachenko, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor	135 hours: 42 hours of contact teaching and 93 hours of self-directed learning
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the principles of scientific inquiry in psychology and distinguish research evidence from unsupported claims, recognising the relationship between theory, research questions and methods.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, concept mapping and discussion of research examples.	Seminar tasks, critical analysis assignments and topic-based quizzes (CAS)
2) Search for relevant academic sources, evaluate their credibility and methodological quality, and synthesise findings with appropriate referencing.			Guided literature searches, source-evaluation workshops, analysis of research articles and reference-management exercises.	Literature review and source-evaluation assignments; references and literature synthesis within the research proposal (CAS)
3) Formulate a focused research problem, aim, research questions and, where appropriate, hypotheses, and define the constructs or variables to be investigated.			Research-planning workshops, analysis of examples, guided operationalisation exercises and formative feedback.	Research-planning assignments and the research proposal (CAS)
4) Compare quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approaches and justify a research design appropriate to the question, available resources and limits of inference.			Comparative design analysis, case-based learning, small-group discussions and proposal workshops.	Design-analysis assignments, topic-based quizzes and the research proposal (CAS)
5) Develop a feasible plan for sampling, recruitment and data collection and justify the selection of methods and instruments.			Sampling exercises, analysis of instrument documentation, interview and observation planning, and structured peer review.	Practical planning assignments and the methods section of the research proposal (CAS)
6) Prepare a basic data-management and analysis plan and interpret supplied research findings while distinguishing			Guided work with supplied data, interpretation of tables and figures, introductory	Data-interpretation assignments, topic-based quizzes and the proposed analysis plan (CAS)

description, association and causal inference.	coding exercises and discussion of research limitations.	
7) Apply research ethics and academic integrity principles and communicate a coherent research proposal in written and oral forms, revising it in response to feedback.	Ethical case analysis, preparation of participant documents, short presentations, peer review and reflective revision.	Ethical documentation, written research proposal, presentation and reflective commentary (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points. No separate final examination is required.
100 points for continuous assessment:
10 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
20 points for literature review and source-evaluation assignments;
20 points for research-planning and data-interpretation assignments;
10 points for topic-based quizzes;
40 points for an integrated research proposal, presentation and reflective commentary.
The integrated research proposal includes a focused research problem, a concise literature synthesis, an aim, research questions and, where appropriate, hypotheses. It also includes definitions of relevant constructs or variables, a justified research design, a sampling and recruitment plan, proposed methods and instruments, a data-management and analysis plan, ethical documentation, a timetable and references.
Students receive formative feedback on a proposal outline or draft before final submission. The reflective commentary explains how feedback informed revisions. The presentation assesses the ability to explain and justify research decisions and recognise limitations.
The proposal is a planning task. Collection of new participant data is not required. Practical exercises use published research, fictional scenarios and supplied or appropriately anonymised data.
Literature and planning assignments assess specific research skills. The final proposal assesses their coherent integration, justification and revision. Previously assessed work does not receive the same marks again.
Assessment criteria:
a) seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions – 10 points
9–10 points: The student accurately applies research concepts, supports contributions with relevant evidence and constructively evaluates alternative explanations. Completed tasks demonstrate critical understanding and recognition of methodological limitations.
6–8 points: Tasks and contributions are relevant and generally accurate, although some explanations require greater depth or supporting evidence.
3–5 points: Tasks and contributions demonstrate basic understanding but remain mainly descriptive or contain gaps in reasoning.
1–2 points: Work is fragmentary, substantially inaccurate or provides limited relevant analysis.
0 points: No assessable seminar work or contribution is provided.
b) literature review and source-evaluation assignments – 20 points
16–20 points: The student uses a clear search strategy, selects credible and relevant sources and critically evaluates research questions, methods, findings and limitations. The review synthesises evidence, identifies a justified research problem and uses accurate referencing.
11–15 points: Sources are relevant and generally evaluated appropriately. The review demonstrates good understanding, although synthesis, methodological evaluation or justification of the research problem requires further development. Referencing contains minor inaccuracies.
6–10 points: The review meets basic requirements but relies mainly on summaries of individual sources. Evaluation is limited, and connections between evidence and the proposed research problem are insufficiently developed.

1–5 points: Source selection is weak, analysis contains significant inaccuracies, or the review lacks coherent synthesis and adequate referencing.
0 points: Assignments are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
c) research-planning and data-interpretation assignments – 20 points
16–20 points: The student formulates coherent research questions and appropriately defines constructs or variables. Design, sampling and methods are justified and feasible. Supplied findings are interpreted accurately, with appropriate recognition of uncertainty, ethical requirements and limits of inference.
11–15 points: Assignments demonstrate generally accurate planning and interpretation. Minor inconsistencies or omissions occur in operationalisation, methodological justification or consideration of limitations.
6–10 points: Assignments demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in planning, interpretation or alignment between the research question and methods.
1–5 points: Assignments contain significant methodological errors, unsupported interpretations or research plans that do not adequately address the stated question.
0 points: Assignments are not submitted or provide no assessable evidence of the required skills.
d) topic-based quizzes – 10 points
Quiz results are aggregated and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points. Points are awarded for correct answers according to the published marking scheme. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
e) integrated research proposal, presentation and reflective commentary – 40 points
31–40 points: The proposal is coherent, feasible and supported by relevant scientific evidence. The problem, questions and methods are clearly aligned. Sampling, data collection, analysis and ethical procedures are appropriately justified. The presentation clearly explains research decisions and limitations. Reflection identifies specific revisions made in response to feedback.
21–30 points: The proposal is generally coherent and feasible. Most research decisions are appropriately justified, although some methodological details, ethical considerations or limitations require fuller development. The presentation is clear, and reflection identifies relevant improvements.
11–20 points: The proposal meets basic requirements but contains gaps in alignment, methodological justification or feasibility. Ethical documentation or the analysis plan is incomplete. The presentation and reflection demonstrate basic understanding.
1–10 points: The proposal is substantially incomplete or contains significant methodological inconsistencies. Research decisions are weakly justified, and the presentation provides limited explanation of the proposed study.
0 points: The proposal is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.

Content

Topic 1. Scientific Inquiry in Psychology
Topic 2. Research Problems and the Relationship Between Theory and Evidence
Topic 3. Searching and Evaluating Academic Sources
Topic 4. Literature Review and Research Gaps
Topic 5. Research Aims and Questions
Topic 6. Hypotheses and Operational Definitions
Topic 7. Quantitative Research Designs
Topic 8. Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research
Topic 9. Sampling and Participant Recruitment
Topic 10. Selecting Research Methods and Instruments
Topic 11. Research Ethics and Participant Protection
Topic 12. Data Collection and Research Documentation
Topic 13. Data Management and Analysis Planning
Topic 14. Interpreting Findings and Research Limitations
Topic 15. Academic Writing and Research Transparency
Topic 16. Organising and Presenting a Research Proposal

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bocheliuk, V. Y., Nechyporenko, V. V., Pozdniakova, O. L., Zavatska, N. Ye., Zavatskyi, Yu. A., Zhyharenko, I. Ye., & Zavatskyi, V. Yu. (2023). Metodyka ta orhanizatsiia naukovykh doslidzhen z psykholohii [Methods and organisation of scientific research in psychology] (3rd ed., revised and expanded). Zaporizhzhia; Kyiv: LAT&K. 384 p.

2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (6th ed., international student ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. 320 p.

3. Morling, B. (2025). Research methods in psychology: Evaluating a world of information (5th international student ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 672 p.

Recommended reading

1. American Psychological Association. (2020). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (7th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. 428 p.

2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. London: SAGE. 376 p.

3. Halian, I. M. (2024). Dyzain psykholohichnoho doslidzhennia [Psychological research design]. Lviv: Spolom. 191 p.

4. Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. Collabra: Psychology, 8(1), Article 33267.

Web-resources

1. Center for Open Science. Preregistration guidance and examples. URL: https://www.cos.io/initiatives/prereg

2. APA Style. Journal Article Reporting Standards. URL: https://apastyle.apa.org/jars

3. Zotero. Documentation and reference-management tutorials. URL: https://www.zotero.org/support/

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to acquire a body of knowledge regarding the psychological patterns of social behavior in individuals and various types of groups, the psychological mechanisms of communication and interaction among people in society, to develop an understanding of the psychology of social phenomena and processes, and to acquire practical skills for professional work by applying the knowledge gained in this course				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4	5.5 / Mandatory **Term paper:** 1 ECTS credit	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	165 h. (28 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars/practical, 123 h. self-directed learning) **Term paper:** 30 hours
Learning outcomes **On completion of the course, students will be able to:**			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Understand the basic theoretical approaches, patterns, and mechanisms underlying social-psychological phenomena, processes of interpersonal interaction, socialization, and group dynamics			Lectures, interactive discussions, analysis of academic sources, problem-based learning, and thematic discussions.	participation in discussions, oral questioning, analysis of theoretical sources (CAS); theoretical questions, testing (FAS)
2) To analyze the socio-psychological processes of communication, interpersonal relationships, social norms, attitudes, and social identity.			Case studies, practical sessions, group exercises, role-playing, and small-group work	case analysis, practical exercises, participation in discussions (CAS); analysis of case studies (FAS)
3) Apply methods of social and psychological research to analyze the behavior of individuals and groups in professional settings			Practical assignments, mini-research projects, analysis of empirical data, and work with digital resources and academic databases	research tasks, analytical assignments, presentation of results (CAS); theoretical and practical tasks (FAS)
4) Formulate and provide well-reasoned justification for one's own position on socio-psychological issues, and critically evaluate the results of research and professional practice.			Discussions, debates, reflective exercises, analysis of academic publications, problem-based learning	participation in discussions, reflective assignments, and analytical essays (CAS); open-ended theoretical questions (FAS)
5) Demonstrate skills in effective communication, interpersonal interaction, and teamwork, taking into account cultural, age, and gender differences.			Training exercises, role-play activities, group work, communication exercises, peer feedback.	group activities, communication exercises, peer assessment (CAS); analysis of communicative situations (FAS)
6) Identify the socio-psychological characteristics of individuals and groups, and			Analysis of psychological	practical assignments, analytical reports,

analyze the influence of the social environment on the development of behavior and self-concept.	situations, case studies, independent work, interactive exercises, research assignments.	presentations (CAS); comprehensive case studies (FAS)
7) Adhere to the principles of professional ethics, social responsibility, and humanistic values in professional and interpersonal interactions	Analysis of ethical dilemmas, group discussions, reflective learning, and elements of supervision.	ethical case analysis, participation in discussions, reflective assignments (CAS); final exam (theoretical questions, test items, analysis of professional scenarios); term paper (FAS)

Assessment

The course grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and combines continuous assessment (CAS – 60 points) with the Final Exam (FAS – 40 points). The term paper is assessed separately and receives an independently recorded grade.

Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:

20 points for seminar tasks, evidence-based discussions, group activities and communication exercises;

20 points for an individual analytical assignment and presentation;

20 points for social psychological case analyses, reflective tasks and practical research assignments.

Final assessment (FAS) – 40 points:

10 points for theoretical questions and test items;

15 points for analysis of a supplied social psychological situation;

15 points for interpretation and critical evaluation of findings concerning interpersonal interaction or group processes.

Work assessed as part of the term paper is not counted again towards CAS. Required tasks, deadlines and task-specific marking criteria are communicated at the beginning of the semester.

Assessment criteria:

a) Seminar tasks, evidence-based discussions, group activities and communication exercises – 20 points

16–20 points: The student accurately explains and applies social psychology concepts, supports contributions with relevant evidence and considers alternative interpretations. Communication is clear and respectful, and group work demonstrates constructive cooperation.

11–15 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and provides relevant contributions. Minor inaccuracies or limitations in justification do not substantially affect performance.

6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but contributions and completed tasks remain mainly descriptive or partially justified.

1–5 points: Work demonstrates fragmented understanding, substantial conceptual errors or unsupported opinions.

0 points: No assessable work or contribution is provided.

b) Individual analytical assignment and presentation – 20 points

16–20 points: The assignment addresses a clearly defined social psychological issue, critically evaluates relevant academic sources and presents coherent, justified conclusions. The presentation clearly communicates the argument and acknowledges limitations.

11–15 points: The assignment is generally accurate and well structured. Sources are appropriate, although some comparisons, arguments or conclusions require further development.

6–10 points: The assignment meets basic requirements but relies mainly on description. Source evaluation and justification of conclusions are limited.

1–5 points: The assignment is substantially incomplete, poorly structured or contains significant conceptual inaccuracies.

0 points: No assessable assignment is submitted.

c) Case analyses, reflective tasks and practical research assignments – 20 points

16–20 points: The student appropriately applies social psychology theories and methods, considers contextual influences and alternative explanations, and distinguishes evidence from assumptions. Conclusions and recommendations are justified, and reflection recognises relevant limitations.
11–15 points: Analysis is generally accurate and appropriately supported, with minor omissions or weaknesses in interpretation or justification.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in applying concepts, interpreting findings or supporting conclusions.
1–5 points: Work contains significant errors, unsupported interpretations or weak connections between evidence and conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Final Exam – 40 points
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive and accurate understanding of social psychology, applies concepts appropriately and critically interprets evidence. Analysis considers contextual factors and alternative explanations, and conclusions are coherent and well supported.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and completes most tasks correctly. Minor conceptual inaccuracies, omissions or weaknesses in justification occur.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in application or interpretation. Responses are partially complete, and conclusions require stronger justification.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding and substantial difficulty applying concepts or drawing supported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable examination response is provided or no assessment criteria are met.
Task-specific criteria and point allocations are provided on the examination paper.

Assessment of the Term Paper

The term paper and oral defence constitute a separate final assessment (FAS), assessed on a 100-point scale:
70 points (70%) for the written term paper;
30 points (30%) for the oral defence.
The term paper examines a focused social psychological problem through a critical review of scientific literature and a theoretically grounded analytical or empirical study. Where participant data collection is included, the research design, methods and ethical procedures are agreed with the supervisor before data collection.
The written term paper is assessed according to the clarity and relevance of the research problem, aim and objectives; accuracy of social psychology concepts; quality of theoretical analysis and source evaluation; appropriateness of the methodological approach; interpretation of evidence; justification of conclusions; acknowledgement of limitations; academic writing, referencing and compliance with academic integrity requirements.
The oral defence is assessed according to the clarity and logic of the presentation, ability to justify research decisions and conclusions, provide reasoned answers to questions, use appropriate social psychology terminology and reflect on the limitations of the work.
The term paper primarily assesses learning outcomes 3, 4, 6 and 7 and applies relevant knowledge from the other learning outcomes according to the approved topic.
Assessment criteria:
90–100 points: The term paper demonstrates an excellent level of achievement for a bachelor-level research assignment. The research problem is clearly formulated and relevant to social psychology. Theoretical analysis systematically evaluates scientific sources and considers alternative explanations. Methodological decisions are appropriate, evidence is accurately interpreted, and conclusions are logically justified. The student presents the work clearly, provides well-reasoned answers and recognises its limitations.
75–89 points: The term paper demonstrates a good level of achievement. The theoretical and methodological foundations are generally sound, and the analysis and conclusions are appropriate. The student presents and defends the work competently, although some aspects require greater depth, precision or justification.

60–74 points: The term paper demonstrates a satisfactory level of achievement. The research problem and theoretical foundations are presented, but source evaluation, methodological justification, interpretation or argumentation are limited. During the defence, the student demonstrates general understanding but has difficulty explaining particular decisions or conclusions.
1–59 points: The term paper demonstrates substantial deficiencies in conceptual accuracy, theoretical analysis, methodology, interpretation, conclusions or academic writing. During the defence, the student demonstrates limited understanding and substantial difficulty justifying decisions or answering questions.
0 points: No assessable work is provided for the relevant component or no assessment criteria are met.

Content

Topic 1. General Overview of Social Psychology as a Field of Psychological Knowledge
Topic 2. Theoretical Approaches in International Social Psychology
Topic 3. Methodology and Methods of Social-Psychological Research
Topic 4. General Overview of the Communication Process
Topic 5. Communication and Interpersonal Relationships
Topic 6. The issue of personality in social psychology
Topic 7. Socialization of the personality
Topic 8. Social identity of the personality and the formation of self-concept
Topic 9. Social norms and values
Topic 10. Socio-psychological characteristics of the personality
Topic 11. Social attitudes of the personality
Topic 12. General Characteristics of Social Psychology of Groups
Topic 13. Social Psychology of Small Groups
Topic 14. Large Social Groups

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Doronina, M. S., Zhdanova, I. V., Poliakova, H. A., & Tiutlikova, V. V. (2009). Sotsialna psykholohiia [Social psychology]. Kharkiv: Kharkiv National University of Economics. 164 p.

2. Khavula, R., & Hrynyk, I. (Comps.). (2023). Entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk z sotsialnoi psykholohii [Encyclopedic dictionary of social psychology]. Drohobych: Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University. 246 p.

3. Kovalenko, A. B., & Korniev, M. N. (2006). Sotsialna psykholohiia [Social psychology] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Kondor. 400 p.

4. Moskalenko, V. V. (2005). Sotsialna psykholohiia [Social psychology]. Kyiv: Tsentr navchalnoi literatury. 624 p.

5. Orban-Lembryk, L. E. (2010). Sotsialna psykholohiia. Knyha 1: Sotsialna psykholohiia osobystosti i spilkuvannia [Social psychology. Book 1: Social psychology of personality and communication]. Chernivtsi: Knyhy-XXI. 463 p.

6. Polishchuk, V. M. (2021). Sotsialna psykholohiia: prohramni osnovy, zmistovi moduli, informatsiine zabezpechennia [Social psychology: Programme foundations, content modules and information resources]. Sumy: Universytetska knyha. 217 p.

7. Sliusarevskyi, M. M. (Ed.). (2018). Osnovy sotsialnoi psykholohii [Fundamentals of social psychology]. Kyiv: Talkom. 579 p.

8. Volianiuk, N. Yu., Lozhkin, H. V., Vynoslavska, O. V., Blokhina, I. O., Kononets, M. O., Moskalenko, O. V., Bokovets, O. I., & Andriitsev, B. V. (2019). Sotsialna psykholohiia [Social psychology]. Kyiv: Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 254 p.

9. Volianiuk, N. Yu., Lozhkin, H. V., Vynoslavska, O. V., Blokhina, I. O., Kononets, M. O., Serbova, O. V., Turynina, O. L., Moskalenko, O. V., Khilko, S. O., & Chumakov, V. O. (2024). Sotsialna psykholohiia [Social psychology] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. 595 p.

Recommended reading

1. Filonenko, M. M. (2008). Psykholohiia spilkuvannia [Psychology of communication]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 224 p.

2. Herasymova, I. V. (2013). Sotsialna psykholohiia: praktykum [Social psychology: A practical workbook]. Cherkasy: Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy. 98 p.

3. Oliinyk, I. V., & Bykova, V. O. (2024). Rozvytok multykulturnoi ta sotsialnoi tolerantnosti yak vazhlyva peredumova pidhotovky mahistriv-psykholohiv do vykladatskoi diialnosti [Development of multicultural and social tolerance as an important prerequisite for preparing master's students in psychology for teaching]. Pedahohichna Akademiia: naukovi zapysky [Pedagogical Academy: Scientific Notes], 9. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.13759966.

4. Oliinyk, I. V., & Hrushka, V. V. (2024). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak efektyvnyi instrument formuvannia u zdobuvachiv liderskykh yakostei, navychok samomenedzhmentu ta motyvatsii do samorozvytku [Social psychological training as an effective tool for developing students' leadership qualities, self-management skills and motivation for personal development]. Aktualni pytannia u suchasnii nautsi [Current Issues in Modern Science], 12(30), 993–1007.

5. Sliusarevskyi, M. M. (Ed.). (2008). Osnovy sotsialnoi psykholohii [Fundamentals of social psychology]. Kyiv: Milenium. 495 p.

6. Tatenko, V. O. (2008). Sotsialna psykholohiia vplyvu [Social psychology of influence]. Kyiv: Milenium. 216 p.

7. Tsyba, V. T. (2006). Systemna sotsialna psykholohiia [Systemic social psychology]. Kyiv: Lybid. 461 p.

8. Tsymbaliuk, I. M. (2007). Psykholohiia spilkuvannia [Psychology of communication] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). Kyiv: Profesional. 464 p.

9. Vlasova, O. I., & Nykonenko, Yu. V. (2010). Sotsialna psykholohiia orhanizatsii ta upravlinnia [Social psychology of organisations and management]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 398 p.

10. Wojciszke, B. (2021). Psychologia społeczna [Social psychology]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar. 636 p.

Web-resources

1. APA PsycNet resources from the American Psychological Association (access to journals and books). https://psycnet.apa.org/home

2. Google Scholar access to academic articles, dissertations, and research papers. https://scholar.google.com/

3. PubMed a database of biomedical and psychological research. URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/

4. Scopus a multidisciplinary database for searching scientific articles. https://www.scopus.com/home.uri

5. SpringerLink scientific articles and books on psychology. https://link.springer.com/

6. ResearchGate a platform for sharing scientific articles and communication among researchers. https://www.researchgate.net/

7. European Education Area. https://education.ec.europa.eu/about-eea

8. Natsionalna biblioteka Ukrainy imeni V. I. Vernadskoho. (n.d.). Official website. http://www.nbuv.gov.ua/

9. Directory of Open Access Books. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.doabooks.org

10. Tsyfrova biblioteka tematychnykh tekstovykh zbirnykiv. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.twirpx.com

11. Instytut sotsialnoi ta politychnoi psykholohii NAPN Ukrainy. (n.d.). Official website. http://ispp.org.ua/

12. Sotsiolohiia: teoriia, metody, marketynh. (n.d.). Official website. http://i-soc.com.ua/ua/edition/journal/

13. Ukrainskyi instytut sotsialnykh doslidzhen imeni Oleksandra Yaremenka. (n.d.). Official website. http://www.uisr.org.ua/monitoring

14. Sotsialna psykholohiia: naukovyi zhurnal. (n.d.). Official website. http://www.appsychology.org.ua

15. In-Mind Magazine: Social Psychology for the Public. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.in-mind.org

PEDAGOGICAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological mechanisms of learning, teaching and personal development in educational environments, and to form professional competencies necessary for counselling, psychoeducational support and correctional-developmental work with different groups of learners. Special attention is given to psychological safety, emotional well-being, communication, inclusive interaction, evidence-based educational practices and ethical principles of professional activity.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5	6 / Mandatory	Nataliia Volkova, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	180 hours (28 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 138 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes on completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Analyse psychological mechanisms of learning, teaching and personal development in educational environments, taking into account age-related, individual and socio-psychological characteristics of learners in the context of counselling and correctional-developmental work.			Lectures, problem-based learning, analysis of psychoeducational situations, discussions, analysis of scientific sources	Case analysis, analytical tasks, participation in discussions (CAS), final exam (FAS)
2) Interpret and critically evaluate psychological and pedagogical situations, identify educational and behavioural difficulties, and justify evidence-based approaches to psychological support and correctional-developmental intervention.			Case-study method, simulations, practical tasks, analysis of professional situations, collaborative learning	Written assignments, case-study reports, practical tasks (CAS), final exam (FAS)
3) Apply psychological knowledge and communication strategies to establish constructive interaction with participants in the educational process in individual and group counselling contexts.			Role-playing, communication training, interactive lectures, situational modelling, peer learning	Role-play assessment, presentations, participation in simulations and discussions (CAS), final exam (FAS)
4) Design psychoeducational, preventive and correctional-developmental activities aimed at supporting emotional well-being, motivation and adaptive behaviour of learners.			Project-based learning, workshops, programme design activities, group work, supervised practical tasks	Project development, psychoeducational programme presentation, practical assignments (CAS), final exam (FAS)
5) Use digital tools and modern psychoeducational resources for analysing educational interaction, organising psychoeducational support and			Digital learning activities, online collaborative tasks, practical exercises using digital tools, mini-research activities	Digital assignments, mini-projects, practical tasks using digital resources

implementing counselling and correctional-developmental activities.		(CAS), final exam (FAS)
6) Demonstrate ethical, tolerant and psychologically safe behaviour in educational interaction and counselling practice, taking into account cultural, social and individual diversity.	Ethical discussions, reflective exercises, case analysis, guided discussions, situational analysis	Ethical case analysis, reflective tasks, participation in discussions (CAS), final exam (FAS)
7) Reflect on personal professional experience, evaluate the effectiveness of interaction strategies and identify directions for professional self-development in counselling and correctional-developmental practice.	Reflective exercises, self-analysis, supervision-oriented discussions, reflective learning activities	Reflective assignments, self-assessment tasks, reflective reports (CAS), final exam (FAS)

Assessment

The final grade is given on a 100-point scale, including 40 points for the final exam and 60 points for the work in the semester. 60 points for continuous assessment (CAS): 20 points for practical, analytical and case-based assignments; 20 points for an individual psychoeducational, counselling or correctional-developmental project/presentation; 20 points for participation in discussions, simulations, role-plays and reflective activities.

40 points for final assessment (FAS): final written/oral exam.

Assessment criteria

a) Practical assignments and case studies (CAS)

16–20 points: The student demonstrates a thorough understanding of educational psychology concepts, correctly applies theoretical knowledge to practical and psychoeducational situations, critically analyses cases, identifies problems and proposes well-reasoned solutions.

11–15 points: The student demonstrates good understanding of the material and is generally able to apply knowledge appropriately, though some inaccuracies or insufficient depth of analysis may occur.

6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding of the material, but the analysis is superficial and the application of theoretical concepts is limited.

1–5 points: The student demonstrates minimal understanding of the material, incorrect or incomplete application of knowledge, and weak or absent analysis.

b) Individual assignment (project / presentation) (CAS)

16–20 points: The assignment demonstrates excellent understanding of the topic, clear structure, logical argumentation and appropriate use of relevant sources. The student demonstrates critical thinking and the ability to apply knowledge in counselling and correctional-developmental contexts.

11–15 points: The student demonstrates a good understanding of the topic with generally logical structure and appropriate argumentation. Minor inaccuracies may be present.

6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding with limited depth of analysis, weak structure or insufficient argumentation.

1–5 points: The assignment is poorly structured and demonstrates minimal understanding of the topic and lack of coherence.

c) Participation in discussions (CAS)

81–100%: Active and consistent participation. The student demonstrates critical thinking, clearly articulates and justifies their position, and interacts effectively with others.

51–80%: Regular participation with general understanding of the material, though some inaccuracies may occur.

21–50%: Limited participation and superficial understanding of the discussed issues.

1–20%: Minimal participation and lack of engagement in learning activities.

d) Final exam (FAS)

36–40 points: Excellent performance. The student demonstrates comprehensive knowledge, critical thinking and the ability to apply theoretical concepts to practical, psychoeducational and professional situations. Answers are well-structured and well-reasoned.

26–35 points: Good performance with minor inaccuracies. The student demonstrates solid understanding of the material and the ability to apply knowledge appropriately.
16–25 points: Satisfactory performance with noticeable gaps in understanding and limited ability to apply theoretical knowledge.
1–15 points: Poor performance with significant errors and insufficient understanding of key concepts.

Content

Topic 1. Educational Psychology as a Basis for Counselling and Correctional-Developmental Practice
Topic 2. Psychological Theories of Learning, Development and Behaviour Formation
Topic 3. Psychological Mechanisms of Learning and Cognitive Development
Topic 4. Motivation, Emotional Regulation and Psychological Safety in Educational Interaction
Topic 5. Communication in Educational and Counselling Contexts
Topic 6. Psychological Characteristics of Learners with Different Educational and Developmental Needs
Topic 7. Psychological Analysis of Pedagogical and Counselling Situations
Topic 8. Psychoeducational Support and Counselling in Educational Settings
Topic 9. Correctional-Developmental Approaches in Educational Psychology
Topic 10. Emotional Well-Being, Stress Prevention and Mental Health in Education
Topic 11. Digital Educational Environment, Psychological Safety and Online Interaction
Topic 12. Professional Reflection, Ethics and Self-Development of the Psychologist

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Kalenychenko, R. A. (2023). Pedahohichna psykholohiia [Pedagogical psychology]. Kyiv: Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture. 196 p.
2. Santrock, J. W. (2026). Educational psychology (2026 release). New York: McGraw Hill. 688 p.
3. Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., & Ross, S. M. (2026). Educational psychology: Theory and practice (14th ed.). Pearson. 618 p.
4. Woolfolk, A., & Usher, E. L. (2024). Educational psychology: Active learning edition (15th ed., global ed.). Harlow: Pearson. 872 p.

Recommended reading

1. Brunzell, T., Stokes, H., & Waters, L. (2016). Trauma-informed positive education: Using positive psychology to strengthen vulnerable students. Contemporary School Psychology, 20(1), 63–83.
2. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140.
3. Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child Development, 82(1), 405–432.
4. Hattie, J. (2023). Visible learning: The sequel. A synthesis of over 2,100 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. 508 p.
5. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81–112.
6. Illeris, K. (Ed.). (2018). Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists … in their own words (2nd ed.). Abingdon: Routledge. 276 p.
7. Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 79(1), 491–525.
8. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. Paris: UNESCO. 48 p.
9. Novikova, Zh. M. (2022). Pedahohichna psykholohiia [Pedagogical psychology]. Lviv: Lviv Polytechnic Publishing House. 148 p.
10. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 61, Article 101860.
11. Zabrotskyi, M. M., & Shaposhnykova, Yu. H. (2017). Pedahohichna psykholohiia. Lektsii [Pedagogical psychology: Lectures]. Kherson: OLDI-PLIUS. 144 p.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association (APA). (n.d.). https://www.apa.org
2. APA Division 15: Educational Psychology. (n.d.). https://apadiv15.org
3. British Psychological Society (BPS). (n.d.). https://www.bps.org.uk
4. CASEL. (n.d.). https://casel.org
5. OECD Education. (n.d.). https://www.oecd.org/education
6. UNESCO Education. (n.d.). https://www.unesco.org/en/education
7. UNICEF. (n.d.). https://www.unicef.org
8. World Health Organization (WHO). (n.d.). https://www.who.int
9. National Library of Ukraine named after V. I. Vernadskyi. (n.d.). http://www.nbuv.gov.ua
10. Legislation of Ukraine. (n.d.). https://zakon.rada.gov.ua

PSYCHOLOGY OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological processes in management and organisational life and their ability to analyse behaviour at individual, group and organisational levels. Students examine leadership, motivation, communication, decision-making, organisational culture and employee well-being. Through case analysis, practical exercises and project work, they learn to formulate evidence-informed recommendations for constructive interaction, employee development and healthy organisational functioning, recognising contextual influences and ethical responsibilities.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5	6 / mandatory	Serhii Dubinskyi PhD (Economy), Associate Professor	180 hours (28 h. lectures, 28 h. practical classes, 124 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain key concepts and approaches in management and organisational psychology and analyse their application to individual, group and organisational behaviour.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks, analytical assignments and topic-based quizzes (CAS)
2) Analyse the influence of motivation, individual characteristics and situational demands on work behaviour and performance.			Case-based learning, practical exercises, analysis of research findings and small-group discussions.	Motivation and performance case analyses, practical assignments and quizzes (CAS)
3) Compare leadership approaches and evaluate their suitability for different organisational situations.			Comparative tables, leadership case studies, debates and scenario analysis.	Comparative analytical assignments, seminar tasks and the organisational case project (CAS)
4) Demonstrate constructive communication, teamwork and basic coaching-style questioning in simulated workplace situations, recognising the limits of these approaches.			Role-play, communication exercises, coaching-style conversation simulations and structured feedback.	Observed practical exercises, role-play tasks and reflective commentary (CAS)
5) Analyse managerial decision-making, organisational change and work-related stress and formulate justified recommendations that consider uncertainty and contextual influences.			Decision-making simulations, change-management cases, problem-based workshops and critical discussion.	Scenario-based assignments, case analyses and the organisational case project (CAS)
6) Develop a basic plan for investigating an organisational issue and interpret supplied findings using appropriate methods, digital tools and ethical safeguards.			Research-planning workshops, guided analysis of supplied data, instrument appraisal and digital exercises.	Research-planning and data-interpretation assignments; methodological justification within the organisational case project (CAS)
7) Communicate evidence-informed recommendations and demonstrate ethical			Ethical case analysis, presentations, peer	Ethical case assignments, project report, presentation

judgement concerning confidentiality, fairness, diversity, employee well-being and professional competence.	review, group work and reflective revision.	and reflective commentary (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points. No separate final examination is required.
100 points for continuous assessment:
20 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
20 points for practical exercises, simulations and communication tasks;
20 points for analytical assignments, organisational case analyses and research-planning tasks;
10 points for topic-based quizzes;
30 points for an organisational case project, presentation and reflective commentary.
The organisational case project examines a defined workplace issue, such as employee motivation, team communication, leadership, organisational change or work-related stress. Students analyse the issue using relevant psychological concepts and research evidence, consider alternative explanations and formulate feasible recommendations.
The project includes a concise report, an oral presentation and reflective commentary explaining revisions made following feedback. Group projects identify each student's contribution, and individual understanding is assessed through presentation questions and reflection.
Assignments use published research, fictional or anonymised cases and supplied organisational data. Collection of new employee data is not required. Recommendations acknowledge the limitations of the available evidence and the boundaries of a student psychologist's competence.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice.
Assessment criteria:
a) Seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately explains organisational psychology concepts, supports contributions with relevant evidence and critically considers alternative interpretations. Completed tasks demonstrate understanding of individual, group and contextual influences.
11–15 points: Tasks and contributions demonstrate good understanding and relevant reasoning, although some explanations require greater depth or supporting evidence.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially justified.
1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported opinions.
0 points: No assessable seminar work or contribution is provided.
b) Practical exercises, simulations and communication tasks – 20 points
16–20 points: The student appropriately applies communication, teamwork and coaching-style questioning skills. Performance responds to the situation, considers different perspectives and demonstrates ethical judgement. Reflection identifies specific improvements.
11–15 points: Performance is generally appropriate and well explained, with minor limitations in responsiveness, communication or reflection.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic practical skills but applies them inconsistently or requires substantial guidance.
1–5 points: Performance demonstrates limited understanding, inappropriate application of techniques or insufficient attention to the situation and participants.
0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.
c) Analytical assignments, case analyses and research-planning tasks – 20 points
16–20 points: The student provides coherent analysis, appropriately applies psychological concepts and distinguishes evidence from assumptions. Proposed research methods address the stated question, and recommendations consider feasibility, ethical requirements and limitations.

11–15 points: Analysis and methodological reasoning are generally accurate, with minor omissions or insufficiently developed justification.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in interpretation, research planning or the connection between evidence and recommendations.
1–5 points: Work contains significant conceptual or methodological errors and unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Topic-based quizzes – 10 points
Quiz results are aggregated and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points. Points are awarded for correct answers according to the published marking scheme. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
e) Organisational case project, presentation and reflective commentary – 30 points
25–30 points: The project presents a focused, coherent and evidence-informed analysis. Recommendations are feasible, ethically appropriate and clearly connected to the findings. The presentation justifies key decisions and acknowledges limitations. Reflection explains specific revisions following feedback.
18–24 points: The project is generally accurate and well structured. Recommendations are relevant, although some contextual influences, alternatives or limitations require fuller consideration. The presentation and reflection demonstrate good understanding.
10–17 points: The project meets basic requirements but remains partly descriptive. Recommendations are general or insufficiently justified, and reflection on feedback is limited.
1–9 points: The project is substantially incomplete or contains significant inaccuracies. Recommendations are weakly connected to the analysis, and the presentation demonstrates limited understanding.
0 points: The project is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Management and Organizational Psychology
Topic 2. Individual Differences and Work Behaviour
Topic 3. Work Motivation and Employee Engagement
Topic 4. Leadership and Management Styles
Topic 5. Communication and Feedback in Organizations
Topic 6. Group Dynamics and Teamwork
Topic 7. Conflict and Constructive Workplace Interaction
Topic 8. Psychological Aspects of Managerial Decision-Making
Topic 9. Organizational Culture and Climate
Topic 10. Work-Related Stress and Employee Well-Being
Topic 11. Coaching Approaches and Employee Development
Topic 12. Organizational Change and Innovation
Topic 13. Research Methods in Organizational Psychology
Topic 14. Ethics and Evidence-Informed Organizational Recommendations

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Conte, J. M. (2024). Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology (7th ed.). Wiley. 656 p.
2. Kohut, Ya. M., Priakhina, N. O., Zhydetskyi, Yu. Ts., Kirzhetskyi, Yu. I., & Potsiurko, O. Yu. (2024). Psykholohiia upravlinnia [Psychology of management] (Ya. M. Kohut, Ed.). Lviv: Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 210 p.
3. Northouse, P. G. (2025). Leadership: Theory and practice (10th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. 576 p.
4. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). Organizational behavior (19th ed., global ed.). Harlow: Pearson. 800 p.

Recommended reading

1. Grant, A. M. (2014). The efficacy of executive coaching in times of organisational change. Journal of Change Management, 14(2), 258–280.
2. Karamushka, L. M. (2024). Psykhichne zdorovia osobystosti v umovakh viiny: yak yoho zberehty i pidtrymaty [Mental health in wartime: How to preserve and support it]. Kyiv: H. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. 48 p.
3. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. 416 p.
4. World Health Organization. (2022). WHO guidelines on mental health at work. Geneva: World Health Organization. 134 p.
5. Yukl, G., & Gardner, W. L. (2020). Leadership in organizations (9th ed., global ed.). Harlow: Pearson. 556 p.

Web-resources

1. Academy of Management (AOM). (n.d.). Official website. https://aom.org
2. American Psychological Association (APA). (n.d.). Official website. https://www.apa.org
3. Center for Creative Leadership (CCL). (n.d.). https://www.ccl.org
4. Coursera. (n.d.). Organizational Psychology Courses. https://www.coursera.org
5. edX. (n.d.). Leadership and Management Courses. https://www.edx.org
6. European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP). (n.d.). Official website. https://eawop.org
7. FutureLearn. (n.d.). Business and Management Courses. https://www.futurelearn.com
8. Gallup Workplace. (n.d.). https://www.gallup.com/workplace
9. Harvard Business Review. (n.d.). https://hbr.org
10. Institute of Psychology named after H. S. Kostiuk. (n.d.). https://psychology-naes-ua.institute
11. LinkedIn Learning. (n.d.). Organizational Psychology Courses. https://www.linkedin.com/learning
12. McKinsey & Company. (n.d.). Organizational insights. https://www.mckinsey.com
13. MindTools. (n.d.). Leadership and management resources. https://www.mindtools.com
14. MIT Sloan Management Review. (n.d.). https://sloanreview.mit.edu
15. National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). https://naps.gov.ua
16. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (SIOP). (n.d.). Official website. https://www.siop.org
17. Ukrainian Association of Organizational Psychologists and Work Psychologists. (n.d.). https://uaoppp.com.ua
18. Yale Center for Emotional Intelligence. (n.d.). https://www.ycei.org

EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological experimentation and their ability to design, critically evaluate and interpret experimental studies. Students examine the manipulation and measurement of variables, experimental control, participant allocation, validity and alternative explanations. Through practical exercises, analysis of published experiments and experimental design tasks, they learn to develop feasible experimental procedures, interpret supplied findings and justify conclusions while recognising ethical responsibilities and methodological limitations.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6	4 / mandatory	Ivan Batrachenko, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor	120 hours: 42 h. contact teaching and 78 h. self-directed learning
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS; final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain the principles of psychological experimentation and distinguish experimental evidence of causation from correlational findings.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis and evidence-based discussions.	Seminar tasks and analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
2) Formulate testable experimental hypotheses and operationalise independent and dependent variables.			Practical exercises, analysis of experimental examples, guided workshops and structured feedback.	Practical and individual analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
3) Compare experimental and quasi-experimental designs and justify the selection of a design for a defined psychological question.			Comparative analysis, case-based learning, problem-based workshops and small-group discussions.	Comparative assignments and experimental case analyses (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
4) Identify confounding variables and threats to validity and propose appropriate methods of experimental control.			Critical appraisal of published studies, error-detection exercises, simulations and structured discussions.	Critical appraisal assignments and practical tasks (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
5) Develop a coherent experimental procedure that incorporates standardised instructions, participant allocation, piloting and ethical safeguards.			Procedure-development workshops, demonstrations, simulated experimental activities and peer feedback.	Practical assignments and an individual experimental design project (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
6) Interpret experimental findings, consider alternative explanations and formulate conclusions consistent with the design and available evidence.			Guided interpretation of supplied data, graphical exercises, analysis of research findings and reflective discussion.	Data-interpretation assignments and experimental case analyses (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
7) Present and justify an experimental design, evaluate its limitations and demonstrate ethical judgement concerning participant protection and research integrity.			Project-based learning, presentations, ethical case analysis, peer review and reflective revision.	Individual experimental design project, presentation and reflective commentary

		(CAS); Final Exam (FAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and consists of continuous assessment (CAS), worth 60 points, and the Final Exam (FAS), worth 40 points.
Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:
10 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
20 points for practical assignments and experimental case analyses;
10 points for critical appraisal of experimental studies and interpretation of supplied findings;
20 points for an individual experimental design project, presentation and reflective commentary.
Final assessment (FAS) – 40 points:
40 points for the Final Exam.
The individual experimental design project addresses a focused psychological question. It includes a testable hypothesis, operational definitions of variables, justification of the design, participant allocation, experimental controls, a standardised procedure, ethical safeguards and a proposed approach to interpreting possible findings. Students present the project, justify their decisions and explain revisions made following feedback. Collection of new participant data is not required.
The Final Exam assesses understanding of experimental psychology, application of experimental principles, evaluation of research designs and interpretation of findings.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. Required assignments, deadlines and assessment procedures are communicated at the beginning of the semester.
Assessment criteria:
a) Seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions – 10 points
9–10 points: The student accurately explains experimental psychology concepts, supports arguments with relevant evidence and critically considers alternative explanations. Contributions demonstrate independent reasoning and recognition of methodological limitations.
6–8 points: Tasks and contributions demonstrate good understanding and relevant reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
3–5 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially justified.
1–2 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported opinions.
0 points: No assessable work is provided.
b) Practical assignments and experimental case analyses – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately identifies hypotheses, variables and design features, proposes appropriate controls and analyses experimental situations coherently. Decisions are justified and address relevant methodological and ethical considerations.
11–15 points: Work is generally accurate and appropriately justified, with minor omissions in operationalisation, design selection or experimental control.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains inconsistencies in applying experimental concepts or explaining methodological decisions.
1–5 points: Work is substantially incomplete or contains significant errors in identifying variables, selecting designs or proposing controls.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Critical appraisal of experimental studies and interpretation of supplied findings – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically evaluates the design and validity of experimental studies, accurately interprets supplied findings and distinguishes supported conclusions from speculation. Alternative explanations and limitations are appropriately identified.
6–8 points: Appraisal and interpretation are generally accurate, although some limitations or alternative explanations require fuller consideration.
3–5 points: Work is mainly descriptive and demonstrates limited evaluation of validity or incomplete interpretation of findings.

1–2 points: Work contains substantial interpretative errors or unsupported causal claims.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Individual experimental design project, presentation and reflective commentary – 20 points
16–20 points: The project presents a clear hypothesis, accurately operationalised variables and a coherent experimental design. Procedures, controls and ethical safeguards are appropriate and clearly justified. The presentation demonstrates independent understanding, and reflection explains meaningful revisions and remaining limitations.
11–15 points: The project is generally coherent and methodologically appropriate. Some procedural details, controls or limitations require further development. The presentation and reflection demonstrate good understanding.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains inconsistencies between the hypothesis, variables, design or procedure. Justification and reflection are limited.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete or contains major methodological errors. The student has difficulty explaining decisions or recognising limitations.
0 points: The project is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.
e) Final Exam – 40 points
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive and accurate understanding of experimental psychology, appropriately applies experimental principles, critically evaluates designs and interprets findings. Conclusions are coherent, justified and attentive to alternative explanations and ethical considerations.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally accurate application. Minor conceptual inaccuracies, omissions or weaknesses in justification occur.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in design evaluation or interpretation. Responses are partially complete and insufficiently justified.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, substantial conceptual errors and difficulty applying experimental principles or drawing supported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Psychological Experiments and Causal Explanation
Topic 2. Experimental Hypotheses and Predictions
Topic 3. Variables and Operational Definitions
Topic 4. Experimental Control and Confounding Variables
Topic 5. Between-Participants and Within-Participants Designs
Topic 6. Factorial Designs and Interaction Effects
Topic 7. Laboratory Experiments, Field Experiments and Quasi-Experiments
Topic 8. Participant Selection and Allocation
Topic 9. Validity and Alternative Explanations
Topic 10. Experimental Procedures and Pilot Studies
Topic 11. Ethics and Participant Protection
Topic 12. Interpretation and Reporting of Experimental Findings

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Coolican, H. (2024). Research methods and statistics in psychology (8th ed.). Abingdon: Routledge. 862 p.
2. Halian, I. M., & Halian, O. I. (2023). Eksperymentalna psykholohiia [Experimental psychology]. Lviv: Spolom. 360 p.
3. Morling, B. (2025). Research methods in psychology: Evaluating a world of information (5th ed., international student ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company. 672 p.

Recommended reading

1. Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. Collabra: Psychology, 8(1), Article 33267.
2. Malkhazov, O. R. (2020). Eksperymentalna psykholohiia [Experimental psychology]. Kyiv: Talkom. 321 p.

3. Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. Behavior Research Methods, 51(1), 195–203.

4. Peirce, J., Hirst, R., & MacAskill, M. (2022). Building experiments in PsychoPy (2nd ed.). London: SAGE. 312 p.

5. Vavryniv, O. S. (2023). Orhanizatsiia ta provedennia psykholohichnykh i sotsialno-psykholohichnykh doslidzhen [Organisation and conduct of psychological and socio-psychological research]. Lviv: Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 116 p.

Web resources

1. OpenSesame. Tutorials and documentation for building psychological experiments. URL: https://osdoc.cogsci.nl/

2. PsyToolkit. Experiment library: interactive experimental tasks and demonstrations. URL: https://www.psytoolkit.org/experiment-library/

CHILD PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological development from infancy through middle childhood and their ability to analyse children's behaviour, learning, emotions and relationships using developmental theories and research evidence. Particular attention is given to individual differences and the influence of family, peers, play, education and wider social conditions. Students learn to interpret observation and case materials, recognise possible developmental concerns and formulate age-appropriate psychoeducational recommendations within the limits of their competence.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6 / 14 weeks	3 / Mandatory	Nataliia Kholodenko, Ph.D., Associate Professor	90 hours: 36 h. contact teaching and 54 h. self-directed learning
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and compare major theories of child development and use them to interpret developmental situations.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises and evidence-based discussions.	Seminar tasks, comparative assignments and child development case analyses (CAS).
2) Analyse cognitive, language, emotional and social development from infancy through middle childhood, taking account of individual differences.			Developmental case studies, comparative activities, analysis of research findings and guided discussions.	Analytical assignments and child development case analyses (CAS).
3) Analyse how attachment, parenting, peer relationships, play and educational environments influence children's development and well-being.			Case-based learning, small-group discussions, analysis of interaction scenarios and practical workshops.	Seminar tasks, case analyses and the psychoeducational project (CAS).
4) Interpret supplied observation records and assessment information, distinguish description from inference and recognise the limitations of developmental conclusions.			Guided observation exercises, analysis of anonymised records, demonstrations and structured feedback.	Observation-based practical assignments and case analyses (CAS).
5) Recognise possible developmental, behavioural and emotional concerns and explain when further assessment or specialist support may be appropriate.			Problem-based learning, contrasting case examples, ethical case analysis and guided discussion.	Case analyses, practical assignments and project justification (CAS).
6) Demonstrate age-appropriate communication with children and constructive communication with caregivers in simulated situations, respecting confidentiality, diversity and professional boundaries.			Role-play, communication exercises, simulations, peer feedback and reflection.	Observed communication tasks, role-play and reflective commentary (CAS).
7) Develop and justify age-appropriate psychoeducational activities and recommendations that support children's learning, self-regulation, relationships and well-being.			Project-based learning, practical workshops, guided source evaluation, presentations and peer review.	Psychoeducational project, presentation and reflective commentary (CAS).

