|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Milgram | Social 1 | Bocchiaro |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Social because it showed how pressure from another could lead people to administer potentially fatal electric shocks, in spite of their discomfort about doing it. Emphasised situational rather than individual explanations | **Area: Social**Behaviour is caused by people / place around us | Social because what people believe they will do about disobedience is different from what they actually do. What they actually do is due to their situation rather than dispositional factors.  |
| How the situation (authority figure and location) cause the agentic shift from autonomous to agentic in obedience | **Key Theme: Responses to people in authority**How do people respond to an authority figure in whether to obey / disobey | How the presence of an authority figure causes obedience. This study also investigated the role of dispositional factors |
| Methodological Issues |
| Data collected through observation of Ps | **Research Method/Design*** Lab experiments with no IV
* Controlled observation in a lab
 | * Bocchiaro called it a 'scenario study'
* Data collected through written self-reports
 |
| * Smaller sample: 40 Ps
* All male – androcentric
* Range of backgrounds and jobs
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Volunteer samples recruited through adverts
* Payment for taking part ($4 / €7)
* Ethnocentric sample (USA / Holland)
 | * Larger sample: 149 Ps
* All students - less representative
* 11 Ps’ data was removed as they were suspicious of the study
 |
| Number of Ps giving full 450V shock | **Quantitative Data**Number of Ps who showed the behaviour | * Number of Ps who whistle blew
* Personality traits and values orientations
 |
| **Reliability**☺ Both high as all Ps experienced the same standardised procedures☺ Both highly replicable |
| **Validity**☺ Both had high levels of control to remove **extraneous variables**☹ Both were ethnocentric - lacking **population validity**☹ Both had tasks which lack mundane realism which may lead to low **ecological validity.** |
| Practical Applications |
| Used by the International Criminal Court to predict atrocities | Both have applications in understanding, predicting and tackling tendency to obey orders that lead to harm in others | * Everyday injustice
* Workplace whistle-blowing
 |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| **To a lesser extent / somewhat.**Bocchiaro suggests that people are still as obedient as they were in 1963 (Milgram’s study). People still believe that they will be less obedient than they are (as seen by asking other Ps what they would do). Bocchiaro confirms the findings from Milgram. So although Bocchiaro does not further our understanding, it does help us understand that the concept of obedience is not time-locked. |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Led to an understanding that all individuals are susceptible if they are asked by an authority figure, to gradually carry out terrible acts they would previously have said were inconceivable. Bocchiaro et al found similar results and extended the evidence to female behaviour. | Both studies highlight the need for society to question authority because obedience levels in both studies was high. Bocchiaro used students so may not explain how different groups in society may behave. Milgram studied volunteers with a range of occupations. | Bocchiaro furthered Milgram’s ethnocentric research and showed that obedience is high across cultures and similar over time, suggesting that people are inherently obedient. |
| Piliavin | Social 2 | Levine |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Social because it investigated the impact of other people on helping behaviour.  | **Area: Social**Behaviour is caused by people / place around us | Social because it investigated how other people affect on non-emergency helping behaviour, in 23 different countries. Results found cultural differences in altruism, so culture is an explanation of behaviour. |
| Whether people will give help in an emergency situation  | **Key Theme: Responses to people in authority**Bystander behaviour—the extent to which people will offer help to strangers in need. | Differences between cities in whether people will give help in a non-emergency situations |
| Methodological Issues |
| * 103 trials over 2 months
* 4 IVs: victim’s race, victim’s responsibility for situation, presence of a model, number of bystanders
 | **Research Method / Design** * Field experiments
* Busy city environments
* Familiar natural environments
* Independent measures design
 | * 23 field experiments
* 3 IVs: dropped pen, hurt leg, helping blind person across the street.
 |
| * Larger sample: just under 4,550
* Target population: New Yorkers – less representative
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Opportunity sampling
* Large nomothetic samples
* Ps were not aware they were participating
* Both tried to be systematic (good range of train times / largest city in the country chosen).