Assessment
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points. 100 points for continuous assessment: 20 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions; 30 points for analytical assignments and child development case analyses; 20 points for observation-based practical assignments and simulated communication tasks; 30 points for a psychoeducational project, presentation and reflective commentary. Analytical assignments and case analyses address developmental theories, age-related characteristics, individual differences and the influence of family, peers and educational environments. Students distinguish observed information from assumptions and consider alternative explanations. Practical assignments involve interpretation of supplied observation records and assessment information, together with simulated communication with children and caregivers. Tasks use fictional, published or anonymised materials. Direct assessment or counselling of children is not required. The psychoeducational project addresses a defined developmental need within a specified childhood age group. It includes a brief developmental rationale, an age-appropriate activity or educational resource, recommendations for caregivers or educators, ethical considerations and limitations. Students present the project and explain revisions made following feedback. For group projects, individual contributions are identified and assessed through the submitted work, presentation questions and reflection. Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. For categories comprising several tasks, task scores are converted to a common percentage scale, averaged and multiplied by the category maximum. Unsubmitted required tasks receive zero points. Required tasks, deadlines and marking arrangements are communicated at the beginning of the semester. Assessment criteria: a) Seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions – 20 points 16–20 points: The student accurately explains child psychology concepts, compares relevant developmental interpretations and supports contributions with appropriate evidence. Arguments consider age, individual differences and context. 11–15 points: Tasks and contributions demonstrate good understanding and relevant reasoning, although some explanations require greater depth or supporting evidence. 6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially justified. 1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported opinions. 0 points: No assessable seminar work is provided. b) Analytical assignments and child development case analyses – 30 points 25–30 points: The student accurately analyses developmental characteristics and contextual influences, appropriately applies theoretical concepts and considers alternative explanations. Conclusions distinguish evidence from assumptions and recognise the limitations of the available information. Where concerns arise, recommendations appropriately identify the need for further assessment or specialist support. 18–24 points: Analysis is generally accurate and well structured. Relevant concepts are applied appropriately, although some contextual factors, alternatives or limitations require fuller consideration. 10–17 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains partly descriptive. Theoretical application and conclusions are incomplete or insufficiently justified. 1–9 points: Work contains significant conceptual errors, unsupported developmental judgements or recommendations poorly connected to the case. 0 points: No assessable work is submitted. c) Observation-based practical assignments and simulated communication tasks – 20 points

16–20 points: The student accurately distinguishes observation from interpretation and recognises the limits of assessment information. Communication is clear, age-appropriate and responsive to the situation. Performance demonstrates respect, ethical judgement and awareness of professional boundaries.
11–15 points: Observation and communication tasks are generally completed appropriately, with minor inaccuracies or limitations in interpretation, responsiveness or justification.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic practical skills but requires substantial guidance. Descriptions and interpretations are sometimes confused, or communication is insufficiently adapted to the situation.
1–5 points: Work contains substantial interpretative errors or demonstrates limited ability to communicate appropriately and recognise ethical boundaries.
0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.
d) Psychoeducational project, presentation and reflective commentary – 30 points
25–30 points: The project addresses a clearly defined developmental need and accurately applies child psychology concepts. Activities and recommendations are age-appropriate, feasible, ethically sound and supported by relevant academic sources. The presentation justifies decisions and acknowledges limitations. Reflection explains specific revisions following feedback.
18–24 points: The project is coherent and developmentally appropriate. Activities and recommendations are generally justified, although some contextual factors, practical details or limitations require further development. The presentation and reflection demonstrate good understanding.
10–17 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains gaps in developmental reasoning, practical planning or source evaluation. Recommendations are general, and reflection is limited.
1–9 points: The project is substantially incomplete, insufficiently adapted to the age group or based on inaccurate developmental assumptions. The presentation demonstrates limited understanding of the proposed activities.
0 points: The project is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Child Psychology
Topic 2. Major Theories of Child Development
Topic 3. Development in Infancy and Toddlerhood
Topic 4. Development in Early and Middle Childhood
Topic 5. Cognitive Development, Language and Learning
Topic 6. Emotional Development and Self-Regulation
Topic 7. Attachment, Family and Peer Relationships
Topic 8. Play and Educational Environments
Topic 9. Observation and Assessment of Child Development
Topic 10. Developmental Difficulties, Stress and Adversity
Topic 11. Psychoeducational Support and Ethical Practice

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Berk, L. E. (2023). *Development through the lifespan* (8th ed.). Pearson.
2. Geldard, K., Geldard, D., & Foo, R. Y. (2017). *Counselling children: A practical introduction* (5th ed.). Sage.
3. Santrock, J. W. (2022). *Child development* (15th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
4. Shaffer, D. R., & Kipp, K. (2014). *Developmental psychology: Childhood and adolescence* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
5. Weare, K. (2015). *What works in promoting social and emotional well-being and responding to mental health problems in schools?* National Children's Bureau.
6. Zelazo, P. D. (Ed.). (2013). *The Oxford handbook of developmental psychology*. Oxford University Press.

Recommended reading

1. Betancourt, T. S., Meyers-Ohki, S. E., Charrow, A., & Tol, W. A. (2013). Interventions for children affected by war: An ecological perspective on psychosocial support and mental health care. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry, 21*(2), 70–91.

2. Colasante, T., Jambon, M., Gao, X., & Malti, T. (2021). A process model linking physiological arousal and fear recognition to aggression via guilt in middle childhood. *Development and Psychopathology, 33*(1), 109–121.

3. Downey, C., & Crummy, A. (2022). The impact of childhood trauma on children's wellbeing and adult behavior. *European Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, 6*(2).

4. Geldard, K., Geldard, D., & Foo, R. Y. (2017). *Counselling children: A practical introduction* (5th ed.). Sage.

5. Malti, T., & Speidel, R. (2024). Development of prosociality and the impacts of adversity. *Nature Reviews Psychology*. Advance online publication.

6. McLaughlin, K. A. (2016). Future directions in childhood adversity and youth psychopathology. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 45*(3), 361–382.

7. Perry, B. D., & Winfrey, O. (2021). *What happened to you? Conversations on trauma, resilience, and healing*. Flatiron Books.

8. Purgato, M., Gross, A. L., Betancourt, T., et al. (2018). Focused psychosocial interventions for children in low-resource humanitarian settings: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Global Health, 6*(4).

9. Siegel, D. J., & Bryson, T. P. (2020). *The whole-brain child*. Bantam Books.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association (APA). (n.d.). https://www.apa.org

2. British Psychological Society (BPS). (n.d.). https://www.bps.org.uk

3. CASEL. (n.d.). Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. https://casel.org

4. National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN). (n.d.). https://www.nctsn.org

5. UNESCO. (n.d.). Education and child development. https://www.unesco.org

6. UNICEF. (2022). *Guidance on mental health and psychosocial support for children in humanitarian settings*. https://www.unicef.org

7. UNICEF. (n.d.). Child protection and development. https://www.unicef.org

8. World Health Organization (WHO). (n.d.). Child and adolescent mental health. https://www.who.int

LEGAL PSYCHOLOGY AND METHODS OF CONDUCTING PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPERTISE				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological processes in legal contexts and the principles and methods of forensic psychological examination. Students analyse behaviour, eyewitness memory, victim experiences and interactions within the justice system. Through case analysis and simulated professional activities, they learn to evaluate assessment methods, interpret supplied psychological information and communicate reasoned conclusions while recognising evidential limitations, ethical responsibilities and the boundaries of professional competence.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7	5 / mandatory	Inesa Harkusha, PhD (Social Communications), Associate Professor	150 h. (28 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars /practical, 108 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain key concepts of legal psychology and distinguish psychological questions from legal judgements and decisions.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks and individual analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
2) Analyse individual, interpersonal and situational influences on offending, victimisation and behaviour within the justice system, avoiding deterministic explanations and unsupported labels.			Case-based learning, analysis of research findings, small-group discussions and comparative case analysis.	Case analyses, seminar tasks and individual analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
3) Evaluate psychological factors affecting eyewitness memory, identification and testimony, recognising the limitations of conclusions about accuracy and credibility.			Analysis of testimony scenarios, memory demonstrations, critical appraisal of studies and guided discussions.	Case analyses and practical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
4) Demonstrate appropriate communication in simulated legal situations, taking account of age, vulnerability, emotional state and professional boundaries.			Role-play, interview simulations, communication exercises and structured feedback.	Observed practical exercises, simulated interviews and reflective commentary (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
5) Explain the purpose, scope and stages of forensic psychological examination and distinguish the roles of the psychologist, expert witness and other legal professionals.			Interactive lectures, procedural case analysis, role comparison and simulated professional discussions.	Seminar tasks, practical assignments and individual analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
6) Select and justify assessment methods for a supplied forensic referral question, considering			Instrument appraisal, method-comparison workshops,	Method-appraisal assignments and the individual forensic

validity, reliability, contextual suitability and ethical requirements.	demonstrations and problem-based learning.	case analysis (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
7) Interpret supplied assessment information and critically evaluate the reasoning, evidential basis and limitations of a forensic psychological report.	Guided interpretation exercises, analysis of anonymised or fictional reports, critical discussion and peer review.	Practical assignments and the individual forensic case analysis (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)
8) Communicate a reasoned psychological analysis orally and in writing and collaborate on recommendations that respect impartiality, confidentiality and professional competence.	Group case workshops, presentations, simulated expert testimony, ethical dilemma analysis and reflective revision.	Group case project, presentation, individual reflective commentary and written analytical work (CAS); Final Exam (FAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and consists of continuous assessment (CAS), worth 60 points, and the Final Exam, worth 40 points.
Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:
20 points for seminar tasks, practical exercises and case analyses;
20 points for an individual forensic case analysis;
20 points for a group case project, presentation and individual reflective commentary.
Final Exam – 40 points.
The individual forensic case analysis addresses a supplied psychological referral question. Students justify appropriate assessment methods, interpret the available information, evaluate alternative explanations and formulate a reasoned analytical conclusion. The assignment recognises the limits of the evidence and does not constitute an official expert report.
The group project examines a defined legal psychology problem, such as eyewitness identification, communication with a vulnerable witness, victim support or psychological aspects of rehabilitation. Students evaluate relevant evidence and present justified recommendations. Each student's contribution and understanding are assessed through the presentation, individual questions and reflective commentary.
Assignments use fictional, published or appropriately anonymised materials. Independent forensic examinations, direct assessment of persons involved in legal proceedings and preparation of official expert opinions are not required.
The Final Exam assesses understanding and application of legal psychology concepts, principles of forensic psychological examination, interpretation of evidence and ethical judgement.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. For categories comprising several tasks, each task score is divided by its maximum possible score. The mean of these proportions, including zeros for unsubmitted required tasks, is multiplied by the category maximum. Required tasks, deadlines and assessment arrangements are communicated at the beginning of the semester.
Assessment criteria:
a) Seminar tasks, practical exercises and case analyses – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately applies legal psychology concepts, analyses contextual influences and supports conclusions with relevant evidence. Practical performance demonstrates appropriate communication, ethical judgement and recognition of professional boundaries.
11–15 points: Work demonstrates good understanding and generally appropriate application, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains partly descriptive. Practical application and justification are inconsistent.

1–5 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors, unsupported judgements or inappropriate application of psychological approaches.
0 points: No assessable work is provided.
b) Individual forensic case analysis – 20 points
16–20 points: The analysis clearly addresses the referral question, justifies suitable methods and accurately interprets the supplied information. Conclusions distinguish evidence from assumptions, consider alternative explanations and recognise methodological and professional limitations.
11–15 points: Analysis is coherent and generally accurate. Method selection and conclusions are appropriate, although some limitations or alternatives require fuller consideration.
6–10 points: The assignment demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in methodological justification, interpretation or the connection between evidence and conclusions.
1–5 points: The analysis is substantially incomplete or contains major errors. Conclusions exceed the available evidence or confuse psychological interpretation with legal judgement.
0 points: The assignment is not submitted or provides no assessable evidence of the required learning outcomes.
c) Group case project, presentation and individual reflective commentary – 20 points
16–20 points: The project presents a focused, evidence-informed analysis and feasible recommendations. The student demonstrates a clear individual contribution, explains key decisions, responds accurately to questions and reflects meaningfully on feedback and limitations.
11–15 points: The project is coherent and relevant. The student contributes appropriately and demonstrates good understanding, although some arguments, recommendations or reflections require further development.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but has limited analytical depth. The student's contribution or understanding is only partially demonstrated.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete or poorly justified. The student demonstrates limited contribution and difficulty explaining the analysis.
0 points: No assessable individual contribution is demonstrated.
d) Final Exam – 40 points
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive understanding, appropriately applies legal psychology concepts and critically evaluates assessment methods and evidence. Conclusions are coherent, ethically informed and proportionate to the available information.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally accurate application, with minor inaccuracies, omissions or weaknesses in justification.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in application or interpretation. Responses are incomplete or insufficiently justified.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, substantial conceptual errors and difficulty drawing supported psychological conclusions.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Legal Psychology
Topic 2. Psychological Factors in Offending Behaviour
Topic 3. Aggression and Violence in Legal Contexts
Topic 4. Victimisation and Psychological Consequences of Crime
Topic 5. Eyewitness Memory and Identification
Topic 6. Interviewing and Communication in Legal Settings
Topic 7. Children and Vulnerable Persons in Legal Proceedings
Topic 8. Psychological Aspects of Judicial Decision-Making
Topic 9. Penitentiary Psychology and Rehabilitation
Topic 10. Principles and Stages of Forensic Psychological Examination
Topic 11. Assessment Methods in Forensic Practice
Topic 12. Assessment of Emotional States and Psychological Harm
Topic 13. Interpretation and Reporting of Forensic Psychological Findings

Topic 14. Ethics and Professional Responsibilities in Legal Psychology

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Davies, G. M., Beech, A. R., & Colloff, M. F. (Eds.). (2024). Forensic psychology: Crime, justice, law, interventions (4th ed.). Chichester: Wiley. 784 p.

2. Katsavets, R. S. (2023). Yurydychna psykholohiia [Legal psychology] (3rd ed., expanded). Kyiv: Alerta. 294 p.

3. Oksiutovych, M. O., Koshyrets, V. V., & Mudryk, A. B. (2024). Yurydychna psykholohiia [Legal psychology]. Zhytomyr: Zhytomyr Polytechnic State University. 161 p.

4. Shepitko, V. Yu., & Konovalova, V. O. (2025). Yurydychna psykholohiia [Legal psychology] (4th ed., revised and expanded). Kharkiv: Pravo. 280 p.

Recommended reading

1. American Psychological Association. (2013). Specialty guidelines for forensic psychology. American Psychologist, 68(1), 7–19.

2. Lamb, M. E., Brown, D. A., Hershkowitz, I., Orbach, Y., & Esplin, P. W. (2018). Tell me what happened: Questioning children about abuse (2nd ed.). Chichester: Wiley. 344 p.

3. Ministry of Justice of Ukraine. (1998). Instruktsiia pro pryznachennia ta provedennia sudovykh ekspertyz ta ekspertnykh doslidzhen [Instruction on the appointment and conduct of forensic examinations and expert studies], and Naukovo-metodychni rekomendatsii z pytan pidhotovky ta pryznachennia sudovykh ekspertyz ta ekspertnykh doslidzhen [Scientific and methodological recommendations on the preparation and appointment of forensic examinations and expert studies]. Approved by Order No. 53/5 of 8 October 1998, as amended.

4. Tsilmak, O. M., & Kuznetsova, L. V. (2025). Osnovy sudovo-psykholohichnoi ekspertyzy: metodychni rekomendatsii z pidhotovky do praktychnykh zaniat [Fundamentals of forensic psychological examination: Methodological recommendations for preparation for practical classes]. Odesa: National University “Odesa Law Academy”. 36 p.

5. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1994). Pro sudovu ekspertyzu [On forensic examination]: Law of Ukraine No. 4038-XII of 25 February 1994, as amended. Vidomosti Verkhovnoi Rady Ukrainy [Bulletin of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine], 28, Article 232.

6. Wells, G. L., Kovera, M. B., Douglass, A. B., Brewer, N., Meissner, C. A., & Wixted, J. T. (2020). Policy and procedure recommendations for the collection and preservation of eyewitness identification evidence. Law and Human Behavior, 44(1), 3–36.

Web-resources

1. College of Policing. Investigative interviewing. URL: https://www.college.police.uk/app/investigation/investigative-interviewing/investigative-interviewing

2. College of Policing. Working with victims and witnesses. URL: https://www.college.police.uk/app/investigation/working-victims-and-witnesses

3. Ministry of Justice of Ukraine. Forensic examination instructions and methodological recommendations: Current text. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/z0705-98

4. NICHD Protocol. Investigative interview protocols for children. URL: https://www.nichdprotocol.com/the-nichd-protocol/

5. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. On forensic examination: Current text. URL: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4038-12

SPECIAL PSYCHOLOGY. PATHOPSYCHOLOGY AND THE BASICS OF PSYCHIATRY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological functioning in the context of developmental disabilities and mental health conditions. Students examine changes in cognition, emotion and behaviour, individual developmental pathways and the influence of social and environmental barriers. Through case analysis, simulated assessment activities and support-planning tasks, they learn to interpret psychological information, identify support needs and formulate evidence-informed recommendations. Particular attention is given to accessible communication, inclusion, ethical practice and the distinction between psychological assessment and medical diagnosis.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7, 8 / 28 weeks	9 / mandatory	Oxana Bayer, PhD (Psychology), Associate Professor	270 h. (44 h. lectures, 38 h. seminars/practical, 188 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Explain the scope and key concepts of special psychology, pathopsychology and psychiatry and distinguish psychological assessment from medical diagnosis.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks and comparative analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
2) Analyse disturbances of perception, attention, memory, thinking, emotion and self-regulation using supplied psychological information.			Case-based learning, demonstrations, analysis of assessment records and guided interpretation exercises.	Practical assignments and case analyses (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
3) Compare the principal features of selected mental health conditions and explain their possible effects on everyday functioning without drawing unsupported diagnostic conclusions.			Comparative case analysis, problem-based workshops, analysis of research findings and guided discussions.	Comparative assignments and case analyses (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
4) Justify the selection of basic psychological assessment methods and interpret supplied findings, recognising limitations and indications for specialist referral.			Instrument-appraisal workshops, simulated assessment activities, guided analysis and structured feedback.	Method-appraisal assignments, practical exercises and case analyses (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
5) Analyse developmental characteristics and support needs associated with intellectual disability, autism and sensory, communication or motor disabilities, taking account of individual variation.			Developmental case studies, comparative exercises, guided reading and small-group discussions.	Analytical assignments, case analyses and the support-planning project (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
6) Demonstrate respectful and accessible communication in simulated interactions with people with disabilities or mental health conditions and their families.			Role-play, communication exercises, accessibility workshops, peer feedback and reflection.	Observed communication tasks, practical assignments and reflective commentary (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
7) Develop and justify basic psychological support and inclusion recommendations			Project-based learning, support-planning	Support-planning project, presentation and

that address individual strengths, participation needs and environmental barriers.	workshops, accessibility case analysis and presentations.	reflective commentary (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
8) Evaluate ethical dilemmas concerning consent, confidentiality, discrimination, autonomy and professional competence and explain appropriate collaboration and referral decisions.	Ethical case analysis, simulated multidisciplinary discussions, peer review and reflective activities.	Ethical case assignments, seminar tasks and project justification (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
	Assessment	

Each semester is assessed separately on a 100-point scale.
Semester 7
The semester grade is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS). The semester concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points.
100 points for continuous assessment:
20 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions;
30 points for practical assignments and interpretation of supplied psychological assessment information;
20 points for individual analytical assignments;
30 points for an integrative pathopsychological case analysis.
The integrative case analysis examines supplied information about cognitive, emotional and behavioural functioning. Students distinguish observations from interpretations, consider alternative explanations, identify limitations and justify further assessment or referral where appropriate.
Semester 8
The semester grade consists of continuous assessment (CAS), worth 60 points, and the Final Exam (FAS), worth 40 points.
Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:
20 points for seminar tasks and individual analytical assignments;
20 points for practical case analyses and accessible communication tasks;
20 points for a psychological support and inclusion project, presentation and reflective commentary.
Final Exam (FAS) – 40 points.
The project addresses a defined support need of a person with a developmental disability. It includes an analysis of strengths and needs, relevant environmental barriers, accessible communication, feasible support activities, ethical considerations and arrangements for collaboration or referral.
The Final Exam assesses knowledge developed across both semesters, including the integration of pathopsychological concepts, developmental characteristics, assessment principles, psychological support and ethical judgement.
Assignments use fictional, published or appropriately anonymised materials. Simulated activities do not require students to independently diagnose mental disorders, prescribe treatment or conduct clinical examinations.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. For categories comprising several tasks, each task score is divided by its maximum possible score. The mean of these proportions, including zeros for unsubmitted required tasks, is multiplied by the category maximum. Required tasks, deadlines and marking arrangements are communicated at the beginning of each semester.
Assessment criteria:
a) Seminar tasks and evidence-based discussions – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately explains relevant concepts, compares interpretations and supports arguments with appropriate academic evidence. Contributions recognise individual variation, contextual influences and professional limitations.
11–15 points: Work demonstrates good understanding and relevant reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially

justified.
1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported assumptions.
0 points: No assessable work is provided.
b) Practical assignments and interpretation of assessment information – 30 points
25–30 points: The student accurately analyses supplied assessment information, identifies relevant patterns of psychological functioning and distinguishes description from interpretation. Methodological decisions are justified, and conclusions acknowledge limitations and referral needs.
18–24 points: Work is generally accurate and coherent, with minor omissions in interpretation, method appraisal or justification.
10–17 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in interpretation or insufficiently justified conclusions.
1–9 points: Work contains significant errors, inappropriate method selection or unsupported diagnostic conclusions.
0 points: No assessable practical work is submitted.
c) Individual analytical assignments – 20 points
16–20 points: The assignment addresses the question clearly, critically evaluates relevant academic sources and accurately distinguishes psychological concepts and clinical descriptions. Conclusions are coherent and appropriately qualified.
11–15 points: The assignment is generally accurate and well structured, although source evaluation or argumentation requires further development.
6–10 points: The assignment demonstrates basic understanding but relies mainly on description and contains gaps in reasoning.
1–5 points: The assignment is incomplete, contains substantial inaccuracies or relies on unsuitable sources.
0 points: No assessable assignment is submitted.
d) Integrative pathopsychological case analysis – 30 points
25–30 points: The analysis coherently integrates information about cognition, emotion, behaviour and context. It considers alternative explanations, identifies missing information and justifies assessment or referral recommendations. Conclusions remain within the evidence and the student's competence.
18–24 points: The analysis is generally accurate and well justified, although some alternatives, limitations or recommendations require fuller consideration.
10–17 points: The analysis meets basic requirements but is partly descriptive, incomplete or insufficiently supported.
1–9 points: The analysis contains major conceptual errors, unsupported diagnostic labels or recommendations inconsistent with the case.
0 points: No assessable case analysis is submitted.
e) Practical case analyses and accessible communication tasks – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately identifies individual strengths, support needs and environmental barriers. Communication is respectful, accessible and responsive to the simulated situation. Recommendations recognise autonomy, diversity and professional boundaries.
11–15 points: Analysis and communication are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or limitations in accessibility or justification.
6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic practical skills but requires substantial guidance in adapting communication or identifying support needs.
1–5 points: Work contains substantial errors, inappropriate assumptions or insufficient attention to accessibility and individual preferences.
0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.
f) Psychological support and inclusion project, presentation and reflective commentary – 20 points
16–20 points: The project provides a coherent, evidence-informed response to a defined support need. Activities are feasible, accessible and connected to individual strengths and participation goals. The presentation justifies decisions, and reflection explains revisions and remaining limitations.

11–15 points: The project is generally appropriate and well structured, although some support activities, accessibility arrangements or limitations require further development.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains gaps in analysis, planning or justification. Reflection is limited.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete, poorly adapted to the individual or based on unsupported assumptions.
0 points: No assessable project is submitted.
g) Final Exam – 40 points
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive understanding, accurately applies relevant concepts and critically interprets psychological information. Responses integrate developmental, clinical and contextual perspectives and demonstrate sound ethical judgement.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates good understanding and generally accurate application, with minor inaccuracies or weaknesses in justification.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in application or interpretation. Responses are incomplete or insufficiently justified.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, substantial conceptual errors and difficulty formulating supported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.

Content

Semester 7
Topic 1. Introduction to Pathopsychology and Psychiatry
Topic 2. Psychological Assessment in Mental Health Settings
Topic 3. Disturbances of Perception, Attention and Memory
Topic 4. Disturbances of Thinking, Emotion and Self-Regulation
Topic 5. Anxiety, Stress-Related and Bodily Distress Conditions
Topic 6. Depressive and Bipolar Disorders
Topic 7. Psychotic Symptoms and Disorders
Topic 8. Altered Consciousness and Neurocognitive Disorders
Topic 9. Substance Use and Addictive Behaviours
Topic 10. Personality Disorders and Patterns of Functioning
Topic 11. Ethical Practice, Risk Recognition and Referral
Semester 8
Topic 12. Foundations of Special Psychology
Topic 13. Developmental Diversity and Individual Support Needs
Topic 14. Intellectual Development and Adaptive Functioning
Topic 15. Autism and Individual Developmental Profiles
Topic 16. Attention, Learning and Communication Difficulties
Topic 17. Sensory and Motor Disabilities
Topic 18. Acquired Brain Injury and Developmental Consequences
Topic 19. Psychological Assessment of Strengths and Support Needs
Topic 20. Accessible Communication and Family Collaboration
Topic 21. Psychological Support and Inclusive Participation
Topic 22. Rights, Accessibility and Prevention of Discrimination

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Comer, R. J., & Comer, J. S. (2024). Psychopathology: Science and practice (12th ed.). New York: Worth Publishers. 800 p.
2. Korniienko, V. V. (2023). Patopsykholohiia [Pathopsychology]. Dnipro: Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs. 120 p.
3. Richards, S. B., Brady, M. P., & Taylor, R. L. (2024). Understanding intellectual disabilities: Historical perspectives, current practices, and future directions (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge. 434 p.
4. Rudenko, N. M. (Comp.). (2025). Spetsialna psykholohiia [Special psychology]. Rivne: Rivne State University of Humanities. 75 p.

Recommended reading

1. Carr, A., Linehan, C., O'Reilly, G., Walsh, P. N., & McEvoy, J. (Eds.). (2016). The handbook of intellectual disability and clinical psychology practice (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. 884 p.

2. Klevets, L. M., & Khomenko, V. I. (2024). Patopsykholohiia: praktykum [Pathopsychology: A practical workbook]. Irpin: State Tax University. 122 p.

3. Kobylchenko, V. V., & Omelchenko, I. M. (2020). Spetsialna psykholohiia [Special psychology]. Kyiv: Akademiia. 224 p.

4. Kobylchenko, V. V., & Omelchenko, I. M. (2024). Spetsialna psykholohiia yak postneklasychna nauka [Special psychology as a post-nonclassical science]. Dystantsiina osvita v Ukraini: innovatsiini, normatyvno-pravovi, pedahohichni aspekty [Distance Education in Ukraine: Innovative, Normative-Legal, Pedagogical Aspects], 4, 293–305.

5. Martin, A. J., Sperling, R. A., & Newton, K. J. (Eds.). (2020). Handbook of educational psychology and students with special needs. New York: Routledge. 742 p.

6. Osgood, T. (2019). Supporting positive behaviour in intellectual disabilities and autism: Practical strategies for addressing challenging behaviour. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. 240 p.

7. Overchuk, V. A. (2023). Patopsykholohiia: navchalnyi posibnyk dlia pidhotovky do ekzamenu [Pathopsychology: A study guide for examination preparation] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). Vinnytsia: Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University. 204 p.

8. World Health Organization. (2023). Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) guideline for mental, neurological and substance use disorders. Geneva: World Health Organization. 184 p.

9. World Health Organization. (2024). Clinical descriptions and diagnostic requirements for ICD-11 mental, behavioural and neurodevelopmental disorders. Geneva: World Health Organization. 852 p.

Web-resources

1. IRIS Center, Vanderbilt University. Autism: An overview for educators. URL: https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/asd1/

2. IRIS Center, Vanderbilt University. Learning modules and case studies on disability, assessment, accessibility and inclusion. URL: https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/resources/iris-resource-locator/

3. World Health Organization. QualityRights e-training on mental health, recovery and community inclusion. URL: https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/policy-law-rights/qualityrights

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TRAINING				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of social and psychological training as a structured form of group learning and their ability to design, facilitate and evaluate training activities. Students examine group dynamics, experiential learning, communication and the facilitator's role. Through practical exercises, supervised facilitation and project work, they learn to select appropriate activities, guide group interaction, conduct debriefing and use feedback to improve training programmes. Particular attention is given to voluntary participation, accessibility, psychological safety and professional boundaries.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7	5 / mandatory	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	150 hours (14 h. lectures, 28 h. seminars/practical, 108 h. self-study time)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the principles and purposes of social and psychological training and distinguish training from group counselling and psychotherapy.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks, analytical assignments and training situation analyses (CAS).
2) Analyse group development, roles, norms, cohesion and conflict and explain their implications for training facilitation.			Group exercises, observation tasks, case-based learning and guided discussions.	Group-process analyses, practical assignments and reflective commentary (CAS).
3) Design a coherent training programme with measurable learning outcomes, appropriate activities, realistic timing and evaluation procedures.			Project-based learning, needs-analysis exercises, programme-design workshops and peer review.	Training programme project and presentation (CAS).
4) Select and adapt training exercises and digital tools to participants' needs, group characteristics and learning objectives.			Activity-appraisal workshops, demonstrations, practical exercises and collaborative planning.	Practical assignments and methodological justification within the training programme project (CAS).
5) Facilitate a short training activity under guidance, communicate instructions clearly, manage participation and conduct a structured debriefing.			Microteaching, role-play, supervised facilitation, observation and structured feedback.	Observed facilitation, communication tasks and practical exercises (CAS).
6) Apply ethical principles and psychological safety procedures in simulated training situations, respecting autonomy, diversity and professional boundaries.			Ethical case analysis, simulated group situations, accessibility exercises and reflective discussion.	Ethical case analyses, observed practical activities and training programme project (CAS).
7) Evaluate training activities using participant feedback and evidence of learning and identify justified improvements to their own facilitation practice.			Feedback-design workshops, peer observation, reflective writing and project revision.	Evaluation tasks, reflective portfolio and revised training programme project (CAS).

Assessment
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points. 100 points for continuous assessment: 30 points for practical training activities and supervised facilitation; 20 points for seminar tasks and analysis of training situations and group processes; 30 points for a training programme project and presentation; 20 points for a reflective portfolio and evaluation of training activities. The training programme project includes a defined target group, needs rationale, measurable learning outcomes, a session plan, activity instructions, debriefing questions, ethical safeguards and evaluation procedures. Students present the programme and justify revisions following feedback. Practical facilitation takes place within supervised classroom activities. Assessment concerns demonstrated skills and reasoning. Students are not required to disclose sensitive personal experiences or conduct training with external participants. Each task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. Group work identifies individual contributions. Required tasks, deadlines and marking arrangements are communicated at the beginning of the semester. Assessment criteria a) Practical training activities and supervised facilitation – 30 points 25–30 points: The student gives clear instructions, facilitates inclusive participation, responds appropriately to group interaction and conducts a purposeful debriefing. Performance demonstrates ethical judgement and psychological safety. 18–24 points: Facilitation is generally effective, with minor limitations in timing, responsiveness, participation management or debriefing. 10–17 points: The student demonstrates basic facilitation skills but requires substantial guidance. 1–9 points: Performance is poorly structured or demonstrates significant difficulties in communication, group management or ethical judgement. 0 points: No assessable practical performance is provided. b) Seminar tasks and analysis of training situations and group processes – 20 points 16–20 points: The student accurately applies relevant concepts, critically analyses group interaction and justifies appropriate facilitation decisions. 11–15 points: Analysis demonstrates good understanding, with minor omissions or insufficiently developed arguments. 6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially justified. 1–5 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors or unsupported interpretations. 0 points: No assessable work is provided. c) Training programme project and presentation – 30 points 25–30 points: The programme coherently connects participant needs, learning outcomes, activities and evaluation. Instructions and timing are realistic, safeguards are appropriate, and the presentation clearly justifies design decisions. 18–24 points: The programme is coherent and feasible, although some activities, evaluation procedures or safeguards require further development. 10–17 points: The programme meets basic requirements but contains gaps in alignment, practical detail or justification. 1–9 points: The programme is substantially incomplete or poorly matched to participants' needs and learning outcomes. 0 points: No assessable project is submitted. d) Reflective portfolio and evaluation of training activities – 20 points

16–20 points: The portfolio critically evaluates facilitation using observations, participant feedback and evidence of learning. It identifies specific improvements and explains changes made following feedback.
11–15 points: Reflection is coherent and identifies relevant strengths and areas for improvement, although some conclusions require stronger evidence.
6–10 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, with limited use of feedback or justification of improvements.
1–5 points: Reflection is fragmentary or contains unsupported claims about training effectiveness.
0 points: No assessable portfolio is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations and Types of Social and Psychological Training
Topic 2. Experiential Learning and Skill Development
Topic 3. Group Development, Roles and Norms
Topic 4. The Trainer's Role and Facilitation Skills
Topic 5. Participant Needs and Training Objectives
Topic 6. Training Programme and Session Design
Topic 7. Training Exercises and Activity Selection
Topic 8. Communication, Feedback and Debriefing
Topic 9. Managing Conflict and Difficult Group Situations
Topic 10. Ethics, Accessibility and Psychological Safety
Topic 11. Online and Hybrid Training
Topic 12. Training Evaluation and Professional Reflection

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bens, I. (2017). Facilitating with ease! Core skills for facilitators, team leaders and members, managers, consultants, and trainers (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass. 320 p.
2. Moroz, L. I., & Yakovenko, S. I. (2011). Profesiino-psykholohichnyi treninh [Professional psychological training]. Kyiv: Palyvoda A. V. 252 p.
3. Schwarz, R. (2017). The skilled facilitator: A comprehensive resource for consultants, facilitators, coaches, and trainers (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass. 416 p.
4. Sysoieva, O. (Ed.). (2024). Metodolohiia rozrobky treninhiv z nulia: yak stvoriuvaty treninhy lehko ta iz zadovolenniam [A methodology for developing training programmes from scratch: How to create training programmes easily and with enjoyment]. Kyiv: 7BTs. 295 p.

Recommended reading

1. Afanasieva, N. Ye., & Perelyhina, L. A. (2016). Teoretyko-metodolohichni osnovy sotsialno-psykholohichnoho treninhu [Theoretical and methodological foundations of social and psychological training]. Kharkiv: National University of Civil Defence of Ukraine. 251 p.
2. Balakhtar, V. V. (2015). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh i manipuliatsiia [Social and psychological training and manipulation]. Vyzhnytsia: Cheremosh. 432 p.
3. Bykova, V. O., Voshkolup, H. Yu., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Pidhotovka maibutnikh psykholohiv do zastosuvannia kouchynhovykh stratehii u konsultuvanni kliientiv [Preparing future psychologists to apply coaching strategies in client counselling]. Alfred Nobel University Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology, 1(29), 32–40.
4. Fedorchuk, V. M. (2014). Treninh osobystisnoho zrostannia [Personal growth training]. Kyiv: Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 250 p.
5. Johnson, D. W. (2003). Sotsialna psykholohiia: treninh mizhosobystisnoho spilkuvannia [Social psychology: Interpersonal communication training] (V. Khomyk, Trans.). Kyiv: KM Akademiia. 288 p.
6. Karpenko, Ye. V. (2015). Osnovy psykhotreninhu [Fundamentals of psychological training]. Drohobych: Prosvit. 78 p.
7. Korniienko, I. O., & Almashi, S. I. (Comps.). (2016). Metodolohiia provedennia treninhiv: kurs lektsii [Methodology of conducting training: A lecture course]. Mukachevo: Mukachevo State University. 60 p.
8. Kroll, J. R. (2022). Preparing leadership educators: A comprehensive guide to theories, practices, and facilitation skills. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing. 270 p.
9. Lebid, O., & Oliinyk, I. (2023). Treninh yak interaktyvnyi metod profesiinoi pidhotovky maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnoi sfery do sotsialnoi pidtrymky batkiv ditei z osoblyvymy potrebamy [Training as an

interactive method of preparing future specialists in socionomic professions to provide social support to parents of children with special needs]. Adaptyvne upravlinnia: teoriia i praktyka. Seriia: Pedahohika [Adaptive Management: Theory and Practice. Series: Pedagogics], 16(31).

10. Miliutina, K. L. (2004). Teoriia ta praktyka psykholohichnoho treninhu [Theory and practice of psychological training]. Kyiv: Interregional Academy of Personnel Management. 192 p.

11. Oliinyk, I. V. (2022). Treninhovi tekhnolohii yak efektyvnyi instrument optymizatsii v maibutnikh doktoriv filosofii motyvatsii ta tsilepokladannia do doslidnytskoi diialnosti [Training technologies as an effective tool for enhancing future Doctors of Philosophy's motivation and goal-setting for research]. Naukovi zapysky Maloi akademii nauk Ukrainy [Scientific Notes of the Junior Academy of Sciences of Ukraine], 2(24), 82–90.

12. Shevchuk, O. M. (Comp.). (2011). Orhanizatsiia i metodyka sotsialno-pedahohichnoho treninhu [Organisation and methodology of social and pedagogical training]. Uman: PP Zhovtyi. 133 p.

13. Volkova, N. P., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak metod interaktyvnoho navchannia u protsesi pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv do sotsialno-psykholohichnoi pidtrymky hromadian v umovakh viiny [Social and psychological training as an interactive learning method in preparing future psychologists to provide psychosocial support to citizens during wartime]. Pedahohichna Akademiia: naukovi zapysky [Pedagogical Academy: Scientific Notes], 16.

Web-resources

1. Aktualni problemy psykholohii (Instytut psykholohii imeni H.S. Kostiuka). (n.d.). [Current Issues of Psychology (G. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology)]. Official website. http://appsychology.org.ua

2. Coursera. (n.d.). Courses in psychology and training methodologies. Official website. https://www.coursera.org

3. EdEra. (n.d.). Educational materials and lectures in psychological disciplines. Official website. https://www.edera.com

4. National Library of Ukraine named after V.I. Vernadskyi. (n.d.). Official website. http://www.nbuv.gov.ua

5. Prometheus. (n.d.). Безкоштовні onlain-kursy z psykholohii, komunikatsii, roboty z hrupamy [Free online courses in psychology, communication, and group work]. Official website. https://prometheus.org.ua

6. Vseosvita. (n.d.). Psykholohichna platforma: kursy, vebinary, statti ta materialy dlia psykholohiv ta pedahohiv [Psychological platform: courses, webinars, articles, and materials for psychologists and educators]. Official website. https://vseosvita.ua

THE BASICS OF PSYCHOTHERAPY. PSYCHOLOGY OF TRAUMA				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of major psychotherapeutic approaches and the psychological effects of trauma and loss. Students examine therapeutic relationships, mechanisms of psychological change, trauma-related reactions and factors influencing recovery. Through critical reading, case analysis and simulated interactions, they learn to compare therapeutic models, evaluate evidence and formulate appropriate psychological support and referral recommendations. Particular attention is given to trauma-informed communication, ethical judgement and the distinction between basic psychological support and specialist psychotherapy.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	8	4 / Mandatory	Oxana Bayer, PhD (Psychology), Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS, final assessment FAS)**
1) Compare major psychotherapeutic approaches in terms of their theoretical assumptions, understanding of psychological difficulties, therapeutic relationships and proposed mechanisms of change.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises and structured discussions.	Comparative analytical assignments and seminar tasks (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
2) Critically evaluate claims about psychotherapy using research evidence, recognising differences between theoretical explanations, demonstrated outcomes and unsupported assertions.			Guided appraisal of research, evidence-comparison workshops, debates and case-based discussions.	Evidence-appraisal assignments and seminar tasks (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
3) Analyse psychological responses to trauma and distinguish common stress reactions, possible trauma-related disorders and grief responses using supplied case information.			Case-based learning, comparative case analysis, analysis of educational materials and guided discussion.	Practical case analyses and individual analytical assignments (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
4) Analyse how personal history, relationships, culture, social conditions and available resources may influence trauma responses, help-seeking and recovery.			Contextual case analysis, small-group discussions, resource-mapping exercises and reflective learning.	Case analyses and the psychological support project (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
5) Demonstrate basic supportive communication and psychological first aid principles in simulated situations, respecting choice and avoiding pressure to disclose traumatic experiences.			Demonstrations, role-play, communication exercises, simulations and structured feedback.	Observed practical exercises and reflective commentary (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
6) Justify the use and limitations of selected trauma-screening tools and recognise circumstances requiring further assessment, urgent assistance or specialist referral.			Instrument-appraisal workshops, guided interpretation of supplied information, referral scenarios and problem-based learning.	Practical assignments, case analyses and project justification (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
7) Develop and present an evidence-informed psychological support plan that identifies			Project-based learning, support-planning	Psychological support project, presentation and

needs, strengths, immediate priorities, appropriate support and referral options.	workshops, presentations and peer review.	reflective commentary (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).
8) Evaluate ethical dilemmas involving consent, confidentiality, professional boundaries and competence and reflect on the practitioner's need for supervision and support.	Ethical case analysis, simulated professional discussions, reflective writing and guided feedback.	Ethical case assignments, seminar tasks and project reflection (CAS); Final Exam (FAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and consists of continuous assessment (CAS), worth 60 points, and the Final Exam (FAS), worth 40 points.

Continuous assessment (CAS) – 60 points:

20 points for seminar tasks, comparative analytical assignments and critical appraisal of academic evidence;

20 points for practical case analyses, simulated supportive communication and reflection;

20 points for an individual psychological support project and presentation.

Final Exam (FAS) – 40 points.

The psychological support project addresses a supplied trauma- or loss-related case. Students analyse the available information, identify needs and resources, formulate appropriate support recommendations and justify referral decisions. The project includes a concise written plan, an oral presentation and reflection on feedback and limitations.

The Final Exam assesses understanding of psychotherapeutic approaches, analysis of trauma and loss, interpretation of psychological information and ethical professional decision-making.

Practical activities use fictional, published or appropriately anonymised materials. Students are not required to disclose personal traumatic experiences, independently deliver psychotherapy or carry out trauma-processing procedures.

Each task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. Required tasks, deadlines and marking arrangements are communicated at the beginning of the semester. Where a category comprises several tasks, task scores are normalised to their respective maximum scores, averaged and multiplied by the category maximum. Unsubmitted required tasks receive zero points.

Assessment criteria

a) Seminar tasks, comparative analytical assignments and critical appraisal – 20 points

16–20 points: The student accurately compares psychotherapeutic approaches, critically evaluates relevant academic evidence and supports conclusions with coherent arguments. Work recognises methodological limitations and distinguishes evidence from theoretical assumptions.

11–15 points: Work demonstrates good understanding and relevant analysis, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some comparisons and arguments.

6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive, with limited source evaluation or justification.

1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported claims.

0 points: No assessable work is provided.

b) Practical case analyses, simulated supportive communication and reflection – 20 points

16–20 points: The student accurately analyses the supplied situation, considers contextual factors and demonstrates respectful, responsive communication. Support and referral decisions are justified, and reflection identifies specific improvements.

11–15 points: Analysis and practical performance are generally appropriate, with minor omissions in interpretation, communication or justification.

6–10 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but requires substantial guidance. Conclusions or support decisions are only partially justified.

1–5 points: Work contains significant interpretative errors or demonstrates inappropriate communication, unsupported diagnostic conclusions or insufficient attention to professional boundaries.

0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.
c) Individual psychological support project and presentation – 20 points
16–20 points: The project presents a coherent analysis of needs, strengths and support priorities. Recommendations are feasible, evidence-informed and consistent with the student's competence. The presentation justifies decisions, acknowledges limitations and explains revisions following feedback.
11–15 points: The project is generally accurate and well structured, although some recommendations, referral arrangements or limitations require further development.
6–10 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains gaps in analysis, planning or justification. The presentation demonstrates partial understanding.
1–5 points: The project is substantially incomplete or proposes poorly justified support that is inconsistent with the case or professional competence.
0 points: No assessable project is submitted.
d) Final Exam – 40 points
32–40 points: The student demonstrates comprehensive understanding of psychotherapeutic approaches and trauma psychology, critically applies relevant concepts and formulates coherent, ethically informed conclusions.
24–31 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally accurate application, with minor inaccuracies, omissions or weaknesses in justification.
16–23 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding but makes significant errors in comparison, case interpretation or support planning. Responses are incomplete or insufficiently justified.
1–15 points: The student demonstrates fragmented understanding, substantial conceptual errors and difficulty applying knowledge to the supplied situations.
0 points: No assessable response is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations of Psychotherapy and Professional Roles
Topic 2. Therapeutic Relationships, Ethics and Professional Boundaries
Topic 3. Psychodynamic Approaches
Topic 4. Person-Centred, Gestalt and Existential Approaches
Topic 5. Cognitive and Behavioural Approaches
Topic 6. Systemic and Group Approaches
Topic 7. Psychological Trauma and Stress Responses
Topic 8. Post-Traumatic Stress, Complex Trauma and Dissociation
Topic 9. Loss, Grief and Adaptation
Topic 10. Trauma-Informed Communication and Psychological First Aid
Topic 11. Evidence-Based Psychotherapies for Trauma
Topic 12. Psychological Support, Referral and Practitioner Well-Being

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Briere, J. N., & Scott, C. (2024). Principles of trauma therapy: A guide to symptoms, evaluation, and treatment (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. 400 p.
2. Corey, G. (2024). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning. 550 p.
3. Koshova, I. V., & Lytovchenko, N. F. (2022). Psykhoterapiia: navchalno-metodychnyi posibnyk [Psychotherapy: A teaching and methodological guide]. Nizhyn: Nizhyn Mykola Gogol State University. 113 p.

Recommended reading

1. Bayer, O. (2023). Terapiia hidnosti yak metod paliatyvnoi psykholohichnoi dopomohy [Dignity therapy as a method of palliative psychological care]. Psykholohichne konsultuvannia i psykhoterapiia [Psychological Counseling and Psychotherapy], 20, 18–25.
2. Beck, J. S. (2021). Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond (3rd ed.). New York: Guilford Press. 414 p.

3. Hlushko, O. I., & Bayer, O. O. (2019). Tsinnisnyi portret ukraintsia, potentsiino zatsikavlenoho u psykhoterapii [A value profile of a Ukrainian potentially interested in psychotherapy]. Psykholohiia i suspilstvo [Psychology and Society], 1(75), 52–59.

4. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2018). Post-traumatic stress disorder. NICE guideline NG116. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence.

5. Wirtz, U. (2020). Trauma and beyond: The mystery of transformation. Abingdon: Routledge. 370 p.

6. World Health Organization, War Trauma Foundation, & World Vision International. (2011). 7. Psychological first aid: Guide for field workers. Geneva: World Health Organization. 60 p.

7. World Health Organization. (2023). Mental Health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) guideline for mental, neurological and substance use disorders. Geneva: World Health Organization. 184 p.

Web-resources

1. National Center for PTSD. Overview of psychotherapy for PTSD. URL: https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/treat/txessentials/overview_therapy.asp

2. National Child Traumatic Stress Network. Psychological First Aid Online: Interactive course. URL: https://www.nctsn.org/resources/psychological-first-aid-pfa-online

3. NICE. Post-traumatic stress disorder: Recommendations. URL: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng116/chapter/recommendations

4. World Health Organization. QualityRights e-training on mental health, recovery and community inclusion. URL: https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/policy-law-rights/qualityrights

BASICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological counselling process and their ability to analyse client concerns, establish a collaborative helping relationship and use basic counselling skills in simulated situations. Students examine how ethical principles, individual characteristics and social and cultural contexts inform counselling decisions. Through case analysis, practical exercises and reflection, they learn to formulate initial counselling plans, evaluate their communication and recognise when consultation or specialist referral is required.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	8	4 / mandatory	Viktoriia Bykova, PhD (Pedagogy), Associate Professor	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 80h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the purposes, principles and boundaries of psychological counselling and distinguish it from psychotherapy, psychological assessment and other forms of assistance.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises and structured discussions.	Seminar tasks and comparative analytical assignments (CAS).
2) Analyse a supplied client concern, distinguish presenting difficulties from initial interpretations and formulate collaborative counselling goals that consider the client's context and preferences.			Case-based learning, analysis of counselling transcripts, goal-setting exercises and practical workshops.	Written case analyses, counselling-planning assignments and practical exercises (CAS).
3) Demonstrate active listening, clarification, paraphrasing, reflection of feelings, appropriate questioning and summarising in simulated counselling interactions.			Demonstrations, role-play, skills practice, observation and structured feedback.	Observed counselling simulations, practical exercises and reflective commentary (CAS).
4) Develop a coherent initial counselling plan that connects agreed goals, appropriate helping strategies, review of progress and arrangements for ending or referral.			Planning workshops, case analysis, collaborative problem-solving and peer review.	Counselling-planning assignments and the integrative counselling case project (CAS).
5) Adapt communication and initial counselling recommendations to individual needs, cultural context, age, accessibility requirements and available resources.			Contrasting case studies, role-play, accessibility exercises and guided discussions.	Practical simulations, case analyses and project justification (CAS).
6) Evaluate ethical dilemmas involving informed consent, confidentiality, boundaries and competence and justify appropriate consultation, safeguarding or referral decisions.			Ethical case analysis, work with professional codes, decision-making exercises and simulated professional discussions.	Ethical analytical assignments, case analyses and the integrative counselling case project (CAS).
7) Recognise signs of significant distress or possible risk in supplied situations and explain			Problem-based learning, referral scenarios,	Practical assignments, case analyses and observed simulations (CAS).

appropriate basic support and referral actions within professional competence.	demonstrations and simulated supportive conversations.	
8) Critically evaluate their own simulated counselling performance, use feedback to identify improvements and explain the contribution of supervision and reflective practice to professional development.	Reflective writing, peer observation, guided feedback, supervision demonstrations and project revision.	Reflective commentary, practical self-evaluation and project presentation (CAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale and is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) completed throughout the semester. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the grade determined by accumulated CAS points.