 | * Smaller sample: just under 1,200
* Target population 23 cities – more representative
 |
| Also collected qualitative data - passenger comments | **Quantitative Data*** Rates of helping
* How long people took to help
 |   |
| **Reliability**☹ **Internal reliability** is poor as it took place in a natural setting |
| **Validity**☺ Observations have better **construct validity** than self-reports (actual helping not just a guess of whether a P would help)☺ Task and environment had good mundane realism, which leads to better **ecological validity**.☺ Lack of consent which helped to remove **P effects** (social desirability bias, demand characteristics) |
| Practical Applications |
| If we are taken ill in a public place and need help, we need to make sure people realise that we are ill and not drunk | Both have applications in understanding and predicting helping behaviour in real life. | Implications in terms of travelling - if we need help, we can expect it a to more in some cities than in others |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| **To a greater extent.** Levine shows that responses to people in need vary across the world. So culture has a big impact on the responses given. Levine suggests that the findings from Piliavin may be due to culture because New York finished 22nd out of 23 in overall help. |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Piliavin and Levine both found that individual’s responses to people in need do vary and factors such as the judgements of an individual in need and cultural factors do have an effect on helping behaviour. | Piliavin suggests individuals use a cost-benefit analysis to decide whether to help those in need. People were more likely to help someone of the same race. Levine found a shift in the helping behaviour of females; Piliavin that showed helpers were mostly males. | Because Levine’s research was cross-cultural, it shows that helping behaviour and altruism are affected by more than just situational explanations with countries that practice simpatia found more likely to help.  |
| Loftus & Palmer | Cognitive 1 | Grant |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Cognitive because it shows the impact that post-event information can have on memory output, even to the point of producing false memories. | **Area: Cognitive**Behaviour is caused by thinking processes | Cognitive because it shows how memory output can be enhanced, rather than distorted. When contextual cues which are used during storage input are the same, memory retrieval can be enhanced. |
| The disrupting effect of information received *between* encoding and retrieval in the form of leading questions | **Key Theme: Memory**the extent to which our memory produces an accurate record of the material encoded: both found that it does not. | The enhancing effects of contextual cues during the process of encoding and retrieval, if they matched or not |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Expt 1: 5 IVs: contacted, hit, bumped, collided, smashed.
* Expt 2: 2 IVs: smashed, hit, control group.
 | **Research Method/Design*** Laboratory experiments
* Independent measures design
 | 4 IVs: silent-silent, silent-noisy, noisy-silent, noisy-noisy. |
| * 45 Ps in Expt 1
* 150 Ps in Expt 2
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Opportunity sampling
* Students
 | * 39 Ps
* Acquaintances of students
 |
| **Quantitative Data**Short answer / Closed questions |
| **Reliability**☺ Both high as all Ps experienced the same standardised procedures☺ Both highly replicable |
| **Validity**☹ Tasks lack mundane realism ☹ Results lack ecological validity |
| Practical Applications |
| **Courtroom applications*** Cognitive interview for questioning witnesses
* Devlin report recommends convictions are not based on EWT alone
 | Both have applications in understanding how memory can be enhanced / improved. | Classroom applications |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| **To a greater extent.** Both studies investigate a separate area of memory. Loftus focuses on reconstructive memory and shows that post event information (PEI) can decrease memory accuracy, whereas Grant looks into the role the environment can play in memory and how context dependent cues can enhance memory.  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Grant found that, further to Loftus and Palmer’s conclusion that post-event information can affect memory recall, the ability to recall information is also affected by context dependent cues and the setting in which material has been processed in the first place. | Accuracy of memory is a concern for the criminal justice system which often relies on EWT: led to changes described in the Devlin report. Grant does not further our understanding of social diversity as it used USA students only.  | Both studies can explain cultural differences by investigating the factors that may influence memory recall. Although these studies are both ethnocentric, they suggest a nomothetic explanation of behaviour that can be applied to different cultures.  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Moray | Cognitive 2 | Simons and Chabris |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Cognitive because it investigated the process of auditory attention. It investigated the ‘cocktail party effect’ and how a person's name breaks the attentional barrier, but words in general and digits don't. | **Area: Cognitive**Behaviour is caused by thinking processes | Cognitive because it investigated the process of visual attention. We may not recall information that we see (gorilla / woman with umbrella), because we do not pay attention to it.  |
| Auditory attention - we are not aware of obvious features of a message, even fail to notice our own name | **Key Theme: Attention**We fail to pay attention to relevant / unexpected things that we would be expected to notice. Measured through dynamic events rather than a single, static one. | Visual inattention - we fail to notice an ongoing but unexpected event |
| Methodological Issues |
| 3 Lab Expts with different 'affective contents'* 1 = repeated measures - story with words
* 2 = independent measures - use of Ps’ name
* 3 = independent measures - digits
 | **Research Method/Design*** Laboratory experiments
* Independent measures design
* Data collected through self-reports
* Dynamic not static events
 | * Only independent measures design
* 16 conditions in 4 pairs: umbrella woman / gorilla, black / white team, easy / hard task, transparent / opaque
 |
| * Sampling method not known - assumed to be opportunity sampling
* Expt 1 = number of Ps not known
* Expt 2 = 12 Ps
* Expt 3 = 14 Ps
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Students / university researchers
* Ethnocentric (Oxford / Harvard Unis)
 | * Volunteer sampling
* 228 Ps - 12 Ps per condition
 |
| **Quantitative Data**Data collected from short answer / closed questions |
|   | **Reliability**☺ Variables were well controlled removing P and investigator effects | ☹ Less consistency as 21 different experimenters and a range of TV screen sizes were used |
| ☺ Better mundane realism as people do have dichotic tasks in real life | **Validity**☹ Tasks lack mundane realism ☹ Results lack ecological validity | ☹ Lower validity - less mundane realism as people do not usually have to count basketball passes in real life |
| Practical Applications |
| Both have applications in understanding why people fail to notice key events, especially when their focus is elsewhere |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| **To a lesser extent / somewhat.** S&C suggests that even though we may see things in our visual field, we might not perceive them if our attention is focused in another direction. It builds upon Moray’s work on auditory attention by concluding that individuals’ inattention is limited not just to sound but also to sight. S&C showed that there was still a significant amount of individual diversity. 46% of Ps did not notice the unexpected event, while 54% did. This changes our understanding from what Moray suggests, showing that not everyone uses their attention in the same way.   |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Simons & Chabris allow us to see how individuals process environmental stimuli differently and this results in individual differences in the ability to pay attention to background stimuli. This extends Moray's research to visual information. | Both pieces of research use students for their sample and therefore may not explain groups in society who do not share characteristics that are similar to these. | Simons and Chabris’s Ps were from Harvard university which allowed research to be applied to American culture as well as English culture that was previously studied by Moray (Ps from Oxford University). |
| Bandura | Developmental 1 | Chaney |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Developmental because it shows that we develop and learn through Social Learning. Children learn through imitation and observation (A.R.R.M.) | **Area: Developmental**Behaviour is caused by level of development reached (age / experience) | Developmental because it shows that children develop and learn through operant conditioning. Children learn through rewards and negative reinforcement. |
| Social Learning: Children are influenced by imitating aggressive behaviour they have observed in adult role models | **Key Theme: External Influences on Children's Behaviour**how external influences can influence behaviour | Operant Conditioning - how children will increase desirable behaviour (medical compliance) when positively reinforced. |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Lab experiment
* Independent measures
* Data collected through observation
 | **Research Method/Design**Experiments | * Field Experiment - could not control factors from the environment which causes compliance
* Repeated Measures
* Data collected through interviews
 |
| * Larger sample: 72 Ps
* Opportunity sample - from Stanford nursery
* Less representative because of smaller geographical area.
* Mean age: 4.3 years.