100 points for continuous assessment:

20 points for seminar tasks and individual analytical assignments;

30 points for practical counselling exercises and observed simulations;

20 points for counselling case analyses and ethical decision-making tasks;

30 points for an integrative counselling case project, presentation and reflective commentary.

The integrative project addresses a supplied counselling case. It includes analysis of the presenting concern and context, proposed collaborative goals, an initial counselling plan, ethical considerations, arrangements for reviewing progress and possible consultation or referral. Students present their reasoning and explain revisions made following feedback.

Practical activities use fictional, published or appropriately anonymised materials. Students are not required to counsel external clients or disclose sensitive personal experiences. Assessment concerns demonstrated communication, analysis and professional judgement.

Each task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. For categories comprising several tasks, each task score is divided by its maximum possible score. The mean of these proportions, including zeros for unsubmitted required tasks, is multiplied by the category maximum. Required tasks, deadlines and marking arrangements are communicated at the beginning of the semester.

Assessment criteria

a) Seminar tasks and individual analytical assignments – 20 points

16–20 points: The student accurately explains counselling concepts, compares relevant interpretations and supports arguments with appropriate academic sources. Work recognises contextual influences and professional boundaries.

11–15 points: Work demonstrates good understanding and relevant reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.

6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or partially justified.

1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported opinions.

0 points: No assessable work is provided.

b) Practical counselling exercises and observed simulations – 30 points

25–30 points: The student demonstrates attentive listening, clear and appropriate responses, purposeful questioning and accurate summarising. Communication supports collaboration, respects client choice and responds sensitively to the simulated situation.

18–24 points: Performance is generally appropriate and coherent, with minor limitations in responsiveness, questioning, structure or use of feedback.

10–17 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but applies them inconsistently or requires substantial guidance.

1–9 points: Performance demonstrates significant communication difficulties, premature advice, unsupported interpretations or insufficient attention to professional boundaries.

0 points: No assessable practical performance is provided.
c) Counselling case analyses and ethical decision-making tasks – 20 points
16–20 points: The student provides a coherent analysis of the concern and context, distinguishes evidence from assumptions and justifies appropriate counselling, consultation or referral decisions. Ethical considerations are accurately identified.
11–15 points: Analysis and decisions are generally appropriate, although some alternatives, contextual factors or ethical implications require fuller consideration.
6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains gaps in interpretation or justification.
1–5 points: Work contains substantial errors, unsupported conclusions or inappropriate professional decisions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Integrative counselling case project, presentation and reflective commentary – 30 points
25–30 points: The project coherently connects the client concern, collaborative goals, proposed counselling process and review arrangements. Decisions are feasible, ethically justified and sensitive to context. The presentation demonstrates independent understanding, and reflection explains specific improvements following feedback.
18–24 points: The project is generally accurate and well structured, although some goals, strategies, review arrangements or reflections require further development.
10–17 points: The project meets basic requirements but contains gaps in planning, justification or reflection.
1–9 points: The project is substantially incomplete, poorly aligned with the case or based on unsupported assumptions. The presentation demonstrates limited understanding.
0 points: No assessable project is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations and Boundaries of Psychological Counselling
Topic 2. The Counsellor's Professional Role and Reflective Practice
Topic 3. Ethical Practice and Informed Consent
Topic 4. The Counselling Relationship and Collaborative Working
Topic 5. Exploring Client Concerns and Context
Topic 6. Basic Counselling Skills
Topic 7. Collaborative Goals and Initial Counselling Plans
Topic 8. Diversity, Accessibility and Culturally Responsive Communication
Topic 9. Reviewing Progress and Ending Counselling
Topic 10. Significant Distress, Risk Recognition and Referral
Topic 11. Supervision, Consultation and Professional Development

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Hirchenko, O. L. (2023). Osnovy psykholohichnoho konsultuvannia [Fundamentals of psychological counselling]. Chernihiv: T. H. Shevchenko National University "Chernihiv Colehium". 124 p.
2. Hanley, T., & Winter, L. A. (Eds.). (2023). The SAGE handbook of counselling and psychotherapy (5th ed.). London: SAGE. 680 p.
3. Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2024). Clinical interviewing (7th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. 688 p.

Recommended reading

1. Bykova, V. O. (2023). Slovnyk logoterapevtychnykh terminiv [Dictionary of logotherapeutic terms]. Dnipro: Aktsent PP. 43 p.
2. Corey, G. (2024). Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning. 550 p.
3. Fedorenko, R. P. (2015). Psykholohiia simi [Family psychology]. Lutsk: Vezha-Druk. 363 p.
4. McLeod, J. (2019). An introduction to counselling and psychotherapy: Theory, research and practice (6th ed.). London: Open University Press. xxi, 718 p.
5. Nelson-Jones, R. (2015). Basic counselling skills: A helper's manual (4th ed.). London: SAGE. 216 p.
6. Tsymbaliuk, I. M. (2009). Psykholohichne konsultuvannia ta korektsiia [Psychological counselling and correction]. Kyiv: Profesional. 544 p.

7. Vaskivska, S. V. (2004). Osnovy psykholohichnoho konsultuvannia [Fundamentals of psychological counselling]. Kyiv: Chetverta khvylia. 256 p.

8. World Health Organization, War Trauma Foundation, & World Vision International. (2011). Psychological first aid: Guide for field workers. Geneva: World Health Organization. 60 p.

Web-resources

1. American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.aamft.org
2. American Counseling Association. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.counseling.org
3. Association for Contextual Behavioral Science. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://contextualscience.org
4. Bowen Center for the Study of the Family. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.thebowencenter.org
5. uropean Association for Psychotherapy. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.europsyche.org
6. Family Process Institute. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.familyprocess.org
7. International Association for Cognitive Psychotherapy. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.the-iacp.com
8. International Family Therapy Association. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.ifta-familytherapy.org
9. International Union of Psychological Science. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.iupsys.net
10. National Council on Family Relations. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.ncfr.org
11. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.npa-ua.org
12. Society for Humanistic Psychology. (n.d.). *Official website.* https://www.apadivisions.org/division-32

ELECTIVE COURSES

PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PERSONALITY SELF-DEVELOPMENT				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological foundations, mechanisms and factors of personality self-development and their ability to apply this knowledge to self-awareness, emotional and volitional self-regulation, motivation, and the planning of personal growth and self-actualisation.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2	4 / elective	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main theoretical approaches to personality development and the psychological mechanisms of self-development, self-awareness and self-actualisation.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis of theoretical approaches, seminar discussions.	Individual analytical assignment and presentation; contributions to discussions; final test (CAS).
2) Analyse how emotional and volitional processes and individual psychological characteristics influence personality self-development.			Lectures, psychological case analysis, guided self-analysis, small-group discussions.	Case analysis within practical assignments; self-analysis tasks in the reflective diary; final test (CAS).
3) Explain the role of self-worth, self-esteem, self-confidence, personal boundaries and motivation in personal growth.			Interactive lectures, case-based learning, reflective exercises, guided discussions.	Individual analytical assignment and presentation; reflective diary entries; case-based practical assignments; final test (CAS).
4) Apply basic self-awareness and emotional and volitional self-regulation techniques to support personal self-development.			Demonstration and guided practice, experiential exercises, analysis of practical situations, reflective discussion.	Practical assignments demonstrating the selection and application of techniques; reflective evaluation of their use in the diary (CAS).
5) Demonstrate assertive communication and respect for personal boundaries in simulated interpersonal situations.			Role-play, communication exercises, small-group activities, guided peer feedback.	Assessed role-play performance and group interaction; practical assignments on communicating and respecting personal boundaries (CAS).
6) Develop and justify an individual self-development plan based on reflection on personal strengths, resources, motivation and areas for growth.			Guided reflection, goal-setting exercises, reflective writing, individual planning, peer discussion of proposed strategies.	Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks; individual self-development plan within practical assignments (CAS).

Assessment
The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The final grade is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS): 30 points for participation in discussions, guided exercises and group interaction; 25 points for an individual analytical assignment and presentation; 20 points for a reflective diary and self-analysis tasks; 15 points for practical assignments, including an individual self-development plan; 10 points for the final test. Assessment criteria: a) Participation in discussions, guided exercises and group interaction – 30 points 24–30 points: The student accurately explains relevant psychological concepts, supports contributions with appropriate reasoning and participates constructively in guided exercises and group interaction. Feedback is relevant and respectful of different perspectives and personal boundaries. 16–23 points: Contributions demonstrate good understanding and constructive engagement, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments. 8–15 points: Contributions demonstrate basic understanding but remain mainly descriptive, contain substantial gaps or require frequent guidance. 1–7 points: Contributions are fragmentary, contain substantial conceptual errors or demonstrate limited engagement with the assigned activities. 0 points: No assessable contribution is provided. b) Individual analytical assignment and presentation – 25 points 20–25 points: The assignment clearly addresses a selected issue, accurately applies psychological concepts and critically evaluates relevant academic sources. Conclusions are coherent and well justified. The presentation clearly communicates the analysis and responds appropriately to questions. 13–19 points: The assignment and presentation demonstrate good understanding and appropriate use of sources, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient analytical depth. 6–12 points: The work demonstrates basic understanding but is mainly descriptive, with limited integration of sources or insufficiently supported conclusions. 1–5 points: The work is fragmented, contains substantial conceptual inaccuracies or relies on unsuitable sources. The presentation provides a limited explanation of the analysis. 0 points: No assessable work is submitted. c) Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks – 20 points 16–20 points: Entries consistently connect reflection with relevant psychological concepts, distinguish observations from interpretations and justify conclusions about strengths, resources, motivation and areas for development. Reflection considers alternative explanations and limitations. 11–15 points: Entries demonstrate relevant reflection and appropriate connections with course concepts, although some interpretations or conclusions require further development. 6–10 points: Entries are mainly descriptive, with limited application of psychological concepts or justification of conclusions. 1–5 points: Entries are incomplete or fragmented and provide little analytical reflection. 0 points: No assessable reflective work is submitted. d) Practical assignments, including an individual self-development plan – 15 points 12–15 points: The student appropriately selects and applies basic self-awareness and self-regulation techniques and demonstrates constructive communication of personal boundaries in simulated situations. The self-development plan includes clear goals, feasible actions, relevant resources and criteria for reviewing progress. 8–11 points: Techniques and communication strategies are generally appropriate. The plan is coherent, although some actions, resources or progress criteria require clarification. 4–7 points: Application of techniques and communication strategies requires substantial guidance. The plan contains broad goals and insufficiently specified actions or progress criteria. 1–3 points: Work demonstrates limited understanding of practical techniques. The plan is substantially incomplete, unrealistic or poorly justified.

0 points: No assessable practical work is submitted.
e) Final test – 10 points
The test includes questions on key theoretical concepts and short case-based tasks. Task values and marking criteria are specified in the test instructions.
8–10 points: The student accurately explains key concepts and applies them appropriately to the situations presented, providing coherent and justified responses.
6–7 points: Responses demonstrate good understanding and generally appropriate application, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
4–5 points: Responses demonstrate basic understanding but contain substantial gaps in explanation, application or justification.
1–3 points: Responses demonstrate fragmentary understanding and substantial conceptual errors.
0 points: No correct or assessable response is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Theoretical approaches to personality development in the human sciences.
Topic 2. Views of the human being in philosophy, psychology and education.
Topic 3. The concept of personality development and its relationship to self-development.
Topic 4. Emotional and volitional processes in personality development: foundations and basic techniques of self-regulation.
Topic 5. Psychological foundations of self-awareness and methods of self-reflection.
Topic 6. Key mechanisms and factors of personality self-development.
Topic 7. Individual psychological characteristics and their role in self-development.
Topic 8. Unconditional self-acceptance and self-worth in personality development.
Topic 9. Awareness of personal strengths and internal resources.
Topic 10. Self-esteem and self-confidence.
Topic 11. Personal boundaries: awareness, assertive communication and respect.
Topic 12. Personal potential and pathways to self-actualisation.
Topic 13. Motivation and its role in self-development: goal setting and individual self-development planning.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Cervone, D., & Pervin, L. A. (2022). *Personality: Theory and Research* (15th ed.). Wiley. 560 p.
2. Katsavets, R. S. (2021). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. Alerta. 134 p.
3. Kuzikova, S. B. (2020). *Psykholohichni osnovy stanovlennia subiekta samorozvytku v yunatskomu vitsi* [Psychological Foundations of Becoming an Agent of Self-Development in Young Adulthood]. Sumy. 324 p.
4. Mitina, S. V. (2020). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. Lira-K. 274 p.
5. Moskalets, V. P. (2020). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology] (3rd ed., revised and expanded). Lira-K. 364 p.
6. Reeve, J. (2024). *Understanding Motivation and Emotion* (8th ed.). Wiley. 464 p.
7. Tytarenko, T. M. (2023). *Suchasna psykholohiia osobystosti* [Contemporary Personality Psychology] (3rd ed.). Karavela. 372 p.

Recommended reading

1. Gross, J. J., & Ford, B. Q. (Eds.). (2024). *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. 606 p.
2. John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (Eds.). (2021). *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (4th ed.). Guilford Press. 942 p.
3. Katsavets, R. S. (2024). *Psykholohiia rozvytku osobystosti* [Psychology of Personality Development]. Alerta. 152 p.
4. Lifarieva, N. V. (2003). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. Tsentr navchalnoi literatury. 240 p.
5. Oliinyk, I. V., & Hrushka, V. V. (2024). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak efektyvnyi instrument formuvannia u zdobuvachiv liderskykh yakostei, navychok samomenedzhmentu ta motyvatsii do samorozvytku [Social and Psychological Training as an Effective Tool for Developing Students' Leadership Qualities, Self-Management Skills and Motivation for Self-Development]. *Aktualni pytannia u suchasnii nautsi*, 12(30), 993–1006.

6. Ryan, R. M. (Ed.). (2023). *The Oxford Handbook of Self-Determination Theory*. Oxford University Press.
7. Varii, M. Y. (2008). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. Tsentr uchbovoi literatury. 592 p.

Web-resources

1. Center for Self-Determination Theory. (n.d.). *Self-Determination Theory*. https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/
2. Greater Good Science Center, University of California, Berkeley. (n.d.). *Greater Good in Action*. https://ggia.berkeley.edu/
3. Self-Compassion Institute. (n.d.). *Self-Compassion Practices*. https://self-compassion.org/self-compassion-practices/
4. Ty yak? (n.d.). *Samodopomoha* [Self-Help]. https://howareu.com/self-help
5. VIA Institute on Character. (n.d.). *Character Strengths and the VIA Survey*. https://www.viacharacter.org/
6. WOOP my life. (n.d.). *WOOP: Wish, Outcome, Obstacle, Plan*. https://woopmylife.org/

BASICS OF BUSINESS PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological foundations of individual and group behaviour in business settings and their ability to apply psychological knowledge to business communication, teamwork, motivation, self-regulation and reasoned decision-making.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2/14 weeks	4 / elective	Liubov Boiko, Associate Professor	120 hours (20 hours of lectures, 20 hours of practical classes, 80 hours of self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main concepts and methods of business psychology and their relevance to individual and group behaviour in organisations.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, analysis of business examples, seminar discussions.	Seminar tasks and contributions to discussions; final test (CAS).
2) Analyse how self-awareness, self-esteem, individual psychological characteristics and motivation influence behaviour in business settings.			Lectures, psychological case analysis, guided reflection, small-group discussions.	Written case analyses within practical assignments; seminar tasks; final test (CAS).
3) Apply active listening, clear questioning and constructive feedback in simulated business communication.			Demonstration, communication exercises, role-play involving colleagues and clients, guided peer feedback.	Assessed role-play performance and communication exercises within practical assignments (CAS).
4) Analyse cooperation, competition, conformity and social loafing in teams and propose ways to improve collaboration.			Interactive lectures, team simulations, group case analysis, collaborative problem-solving.	Teamwork case analyses within practical assignments; group project and presentation; final test (CAS).
5) Evaluate alternative responses to business situations using critical thinking, creative problem-solving and ethical reasoning.			Case-based learning, structured debates, brainstorming, comparison of alternative solutions.	Seminar debates; written case analyses within practical assignments; group project and presentation; final test (CAS).
6) Develop and justify a plan for improving communication, teamwork or self-regulation in a defined business situation.			Project-based learning, collaborative planning, guided reflection, presentations and peer feedback.	Group project and presentation, including an individual explanation of contributions and proposed actions (CAS).

Assessment
The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the final grade determined by accumulated continuous assessment (CAS) points. 100 points for continuous assessment: 20 points for seminar tasks and evidence-based contributions to discussions; 30 points for practical assignments, including business case analyses and simulated communication tasks; 30 points for a group project and presentation; 20 points for the final test. Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. Assessment criteria: a) Seminar tasks and evidence-based discussions – 20 points 16–20 points: The student accurately explains relevant psychological concepts, applies them to business examples and supports arguments with appropriate academic evidence. Contributions are reasoned, relevant and responsive to alternative perspectives. 11–15 points: Work demonstrates good understanding and relevant reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments. 6–10 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive or contains gaps in explanation and justification. 1–5 points: Work is fragmentary, contains substantial conceptual errors or relies on unsupported assumptions. 0 points: No assessable work is provided. b) Practical assignments – 30 points 24–30 points: The student accurately analyses the psychological aspects of supplied business situations, distinguishes observations from interpretations and proposes justified responses. Simulated communication demonstrates active listening, clear questioning, constructive feedback and respect for others. 16–23 points: Analysis and communication are generally appropriate, with minor inaccuracies or omissions in explanation, application or justification. 8–15 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains substantial gaps in case analysis or application of communication skills. Proposed responses require further development. 1–7 points: Work contains significant conceptual errors, poorly justified responses or limited demonstration of the required communication skills. 0 points: No assessable practical work is provided. c) Group project and presentation – 30 points The project addresses a defined communication, teamwork or self-regulation issue in a fictional, published or appropriately anonymised business situation. Each student’s contribution is assessed individually. 24–30 points: The project clearly defines the issue, applies relevant psychological concepts and proposes coherent, feasible and ethically justified actions. The presentation explains the reasoning and expected outcomes. The student demonstrates a substantive individual contribution and responds convincingly to questions. 16–23 points: The project is generally accurate, coherent and feasible, although some actions or arguments require further development. The student explains their contribution and responds appropriately to most questions. 8–15 points: The project meets basic requirements but remains partly descriptive or contains gaps in analysis, planning or justification. The student’s contribution or understanding is insufficiently demonstrated. 1–7 points: The project is substantially incomplete, contains major conceptual errors or proposes actions poorly related to the identified issue. The student provides little explanation of their contribution. 0 points: No assessable individual contribution is demonstrated.

d) Final test – 20 points
The test includes questions on key psychological concepts and short business case-based tasks. Task values and marking criteria are specified in the test instructions.
16–20 points: The student demonstrates accurate understanding of the course concepts and applies them appropriately to business situations. Responses are coherent and well justified.
11–15 points: Responses demonstrate good understanding and generally appropriate application, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
6–10 points: Responses demonstrate basic understanding but contain substantial gaps in explanation, application or justification.
1–5 points: Responses demonstrate fragmentary understanding and substantial conceptual errors.
0 points: No correct or assessable response is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Subject, objectives and methods of psychology. Business psychology and the psychological foundations of management.
Topic 2. Psyche, consciousness and self-awareness. Self-esteem and level of aspiration in business settings.
Topic 3. The concept of personality in psychology. Personality characteristics and behaviour in business.
Topic 4. Individual psychological characteristics and personality differences. Development of soft skills.
Topic 5. Activity, communication and self-development as contexts for personal and professional growth. Planning improvements in business-related skills.
Topic 6. Communication skills and interpersonal interaction. Business communication techniques: active listening, questioning and constructive feedback.
Topic 7. Teamwork. Cooperation and competition. Conformity, social loafing and effective collaboration.
Topic 8. Critical thinking, intelligence and creativity in business problem-solving. Reasoned and ethical decision-making.
Topic 9. Emotions, volition, needs and motivation in business settings. Self-regulation and strategies for improvement.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Kalenychenko, R. A., Kokhanets, A. S., & Nezhynska, O. O. (2023). *Psykholohiia biznesu* [Business Psychology]. Derzhavnyi podatkovyi universytet. 270 p.
2. Miliutina, K. L., & Trofimov, A. Yu. (2020). *Psykholohiia suchasnoho biznesu* [Psychology of Modern Business]. Lira-K. 168 p.
3. Reeve, J. (2024). *Understanding Motivation and Emotion* (8th ed.). Wiley. 464 p.
4. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2023). *Organizational Behavior* (19th ed.). Pearson.
5. Zhyhailo, N. I., Tsymbaliuk, M. M., Kokhan, M. O., Danylevych, N. M., Demchyshak, N. B., Dmyshko, O. S., & Zoshii, I. V. (2023). *Psykholohiia biznesu ta upravlinnia* [Psychology of Business and Management] (2nd ed., revised and expanded; N. I. Zhyhailo, Ed.). Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. 400 p.

Recommended reading

1. Cervone, D., & Pervin, L. A. (2022). *Personality: Theory and Research* (15th ed.). Wiley. 560 p.
2. Ferguson, K. (2023). *Head and Heart: The Art of Modern Leadership*. Viking. 336 p.
3. Gross, J. J., & Ford, B. Q. (Eds.). (2024). *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. 606 p.
4. Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Noise: A Flaw in Human Judgment*. Little, Brown Spark. 464 p.
5. Mitina, S. V. (2020). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality Psychology]. Lira-K. 274 p.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Workplaces*. https://www.apa.org/topics/workplace/
2. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (n.d.). *Organisational Culture*. https://www.cipd.org/en/topics/organisational-culture/

3. Google re:Work. (n.d.). *Understand Team Effectiveness*. https://rework.withgoogle.com/intl/en/guides/understand-team-effectiveness

4. Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. (n.d.). *Negotiation Skills*. https://www.pon.harvard.edu/negotiation-skills-daily/

5. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. (n.d.). *Resources & Publications*. https://www.siop.org/resources-publications/

6. TED. (n.d.). *WorkLife with Adam Grant* [Podcast series]. https://www.ted.com/series/worklife_with_adam_grant

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF A SPECIALIST

The course aims to develop students' communicative competence for ethical and effective interaction in psychological practice. It focuses on understanding communication processes, applying verbal and non-verbal communication skills, responding constructively to barriers and conflict, and adapting communication to diverse audiences and emotionally challenging situations. Students also develop skills in digital communication, the design of communication-focused educational activities, and reflection on their own communicative performance.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3 / 14 weeks	4 / elective	Nataliia Volkova, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	120 hours (20 hours of lectures, 20 hours of practical classes, 80 hours of self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Analyse psychological mechanisms of interpersonal communication and explain how communication barriers influence professional interaction.	Interactive lectures, guided reading, case analysis, analysis of communication videos, seminar discussions.	Individual analytical presentation; written case analyses within practical assignments; final integrated communication task (CAS).
2) Apply active listening, empathic responses, questioning, paraphrasing and constructive feedback in simulated helping interactions.	Demonstration, paired exercises, role-play, simulated professional conversations, guided peer feedback.	Assessed communication exercises and role-play performance within practical assignments; final integrated communication task (CAS).
3) Adapt verbal and non-verbal communication to the needs, cultural backgrounds and communication preferences of different audiences, respecting ethical principles and personal boundaries.	Scenario-based learning, inclusive and intercultural communication exercises, ethical case discussions, role-play.	Scenario analyses and simulated interactions within practical assignments; individual presentation; final integrated communication task (CAS).
4) Select and justify communication strategies for conflict prevention and supportive interaction with a distressed person, applying trauma-informed principles.	Case-based learning, comparison of alternative responses, conflict-resolution role-play, guided simulations of supportive conversations.	Written case analyses and role-play performance within practical assignments; final integrated communication task (CAS).
5) Design a communication-focused psychoeducational or developmental activity with clear objectives, appropriate exercises and an evaluation method.	Project-based learning, activity-design workshops, collaborative planning, peer review.	Activity plan and presentation within the final integrated communication task (CAS).

6) Present psychological information clearly and accurately to specialist and non-specialist audiences using appropriate oral, written and digital formats.	Presentation workshops, plain-language rewriting, preparation of digital materials, simulated online communication, peer feedback.	Individual analytical or psychoeducational presentation; written and digital communication assignments within practical tasks (CAS).
7) Evaluate personal communicative performance using self-reflection and feedback and identify specific steps for improvement.	Guided reflection, communication diaries, self-assessment, structured peer feedback, reflective discussions.	Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks; reflective commentary within the final integrated communication task (CAS).

Assessment

The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the final grade determined by accumulated continuous assessment (CAS) points.
100 points for continuous assessment:
25 points for an individual analytical or psychoeducational presentation;
30 points for practical assignments, including case analyses, communication exercises and simulated interactions;
20 points for a reflective diary and self-analysis tasks;
25 points for a final integrated communication task.
Each assessed task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice.
Assessment criteria:
a) Individual analytical or psychoeducational presentation – 25 points
20–25 points: The presentation accurately explains the selected communication issue, uses relevant academic sources and develops well-grounded conclusions. Information is clearly structured and appropriately adapted to the intended audience. The student responds convincingly to questions.
13–19 points: The presentation demonstrates good understanding, logical organisation and generally appropriate adaptation to the audience, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–12 points: The presentation demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive, with limited use of sources or insufficient adaptation to the audience.
1–5 points: The presentation is fragmented, contains substantial conceptual errors or communicates information unclearly.
0 points: No assessable presentation is provided.
b) Practical assignments – 30 points
24–30 points: The student accurately analyses communication situations and justifies appropriate responses. Simulated interactions demonstrate active listening, empathic responses, clear questioning, constructive feedback and appropriate verbal and non-verbal behaviour. Communication respects diversity, personal boundaries and the needs of the interlocutor.
16–23 points: Analysis and communication are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or inconsistencies in the application or justification of communication strategies.
8–15 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but contains substantial gaps in analysis or practical performance. Communication strategies require further adaptation or guidance.
1–7 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors, poorly justified responses or limited demonstration of the required communication skills.
0 points: No assessable practical work is provided.
c) Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks – 20 points
16–20 points: Reflection connects specific communication examples with relevant psychological concepts and feedback. The student identifies strengths and limitations, considers alternative responses and proposes clear, feasible steps for improvement.
11–15 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies strengths and areas for improvement, although some

conclusions or proposed actions require further development.
6–10 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, with limited use of course concepts, feedback or specific improvement strategies.
1–5 points: Reflection is fragmented, superficial or insufficiently connected to communication performance.
0 points: No assessable reflective work is submitted.
d) Final integrated communication task – 25 points
The task includes a communication-focused activity plan, a brief simulated delivery and reflective commentary.
20–25 points: The task identifies a clear communication need and provides a coherent activity plan with appropriate objectives, exercises and an evaluation method. Simulated delivery demonstrates effective, ethical and inclusive communication. Reflection explains decisions, limitations and possible improvements.
13–19 points: The task is generally coherent and appropriate, although some objectives, exercises, evaluation arrangements or aspects of delivery require further development.
6–12 points: The task meets basic requirements but contains gaps in planning, communication performance or justification. Reflection is limited.
1–5 points: The task is substantially incomplete, poorly adapted to the intended audience or based on inappropriate communication strategies.
0 points: No assessable task is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Communicative competence of a psychologist: structure, functions and ethical foundations.
Topic 2. Psychological mechanisms of communication and interpersonal interaction.
Topic 3. Verbal communication in psychological practice: questioning, paraphrasing and clear explanation.
Topic 4. Non-verbal communication, emotional awareness and self-regulation.
Topic 5. Active listening, empathy and constructive feedback in helping interactions.
Topic 6. Communication barriers, conflict prevention and constructive responses to difficult interactions.
Topic 7. Trauma-informed principles and supportive communication in crisis situations.
Topic 8. Inclusive and intercultural communication in psychological practice.
Topic 9. Digital professional communication and the presentation of psychoeducational information.
Topic 10. Designing communication-focused psychoeducational and developmental activities. Evaluation and reflection on communicative performance.

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. DeVito, J. A. (2022). *The Interpersonal Communication Book* (16th ed.). Pearson.
2. Egan, G., & Reese, R. J. (2019). *The Skilled Helper: A Problem-Management and Opportunity-Development Approach to Helping* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning.
3. Hargie, O. (2022). *Skilled Interpersonal Communication: Research, Theory and Practice* (7th ed.). Routledge.
4. Lazarenko, V. I. (2022). *Psykholohiia spilkuvannia u riznykh sferakh profesiinoi diialnosti* [Psychology of Communication in Different Spheres of Professional Activity] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). 104 p.
5. Zasiekina, L. V., & Pastryk, T. V. (2018). *Osnovy psykholohii ta mizhosobove spilkuvannia* [Fundamentals of Psychology and Interpersonal Communication] (2nd ed.). 216 p.

Recommended reading

1. Bevz, H. M., & Kanibolotska, M. S. (Eds.). (2022). *Psykholohichni resursy vzaiemodii shkoly, simi, hromady* [Psychological Resources for Interaction between School, Family and Community]. Imeks-LTD. 106 p.
2. Dobroskok, S. S. (2023). Psykholohichnyi suprovid rozvytku komunikatyvnoi tolerantnosti maibutnikh psykholohiv [Psychological Support for the Development of Communicative Tolerance in Future Psychologists]. *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho natsionalnoho universytetu. Seriia: Psykholohiia*, 1, 57–61.
3. Elliott, R., Bohart, A. C., Watson, J. C., & Murphy, D. (2018). Therapist empathy and client outcome:

An updated meta-analysis. *Psychotherapy*, *55*(4), 399–410.

4. Gross, J. J., & Ford, B. Q. (Eds.). (2024). *Handbook of Emotion Regulation* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. 606 p.

5. Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9*, 121–146.

6. Nikolaichuk, H., & Demchuk, O. (2023). Psykholohichni zasoby pidvyshchennia komunikatyvnoi kompetentnosti maibutnikh psykholohiv [Psychological Means of Enhancing Future Psychologists' Communicative Competence]. *Nauka i osvita*, 2, 104–109.

7. Rosenberg, M. B. (2015). *Nonviolent Communication: A Language of Life* (3rd ed.). PuddleDancer Press.

8. Siegel, D. J. (2020). *The Developing Mind: How Relationships and the Brain Interact to Shape Who We Are* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press. 674 p.

9. Tenzer, H., & Pudelko, M. (2017). The influence of language differences on power dynamics in multinational teams. *Journal of World Business, 52*(1), 45–61.

10. van Laar, E., van Deursen, A. J. A. M., van Dijk, J. A. G. M., & de Haan, J. (2019). Determinants of 21st-century digital skills: A large-scale survey among working professionals. *Computers in Human Behavior, 100*, 93–104.

11. Volkova, N. P., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak metod interaktyvnoho navchannia u protsesi pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv do sotsialno-psykholohichnoi pidtrymky hromadian v umovakh viiny [Social-Psychological Training as an Interactive Learning Method in Preparing Future Psychologists to Provide Social-Psychological Support to Citizens during Wartime]. *Pedahohichna Akademiia: naukovi zapysky*, 16.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (2023). *Inclusive Language Guide* (2nd ed.). https://www.apa.org/about/apa/equity-diversity-inclusion/language-guidelines

2. Bez barieriv. (n.d.). *Dovidnyk bezbariernosti* [Barrier-Free Communication Handbook]. https://bf.in.ua/

3. National Child Traumatic Stress Network & National Center for PTSD. (2006). *Psychological First Aid: Field Operations Guide* (2nd ed.). https://www.nctsn.org/resources/psychological-first-aid-pfa-field-operations-guide-2nd-edition

4. Prometheus. (n.d.). *Dialoh ta mediatsiia: Shliakh do porozuminnia* [Dialogue and Mediation: A Path to Mutual Understanding] [Online course]. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-free/mediacia-dialog/

5. PsychotherapyNet. (n.d.). *Carl Rogers on Person-Centered Therapy Video* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0neRQzudzw

6. Royal Society of Arts. (2013). *Brené Brown on Empathy* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Evwgu369Jw

7. TED. (2016). *Celeste Headlee: 10 Ways to Have a Better Conversation* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R1vskiVDwl4

8. University of Pennsylvania. (n.d.). *Improving Communication Skills* [Online course]. Coursera. https://www.coursera.org/learn/wharton-communication-skills

INNOVATIVE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND STARTUP PROJECT MANAGEMENT				
The course aims to develop students' ability to identify entrepreneurial opportunities and prepare an evidence-informed startup project proposal. Students apply design thinking, customer research and business modelling to define a value proposition, design a simple prototype and plan the validation of key assumptions. The course also develops basic skills in team and project management, marketing, financial planning, risk assessment and communication with stakeholders. Examples include commercial and socially oriented ventures, including initiatives relevant to psychology, education and community wellbeing.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3/14 weeks	4 / elective	Valeriia Pysarkova, PhD in Economics	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the characteristics and development stages of startups and distinguish startup approaches from conventional business planning.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative case analysis, structured discussions.	Oral questioning; assessed discussion contributions; individual case analyses (CAS).
2) Analyse customer needs, target market segments and competitors using relevant information sources and basic customer research methods.			Interactive lectures, customer research exercises, analysis of market data, case-based learning, group discussions.	Customer and market analysis assignments; individual case analyses; assessed discussion contributions (CAS).
3) Develop a startup business model and justify its value proposition, main components and key assumptions.			Design thinking exercises, business modelling workshops, comparison of alternative models, guided peer feedback.	Business modelling assignment; startup project; project presentation and responses to questions (CAS).
4) Design a simple product or service prototype and propose an appropriate procedure for testing key startup assumptions.			Demonstrations, prototyping exercises, scenario-based learning, workshops on testing startup assumptions.	Practical prototyping and testing-plan assignments; startup project; project presentation and responses to questions (CAS).
5) Apply basic project management and leadership tools to allocate team roles, organise tasks and plan startup development milestones.			Teamwork activities, role-play, project planning exercises, analysis of team management situations.	Project planning assignments; assessed role-play and teamwork performance; individual reflection (CAS).
6) Evaluate the preliminary feasibility of a startup project by considering marketing decisions, basic financial estimates, funding options and legal and ethical requirements.			Interactive lectures, financial planning exercises, comparative analysis of funding options, legal and ethical	Individual case analyses; practical planning assignments; startup project and responses to questions (CAS).

	case discussions, project workshops.	
7) Present and defend a startup project, respond to stakeholder questions and propose improvements based on feedback.	Presentation workshops, pitching simulations, structured peer feedback, guided reflection.	Project presentation and responses to questions; individual reflection (CAS).

Assessment

The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the final grade determined by accumulated continuous assessment (CAS) points.
100 points for continuous assessment:
15 points for oral questioning and contributions to structured discussions;
15 points for individual case analyses;
30 points for practical assignments;
20 points for a startup project;
10 points for a project presentation and responses to questions;
10 points for teamwork performance and individual reflection.
Assessment criteria:
a) Oral questioning and contributions to structured discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student accurately explains startup concepts, makes relevant comparisons and provides well-justified responses. Discussion contributions engage constructively with questions and alternative viewpoints.
10–12 points: Responses and contributions demonstrate sound understanding, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses remain mainly descriptive and arguments require further justification.
1–5 points: Responses are fragmented, contain substantial conceptual errors or provide little relevant justification.
0 points: No assessable responses or discussion contributions are provided.
b) Individual case analyses – 15 points
13–15 points: The student identifies the central problem, accurately applies relevant concepts, compares feasible alternatives and justifies decisions using case evidence.
10–12 points: Analysis and decisions are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or weaknesses in the consideration of alternatives.
6–9 points: The analysis identifies some relevant issues but contains substantial gaps in the application of concepts or justification of decisions.
1–5 points: The analysis is incomplete, contains major conceptual errors or offers unsupported decisions.
0 points: No assessable case analysis is submitted.
c) Practical assignments – 30 points
24–30 points: The student appropriately applies customer research, business modelling, prototyping and planning tools. Outputs are coherent, calculations are accurate, assumptions are explicit and proposed testing procedures are feasible.
16–23 points: Assignments are generally completed correctly, with minor weaknesses in evidence, calculations, consistency or justification.
8–15 points: Assignments meet basic requirements but contain substantial gaps in the application of tools, interpretation of information or planning.
1–7 points: Assignments are substantially incomplete, contain major errors or rely on poorly justified assumptions.
0 points: No assessable practical work is submitted.
d) Startup project – 20 points
16–20 points: The proposal coherently integrates its main components and demonstrates preliminary feasibility. Decisions are supported by relevant evidence or clearly identified assumptions. Marketing

choices, financial estimates, resources, milestones, funding needs, risks and relevant legal and ethical considerations are addressed consistently.
11–15 points: The proposal is generally coherent and feasible, with minor gaps in the integration or justification of some components.
6–10 points: The proposal meets basic requirements but contains substantial inconsistencies or insufficient consideration of feasibility, resources or risks.
1–5 points: The proposal is fragmented, substantially incomplete or based on poorly justified decisions.
0 points: No assessable project or individual contribution to the project is demonstrated.
e) Project presentation and responses to questions – 10 points
9–10 points: The student presents the proposal clearly and persuasively, uses evidence appropriately and provides well-justified responses to stakeholder questions.
7–8 points: The presentation is clear and generally well supported, with minor omissions or weaknesses in responses.
4–6 points: The presentation communicates the main idea but lacks clear structure, sufficient evidence or adequate responses.
1–3 points: The presentation is unclear, substantially incomplete or contains major inconsistencies that the student cannot explain.
0 points: No assessable individual presentation is delivered.
f) Teamwork performance and individual reflection – 10 points
9–10 points: The student fulfils assigned responsibilities, contributes constructively to role-play and collaborative work, and supports team decisions. Reflection uses specific examples and feedback to justify feasible improvements.
7–8 points: The student demonstrates a clear contribution and constructive collaboration. Reflection identifies relevant strengths and areas for improvement, with minor gaps in justification.
4–6 points: The student demonstrates some contribution, but collaboration is inconsistent. Reflection is mainly descriptive and proposed improvements lack sufficient justification.
1–3 points: The student demonstrates a limited contribution or difficulty fulfilling assigned responsibilities. Reflection is superficial or incomplete.
0 points: No assessable teamwork contribution or individual reflection is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Startup as an innovative form of entrepreneurship
Topic 2. Startup team formation: role distribution, team dynamics and leadership
Topic 3. Design thinking: problem identification, idea generation and selection
Topic 4. Business model canvas and startup business model development
Topic 5. Prototyping, Minimum Viable Products and Testing Startup Assumptions
Topic 6. Customer research in startups: identifying needs and behavior of the target audience
Topic 7. Market segmentation and competitive analysis
Topic 8. Startup Business Planning: Resources, Financial Feasibility and Risk Assessment
Topic 9. Startup marketing
Topic 10. Funding Options and Legal and Ethical Aspects of Startup Projects
Topic 11. Startup presentation: pitching

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Aulet, B. (2024). *Disciplined entrepreneurship: 24 steps to a successful startup* (Expanded and updated 2nd ed.). Wiley.

2. Blank, S., & Dorf, B. (2019). *Sviashchenna knyha startapera. Yak zbuduvaty uspishnu kompaniiu* [The startup owner's manual: The step-by-step guide for building a great company]. Nash Format.

3. Hrytsiuk, N. O., Ivashko, O. A., & Sak, T. V. (2022). *Innovatsiine pidpryiemnytstvo ta upravlinnia startap proiektamy* [Innovative entrepreneurship and startup project management]. Vezha-Druk.

4. Neck, H. M., Neck, C. P., & Murray, E. L. (2024). *Entrepreneurship: The practice and mindset* (3rd ed., international student ed.). SAGE Publications.

Recommended reading

1. Bodin, L. (2024). *Atomic scaling: How small teams create huge growth*. Houndstooth Press.
2. Golomb, V. (2020). *Pryskorenyi startap* [Accelerated startup]. Samit-Knyha.
3. Gupta, A., George, G., & Fewer, T. J. (2024). *Venture meets mission: Aligning people, purpose, and profit to innovate and transform society*. Stanford University Press.
4. Havrysh, O. A., Boiarynova, K. O., & Kopishynska, K. O. (2019). *Rozrobka startap-proektiv. Konspekt lektsii* [Startup project development: Lecture notes]. Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute.
5. Havrysh, O. A., Boiarynova, K. O., Kravchenko, M. O., & Kopishynska, K. O. (2020). *Upravlinnia startapamy* [Startup management]. Politekhnika.
6. Pysarkova, V. R. (2025). Formuvannia innovatsiinoho potentsialu startapiv na osnovi informatsiino-analitychnykh platform [Formation of startups' innovation potential based on information and analytical platforms]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, (80).
7. Ries, E. (2011). *The lean startup: How today's entrepreneurs use continuous innovation to create radically successful businesses*. Crown Business.
8. Strelchenko, I. I., Pysarkova, V. R., & Arakelova, I. O. (2025). Sotsialno-oriientovani startapy v Ukraini ta sviti: tendentsii i skladnoshchi realizatsii [Socially oriented startups in Ukraine and the world: Trends and implementation challenges]. *Naukovyi visnyk Odeskoho natsionalnoho ekonomichnoho universytetu*, *6*(331), 17–26.
9. Strelchenko, I. I., Pysarkova, V. R., & Tereshchenko, P. V. (2026). Mekhanizmy stymuliuvannia startap-aktyvnosti cherez rehionalni klastery v systemi innovatsiinoho rozvytku [Mechanisms for stimulating startup activity through regional clusters in the innovation development system]. *Review of Transport Economics and Management*, (14(30)), 34–44.

Web-resources

1. Diia.Business. (n.d.). *Business support and educational resources*. https://business.diia.gov.ua/
2. IDEO.org. (n.d.). *How might we*. Design Kit. https://www.designkit.org/methods/how-might-we.html
3. Prometheus. (n.d.). *Pidpryiemnytstvo* [Entrepreneurship] [Online course collection]. https://prometheus.org.ua/cub/
4. Startup Genome. (n.d.). *Insights and startup ecosystem reports*. https://startupgenome.com/insights
5. Strategyzer. (n.d.). *The Business Model Canvas*. https://www.strategyzer.com/library/the-business-model-canvas
6. Ukrainian Startup Fund. (n.d.). *Startup support programmes and ecosystem resources*. https://usf.com.ua/
7. World Intellectual Property Organization. (n.d.). *Why intellectual property is essential for your business*. https://www.wipo.int/en/web/business
8. Y Combinator. (n.d.). *How to pitch your startup*. YC Startup Library. https://www.ycombinator.com/library/6q-how-to-pitch-your-startup
9. Y Combinator. (n.d.). *How to design a better pitch deck*. YC Startup Library. https://www.ycombinator.com/library/4T-how-to-design-a-better-pitch-deck

CONFLICTOLOGY

The course aims to develop students' understanding of the nature, causes and dynamics of conflicts and their ability to analyse conflict situations and select constructive responses. Students explore conflict behaviour, communication, negotiation, mediation and other approaches to conflict prevention and resolution. The course develops practical skills through cases, exercises and simulated interactions, with attention to ethical principles, cultural differences and the interests of the parties involved. Examples are drawn from everyday life, education, teamwork, organisations and professional contexts relevant to different fields of study.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4	4 /elective	Serhii Dubinskyi, PhD in Economics, Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main concepts, structural elements, types and functions of conflict in interpersonal, group and organisational contexts.	Interactive lectures, guided reading, classification exercises, structured discussions.	Oral questioning; discussion contributions; written tests (CAS).
2) Analyse a conflict situation by identifying its causes, parties, interests, development stage and potential consequences.	Problem-based learning, conflict mapping exercises, case analysis, group discussions.	Written case analyses; conflict mapping assignments; discussion contributions (CAS).
3) Compare conflict-handling styles and justify an appropriate response to a given situation, considering context, power relations and possible consequences.	Comparative case analysis, scenario-based exercises, structured discussions.	Case analyses; practical assignments; written tests (CAS).
4) Apply active listening, assertive communication and basic de-escalation techniques in simulated conflict interactions.	Demonstrations, paired communication exercises, role-play, guided feedback.	Assessed communication exercises; role-play performance (CAS).
5) Use interest-based negotiation techniques to clarify priorities, explore alternatives and formulate a mutually acceptable proposal in a simulated dispute.	Negotiation workshops, role-play, negotiation simulations, structured debriefing.	Negotiation simulation performance; practical assignments; individual reflective assignment (CAS).
6) Distinguish negotiation, mediation and arbitration and justify the suitability and limitations of third-party involvement in a given conflict.	Interactive lectures, comparative case analysis, mediation demonstrations, guided simulations.	Written tests; comparative case analyses; analysis of simulated mediation situations (CAS).
7) Develop and justify a feasible conflict-prevention and management plan for a team or organisation.	Project-based learning, collaborative planning, problem-solving workshops, presentations, peer feedback.	Group project; project presentation and responses to questions (CAS).

8) Evaluate personal conflict behaviour and propose improvements using feedback and principles of ethical, respectful and culturally sensitive interaction.	Ethical case discussions, role-play, guided self-assessment, reflective exercises.	Discussion contributions; role-play performance; individual reflective assignment (CAS).

Assessment

The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the final grade determined by accumulated continuous assessment (CAS) points.
100 points for continuous assessment:
15 points for oral questioning and contributions to discussions;
20 points for written case analyses and analytical assignments;
25 points for practical exercises, role-play and simulations;
20 points for a group project and its presentation;
10 points for written tests;
10 points for an individual reflective assignment.
The group project involves developing a conflict-prevention and management plan for a team or organisation. Project assessment considers both the quality of the proposal and each student's demonstrated contribution and responses to questions.
Written tests are completed during the semester and form part of CAS. Practical assessment is based on performance in educational exercises and simulations.
Each task contributes to one assessment component and is not awarded points twice. Peer feedback supports learning; the teacher determines all marks.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral questioning and contributions to discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student accurately explains relevant concepts, provides well-reasoned responses and contributes constructively to discussions by considering evidence and alternative viewpoints.
10–12 points: Responses and contributions demonstrate sound understanding, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses are mainly descriptive and require further explanation or justification.
1–5 points: Responses are fragmented, contain substantial conceptual errors or show limited understanding of the issues discussed.
0 points: No assessable responses or discussion contributions are provided.
b) Written case analyses and analytical assignments – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately identifies the parties, causes, interests and dynamics of the conflict, considers relevant contextual factors and justifies feasible responses using appropriate concepts and evidence.
11–15 points: Analysis is generally accurate and logically structured, with minor omissions or insufficient consideration of some factors or alternatives.
6–10 points: Work identifies the main conflict issues but contains substantial gaps in analysis, application of concepts or justification of proposed responses.
1–5 points: Work is substantially incomplete, contains major conceptual errors or offers unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical exercises, role-play and simulations – 25 points
20–25 points: The student appropriately applies communication, de-escalation and negotiation techniques, fulfils the assigned role and adapts responses to the situation. Performance respects the interests, boundaries and cultural perspectives of the parties and the principles relevant to mediation simulations.
13–19 points: Performance demonstrates generally appropriate skills and role fulfilment, with minor inconsistencies or a need for occasional guidance.
6–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but has difficulty selecting or applying appropriate techniques and requires substantial guidance.

1–5 points: Performance shows limited application of relevant skills, poor role fulfilment or responses that intensify the conflict.
0 points: No assessable practical performance is demonstrated.
d) Group project and its presentation – 20 points
16–20 points: The plan addresses a clearly defined conflict context and proposes coherent, feasible prevention and management measures. Responsibilities and indicators for reviewing progress are specified. The student clearly explains their contribution and justifies decisions during the presentation.
11–15 points: The plan is generally appropriate and feasible, with minor gaps in justification, implementation arrangements or presentation.
6–10 points: The plan meets basic requirements but contains substantial gaps in analysis, feasibility or the connection between proposed measures and the conflict context. The student demonstrates partial understanding of the proposal.
1–5 points: The plan is fragmented, substantially incomplete or poorly justified. The student demonstrates limited understanding of the proposed measures.
0 points: No assessable project or individual contribution is demonstrated.
e) Written tests — 10 points
9–10 points: Responses demonstrate accurate understanding of the main concepts and appropriate application to short conflict scenarios.
7–8 points: Responses are generally accurate, with minor conceptual or application errors.
4–6 points: Responses demonstrate basic knowledge but contain substantial gaps or errors in application.
1–3 points: Responses demonstrate limited knowledge and substantial misunderstanding of the material.
0 points: No correct responses are provided or no test is completed.
Test scores are calculated from correct responses and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points.
f) Individual reflective assignment – 10 points
9–10 points: Reflection analyses specific examples of personal conflict behaviour, connects them with course concepts and feedback, and proposes feasible improvements that respect ethical principles and cultural differences.
7–8 points: Reflection identifies relevant strengths and areas for improvement, with minor gaps in the use of examples, concepts or feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, with limited analysis and insufficient justification of proposed improvements.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial, fragmented or insufficiently connected to conflict behaviour and course concepts.
0 points: No assessable reflective assignment is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Conflictology: Concepts, Structure and Functions of Conflict
Topic 2. Classification and Levels of Conflict
Topic 3. Causes and Conditions of Conflict
Topic 4. Dynamics of Conflict Development
Topic 5. Conflict Behaviour and Conflict-Handling Styles
Topic 6. Conflict Analysis and Mapping
Topic 7. Constructive Communication and De-escalation
Topic 8. Manipulation and Destructive Communication in Conflict
Topic 9. Conflict Prevention in Groups and Teams
Topic 10. Negotiation as a Method of Conflict Resolution
Topic 11. Mediation, Arbitration and Third-Party Intervention
Topic 12. Conflicts in Organisations and the Workplace
Topic 13. Developing and Evaluating Conflict-Management Strategies

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Johnson, A. J., Cionea, I. A., McCorkle, S., & Reese, M. J. (2024). *Personal conflict management: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

2. Lewicki, R. J., Saunders, D. M., & Barry, B. (2024). *Negotiation* (9th ed.). McGraw Hill.

3. Petrovska, T. V., & Kurdybakha, O. M. (2024). *Konfliktolohiia* [Conflictology]. Pozdnyshev.

4. Rahim, M. A. (2023). *Managing conflict in organizations* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Recommended reading

1. Boothby, E. J., Cooney, G., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2023). Embracing complexity: A review of negotiation research. *Annual Review of Psychology, 74*, 299–332.

2. Coleman, P. T., Deutsch, M., & Marcus, E. C. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of conflict resolution: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

3. Demchenko, N., & Vasylyk, A. (2024). Mediatsiia yak zasib podolannia konfliktiv u studentskoi molodi [Mediation as a means of overcoming conflicts among university students]. *Psychology Travelogs*, (4), 157–167.

4. de Wit, F. R. C., Greer, L. L., & Jehn, K. A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(2), 360–390.

5. Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (3rd ed.). Penguin Books.

6. Mayer, B. (2012). *The dynamics of conflict: A guide to engagement and intervention* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Web-resources

1. Acas. (2022). *What mediation is and how it can help*. https://www.acas.org.uk/mediation

2. Conflict Resolution Network. (n.d.). *CR kit* [Practical conflict-resolution resources]. https://www.crnhq.org/cr-kit/

3. Maiese, M. (2003). *Destructive escalation*. Beyond Intractability. https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/escalation

4. Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. (n.d.). *Conflict resolution* [Article collection]. https://www.pon.harvard.edu/category/daily/conflict-resolution/

5. Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School. (n.d.). *Videos* [Video collection]. https://www.pon.harvard.edu/free-videos/

6. Prometheus. (n.d.). *Dialoh ta mediatsiia: Shliakh do porozuminnia* [Dialogue and mediation: A path to mutual understanding] [Online course]. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-free/mediacia-dialog/

7. Shmueli, D. (2003). *Conflict assessment*. Beyond Intractability. https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/conflict_assessment

SALES PSYCHOLOGY AND CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIPS

The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological factors influencing purchasing decisions and the formation of customer relationships. Students learn to analyse customer needs and expectations, communicate product and service value, respond constructively to objections and complaints, and propose approaches to building trust and maintaining customer relationships. The course combines consumer behaviour concepts with practical communication exercises, case analysis and introductory customer relationship management tools. Ethical persuasion, respect for customer autonomy, cultural sensitivity and responsible use of customer information are addressed throughout. Examples are drawn from retail, services and other professional contexts relevant to different fields of study.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4	4 /elective	Svitlana Yaremenko, PhD in Economics, Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain how motivation, perception, emotions, attitudes and social influences affect purchasing decisions and customer relationships.	Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative examples, structured discussions.	Oral questioning; discussion contributions; written tests (CAS).
2) Analyse customer needs, expectations and decision-making contexts using relevant information and distinguish evidence-based conclusions from unsupported assumptions and stereotypes.	Problem-based learning, customer profile exercises, case analysis, group discussions.	Written case analyses; customer analysis assignments; discussion contributions (CAS).
3) Apply active listening, questioning, paraphrasing and empathic responses to identify customer needs in simulated sales and service interactions.	Demonstrations, paired communication exercises, role-play, guided feedback.	Assessed communication exercises; role-play performance (CAS).
4) Present product or service value and respond to customer objections using clear, accurate and ethically justified communication.	Sales presentation workshops, scenario-based exercises, role-play, simulated sales conversations.	Sales presentation exercises; assessed responses to objections; role-play performance (CAS).
5) Select and apply appropriate responses to customer complaints and difficult interactions in simulated situations, considering fairness, emotional tension and professional boundaries.	Complaint-handling cases, problem-solving exercises, de-escalation demonstrations, service simulations.	Case analyses; complaint-handling exercises; simulation performance (CAS).
6) Interpret basic customer feedback and customer relationship records to identify problems across the customer journey and propose improvements.	Customer journey mapping, analysis of anonymised customer records, introductory CRM	Customer journey mapping assignments; customer feedback

	demonstrations, feedback analysis workshops.	and CRM analysis tasks (CAS).
7) Develop and justify a feasible customer relationship plan that addresses communication, trust, follow-up, retention and evaluation of customer experience.	Project-based learning, collaborative planning, project workshops, presentations, peer feedback.	Group project; project presentation and responses to questions (CAS).
8) Evaluate sales and customer relationship practices using principles of ethical persuasion, inclusion and privacy, and propose improvements to personal communication based on feedback.	Ethical case discussions, analysis of digital sales practices, guided self-assessment, reflective exercises.	Ethical case analyses; discussion contributions; individual reflective assignment (CAS).

Assessment

The course is assessed on a 100-point scale. The course concludes with a Final Test, with the final grade determined by accumulated continuous assessment (CAS) points.
100 points for continuous assessment:
15 points for oral questioning and contributions to discussions;
20 points for written case analyses and analytical assignments;
25 points for practical exercises, role-play and simulations;
20 points for a group project and its presentation;
10 points for written tests;
10 points for an individual reflective assignment.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral questioning and contributions to discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student accurately explains relevant concepts, provides well-reasoned responses and contributes constructively to discussions by considering evidence and alternative viewpoints.
10–12 points: Responses and contributions demonstrate sound understanding, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient development of some arguments.
6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses are mainly descriptive and require further explanation or justification.
1–5 points: Responses are fragmented, contain substantial conceptual errors or show limited understanding of the issues discussed.
0 points: No assessable responses or discussion contributions are provided.
b) Written case analyses and analytical assignments – 20 points
16–20 points: The student accurately analyses customer needs, behaviour and relationship problems, uses relevant evidence and appropriately applies course concepts and analytical tools. Recommendations are feasible and account for ethical considerations.
11–15 points: Analysis and recommendations are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or weaknesses in evidence, interpretation or justification.
6–10 points: Work identifies the main issues but contains substantial gaps in analysis, application of tools or justification of recommendations.
1–5 points: Work is substantially incomplete, contains major conceptual errors or relies on unsupported assumptions about customers.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical exercises, role-play and simulations – 25 points
20–25 points: The student effectively identifies customer needs, communicates value accurately and responds constructively to objections or complaints. Performance demonstrates appropriate listening, questioning, empathy and adaptation to the situation while respecting customer autonomy and professional boundaries.
13–19 points: Performance demonstrates generally appropriate communication and problem-solving skills, with minor inconsistencies or a need for occasional guidance.
6–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but has difficulty adapting communication or selecting appropriate responses and requires substantial guidance.

1–5 points: Performance demonstrates limited application of relevant skills, inaccurate communication or poorly justified responses to customer concerns.
0 points: No assessable practical performance is demonstrated.
d) Group project and its presentation – 20 points
16–20 points: The plan coherently addresses the selected customer group and relationship context. Proposed communication, follow-up and retention measures are feasible, ethically justified and supported by relevant evidence or clearly identified assumptions. Appropriate indicators for reviewing customer experience are specified. The student explains their contribution and justifies decisions convincingly.
11–15 points: The plan is generally coherent and feasible, with minor gaps in justification, evaluation arrangements or presentation. The student adequately explains their contribution.
6–10 points: The plan meets basic requirements but contains substantial inconsistencies or insufficient consideration of customer needs, feasibility or evaluation. The student demonstrates partial understanding of the proposal.
1–5 points: The plan is fragmented, substantially incomplete or poorly justified. The student demonstrates limited understanding of the proposed measures.
0 points: No assessable project or individual contribution is demonstrated.
e) Written tests — 10 points
9–10 points: Responses demonstrate accurate understanding of the main concepts and appropriate application to short sales and customer relationship scenarios.
7–8 points: Responses are generally accurate, with minor conceptual or application errors.
4–6 points: Responses demonstrate basic knowledge but contain substantial gaps or errors in application.
1–3 points: Responses demonstrate limited knowledge and substantial misunderstanding of the material.
0 points: No correct responses are provided or no test is completed.
Test scores are calculated from correct responses and converted proportionally to a maximum of 10 points.
f) Individual reflective assignment – 10 points
9–10 points: Reflection analyses specific examples of personal communication, connects them with course concepts and feedback, and proposes feasible improvements that respect customer needs, autonomy and diversity.
7–8 points: Reflection identifies relevant strengths and areas for improvement, with minor gaps in the use of examples, concepts or feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, with limited analysis and insufficient justification of proposed improvements.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial, fragmented or insufficiently connected to communication performance and course concepts.
0 points: No assessable reflective assignment is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Sales Psychology and Customer Relationships
Topic 2. Customer Motivation, Needs and Expectations
Topic 3. Perception, Emotions, Attitudes and Social Influences in Purchasing Decisions
Topic 4. Customer Decision-Making, Perceived Value and Perceived Risk
Topic 5. Customer Analysis, Segmentation and Profiles
Topic 6. Trust, Rapport and Communication in Sales and Service
Topic 7. Active Listening, Questioning and Needs Discovery
Topic 8. Value Presentation, Ethical Persuasion and Responses to Objections
Topic 9. Customer Complaints, Difficult Interactions and Service Recovery
Topic 10. Customer Experience, Satisfaction, Loyalty and Retention
Topic 11. Customer Journey Mapping, Feedback and CRM Fundamentals

Topic 12. Digital Customer Relationships, Privacy and Manipulative Sales Practices
Topic 13. Developing and Evaluating Customer Relationship Plans

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Castleberry, S. B., & Tanner, J. F., Jr. (2025). *Selling: Building partnerships* (2025 release). McGraw Hill.

2. Ivanenko, L. M., Smerichevska, S. V., & Smerichevskyi, S. F. (2024). *Povedinka spozhyvachiv* [Consumer behaviour]. Universytetska Knyha.

3. Prior, D. D., Buttle, F., & Maklan, S. (2024). *Customer relationship management: Concepts, applications and technologies* (5th ed.). Routledge.

4. Solomon, M. R., & Russell, C. A. (2024). *Consumer behavior: Buying, having, and being* (14th ed.). Pearson.

Recommended reading

1. Becker, L., & Jaakkola, E. (2020). Customer experience: Fundamental premises and implications for research. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *48*, 630–648.

2. Fagan, P. (2024). Clicks and tricks: The dark art of online persuasion. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 58*, Article 101844.

3. Itani, O. S., Goad, E. A., & Jaramillo, F. (2019). Building customer relationships while achieving sales performance results: Is listening the holy grail of sales? *Journal of Business Research, 102*, 120–130.

4. Raiko, D. V. (2023). *Praktykum z dystsypliny "Povedinka spozhyvachiv"* [Practical exercises for the course "Consumer behaviour"]. Trytoriia.

5. Yaremenko, S. S., Taranenko, I. V., Shevchenko, V. M., & Kuzmenko, M. O. (2023). Influens-marketynh yak efektyvnyi instrument zaluchennia spozhyvachiv [Influencer marketing as an effective tool for attracting consumers]. *European Vector of Economic Development*, 2(35), 125–142.

Web-resources

1. Diia.Osvita. (n.d.). *Menedzher iz prodazhiv* [Sales manager] [Educational video series]. https://osvita.diia.gov.ua/courses/sales-manager

2. Diia.Osvita. (n.d.). *Spetsialist kliientskoi pidtrymky* [Customer support specialist] [Educational video series]. https://osvita.diia.gov.ua/courses/customer-support-specialist

3. Federal Trade Commission. (2022). *Bringing dark patterns to light* [Staff report]. https://www.ftc.gov/reports/bringing-dark-patterns-light

4. Gibbons, S. (2018). *Journey mapping 101*. Nielsen Norman Group. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/journey-mapping-101/

5. HubSpot Academy. (n.d.). *Inbound sales certification course* [Online course]. https://academy.hubspot.com/courses/inbound-sales

6. IDEO.org. (n.d.). *Journey map*. Design Kit. https://www.designkit.org/methods/journey-map.html

7. Salesforce. (n.d.). *Get started with Salesforce CRM* [Online learning unit]. Trailhead. https://trailhead.salesforce.com/content/learn/modules/lex_implementation_basics/lex_implementation_basics_welcome

EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of employee motivation and their ability to apply motivational theories and evidence-informed approaches in different organisational settings. Students learn to analyse motivational needs and workplace conditions, compare financial and non-financial rewards, practise supportive communication, and develop feasible recommendations that balance employee well-being, fairness and organisational objectives.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5 / 14 weeks	4 / elective	Hanna Mytrofanova Doctor of Science (Economics), Full Professor	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1. Explain and compare major theories of work motivation, distinguishing motivation from job satisfaction and employee engagement.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis of theories, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2. Analyse individual and organisational factors that support or undermine employee motivation in workplace situations.			Problem-based learning, case study analysis, group discussions	Case analysis and proposed solutions; discussion contributions (CAS)
3. Interpret basic employee feedback and survey summaries to identify motivational needs, recognising the limitations of the available information.			Demonstration of data interpretation, guided analysis of employee feedback and survey summaries	Data interpretation assignments (CAS)
4. Compare financial and non-financial rewards and justify their suitability for different employees, teams and organisational contexts.			Interactive lectures, comparative case analysis, practical reward-selection exercises	Case analysis; practical assignments (CAS)
5. Apply goal-setting, constructive feedback and recognition techniques in simulated workplace conversations.			Demonstration, communication exercises, role-playing, guided reflection	Practical assignments; role-play performance; reflective assignments (CAS)
6. Propose approaches to supporting team motivation in face-to-face, remote and hybrid work settings.			Collaborative case analysis, scenario-based problem-solving, group discussions	Group case analysis and recommendations; discussion contributions (CAS)
7. Develop and present a feasible employee motivation improvement plan, specifying actions, responsibilities and indicators for reviewing progress.			Project-based learning, team project workshops, presentations and peer feedback	Motivation improvement project; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)

8. Evaluate motivational practices in terms of fairness, inclusion, employee autonomy and well-being, and justify ethical alternatives.	Ethical case analysis, structured discussions, guided reflection	Ethical case analysis; discussion contributions; reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
15 points for contributions to discussions;
20 points for case analysis and analytical assignments;
25 points for practical assignments and role-play performance;
20 points for the motivation improvement project and its presentation;
10 points for tests; and 10 points for reflective assignments.
Assessment criteria
a) Contributions to discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, presents well-reasoned arguments and responds constructively to other viewpoints.
10–12 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and contributes relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies.
6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but contributions have limited justification.
–5 points: Contributions show substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning.

0 points: No assessable contribution.
b) Case analysis and analytical assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately compares theories, analyses motivational factors, interprets available information and proposes justified solutions, recognising ethical issues and limitations.
13–16 points: The analysis and proposed solutions are generally appropriate, with minor errors or omissions.
8–12 points: The analysis identifies some relevant factors, but interpretation and recommendations are insufficiently justified.
1–7 points: The analysis contains substantial errors, and proposed solutions are weakly connected to the situation.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical assignments and role-play performance – 25 points
22–25 points: The student applies appropriate motivational and communication techniques, adapts them to the situation and justifies decisions while demonstrating respect and fairness.
17–21 points: The student applies suitable techniques and communicates clearly, with minor weaknesses.
10–16 points: The student demonstrates basic practical skills, but application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation.
1–9 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in applying techniques or explaining decisions.
0 points: No assessable work or performance.
d) Motivation improvement project and presentation – 20 points
17–20 points: The project addresses identified motivational needs through justified and feasible actions, specifies responsibilities and suitable review indicators, and is clearly presented and defended.
13–16 points: The project is coherent and generally feasible, with minor gaps in justification, review indicators or presentation.
8–12 points: The project addresses some relevant needs, but proposed actions, responsibilities or review indicators require further development.
1–7 points: The project is incomplete, poorly justified or insufficiently connected to the identified needs.

0 points: No project is submitted.
e) Tests – 10 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of motivational theories. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically evaluates decisions and communication, uses course concepts and feedback, and identifies specific improvements.
7–8 points: The student provides relevant reflection and reasonable suggestions for improvement, with some limitations in depth.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes the experience, with limited analysis or connection to course concepts.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly related to the task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Theoretical foundations of the motivational process
Topic 2. Early theories of motivation. Modern theories of motivation.
Topic 3. Motivation in the work of the leader
Topic 4. Methods of influencing the motivation of subordinates
Topic 5. Motivating role of the remuneration system. Organization of personnel bonuses.
Topic 6. Methods of intangible motivational work
Topic 7. Personnel evaluation and its motivating role
Topic 8. Factors reducing motivation
Topic 9. Motivation of teams

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Armstrong, M., & Brown, D. (2023). *Armstrong's handbook of reward management practice: Improving performance through reward* (7th ed.). Kogan Page.

2. Hutsan, O. M. (Comp.). (2024). *Motyvuvannia personalu* [Employee motivation]. National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute".

3. van den Broeck, A., van Coillie, H., Forest, J., & Muller, M. B. (2024). *The ABC of work motivation: How to energize any organization*. Amsterdam University Press.

Recommended reading

1. Armstrong, M. (2007). *Handbook of Employee Reward Management and Practice* (2nd ed.). Kogan Page Ltd. 548 p.

2. Fuehrer, V. (1994). Total reward strategy: A prescription for organizational survival. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 26(1), 44–53.

3. Gagné, M. (Ed.). (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Work Engagement, Motivation, and Self-Determination Theory*. Oxford University Press. 465 p.

4. Gomez-Mejia, L. R., & Balkin, D. B. (1992). *Compensation, Organizational Strategy, and Firm Performance*. South-Western Publishing.

5. Griffin, R. W. (2013). *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations* (11th ed.). Cengage Learning. 624 p.

6. Hamel, M. C. (2008). Compensation guide. In *A Manual on Compensation Practice and Theory*.

7. Heneman, R. (2007). *Implementing Total Rewards Strategies*. SHRM Foundation.

8. Herzberg, F. (2017). *Motivation to Work*. Routledge.

9. Hlukhyy, A. O., Yevtushenko, O. A., & Mytrofanova, H. Ya. (2026). Svitovi tendentsii u formuvanni personalu orhanizatsii [Global trends in personnel formation of organizations]. *Akademichnyi ohliad* [Academic Review], 2.

10. Kolot, A. M. (2002). Motyvatsiia personalu [Personnel motivation]. KNEU.

11. Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row.

12. McPheat, S. (2013). *Personal Confidence & Motivation*. Bookboon. 56 p.

13. Mytrofanova, H., & Yevtushenko, O. (2023). Strukturni skladovi profesiynoyi motyvatsiyi maybutnikh menedzheriv u konteksti formuvannya suchasnoho kerivnyka-lidera [Structural components of professional

motivation of future managers in the context of the formation of a modern manager-leader]. *Yevropeys'kyy vektor ekonomichnoho rozvytku* [European vector of economic development], 1(34), 45–56.

14. Mytrofanova, H., Yevtushenko, O., & Hlukhyy, A. (2023). Rol' motyvatsiy dosyahnennya uspikhu u protsesi profesijnoho stanovlennya potentsijnykh kerivnykiv-lideriv [The role of achievement success motivation in the process of professional formation of potential manager-leaders]. *Yevropeys'kyy vektor ekonomichnoho rozvytku* [European vector of economic development], 2(35), 84–100.

15. Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J. M. (2010). *Compensation* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

16. Nikolaou, I., & Oostrom, J. (Eds.). (2023). Employee Recruitment and Selection: A Contemporary Perspectives [Electronic edition]. *Routledge*. 342 p.

17. Porter, L. W., Bigley, G., & Steers, R. M. (2002). *Motivation and Work Behavior* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

18. Prokhorovska, S., Ostroverkhov, V., & Zaporozhan, L. (2018). Vynahoroda za pratsiu v motyvatsii personalu v sferi publichnoho upravlinnia [Remuneration in personnel motivation in public administration]. *Rehionalni aspekty rozvytku produktyvnykh syl Ukrainy*, 22, 92–97.

19. Rogers, S., & Marcotte, S. (2010). *Communicating Total Rewards: How-To Series for the HR Professional*. WorldatWork Press.

20. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Web-resources

1. *Kadrovyk UA* (n.d.). Professional journal website. https://www.kadrovik.ua/

2. *Kadrova praktyka* (n.d.). Professional journal website. https://journals.ua/prof/kadrova-praktyka

POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY AND ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological processes underlying political behaviour, cultural diversity and intergroup relations. Students learn to analyse political attitudes, ethnic and civic identities, leadership, collective action and intercultural encounters; critically evaluate relevant research and public information; and apply principles of respectful communication, human rights and responsible civic participation.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5/14 weeks	4 / elective	Liubov Boiko, Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and compare key concepts and approaches in political psychology and ethnopsychology, distinguishing evidence-based explanations from stereotypes.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Analyse how cultural contexts, socialisation and collective experiences contribute to ethnic, national, civic and political identities.			Interactive lectures, comparative case analysis, group discussions	Case analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse the roles of values, emotions, social identities and cognitive biases in political attitudes, leadership and participation.			Interactive lectures, problem-based learning, analysis of political behaviour and leadership cases	Case analysis and proposed explanations; tests (CAS)
4) Interpret published research findings and public opinion summaries, recognising methodological limitations and avoiding unsupported generalisations about groups.			Guided analysis of research articles and survey summaries, data interpretation exercises	Research analysis and data interpretation assignments (CAS)
5) Evaluate political and intercultural messages for stereotyping, emotional framing and misleading claims, using source verification and evidence.			Media analysis workshops, source verification exercises, structured discussions	Media analysis assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
6) Apply respectful communication and perspective-taking skills in simulated intercultural encounters and intergroup disagreements.			Demonstration, role-playing, scenario-based exercises, guided reflection	Role-play performance; practical assignments; reflective assignments (CAS)
7) Develop and present evidence-informed recommendations for constructive intergroup interaction or responsible civic communication in a selected case.			Project-based learning, collaborative workshops, presentations and peer feedback	Case-based project; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
8) Evaluate ethical issues in the analysis of political and ethnic differences and reflect on personal assumptions using principles of human rights and non-discrimination.			Ethical case analysis, structured discussions, reflective exercises	Ethical case analysis; discussion contributions; reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
15 points for contributions to discussions;
25 points for case analysis and analytical assignments, including comparison of theoretical approaches, interpretation of research and survey findings, and evaluation of media messages;
20 points for practical assignments and role-play performance;
20 points for the case-based project and its presentation;
10 points for tests;
10 points for reflective assignments.
Assessment criteria
a) Contributions to discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, supports arguments with evidence, considers alternative interpretations and communicates respectfully.
10–12 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and presents relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies or limited consideration of alternatives.
6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but arguments have limited justification or connection to evidence.
1–5 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors or unsupported generalisations.
0 points: No assessable contribution.
b) Case analysis and analytical assignments – 25 points
22–25 points: The student applies appropriate concepts, evaluates sources, interprets findings accurately and develops justified conclusions while recognising methodological limitations and the risk of stereotyping.
17–21 points: Analysis is relevant and generally accurate, with minor omissions in interpretation, source evaluation or justification.
10–16 points: Analysis identifies some relevant issues but relies on limited evidence or provides insufficiently justified conclusions.
1–9 points: Analysis contains substantial errors, weak source evaluation or unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical assignments and role-play performance – 20 points
17–20 points: The student applies respectful communication and perspective-taking effectively, recognises different viewpoints and responds constructively to the situation.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates appropriate practical skills, with minor difficulties in adapting communication or considering alternative perspectives.
8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but their application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation.
1–7 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in applying relevant skills or justifying responses.
0 points: No assessable work or performance.
d) Case-based project and presentation – 20 points
17–20 points: The project provides a coherent analysis supported by credible sources, proposes feasible and ethically justified recommendations, and is clearly presented and defended.
13–16 points: The project is relevant and generally well-supported, with minor gaps in analysis, recommendations or presentation.
8–12 points: The project addresses the selected case, but evidence, justification or feasibility requires further development.
1–7 points: The project is incomplete, poorly supported or weakly connected to the selected case.
0 points: No project is submitted.
e) Tests – 10 points

Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of course concepts. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically examines personal assumptions and responses, connects reflection to course concepts and identifies specific ways to improve interpretation or communication.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in depth or conceptual support.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes experiences or opinions, with limited analysis.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Political Psychology and Ethnopsychology: Concepts, Research Approaches and Ethics
Topic 2. Culture, Values and Behaviour: Diversity Within and Between Groups
Topic 3. Ethnic, National and Civic Identities
Topic 4. Stereotypes, Prejudice, Ethnocentrism and Discrimination
Topic 5. Intercultural Communication, Migration and Cultural Adaptation
Topic 6. Interethnic Relations, Conflict and Constructive Intergroup Contact
Topic 7. Political Consciousness, Attitudes and Political Culture
Topic 8. Political Socialisation, Civic Identity and Democratic Participation
Topic 9. Values, Emotions and Cognitive Biases in Political Judgement
Topic 10. Political Leadership, Authority and Followership
Topic 11. Political Communication, Propaganda and Misinformation
Topic 12. Group Processes, Collective Action and Crowd Behaviour
Topic 13. Collective Memory, Identity and Social Cohesion in Contemporary Ukraine

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Heine, S. J. (2026). *Cultural psychology* (5th international student ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.
2. Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., Levy, J. S., & Jerit, J. (Eds.). (2023). *The Oxford handbook of political psychology* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
3. Ostapenko, I., Zhadan, I., Sknar, O., & Pozniak, S. (2024). *Suchasna ukrainska molod: rehionalni osoblyvosti identyfikatsii* [Contemporary Ukrainian youth: Regional characteristics of identification] (I. Ostapenko, Ed.). Imeks-LTD.
4. Sviderska, O. I., & Chornii, O. V. (2023). *Politychna psykholohiia* [Political psychology]. Lviv Polytechnic Publishing House.

Recommended reading

1. Biletska, T. V., & Kupchyshyna, V. Ch. (2022). *Politychna psykholohiia* [Political psychology]. Publishing House of the National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi.
2. Kupchyshyna, V. Ch. (2021). *Etnopsykholohiia* [Ethnopsychology]. Publishing House of the National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi.
3. Paluck, E. L., Porat, R., Clark, C. S., & Green, D. P. (2021). Prejudice reduction: Progress and challenges. *Annual Review of Psychology, 72*, 533–560.
4. Pavlenko, V. M. (2019). *Etnopsykholohiia* [Ethnopsychology]. V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University.
5. Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2021). The psychology of fake news. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 25*(5), 388–402.
6. Petrovska, I. (2024). Hromadianska identychnist ukraintsiv: vikovi, statevi, politychni vymiry [Civic identity of Ukrainians: Age, gender, political dimensions]. *Insait: psykholohichni vymiry suspilstva [Insight: The Psychological Dimensions of Society], 11*, 38–56.

Web-resources

1. Council of Europe. (n.d.). *Autobiography of intercultural encounters: Reflection tools and self-study resources*. https://www.coe.int/en/web/autobiography-intercultural-encounters/

2. Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Electronic library*. https://ispp.org.ua/elektronna-biblioteka/

3. Institute of Social and Political Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Public opinion surveys*. https://ispp.org.ua/opituvannya-gromadskoii-dumki/

4. Project Implicit. (n.d.). *Educational resources on implicit associations*. https://implicit.harvard.edu/implicit/education.html

5. Prometheus. (n.d.). *Mediahramotnist: praktychni navychky* [Media literacy: Practical skills] [Online course]. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-free/mediagramotnist-praktichni-navichki/

6. Razumkov Centre. (n.d.). *Sociological research*. https://razumkov.org.ua/napriamky/sotsiologichni-doslidzhennia

THE ART OF PUBLIC SPEAKING AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH				
The course aims to develop students' ability to prepare and deliver clear, well-structured and ethical speeches and presentations in English and to communicate effectively in academic, professional and social settings. Students practise audience analysis, evidence-based argumentation, active listening, constructive interaction and the use of appropriate language, vocal delivery and visual aids. The course also develops their ability to collaborate across cultural differences and improve communication through practice, feedback and reflection.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
English	6/ 11 weeks	4 / Elective	Svitlana Medynska, PhD in Professional Education, Associate Professor	120 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain key concepts of communication theory, including verbal and non-verbal communication, communication models, and barriers to effective communication			Lectures, seminars, discussions, brainstorming, work in pairs/ mini-groups, Internet search	Oral answers to questions, test tasks, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills, final test (CAS)
2) Analyse various communicative contexts and adapt their communication style accordingly			Lectures, seminars, discussions, Internet search, role plays	Oral answers to questions, test tasks, participation in group work, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking skills, final test (CAS)
3) Apply the principles of persuasive and informative speaking, including various organizational models and rhetorical devices, and be aware of the role and influence of non-verbal communication in public speaking and interpersonal interaction			Lectures, practical classes, completion of independent study tasks, work in pairs/ mini-groups, Internet search, project method, role plays, presentation	Oral answers to questions, participation in group work, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking skills, evaluation of projects and presentations,final test (CAS)
4) Deliver speeches and presentations in English clearly, concisely, and engagingly, effectively structuring and organizing thoughts and ideas for public speaking			Lectures, practical classes, Internet search, presentation	Assessment of practical skills, peer assessment, evaluation of presentations (CAS)
5) Use appropriate language and style for different audiences and communicative contexts, applying effective vocal delivery techniques, including appropriate volume, pace, pitch, and articulation			Lectures, practical classes, Internet search, completion of independent study tasks, role plays, presentation	Assessment of practical skills, oral answers to questions, participation in group work, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking skills, evaluation of presentations (CAS)
6) Practise active listening skills and respond thoughtfully to the communication of others, participate effectively in group discussions, and communicate respectfully			Lectures, practical classes, Internet search, completion of independent study	Assessment of practical skills, participation in group work, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking

in various cultural contexts, building persuasive arguments and supporting claims with evidence	tasks, role plays, presentation	skills, peer assessment, evaluation of presentations (CAS)
7) Apply the language tools necessary for conducting business negotiations, presenting the results of a completed project, interviews, etc.	Lectures, practical classes, group discussion, project method, role plays/ business games, presentation	Participation in discussions, business games, review of written assignments, oral questioning, assessment of interaction/pair/group work skills and speaking skills, project evaluation, presentations (CAS)
8) Work actively in a team and reach an understanding with both specialists and non-specialists in the same professional field	Lectures, practical classes, brainstorming, group discussion, role plays	Participation in discussions, role plays, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking skills (CAS)
9) Demonstrate appropriate behaviour in a multicultural environment, taking into account the national characteristics of representatives of different cultures	Lectures, practical classes, brainstorming, group discussion, project method, presentation	Participation in discussions, role plays, assessment of interaction/ pair/ group work skills and speaking skills, project evaluation, presentations (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is given on a 100-point scale as a result of 100% continuous assessment:
40 points for individual assignments (presentations and speeches);
10 points for discussions;
20 points for role plays/ business games;
10 points for project-based activities;
20 points for the final test (FAS)
Assessment criteria:
a) presentation / speech
17–20 points: The student demonstrates fluency in oral speech, full adherence to the presentation structure and use of linguistic potential, the relevance of the topic is justified, the topic is fully disclosed, the results obtained are systematized and classified, and the conclusions are persuasive. There are practically no errors in the student's speech, or there are insignificant errors that do not hinder the delivery of information to the listeners in full.
13–16 points: The student demonstrated good command of oral speech, adherence to the presentation structure, sufficient use of the linguistic potential of the presentation, and the relevance of the topic is justified, the topic is fully disclosed, the results obtained are systematized and classified, but the conclusions are not fully persuasive. There are errors in the student's speech that do not hinder the delivery of information to the listeners in full.
9–12 points: The student demonstrates satisfactory command of oral speech, incomplete adherence to the presentation structure, insufficient use of the linguistic potential of the presentation, and the relevance of the topic is not sufficiently justified, the topic is partially disclosed, the results obtained are not fully systematized and classified, and the conclusions are not fully persuasive. There are errors in the student's speech that partially hinder the delivery of information to the listeners in full.
1–8 points: The structure of the presentation is not followed. The topic is not disclosed. A less than mediocre level of oral speech skills is demonstrated. There are many errors in the student's speech that hinder the delivery of information to the listeners in full.
b) participation in discussions/ role plays/ business games
For participating in the discussion, the student will receive points from the total number specified in the course map for this type of assessment:

81–100%: The student participates actively, presents ideas freely and independently with strong reasoning using a wide range of vocabulary and complex grammar, and fully performs role-specific tasks following all procedural recommendations.
61–80%: The student takes a fairly active part, provides logical arguments but may lack depth or spontaneous speech preparation, and uses a sufficient range of vocabulary. Minor errors are present but do not hinder the delivery of information. Role tasks are performed in full.
41–60%: Participation is superficial and lacks solid argumentation. The student demonstrates a narrow vocabulary, makes significant grammatical errors, and relies on reproducing provided info rather than proposing ideas. Tasks are only partially performed.
1–40 %: Participation is limited to isolated phrases or remarks. The student demonstrates minimal vocabulary and frequent grammatical errors that hinder understanding or does not perform the required role effectively.
c) participation in project-based activities
9–10 points: The student demonstrates a high level of analytical thinking and full adherence to the project structure. The relevance of the topic is convincingly justified using appropriate evidence. The subject is fully disclosed through a deep and systematic analysis; the results obtained are clearly classified and logically organized. The conclusions are persuasive, original, and directly supported by the analysis. There are practically no errors, or there are only insignificant inaccuracies that do not affect the clarity of the analysis.
7–8 points: The student demonstrates a good command of analytical tools and adheres to the project structure. The relevance of the topic is justified, and the subject is fully disclosed. The results are systematized and classified, showing a clear understanding of the material. However, the conclusions may lack depth or are not fully persuasive. There are some errors in the language, but they do not hinder the reader's understanding of the analytical findings.
5–6 points: The student demonstrates a satisfactory level of analysis but only incomplete adherence to the project structure. The relevance of the topic is not sufficiently justified, and the subject is only partially disclosed. The results obtained are not fully systematized or classified, leading to a fragmented presentation of ideas. Conclusions are weak, superficial, or not fully supported by the data. There are linguistic errors that partially hinder the delivery of the analytical information.
1–4 points: The structure of the analytical project is not followed or is highly disorganized. The topic is not disclosed, and the work remains purely descriptive without any actual analysis. A less than mediocre level of critical thinking is demonstrated. There are many errors in the use of English that significantly hinder the understanding of the work.
d) test papers
The criteria for the test assignment are written on the test card.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations of Effective Communication and Public Speaking
Topic 2. Structuring a Speech/Presentation. Visual Aids and Multimedia
Topic 3. Delivery Techniques, Voice Modulation and Non-Verbal Communication
Topic 4. Language and Style
Topic 5. Persuasive Speaking
Topic 6. Informative Speaking
Topic 7. Effective Communication in Professional and Social Settings
Topic 8. Intercultural Communication and Global Public Speaking

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. A. (2024). *A Concise Public Speaking Handbook* (6th ed.). Pearson. 304 p.
2. Ford Brown, L. A. (2012). *Guide to Public Speaking*. Pearson Education, Inc. 576 p.
3. Hamilton, C. (2015). *Essentials of Public Speaking* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning. 398 p.

Recommended reading

1. Chivers, B., & Shoolbred, M. (2007). *A Student's Guide to Presentations*. SAGE Publications. 177 p.
2. Cialdini, R. (2006). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. HarperCollins e-books. 279 p.

3. Grussendorf, M. (2008). *English for Presentations*. Oxford University Press. 80 p.
4. Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). *Communication: The Process, Barriers, and Improving Effectiveness*. Sam Houston State University.
5. Meyer, E. (2016). *The Culture Map.* Public Affairs. 288 p.
6. Moss, J. (2009). *Successful Negotiations*. Business English Pod Ltd. 108 p.
7. O'Loghlin, J. (2006). *Umm… A Complete Guide to Public Speaking*. Allen & Unwin. 184 p.
8. Reynolds, G. (2012). *Presentation Zen: Simple Ideas on Presentation Design and Delivery* (2n ed.). New Riders. 314 p.
9. Semerenko, L., & Medynska, S. (2010). *Effective Business Communication*. Dnipropetrovsk University of Economics and Law. 152 p.
10. Tomalin, B. (2013). *Key Business Skills (presentations, meetings, negotiations and networking)*. Collins. 144 p.
11. Williams, E. (2008). *Presentations in English*. Macmillan, 2008. 131 p.

Web-resources

1. American Rhetoric. (n.d.). *Official website*.www.americanrhetoric.com
2. Country Comparison Tool. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.theculturefactor.com/country-comparison-tool
3. Meaning of gestures in different countries. (2017). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JCwyRn40fvk
4. Reading minds through body language. (2018). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W3P3rT0j2gQ&t=134s
5. The 110 techniques of communication and public speaking. (2019). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K0pxo-dS9Hc
6. Robert Cialdini Explains the Seven Principles of Influence. (2022). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1_urunjhCsw&t=88s
7. Robert Cialdini – Science of Persuasion. (2018). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kv0sOX6Alrk
8. TED: Ideas worth spreading. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.ted.com/

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CAREER MANAGEMENT THROUGH MENTORING AND COACHING				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of professional self-development and career management and their ability to use basic coaching and mentoring approaches in career planning. Students learn to analyse career development models, personal values, strengths and contextual opportunities; practise goal-setting, active listening and constructive feedback; and develop feasible career development plans. The course emphasises ethical boundaries, inclusion and the critical evaluation of coaching and mentoring practices.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6	4 /elective	Serhii Dubinskyi, PhD (Economics), Associate Professor	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain key concepts of professional self-development and career management and distinguish coaching, mentoring, advice-giving and psychological counselling.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Compare career development models and career pathways and explain their relevance to different professional and socio-cultural contexts.			Interactive lectures, comparative case analysis, group discussions	Case analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse career-related needs, values, strengths, opportunities and barriers using structured reflection and relevant career information.			Guided self-assessment, career information analysis, practical workshops	Career analysis assignments (CAS)
4) Apply basic coaching and mentoring skills, including active listening, questioning, goal clarification and constructive feedback, in simulated career conversations.			Demonstration, communication exercises, coaching and mentoring role-playing, feedback and reflection	Practical assignments; role-play performance; reflective assignments (CAS)
5) Develop and justify a feasible career development plan specifying goals, actions, resources, support and milestones for reviewing progress.			Goal-setting workshops, project-based learning, peer review, presentations	Career development project; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
6) Evaluate the contribution and limitations of coaching and mentoring in selected career situations and identify improvements using evidence and feedback.			Analysis of research summaries and practice cases, structured discussions, guided reflection	Analytical assignments; discussion contributions; reflective assignments (CAS)
7) Apply principles of confidentiality, informed agreement, professional boundaries and non-discrimination when responding to ethical issues in coaching and mentoring scenarios.			Guided analysis of professional codes, ethical case analysis, role-playing	Ethical case analysis; role-play performance (CAS)

Assessment
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 15 points for contributions to discussions; 20 points for case analysis and analytical assignments, including comparison of career models, analysis of career information and evaluation of ethical issues; 25 points for practical assignments and coaching and mentoring role-play performance; 20 points for the career development project and its presentation; 10 points for tests; 10 points for reflective assignments. Assessment criteria a) Contributions to discussions – 15 points 13–15 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, presents well-reasoned arguments, considers alternative perspectives and responds constructively to others. 10–12 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and contributes relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies or omissions. 6–9 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but contributions have limited justification or connection to course concepts. 1–5 points: Contributions contain substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning. 0 points: No assessable contribution. b) Case analysis and analytical assignments – 20 points 17–20 points: The student applies appropriate career development concepts, evaluates relevant information and proposes justified conclusions, recognising contextual factors, ethical issues and limitations. 13–16 points: The analysis is relevant and generally accurate, with minor omissions in interpretation or justification. 8–12 points: The analysis identifies some relevant factors, but conclusions are only partly supported by information or theory. 1–7 points: The analysis contains substantial errors or recommendations that are poorly connected to the case. 0 points: No assessable work is submitted. c) Practical assignments and role-play performance – 25 points 22–25 points: The student selects an appropriate coaching or mentoring approach, listens attentively, uses relevant questions or feedback, clarifies goals and respects agreed boundaries. 17–21 points: The student generally applies appropriate skills and maintains constructive interaction, with minor weaknesses. 10–16 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but their application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation. 1–9 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in listening, questioning, feedback or maintaining the appropriate role and boundaries. 0 points: No assessable work or performance. d) Career development project and presentation – 20 points 17–20 points: The plan connects career goals to a clear analysis of needs and context, proposes feasible actions and support, specifies review milestones, and is convincingly presented and justified. 13–16 points: The plan is coherent and generally feasible, with minor gaps in justification, resources, milestones or presentation. 8–12 points: The plan identifies relevant goals, but actions, support or review arrangements require further development. 1–7 points: The plan is incomplete, weakly justified or insufficiently connected to the career analysis. 0 points: No project is submitted. e) Tests – 10 points

Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of career development, coaching and mentoring principles. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically examines decisions and communication, integrates course concepts and feedback, and identifies specific improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in depth or conceptual support.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes experiences, with limited analysis or use of feedback.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Self-Development and Personal Growth
Topic 2. Theoretical Foundations of Career Management
Topic 3. Career Types and Development Stages
Topic 4. Personal Values, Strengths and Contextual Factors in Career Development
Topic 5. Gender, Inclusion and Equal Opportunities in Career Development
Topic 6. Coaching and Mentoring: Roles, Professional Standards and Ethical Boundaries
Topic 7. Mentoring Relationships, Developmental Networks and Career Support
Topic 8. Structure of a Coaching Conversation: Agreement, Goals and the GROW Model
Topic 9. Coaching and Mentoring Approaches to Career Decisions and Challenges
Topic 10. Business Coaching: Tools and Applications
Topic 11. Career Development Planning: Goals, Actions and Resources
Topic 12. Reviewing Progress and Evaluating Coaching and Mentoring Outcomes

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Clutterbuck, D. (2023). *Coaching and mentoring: A journey through the models, theories, frameworks and narratives of David Clutterbuck*. Routledge.

2. Sudakov, M. (2026). *Karierne konsultuvannia: zadacha, vplyv ta protses* [Career counselling: Task, influence and process]. Scientific and Educational Innovation Center for Social Transformations.

3. Whitmore, J., & Gaskell, T. (2024). *Coaching for performance* (6th ed.). John Murray Business.

Recommended reading

1. Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Bowers, C. A., Carlson, C. E., Doherty, S. L., Evans, J., & Hall, J. (2023). Workplace coaching: A meta-analysis and recommendations for advancing the science of coaching. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1204166.

2. Dubinskyi, S. V. (2022). Osoblyvosti kouchynhovoho styliu upravlinnia u biznes-strukturakh [Features of the coaching management style in business organisations]. In *Formuvannia mekhanizmiv upravlinnia yakistiu ta pidvyshchennia konkurentospromozhnosti pidpryiemstv* [Developing quality management mechanisms and improving enterprise competitiveness] (Conference proceedings, pp. 89–93). Alfred Nobel University.

3. Dubinskyi, S. V. (2023). Etychni standarty vprovadzhennia kouchynhu v osvitnii protses [Ethical standards for integrating coaching into the educational process]. In *Teoriia i praktyka profesiinoho stanovlennia fakhivtsia v innovatsiinomu sotsiokulturnomu prostori* [Theory and practice of professional development in an innovative sociocultural environment] (Conference proceedings, pp. 116–119). Alfred Nobel University.

4. Greenhaus, J. H., Callanan, G. A., & Godshalk, V. M. (2019). *Career management for life* (5th ed.). Routledge.

5. Nikolaiev, L. (2024). Tekhnolohii kouchynhu yak instrument pidvyshchennia efektyvnosti diialnosti fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh profesii [Coaching technologies as a tool for improving the effectiveness of professionals in socionomic occupations]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu oborony Ukrainy [Bulletin of the National Defence University of Ukraine], 81*(5), 126–134.

Web-resources

1. International Coaching Federation. (2025). *ICF core competencies*. https://coachingfederation.org/credentialing/coaching-competencies/icf-core-competencies/

2. International Coaching Federation. (2025). *ICF code of ethics*. https://coachingfederation.org/credentialing/coaching-ethics/icf-code-of-ethics/

3. Global Code of Ethics. (2025). *Global code of ethics for coaches, mentors and supervisors* (Version 4). https://globalcodeofethics.org/

4. EMCC Global. (n.d.). *Ethics Centre for Excellence*. https://emccglobal.org/home/leadership-development/ethics/

5. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring. (n.d.). *Research articles and reviews*. https://journals.sagepub.com/home/ecm

6. Macquarie University. (n.d.). *Career planning: Your career, your life* [Online course]. Coursera. https://www.coursera.org/learn/career-development-planning

BASICS OF COACHING TECHNOLOGIES IN THE PRACTICE OF A SPECIALIST				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of coaching principles and their ability to use basic coaching tools in simulated professional interactions. Students learn to distinguish coaching from related helping approaches, structure coaching conversations, clarify goals, practise active listening and questioning, and select techniques appropriate to educational, organisational and personal-development contexts. The course emphasises ethical boundaries, cultural sensitivity, client autonomy and the critical evaluation of coaching practices and outcomes.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7	4 /elective	Serhii Dubinskyi, PhD (Economics), Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and compare the foundations, principles and major models of coaching, distinguishing coaching from counselling, mentoring and psychotherapy.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Apply relevant professional standards and ethical principles to coaching scenarios, including agreement, confidentiality, role boundaries and recognition of situations requiring referral.			Guided analysis of professional standards, ethical case analysis, role-playing	Ethical case analysis; role-play performance (CAS)
3) Plan and conduct a structured simulated coaching conversation using the GROW model and appropriate goal-setting techniques, including SMART.			Demonstration, session-planning workshops, guided rehearsal, coaching simulations	Coaching session plan; simulation performance (CAS)
4) Demonstrate active listening, purposeful questioning, summarising and constructive feedback in simulated coaching interactions.			Communication exercises, role-playing, observation and feedback	Practical assignments; role-play performance (CAS)
5) Select and justify coaching tools appropriate to the goals and circumstances of educational, organisational and personal-development cases.			Comparative case analysis, problem-based learning, practical workshops, mini-project development and presentation	Case analysis; coaching application mini-project and presentation (CAS)
6) Evaluate coaching processes and outcomes using relevant evidence, agreed indicators and feedback, and identify priorities for improving their own skills.			Analysis of research summaries and coaching examples, peer review, guided reflection	Analytical assignments; reflective assignments (CAS)

7) Adapt coaching communication to individual and cultural differences while respecting autonomy, inclusion and the participant's right to make decisions.	Intercultural scenario analysis, structured discussions, role-playing and reflection	Scenario analysis; discussion contributions; role-play performance (CAS)

Assessment
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 10 points for contributions to discussions; 20 points for case analysis and analytical assignments, including comparison of coaching approaches, ethical analysis and evaluation of research findings; 30 points for practical assignments, role-playing and coaching simulations; 20 points for the coaching application mini-project, including a session plan and its presentation; 10 points for tests; 10 points for reflective assignments. Assessment criteria a) Contributions to discussions – 10 points 9–10 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, supports arguments with evidence, considers alternative perspectives and responds constructively to others. 7–8 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and presents relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies or omissions. 4–6 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but arguments have limited justification or connection to course concepts. 1–3 points: Contributions contain substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning. 0 points: No assessable contribution. b) Case analysis and analytical assignments – 20 points 17–20 points: The student accurately analyses the situation, applies appropriate concepts and standards, justifies the choice of tools and recognises ethical issues and limitations of the available evidence. 13–16 points: Analysis and proposed approaches are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or inaccuracies. 8–12 points: The student identifies some relevant issues, but interpretation and proposed approaches are only partly justified. 1–7 points: Analysis contains substantial errors or recommendations are poorly connected to the case. 0 points: No assessable work is submitted. c) Practical assignments, role-playing and coaching simulations – 30 points 26–30 points: The student establishes a clear agreement, maintains a coherent conversation, listens attentively, uses purposeful questions and feedback, supports participant autonomy and agrees appropriate next steps. 20–25 points: The student demonstrates effective basic coaching skills and a generally coherent process, with minor difficulties in questioning, pacing or summarising. 12–19 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but their application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation. 1–11 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in structuring the conversation, listening, questioning or respecting role boundaries. 0 points: No assessable work or performance. d) Coaching application mini-project and presentation – 20 points 17–20 points: The project clearly defines the context and goals, justifies appropriate tools, provides a coherent session plan, addresses ethical considerations and specifies suitable indicators for reviewing progress. The presentation and responses to questions are clear and well-reasoned.