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Young children
* Male and female
* Ethnocentric (USA / Australia)
 | * Smaller sample: 32 Ps
* Random sampling - recruited through local paediatrician or GP clinics.
* Mean age: 3.2 years.
 |
|   | **Quantitative Data**Number of Ps who showed the behaviour modelled / desired | Also collected qualitative data - parent comments |
| ☺ Aggression levels assessed before the study and matched between groups☺ Inter-rater reliability of observers checked and was excellent | **Reliability**☺ Procedure and materials and conditions all carefully controlled☺ Highly replicable |   |
| Less validity* Tasks lack mundane realism
* Location was not a real life setting
* Results lack ecological validity
 | **Validity**Demand characteristics could lead to P effects | ☺ Higher ecological validity because it was in a natural environment☹ Children had previously used the standard device - may lead to P effects (order effects, social desirability bias) |
| Practical Applications |
| Understand how children learn and express aggression  | Both have applications in understanding how to modify children's behaviour | Modify children’s and healthcare patients' behaviour through the use of positive reinforcement |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a greater extent. Chaney shows that by using operant conditioning (rewards and negative reinforcement) you can influence a child's behaviour whereas Bandura’s study focused on the way that social learning theory can explain behaviour (attention, retention, reproduction, motivation).  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Bandura showed that M/F are affected more by same sex role models. Chaney furthered the understanding of how M/F learn through operant conditioning. | Bandura explained the causes of behaviour (Social Learning) and Chaney furthered an understanding of how behaviourist theories can be used to improve behaviour.  | Chaney carried out research with Australian children which furthers Bandura’s research in America and suggests that all children, regardless of culture, are able to learn and acquire behaviour using reinforcement. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Kohlberg | Developmental 2 | Lee |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Developmental because it investigated how, as people get older, their moral thinking evolves. There are six distinct stages of moral development which people go through regardless of their culture | **Area: Developmental**Behaviour is caused by level of development reached (age / experience) | Developmental because it showed that the way children develop moral thinking is affected by culture.  |
| There is a universal sequence of moral development that all children naturally follow (Pre-C, Conventional, Post-C) | **Key Theme: Moral Development**How children make judgements about what is right and wrong in fictional scenarios | Cultural differences in moral evaluations of lying and truth-telling |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Longitudinal study - tracked the same Ps over 12 years at 3 year intervals
* Repeated measures
* No individual differences as same Ps used all through
 | **Research Method / Design*** Fictional moral stories / dilemmas
* Data collected through self-report (spoken)
 | * Cross-cultural snapshot study of 2 groups of kids (Canada & China) all aged 7, 9, or 11 yrs old
* Laboratory experiment
* Independent measures - so differences in scores between age groups may be result of individual differences
 |
| * Androcentric
* 75 American males (Chicago)
* Afterwards, boys from UK, Canada, Taiwan, Mexico, Turkey used
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Nomothetic large samples
* Not known how samples were recruited
* Ethnocentric
 | * Mix of M and F
* 228 Ps (120 Chinese, 108 Canadian)
 |
| **Qualitative data**Kohlberg fitted the Ps' responses to his own categories - subjective | **Data**collected through self-reports using fictional moral stories / dilemmas | **Quantitative Data**7 point rating scale allowed for quantitative data for comparison |
| **Reliability**☺ Good external reliability as it is easy to replicate☹ Ps' responses did not have to link to a particular stage |
| ☹ Lacks **face validity** - the links Kohlberg made between Tommy & Richard's responses and the stage he allocated these to is not clear. | **Validity*** Moral stories / dilemmas were fictional so lack mundane realism
* Results lack ecological validity
 | ☺ Randomised order of the 4 stories - helps reduce P effects |
| Practical Applications |