13–16 points: The project is coherent and generally feasible, with minor gaps in justification, session planning, review indicators or presentation.
8–12 points: The project addresses the selected situation, but the choice of tools, session structure or evaluation approach requires further development.
1–7 points: The project is incomplete, weakly justified or insufficiently connected to the stated goals.
0 points: No project is submitted.
e) Tests – 10 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of coaching principles and ethical standards. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically evaluates their performance using course concepts, observation and feedback, identifies specific development needs and proposes feasible improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in depth or use of feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes activities, with limited analysis or identification of development needs.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. The Nature and Principles of Coaching
Topic 2. Professional Coaching Standards, Ethics and Role Boundaries
Topic 3. Coaching Approaches and Models
Topic 4. Establishing Agreements and Defining Goals: SMART Goal-Setting
Topic 5. Structure of a Coaching Conversation: The GROW Model
Topic 6. Active Listening, Presence and Summarising
Topic 7. Questioning, Constructive Feedback and Facilitating Awareness
Topic 8. Solution-Focused Tools and Action Planning
Topic 9. Coaching in Educational and Professional Learning Contexts
Topic 10. Business Coaching: Tools and Applications
Topic 11. Life Coaching and Personal Development: Applications and Boundaries
Topic 12. Individual Differences, Cultural Sensitivity and Inclusive Coaching
Topic 13. Evaluating Coaching Outcomes, Feedback and Reflective Practice

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Cox, E., Bachkirova, T., & Clutterbuck, D. (Eds.). (2023). *The complete handbook of coaching* (4th ed.). SAGE.

2. Nikolaiev, L. (2024). Tekhnolohii kouchynhu yak instrument pidvyshchennia efektyvnosti diialnosti fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnykh profesii [Coaching technologies as a tool for improving the effectiveness of professionals in socionomic occupations]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu oborony Ukrainy [Bulletin of the National Defence University of Ukraine], 81*(5), 126–134.

3. Starr, J. (2021). *The coaching manual* (5th ed.). Pearson.

4. Whitmore, J., & Gaskell, T. (2024). *Coaching for performance* (6th ed.). John Murray Business.

Recommended reading

1. Berg, I. K., & Szabó, P. (2005). *Brief coaching for lasting solutions*. W. W. Norton & Company.

2. Cannon-Bowers, J. A., Bowers, C. A., Carlson, C. E., Doherty, S. L., Evans, J., & Hall, J. (2023). Workplace coaching: A meta-analysis and recommendations for advancing the science of coaching. *Frontiers in Psychology, 14*, Article 1204166.

3. Dubinskyi, S. V. (2022). Osoblyvosti kouchynhovoho styliu upravlinnia u biznes-strukturakh [Features of the coaching management style in business organisations]. In *Formuvannia mekhanizmiv upravlinnia yakistiu ta pidvyshchennia konkurentospromozhnosti pidpryiemstv* [Developing quality management mechanisms and improving enterprise competitiveness] (Conference proceedings, pp. 89–93). Alfred Nobel University.

4. Dubinskyi, S. V. (2023). Etychni standarty vprovadzhennia kouchynhu v osvitnii protses [Ethical standards for integrating coaching into the educational process]. In *Teoriia i praktyka profesiinoho stanovlennia*

fakhivtsia v innovatsiinomu sotsiokulturnomu prostori [Theory and practice of professional development in an innovative sociocultural environment] (Conference proceedings, pp. 116–119). Alfred Nobel University.

5. Kluger, A. N., & Itzchakov, G. (2022). The power of listening at work. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 9*, 121–146.

6. Nezhynska, O. O., & Tymenko, V. M. (2017). *Osnovy kouchynhu* [Fundamentals of coaching]. Disa Plus.

Web-resources

1. International Coaching Federation. (2025). *ICF core competencies*. https://coachingfederation.org/credentialing/coaching-competencies/icf-core-competencies/

2. International Coaching Federation. (2025). *ICF code of ethics*. https://coachingfederation.org/credentialing/coaching-ethics/icf-code-of-ethics/

3. Global Code of Ethics. (2025). *Global code of ethics for coaches, mentors and supervisors* (Version 4). https://globalcodeofethics.org/

4. International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring. (n.d.). *Research articles and reviews*. https://journals.sagepub.com/home/ecm

EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of employee development and its contribution to individual growth and organisational effectiveness. Students learn to analyse learning needs and competence gaps, select appropriate training and workplace learning methods, develop feasible employee development plans, and evaluate learning outcomes and their application at work. The course also addresses career and leadership development, constructive feedback, inclusion and employee well-being during organisational change.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7 / 14 weeks	4 / elective	Viktoriia Orlova Ph.D, Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the role of employee development within human resource management and its relationship with organisational objectives and lifelong learning.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, structured discussions	Tests; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Analyse learning needs and competence gaps using information about job requirements, employee performance and development goals.			Demonstration, case study analysis, guided interpretation of employee development information	Needs analysis and competence-gap assignments (CAS)
3) Compare training and development methods, including workplace, external and digital learning, and justify their suitability for different needs and contexts.			Comparative case analysis, digital learning resource evaluation, problem-solving exercises	Comparative assignments; case analysis (CAS)
4) Develop and present a feasible employee development plan specifying learning objectives, activities, resources, responsibilities and evaluation indicators.			Project-based learning, planning workshops, peer review, presentations	Employee development project; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
5) Apply constructive feedback, basic coaching and collaborative learning techniques in simulated employee development situations.			Demonstration, communication exercises, role-playing, collaborative problem-solving	Practical assignments; role-play performance (CAS)
6) Analyse career and leadership development needs and propose fair, evidence-informed approaches to talent development.			Interactive lectures, career and leadership case analysis, structured discussions	Case analysis and recommendations; discussion contributions (CAS)
7) Propose appropriate measures to support employee adaptation, manageable learning demands and well-being during organisational change.			Problem-based learning, adaptation and well-being case analysis, group discussions	Case analysis and proposed solutions; discussion contributions (CAS)
8) Evaluate employee development activities using learning, transfer and performance indicators, and identify improvements while			Guided analysis of evaluation data and research summaries, project review,	Evaluation assignments; project evaluation section;

recognising evidence limitations and ethical considerations.	reflective exercises	reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
30 points for the individual employee development project and its presentation;
20 points for case analysis and analytical assignments;
20 points for practical assignments and role-play performance;
10 points for contributions to discussions;
10 points for tests;
10 points for reflective assignments.
Assessment criteria
a) Individual employee development project and presentation – 30 points
The project is assessed for analysis of development needs (6 points); justification of learning objectives and methods (8 points); feasibility of activities, resources and responsibilities (6 points); evaluation indicators and consideration of ethical issues (6 points); and presentation and responses to questions (4 points).
26–30 points: The project provides a coherent, evidence-informed analysis and a feasible development plan. Objectives, methods and evaluation indicators are aligned, and decisions are convincingly justified.
20–25 points: The project is relevant and generally well-developed, with minor gaps in analysis, feasibility, evaluation or presentation.
12–19 points: The project identifies relevant needs, but objectives, activities or evaluation arrangements are insufficiently justified or only partly aligned.
1–11 points: The project is incomplete, poorly justified or weakly connected to the identified development needs.
0 points: No project is submitted.
b) Case analysis and analytical assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately interprets relevant information, identifies development needs, compares suitable approaches and provides justified recommendations while recognising limitations and ethical issues.
13–16 points: Analysis and recommendations are generally appropriate, with minor errors or omissions.
8–12 points: The student identifies some relevant issues, but interpretation or recommendations lack sufficient justification.
1–7 points: Analysis contains substantial errors or proposed solutions are poorly connected to the case.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical assignments and role-play performance – 20 points
17–20 points: The student applies appropriate feedback, coaching or collaborative learning techniques, communicates respectfully and adapts effectively to the situation.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates appropriate practical skills, with minor weaknesses in application or communication.
8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but their application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation.
1–7 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in applying relevant techniques or explaining decisions.
0 points: No assessable work or performance.
d) Contributions to discussions – 10 points
9–10 points: The student contributes relevant, well-reasoned ideas, uses course concepts and responds constructively to alternative perspectives.
7–8 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and presents relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies.
4–6 points: Contributions demonstrate basic understanding but limited analysis or justification.

1–3 points: Contributions contain substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning.
0 points: No assessable contribution.
e) Tests – 10 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of employee development principles. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.
f) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically evaluates learning activities and personal contributions, uses course concepts and feedback, and identifies specific improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in depth or conceptual support.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes activities, with limited analysis or use of feedback.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Employee Development and Principles of Adult Learning
Topic 2. Employee Development in the Human Resource Management System
Topic 3. Strategic Employee Development and Organisational Objectives
Topic 4. Analysis of Employee Learning and Development Needs
Topic 5. Competence Gaps, Assessment Information and Ethical Data Use
Topic 6. Development Planning: Objectives, Activities and Resources
Topic 7. Corporate and External Training
Topic 8. Online Learning, Digital Platforms and Accessible Learning Design
Topic 9. Workplace Learning, Coaching, Mentoring and Constructive Feedback
Topic 10. Career Development and Talent Management
Topic 11. Development of Leadership and Management Skills
Topic 12. Evaluating Learning, Transfer and Employee Development Outcomes
Topic 13. Employee Adaptation, Well-Being and Development During Organisational Change

Literature

Compulsory reading

Affleck, M. (Ed.). (2021). *People learning and development*. Kwantlen Polytechnic University.

Noe, R. A. (2023). *Employee training and development* (9th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Sochynska-Sybirtseva, I. M., Storozhuk, O. V., & Dorenska, A. O. (2023). *Novitni tekhnolohii upravlinnia personalom* [Contemporary technologies of human resource management]. Central Ukrainian National Technical University.

Recommended reading

Ford, J. K., Baldwin, T. T., & Prasad, J. (2018). Transfer of training: The known and the unknown. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5*, 201–225.

Losieva, E. S., & Dashko, I. M. (2024). Suchasni tendentsii rozvytku upravlinnia personalom [Current trends in human resource management development]. *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo [Economy and Society]*, (68).**

Novikova, M. M., & Shved, A. B. (2022). *HR-menedzhment* [HR management] [Lecture notes]. O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv.

Semykina, M. V., Dudko, S. V., Orlova, A. A., Nisfoian, S. S., Storozhuk, O. V., & Koval, L. A. (2021). *Profesiinyi rozvytok personalu pidpryiemstv v systemi motyvatsiinoho menedzhmentu* [Professional development of enterprise personnel within motivational management]. KOD.

Shkrobot, M. V., & Veduta, L. L. (2020). *HR-menedzhment. Konspekt lektsii* [HR management: Lecture notes]. Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute.

Web-resources

1. Affleck, M. (Ed.). (2021). *People learning and development* [Open-access textbook]. Kwantlen Polytechnic University. https://kpu.pressbooks.pub/peoplelearningdevelopment/

2. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (n.d.). *Learning needs analysis*. https://www.cipd.org/en/knowledge/factsheets/learning-needs-factsheet/

3. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. (n.d.). *Learning evaluation, impact and transfer*. https://www.cipd.org/en/knowledge/factsheets/evaluating-learning-factsheet/

4. Prometheus. (n.d.). *Kariera HR: roli, kompetentsii ta vyklyky* [HR career: Roles, competencies and challenges] [Online course]. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-plus/hr-career/

5. Sochynska-Sybirtseva, I. M., Storozhuk, O. V., & Dorenska, A. O. (2023). *Novitni tekhnolohii upravlinnia personalom* [Contemporary technologies of human resource management] [Open-access study guide]. https://dspace.kntu.kr.ua/handle/123456789/13256

6. University of Minnesota. (n.d.). *Managing employee performance* [Online course]. Coursera. https://www.coursera.org/learn/employee-performance

7. World Health Organization. (n.d.). *Mental health in the workplace*. https://www.who.int/teams/mental-health-and-substance-use/promotion-prevention/mental-health-in-the-workplace/

MINDFULNESS TRAINING				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of mindfulness and its potential contribution to attention regulation, awareness of stress responses and everyday self-care. Students learn to practise basic mindfulness exercises, distinguish mindfulness from relaxation and clinical treatment, evaluate relevant evidence, and communicate respectfully in experiential learning activities. The course also develops reflective skills and the ability to prepare simple mindfulness-related psychoeducational materials, taking account of individual differences, informed choice and the limits of introductory training.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2	4 / elective	Iryna Oliinyk, PhD., Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain basic concepts of mindfulness, stress and emotional self-regulation, distinguishing mindfulness from relaxation and clinical treatment.			Mini-lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Explain the steps of basic mindfulness practices and justify appropriate options for adapting, pausing or ending an exercise.			Demonstration, guided attention exercises, mindful movement, structured observation and discussion	Practical or observation-based assignments; explanation of practice instructions; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse introductory research summaries and practical cases to identify potential benefits, limitations and individual differences in responses to mindfulness practices.			Guided analysis of research summaries, case analysis, problem-based learning	Research and case analysis assignments; tests (CAS)
4) Select and justify basic mindfulness and self-care activities for everyday situations, recognising when additional professional support may be needed.			Scenario-based exercises, practical workshops, group discussions	Practical assignments; case analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
5) Apply attentive listening, respectful communication and non-judgemental feedback in group learning and simulated interpersonal situations.			Communication exercises, role-playing, collaborative activities and peer feedback	Communication task performance; discussion contributions (CAS)
6) Reflect on learning and practice using course concepts, identify personal learning needs and recognise the boundaries of their competence.			Structured reflective writing, guided self-evaluation, feedback discussions	Reflective learning journal; reflective assignments (CAS)
7) Develop and present a brief mindfulness-related psychoeducational activity with clear aims, instructions, participation options and appropriate supporting sources.			Project-based learning, activity-design workshops, rehearsal, presentations and peer review	Psychoeducational project; activity demonstration and responses to questions (CAS)

Assessment
The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 25 points for practical and communication tasks and contributions to discussions; 20 points for the reflective learning journal and reflective assignments; 20 points for the psychoeducational project, its presentation and activity demonstration; 15 points for comparative, research and case analysis assignments; 20 points for tests assessing theoretical understanding and its application to practical situations. Assessment criteria a) Practical and communication tasks and contributions to discussions – 25 points 22–25 points: The student accurately follows or analyses practice instructions, explains appropriate participation options, applies attentive listening and respectful communication, and provides well-reasoned discussion contributions. 17–21 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and appropriate practical or observational performance, with minor inaccuracies in explanation or communication. 10–16 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but application, observation or explanation is incomplete or inconsistent. 1–9 points: The student demonstrates substantial misunderstandings or provides limited relevant evidence of learning. 0 points: No assessable task or contribution is completed. b) Reflective learning journal and reflective assignments – 20 points 17–20 points: Reflection clearly connects learning observations to course concepts, distinguishes observation from interpretation, considers feedback and identifies specific learning needs or improvements. 13–16 points: Reflection is relevant and generally analytical, with minor limitations in conceptual support or proposed improvements. 8–12 points: Reflection mainly describes activities, with limited analysis or connection to course concepts. 1–7 points: Reflection is fragmented, superficial or poorly related to the learning task. 0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted. c) Psychoeducational project, presentation and activity demonstration – 20 points 17–20 points: The project has clear aims, accurate and accessible instructions, credible supporting sources and appropriate participation options. Its scope is suitable for introductory psychoeducation, and the student clearly explains its limitations and intended use. 13–16 points: The project is relevant and generally well-developed, with minor gaps in instructions, justification, adaptation or presentation. 8–12 points: The project demonstrates basic understanding, but its aims, instructions or supporting evidence require further development. 1–7 points: The project is incomplete, poorly justified or contains substantial conceptual or instructional inaccuracies. 0 points: No project is submitted. d) Comparative, research and case analysis assignments – 15 points 13–15 points: The student accurately interprets the information, distinguishes evidence from unsupported claims, identifies relevant limitations and proposes justified responses to the case. 10–12 points: The analysis is generally accurate and relevant, with minor omissions in interpretation or justification. 6–9 points: The analysis identifies some relevant issues but provides limited evidence or insufficiently justified conclusions. 1–5 points: The analysis contains substantial errors or unsupported recommendations. 0 points: No assessable analysis is submitted. e) Tests – 20 points

Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy, interpretation of evidence and appropriate recognition of the scope and limitations of mindfulness practices. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

Content

Topic 1. Mental Well-Being, Stress and Resilience: Basic Concepts
Topic 2. Self-Regulation, Self-Care and Sources of Support
Topic 3. Mindfulness: Definitions, Principles and Common Misconceptions
Topic 4. Attention, Automatic Reactions and Mindful Awareness
Topic 5. Mindfulness of Breathing and External Sensory Anchors
Topic 6. Body Awareness and Mindful Movement
Topic 7. Awareness of Thoughts and Emotions
Topic 8. Mindfulness and Everyday Stress: Applications and Limitations
Topic 9. Mindfulness-Based Programmes: An Introduction to MBSR and MBCT
Topic 10. Self-Compassion and Non-Judgemental Attitudes
Topic 11. Mindful Listening and Interpersonal Communication
Topic 12. Informal Practice and Mindfulness in Everyday Activities
Topic 13. Evidence, Participation Options and the Design of Brief Psychoeducational Activities

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Galante, J., Friedrich, C., Collaboration of Mindfulness Trials (CoMinT), Dalgleish, T., Jones, P. B., & 2. White, I. R. (2023). Systematic review and individual participant data meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials assessing mindfulness-based programs for mental health promotion. *Nature Mental Health, 1*, 462–476.

3. Sokolov, M. (2024). *Praktyka usvidomlenosti* [Mindfulness practice]. Vivat.

4. Williams, M., & Penman, D. (2021). *Usvidomlenist. Yak znaity harmoniiu v nashomu shalenomu sviti* [Mindfulness] (M. Kovalenko, Trans.). Monolit.

Recommended reading

1. Goleman, D., & Davidson, R. J. (2019). *Nove "Ia". Vplyv medytatsii na svidomist, tilo y mozok* [Altered traits: The effects of meditation on the mind, body and brain]. Nash Format.

2. Neff, K., & Germer, C. (2018). *The mindful self-compassion workbook: A proven way to accept yourself, build inner strength, and thrive*. Guilford Press.

3. Sweeny, K., & Howell, J. L. (2017). Bracing later and coping better: Benefits of mindfulness during a stressful waiting period. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*(10), 1399–1414.

4. Williams, M., & Penman, D. (2023). *Deeper mindfulness*. Piatkus.

Web-resources

1. Fizis. (n.d.). *Audio-medytatsii* [Guided audio meditations]. https://fizis.net/audio-files/

2. Fizis. (2020). *Kyshenkovi praktyky maindfulnesu* [Brief mindfulness practices]. https://fizis.net/psyhologichna-gramotnist/kyshenkovi-praktyky-maindfulnesu/

3. Ministry of Health of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Zhyty "tut i zaraz" abo shcho take maindfulnes* [Living "here and now": What mindfulness means]. https://moz.gov.ua/uk/zhiti-tut-i-zaraz-abo-scho-take-majndfulnes

4. National Center for Complementary and Integrative Health. (n.d.). *Meditation and mindfulness: Effectiveness and safety*. https://www.nccih.nih.gov/health/meditation-and-mindfulness-effectiveness-and-safety

5. Self-Compassion Institute. (n.d.). *Self-compassion practices*. https://self-compassion.org/self-compassion-practices/

6. UCLA Mindful. (n.d.). *Free guided meditations*. UCLA Health. https://www.uclahealth.org/uclamindful/free-guided-meditations

CURRENT TRENDS IN PERSONALITY RESEARCH IN INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to introduce students to contemporary international personality research and its contribution to understanding individual differences, identity, self-regulation and adaptation. Students learn to compare theoretical approaches, interpret selected research findings, consider cultural and situational influences, and critically examine claims about personality in everyday and digital contexts. The course develops introductory scientific reading, evidence-based discussion and academic communication skills, with attention to research ethics, cultural diversity and the limitations of generalising findings to individuals.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	2/14 weeks	4 / elective	Ivan Batrachenko, Doctor of Sciences, Associate Professor	120 hours (26 hours of lectures, 14 hours of practical classes, 80 hours of self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1. Explain and compare major contemporary approaches to personality, including trait-based, social-cognitive and dynamic perspectives.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis of theories, structured discussions	Comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2. Locate relevant scientific sources and identify research questions, methods, findings and limitations in selected personality studies.			Guided literature searches, demonstration of article appraisal, structured research-reading workshops	Source evaluation tasks; structured article review (CAS)
3. Compare findings from different cultural contexts and identify limitations in claims about universal or culture-specific personality characteristics.			Comparative analysis of cross-cultural studies, case analysis, group discussions	Cross-cultural comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
4. Explain how selected personality approaches relate to identity, self-regulation, coping and adaptation, using relevant research examples.			Interactive lectures, guided analysis of research examples, scenario-based exercises	Analytical assignments; scenario analysis (CAS)
5. Apply personality concepts to the interpretation of everyday, educational and digital situations, distinguishing evidence-based explanations from speculation and causal overstatement.			Case-based learning, analysis of digital behaviour studies, problem-solving exercises	Case analysis and justified interpretations (CAS)
6. Present a structured review of a selected personality research topic and provide constructive feedback using agreed criteria.			Review-writing workshops, presentations, academic discussions and peer review	Written review; presentation and responses to questions; peer-review task (CAS)

7. Apply principles of research ethics, academic integrity and cultural sensitivity when evaluating studies and communicating conclusions about personality.	Ethical case analysis, source attribution exercises, guided reflection and discussions	Ethical analysis assignments; accurate source use in the review; reflective commentary (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
30 points for contributions to academic discussions and constructive peer review;
40 points for comparative, case-based and methodological assignments;
30 points for the individual research review, comprising the written review (15 points), presentation and responses to questions (10 points), and reflective commentary (5 points).
Assessment criteria
a) Contributions to academic discussions and peer review – 30 points
26–30 points: The student contributes accurate, well-reasoned interpretations, uses relevant evidence, considers alternative explanations and provides specific, respectful feedback using agreed criteria.
20–25 points: Contributions demonstrate sound understanding and appropriate reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or limited analytical depth. Peer feedback is relevant and generally constructive.
12–19 points: Contributions demonstrate basic understanding but limited justification, engagement with evidence or consideration of alternative perspectives. Peer feedback is mainly general.
1–11 points: Contributions contain substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning, and peer feedback provides limited useful guidance.
0 points: No assessable contribution is provided.
b) Comparative, case-based and methodological assignments – 40 points
34–40 points: The student accurately compares approaches or findings, identifies relevant methodological and cultural limitations, applies concepts appropriately and provides justified conclusions without unsupported generalisations.
26–33 points: The analysis is generally accurate and well-supported, with minor omissions in comparison, interpretation or recognition of limitations.
16–25 points: The analysis identifies relevant concepts but remains partly descriptive, with limited evidence or insufficiently justified conclusions.
1–15 points: The analysis is fragmented, contains substantial conceptual errors or makes unsupported claims about individuals or groups.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Individual research review, presentation and reflective commentary – 30 points
The written review is assessed for relevance and credibility of sources (4 points), accurate explanation and comparison of findings (7 points), and structure and source attribution (4 points). The presentation is assessed for clarity and organisation (5 points) and responses to questions (5 points). The reflective commentary is assessed for recognition of limitations, use of feedback and identification of learning needs (5 points).
26–30 points: The review addresses a focused question, accurately integrates credible sources and distinguishes findings from interpretation. The presentation is clear, responses are well-reasoned, and reflection identifies specific limitations and improvements.
20–25 points: The review and presentation demonstrate sound understanding, with minor gaps in comparison, justification, source use or reflection.
12–19 points: The review summarises relevant material but provides limited comparison or critical interpretation. Presentation and reflection require further development.
1–11 points: The work is incomplete, poorly organised or contains substantial inaccuracies and unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Personality Research in Contemporary International Psychology
Topic 2. Classical Foundations and Contemporary Theoretical Perspectives
Topic 3. Trait Theories of Personality: Big Five, HEXACO and Emerging Models
Topic 4. Cross-Cultural Personality Research: Universality, Diversity and Sampling Limitations
Topic 5. Personality and Identity in the Context of Globalisation
Topic 6. Personality, Resilience and Coping: Research Findings and Limitations
Topic 7. Self-Regulation, Motivation and Self-Determination
Topic 8. Personality Stability and Change During Major Life Events and Crises
Topic 9. Digital Behaviour and Personality: Research Opportunities and Interpretation Limits
Topic 10. Contemporary Research Methods: Questionnaires, Longitudinal Studies and Repeated Assessments
Topic 11. Research Ethics, Cultural Sensitivity and Responsible Interpretation
Topic 12. Personality Dynamics, Personalised Research and Future Directions

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2024). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature* (8th ed.). McGraw Hill.

2. Modersitzki, N., Phan, L. V., McDonald, S., Wright, A. G. C., & Renner, K.-H. (2026). Personality psychology is getting personal: Advancing the field through personalization. *European Journal of Personality, 40*(2), 435–455.

3. Sulima, Ye. M. (Ed.). (2021). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality psychology]. University of the State Fiscal Service of Ukraine.

Recommended reading

1. DeYoung, C. G. (2015). Cybernetic Big Five Theory. *Journal of Research in Personality, 56*, 33–58.

2. Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*(2–3), 61–83.

3. Jukić, J., Vukojević, I., & Snajder, J. (2022). You are what you talk about: Inducing evaluative topics for personality analysis. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022* (pp. 3986–3999). Association for Computational Linguistics.

4. Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (2010). Cultures and selves. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(4), 420–430.

5. Rauthmann, J. F. (Ed.). (2021). *The handbook of personality dynamics and processes*. Academic Press.

6. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. Guilford Press.

Web-resources

1. Berkeley Personality Lab. (n.d.). *Big Five Inventory–2: Description and research materials*. https://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~johnlab/bfi

2. DeYoung Personality Lab. (n.d.). *Publications*. University of Minnesota. https://deyoung.psych.umn.edu/publications

3. Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (n.d.). *Personality traits* [Learning module]. Noba. https://nobaproject.com/modules/personality-traits

4. Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (n.d.). *The HEXACO Personality Inventory–Revised: Materials for researchers*. https://hexaco.org/hexaco-inventory

5. Sulima, Ye. M. (Ed.). (2021). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality psychology] [Open-access study guide]. https://ir.dpu.edu.ua/entities/publication/7e4cd7b5-a13f-410b-9de2-7d253c3c952b

6. The Personality Project. (n.d.). *Personality theory and research resources*. https://www.personality-project.org/

BASICS OF SEXOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of human sexuality as a multidimensional aspect of life shaped by biological, psychological, social and cultural factors. Students learn to explain sexual development and diversity, analyse relationships and communication, evaluate sexual health information, and apply principles of consent, confidentiality and non-discrimination to educational scenarios. The course develops introductory skills in sexuality-related psychoeducation and respectful communication, including recognition of concerns that require referral to appropriately qualified professionals.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3	4 /elective	Serhii Dubinskyi, Ph.D (Economy), Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 16 h. practical classes, 78 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain human sexuality using biological, psychological, social and cultural perspectives and appropriate scientific terminology.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Describe sexual development across the lifespan and distinguish sex characteristics, gender identity, sexual orientation and sexual behaviour.			Interactive lectures, guided analysis of developmental examples, comparative exercises	Tests; developmental and comparative assignments (CAS)
3) Analyse interpersonal relationships in terms of communication, intimacy, consent, personal boundaries and respect for individual differences.			Case analysis, problem-based learning, group discussions	Case analysis and proposed responses; discussion contributions (CAS)
4) Apply principles of confidentiality, informed consent, non-discrimination and professional boundaries to sexuality-related ethical scenarios.			Ethical case analysis, structured discussions, scenario-based exercises	Ethical case analysis; practical assignments (CAS)
5) Evaluate information about sexuality and sexual and reproductive health, distinguishing credible evidence from myths, stereotypes and unsupported claims.			Guided source appraisal, media analysis, information-comparison workshops	Source evaluation and comparative assignments; tests (CAS)
6) Identify concerns in educational cases involving sexual difficulties, coercion or violence and explain appropriate sources of professional support and referral.			Interactive lectures, guided case analysis, referral-mapping exercises	Case analysis; support and referral assignments (CAS)
7) Demonstrate respectful, non-judgemental and culturally sensitive communication when responding to sexuality-related questions in simulated educational situations.			Demonstration, communication exercises, role-playing, feedback	Communication task and role-play performance (CAS)
8) Develop and present an evidence-informed psychoeducational resource on a selected			Project-based learning, resource-design	Psychoeducational project; presentation

sexuality-related topic, appropriate to a defined audience.	workshops, peer review, presentations	and responses to questions (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
15 points for contributions to discussions;
20 points for comparative, developmental, source evaluation and case analysis assignments, including support and referral tasks;
20 points for practical communication tasks and role-play performance;
25 points for the psychoeducational project and its presentation;
20 points for modular tests.
Assessment criteria
a) Contributions to discussions – 15 points
13–15 points: The student uses terminology accurately, presents evidence-informed arguments, considers alternative explanations and communicates respectfully without unsupported generalisations.
10–12 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and contributes relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
6–9 points: Contributions demonstrate basic understanding but limited justification or connection to evidence.
1–5 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors or little relevant reasoning.
0 points: No assessable contribution.
b) Comparative and analytical assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately interprets information, evaluates source credibility, distinguishes evidence from assumptions and proposes justified responses that recognise ethical issues and limits of competence.
13–16 points: Analysis is relevant and generally accurate, with minor gaps in interpretation, source evaluation or justification.
8–12 points: Analysis identifies some relevant issues but relies on limited evidence or provides insufficiently justified conclusions.
1–7 points: Analysis contains substantial errors or unsupported recommendations.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Practical communication tasks and role-play performance – 20 points
17–20 points: The student communicates clearly and respectfully, uses appropriate terminology, listens attentively, maintains boundaries and explains suitable sources of information or support.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates appropriate communication skills, with minor weaknesses in clarity, responsiveness or explanation.
8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but communication is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the educational situation.
1–7 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in communicating accurately, maintaining boundaries or responding appropriately.
0 points: No assessable performance.
d) Psychoeducational project and presentation – 25 points
The project is assessed for scientific accuracy and source quality (8 points), suitability for the intended audience and inclusive language (6 points), structure and practical usefulness (6 points), and presentation and responses to questions (5 points).
22–25 points: The resource is accurate, evidence-informed, clearly structured and appropriate to its audience. It respects diversity and privacy, distinguishes education from individual clinical advice and is convincingly presented.
17–21 points: The resource is relevant and generally well-developed, with minor gaps in evidence, audience adaptation or presentation.
10–16 points: The resource communicates basic information, but source use, clarity, structure or audience suitability requires further development.

1–9 points: The resource is incomplete, poorly supported or contains substantial inaccuracies.
0 points: No project is submitted.
e) Modular tests – 20 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy, interpretation of evidence and appropriate application of ethical and sexual health principles. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

Content

Topic 1. Sexology as a Field of Study: Biological, Psychological, Social and Cultural Perspectives
Topic 2. Sexual Anatomy, Physiology and Models of Sexual Response
Topic 3. Sexual Development Across the Lifespan
Topic 4. Sex Characteristics, Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation
Topic 5. Culture, Gender Norms and Social Beliefs About Sexuality
Topic 6. Attraction, Intimacy and Interpersonal Relationships
Topic 7. Communication, Consent and Personal Boundaries
Topic 8. Ethics, Sexual Rights, Confidentiality and Professional Boundaries
Topic 9. Sexual Well-Being, Relationship Satisfaction and Individual Variation
Topic 10. Sexual Difficulties and Dysfunctions: Basic Concepts and Referral
Topic 11. Sexual and Reproductive Health: Contraception and Prevention of Sexually Transmitted Infections
Topic 12. Sexual Coercion and Violence: Recognition, Consequences and Sources of Support
Topic 13. Sexuality Education, Digital Media and Critical Evaluation of Information

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Hyde, J. S., & DeLamater, J. D. (2024). *Understanding human sexuality* (15th ed.). McGraw Hill.
2. UNESCO. (2018). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach* (Rev. ed.).
3. Vornik, B. M., & Kryshtal, Ye. V. (2023). *Seksolohiia i seksopatolohiia* [Sexology and sexual pathology] (2nd rev. and expanded ed.). Medytsyna.

Recommended reading

1. Basson, R. (2000). The female sexual response: A different model. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 26*(1), 51–65.
2. Diamond, L. M. (2008). *Sexual fluidity: Understanding women's love and desire*. Harvard University Press.
3. Goldfarb, E. S., & Lieberman, L. D. (2021). Three decades of research: The case for comprehensive sex education. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 68*(1), 13–27.
4. World Health Organization. (2015). *Sexual health, human rights and the law*.

Web-resources

1. Divchata. (n.d.). *Seksosvita* [Sexuality education: Educational resources]. https://divchata.org/sex-education
2. National Health Service. (n.d.). *Sexual health*. https://www.nhs.uk/live-well/sexual-health/
3. UNESCO. (n.d.). *International technical guidance on sexuality education: An evidence-informed approach*. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/international-technical-guidance-sexuality-education-evidence-informed-approach
4. UNICEF Ukraine. (n.d.). *Seksualne vykhovannia ditei: zapytannia i vidpovidi* [Sexuality education for children: Questions and answers]. https://www.unicef.org/ukraine/documents/sex-education
5. World Association for Sexual Health. (2014). *Declaration of sexual rights*. https://www.worldsexualhealth.net/was-declaration-on-sexual-rights
6. World Health Organization. (n.d.). *Sexual health*. https://www.who.int/health-topics/sexual-health

SELF-MANAGEMENT OF A SPECIALIST

The course aims to develop students' understanding of self-management and their ability to organise learning, work and personal development in accordance with goals, available resources and contextual demands. Students practise goal-setting, time and workload planning, constructive communication, self-leadership and basic stress-management strategies. The course also develops their ability to evaluate self-management approaches, make informed choices about learning and financial resources, and revise development plans using evidence, feedback and reflection.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	3	4 / elective	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	120 hours (28 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 78 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1. Explain the principles of self-management, self-leadership and professional development, distinguishing evidence-informed approaches from unsupported productivity claims.	Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2. Analyse motivations, strengths, habits and contextual constraints that influence learning, work organisation and progress towards goals.	Guided self-assessment, case analysis, structured reflection	Analytical assignments; reflective assignments (CAS)
3. Apply prioritisation, scheduling and workload-management techniques to realistic learning and professional situations.	Demonstration, time-use analysis, planning exercises, problem-based learning	Time-management assignments; case-based planning tasks (CAS)
4. Demonstrate constructive communication, responsible self-presentation and collaborative leadership in simulated professional situations.	Communication exercises, role-playing, teamwork simulations and peer feedback	Communication and role-play performance; individual contribution to teamwork (CAS)
5. Select and justify basic emotional self-regulation and conflict-management strategies, recognising situations that require additional support.	Demonstration, guided strategy comparison, conflict case analysis, scenario-based exercises	Case analysis; practical response-planning assignments (CAS)
6. Use goal-setting and self-coaching questions to develop a feasible personal or professional development plan with actions, milestones and review arrangements.	Goal-setting workshops, self-coaching exercises, project-based learning, presentations	Individual development plan; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)

7. Compare options for allocating learning, financial and other personal resources and justify choices in relation to priorities and constraints.	Learning-resource evaluation, budgeting exercises, resource-allocation cases, group discussions	Resource-management assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
8. Evaluate self-management decisions and progress using agreed indicators and feedback, and propose justified adjustments.	Guided analysis of progress records, peer review, reflective writing and plan revision	Reflective learning journal; plan review and revision (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
25 points for discussion contributions, communication and role-play performance, and individual contributions to teamwork;
25 points for the individual self-management development plan and its presentation;
20 points for comparative, analytical and practical planning assignments;
20 points for the reflective learning journal and reflective assignments;
10 points for tests.
Assessment criteria
a) Discussions, communication tasks, role-playing and teamwork – 25 points
22–25 points: The student contributes well-reasoned ideas, communicates clearly and respectfully, applies appropriate interaction strategies and demonstrates a constructive individual contribution to teamwork.
17–21 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and effective interaction, with minor weaknesses in reasoning, communication or coordination.
10–16 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but contributions or communication strategies are inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation.
1–9 points: The student demonstrates substantial misunderstandings or provides limited relevant evidence of communication and teamwork skills.
0 points: No assessable contribution or performance.
b) Individual self-management development plan and presentation – 25 points
The plan is assessed for analysis of the starting situation and priorities (5 points); clarity and relevance of goals (5 points); feasibility of actions, resources and milestones (8 points); review indicators (4 points); and presentation and responses to questions (3 points).
22–25 points: The plan connects a clear analysis of needs and constraints to relevant goals, feasible actions and suitable review indicators. Decisions are convincingly justified and clearly presented.
17–21 points: The plan is coherent and generally feasible, with minor gaps in analysis, justification, milestones or presentation.
10–16 points: The plan identifies relevant goals, but actions, resources or review indicators require further development.
1–9 points: The plan is incomplete, weakly justified or insufficiently connected to the identified priorities.
0 points: No plan is submitted.
c) Comparative, analytical and practical planning assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately analyses the situation, compares appropriate approaches and develops feasible, well-justified responses that account for constraints and limitations.
13–16 points: Analysis and proposed responses are generally appropriate, with minor errors or omissions.
8–12 points: The student identifies some relevant issues, but analysis or proposed responses are only partly justified.

1–7 points: The work contains substantial errors or proposed responses are poorly connected to the task.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Reflective learning journal and reflective assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student critically examines decisions and progress using course concepts and feedback, recognises limitations and proposes specific, justified adjustments.
13–16 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in depth or use of evidence.
8–12 points: Reflection mainly describes activities, with limited analysis or justification of changes.
1–7 points: Reflection is fragmented, superficial or poorly connected to the learning task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.
e) Tests – 10 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of self-management principles. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

Content

Topic 1. Theoretical Foundations of Professional Self-Management
Topic 2. Goal-Setting, Priorities and Review Indicators
Topic 3. Self-Coaching and Planning Personal Change
Topic 4. Responsible Self-Presentation and Impression Management
Topic 5. Professional Image, Authenticity and Digital Reputation
Topic 6. Self-Leadership and Collaborative Leadership
Topic 7. Constructive Business Communication and Professional Boundaries
Topic 8. Basic Principles and Techniques of Time Management
Topic 9. Distractions, Procrastination and Digital Habits
Topic 10. Managing Learning Resources and Lifelong Development
Topic 11. Personal Financial Resources and Basic Budgeting
Topic 12. Workload, Productivity and Sustainable Working Habits
Topic 13. Stress Management, Recovery and Sources of Support
Topic 14. Conflict Management and Emotional Self-Regulation

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Buniak N.M., Cherchyk L.M., Mylko I.P. (2023). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Lutsk: Volynskyi natsionalyi universytet imeni Lesi Ukrainky. 221 s.
2. Kolpakov V.M. (2008). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Kyiv: Personal. 528 s.
3. Netepchuk V.V. (2013). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Rivne: NUVHP. 354 s.
4. Ratushniak O.H., Lialiuk O.H. (2021). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Vinnytsia: VNTU, 170 s.
5. Leskiv H.Z., Levkiv H.Ia., Blikhar M.M., Hobela V.V., Podra O.P., Koval H.V. (2021). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Lviv: Lvivskyi derzhavnyi universytet vnutrishnikh sprav. 280 s.
6. Vasylyk S.K., Maistrenko O.V., Nemashkalo K.R. ta in. (2020). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Kharkiv: KhNEU imeni S. Kuznetsia. 150 s.
7. Chkan A.S. (2014). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Zaporizhzhia: ZNU. 84 s.
8. Yurynec Z.V. (2014). Samomenedzhment [Self-Management]. Lviv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka. 272 s.
9. Zhu M., Bonk C.J., Doo M.Y. (2020). Self-Directed Learning in MOOCs: Exploring the Relationships among Motivation, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Management [Self-Directed Learning in MOOCs]. Educational Technology Research and Development, № 68, p. 2073–2093.

Recommended reading

1. Covey S.R. (2014). 7 zvychok nadzvychaino efektyvnykh liudei [The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People]; per. z anhl. O. Liubenko. Kharkiv: Knyzhkovyi Klub “Klub Simeinoho Dozvillia”. 384 s.
2. Lukashevych N.P. (2007). Samomenedzhment. Teoriia i praktyka [Self-Management. Theory and Practice]. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr. 344 s.
3. Oliinyk I.V. (2020). Samomenedzhment yak tekhnolohiia profesiinoho samorozvytku ta formuvannia doslidnytskoi kompetentnosti u maibutnikh doktoriv filosofii [Self-Management as a Technology of Professional Self-Development and Formation of Research Competence in Future PhD Students]. Visnyk universytetu imeni

Alfreda Nobelia. Seriia “Pedahohika i psykholohiia”, № 2 (20), s. 231–243. DOI: 10.32342/2522-4115-2020-2-20-27

4. Oliinyk I.V., Hrushka V.V. (2024). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak efektyvnyi instrument formuvannia liderskykh yakostei, navychok samomenedzhmentu ta motyvatsii do samorozvytku [Social-Psychological Training as an Effective Tool for Developing Leadership Qualities, Self-Management Skills, and Motivation for Self-Development]. Aktualni pytannia u suchasnii nautsi, № 12(30), s. 993–1007.

5. Soft skills – nevidiemni aspekty formuvannia konkurentospromozhnosti studentiv u XXI stolitti (2020). [Soft Skills as Essential Aspects of Students’ Competitiveness in the 21st Century]. Kyiv: Kyivskyi natsionalnyi torhovelno-ekonomichnyi universytet. 90 s.

6. Grete D. (2020). Time Management Tactics [Time Management Tactics]. Independently Published. 98 p.

7. Larson R. (2021). Strength of Self-Management: How to Achieve Goals in Life [Strength of Self-Management]. Independently Published. 76 p.

8. Patnaik S. (2021). Self-Management: For Individual and Organizational Success [Self-Management for Success]. Partridge Publishing India. 192 p.

9. Rothman J. (2020). Practical Ways to Manage Yourself: Modern Management Made Easy [Practical Ways to Manage Yourself]. Practical Ink. 184 p.

10. Rzepka A., Prachowski J., Olesinski Z., Jedrych E. (eds.) (2023). Self-Management, Entrepreneurial Culture, and Economy 4.0 [Self-Management and Economy 4.0]. New York: Routledge. 264 p.

Web-resources

1. Psychological Methods and Tests. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.eztests.xyz

2. Work Smarter, Not Harder: Time Management for Personal and Professional Productivity. (n.d.). Official website. https://www.coursera.org/learn/upravlinnya-chasom

3. Stress Management for Educators. (n.d.). Official website. https://prometheus.org.ua/prometheus-free/stress-management-for-educators/

4. The Art of Pitching. (n.d.). Official website. https://ugf.academy/lectures/arts-and-humanities-social-sciences/the-art-ofpitching/

PSYCHOLOGY OF HEALTH

The course aims to develop students' understanding of the psychological, behavioural and social processes that influence health, illness and the use of healthcare. Students learn to apply biopsychosocial and health-behaviour models to educational cases, analyse stress and coping, evaluate health information and research findings, and develop evidence-informed health-promotion materials. The course also develops respectful health-related communication, ethical reasoning and reflection on personal and professional well-being, with recognition of the limits of undergraduate competence.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4/14 weeks	5/ elective	Maryna Karpova, Ph.D	150 h. (26 h. lectures, 24 h. seminars/practical, 100 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and compare biomedical and biopsychosocial approaches to health and illness, recognising psychological, behavioural and social influences.	Interactive lectures, guided reading, conceptual mapping, comparative discussions	Conceptual and comparative assignments; discussion contributions; modular tests (CAS)
2) Analyse health-related behaviour using selected models of health beliefs, motivation and behaviour change, taking account of social and environmental constraints.	Interactive lectures, problem-based learning, health-behaviour case analysis	Case analysis and proposed explanations; modular tests (CAS)
3) Analyse relationships between stress, coping, social support and health, distinguishing research findings from unsupported causal claims.	Guided analysis of research summaries, stress-and-coping cases, structured discussions	Research and case analysis; discussion contributions; modular tests (CAS)
4) Interpret basic research findings and provided health-related data, recognising methodological limitations and ethical issues.	Demonstration, guided data interpretation, structured article appraisal, practical workshops	Data interpretation assignments; article appraisal; modular tests (CAS)
5) Apply attentive listening, clear explanation and collaborative goal-setting in simulated health-promotion conversations.	Demonstration, communication exercises, role-playing and feedback	Communication task and role-play performance (CAS)
6) Develop and present a feasible psychoeducational or health-promotion resource for a defined audience, specifying its aims, evidence base and evaluation indicators.	Project-based learning, resource-design workshops, peer review and presentations	Health-promotion resource; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
7) Compare self-regulation, recovery and support strategies relevant to personal and professional well-being and justify their suitability in selected situations.	Strategy-comparison workshops, case analysis, guided reflection	Practical assignments; reflective commentary (CAS)
8) Evaluate health and wellness claims using credible sources and communicate conclusions without stigma, blame or overstatement.	Source evaluation, media analysis, ethical case discussions	Source appraisal; ethical case analysis; discussion

		contributions (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
30 points for discussion contributions, classroom case analysis, data interpretation and practical communication tasks;
30 points for the individual learning portfolio;
40 points for two modular tests, worth 20 points each.
Assessment criteria
a) Discussions, classroom analytical assignments and practical communication tasks – 30 points
26–30 points: The student accurately applies health psychology concepts, interprets information critically, considers contextual factors and communicates clearly and respectfully. Conclusions and proposed responses are supported by relevant evidence.
20–25 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally appropriate analysis and communication, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
12–19 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but analysis, justification or application of communication skills is inconsistent.
1–11 points: The student demonstrates substantial conceptual errors, unsupported conclusions or limited evidence of the required practical skills.
0 points: No assessable work or contribution is completed.
b) Individual learning portfolio – 30 points
The health-promotion resource is assessed for scientific accuracy and source use (5 points), suitability for the intended audience (4 points), feasibility and ethical considerations (3 points), and evaluation indicators (3 points). The source appraisal, reflective commentary and presentation are each worth 5 points.
26–30 points: The portfolio integrates accurate theory and credible evidence, provides a clear and feasible resource, critically appraises sources and identifies justified improvements. The presentation and responses to questions are coherent and well-reasoned.
20–25 points: The portfolio is relevant and generally well-developed, with minor gaps in evidence appraisal, audience adaptation, evaluation or reflection.
12–19 points: The portfolio demonstrates basic understanding, but remains partly descriptive or contains insufficiently justified design and evaluation decisions.
1–11 points: The portfolio is incomplete, poorly supported or contains substantial conceptual or practical inaccuracies.
0 points: No assessable portfolio is submitted.
c) Modular tests – 40 points
Each test is worth 20 points and includes conceptual questions and short applied tasks. Points are awarded according to the marking scheme provided with each test. Conceptual responses are assessed for accuracy; applied responses are assessed for appropriate use of theory, interpretation of information and justification of conclusions. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

Content

Topic 1. Health Psychology: Scope, Research Methods and Biopsychosocial Models
Topic 2. Health Beliefs, Illness Perceptions and the Internal Representation of Health
Topic 3. Social Determinants of Health, Inequality and Cultural Contexts
Topic 4. Health Behaviour, Motivation and Models of Behaviour Change
Topic 5. Everyday Health Practices: Sleep, Physical Activity, Eating and Substance Use
Topic 6. Stress, Coping, Psychological Defences and Adaptation
Topic 7. Self-Efficacy, Personal Agency and Self-Regulation
Topic 8. Social Support, Resilience and Mental Well-Being
Topic 9. Psychological Adjustment to Illness, Pain and Long-Term Health Conditions
Topic 10. Communication, Healthcare Use and Adherence to Agreed Care Plans
Topic 11. Health Literacy, Wellness Claims and Critical Evaluation of Information

Topic 12. Professional Well-Being, Recovery and Sustainable Working Practices
Topic 13. Designing and Evaluating Ethical Health-Promotion Activities

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Karamushka, L. M. (2022). *Psykhichne zdorovia osobystosti pid chas viiny: yak yoho zberehty ta pidtrymaty* [Personal mental health during war: How to preserve and support it] [Methodological recommendations]. H. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine.

2. Ogden, J. (2023). *Health psychology* (7th ed.). Open University Press.

3. Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2022). *Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions* (10th ed.). Wiley.

Recommended reading

1. Dvornyk, M. S., Lazorenko, B. P., Larina, T. O., Hromova, H. M., Pohorilska, N. I., Savinov, V. V., & Hundertailo, Yu. D. (2024). Zdorovyi sposib zhyttia ukraintsiv pid chas viiny: pervynnyi analiz danykh opytuvannia [Healthy lifestyle of Ukrainians during war: Primary analysis of survey data]. *Psykholohichni perspektyvy [Psychological Prospects]*, *43*, 80–102.

2. Michie, S., van Stralen, M. M., & West, R. (2011). The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation Science, 6*, Article 42.

3. Stea, J. N. (2024). *Mind the science: Saving your mental health from the wellness industry*. Oxford University Press.

4. Taylor, S. E., & Stanton, A. L. (2021). *Health psychology* (11th ed.). McGraw Hill.

5. World Health Organization. (2020). *Doing what matters in times of stress: An illustrated guide*.

Web-resources

1. WHO. https://www.who.int/
2. APA PsycHealth. https://www.apa.org/
3. CDC Mental Health. https://www.cdc.gov/mental-health/index.html
4. National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). https://www.nimh.nih.gov/
5. Frontiers in Psychology. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology
6. PubMed. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/
7. PsycNET. https://psycnet.apa.org/home

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SELF-PERCEPTION AND LIFE SCRIPTS				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of self-perception, self-concept and narrative identity, and of life scripts as a concept used in selected psychological approaches. Students learn to compare theoretical explanations, analyse the influence of personal experience and social and cultural contexts on self-understanding, and critically evaluate relevant research. The course develops introductory skills in narrative analysis, reflective learning, respectful communication and the design of psychoeducational activities supporting self-awareness and life planning, with attention to privacy, individual differences and professional boundaries.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	4/14 weeks	5 / elective	Nataliia Kholodenko, Ph.D.	150 h. (26 h. lectures, 24 h. seminars/practical, 100 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and distinguish self-perception, self-concept, self-esteem and identity using appropriate psychological terminology.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises, structured discussions	Comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Compare theoretical approaches to self-perception, narrative identity and life scripts, recognising differences in their assumptions and supporting evidence.			Interactive lectures, comparative reading, theory-comparison workshops, discussions	Comparative analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse how cognitive, emotional, interpersonal and cultural factors influence self-understanding and interpretations of life experiences.			Case analysis, problem-based learning, group discussions	Case analysis and proposed explanations; discussion contributions (CAS)
4) Analyse selected narratives to identify themes of agency, relationships, continuity and meaning, distinguishing textual evidence from interpretation.			Demonstration, guided narrative analysis, practical workshops	Narrative analysis assignments (CAS)
5) Evaluate research and popular claims about self-perception and life scripts, recognising methodological limitations and avoiding unsupported causal conclusions.			Guided source appraisal, analysis of research summaries, comparative discussions	Source evaluation assignments; research analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
6) Apply principles of informed agreement, confidentiality, non-discrimination and professional boundaries in simulated discussions of identity and personal experience.			Ethical case analysis, communication exercises, role-playing, feedback	Ethical case analysis; communication task and role-play performance (CAS)
7) Develop and present an evidence-informed psychoeducational activity supporting self-awareness or life planning for a defined audience.			Project-based learning, activity-design workshops, peer review, presentations	Psychoeducational project; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
8) Evaluate their analytical and communication approaches using course concepts and feedback, and identify priorities for further learning.			Structured reflection, guided self-evaluation, feedback discussions	Reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 20 points for discussion contributions and practical communication tasks; 25 points for comparative and case analysis assignments; 20 points for narrative analysis and reflective assignments; 25 points for the psychoeducational project and its presentation; and 10 points for source evaluation and research analysis assignments. Each assessed task is allocated to one assessment component to avoid double counting.

Assessment criteria

a) Discussion contributions and practical communication tasks – 20 points

17–20 points: The student uses psychological terminology accurately, presents well-supported arguments, considers alternative interpretations and communicates respectfully while maintaining appropriate boundaries.

13–16 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and constructive communication, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.

8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but arguments have limited support or communication requires further development.

1–7 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors, limited relevant reasoning or significant difficulties in responding appropriately.

0 points: No assessable contribution or task is completed.

b) Comparative and case analysis assignments – 25 points

22–25 points: The student accurately compares relevant concepts or approaches, analyses contextual factors, distinguishes evidence from assumptions and provides justified conclusions that recognise ethical issues and alternative explanations.

17–21 points: Analysis is relevant and generally accurate, with minor gaps in comparison, interpretation or justification.

10–16 points: Analysis identifies some relevant concepts and factors, but explanations are mainly descriptive or only partly justified.

1–9 points: Analysis contains substantial errors, unsupported interpretations or weak connections to the case.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

c) Narrative analysis and reflective assignments – 20 points

17–20 points: The student systematically identifies relevant narrative themes, supports interpretations with examples, considers alternative readings and uses concepts and feedback to identify specific improvements in their analytical approach.

13–16 points: Analysis and reflection are relevant and generally well-supported, with minor limitations in interpretation or proposed improvements.

8–12 points: Work identifies basic themes but remains mainly descriptive, with limited justification or reflection.

1–7 points: Work is fragmented, contains unsupported interpretations or shows limited connection to the learning task.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

d) Psychoeducational project and presentation – 25 points

22–25 points: The project defines clear aims and an appropriate audience, uses credible sources, provides coherent instructions and respects privacy, inclusion and professional boundaries. The presentation and responses to questions are clear and well-reasoned.

17–21 points: The project is relevant and generally feasible, with minor gaps in evidence, audience adaptation, instructions or presentation.

10–16 points: The project demonstrates basic understanding, but its justification, structure or practical usefulness requires further development.

1–9 points: The project is incomplete, poorly supported or contains substantial conceptual or instructional inaccuracies.

0 points: No project is submitted.

e) Source evaluation and research analysis assignments – 10 points

9–10 points: The student selects credible sources, accurately identifies research questions and findings, recognises relevant methodological limitations and distinguishes associations from causal claims.

7–8 points: Source selection and interpretation are generally appropriate, with minor omissions or inaccuracies.

4–6 points: The student identifies basic findings but provides limited appraisal of source quality or research limitations.

1–3 points: Sources are poorly selected or findings are substantially misinterpreted.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Self-Perception as a Psychological Construct
Topic 2. Self-Concept, Self-Esteem and Identity
Topic 3. Cognitive and Emotional Processes in Self-Perception
Topic 4. Self-Attitudes and Psychological Well-Being
Topic 5. Narrative Psychology and Narrative Identity
Topic 6. Life Scripts in Transactional Analysis: Concepts and Critical Perspectives
Topic 7. Early Experiences, Family Messages and Interpretations of Life Events
Topic 8. Personal Myths, Meaning-Making and Autobiographical Memory
Topic 9. Social Interaction, Cultural Expectations and Self-Understanding
Topic 10. Identity, Professional Development and Life Choices
Topic 11. Life Transitions, Crises and Changes in Personal Narratives
Topic 12. Strengths, Resources and Alternative Interpretations of Experience
Topic 13. Narrative Analysis, Reflection and Ethical Communication
Topic 14. Psychoeducation, Self-Awareness and Life Planning

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Handzilevska, H. B. (2018). *Zhyttievi stsenarii ukrainskykh emihrantiv (psykholoho-akmeolohichnyi dyskurs)* [Life scripts of Ukrainian emigrants: A psychological and acmeological discourse]. National University of Ostroh Academy.

2. Lind, M., Ture, S., McAdams, D. P., & Cowan, H. R. (2024). Narrative identity, traits, and trajectories of depression and well-being: A 9-year longitudinal study. *Psychological Science, 35*(12), 1325–1339.

3. McLean, K. C., Syed, M., Pasupathi, M., Adler, J. M., Dunlop, W. L., Drustrup, D., Fivush, R., Graci, M. E., Lilgendahl, J. P., Lodi-Smith, J., McAdams, D. P., & McCoy, T. P. (2020). The empirical structure of narrative identity: The initial Big Three. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *119*(4), 920–944.

Recommended reading

1. Adler, J. M., Dunlop, W. L., Fivush, R., Lilgendahl, J. P., Lodi-Smith, J., McAdams, D. P., McLean, K. C., Pasupathi, M., & Syed, M. (2017). Research methods for studying narrative identity: A primer. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *8*(5), 519–527.

2. Berne, E. (1972). *What do you say after you say hello? The psychology of human destiny*. Grove Press.

3. Chepelieva, N. V., & Rudnytska, S. Yu. (2019). Dyskursyvni tekhnolohii samoproektuvannia osobystosti [Discursive technologies of personality self-design]. *Tekhnolohii rozvytku intelektu [Technologies of Intellect Development]*, *3*(2[23]).

4. Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299–337.

5. McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*(3), 233–238.

Web-resources

1. International Transactional Analysis Association. (n.d.). About transactional analysis. https://itaaworld.com/about-ta/

2. Greater Good Science Center, University of California, Berkeley. (n.d.). Purpose. https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/topic/purpose

3. Greater Good Science Center, University of California, Berkeley. (n.d.). Best possible self. Greater Good in Action. https://ggia.berkeley.edu/practice/best_possible_self

4. VIA Institute on Character. (n.d.). The 24 character strengths. https://www.viacharacter.org/character-strengths

COMMUNICATION AND CREATIVITY TRAINING				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of interpersonal communication, creative thinking and group learning, together with introductory skills in applying communication and creativity exercises. Students practise active listening, clear expression, constructive feedback, collaborative problem-solving and idea generation. They learn to design and facilitate a brief training activity, evaluate its suitability for a defined group, and reflect on their performance while respecting voluntary participation, inclusion, privacy and the boundaries of educational training.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5	4 / selective	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain key principles of interpersonal communication, creative thinking and experiential group learning, distinguishing educational training from counselling and psychotherapy.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative exercises, structured discussions	Tests; comparative assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Analyse communication barriers, group interaction and conflict situations, and propose context-appropriate responses.			Case analysis, problem-based learning, group discussions	Case analysis and proposed solutions; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Demonstrate active listening, clear questioning, assertive expression and constructive feedback in simulated interpersonal and professional situations.			Demonstration, communication exercises, role-playing, observation and feedback	Communication task and role-play performance (CAS)
4) Apply idea-generation techniques and explicit selection criteria to develop and justify solutions to a defined problem.			Demonstration, brainstorming and brainwriting, creative problem-solving workshops, collaborative exercises	Creative problem-solving assignments; justification of selected ideas (CAS)
5) Design a brief communication or creativity training activity with clear learning objectives, instructions, timing, materials and arrangements for feedback.			Training-design workshops, project-based learning, peer review, presentations	Training activity plan; presentation and responses to questions (CAS)
6) Facilitate a brief training activity using clear instructions, inclusive participation and an appropriate debriefing process.			Facilitator demonstration, guided rehearsal, small-group facilitation practice, peer feedback	Facilitation performance (CAS)
7) Apply ethical principles and basic self-regulation strategies in training scenarios, respecting consent, privacy, individual differences and participation boundaries.			Ethical case analysis, scenario-based exercises, guided self-regulation practice, discussions	Ethical case analysis; practical assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
8) Evaluate their communication, creative problem-solving and facilitation performance			Structured reflective writing, guided self-	Reflective learning journal; reflective assignments (CAS)

using course concepts, observation and feedback, and identify specific improvements.	evaluation, feedback discussions	

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 10 points for discussion contributions; 20 points for comparative, case analysis and creative problem-solving assignments; 30 points for practical communication tasks, role-playing and facilitation performance; 20 points for the training activity plan and its presentation; 10 points for the reflective learning journal and reflective assignments; and 10 points for tests.

Assessment criteria

a) Discussion contributions – 10 points

9–10 points: The student uses relevant concepts accurately, presents well-reasoned arguments, considers alternative perspectives and responds constructively to others.

7–8 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and contributes relevant arguments, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.

4–6 points: Contributions demonstrate basic understanding but limited justification or connection to course concepts.

1–3 points: Contributions contain substantial misunderstandings or little relevant reasoning.

0 points: No assessable contribution.

b) Comparative, case analysis and creative problem-solving assignments – 20 points

17–20 points: The student accurately compares concepts, identifies relevant communication or group factors, generates varied ideas and justifies suitable solutions using explicit criteria and ethical considerations.

13–16 points: Analysis and proposed solutions are generally appropriate, with minor gaps in comparison, idea development or justification.

8–12 points: The student identifies some relevant issues, but analysis is mainly descriptive or proposed solutions are only partly justified.

1–7 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors, limited relevant analysis or poorly justified solutions.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

c) Practical communication tasks, role-playing and facilitation performance – 30 points

26–30 points: The student communicates clearly, listens attentively, uses appropriate questions and feedback, provides understandable instructions and facilitates inclusive interaction. Debriefing connects the activity to its learning objectives.

20–25 points: The student demonstrates effective basic communication and facilitation skills, with minor difficulties in clarity, timing, responsiveness or debriefing.

12–19 points: The student demonstrates basic skills, but their application is inconsistent or insufficiently adapted to the situation.

1–11 points: The student demonstrates substantial difficulties in communication, instructions, group interaction or maintaining appropriate boundaries.

0 points: No assessable performance.

d) Training activity plan and presentation – 20 points

17–20 points: The plan aligns objectives, methods and feedback, suits the intended group and available time, provides clear instructions and addresses participation options and ethical considerations. The presentation and responses to questions are well-reasoned.

13–16 points: The plan is coherent and generally feasible, with minor gaps in alignment, instructions, timing or presentation.

8–12 points: The plan identifies relevant aims and activities, but their alignment, practical detail or suitability requires further development.

1–7 points: The plan is incomplete, poorly justified or insufficiently connected to its learning objectives.

0 points: No plan is submitted.

e) Reflective learning journal and reflective assignments – 10 points

9–10 points: The student evaluates specific aspects of their performance using course concepts, observation and feedback, and proposes feasible improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in analysis or use of feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes activities, with limited evaluation or identification of improvements.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the learning task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.
f) Tests – 10 points
Points are awarded proportionally to correct answers. Short-answer and scenario-based responses are assessed for conceptual accuracy and appropriate application of communication, creativity, group learning and ethical principles. Incorrect or unanswered questions receive no points.

Content

Topic 1. Educational Training: Purposes, Principles and Professional Boundaries
Topic 2. Experiential Learning and Group Dynamics
Topic 3. Interpersonal Communication: Processes, Contexts and Barriers
Topic 4. Active Listening, Questioning and Clear Expression
Topic 5. Assertive Communication, Constructive Feedback and Conflict Interaction
Topic 6. Creative Thinking: Processes, Conditions and Barriers
Topic 7. Idea Generation: Brainstorming, Brainwriting and Alternative Perspectives
Topic 8. Idea Evaluation and Collaborative Creative Problem-Solving
Topic 9. Training Design: Objectives, Sequence, Timing and Materials
Topic 10. Selecting and Adapting Training Exercises and Game-Based Methods
Topic 11. Facilitation Skills, Inclusive Participation and Group Agreements
Topic 12. Ethics, Participation Boundaries and Self-Regulation in Training
Topic 13. Debriefing, Feedback and Evaluation of Training Activities

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bezpalko, O., & Savych, Zh. (2002). *Spilkuiemos ta diiemo* [We communicate and act]. Kyiv. 112 p.
2. Fedorchuk, V. M., Fedorchuk, V. V., & Komarnytska, L. M. (2020). *Treninh komunikatyvnoi kompetentnosti* [Communication competence training]. Kamianets-Podilskyi. 236 p.
3. Johnson, D. W. (2003). *Sotsialna psykholohiia: treninh mizhosobystisnoho spilkuvannia* [Social psychology: Interpersonal communication training] (V. Khomyk, Trans.). Kyiv. 288 p.
4. Lefterov, V. O., Formaniuk, Yu. V., & Tretiakova, T. M. (2021). *Teoriia i praktyka psykholohichnoho treninhu* [Theory and practice of psychological training]. Feniks. 44 p.
5. Moroz, L. I. (2004). *Osnovy profesiino-psykholohichnoho treninhu* [Fundamentals of professional psychological training]. Palyvoda A. V. 130 p.
6. Moroz, L. I., & Yakovenko, S. I. (2011). *Profesiino-psykholohichnyi treninh* [Professional psychological training]. Palyvoda A. V. 252 p.
7. Sobolevska, O. B. (2020). *Treninh komunikatyvnosti ta kreatyvnosti v sotsialnii roboti* [Communication and creativity training in social work]. Malyi vydavnychyi tsentr. 86 p.
8. Stelmakh, V. (2019). *Kreatyvnyi osobystyi brendynh* [Creative personal branding]. Fabula. 240 p.
9. Sysoieva, O. (2024). *Metodolohiia rozrobky treninhiv z nulia: yak stvoriuvaty treninhy lehko ta iz zadovolenniam* [Developing training from scratch: How to create training easily and enjoyably]. 7BTs. 296 p.

Recommended reading

1. Afanasieva, N. Ye., & Perelyhina, L. A. (2008). *Teoretyko-metodolohichni osnovy sotsialno-psykholohichnoho treninhu* [Theoretical and methodological foundations of social-psychological training]. UTsZU. 251 p.
2. Balakhtar, V. V. (2017). *Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh i manipuliatsiia* [Social-psychological training and manipulation]. Cheremosh. 432 p.
3. Bykova, V. O., Voshkolup, H. Yu., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Pidhotovka maibutnikh psykholohiv do zastosuvannia kouchynhovykh stratehii u konsultuvanni kliientiv [Preparing future psychologists to apply coaching strategies in client counselling]. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Pedagogy and Psychology, 1*(29), 32–40.

4. Evans, D. R., et al. (2021). *Human adjustment: Skills*. Monterey, CA, 1998.

5. Hlavnik, O., & Bevz, H. (2005). *Tekhnolohiia treninhu* [Training technology]. Hlavnyk. 152 p.

6. Karpenko, Ye. (2016a). *Orhanizatsiia treninhu spilkuvannia z ditmy riznoho viku* [Organising communication training with children of different ages]. Drohobych. 145 p.

7. Karpenko, Ye. (2016b). *Osnovy psykhotreninhu* [Fundamentals of psychological training]. Drohobych. 80 p.

8. Korniienko, I. O., & Almashi, S. I. (2016). *Metodolohiia provedennia treninhiv* [Methodology of conducting training]. MDU. 60 p.

9. Lebid, O., & Oliinyk, I. (2023). Treninh yak interaktyvnyi metod profesiinoi pidhotovky maibutnikh fakhivtsiv sotsionomichnoi sfery do sotsialnoi pidtrymky batkiv ditei z osoblyvymy potrebamy [Training as an interactive method of preparing future specialists in socionomic occupations to provide social support to parents of children with special needs]. *Adaptyvne upravlinnia: teoriia i praktyka. Seriia Pedahohika [Adaptive Management: Theory and Practice. Series Pedagogy], 16*(31).

10. Lefterov, V. O. (2008). *Psykhotreninh v OVS* [Psychological training in internal affairs bodies] (Vol. 2). 286 p.

11. Miliutina, K. (2004). *Teoriia ta praktyka psykholohichnoho treninhu* [Theory and practice of psychological training]. MAUP. 192 p.

12. Perepeliuk, T. D., & Ilchenko, I. S. (2014). *Orhanizatsiia i metodyka sotsialno-psykholohichnykh treninhiv* [Organisation and methods of social-psychological training]. Vizavi. 255 p.

13. Volkova, N. P., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak metod interaktyvnoho navchannia u protsesi pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv do sotsialno-psykholohichnoi pidtrymky hromadian v umovakh viiny [Social-psychological training as an interactive learning method in preparing future psychologists to provide social-psychological support to citizens during wartime]. *Pedahohichna akademiia: naukovi zapysky [Pedagogical Academy: Scientific Notes], 16*.

14. Vopel, K. W. (2000). *Handbuch für Gruppenleiter/innen: Zur Theorie und Praxis der Interaktionsspiele* [Handbook for group leaders: Theory and practice of interaction games]. Iskopress.

15. Zawadzka, A. M. (n.d.). *Psychologia zarządzania w organizacji* [Psychology of management in organisations]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

16. Zlyvkov, V. L., & Lukomska, S. O. (2019). *Teoriia ta praktyka psykholohichnykh treninhiv* [Theory and practice of psychological training]. Lysenko M. M. 209 p.

Web-resources

1. Osvita.ua. (n.d.). Osnovni polozhennia shchodo provedennia treninhiv [Basic principles of conducting trainings]. https://osvita.ua/school/method/technol/598/

2. Association of Ukrainian Universities. (n.d.). Yak skladyty prohramu treninhu? [How to design a training program?]. http://www.auu.org.ua/media/publications/1114/files/Tr-3-_2020_02_04_13_11_11_259064.pdf

3. Prometheus. (n.d.). Online learning platform. https://prometheus.org.ua/

4. EdEra. (n.d.). Online education studio. https://www.ed-era.com/courses/

5. EduHub. (n.d.). Educational Hub platform. https://eduhub.in.ua

PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSONALITY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of major personality theories and contemporary research on personality structure, development and functioning. Students learn to compare psychological approaches, analyse self-concept, identity, self-regulation and individual differences, and examine personality resources and adaptation in context. The course develops introductory skills in interpreting personality assessment information and critically evaluating theoretical and empirical explanations, including integrative and meta-systemic perspectives, with attention to ethical principles and the limitations of available evidence.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5	4 / elective	Viktoriia Bykova, PhD (Pedagogy), Associate Professor	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes,80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Compare major personality theories in terms of their assumptions, key concepts, supporting evidence and limitations.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, comparative analysis, structured discussions	Theory-comparison assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
2) Explain personality structure, development and functioning using different theoretical perspectives and assess the contribution of integrative and meta-systemic explanations.			Interactive lectures, conceptual mapping, analysis of theoretical models, group discussions	Conceptual maps and explanations; theoretical analysis assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse self-awareness, identity, self-concept, self-regulation and self-presentation in selected personality cases.			Case analysis, problem-based learning, analytical discussions	Case analysis and proposed explanations; discussion contributions (CAS)
4) Interpret individual differences in personality and behaviour in relation to situational, cultural, social, gender and lifespan factors, avoiding stereotypical conclusions.			Contextual and intercultural case analysis, comparative exercises, group discussions	Comparative and case analysis assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
5) Analyse relationships between personality characteristics, coping, resilience and adaptation, recognising contextual influences and limits of prediction.			Interactive lectures, analysis of research summaries, problem-based case analysis	Research and case analysis assignments (CAS)
6) Interpret basic personality assessment information in supplied examples and evaluate its reliability, validity, contextual suitability and ethical limitations.			Demonstration, guided analysis of assessment materials, interpretation workshops, ethical case discussions	Assessment interpretation assignments; ethical case analysis; discussion contributions (CAS)
7) Critically evaluate selected personality research and communicate justified conclusions, using			Guided research appraisal, independent	Research review and presentation;

feedback to identify improvements in their analytical approach.	source analysis, presentations, peer feedback, structured reflection	reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 20 points for discussion contributions and explanations of conceptual maps; 30 points for theory-comparison and case analysis assignments; 20 points for personality assessment interpretation and ethical analysis assignments; 20 points for a research review and its presentation; and 10 points for reflective assignments. Each task is allocated to one assessment component to avoid double counting.

Assessment criteria

a) Discussion contributions and conceptual map explanations – 20 points

17–20 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, identifies meaningful relationships between them, presents well-reasoned arguments and responds constructively to alternative perspectives.

13–16 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally clear conceptual connections, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.

8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but explanations are mainly descriptive or relationships between concepts are insufficiently justified.

1–7 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors or limited relevant reasoning.

0 points: No assessable contribution or explanation.

b) Theory-comparison and case analysis assignments – 30 points

26–30 points: The student accurately compares theoretical assumptions, applies appropriate concepts to cases, considers contextual factors and alternative explanations, and provides justified conclusions without unsupported generalisations.

20–25 points: Comparison and analysis are generally accurate and relevant, with minor gaps in interpretation or justification.

12–19 points: Work identifies relevant concepts but remains mainly descriptive or applies theories inconsistently.

1–11 points: Work contains substantial theoretical errors, unsupported interpretations or weak connections to the case.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

c) Personality assessment interpretation and ethical analysis assignments – 20 points

17–20 points: The student accurately interprets the supplied information, considers reliability, validity and contextual suitability, recognises uncertainty and maintains appropriate ethical and professional boundaries.

13–16 points: Interpretation is generally accurate and identifies relevant limitations, with minor omissions.

8–12 points: Interpretation demonstrates basic understanding but gives insufficient attention to measurement limitations, context or ethical issues.

1–7 points: Interpretation contains substantial errors, unjustified labels or conclusions that exceed the available information.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

d) Research review and presentation – 20 points

17–20 points: The student selects relevant academic sources, accurately explains research questions, methods and findings, evaluates limitations and clearly presents conclusions supported by evidence.

13–16 points: The review and presentation are coherent and generally accurate, with minor gaps in critical appraisal or justification.

8–12 points: The review identifies basic findings but remains mainly descriptive, with limited methodological appraisal or integration of sources.

1–7 points: The review is fragmented, relies on unsuitable sources or substantially misinterprets findings.
0 points: No review is submitted.
e) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically examines their analytical decisions using course concepts and feedback, identifies specific limitations and proposes feasible improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in analysis or use of feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes learning activities, with limited evaluation or identification of improvements.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial or poorly connected to the learning task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Personality Psychology: Concepts, Research Questions and Methods
Topic 2. Psychodynamic and Neo-Psychodynamic Approaches to Personality
Topic 3. Dispositional Approaches: Personality Traits and the Big Five
Topic 4. Behavioural, Social-Cognitive and Cognitive Approaches
Topic 5. Humanistic and Existential Approaches
Topic 6. Transpersonal Approaches: Concepts, Evidence and Limitations
Topic 7. Integrative and Meta-Systemic Perspectives on Personality
Topic 8. Self-Awareness, Identity, Self-Concept and Self-Presentation
Topic 9. Motivation, Agency and Self-Regulation
Topic 10. Personality Development, Stability and Change Across the Lifespan
Topic 11. Personality in Cultural, Social and Situational Contexts
Topic 12. Personality Resources, Coping, Resilience and Adaptation
Topic 13. Personality Assessment: Interpretation, Evidence and Ethical Boundaries

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Funder, D. C. (2024). *The personality puzzle* (9th ed.). W. W. Norton & Company.
2. Matviichuk, T. V. (2021). *Teorii osobystosti u zarubizhnii ta ukrainskii psykholohii* [Personality theories in international and Ukrainian psychology]. Marchenko T. V.
Mitina, S. V. (2020). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality psychology]. Lira-K.

Recommended reading

1. Bühler, J. L., Orth, U., Bleidorn, W., Weber, E., Kretzschmar, A., Scheling, L., & Hopwood, C. J. (2024). Life events and personality change: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Personality, 38*(3), 544–568.
2. John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (Eds.). (2021). *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (4th ed.). Guilford Press.
3. Kopets, L. V. (2007). *Psykholohiia osobystosti* [Personality psychology]. Vydavnychyi dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia".
4. McAdams, D. P., & McLean, K. C. (2013). Narrative identity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*(3), 233–238.
5. Rybalka, V. V. (2006). *Teorii osobystosti u vitchyznianii psykholohii* [Personality theories in Ukrainian psychology]. IPPPO APN Ukrainy.
6. Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(1), 117–143.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.apa.org
2. Society for Personality and Social Psychology. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.spsp.org
3. European Association of Personality Psychology. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.eapp.org
4. International Association of Applied Psychology. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.iaapsy.org
5. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://npa-ua.org

LOGOTHERAPY AND EXISTENTIAL ANALYSIS

The course aims to develop students' understanding of Viktor Frankl's logotherapy and existential analysis and their ability to explain its key concepts, analyse meaning-related concerns and critically examine relevant theoretical and empirical sources. Students develop introductory skills in meaning-oriented communication and planning support strategies for fictional cases through structured educational simulations. The course emphasises ethical reasoning, respect for individual values and cultural contexts, and recognition of the limitations of available evidence and undergraduate competence.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5	5 / Elective	Viktoriia Bykova, PhD (Pedagogy), Associate Professor	150 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 110 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the theoretical foundations and key concepts of Frankl's logotherapy and existential analysis, including freedom of will, will to meaning, responsibility, self-distancing and self-transcendence.	Interactive lectures, guided reading of primary texts, conceptual mapping, structured discussions	Conceptual map explanations; discussion contributions; method-comparison assignments (CAS)
2) Compare selected logotherapeutic methods, including paradoxical intention, dereflection and meaning-oriented dialogue, in terms of their rationale, purposes, limitations and requirements for professional application.	Interactive lectures, comparative analysis of sources, teacher demonstrations, structured discussions	Method-comparison and case analysis assignments; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse meaning-related concerns in fictional or anonymised cases, considering personal resources, relationships, situational constraints and alternative interpretations.	Problem-based learning, contextual case analysis, small-group work, analytical discussions	Case analysis assignments and proposed explanations; discussion contributions (CAS)
4) Demonstrate basic meaning-oriented communication skills in educational simulations, including attentive listening, exploratory questioning and respectful clarification of values and concerns.	Teacher demonstrations, structured role plays, communication exercises, guided feedback	Assessed educational simulations and accompanying explanations (CAS)
5) Develop and justify a preliminary meaning-oriented support plan for a fictional case, recognising individual preferences, ethical boundaries, limits of competence and circumstances requiring supervision or referral.	Planning workshops, ethical case discussions, scaffolded support-plan development, peer feedback	Preliminary support plan and presentation; ethical justification within the practical assignment (CAS)
6) Critically evaluate selected research on logotherapy and meaning-oriented approaches, distinguishing theoretical assumptions, personal	Guided research appraisal, independent source analysis, research	Research review and presentation (CAS)

narratives and empirical findings, and communicate justified conclusions.	discussions, presentations, peer feedback	
7) Evaluate their analytical and communication decisions using course concepts and feedback, identifying ethical issues and specific areas for further professional development.	Structured reflection, analysis of simulation feedback, discussion of ethical dilemmas, reflective writing	Reflective assignments (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester: 20 points for discussion contributions and conceptual map explanations; 30 points for method-comparison and case analysis assignments; 20 points for educational simulations and a preliminary support plan; 20 points for a research review and its presentation; and 10 points for reflective assignments.

Assessment criteria

a) Discussion contributions and conceptual map explanations – 20 points

17–20 points: The student explains relevant concepts accurately, identifies meaningful relationships between them, supports arguments with appropriate sources and responds constructively to alternative perspectives.

13–16 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally clear conceptual connections, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.

8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but explanations are mainly descriptive or connections between concepts are insufficiently justified.

1–7 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors, unsupported statements or limited relevant reasoning.

0 points: No assessable contribution or explanation.

b) Method-comparison and case analysis assignments – 30 points

26–30 points: The student accurately compares the rationale, purposes and limitations of selected methods; applies relevant concepts to cases; considers personal resources and contextual constraints; and provides justified interpretations without unsupported clinical conclusions.

20–25 points: Comparison and case analysis are generally accurate and relevant, with minor gaps in interpretation, consideration of context or justification.

12–19 points: Work identifies relevant concepts but remains mainly descriptive, compares methods incompletely or applies theoretical explanations inconsistently.

1–11 points: Work contains substantial theoretical errors, inappropriate proposed applications or weak connections between concepts and case information.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

c) Educational simulations and a preliminary support plan – 20 points

This component comprises an educational communication simulation and its explanation (10 points) and a preliminary support plan for a fictional case with its presentation (10 points).

17–20 points: The student demonstrates attentive listening, relevant exploratory questioning and respect for individual values; develops a coherent support plan grounded in case information; and clearly recognises ethical boundaries, competence limits and the need for supervision or referral.

13–16 points: Communication and planning are generally appropriate and justified, with minor omissions in questioning, consideration of resources or identification of professional limitations.

8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic communication skills and proposes a partially relevant plan, but justification is limited or important contextual and ethical considerations are insufficiently addressed.

1–7 points: Communication is leading, judgemental or insufficiently responsive to the case; the proposed plan is poorly justified or exceeds appropriate competence boundaries.

0 points: No assessable practical work is completed.

d) Research review and presentation – 20 points
17–20 points: The student selects relevant academic sources, accurately explains research questions, methods and findings, distinguishes empirical evidence from theoretical claims and personal narratives, evaluates limitations and presents justified conclusions.
13–16 points: The review and presentation are coherent and generally accurate, with minor gaps in methodological appraisal, comparison of sources or justification.
8–12 points: The review identifies basic findings but remains mainly descriptive, with limited evaluation of methods, evidence or limitations.
1–7 points: The review is fragmented, relies on unsuitable sources or substantially misinterprets theoretical claims or research findings.
0 points: No review is submitted.
e) Reflective assignments – 10 points
9–10 points: The student critically examines analytical and communication decisions using course concepts and feedback, identifies specific ethical or professional limitations and proposes feasible improvements.
7–8 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in analysis or use of feedback.
4–6 points: Reflection mainly describes learning activities, with limited evaluation of decisions or identification of improvements.
1–3 points: Reflection is superficial, unsupported or poorly connected to the learning task.
0 points: No assessable reflection is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations and Development of Frankl's Logotherapy and Existential Analysis
Topic 2. The Human Person: Somatic, Psychological and Noetic Dimensions
Topic 3. Freedom, Responsibility, Self-Distancing and Self-Transcendence
Topic 4. Will to Meaning, Values and Meaning in Everyday Life
Topic 5. Existential Frustration, Existential Vacuum and Meaning-Related Concerns
Topic 6. Meaning-Oriented Communication and Dialogue
Topic 7. Paradoxical Intention and Dereflection: Rationale, Applications and Limitations
Topic 8. Meaning in Relationships, Study, Work and Decision-Making
Topic 9. Suffering, Loss and Uncertainty: Resources, Support and Ethical Boundaries
Topic 10. Research Evidence, Case-Based Support Planning and Professional Reflection

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bykova, V. O. (2023). *Slovnyk lohoterapevtychnykh terminiv* [Dictionary of logotherapeutic terms]. Aktsent PP.
2. Frankl, V. E. (2006). *Man's search for meaning*. Beacon Press.
3. Frankl, V. E. (2014). *The will to meaning: Foundations and applications of logotherapy*. Plume.

Recommended reading

1. Batthyány, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Logotherapy and existential analysis: Proceedings of the Viktor Frankl Institute Vienna* (Vol. 1). Springer.
2. Fabry, J. B. (2024). *Prahnennia do sensu: Viktor Frankl, lohoterapiia ta zhyttia* [The pursuit of meaning: Viktor Frankl, logotherapy, and life]. Seredniak T. K.
3. Frankl, V. E. (2023). *Likar ta dusha. Osnovy lohoterapii* [The doctor and the soul: Foundations of logotherapy]. KSD.
4. Frankl, V. E. (2025). *Vidchuttia vtraty sensu. Vyklyk psykhoterapii ta filosofii* [The feeling of meaninglessness: A challenge to psychotherapy and philosophy]. Art-Pres.
5. Marshall, E., & Marshall, M. (2024a). *Lohoterapiia ta ekzystentsiinyi analiz v upravlinni moralnoiu travmoiu* [Logotherapy and existential analysis in addressing moral injury]. Seredniak T. K.
6. Marshall, E., & Marshall, M. (2024b). *Lohoterapiia v tezakh* [Logotherapy in key points]. IntrolihaTOR.
7. Purjo, T. (2022). *Dukhovni mozhlyvosti lohoteorii Viktora Frankla* [The spiritual capabilities of Viktor Frankl's logotheory]. UALEA.
8. Russo-Netzer, P., Schulenberg, S. E., & Batthyány, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Clinical perspectives on meaning: Positive and existential psychotherapy*. Springer.

Web-resources

1. Viktor Frankl Institute Vienna. (n.d.). *Logotherapy and existential analysis*. https://www.viktorfrankl.org/logotherapy.html

2. Viktor Frankl Institute Vienna. (n.d.). *Logotherapy bibliography: Books*. https://www.viktorfrankl.org/php/bibE_books.php

3. Viktor Frankl Institute Vienna. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.viktorfrankl.org

GENDER PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological theories and research on gender identity, gender roles, stereotypes, socialisation, and gender-related behaviour. Students learn to analyse gender similarities and differences, examine the influence of social and cultural contexts on psychological well-being, and critically evaluate gender-related research and representations in digital media. The course develops introductory skills in gender-sensitive communication, case analysis, and the design of evidence-informed psychoeducational and preventive activities, with attention to equality, non-discrimination, ethical principles, and the limits of undergraduate competence.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	5/14 weeks	5 / elective	Alina Yudina, PhD in Psychology	150 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h., seminars/practical, 110 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain and compare major psychological approaches to gender identity, gender roles and gender socialisation, distinguishing gender identity, gender expression, sex-related characteristics and sexual orientation.			Interactive lectures, guided reading, conceptual mapping, comparative theoretical discussions	Conceptual explanations and discussion contributions; theoretical comparison tasks within case analysis assignments (CAS)
2) Critically evaluate claims about gender similarities and differences, considering research methods, effect sizes, within-group variation, contextual influences and limitations of generalisation.			Guided research appraisal, analysis of research summaries, comparative exercises, structured discussions, presentation preparation and peer feedback	Research review and presentation; discussion contributions (CAS)
3) Analyse gender stereotypes, discrimination and inequality in interpersonal, educational, professional and digital contexts, explaining their possible psychological consequences.			Contextual case analysis, problem-based learning, analysis of media materials, small-group discussions	Case analysis and situational assignments (CAS)
4) Analyse relationships between gender-related experiences, social conditions and psychological well-being, recognising individual resources, intersecting social factors and the limits of available evidence.			Interactive lectures, research-informed case analysis, guided research appraisal, contextual comparison, analytical discussions, presentation preparation	Case analysis assignments; research review and presentation (CAS)
5) Demonstrate respectful, inclusive and gender-sensitive communication in educational simulations involving diverse identities, experiences and cultural backgrounds.			Teacher demonstrations, role plays, communication exercises, guided feedback	Assessed communication simulations (CAS)
6) Design and justify a small-scale gender-			Project-based learning,	Programme proposal,

sensitive psychoeducational or preventive programme, develop an accompanying educational product for a defined audience, and propose a feasible approach to evaluating its intended outcomes.	programme-design workshops, audience analysis, evaluation-planning exercises, peer review, presentation and revision of materials	including an evaluation plan, and accompanying psychoeducational product (CAS)
7) Evaluate ethical issues and their own analytical and communication decisions, using academic evidence and feedback to identify feasible improvements.	Ethical case discussions, structured reflection, analysis of feedback, reflective writing	Ethical justification within case and project assignments; reflective commentary accompanying communication simulations (CAS)

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
20 points for discussion contributions and conceptual explanations;
25 points for case analysis and situational assignments;
25 points for a psychoeducational or preventive programme and accompanying product;
20 points for a research review and its presentation;
10 points for communication simulations and reflective commentary.
Assessment criteria
a) Discussion contributions and conceptual explanations – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains and distinguishes relevant concepts, compares theoretical perspectives, supports arguments with academic sources and responds constructively to alternative interpretations.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and generally well-supported explanations, with minor conceptual inaccuracies or omissions.
8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but contributions are mainly descriptive or insufficiently supported by evidence.
1–7 points: Contributions contain substantial conceptual errors, stereotypical generalisations or limited relevant reasoning.
0 points: No assessable contribution or explanation.
b) Case analysis and situational assignments – 25 points
22–25 points: The student provides a structured, theoretically grounded analysis; identifies relevant stereotypes, contextual influences and possible discriminatory practices; considers alternative explanations and individual resources; and proposes justified responses within appropriate professional boundaries.
17–21 points: Analysis and proposed responses are generally accurate and relevant, with minor gaps in contextual interpretation, theoretical justification or ethical consideration.
10–16 points: Work identifies some relevant issues but remains mainly descriptive, applies concepts inconsistently or gives insufficient attention to context and alternative explanations.
1–9 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors, unsupported assumptions, stereotypical interpretations or poorly justified responses.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Psychoeducational or preventive programme and accompanying product – 25 points
This component comprises a programme proposal (15 points) and an accompanying psychoeducational product (10 points). The proposal and product are assessed separately for their respective purposes.
The programme proposal specifies the audience, identified need, objectives, activities, resources, ethical considerations and a feasible approach to evaluating intended learning outcomes. The product may be an informational leaflet, educational presentation, brief video script, workshop material or another justified format. Implementation with actual participants is not required.

Programme proposal – 15 points
13–15 points: The proposal is coherent, evidence-informed and appropriate for the intended audience; objectives, activities and evaluation are aligned; inclusion, accessibility and ethical boundaries are clearly addressed.
10–12 points: The proposal is relevant and generally coherent, with minor gaps in justification, feasibility or alignment.
6–9 points: The proposal contains basic elements but has unclear objectives, weak links between activities and outcomes, or insufficient attention to the audience and ethical issues.
1–5 points: The proposal is fragmented, poorly justified or impractical, or contains substantial conceptual or ethical problems.
0 points: No proposal is submitted.
Psychoeducational product – 10 points
9–10 points: The product communicates accurate, evidence-informed content clearly and accessibly; matches the programme objectives and audience; uses respectful language and appropriately acknowledges sources.
7–8 points: The product is relevant and generally accurate, with minor limitations in clarity, accessibility or integration with the programme.
4–6 points: The product communicates basic information but has limited coherence, weak audience adaptation or insufficient source support.
1–3 points: The product is incomplete, unclear or contains substantial inaccuracies or stereotypical messages.
0 points: No product is submitted.
d) Research review and presentation – 20 points
17–20 points: The student selects relevant academic research, accurately explains its questions, methods and findings, evaluates limitations and contextual applicability, distinguishes group-level findings from individual prediction, and presents justified conclusions.
13–16 points: The review and presentation are coherent and generally accurate, with minor gaps in methodological appraisal, comparison of findings or justification.
8–12 points: The review identifies basic findings but remains mainly descriptive, with limited evaluation of methods, contextual influences or generalisation.
1–7 points: The review relies on unsuitable sources, substantially misinterprets findings or presents unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No review is submitted.
e) Communication simulations and reflective commentary – 10 points
This component comprises a communication simulation (5 points) and a reflective commentary (5 points).
Communication simulation – 5 points
5 points: The student demonstrates attentive listening, respectful and context-appropriate language, clarification without assumptions, and an appropriate response to biased or discriminatory statements.
3–4 points: Communication is generally respectful and appropriate, with minor inconsistencies or missed opportunities for clarification.
1–2 points: Communication demonstrates limited responsiveness or contains unexamined assumptions, with insufficient application of gender-sensitive principles.
0 points: No assessable simulation is completed.
Reflective commentary – 5 points
5 points: The student evaluates specific analytical or communication decisions using course concepts and feedback, identifies limitations and proposes feasible improvements.
3–4 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with some limitations in analysis or use of feedback.
1–2 points: Reflection mainly describes the activity and provides little evaluation or justification.
0 points: No assessable commentary is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Gender Psychology: Key Concepts, Research Questions and Ethical Principles
Topic 2. Psychological Theories of Gender: Social Learning, Cognitive and Social Role Approaches
Topic 3. Gender Identity, Gender Expression and Development Across the Lifespan
Topic 4. Gender Socialisation, Family, Education and Cultural Contexts
Topic 5. Gender Stereotypes, Bias and Social Expectations
Topic 6. Gender Similarities and Differences: Research Methods, Evidence and Limitations
Topic 7. Gender-Sensitive Communication and Interpersonal Relationships
Topic 8. Gender in Professional Activity, Career Development and Leadership
Topic 9. Discrimination, Inequality, Harassment and Gender-Based Violence: Psychological Implications
Topic 10. Gender, Mental Health, Coping and Psychological Resources
Topic 11. Gender in Digital Environments and Media Representations
Topic 12. Designing and Evaluating Gender-Sensitive Psychoeducational and Preventive Activities

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*. Yale University Press.

2. Bohdan, Zh. B., & Movchan, Ya. O. (2021). *Henderna psykholohiia* [Gender psychology]. Drukarnia Madryd.

3. Panchuk, N. P. (2026). *Henderna psykholohiia* [Gender psychology] (2nd ed., revised and expanded). SBA-Print.

Recommended reading

1. American Psychological Association. (2018). *APA guidelines for psychological practice with girls and women*.

2. Bao, C., & Han, L. (2025). Gender difference in anxiety and related factors among adolescents. *Frontiers in Public Health, 12*, Article 1410086.

3. Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2012). Social role theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 458–476). SAGE.

4. Hovorun, T. V., & Kikiniez hdi, O. M. (2004). *Henderna psykholohiia* [Gender psychology]. Akademiia.

5. Hyde, J. S. (2014). Gender similarities and differences. *Annual Review of Psychology, 65*, 373–398.

6. Maierchyk, M., Plakhotnik, O., & Yarmanova, H. (Eds.). (2017). *Hender dlia medii: Pidruchnyk iz hendernoi teorii dlia zhurnalistyky ta inshykh sotsiohumanitarnykh spetsialnostei* [Gender for media: A textbook on gender theory for journalism and other social sciences and humanities] (3rd ed.). Krytyka.

7. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2005). *Pro zabezpechennia rivnykh prav ta mozhlyvostei zhinok i cholovikiv* [On ensuring equal rights and opportunities for women and men] (Law No. 2866-IV).

8. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2017). *Pro zapobihannia ta protydiiu domashnomu nasylstvu* [On prevention and counteraction to domestic violence] (Law No. 2229-VIII).

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.apa.org

2. Council of Europe. (n.d.). *Gender equality*. https://www.coe.int/en/web/genderequality

3. European Institute for Gender Equality. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://eige.europa.eu

4. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.oecd.org

5. PubMed. (n.d.). *Literature database*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

6. UN Women. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.unwomen.org

7. UNFPA Ukraine. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://ukraine.unfpa.org

8. World Health Organization. (n.d.). *Official website*. https://www.who.int

CRISIS TELEPHONE COUNSELING

The course aims to develop students' knowledge of crisis telephone counseling and introductory skills in providing structured, ethical, and responsive telephone support. Students explore the opportunities and limitations of telephone communication, practice active listening and basic crisis intervention techniques, and analyze ethical dilemmas and callers' diverse needs. Through guided simulations, students learn to recognize indications of possible suicide risk, follow a provided response protocol, and identify when consultation, referral, or emergency escalation is required. The course also develops students' ability to use research evidence, reflect on their performance, and plan measures to prevent professional burnout.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6/14 weeks	4 / elective	Oxana Bayer, PhD (Psychology), Associate Professor	120 hours (20 h. lectures, 20 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main principles, stages, opportunities, and limitations of crisis telephone counseling.	Interactive lectures; guided reading; comparison of counseling formats; analysis of model telephone conversations.	Knowledge tests and ethical case analysis: questions on theoretical foundations and the structure of a crisis call (CAS).
2) Apply ethical principles concerning confidentiality, informed consent, professional boundaries, and the limits of competence to telephone counseling scenarios.	Ethical case discussions; guided analysis of professional codes and applicable requirements; problem-based exercises.	Knowledge tests and ethical case analysis: written responses to ethical dilemmas (CAS).
3) Demonstrate active listening, empathic responses, clarification, summarizing, and basic stabilization techniques in a structured simulated telephone conversation.	Instructor demonstrations; paired and small-group role plays; skills rehearsal; observation using checklists; formative feedback.	Simulated telephone counseling conversations assessed using a performance rubric (CAS).
4) Identify indications of possible suicide risk in a fictional case or simulated call, select appropriate actions according to a provided protocol, including consultation, referral, and emergency escalation, and prepare brief factual case notes.	Guided analysis of fictional cases; protocol-based exercises; scenario simulations; preparation of brief case notes and referral decisions.	Protocol-based crisis response and referral assignments (CAS).
5) Adapt communication to callers' circumstances, communication needs, and social and cultural backgrounds while maintaining respectful professional boundaries.	Case discussions; perspective-taking exercises; role plays involving diverse callers and complex communication situations; peer feedback.	Simulated telephone counseling conversations: assessment of communication adaptations and boundary management (CAS).

6) Summarize research findings on telephone counseling or crisis line services and explain their practical implications and limitations.	Guided literature searches; structured reading of research articles; small-group discussion; preparation and presentation of an evidence review.	Evidence reviews and short presentation (CAS).
7) Analyze their performance in a simulated conversation and develop a realistic plan for further learning, supervision, and burnout prevention.	Structured reflection; instructor-led debriefing; analysis of feedback; guided planning of professional development and self-care.	Reflective report and professional development plan (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment

Assessment is based on a 100-point scale and consists entirely of continuous assessment (CAS). The final grade comprises:

Knowledge tests and ethical case analysis – 20 points.