| Moral development in childhood - Life Skills in schools, parenting; Age of criminal responsibility |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a greater extent. Lee does not simply follow Kohlberg’s universal stages of development but suggests that culture has an impact on moral development. Kohlberg suggested that age was the only factor that affected moral understanding, Lee showed that culture also was a factor.  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Kohlberg only studied boys. Lee was able to study girls too and explain how both genders develop morally, based on cultural factors. |   | Lee reinforces Kohlberg’s idea that morality is developed over time. Lee also showed that moral development is due to cultural factors that affect a person’s understanding of whether lies should be told. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sperry | Biological 1 | Casey |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Biological because it investigated how the brain's 2 hemispheres and the corpus callosum cause and control specific behaviours. LH = language, RH = recognition. | **Area: Biological**Behaviour is caused by brain (structure / activity), chemicals (hormones / neurotransmitters) and genes | Biological because it investigated how different areas of the brain cause and control self-regulation and giving into temptation. Inferior frontal gyrus causes self-control, ventral striatum controls impulse. |
| What behaviours the left (language) and right (recognition) hemispheres control | **Key Theme: Regions of the brain** What behaviours different regions of the brain control | Inferior frontal gyrus (‘no-go’ tasks and impulse control) and the ventral striatum (not being able to delay gratification) |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Snapshot study
* Data collected through observation and self-report (spoken)
 | **Research Method / Design*** Natural experiments (IV occurred naturally – commisurotomy / low or high delayer)
* Laboratory based
* Multiple trials
 | * Part of a longitudinal study
* Data collected through scientific electronic equipment (laptop data recording, fMRI)
 |
| 11 Ps (1F, 10M) | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Restricted samples
* Not known how samples were recruited
* Ethnocentric
 | * Previous studies: Mischel’s Marshmallow Expt: 562 Ps from Stanford Bing Nursery at 4 yrs old, 1993: 155 Ps in their 20s; 2003: 135 in their 30s
* Casey Expt 1: 59 (23M, 36F).
* Casey Expt 2: 27 (13M, 14F). 1 P’s data was excluded - so 26.
 |
| Data collected through observation and self-report (spoken) | **Quantitative Data** | Data collected through scientific electronic equipment (laptop data recording, fMRI) |
| ☹ Lower **external reliability** as sample was so small. | **Reliability**☺ Procedure and materials and conditions all carefully controlled☺ Highly replicable | ☺ Use of fMRI scanner - **good test retest reliability** |
| **Validity**• Tasks lack mundane realism • Results lack ecological validity |
| Practical Applications |
| • Understanding brain localisation• Awareness of specific problems that come from brain damage• Helps to advise doctors when performing surgery |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a greater extent. Casey found evidence for ‘hot’ and ‘cool’ systems in the brain (the ventral striatum and the inferior frontal gyrus). Sperry identified the role of the corpus callosum and hemispheres in general, Casey identified specific regions that play a role in self-control. |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Sperry suggested that individual differences in the brain lead to differences in behaviour and Casey furthered this understanding by focusing on more specific regions of the brain that contribute to individual differences - the ventral striatum is associated with a lack of self-control. |   | Casey had American Ps , like Sperry did, so both are limited in their ability to explain cultural differences. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Blakemore & Cooper | Biological 2 | Maguire |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Biological because it investigates how the visual environment can affect a cat's brain structure and activity in the visual cortex. It discusses whether brain activity / structure affects behaviour or the other way around.  | **Area: Biological**Behaviour is caused by brain (structure / activity), chemicals (hormones / neurotransmitters) and genes | Biological because it investigated how the job (taxi-driver - greater use of navigational experience) affects the volume of the hippocampi. It proved that the brain activity / structure is altered by experiences.  |
| In the visual cortex, orientation-specific cells can change the kind of stimulus they can respond to according the animal’s early visual environment | **Key Theme: Brain plasticity**How the brain adapts to experience with the environment.  | The posterior hippocampus increased in volume (and the anterior hippocampus decreased) in taxi drivers |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Laboratory experiment (IV = horizontal / vertical stripes)
* Data also collected through observation
 | **Research Method / Design*** Experiments
* Laboratory based
* Independent measures
* Data collected through brain imaging
 | * Natural experiment: IV= taxi driver/no
* Data collected through Voxel based morphometry (VBM) and MRI scans
 |
| Kittens | **Sampling Technique/Sample** | * 16 taxi drivers - all right-handed and male, mean age 44 years, mean time as a licensed London taxi driver (passed The Knowledge) 14.3 years
* 50 in control group, 16 matched for age, male, right handed.