Simulated telephone counseling conversations – 30 points.

Protocol-based crisis response and referral assignments – 20 points.

Evidence review and short presentation – 20 points.

Reflective report and professional development plan – 10 points.

Assessment criteria

a) Knowledge tests and ethical case analysis – maximum 20 points

17–20 points: The student accurately explains the principles and stages of crisis telephone counseling, identifies ethical issues, and justifies appropriate responses with reference to confidentiality, professional boundaries, and competence limits.

13–16 points: The student demonstrates a sound understanding of the material and proposes generally appropriate responses, with minor inaccuracies or insufficient justification.

9–12 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge but provides incomplete explanations and identifies only some of the relevant ethical issues.

1–8 points: The student demonstrates substantial gaps in knowledge and provides inaccurate or poorly justified responses.

0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

b) Simulated telephone counseling conversations – maximum 30 points

25–30 points: The student maintains a coherent conversation structure, demonstrates active listening and empathy, uses appropriate basic stabilization techniques, adapts communication to the caller's needs, and maintains professional boundaries.

19–24 points: The student demonstrates the main counseling skills effectively, with occasional difficulties in structuring the conversation, adapting responses, or identifying appropriate next steps.

13–18 points: The student demonstrates basic communication skills, but responses are inconsistent, insufficiently responsive to the caller, or require substantial prompting.

1–12 points: The student demonstrates significant difficulties in listening, structuring the conversation, responding appropriately, or maintaining boundaries.

0 points: The assessed simulations are not completed.

c) Protocol-based crisis response and referral assignments – maximum 20 points

17–20 points: The student identifies relevant warning signs, selects and sequences appropriate actions according to the provided protocol, justifies consultation or referral decisions, and prepares concise, factual case notes.

13–16 points: The student identifies the main concerns and generally follows the protocol, with minor omissions in reasoning, sequencing, or documentation.

9–12 points: The student recognizes some concerns but provides an incomplete response, insufficient justification, or unclear documentation.

1–8 points: The student overlooks important information or proposes actions inconsistent with the provided protocol and competence limits.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
d) Evidence review and short presentation – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student uses relevant academic sources, accurately summarizes findings, identifies limitations, and explains appropriate implications for telephone counseling. The presentation is clear and correctly referenced.
13–16 points: The review is accurate and relevant, but the discussion of limitations or practical implications requires further development.
9–12 points: The review is mainly descriptive, with limited comparison, insufficient discussion of evidence, or referencing inaccuracies.
1–8 points: The review contains substantial inaccuracies, relies on unsuitable sources, or provides unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
e) Reflective report and professional development plan – maximum 10 points
9–10 points: The student analyzes specific examples from their performance, constructively uses feedback, and proposes realistic learning goals, consultation needs, and burnout prevention measures.
7–8 points: The student identifies relevant strengths and areas for improvement and proposes a generally realistic development plan.
5–6 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, and the proposed development measures are general or only partly connected to performance.
1–4 points: Reflection is superficial, makes limited use of feedback, or lacks a feasible development plan.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations and Development of Crisis Telephone Counseling
Topic 2. Ethics, Confidentiality, Legal Requirements, and Professional Boundaries
Topic 3. Telephone Communication and the Structure of a Crisis Call
Topic 4. Active Listening, Empathic Responses, and Basic Stabilization
Topic 5. Diversity, Intersectionality, and Accessible Communication
Topic 6. Complex Calls and Communication Difficulties
Topic 7. Suicide Prevention: Warning Signs and Protocol-Based Responses
Topic 8. Gatekeeping, Referral, and Emergency Escalation
Topic 9. Case Documentation and Continuity of Support
Topic 10. Research Evidence and Quality in Crisis Telephone Counseling
Topic 11. Reflective Practice, Supervision, and Burnout Prevention

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Chernobrovkina, V., Siqveland, J., & Lorentzen, K. E. A. (2022). *Suitsydolohiia i preventsiia suitsydu* [Suicidology and suicide prevention] (V. Chernobrovkina, Ed.). Dyskursus, 78 p.

2. Fedorenko, R. P. (2025). *Psykholohiia suitsydu* [Psychology of suicide] (3rd revised and expanded ed.). Vezha-Druk. 520 p.

3. Jackson-Cherry, L. R., & Erford, B. T. (2024). *Crisis assessment, intervention, and prevention* (4th ed.). Pearson.

4. James, R. K., Whisenhunt, J., & Myer, R. (2025). *Crisis intervention strategies* (9th ed.). Cengage.

5. Mahdysiuk, L. I., & Fedorenko, R. P. (2025). *Osnovy psykholohichnoho konsultuvannia* [Fundamentals of psychological counseling] (2nd revised and expanded ed.). Vezha-Druk. 356 p.

6. Sulitskyi, V. V., & Shved, O. V. (2023). *Konsultuvannia v sotsialnii roboti* [Counseling in social work]. Vydavnychyi dim ‘Vinichenko’.

Recommended reading

1. Donkin, V., Clarkin, C., Gambin, A., Sanches, M., VanderSluis, K., & Crawford, A. (2025). Enhancing equity on crisis lines: Understanding the background, practices and learning needs of responders in Canada. *Community Mental Health Journal, 61*, 860–873.

2. Hoffberg, A. S., Stearns-Yoder, K. A., & Brenner, L. A. (2020). The effectiveness of crisis line services: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Public Health, 7*, Article 399.

3. Pashko, T., & Hlichenko, O. (2023). *Telefonne konsultuvannia: Pamiatka dlia pratsivnykiv na mistsiakh* [Telephone counseling: A guide for field workers] (V. Chernobrovkina, Ed.). National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. 16 p.

4. Shved, O. V. (2024). Pidhotovka sotsialnykh pratsivnykiv dlia dystantsiinoho konsultuvannia [Preparing social workers for distance counseling]. [Conference contribution]. *Aktualni pytannia rozvytku osobystosti: Suchasnist, innovatsii, perspektyvy*, Zhytomyr, Ukraine, April 4, 2024.

5. Voitovych, M. V., & Lupanets, O. M. (2024). Telefonne y onlain konsultuvannia yak vazhlyvi formy psykhofiziolohichnoho zabezpechennia zhyttiestiikosti ukraintsiv pid chas viiny [Telephone and online counseling as important forms of psychophysiological support for Ukrainians' resilience during wartime]. *Aktualni problemy psykholohii*, *5*(24), 37–47.

6. Willems, R., Drossaert, C., & Vuijk, P. (2020). Impact of crisis line volunteering on mental wellbeing and the associated factors: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(5), Article 1641.

7. World Health Organization. (2021). *LIVE LIFE: An implementation guide for suicide prevention in countries*.

Web-resources

1. International Federation of Telephone Emergency Services (IFOTES). International norms of listening services. https://www.ifotes.org/en/about

2. National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Centre for Mental Health. Onlain-kurs "Profilaktyka samohubstv" [Online course "Suicide prevention"]. https://kmarehab.com/onlayn-kurs-profilaktyka-samohubstv/

3. Ukrainian Union of Psychotherapists. Etychnyi kodeks [Ethical code]. https://usp.community/documentation/40-etychnyy-kodeks

4. Ukrainian Union of Psychotherapists. Sektsiia telefonnoho konsultuvannia [Telephone Counseling Section]. https://usp.community/section/sektsiia-telefonnoho-konsultuvannia/pro-sektsiiu

5. World Health Organization. LIVE LIFE initiative for suicide prevention. https://www.who.int/initiatives/live-life-initiative-for-suicide-prevention/

TECHNIQUES FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL INTERVENTION AND PERSONAL RECOVERY IN CHALLENGING LIFE SITUATIONS				
The course aims to develop students' knowledge of psychological responses to challenging life situations and introductory practical skills in psychological support, emotional stabilization, and recovery-oriented practice. Students explore stress, crisis, loss, uncertainty, traumatic experiences, and adaptation difficulties. Through case analysis and guided simulations, they learn to identify support needs and coping resources, select basic intervention techniques, communicate sensitively, and recognize when referral or consultation is required. The course also develops students' ability to design psychoeducational activities, evaluate research evidence, apply ethical and trauma-informed principles, and plan strategies for professional recovery, self-care, and burnout prevention.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6/14 weeks	4 / elective	Ruslan Ilchenko, Ph.D., Associate Professor	120 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. seminars/practical, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain psychological responses to stress, crisis, loss, uncertainty, and traumatic experiences and analyze their implications for psychological support.			Interactive lectures; guided reading; case analysis; comparison of psychological responses; analytical discussions.	Case analysis; situational tasks (CAS).
2) Identify emotional support needs, coping resources, and indications requiring referral or consultation in fictional cases using structured information-gathering procedures.			Case-based learning; guided interview exercises; observation tasks; demonstrations of structured information gathering; referral decision exercises.	Case analysis; situational tasks (CAS).
3) Select and demonstrate basic emotional stabilization, grounding, and self-regulation techniques appropriate to a fictional person's needs and the limits of the helping role.			Instructor demonstrations; skills rehearsal; guided practical exercises; role plays; feedback using observation checklists.	Practical demonstrations; intervention simulations (CAS).
4) Demonstrate active listening, empathic responses, and culturally sensitive communication in simulated supportive interactions with individuals experiencing distress.			Communication exercises; paired and small-group role plays; simulations involving diverse needs and circumstances; peer and instructor feedback.	Practical demonstrations; intervention simulations (CAS).
5) Develop and justify a structured psychoeducational or supportive activity addressing the needs of a specified individual or group in a challenging life situation.			Project-based learning; analysis of model activities; design workshops; collaborative discussion; guided independent preparation; project presentations and feedback.	Psychoeducational or supportive activity project; presentation (CAS).
6) Compare research findings on psychological intervention and recovery			Guided literature searches; structured reading of research	Evidence review (CAS).

support and explain their practical implications and limitations.	articles; comparison of intervention approaches; critical appraisal exercises; evaluation of selected digital resources.	
7) Apply ethical and trauma-informed principles to decisions about consent, confidentiality, communication, professional boundaries, and referral in fictional helping situations.	Ethical dilemma analysis; problem-based exercises; guided examination of professional principles; simulations and structured debriefing.	Case analysis; situational tasks; practical demonstrations; intervention simulations (CAS).
8) Analyze their performance in learning activities and develop a realistic plan for professional recovery, self-care, further learning, and appropriate use of supervision or consultation.	Structured reflection; analysis of feedback; guided discussion of professional demands; professional recovery and wellbeing planning.	Reflective report; professional recovery plan (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based on a 100-point scale and consists entirely of continuous assessment (CAS):
Case analysis and situational tasks – 20 points.
Practical demonstrations and intervention simulations – 30 points.
Psychoeducational or supportive activity project and presentation – 20 points.
Evidence review – 20 points.
Reflective report and professional recovery plan – 10 points.
Each assessment component is graded separately, without double counting. Practical assessment uses fictional scenarios.
Assessment criteria
a) Case analysis and situational tasks – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains relevant psychological responses, identifies support needs and coping resources, and justifies appropriate support or referral decisions. Ethical considerations and competence limits are clearly addressed.
13–16 points: The student provides a generally accurate analysis and appropriate recommendations, with minor omissions in interpretation, ethical reasoning, or justification.
9–12 points: The analysis identifies some relevant needs and resources but remains mainly descriptive. Recommendations are only partly justified.
1–8 points: The analysis contains substantial inaccuracies, overlooks important needs, or proposes poorly justified actions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted, or the work does not demonstrate achievement of the assessed learning outcomes.
b) Practical demonstrations and intervention simulations – maximum 30 points
25–30 points: The student selects appropriate basic techniques, explains their purpose, seeks agreement before proceeding, and demonstrates them clearly. Communication is empathic, culturally sensitive, and responsive to the person’s needs. Ethical and professional boundaries are maintained.
19–24 points: The student demonstrates the main techniques and communication skills appropriately, with occasional difficulties in sequencing, explanation, or adaptation.
13–18 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but requires substantial prompting or provides insufficient explanation and adaptation.
1–12 points: The student demonstrates significant difficulties in selecting or performing techniques, responding to the person’s needs, or maintaining appropriate boundaries.
0 points: No assessable performance is demonstrated.
c) Psychoeducational or supportive activity project and presentation – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The project addresses clearly specified needs and includes coherent objectives, an appropriate sequence of activities, justified techniques, and a feasible approach to obtaining feedback. Ethical, cultural, and accessibility considerations are addressed. The presentation clearly explains and

justifies the proposed activity.
13–16 points: The project is relevant and generally coherent, with minor weaknesses in justification, adaptation, feasibility, or evaluation.
9–12 points: The project has a basic structure, but objectives, activities, or feedback procedures are insufficiently connected or developed.
1–8 points: The project is fragmented, poorly justified, or insufficiently responsive to the intended participants' needs.
0 points: No assessable project is submitted.
d) Evidence review – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student selects relevant academic sources, accurately compares findings, identifies methodological limitations, and draws appropriately qualified implications for psychological intervention and recovery support.
13–16 points: The review uses relevant sources and accurately explains the main findings, but comparison or discussion of limitations requires further development.
9–12 points: The review is mainly descriptive, with limited comparison, incomplete interpretation, or referencing inaccuracies.
1–8 points: The review relies on unsuitable sources, substantially misinterprets findings, or presents unsupported conclusions.
0 points: No assessable review is submitted.
e) Reflective report and professional recovery plan – maximum 10 points
9–10 points: The student analyzes specific examples from learning activities, constructively uses feedback, and develops realistic goals and actions for professional recovery, self-care, further learning, and consultation or supervision.
7–8 points: The student identifies relevant strengths and areas for development and proposes a generally realistic professional recovery plan.
5–6 points: Reflection is mainly descriptive, and planned actions are general or only partly connected to identified professional needs.
1–4 points: Reflection is superficial, makes limited use of feedback, or lacks a feasible professional recovery plan.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations and Scope of Psychological Intervention and Recovery Support
Topic 2. Stress, Psychological Crisis, and Adaptation to Challenging Life Situations
Topic 3. Identification of Support Needs, Coping Resources, and Referral Requirements
Topic 4. Resource-Oriented and Strengths-Based Approaches
Topic 5. Emotional Stabilization, Grounding, and Self-Regulation Techniques
Topic 6. Psychological First Aid and Basic Supportive Communication
Topic 7. Ethics, Professional Boundaries, and Trauma-Informed Practice
Topic 8. Psychological Support in Situations of Loss, Grief, and Uncertainty
Topic 9. Developmentally Appropriate Support for Children, Adolescents, and Families
Topic 10. Designing Group-Based and Psychoeducational Activities
Topic 11. Research Evidence, Digital Resources, and Evaluation of Support Activities
Topic 12. Professional Recovery, Reflective Practice, Supervision, and Burnout Prevention

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Jackson-Cherry, L. R., & Erford, B. T. (2024). *Crisis assessment, intervention, and prevention* (4th ed.). Pearson.

2. James, R. K., Whisenhunt, J., & Myer, R. (2025). *Crisis intervention strategies* (9th ed.). Cengage.

3. Kuzikova, S. B., Zlyvkov, V. L., Lukomska, S. O., Shcherbak, T. I., & Kotukh, O. (2024). *Psykholohichnyi suprovid osobystosti v umovakh viiny* [Psychological support of the individual during wartime]. Vydavets PP Lysenko M. M. 260 p.

4. Mahdysiuk, L. I., & Fedorenko, R. P. (2025). *Osnovy psykholohichnoho konsultuvannia* [Fundamentals of psychological counseling] (2nd revised and expanded ed.). Vezha-Druk. 356 p.

5. Pasko, O. M., Prudka, L. M., & Matiienko, T. V. (2025). *Psykholohichna dopomoha osobam, yaki postrazhdaly vid viiny* [Psychological assistance to people affected by war]. Odesa State University of Internal Affairs. 176 p.

Recommended reading

1. Beck, J. S. (2020). *Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

2. Karamushka, L. M. (2022). *Psykhichne zdorovia osobystosti pid chas viiny: Yak yoho zberehty ta pidtrymaty: Metodychni rekomendatsii* [Personal mental health during wartime: How to preserve and support it: Methodological recommendations]. G. S. Kostiuk Institute of Psychology of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine. 52 p.

3. Maddox, G. A., Bodner, G. E., Christian, M. W., & Williamson, P. (2024). On the effectiveness of visual arts therapy for traumatic experiences: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 31*(4), Article e3041.

4. Redlener, I., Dudashvili, K., Viontsek, O., Grant, R., & Roca, E. (2025). Intervention for psychological trauma in children impacted by war in Ukraine. *JAMA Network Open, 8*(3), Article e253057.

5. Sodolevska, V. (2025). Enhancing psychological resilience and reducing maladaptation in war-exposed young adults: A randomized controlled trial in Ukraine. *Psychosomatic Medicine and General Practice, 10*(2).

6. Willems, R., Drossaert, C., & Vuijk, P. (2020). Impact of crisis line volunteering on mental wellbeing and the associated factors: A systematic review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(5), Article 1641.

7. World Health Organization. (2020). *Doing what matters in times of stress: An illustrated guide*.

8. World Health Organization. (2021). *Self-Help Plus (SH+): A group-based stress management course for adults*.

Web-resources

1. National Child Traumatic Stress Network. Psychological First Aid (PFA) Field Operations Guide: 2nd edition. https://nctsn.org/resources/psychological-first-aid-pfa-field-operations-guide-2nd-edition

2. National Child Traumatic Stress Network. Skills for Psychological Recovery (SPR) Field Operations Guide. https://nctsn.org/resources/skills-for-psychological-recovery

3. Ukrainian Union of Psychotherapists. Etychnyi kodeks [Ethical code]. https://usp.community/documentation/40-etychnyy-kodeks

4. Ukrainian Mental Health Programme “Ty yak?”. Samodopomoha [Self-help]. https://howareu.com/self-help

5. World Health Organization. Mental health in emergencies. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-in-emergencies

MATHEMATICAL METHODS IN PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' statistical literacy and practical skills in preparing, analyzing, and interpreting quantitative psychological data. Students explore psychological measurement, descriptive statistics, probability, sampling, estimation, and hypothesis testing. Through practical exercises and analysis of psychological research scenarios, they learn to select appropriate statistical methods, check relevant assumptions, perform introductory analyses using statistical software, and interpret findings in relation to research questions. Particular attention is paid to effect sizes, confidence intervals, the limitations of statistical inference, ethical data handling, and transparent reporting of results.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6/14 weeks	4 / elective	Olena Lavrentieva, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	120 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. seminars/practical, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain basic statistical concepts and solve introductory problems involving measurement scales, descriptive statistics, probability, sampling, and hypothesis testing.			Interactive lectures with questions and discussion; explanation of worked examples; guided problem solving; short written exercises; practice tests with feedback.	Oral responses; written tests; introductory statistical problem-solving tasks (CAS).
2) Prepare and describe a psychological dataset using appropriate coding procedures, descriptive statistics, tables, and graphs.			Instructor demonstrations; computer-based workshops; guided data-coding and cleaning exercises; calculation of descriptive statistics; construction and interpretation of tables and graphs.	Data-preparation tasks; descriptive-analysis assignments (CAS).
3) Select and justify statistical methods according to the research question, measurement scales, study design, and relevant assumptions.			Problem-based learning; analysis of research scenarios; comparison of alternative methods; preparation of analysis plans; discussion and written justification of statistical decisions.	Method-selection tasks; written analysis plans (CAS).
4) Perform basic correlation, group-comparison, and categorical-data analyses using statistical software and check relevant assumptions.			Step-by-step software demonstrations; guided computer-based exercises; independent analysis of teaching datasets; assumption-checking exercises; identification and correction of analytical errors.	Computer-based statistical analysis tasks; assumption-checking tasks (CAS).
5) Interpret statistical estimates, p-values, confidence intervals, and effect sizes, taking account of study design, statistical power, and multiple testing, and formulate			Guided interpretation of statistical output; worked examples illustrating statistical power and multiple testing; written	Statistical output interpretation tasks; statistical analysis project

appropriately qualified conclusions.	interpretation exercises; comparison and correction of misleading conclusions; feedback on students' interpretations.	and report (CAS).
6) Develop and implement a basic analysis plan for a provided psychological dataset and report the findings using appropriate statistical notation, tables, and figures.	Project-based learning; analysis-planning workshops; independent data analysis; examination of model reports; report-writing exercises; revision of draft reports following feedback.	Statistical analysis project and report (CAS).
7) Evaluate the suitability of statistical methods and the justification of conclusions in selected psychological research publications.	Guided critical reading; instructor demonstration of article appraisal; application of appraisal checklists; structured discussions of published findings; preparation of a written critique.	Critical appraisal of a research publication (CAS).
8) Apply principles of confidentiality, accurate reporting, and reproducibility when preparing data, conducting analyses, and presenting findings.	Ethical case discussions; practical exercises in removing identifying information; preparation of codebooks and analysis records; reproduction of analyses from saved files; documentation of data-processing decisions.	Data-preparation tasks; computer-based statistical analysis tasks; statistical analysis project and report (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based on a 100-point scale and consists entirely of continuous assessment (CAS). The final grade comprises:
Oral responses, written tests, and introductory statistical problem-solving tasks – 20 points;
Method-selection tasks and written analysis plans – 20 points;
Practical data-analysis assignments – 30 points;
Statistical analysis project and report – 20 points;
Critical appraisal of a research publication – 10 points.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses, written tests, and introductory statistical problem-solving tasks – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains statistical concepts, distinguishes measurement scales and types of analysis, solves introductory problems correctly, and interprets the results with clear reasoning.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates a sound understanding of the main concepts and generally solves problems correctly, with minor errors in calculation, explanation, or interpretation.
9–12 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge but provides incomplete explanations or makes recurring errors in solving problems.
1–8 points: The student demonstrates substantial conceptual gaps and frequent errors in calculations and interpretation.
0 points: No assessable responses are provided, or the responses do not demonstrate achievement of the assessed learning outcome.
Points for individual test questions and problems are specified in the task instructions. Oral responses are assessed for accuracy, clarity, and justification rather than frequency of participation.
b) Method-selection tasks and written analysis plans – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student correctly identifies the research question, measurement scales, and study design; selects suitable statistical methods; specifies relevant assumptions; and provides a coherent analysis plan with justified alternatives where necessary.
13–16 points: The student generally selects appropriate methods and prepares a workable analysis plan, with minor omissions in justification, assumptions, or sequencing.

9–12 points: The student identifies some relevant features of the research scenario, but method selection or the analysis plan is only partly justified.
1–8 points: The student selects inappropriate methods, overlooks essential features of the study design, or provides a fragmented analysis plan.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted, or the work does not demonstrate achievement of the assessed learning outcome.
c) Practical data-analysis assignments – maximum 30 points
25–30 points: The student accurately codes and prepares data, documents data-quality decisions, produces appropriate descriptive statistics and visualizations, checks relevant assumptions, and performs statistical analyses correctly. Interpretations are consistent with the output, and saved files allow the analysis to be reproduced.
19–24 points: The student completes the main procedures correctly, with minor errors in data preparation, assumption checking, interpretation, or documentation.
13–18 points: The student completes basic procedures but demonstrates inconsistencies in software use, method application, interpretation, or documentation.
1–12 points: The work contains substantial analytical errors, incomplete procedures, misleading interpretations, or insufficient documentation.
0 points: No assessable analysis is submitted.
d) Statistical analysis project and report – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The project includes a clear research question, a justified analysis plan, appropriate data preparation and statistical procedures, and accurate interpretation. The report presents relevant estimates, p-values, confidence intervals, and effect sizes where applicable, supported by appropriate tables and figures. Limitations, confidentiality, and reproducibility are addressed.
13–16 points: The project is generally accurate and coherent, with minor weaknesses in justification, analysis, interpretation, reporting, or documentation.
9–12 points: The project has a basic structure, but the connection between the research question, methods, results, and conclusions is insufficiently developed.
1–8 points: The project is incomplete, contains major analytical errors, or presents conclusions unsupported by the results.
0 points: No assessable project is submitted.
e) Critical appraisal of a research publication – maximum 10 points
9–10 points: The student accurately identifies the research question, design, and selected statistical procedures; evaluates their suitability; and explains whether the conclusions are supported by the reported results. The appraisal identifies relevant limitations and distinguishes associations from causal claims.
7–8 points: The student identifies the main methodological features and provides generally appropriate evaluation, with minor omissions.
5–6 points: The appraisal is mainly descriptive and identifies only some relevant strengths, limitations, or interpretation problems.
1–4 points: The appraisal substantially misinterprets the methods or findings or provides unsupported judgments.
0 points: No assessable appraisal is submitted.

Content

Topic 1. Statistical Reasoning and the Role of Mathematical Methods in Psychology
Topic 2. Psychological Measurement, Variables, Measurement Scales, and Data Quality
Topic 3. Data Coding, Preparation, Descriptive Statistics, and Visualization
Topic 4. Probability, Distributions, Sampling, and Sampling Variability
Topic 5. Statistical Hypotheses, Estimation, Confidence Intervals, and p-Values
Topic 6. Statistical Assumptions, Effect Sizes, Statistical Power, and Multiple Testing
Topic 7. Correlation Analysis: Pearson and Spearman Coefficients
Topic 8. Comparing Two Groups: Independent and Paired-Samples t-Tests
Topic 9. Comparing Several Groups: One-Way Analysis of Variance

Topic 10. Nonparametric Comparisons: Mann–Whitney, Wilcoxon, and Kruskal–Wallis Tests
Topic 11. Categorical Data Analysis: Contingency Tables, Chi-Square Tests, and Fisher's Exact Test
Topic 12. Analysis Planning, Statistical Reporting, Critical Appraisal, Ethics, and Reproducibility

Literature

Compulsory reading

Field, A. (2024). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (6th ed.). SAGE.

Hudyma, O. V., & Hudyma, U. V. (2023). *Matematychni metody v psykholohii: Osnovni poniattia ta pryklady* [Mathematical methods in psychology: Basic concepts and examples]. Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University. 150 p.

Lohvinova, D. V. (2024). *Matematychni metody v psykholohii* [Mathematical methods in psychology] (2nd expanded ed.). Lviv Polytechnic Publishing House. 228 p.

Navarro, D. J., & Foxcroft, D. R. (2025). *Learning statistics with jamovi: A tutorial for beginners in statistical analysis*. Open Book Publishers.

Recommended reading

1. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.).

2. Cumming, G., & Calin-Jageman, R. (2024). *Introduction to the new statistics: Estimation, open science, and beyond* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

3. Lakens, D. (2013). Calculating and reporting effect sizes to facilitate cumulative science: A practical primer for t-tests and ANOVAs. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, Article 863.

4. Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. *Collabra: Psychology, 8*(1), Article 33267.

5. Olefir, V. O., & Bosniuk, V. F. (2024). Adaptatsiia ukrainskomovnoi versii shkaly zadovolenosti zhyttiam E. Dinera [Adaptation of the Ukrainian-language version of E. Diener's Satisfaction with Life Scale]. *Nauka i osvita*, (2), 64–72.

6. Wasserstein, R. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2016). The ASA statement on p-values: Context, process, and purpose. *The American Statistician, 70*(2), 129–133.

7. Wasserstein, R. L., Schirm, A. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2019). Moving to a world beyond "p < 0.05". *The American Statistician, 73*(sup1), 1–19.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. Quantitative Research Design: Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS-Quant). https://apastyle.apa.org/jars/quantitative

2. jamovi. Statistical software documentation. https://docs.jamovi.org/

3. JASP. How to use JASP. https://jasp-stats.org/how-to-use-jasp/

4. Navarro, D. J., & Foxcroft, D. R. Learning Statistics with jamovi: Online textbook and teaching datasets. https://www.learnstatswithjamovi.com/

5. Rice University, University of Houston-Clear Lake, and Tufts University. Online Statistics Education: An Interactive Multimedia Course of Study. https://onlinestatbook.com/2/index.html

ETHICS AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN PSYCHOLOGY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of ethical principles and academic integrity in psychological education, research, and professional practice. Students learn to distinguish ethical standards, legal requirements, and institutional rules; analyze ethical dilemmas; and justify decisions concerning competence, informed consent, confidentiality, professional boundaries, and respectful communication. The course develops practical skills in responsible academic writing, accurate attribution, ethical research planning, and transparent use of digital tools and artificial intelligence. Particular attention is paid to authorship, data integrity, protection of research participants, and appropriate responses to suspected misconduct, including recognition of situations requiring consultation or institutional review.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6/14 weeks	4 / elective	Olha Lebid, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	120 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. seminars/practical, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the main principles of professional ethics and academic integrity in psychology and distinguish ethical standards, legal requirements, and institutional rules.			Interactive lectures; guided comparison of ethical codes, legal requirements, and institutional rules; questions and answers; discussion of examples; short written exercises and practice tests.	Oral responses; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).
2) Identify ethical issues in psychological practice and justify appropriate responses using relevant ethical principles.			Case studies; ethical dilemma discussions; comparison of possible decisions; preparation of short written case analyses.	Participation in discussions; case analysis (CAS).
3) Apply principles of informed consent, confidentiality, respect, and professional boundaries and recognize competence limits in simulated psychological interactions.			Instructor demonstrations; role plays; paired communication exercises; practice in explaining confidentiality limits and the need for consultation; discussion of performance and feedback.	Role-play tasks; practical tasks; participation in discussions (CAS).
4) Use quotation, paraphrasing, citation, and referencing correctly in short academic texts.			Academic writing workshops; analysis of source texts; quotation and paraphrasing exercises; citation and reference checking; revision of written work.	Written assignments; practical tasks (CAS).
5) Prepare participant information, consent materials, and basic data-protection measures for a fictional psychological study, addressing foreseeable risks, voluntary participation, withdrawal, and debriefing where applicable.			Analysis of sample research documents; guided identification of risks and safeguards; practical workshops; preparation and revision of documents; presentation and discussion of proposed safeguards.	Practical tasks; individual assignment; presentation; participation in discussions (CAS).

6) Distinguish plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, and inappropriate authorship from responsible practices in academic writing, data collection and reporting, collaboration, and publication, including peer review.	Interactive lectures; analysis of academic, data-reporting, authorship, and peer-review cases; group discussions; written exercises on identifying and correcting integrity problems.	Written tests; case analysis; participation in discussions; written assignments (CAS).
7) Explain ethical risks of digital tools and generative AI and demonstrate accurate source checking and transparent disclosure of permitted assistance.	Discussion of digital-use scenarios; analysis of provided AI-generated texts; practical source-verification exercises; comparison of proposed tool use with institutional rules; preparation of short assistance-disclosure statements.	Participation in discussions; practical tasks; written assignments (CAS).
8) Propose appropriate responses to ethical and academic integrity concerns while respecting fair procedures, and identify when consultation or institutional guidance is needed.	Problem-based learning; analysis of fictional complaints; group discussions; preparation and presentation of justified responses to ethical concerns arising in the individual assignment.	Case analysis; participation in discussions; individual assignment; presentation (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based on a 100-point scale and consists entirely of continuous assessment (CAS). The course result (Final Test) is determined by the accumulated CAS score in accordance with institutional regulations. The final grade comprises:
Oral responses, participation in discussions, and written tests – 20 points.
Case analysis – 20 points.
Role-play tasks and practical tasks – 20 points.
Written assignments – 20 points.
Individual assignment and presentation – 20 points.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses, participation in discussions, and written tests – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains ethical principles and academic integrity requirements, distinguishes ethical standards, legal requirements, and institutional rules, provides well-justified oral responses, contributes relevant arguments to discussions, and demonstrates thorough knowledge in written tests.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates a sound understanding of the material and provides generally justified responses, with minor inaccuracies or incomplete explanations.
9–12 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge, but responses and discussion contributions are mainly descriptive or insufficiently justified.
1–8 points: The student demonstrates substantial gaps in knowledge, inaccurate responses, or poorly supported arguments.
0 points: No assessable responses or contributions are provided.
Participation in discussions is assessed for relevance, reasoning, and respectful engagement rather than frequency. Test instructions specify the points available for individual questions.
b) Case analysis – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student identifies relevant ethical and academic integrity concerns, applies appropriate principles and standards, considers alternative actions, and justifies a suitable response, including consultation or institutional guidance where necessary. The analysis distinguishes concerns from established findings and respects fair procedures.
13–16 points: The student identifies the main concerns and proposes generally appropriate responses,

with minor omissions in reasoning or consideration of alternatives.
9–12 points: The analysis identifies some relevant issues but remains mainly descriptive or provides incomplete justification.
1–8 points: The analysis overlooks important concerns, misapplies ethical principles, or proposes poorly justified responses.
0 points: No assessable case analysis is submitted.
c) Role-play tasks and practical tasks – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student communicates clearly and respectfully, appropriately explains informed consent and confidentiality and its limits, maintains professional boundaries, and recognizes competence limits. Practical tasks demonstrate accurate application of ethical principles in communication, source use, research safeguards, and digital-tool decisions, as relevant to the task.
13–16 points: The student generally applies ethical principles appropriately, with minor omissions in communication, explanation, or task completion.
9–12 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but requires prompting or provides incomplete explanations of rights, responsibilities, or safeguards.
1–8 points: The student demonstrates significant difficulties in ethical communication or completes practical tasks with substantial errors.
0 points: No assessable practical work or role-play performance is demonstrated.
d) Written assignments – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately quotes and paraphrases sources, provides consistent citations and references, verifies source information, and transparently discloses permitted assistance. Written explanations correctly distinguish responsible academic practice from integrity violations, including relevant issues of authorship, collaboration, data reporting, and peer review.
13–16 points: Assignments are generally accurate and complete, with minor errors in attribution, referencing, verification, or disclosure.
9–12 points: Assignments demonstrate basic skills but contain recurring referencing errors, overly close paraphrasing, or incomplete source verification.
1–8 points: Assignments contain substantial inaccuracies, inappropriate source use, or insufficient documentation of assistance.
0 points: No assessable written assignments are submitted.
e) Individual assignment and presentation – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student prepares clear participant information, consent materials, and appropriate data-protection measures for a fictional psychological study. The documents address foreseeable risks, voluntary participation, withdrawal, and debriefing where applicable. The presentation justifies safeguards, addresses relevant ethical concerns, and identifies consultation needs.
13–16 points: The assignment is generally coherent and appropriate, with minor omissions in documentation or safeguards. The presentation clearly explains the main decisions.
9–12 points: The assignment has a basic structure but contains gaps or inconsistencies. The presentation provides limited justification of ethical decisions.
1–8 points: The assignment is incomplete or contains substantial weaknesses in participant protection. The presentation is unclear or insufficiently justified.
0 points: No assessable individual assignment or presentation is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations of Professional Ethics and Academic Integrity in Psychology
Topic 2. Ethical Codes, Legal Requirements, Institutional Policies, and Ethical Decision-Making
Topic 3. Competence, Professional Boundaries, Multiple Relationships, and Conflicts of Interest
Topic 4. Informed Consent, Confidentiality, Privacy, and Respectful Communication
Topic 5. Research Ethics: Risk, Voluntary Participation, Vulnerability, Deception, and Debriefing
Topic 6. Responsible Data Collection, Storage, Analysis, and Reporting
Topic 7. Academic Integrity Values, Academic Misconduct, and Responsible Collaboration
Topic 8. Academic Writing, Quotation, Paraphrasing, Citation, and Referencing
Topic 9. Authorship, Contributorship, Peer Review, and Publication Ethics

Topic 10. Digital Ethics, Generative AI, Source Verification, and Assistance Disclosure
Topic 11. Responding to Ethical Concerns: Consultation, Reporting, Fair Procedures, and Appeals
Topic 12. Preparing and Justifying Research Ethics Documents

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Fisher, C. B. (2022). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide for psychologists* (5th ed.). SAGE.

2. Kharytonova, O. I., Ulianova, H. O., Kyryliuk, A. V., Halupova, L. I., & Baadzhy, N. P. (2024). *Akademichna dobrochesnist* [Academic integrity]. Yurydyka. 74 p.

3. Knapp, S. J., & Fingerhut, R. (2024). *Practical ethics for psychologists: A positive approach* (4th ed.). American Psychological Association.

4. Perevalova, L. V., Lysenko, I. V., & Hariaieva, H. M. (2023). *Pravove rehuliuvannia profesiinoi diialnosti psykholoha* [Legal regulation of psychologists' professional activities]. FOP Panov A. M. 92 p.

Recommended reading

1. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.).

2. Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61*(2), 228–239.

3. Eaton, S. E. (Ed.). (2024). *Second handbook of academic integrity*. Springer.

4. Perkins, M. (2023). Academic integrity considerations of AI large language models in the post-pandemic era: ChatGPT and beyond. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 20*(2), Article 7.

5. Vasianovych, H. P., Lohvynenko, V. M., & Kostyshyn, E. I. (Comps.). (2023). *Etyka ta akademichna dobrochesnist v osviti i nautsi* [Ethics and academic integrity in education and science]. FOP Korpan B. I. 126 p.

Web-resources

1. ALLEA. The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/

2. American Psychological Association. Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code

3. American Psychological Association. APA Style: Reference examples. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples

4. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. Etychnyi komitet: Etychnyi kodeks ta profesiini rekomendatsii [Ethics Committee: Ethical code and professional guidance]. https://npa-ua.org/ethics/

5. UNESCO. Guidance for generative AI in education and research. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

6. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. Zakon Ukrainy "Pro akademichnu dobrochesnist", No. 4742-IX [Law of Ukraine "On Academic Integrity"]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/4742-20#Text

PSYCHOLOGY OF CRISIS AND EXTREME SITUATIONS				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of psychological responses to crises and extreme situations and practical skills in providing basic psychological support within professional boundaries. Students examine stress, coping, trauma, loss, displacement, and war-related experiences. Through case studies and supervised classroom simulations, they learn to identify immediate needs and warning signs, demonstrate psychological first aid, explain the limitations of brief screening tools, and prepare appropriate support and referral plans. Particular attention is paid to ethical communication, individual and contextual differences, recovery resources, and the prevention of secondary traumatic stress and burnout.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7	4 / elective	Oxana Bayer, PhD (Psychology), Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain psychological responses to crises and extreme situations, including stress, coping, vulnerability, and protective factors.			Interactive lectures; guided reading; questions and answers; discussion of examples; practice quizzes.	Oral responses; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).
2) Identify immediate needs and warning signs in fictional crisis cases and explain when specialist or emergency assistance is required.			Instructor demonstrations; case studies; practical exercises identifying needs and warning signs; discussion of support and referral priorities.	Practical tasks; case analysis; participation in discussions (CAS).
3) Demonstrate psychological first aid in supervised simulations, using supportive communication and respecting consent, confidentiality, and professional boundaries.			Instructor demonstrations; role plays; paired communication exercises; scenario-based practice; discussion of performance and feedback.	Role-play tasks; practical tasks; participation in discussions (CAS).
4) Explain the purpose and limitations of brief screening tools and interpret provided results without making clinical diagnoses.			Interactive lectures; guided examination of screening tools and instructions; worked examples using fictional results; practical interpretation exercises; practice quizzes.	Written tests; practical tasks (CAS).
5) Prepare and justify a basic support and referral plan that considers the person's circumstances, available resources, and recovery needs.			Comparative case studies; planning workshops; preparation of short written recommendations; guided independent work on an individual support plan;	Case analysis; written assignments; individual assignment; presentation; oral responses (CAS).

	presentation followed by questions and answers.	
6) Recognize professional risks associated with crisis work and formulate appropriate self-care, boundary-setting, and supervision strategies.	Guided reading; discussion of fictional helper scenarios; structured reflective exercises; preparation of a written professional self-care plan.	Participation in discussions; written assignments (CAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
10 points for oral responses and participation in discussions;
20 points for written tests;
30 points for practical tasks and role-play tasks;
20 points for case analysis and written assignments;
20 points for an individual assignment and its presentation.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses and participation in discussions – 10 points
9–10 points: The student accurately explains relevant concepts, supports responses with appropriate reasoning, and contributes constructively and respectfully to discussions.
7–8 points: The student demonstrates sound understanding and provides relevant responses, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
4–6 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding, but responses are mainly descriptive or insufficiently justified.
1–3 points: Responses contain substantial conceptual errors or limited relevant reasoning.
0 points: No assessable responses or contributions are provided.
b) Written tests – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains crisis responses, coping, protective factors, and screening limitations and correctly applies these concepts to situational questions.
13–16 points: Answers demonstrate sound understanding, with minor errors or omissions.
8–12 points: Answers demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in conceptual knowledge or application.
1–7 points: Answers contain substantial errors and demonstrate limited understanding of the material.
0 points: No correct answers or no test submission.
Points for individual questions are specified in the test instructions.
c) Practical tasks and role-play tasks – 30 points
26–30 points: The student identifies immediate needs and warning signs, demonstrates supportive communication and appropriate psychological first aid, respects consent and professional boundaries, and identifies suitable referral options. Screening information is interpreted without unsupported diagnostic conclusions.
20–25 points: Performance is generally appropriate, with minor omissions or occasional instructor guidance.
12–19 points: The student demonstrates basic skills but requires repeated guidance in communication, prioritization, interpretation, or selection of appropriate actions.
1–11 points: Performance contains substantial omissions, inappropriate communication, unsupported diagnostic claims, or actions exceeding professional boundaries.
0 points: No assessable practical work or role-play performance is completed.
d) Case analysis and written assignments – 20 points
17–20 points: The student provides a structured analysis, identifies relevant needs and contextual factors, and justifies appropriate support and referral. Written assignments demonstrate ethical awareness and realistic strategies for professional self-care, boundaries, and supervision.

13–16 points: Analysis and proposed responses are generally appropriate, with minor gaps in reasoning, contextual understanding, or ethical consideration.
8–12 points: Work identifies some relevant issues but remains mainly descriptive or provides insufficient justification for proposed actions.
1–7 points: Work overlooks important needs or risks, contains substantial conceptual errors, or proposes inappropriate responses.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
e) Individual assignment and presentation – 20 points
The assignment involves preparing and presenting a basic support and referral plan for a fictional crisis case. The plan addresses immediate needs, warning signs, appropriate support, ethical considerations, referral, and recovery resources.
17–20 points: The plan is coherent, context-sensitive, and well justified. Proposed actions respect professional boundaries and distinguish immediate support from specialist assistance. The student presents the plan clearly and provides reasoned answers to questions.
13–16 points: The plan and presentation are generally coherent and appropriate, with minor omissions in justification, ethical considerations, or referral.
8–12 points: The plan contains basic elements but provides incomplete reasoning, limited attention to context, or unclear referral arrangements. The presentation requires clarification.
1–7 points: The work contains major omissions, inappropriate recommendations, unsupported diagnostic claims, or poorly justified decisions.
0 points: No assessable assignment or presentation is provided.

Content

Topic 1. Foundations of Crisis and Extreme Psychology: Concepts, Contexts, and Professional Roles
Topic 2. Stress Responses, Coping, Vulnerability, and Protective Factors
Topic 3. Trauma, Acute Stress Reactions, Post-Traumatic Symptoms, and Recovery
Topic 4. Identifying Immediate Needs, Warning Signs, and Referral Priorities
Topic 5. Psychological First Aid: Supportive Communication, Practical Assistance, and Ethical Boundaries
Topic 6. Brief Screening Tools: Purpose, Interpretation, and Limitations
Topic 7. War, Displacement, Loss, and Bereavement: Individual, Family, Age, and Cultural Contexts
Topic 8. Support and Referral Planning: Community Resources, Recovery, and Specialist Rehabilitation
Topic 9. Professional Risks in Crisis Work: Secondary Traumatic Stress, Burnout, Boundaries, and Supervision

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Jackson-Cherry, L. R., & Erford, B. T. (Eds.). (2024). *Crisis assessment, intervention, and prevention* (4th ed.). Pearson.
2. James, R. K., Whisenhunt, J., & Myer, R. (2025). *Crisis intervention strategies* (9th ed.). Cengage.
3. Muzychko, L., Matsevko, T., & Kapinus, O. (2024). *Psykholohiia kryzovykh staniv* [Psychology of crisis states]. National Army Academy. 325 p.
4. Sova, M. O., Dienizhna, S. O., & Mytrofanova, S. S. (2023). *Ekstremalna psykholohiia* [Extreme psychology]. State Tax University. 346 p.

Recommended reading

1. Bayer, O. (2023). Terapiia hidnosti yak metod paliatyvnoi psykholohichnoi dopomohy [Dignity therapy as a method of palliative psychological assistance]. *Psychological Counseling and Psychotherapy*, (20), 18–25.
2. Bonanno, G. A. (2021). *The end of trauma: How the new science of resilience is changing how we think about PTSD*. Basic Books.
3. Hermosilla, S., Forthal, S., Sadowska, K., Magill, E. B., Watson, P., & Pike, K. M. (2023). We need to build the evidence: A systematic review of psychological first aid on mental health and well-being. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 36*(1), 5–16.

4. Ohorenko, V. V., Nikolenko, A. Ye., Shusterman, T. Y., & Kokashynskyi, V. O. (2023). *Kompleks osvitnikh treninhiv z pershoi psykholohichnoi dopomohy osobam u kryzovykh sytuatsiiakh* [A set of educational training sessions on psychological first aid for people in crisis situations]. Lira. 268 p.

Web-resources

1. National Center for PTSD. *Primary Care PTSD Screen for DSM-5 (PC-PTSD-5)*. https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/assessment/screens/pc-ptsd.asp

2. National Center for PTSD. *Psychological First Aid: Field Operations Guide*. https://www.ptsd.va.gov/professional/treat/type/psych_firstaid_manual.asp

3. Vseukrainska prohrama mentalnoho zdorovia “Ty yak?” [All-Ukrainian Mental Health Programme “How Are You?”]. https://howareu.com/

4. World Health Organization. *Psychological First Aid: Guide for Field Workers*. https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241548205

ART THERAPY				
The course aims to develop students' understanding of the role, principles, and main approaches of art therapy in psychological support and correctional and developmental work with different client groups. Students become familiar with individual and group formats and selected techniques involving drawing, mandalas, masks, stories, puppets, photography, metaphorical associative cards, and sand. Through practical workshops, case analysis, and classroom simulations, they develop introductory skills in selecting and adapting activities, preparing session plans, and facilitating creative self-expression. Particular attention is paid to the limitations of interpreting creative products, psychological safety, ethical communication, professional boundaries, and reflection on practice.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7	4 / elective	Iryna Oliinyk, Ph.D., Associate Professor	120 hours (26 h. of lectures, 14 h. practical classes, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the theoretical foundations, history, contemporary approaches, and proposed psychological mechanisms of art therapy.			Interactive lectures; guided reading; questions and answers; analysis of multimedia examples; theoretical discussions; practice quizzes.	Oral responses; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).
2) Explain the exploratory potential and limitations of art-based techniques and distinguish participant-led exploration from unsupported diagnostic interpretation.			Case studies; analysis of creative products and accompanying contextual information; comparison of interpretations; practical exercises; group discussions.	Practical tasks; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).
3) Demonstrate selected art-based techniques in classroom simulations and adapt instructions and materials to a defined audience and purpose.			Practical demonstrations; training exercises; experiential learning; role plays; supervised practice; feedback and discussion.	Practical tasks; role-play tasks; participation in discussions (CAS).
4) Prepare and present a structured plan for an individual or group art-based session appropriate to identified psychological needs and professional boundaries.			Analysis of sample session plans; planning workshops; brainstorming; guided independent work; presentation and discussion of proposed plans.	Individual assignment; presentation; participation in discussions (CAS).
5) Select and justify resource-oriented and developmental art-based activities intended to support well-being, self-expression, and emotional self-regulation.			Instructor demonstrations; practical workshops; analysis of activity examples; guided selection and adaptation exercises; discussion of proposed applications; incorporation of a justified resource-oriented or	Practical tasks; participation in discussions; individual assignment (CAS).

	developmental activity into the individual session plan.	
6) Demonstrate attentive listening, empathetic communication, and supportive interaction when facilitating creative activities.	Instructor demonstrations; communication exercises; paired and group work; role plays; discussion of peer and instructor feedback.	Practical tasks; role-play tasks; participation in discussions (CAS).
7) Apply ethical principles to art-based activities, including voluntary participation, confidentiality, psychological safety, responsible handling of creative products, and recognition of professional limits.	Ethical case discussions; practical decision-making exercises; analysis of consent and artwork-sharing scenarios; ethical review of session plans; practice quizzes.	Participation in discussions; practical tasks; individual assignment; written tests (CAS).
8) Reflect on facilitation decisions and feedback, identify limitations, and propose improvements and further professional learning needs.	Structured reflection; reflective writing; guided self-analysis; discussion of feedback; revision of practical decisions and session plans.	Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks; participation in discussions; individual assignment (CAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
25 points for oral responses and participation in discussions;
25 points for an individual assignment and its presentation;
20 points for practical tasks and role-play tasks;
20 points for a reflective diary and self-analysis tasks;
10 points for written tests.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses and participation in discussions – 25 points
22–25 points: The student accurately explains relevant concepts, compares approaches, justifies the selection of activities, recognizes ethical and interpretive limitations, and contributes constructively to discussions.
17–21 points: Responses demonstrate sound understanding and generally appropriate reasoning, with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
10–16 points: Responses demonstrate basic understanding but remain mainly descriptive or insufficiently justified.
1–9 points: Responses contain substantial conceptual errors, unsupported interpretations, or limited relevant reasoning.
0 points: No assessable responses or contributions are provided.
b) Individual assignment and presentation – 25 points
The assignment involves preparing and presenting a structured plan for an individual or group art-based session. The plan specifies the audience, identified need, objectives, materials, stages, adaptations, ethical considerations, and procedures for obtaining feedback.
22–25 points: The plan is coherent, psychologically grounded, and appropriate for the intended audience. Objectives and activities are aligned, ethical boundaries are addressed, and the student clearly justifies decisions and incorporates relevant feedback.
17–21 points: The plan and presentation are generally coherent and appropriate, with minor gaps in justification, adaptation, or ethical consideration.
10–16 points: The plan contains basic elements but has unclear objectives, weak links between activities and intended outcomes, or insufficient attention to the audience.
1–9 points: The work is fragmented, poorly justified, impractical, or contains substantial conceptual or ethical problems.

0 points: No assessable assignment or presentation is provided.
c) Practical tasks and role-play tasks – 20 points
17–20 points: The student appropriately selects and uses materials, provides clear instructions, demonstrates supportive communication, and adapts activities to the stated purpose. Facilitation respects participant choice and avoids imposed interpretations.
13–16 points: Performance is generally appropriate, with minor omissions or occasional instructor guidance.
8–12 points: The student demonstrates basic practical skills but requires guidance in instructions, adaptation, communication, or facilitation.
1–7 points: Performance contains substantial omissions, inappropriate instructions, unsupported interpretations, or insufficient attention to professional boundaries.
0 points: No assessable practical work or role-play performance is completed.
d) Reflective diary and self-analysis tasks – 20 points
17–20 points: Reflection evaluates specific learning and facilitation decisions, connects observations with course concepts and feedback, recognizes limitations, and proposes feasible improvements.
13–16 points: Reflection is relevant and identifies reasonable improvements, with minor limitations in analysis or use of feedback.
8–12 points: Reflection mainly describes activities and provides limited evaluation of decisions or learning needs.
1–7 points: Reflection is fragmented, superficial, or provides little relevant analysis.
0 points: No assessable reflective work is submitted.
Reflection is assessed for analysis and professional learning rather than the intimacy of personal disclosure.
e) Written tests – 10 points
9–10 points: The student accurately explains theoretical foundations, approaches, interpretive limitations, and ethical principles and applies them appropriately to short situational questions.
7–8 points: Answers demonstrate sound understanding, with minor errors or omissions.
4–6 points: Answers demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in conceptual knowledge or application.
1–3 points: Answers contain substantial errors and demonstrate limited understanding of the material.
0 points: No correct answers or no test submission.
Points for individual questions are specified in the test instructions.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Art Therapy: History, Principles, and Professional Contexts
Topic 2. Contemporary Approaches to Art Therapy and Their Psychological Foundations
Topic 3. Individual and Group Formats: Session Structure, Materials, and Supportive Communication
Topic 4. Exploratory and Assessment Uses of Art-Based Techniques: Possibilities and Interpretive Limitations
Topic 5. Drawing and Painting: Colour, Imagery, Creative Expression, and Participant-Led Discussion
Topic 6. Mandala-Based Activities: Creating Images, Exploring Personal Meaning, and Supporting Self-Regulation
Topic 7. Mask-Based Activities: Self-Expression, Roles, and Interpersonal Communication
Topic 8. Fairy Tales and Therapeutic Storytelling: Selection, Creation, and Discussion of Stories
Topic 9. Puppet- and Doll-Based Activities: Play, Communication, and Developmental Applications
Topic 10. Photography-Based Activities: Personal Meaning, Reflection, and Ethical Use of Images
Topic 11. Metaphorical Associative Cards: Facilitation, Applications, and Interpretive Limitations
Topic 12. Sand-Based Activities: Materials, Setting, Facilitation, and Professional Boundaries
Topic 13. Other Creative Activities: Collage, Clay, Textiles, Origami, and Bibliotherapy; Integrated Session Planning, Feedback, and Professional Reflection

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Case, C., Dalley, T., & Reddick, D. (2023). *The handbook of art therapy* (4th ed.). Routledge.

2. da Silva Prado, M., & Lehtioksa, I. (2022). *LogoArt: Meaning-centered art therapy*. LogoArt Irmeli Lehtioksa.

3. Kalka, N. M., & Lehka, A. I. (2024). *Osnovy artterapii* [Fundamentals of art therapy]. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 104 p.

4. Miroshnychenko, O. A. (Comp.). (2024). *Art-tekhnolohii* [Art technologies]. Buk-Druk. 180 p.

5. Tararina, O. (2023). *Hlybynna art-terapiia: Praktyky transformatsii* [Depth art therapy: Practices of transformation] (N. Raduzhna, Trans.). Astamir-V. 240 p.

Recommended reading

1. Abbing, A., Ponstein, A., van Hooren, S., de Sonneville, L., Swaab, H., & Baars, E. (2018). The effectiveness of art therapy for anxiety in adults: A systematic review of randomised and non-randomised controlled trials. *PLOS ONE, 13*(12), Article e0208716.

2. Artiukhina, N. V. (2022). *Psykhodiahnostychnyi potentsial art-terapii* [Psychodiagnostic potential of art therapy]: Methodological recommendations. Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University. 20 p.

3. Hrynova, N. V., & Stanishevska, V. I. (2022). *Artterapiia* [Art therapy]: Methodological recommendations. Vizavi. 36 p.

4. Kaimal, G., Ray, K., & Muniz, J. (2016). Reduction of cortisol levels and participants' responses following art making. *Art Therapy, 33*(2), 74–80.

5. Kalka, N., & Kovalchuk, Z. (2020). *Praktykum z art-terapii* [Art therapy practicum] (Part 1). Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 232 p.

6. Oliinyk, I. V. (2024). Poiednannia loho- ta artterapevtychnykh kontseptiv u psykhoterapevtychnii roboti z ekzystentsiinoiu kryzoiu [Integrating logotherapeutic and art-therapeutic concepts in psychotherapeutic work with existential crisis]. *Naukovi innovatsii ta peredovi tekhnolohii*, (11[39]), 1835–1849.

7. Oliinyk, I. V. (2025a). Tekhnika "Khram moiei zhinochnosti"; tekhnika "Mandala moiei zhinochnosti" [The "Temple of my femininity" and "Mandala of my femininity" techniques]. In T. Humennykova (Ed.), *Psykholohichne meniu dlia dushi: Retsepty zhinochoho shchastia* [A psychological menu for the soul: Recipes for women's happiness] (pp. 150–155). 7BTs.

8. Oliinyk, I. V. (2025b). Tekhnika "Kintsugi: Vidnovlennia cherez nezlamnist" (lohoartterapiia); tekhnika "Lohomandala vnutrishnoi syly" [The "Kintsugi: Recovery through resilience" (logoart therapy) and "Logomandala of inner strength" techniques]. In T. Kurhanska (Ed.), *Syla nezlamnosti: Tekhniky pidtrymky ta vidnovlennia* [The power of resilience: Support and recovery techniques] (pp. 47–49, 112–113). 7BTs.

9. Oliinyk, I. V. (2025c). Tekhnika "Mandala emotsiinoi rivnovahy" ("In ta Yan"); tekhnika "Vikno do vnutrishnikh resursiv" [The "Mandala of emotional balance" ("Yin and Yang") and "Window to inner resources" techniques]. In T. Kurhanska (Ed.), *Svitlo vseredyni: Tekhniky dlia podolannia emotsiinoho vyhorannia* [Light within: Techniques for overcoming emotional burnout] (pp. 204–209). 7BTs.

10. Shamlian, K., & Klimanska, M. (2014). *Proektyvni metody doslidzhennia osobystosti* [Projective methods of personality assessment]. Ivan Franko National University of Lviv. 466 p.

11. Volkova, N. P., & Oliinyk, I. V. (2025). Sotsialno-psykholohichnyi treninh yak metod interaktyvnoho navchannia u protsesi pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv do sotsialno-psykholohichnoi pidtrymky hromadian v umovakh viiny [Social-psychological training as an interactive teaching method in preparing future psychologists to provide psychosocial support during wartime]. *Pedahohichna Akademiia: Naukovi zapysky*, (16).

12. Voznesenska, O. L., & Sknar, O. M. (Eds.). (2017). *Entsyklopedychnyi slovnyk z art-terapii* [Encyclopedic dictionary of art therapy]. FOP Nazarenko T. V. 312 p.

Web-resources

1. American Art Therapy Association. *About Art Therapy*. https://arttherapy.org/about-art-therapy/

2. American Art Therapy Association. *Ethics*. https://arttherapy.org/ethics/

3. British Association of Art Therapists. *Art Therapy*. https://baat.org/art-therapy/

4. British Association of Art Therapists. *Evidence for Art Therapy*. https://baat.org/art-therapy/evidence/

5. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. *Osnovy artterapii* [Fundamentals of art therapy]: electronic manual. https://dspace.lvduvs.edu.ua/handle/1234567890/8210

CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY

The course aims to provide undergraduate psychology students with essential knowledge of clinical psychology, mental health, psychological disorders, stress-related conditions, somatic illness, deviant behaviour, and the diagnostic and treatment process. The course develops introductory skills in clinical case analysis, psychological observation and assessment, ethical communication, and initial psychological support. Particular attention is paid to the limitations of assessment, recognition of situations requiring referral, and professional boundaries appropriate to undergraduate training.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7/14 weeks	4/ elective	Maryna Karpova, Ph.D	120 h. (26 h. lectures, 14 h. seminars/practical, 80 h. self-directed learning)

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Explain the basic principles of clinical psychology, mental health, and the role of psychological factors in health and illness.	Interactive lectures; guided reading; conceptual mapping; questions and answers; group discussions; practice quizzes.	Oral responses; participation in discussions; written assignments; written tests (CAS).
2) Identify and analyse common symptoms and behavioural manifestations associated with mental disorders in provided clinical examples, without making independent clinical diagnoses.	Case studies; analysis of visual and written materials; group discussions; problem-based learning; practice quizzes.	Case analysis; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).
3) Demonstrate basic psychological observation, assessment, and professional communication skills in classroom simulations, recognizing their limitations.	Instructor demonstrations; role plays; practical exercises; guided use of observation checklists; simulated psychologist–client interactions; feedback.	Practical tasks; simulation performance (CAS).
4) Apply ethical principles and professional boundaries when communicating in simulated interactions and analysing clinical situations.	Ethical dilemma discussions; ethical case studies; role plays; reflective exercises; preparation of short written justifications.	Participation in discussions; practical tasks; case analysis; written assignments (CAS).
5) Demonstrate initial psychological support in simulated situations involving stress, loss, somatic illness, or behavioural difficulties and identify when referral is needed.	Instructor demonstrations; simulations; role plays; supervised classroom practice; case-based learning; discussion of support and referral decisions.	Practical tasks; simulation performance; participation in discussions (CAS).
6) Analyse provided clinical cases using knowledge of psychopathology, stress and adaptation, internal representations of illness, and the diagnostic and treatment process.	Problem-based learning; clinical case analysis; seminars; guided interpretation of provided psychological information; preparation of case reports;	Case analysis; written assignments; participation in discussions; written tests (CAS).

	practice quizzes.	
7) Prepare and present an evidence-informed analysis of a selected clinical psychology topic and reflect on professional limitations and further learning needs.	Guided independent study; academic writing exercises; analysis of research literature; preparation of an individual assignment; presentation; questions and answers; reflection on feedback.	Individual assignment; presentation; written assignments; oral responses (CAS).

Assessment

The final grade is awarded on a 100-point scale based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS) throughout the semester:
40 points for oral responses, participation in discussions, practical tasks, and simulation performance;
40 points for case analysis, written assignments, and an individual assignment with presentation;
20 points for written tests.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses, participation in discussions, practical tasks, and simulation performance – 40 points
35–40 points: The student accurately explains clinical psychology concepts, provides justified responses, and demonstrates appropriate observation, supportive communication, and initial support skills. Performance respects consent, confidentiality, professional boundaries, and the need for referral.
27–34 points: Responses and practical performance are generally accurate and appropriate, with minor omissions or occasional instructor guidance.
16–26 points: The student demonstrates basic understanding and skills but requires guidance in applying concepts, communicating appropriately, or identifying professional limitations.
1–15 points: Responses or practical performance contain substantial inaccuracies, unsupported diagnostic claims, inappropriate communication, or insufficient attention to professional boundaries.
0 points: No assessable responses, contributions, or practical performance are provided.
b) Case analysis, written assignments, and individual assignment with presentation – 40 points
35–40 points: The student provides a coherent and evidence-informed analysis, accurately applies relevant concepts, considers context and alternative explanations, and identifies ethical issues and professional limitations. Written work uses appropriate sources and accurate attribution. The presentation is clear, and decisions are appropriately justified.
27–34 points: Analysis and presentation are generally accurate and coherent, with minor gaps in interpretation, argumentation, source use, or ethical consideration.
16–26 points: Work demonstrates basic understanding but remains mainly descriptive, applies concepts inconsistently, or provides insufficient justification for conclusions.
1–15 points: Work contains substantial conceptual errors, unsupported conclusions, unsuitable sources, or major omissions.
0 points: No assessable work is submitted.
c) Written tests – 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately explains the main concepts, recognizes relevant symptoms and psychological factors in short cases, and identifies appropriate assessment limitations and professional responses.
13–16 points: Answers demonstrate sound understanding, with minor errors or omissions.
8–12 points: Answers demonstrate basic understanding but contain gaps in conceptual knowledge or application.
1–7 points: Answers contain substantial errors and demonstrate limited understanding of the course material.
0 points: No correct answers or no test submission.

Content

Topic 1. Introduction to Clinical Psychology: Mental Health, Professional Roles, and Ethical Principles
Topic 2. Research and Psychological Assessment Methods in Clinical Psychology: Observation, Interviewing, and Interpretive Limitations

Topic 3. General Psychopathology: Common Symptoms and Behavioural Manifestations
Topic 4. Psychological Responses to Somatic Illness
Topic 5. Internal Representations of Illness and Their Implications for Support
Topic 6. Stress and Adaptation: Psychology of Loss and Death
Topic 7. Psychology of Deviant Behaviour: Context, Psychological Factors, and Professional Responses
Topic 8. Psychology of the Diagnostic and Treatment Process: Communication, Initial Support, and Referral

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Chaban, O. S., Khaustova, O. O., & Omelianovych, V. Yu. (2023). *Medychna psykholohiia: Etalony praktychnykh navychok* [Medical psychology: Standards of practical skills]. Mahnoliia 2006. 352 p.
2. Maksymenko, S. D. (Ed.). (2023). *Medychna psykholohiia* [Medical psychology] (Vol. 1, 3rd revised and expanded ed.). Vydavnytstvo Liudmyla. 512 p.
3. Moini, J., LoGalbo, A., Gutierrez, A., & Aragon, P. J. (2024). *Essentials of mental health*. Elsevier.
4. Pomerantz, A. M. (2023). *Clinical psychology: Science, practice, and diversity* (6th ed.). SAGE.
5. Skrypnikov, A. M., Herasymenko, L. O., Isakov, R. I., & Rud, V. O. (2023). *Medical psychology*. Mahnoliia 2006.

Recommended reading

1. Asmundson, G. J. G. (Ed.). (2022). *Comprehensive clinical psychology* (2nd ed.). Elsevier.
2. Burlakova, I., Chernysh, O., & Kondes, T. (2024). Clinical psychology in the EU: A comparative analysis of best practices. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (2[18]), 77–85. https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2024-2-77-85
3. Isakov, R. I. (2023). *Psykhosomatychna patolohiia* [Psychosomatic pathology]. Medytsyna. 167 p.
4. Klymchuk, V., Kalendruz, K., & Gorbunova, V. (2019). Mental health care system and reform efforts in Ukraine. *Mental Health: Global Challenges Journal*, *1*(1), 38–39. https://doi.org/10.32437/mhgcj.v1i1.17
5. Zakalyk, H. M., Voitsekhovska, O. V., & Shuvar, N. M. (2020). *Osnovy klinichnoi psykholohii* [Fundamentals of clinical psychology]. Lviv Polytechnic Publishing House. 432 p.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code
2. National Institute of Mental Health. *Health Topics*. https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics
3. National Library of Medicine. *PubMed*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/
4. Vseukrainska prohrama mentalnoho zdorovia “Ty yak?” [All-Ukrainian Mental Health Programme “How Are You?”]. https://howareu.com/
5. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Diseases (ICD)*. https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/classification-of-diseases

INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES				
The course aims to develop students' practical skills in interpreting, discussing, and communicating the results of psychological studies. Working with provided research materials, students learn to identify the main findings, check whether interpretations are supported by evidence, compare findings with theoretical explanations and previous research, and explain uncertainty and limitations. Particular attention is paid to unexpected and contradictory findings, unsupported causal claims, excessive generalization, and recommendations that exceed the available evidence. Through practical exercises, case analysis, writing workshops, peer feedback, and revision, students prepare discussion sections, conclusions, proportionate recommendations, and accessible research summaries. The course builds on previously acquired knowledge of research methodology and mathematical methods and focuses on using this knowledge to produce clear, justified, and responsible interpretations.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7/14 weeks	4 / elective	Olha Lebid, Doctor of Sciences, Full Professor	120 h. (20 h. lectures, 20 h. seminars/practical, 80 h. self-directed learning)
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Identify the main findings in provided research materials and distinguish evidence, interpretation, explanation, and practical implications.			Interactive lectures; guided reading of research extracts; instructor demonstrations; practical exercises matching research questions, findings, and claims; questions and answers; discussion of examples.	Oral responses; practical tasks; participation in discussions (CAS).
2) Check interpretations of provided quantitative findings and correct unsupported statements about relationships, differences, uncertainty, and practical importance.			Worked examples; guided examination of tables, graphs, and accompanying interpretations; case studies of misleading interpretations; practical correction of misleading statements; comparison and discussion of revised explanations.	Practical tasks; case analysis; participation in discussions (CAS).
3) Support interpretations of provided qualitative findings with relevant extracts and explain agreement or differences between qualitative and quantitative evidence.			Guided examination of prepared thematic summaries and supporting extracts; practical evidence-matching exercises; comparison of findings from different sources; small-group case discussions.	Practical tasks; case analysis; participation in discussions (CAS).
4) Write interpretive paragraphs connecting findings with research questions, theoretical explanations, and relevant previous studies.			Guided reading of selected discussion sections; construction of evidence-comparison tables; academic writing workshops; preparation and revision of short	Practical tasks; written assignments (CAS).

	interpretive paragraphs following feedback.	
5) Explain unexpected or contradictory findings, identify plausible alternative explanations, and describe how specific limitations affect conclusions.	Case studies; comparison of alternative explanations; guided analysis of unexpected findings; group discussions; preparation of short written analyses addressing limitations and the scope of conclusions.	Case analysis; participation in discussions; written assignments (CAS).
6) Prepare a coherent discussion, conclusions, and proportionate recommendations based on provided psychological research findings.	Analysis of model texts; writing workshops; guided drafting; independent preparation of an individual interpretation assignment; instructor feedback and revision.	Written assignments; individual assignment (CAS).
7) Review and revise interpretive texts to improve evidential support, clarity, accurate attribution, and respectful representation of participants.	Instructor modelling of text review; checklist-based peer review; practical editing exercises; discussion of feedback; revision of written work and the individual assignment.	Practical tasks; participation in discussions; written assignments; individual assignment (CAS).
8) Present and justify an interpretation of psychological findings and adapt its explanation for specialist and non-specialist audiences.	Comparison of specialist and plain-language summaries; practical preparation of slides and accessible explanations; short presentations; questions and answers; discussion of peer and instructor feedback.	Practical tasks; presentation; oral responses (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based on a 100-point scale and consists entirely of continuous assessment (CAS). The course result (Final Test) is determined by the accumulated CAS score in accordance with institutional regulations. The final grade comprises:
Oral responses and participation in discussions – 20 points.
Practical tasks – 20 points.
Case analysis – 20 points.
Written assignments – 20 points.
Individual assignment and presentation – 20 points.
Assessment criteria
a) Oral responses and participation in discussions – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately distinguishes findings from interpretations and implications, supports oral responses with relevant evidence, compares possible explanations, and contributes reasoned arguments to discussions.
13–16 points: The student demonstrates a sound understanding of the material and provides generally justified responses, with minor inaccuracies or incomplete explanations.
9–12 points: The student demonstrates basic knowledge, but responses and discussion contributions are mainly descriptive or insufficiently justified.
1–8 points: The student demonstrates substantial conceptual gaps, inaccurate responses, or poorly supported arguments.
0 points: No assessable responses or contributions are provided.
Participation is assessed for relevance, reasoning, use of evidence, and respectful engagement rather than frequency of speaking.

b) Practical tasks – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student accurately connects claims with evidence, corrects misleading interpretations, compares findings appropriately, and improves texts through review and revision. Explanations distinguish association from causation, acknowledge relevant uncertainty, and communicate findings clearly to the intended audience.
13–16 points: Practical work is generally accurate, with minor omissions in justification, revision, clarity, or recognition of uncertainty.
9–12 points: The student completes basic tasks but requires guidance to identify unsupported claims, connect evidence and conclusions, or improve explanations.
1–8 points: Practical work contains substantial interpretive errors, ineffective revisions, or explanations inconsistent with the provided evidence.
0 points: No assessable practical work is submitted.
c) Case analysis – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student identifies the central interpretive problem, supports the analysis with specific evidence from the case, considers plausible alternative explanations, and proposes appropriately qualified conclusions. The analysis explains how relevant methodological and contextual limitations affect the interpretation.
13–16 points: The analysis identifies the main interpretive issues and provides generally justified conclusions, with minor omissions in supporting evidence or consideration of alternatives.
9–12 points: The analysis identifies some relevant issues but remains mainly descriptive or provides insufficient justification.
1–8 points: The analysis overlooks the central problem or major limitations, relies on unsupported explanations, or proposes conclusions inconsistent with the evidence.
0 points: No assessable case analysis is submitted.
d) Written assignments – maximum 20 points
17–20 points: The student produces coherent interpretive texts that connect findings with research questions, theory, and previous studies. Claims are supported by evidence, proposed explanations are appropriately qualified, sources are accurately attributed, and relevant contradictions and limitations are addressed. Revisions respond appropriately to feedback.
13–16 points: Written work is generally accurate and coherent, with minor weaknesses in argumentation, comparison of findings, attribution, or revision.
9–12 points: Written work is mainly descriptive, with limited integration of evidence and theory or incomplete discussion of limitations.
1–8 points: Written work contains substantial inaccuracies, unsupported claims, or weak connections between findings and conclusions.
0 points: No assessable written assignments are submitted.
e) Individual assignment and presentation – maximum 20 points
The written report is worth 15 points: evidence-based interpretation and connections with relevant literature – 6 points; coherence of the discussion and conclusions — 4 points; limitations and proportionate recommendations – 3 points; clarity, accurate attribution, and the plain-language summary – 2 points.
The presentation is worth 5 points: clear and audience-appropriate communication – 3 points; justified responses to questions –2 points. Points for the report and presentation are awarded separately and then combined.
17–20 points: The student prepares a coherent report in which the discussion, conclusions, limitations, and recommendations are supported by the findings. Alternative explanations are considered, sources are accurately attributed, and the plain-language summary preserves the meaning and uncertainty of the results. The presentation is clear, and responses to questions are justified.
13–16 points: The report and presentation are generally accurate and coherent, with minor omissions in interpretation, limitations, recommendations, or responses to questions.
9–12 points: The report has a basic structure but remains partly descriptive or contains insufficiently justified conclusions. The presentation communicates the main findings but requires greater clarity or

adaptation to the audience.
1–8 points: The submitted work contains major interpretive errors, unsupported conclusions, substantial omissions, or unclear communication. Responses to questions demonstrate limited understanding of the evidence.
0 points: No assessable individual assignment or presentation is provided.

Content

Topic 1. From Research Materials to Main Findings: Selecting What Answers the Research Question
Topic 2. Evidence and Claims: Distinguishing Description, Interpretation, Explanation, and Implications
Topic 3. Checking Quantitative Interpretations: Relationships, Differences, Uncertainty, and Practical Importance
Topic 4. Supporting Qualitative Interpretations: Themes, Extracts, Context, and the Participant's Voice
Topic 5. Bringing Findings Together: Agreement, Complementarity, and Contradictions across Sources
Topic 6. Connecting Findings with Theory and Previous Studies
Topic 7. Explaining Unexpected Findings and Considering Alternative Interpretations
Topic 8. Writing Specific Limitations and Defining the Scope of Conclusions
Topic 9. Building a Discussion Section: Claims, Evidence, Explanations, and Qualification
Topic 10. Formulating Conclusions and Proportionate Practical Recommendations
Topic 11. Reviewing and Revising Interpretive Texts: Evidence, Clarity, Attribution, and Respectful Language

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.
2. Cumming, G., & Calin-Jageman, R. (2024). *Introduction to the new statistics: Estimation, open science, and beyond* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
3. Hudyma, O. V., & Hudyma, U. V. (2023). *Matematychni metody v psykholohii: Osnovni poniattia ta pryklady* [Mathematical methods in psychology: Basic concepts and examples]. Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University. 150 p.
4. Koloiz, Zh. V. (2024). *Osnovy akademichnoho pysma* [Fundamentals of academic writing] (2nd revised and expanded ed.). FOP Marynchenko S. V. 143 p.
5. Miller, S. A. (2022). *Writing in psychology* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Recommended reading

1. Appelbaum, M., Cooper, H., Kline, R. B., Mayo-Wilson, E., Nezu, A. M., & Rao, S. M. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for quantitative research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist, 73*(1), 3–25.
2. Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity, 56*, 1391–1412.
3. Cooper, H. (2020). *Reporting quantitative research in psychology: How to meet APA Style Journal Article Reporting Standards* (2nd ed., rev.). American Psychological Association.
4. Hudyma, O. V., & Hudyma, U. V. (2023). *Matematychni metody v psykholohii: Osnovni poniattia ta pryklady* [Mathematical methods in psychology: Basic concepts and examples]. Kamianets-Podilskyi Ivan Ohiienko National University. 150 p.
5. Levitt, H. M., Bamberg, M., Creswell, J. W., Frost, D. M., Josselson, R., & Suárez-Orozco, C. (2018). Journal article reporting standards for qualitative primary, qualitative meta-analytic, and mixed methods research in psychology: The APA Publications and Communications Board task force report. *American Psychologist, 73*(1), 26–46.
6. Olefir, V. O., & Bosniuk, V. F. (2024). Adaptatsiia ukrainskomovnoi versii shkaly zadovolenosti zhyttiam E. Dinera [Adaptation of the Ukrainian-language version of E. Diener's Satisfaction with Life Scale]. *Nauka i osvita*, (2), 64–72.
7. Wasserstein, R. L., Schirm, A. L., & Lazar, N. A. (2019). Moving to a world beyond "p < 0.05". *The American Statistician, 73*(sup1), 1–19.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. Quantitative Research Design: Journal Article Reporting Standards

(JARS-Quant). https://apastyle.apa.org/jars/quantitative

2. American Psychological Association. Qualitative Research Design: Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS-Qual). https://apastyle.apa.org/jars/qualitative

3. American Psychological Association. Mixed Methods Research Design: Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS-Mixed). https://apastyle.apa.org/jars/mixed-methods

4. American Psychological Association. *APA Style: Tables and Figures*. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/tables-figures

5. University of Manchester. *Academic Phrasebank: Discussing Findings*. https://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/discussing-findings/

6. University of Manchester. *Academic Phrasebank: Writing Conclusions*. https://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/writing-conclusions/

EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP

The internship aims to familiarize undergraduate psychology students with the organization, main activities, and professional responsibilities of a practising psychologist and support their initial professional adaptation. Through guided observation, simulations, and agreed introductory tasks, students become familiar with psychological assessment, counseling, psychoeducation, and preventive and developmental work. They practise selected communication and assessment skills, assist with the preparation of professional materials, and learn to maintain appropriate internship records. Particular attention is paid to ethical standards, confidentiality, professional boundaries, and the use of supervision and reflection to identify further learning needs.

Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	6 / 2 weeks	4 / mandatory	Alina Yudina, PhD in Psychology	120 h. self-directed internship work, including guided observation, supervised introductory tasks, preparation of materials, documentation, and reflection

Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:	**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment, CAS)**
1) Describe the host organization's functions, the psychologist's main activities, and the procedures governing psychological services.	Placement induction; examination of organizational documents; guided observation; discussions with the supervisor; preparation of an organizational overview.	Assessed placement activities; internship documentation; internship report (CAS).
2) Identify the aims and main stages of observed psychological activities and relate them to previously acquired psychological knowledge.	Structured observation; analysis of anonymized examples; guided case discussions; preparation of observation notes; supervisor feedback.	Practical tasks; internship documentation; internship report (CAS).
3) Use academic and professional resources to prepare information and materials for an introductory task agreed with the supervisor.	Guided information searches; reading and comparison of sources; preparation of brief evidence summaries and professional materials; supervisor review.	Practical tasks; internship documentation (CAS).
4) Complete selected introductory assessment tasks under guidance, following instructions and recognizing the limitations of the information obtained.	Instructor or supervisor demonstrations; examination of tools and instructions; practice with educational or anonymized materials; guided scoring and interpretation exercises; feedback.	Practical tasks; internship documentation (CAS).
5) Demonstrate basic professional communication skills, including establishing contact, attentive listening, clarification, and respectful interaction.	Observation of professional communication where permitted; role plays; paired exercises; supervised	Practical tasks; supervisor evaluation (CAS).

	participation in agreed activities; discussion of feedback.	
6) Assist in preparing or delivering a psychoeducational, preventive, or developmental activity appropriate to the placement setting.	Observation of activities; preparation of materials; supervisor-guided planning; assistance or co-facilitation where authorized; discussion of feedback.	Assessed placement activities; practical tasks; internship report and presentation (CAS).
7) Follow ethical requirements concerning confidentiality, consent, documentation, respectful communication, and the limits of the student's role.	Placement induction; discussion of ethical examples; supervised tasks; review of documentation; feedback on professional conduct.	Assessed placement activities; internship documentation; supervisor evaluation (CAS).
8) Summarize their internship experience, evaluate initial skills using supervisor feedback, and identify further professional learning needs.	Reflective writing; supervisory discussions; analysis of feedback; preparation and presentation of the internship report.	Internship documentation; supervisor evaluation; internship report and presentation (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS), accounting for 100% of the internship grade:
20% – Participation in placement activities: guided observation, completion of agreed activities, and engagement in supervisory discussions.
25% – Practical tasks: introductory assessment and communication exercises, preparation of materials, and assistance with psychoeducational, preventive, or developmental activities.
20% – Internship documentation: completeness, accuracy, organization, and confidentiality of the individual plan, diary, observation notes, and task materials.
15% – Supervisor evaluation: responsibility, ethical conduct, professional communication, and constructive use of guidance and feedback.
20% – Internship report and presentation: clear description and analysis of completed activities, reflection on learning, and responses to questions.

Content

Topic 1. Placement Induction: Organizational Structure, Psychological Services, and Professional Responsibilities
Topic 2. Ethical Requirements, Internship Planning, Confidentiality, and Documentation
Topic 3. Guided Observation of Psychological Assessment, Counseling, and Other Professional Activities
Topic 4. Introductory Assessment Tasks and Basic Professional Communication Skills
Topic 5. Preparation of Materials and Supervised Assistance with Psychoeducational, Preventive, and Developmental Activities
Topic 6. Supervision, Reflection on Initial Professional Experience, and Presentation of Internship Results

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Butuzova, L. P., Dmytriieva, S. M., & Maksymets, S. M. (Comps.). (2023). *Robochyi zoshyt z psykholohii* [Psychology workbook]. Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University. 136 p.
2. Chumak, O. O., & Tovstukha, O. M. (2024). *Psykhodiahnostyka* [Psychodiagnostics]. Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. 121 p.
3. Corey, G. (2024). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (11th ed.). Cengage.
4. Kuzio, O. B. (2022). *Osnovy psykholohichnoi praktyky* [Fundamentals of psychological practice]. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 124 p.
5. Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2023). *Clinical interviewing* (7th ed.). Wiley.

Recommended reading

1. Ameen, E. J., Bergner, C. G., Grus, C. L., & El-Ghoroury, N. H. (2021). Internship factors associated with the mobility of early career psychologists. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 15*(3), 195–201.

2. Elmose, M., Troelsen, R., & Rottmann, N. (2024). Moving into communities of practice: Experiences of psychology students in their internship. *Nordic Psychology, 76*(3), 317–332.

3. Kalishchuk, S. M. (2020). Akademichnyi format pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv-konsultantiv v konteksti makrohenezy yikh "kartyny svitu": Teoretychni modeli ta dosvid [Academic preparation of future counseling psychologists in the context of the macrogenesis of their worldview: Theoretical models and experience]. *Psychological Journal, 6*(6), 127–138.

4. Shevchenko, N. F., & Frenkel, N. S. (2023). Navchalno-profesiina ustanovka u strukturi profesiinoi svidomosti psykholoha-praktyka [Educational and professional attitude in the structure of a practising psychologist's professional consciousness]. *Journal of Modern Psychology*, 4(31), 67–75.

5. Synyshyna, V. (2022). Psykholohichni chynnyky realizatsii kompetentnisnoho pidkhodu do pidhotovky psykholohiv [Psychological factors in implementing a competency-based approach to psychologist training]. *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu oborony Ukrainy, 64*(6), 94–104.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code

2. American Psychological Association. *Testing, Assessment, and Measurement*. https://www.apa.org/topics/testing-assessment-measurement

3. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. *Osnovy psykholohichnoi praktyky* [Fundamentals of psychological practice]: electronic manual. https://dspace.lvduvs.edu.ua/handle/1234567890/4400

4. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. *Etychnyi komitet* [Ethics Committee]. https://npa-ua.org/ethics/

5. Zhytomyr Ivan Franko State University. *Robochyi zoshyt z psykholohii* [Psychology workbook]: electronic teaching resource. https://eprints.zu.edu.ua/36953/

PROFESSIONAL INTERNSHIP				
The internship aims to develop students' ability to integrate psychological knowledge and practical skills when completing agreed professional tasks under supervision. Building on previous placement experience, students clarify client needs, select appropriate assessment methods, analyse psychological information, and practise basic counseling skills. They prepare justified recommendations and contribute to psychological support, psychoeducational, preventive, or developmental activities appropriate to the placement setting. Particular attention is paid to ethical decision-making, confidentiality, professional documentation, consultation and referral, and the use of supervision and feedback to improve professional performance.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	7/2 weeks	3/mandatory	Alina Yudina, PhD Oxana Bayer, PhD Nataliia Hrysenko, PhD (Psychology), Associate Professors	90 h. self-directed internship work, including supervised placement activities, preparation, documentation, reflection, and reporting
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Analyse a client's request and available information to formulate an agreed professional task and justify a proposed course of work under supervision.			Guided case analysis; observation of initial interviews where permitted; preparation of case summaries and task proposals; supervisory discussions.	Practical tasks; internship documentation; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
2) Explain how organizational procedures and professional responsibilities influence psychological work in the placement setting.			Placement induction; examination of organizational documents; observation of service procedures and professional interactions; discussions with the supervisor.	Assessed placement activities; internship documentation; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
3) Select and use appropriate psychodiagnostic tools for agreed tasks under supervision, recognizing their purpose, limitations, and requirements for ethical use.			Comparison of assessment tools; supervisor review of proposed methods; supervised administration and scoring where authorized; analysis of protocols; feedback.	Practical tasks; internship documentation (CAS).
4) Demonstrate basic counseling skills, including establishing contact, attentive			Observation of consultations where permitted; role plays;	Practical tasks; supervisor

listening, clarification, emotional validation, and agreeing appropriate next steps.	supervised participation in agreed consultation tasks; review of performance and feedback.	evaluation (CAS).
5) Integrate assessment results, observations, and contextual information into a justified psychological summary and formulate appropriate recommendations.	Guided analysis of psychological information; comparison of possible interpretations; preparation of anonymized summaries and recommendations; supervisory review.	Practical tasks; internship documentation; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
6) Prepare and contribute to a psychological support activity or plan that links identified needs, appropriate methods, intended outcomes, and review procedures.	Evidence-informed planning; preparation of materials; supervisor review; authorized implementation or co-facilitation; analysis of available feedback.	Practical tasks; internship documentation; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
7) Communicate respectfully and effectively with clients and professionals and explain psychological information appropriately for the audience and assigned role.	Supervised professional interactions; communication exercises; preparation of accessible explanations; participation in team discussions; feedback.	Assessed placement activities; practical tasks; supervisor evaluation (CAS).
8) Apply ethical principles to assessment, counseling, documentation, and support planning and recognize when consultation or referral is required.	Ethical case discussions; supervised practice; review of consent procedures and documentation; analysis of referral decisions; feedback on professional conduct.	Assessed placement activities; internship documentation; supervisor evaluation (CAS).
9) Evaluate professional decisions and performance using supervision and feedback and identify realistic improvements and further learning needs.	Reflective writing; case discussions; supervision and peer consultation; analysis of feedback; preparation and oral defence of the internship report.	Internship documentation; supervisor evaluation; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
Assessment		
Assessment is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS), accounting for 100% of the internship grade: 20% – Assessed placement activities: completion of agreed activities, understanding of service procedures, and constructive participation in professional cooperation and supervisory discussions. 25% – Practical tasks: clarification of a professional request, appropriate use of assessment methods, demonstration of basic counseling skills, and preparation of justified recommendations or a support plan. 20% – Internship documentation: completeness, accuracy, organization, and confidentiality of the individual plan, activity diary, anonymized protocols, case summaries, and task materials. 15% – Supervisor evaluation: professional responsibility, ethical conduct, communication, recognition of professional limitations, and constructive use of supervision and feedback. 20% – Internship report and oral defence: coherent analysis of completed professional tasks, justification of methods and recommendations, reflection on limitations, and responses to questions.		

Content

Topic 1. Placement Induction: Organizational Procedures, Professional Responsibilities, and Ethical Requirements
Topic 2. Clarifying the Client's Request and Planning an Agreed Professional Task
Topic 3. Selection and Supervised Use of Psychodiagnostic Tools
Topic 4. Basic Counseling Skills and Supervised Consultative Interaction
Topic 5. Integration and Interpretation of Psychological Information: Case Summaries and Recommendations
Topic 6. Psychological Support Planning, Professional Cooperation, and Referral
Topic 7. Documentation, Supervision, Professional Reflection, and Oral Defence of Internship Results

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Chaban, O. S., Khaustova, O. O., & Omelianovych, V. Yu. (2023). *Medychna psykholohiia: Etalony praktychnykh navychok* [Medical psychology: Standards of practical skills]. Mahnoliia 2006. 352 p.
2. Cohen, R. J., Schneider, W. J., & Tobin, R. M. (2022). *Psychological testing and assessment: An introduction to tests and measurement* (10th ed.). McGraw Hill.
3. Corey, G. (2024). *Theory and practice of counseling and psychotherapy* (11th ed.). Cengage.
4. Sablina, N. (2024). *Psykholohichne konsultuvannia ta psykhoterapiia skladnykh zapytiv: Travma, PTSR, nasylstvo, zgvaltuvannia, hore, vtrata. Robota z ditmy, pidlitkamy, doroslymy, viiskovymy ta yikh simiamy* [Psychological counseling and psychotherapy for complex concerns: Trauma, PTSD, violence, rape, grief, and loss. Working with children, adolescents, adults, military personnel, and their families]. Tvory. 223 p.
5. Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Sommers-Flanagan, R. (2023). *Clinical interviewing* (7th ed.). Wiley.

Recommended reading

1. Ameen, E. J., Bergner, C. G., Grus, C. L., & El-Ghoroury, N. H. (2021). Internship factors associated with the mobility of early career psychologists. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 15*(3), 195–201.
2. Kalishchuk, S. M. (2020). Akademichnyi format pidhotovky maibutnikh psykholohiv-konsultantiv v konteksti makrohenezy yikh "kartyny svitu": Teoretychni modeli ta dosvid [Academic preparation of future counseling psychologists in the context of the macrogenesis of their worldview: Theoretical models and experience]. *Psychological Journal, 6*(6), 127–138.
3. Moulton-Perkins, A., Wressle, A., Grey, N., & Sired, R. (2019). Evaluation of a psychology graduate internship programme. *The Journal of Mental Health Training, Education and Practice, 14*(6), 423–435.
4. Shakhov, V., Shakhov, V., & Goral-Polrola, J. (2026). Profesiina samosvidomist studentiv-psykholohiv u dynamitsi fakhovoi pidhotovky [Professional self-awareness of psychology students during professional training]. *Naukovi zapysky VDPU. Seriia: Pedahohika i psykholohiia*, (85), 162–172.
5. Shelley, J., Rock, A. J., Schutte, N., Cosh, S. M., & Rice, K. (2025). Accessibility and competency development: Student experiences of a simulated practicum in postgraduate psychology training. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 77*(1), Article 2530961.

Web-resources

1. American Psychological Association. *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. https://www.apa.org/ethics/code
2. American Psychological Association. *Testing, Assessment, and Measurement*. https://www.apa.org/topics/testing-assessment-measurement
3. National Institute of Mental Health. *Health Topics*. https://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics
4. National Library of Medicine. *PubMed*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/
5. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. *Etychnyi komitet* [Ethics Committee]. https://npa-ua.org/ethics/

PRE-GRADUATION INTERNSHIP				
The pre-graduation internship aims to integrate students' psychological knowledge, professional skills, and research experience through tasks connected with their bachelor's thesis and the placement setting. Students implement agreed research procedures, organize and analyse psychological information, interpret findings, and formulate evidence-informed conclusions and recommendations. They also analyse relevant professional practice and prepare a practical output supported by research or identified placement needs. Particular attention is paid to ethical research conduct, confidentiality, methodological limitations, professional boundaries, and the use of supervision and feedback. The internship concludes with a report and oral defence of the completed internship activities.				
Language of teaching	**Semester / Duration**	**ECTS credits / Type of course (mandatory, elective)**	**Course Coordinator**	**Student workload**
Ukrainian	8	4 / mandatory	Inesa Harkusha, PhD in Social Communications, Associate Professor	120 h. self-directed internship work, including supervised research and placement activities, analysis, documentation, reflection, and reporting
Learning outcomes On completion of the course, students will be able to:			**Teaching methods, teaching and learning activities**	**Forms of assessment (continuous assessment CAS)**
1) Prepare and implement an internship work plan linking the approved bachelor's thesis objectives with feasible research and professional tasks in the placement setting.			Placement induction; examination of placement opportunities; review of thesis objectives; preparation and revision of an individual work plan; supervisor consultations.	Practical and research tasks; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
2) Select and critically analyse academic sources to justify research procedures, interpret findings, and support practical recommendations.			Guided literature searches; critical reading; comparison of relevant studies; preparation of evidence summaries; supervisor consultations.	Practical and research tasks; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
3) Apply appropriate data-collection or psychodiagnostic procedures for agreed research tasks, documenting their use and recognizing methodological limitations.			Review of instruments and instructions; supervised preparation and implementation of research procedures; collection and organization of data; review of anonymized records; feedback.	Practical and research tasks; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
4) Analyse and interpret research findings, relate them to the research questions and previous studies, and formulate justified conclusions and recommendations.			Guided data analysis; interpretation workshops or individual consultations; comparison with previous research; preparation and revision of analytical summaries.	Practical and research tasks; internship report and oral defence (CAS).

5) Analyse selected professional activities at the placement setting, considering their aims, methods, contextual requirements, and professional boundaries.	Structured observation where permitted; analysis of anonymized cases or professional materials; discussions with practitioners; preparation of an observation analysis.	Analysis of observed professional activities; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
6) Develop an evidence-informed practical output appropriate to research findings or an identified placement need and propose a feasible approach to reviewing its usefulness.	Needs analysis; selection of supporting evidence; development of materials or an activity plan; supervisor review; authorized implementation where appropriate; analysis of available feedback.	Practical output; internship report and oral defence (CAS).
7) Demonstrate ethical research and professional conduct, evaluate their decisions using supervision and feedback, and present a coherent account of completed internship work.	Review of consent and data-handling procedures; supervised research and professional activities; ethical case discussions; reflective writing; preparation and oral defence of the internship report.	Practical and research tasks; reflective diary and self-analysis; internship report and oral defence (CAS).

Assessment

Assessment is based entirely on continuous assessment (CAS), accounting for 100% of the internship grade:

40% – Practical work during the internship: appropriate application of psychological methods and assessment procedures, analysis and interpretation of information, and adherence to ethical and professional requirements.

25% – Internship report and oral defence: clear presentation and analysis of completed activities, justification of methods, conclusions and recommendations, recognition of limitations, and responses to questions.

15% – Analysis of observed professional activities: examination of the aims, methods, context, and ethical aspects of selected psychological activities, supported by relevant psychological concepts.

10% – Evidence-informed practical output: development of recommendations, psychoeducational materials, an activity plan, or another approved product appropriate to research findings or identified placement needs.

10% – Reflective diary and self-analysis: evaluation of professional and research decisions, use of supervisor feedback, recognition of difficulties, and identification of further learning needs.

Content

Topic 1. Internship Planning: Placement Opportunities, Thesis Objectives, and Agreed Research Tasks

Topic 2. Research Preparation: Academic Sources, Instruments, Procedures, Consent, and Data Protection

Topic 3. Implementation and Documentation of Approved Research Procedures

Topic 4. Analysis and Interpretation of Findings: Conclusions, Limitations, and Practical Recommendations

Topic 5. Observation and Analysis of Professional Psychological Activities

Topic 6. Development of an Evidence-Informed Practical Output

Topic 7. Supervision, Professional Reflection, Internship Reporting, and Oral Defence

Literature

Compulsory reading

1. Chumak, O. O., & Tovstukha, O. M. (2024). *Psykhodiahnostyka* [Psychodiagnostics]. Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University. 121 p.

2. Coolican, H. (2024). *Research methods and statistics in psychology* (8th ed.). Routledge.

3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE.

4. Kuzio, O. B. (2022). *Osnovy psykholohichnoi praktyky* [Fundamentals of psychological practice]. Lviv State University of Internal Affairs. 124 p.

5. Spivak, L. M., & Osmanova, A. M. (Comps.). (2023). *Psykhodiahnostyka v klinichnii psykholohii* [Psychodiagnostics in clinical psychology]. University "Ukraine". 146 p.

Recommended reading

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE.

2. Koloiz, Zh. V. (2024). *Osnovy akademichnoho pysma* [Fundamentals of academic writing] (2nd revised and expanded ed.). FOP Marynchenko S. V. 143 p.

3. Makhnii, M. M. (2022). *Psykholohichni hrafichno-maliunkovi metodyky u diahnostychno-korektsiinii roboti z ditmy* [Psychological graphic and drawing techniques in diagnostic and correctional work with children]. Desna Polihraf. 216 p.

4. Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science, 349*(6251), Article aac4716.

Web-resources

1. Alfred Nobel University. *University Library*. https://lib.duan.edu.ua/uk/

2. American Psychological Association. *Journal Article Reporting Standards*. https://apastyle.apa.org/jars

3. American Psychological Association. *APA Style: Reference Examples*. https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/references/examples

4. National Library of Medicine. *PubMed*. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/

5. National Psychological Association of Ukraine. *Etychnyi komitet* [Ethics Committee]. https://npa-ua.org/ethics/

6. University of Manchester. *Academic Phrasebank: Discussing Findings*. https://www.phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk/discussing-findings/

Structure of the Counselling, Correction and Development Work Study Programme (Bachelor's degree)

	Semesters							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Teaching Units (Courses), 159 ECTS* Mandatory								
Courses of General Training	22	13	6	6	4	4	4	4
Courses of Professional Training	8.5	9.5	13.5	18.5	12	7	14.5	12.5
TOTAL	**30.5**	**22.5**	**19.5**	**24.5**	**16**	**11**	**18.5**	**16.5**

Teaching Units (Courses), 62 ECTS
Elective**

Courses of General Training
24

Courses of Professional Training
38

					Educational and Professional Internship 4 ECTS	Professional Internship 3 ECTS	Pre-Graduation Internship 4 ECTS

Bachelor's Thesis
7 ECTS

Certification Examination in the Profession
1 ECTS

TOTAL	Mandatory	Elective	Internship	Final Attestation	Bachelor's Thesis
	159	62	11	1	7

*One ECTS credit = 30 academic hours.
**There are no restrictions of choice for students within each elective block. The only requirement for the student is to obtain the determined number of credits for each elective block.