 |
| **Quantitative Data**Data collected through scientific electronic equipment |
| ☹ Lower **external reliability** as sample was so small (2 kittens)☹ Might be difficult to extrapolate the results to humans | **Reliability**☺ Procedure and materials and conditions all carefully controlled☺ Highly replicable | 😐 Only 1 person assessed all of the images - could show consistency but lacks ability to judge inter-rater reliability |
| **Validity**☹ Tasks lack mundane realism ☹ Results lack ecological validity |
| Practical Applications |
| * Shows how the brain is capable of structural change in response to experience and the environment
* Awareness of specific problems that come from brain damage
* Helps to advise doctors when performing surgery
 |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a lesser extent / somewhat. Maguire investigates brain plasticity by looking at the difference between taxi drivers and non-taxi drivers in terms of hippocampus volume. Maguire shows that if you use a specific area of the brain (the hippocampus) a lot then your brain is able to adapt to this increase in demands. Whereas Blakemore and Cooper suggests that brain plasticity is a phenomenon found not only in cats.  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Maguire’s research showed that brain plasticity does not only apply to animals such as cats but to humans as well. Excessive use of navigation skills led for grey matter in the posterior hippocampi to develop to accommodate this demand. | Maguire does not tell us more about social diversity but it does show great improvements in the ability to measure human brain activity and allow for future research to explore this. |   |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Freud | Individual Differences 1 | Baron Cohen |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Individual differences because it explains why people differ, such as having a phobia. It also considers how all people are similar - how the Oedipus (and Electra) complexes are a part of normal development. | **Area: Individual Differences**Behaviour is caused by different things for each person, as everyone is different and unique | Individual differences because it explains why people differ, such as having Autism due to differences in people's Theory of Mind.  |
| Case study focussing on the Oedipus Complex of Little Hans and the development of phobias. | **Key Theme: Understanding Disorders**What we understand about psychological and mental health disorders | Investigated the theory of mind in high-functioning adults with autism. |
| Methodological Issues |
| * Longitudinal case study
* Data collected through self-reports with father Max Graf - secondary data
 | **Research Method / Design** | * Natural experiment
* IVs = autism, Tourette's, normal
* Matched pairs design (trios)
 |
| Single male: five year old boy, whose father was a fan of Freud’s work. Highly unrepresentative; unwise to attempt to generalise findings. | **Sampling Technique/Sample*** Restricted samples
* Ethnocentric
 | * 16 Ps with Autism (13M, 3F)
* 10 Ps with Tourette's (8M, 2F).
* Both these groups had passed 1st order ToM tests (basic emotion test, gender recognition, Sally Ann tests / Happe's Strange Stories)
* 50 'normal' Ps (25M, 25F)
 |
| Qualitative data | **Data** | Quantitative data |
| * Not replicable
* Not standardised
 | **Reliability** | ☺ Pictures standardised - all 15 x 10cm shown for 3 seconds, same conditions, standardised instructions☺ **Inter-rater reliability** – judges checked word pair choices for each of the Eyes |
|   | **Validity** | ☺ **Concurrent validity** – compared Eyes task to Happe’s Strange Stories☹ The Eyes Task lacks mundane realism, so results may lack **ecological validity** |
| Practical Applications |
| **Psychoanalysis:** using dream analysis, free association, Rorscach inblots, Thematic Apperception Tests | Methods to understand and treat disorders - useful for training therapists | Use of images to train people with autism to understand emotions |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a greater extent. Baron Cohen changes the way psychologists ‘understand disorders’, by giving a cognitive explanation of disorders (lack of theory of mind causing autism) and an objective way of measuring this (the Eyes Task), rather than a psychodynamic explanation of mental illness (Freud – phobias due to fixation at the anal stage as part of the 5psychosexual stages) and a subjective way of measuring this (psychoanalysis using dream analysis).  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Both studies develop an understanding of why behaviour may differ among people. Baron-Cohen - lack of ToM leads to changes in behaviour over a lifetime; Freud - why some experience phobias for a shorter period of time  |   | Baron Cohen’s study was carried out in the UK and suggests that autism can be explained in the same way (lack of ToM) across other cultures however, like Freud, this research only focused on one culture (Austria). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gould | Individual Differences 2 | Hancock |
| Differences | Similarities | Differences |
| Individual differences because it criticises Yerkes' attempt to develop a test to measure intelligence levels. It looks at how difficult it is to avoid cultural bias in supposedly objective measures. | **Area: Individual Differences**Behaviour is caused by different things for each person, as everyone is different and unique | Individual differences because it focuses on trying to measure differences in the language used by 14 psychopathic and 38 non-psychopathic homicide offenders. |
| The difficulties associated with creating a valid and reliable tool to measure intelligence | **Key Theme: Measuring Differences**Is it possible to have a valid, reliable and objective test to measure and compare differences between people? | Compared the language of psychopaths to non-psychopaths |
| Methodological Issues |
| Review of IQ testing undertaken by Yerkes | **Research Method/Design**Self-reports (written / spoken) | * Content analysis of interviews
* Data collected through interviews
* Content analysis of data collected using 2 text analysis tools: Wmatrix and DAL.
 |
| * Opportunity sampling
* 1.75 million male US Army recruits
 | **Sampling Technique/Sample**Ethnocentric (USA / Canada) | * Volunteer sampling
* 52 Canadian murderers
* 14 psychopaths
* 38 non- psychopaths
 |
| Data collected through self-report (written / spoken) | **Quantitative Data** | Data collected through scientific electronic equipment (linguistic analysis tools) |
| ☺ Alpha and Beta tests highly standardised - **good test retest reliability**☹ Conditions in which the tests were sat were different for different people - **lacks standardisation and control** | **Reliability** | ☺ Highly **replicable** interviews ☺ Random checks by another researcher - **inter-rater reliability**☺ Interviewers did not know which was a psychopath **- limits investigator effects** |
| ☹ Yerkes' tests lacked **construct validity** - positive correlation between higher scores and time spent in America, literacy and education | **Validity** | ☺ Murderers interviewed on own crimes - **good ecological validity**☺ Free recall and no leading questions - limits **social desirability bias**☺ Linguistic analysis tools tested for validity - **concurrent validity** |
| Practical Applications |
| **Psychometric testing in education and workplaces** - ensuring standardised, reliable, objective and valid tests for IQ and skills |  | **Analysing word-pattern to calculate the likelihood that the person is psychopathic**• Social media and online dating• Criminal justice system |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of the key theme |
| To a lesser extent. Both studies raise the issue of constructing valid, reliable and objective tests to measure and compare differences between people. Gould - it is very problematic to construct IQ tests and the implications of getting it wrong are severe (scientific racism). Hancock - it is possible - by using computer analysis but and that there still needs to be sensitivity in the ways people are compared.  |
| To what extent the contemporary study changes our understanding of … diversity |
| Individual diversity | Social diversity | Cultural diversity |
| Hancock - it is possible to measure behaviour to establish factors that cause individual differences **fairly.** It allowed more specific behaviours to be measured (use of sub-ordinating conjunctions, more emphasis on basic needs, greater use of the past tense) to understand abnormal behaviour rather than Gould’s focus on typical intelligence. | Hancock’s sample of 52 Canadian prisoners (murderers) does not tell us more about social diversity as a whole but about a particular group of individuals who are likely to have similar backgrounds. This did enable Hancock to explain an important issue in society and potentially reduce future offending. | Hancock’s sample of 52 Canadian prisoners (murderers) does not offer further insight into cultural diversity overall, but it does extend our understanding from America in Gould’s study. |