|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of Watson and Rayner (1920)** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | | **Could Know** | | |
| **Lacks Ecological Valdity** | **Low Population Validity** | | **Ethical Issues** | | |
| P: One weakness of Watson and Rayner’s study is that it lacks ecological validity. | P: Another weakness of Watson and Rayner’s study is that a small sample size was used. | | P: A final weakness of Watson and Rayner’s study is that there are a number of reasons why it is highly unethical. | | |
|  | | E: This is because the research was conducted in a highly controlled environment (a lab setting). | E: This is a problem because the sample consisted of only one baby who was 11 months old. | | E: For example, Albert was clearly caused distress as he was made afraid of white rats and there was no attempt to counter-condition the phobia. In addition, Albert could have been left with a mental disorder for life and was therefore psychologically harmed. | | |
| E: The research was therefore carried out in an artificial setting. This means that the researchers may have shown that you can condition a phobia in a laboratory but they did not show it can happen in a more natural setting. | E: This means that we do not know whether it would be easier or more difficult to condition other children. | | E: Although this was unethical research, a cost benefit analysis would have been conducted beforehand. This would be to establish if the potential costs (i.e. psychological harm) would outweigh the benefits (in this case, finding out if phobias can be learnt). If they do not, the research would go ahead. | | |
|  | | L: Therefore, the findings cannot be generalised to a real life settingbecause individuals would act differently in the real world. This means that the credibility of the research is weakened as it lacks applicability. | L: Consequently, the results of the study cannot be generalised to the wider population which means the Behaviourist theory being tested by Watson and Rayner lacks explanatory power. | | L: As a consequence, it can be said that although Watson and Rayner’s study does break ethical guideline, it still provides valuable insight into forming phobias. | | |
|  | | | | | | http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSUUB6ZF__9Wsj7M2RqfBCcuTVi5P28hEXTFL5kqeTCNEnpkRDU96RFZeQ:a.tgcdn.net/images/products/zoom/f2cc_laboratory_shot_glasses.jpg | http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcS4FChGGTozDrvPwq8jG2325DG5igtm5ECsCr_SENrdOOL69oqSeMKw6_qF:theopenend.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/Little-Albert.jpg | | http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcRY28D60WsaCVchZpjrFJNr1i-CAjwet4llj7sS5Y5NHqKxT_31prS-mw:i.kinja-img.com/gawker-media/image/upload/s--_fXTV26u--/191h73zg2zgijjpg.jpg | | |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of the Mednick’s Research** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | | | **Must Know** | | **Could Know** |
| **Androcentric** | | | **☹ Ignores the role of participants’ early childhood** | | **☹ Study relied on records that may be unreliable** |
| P: Another issue with Mednick’s study is it androcentric. | | | P: Another limitation of Mednick’s research is that it ignores the role the participants’ early childhood experience may have played in their behaviour. | | P: One issue with Mednick’s research is that the study relied on records of criminal convictions that may have been unreliable. |
| E: This is because Mednick used a sample of over 14,000 males from Denmark. | | | E: This is because even though over 90% of the adoptees were adopted before the age of 2, many still spent some of their early lives with their biological parents. | | E: This is because they rely on crimes being reported or detected, and criminals then convicted. |
|  | | E: This is an issue because it is not safe to generalise and apply the findings to the wider population (females). It could be that females are more or less likely to inherit criminal behaviour from their parents. Without testing this, the researchers could not be sure how representative the results are. | | | E: This is an issue because the ‘contamination effect’ may have impacted on their behaviour already. One reason why the children may have been removed/put up for adoption in the first place could be due to abuse or neglect. | | E: For example, some of the parents or adoptees may have committed crimes but may not have been caught, so that the statistics may be inaccurate. Similarly, some of the convictions may not have been fair. Therefore it can be questioned whether so many adoptive parents were really non-offenders. |
|  | | | | L: This casts doubt over the credibility of Mednick’s research and as a result, weakens the support for the Biological Approach to criminal behaviour. | | | L: This further questions the internal validity of Mednick’s findings as he may not be measuring what he set out to measure - the relationship between the adoptees’ behaviour and that of their biological/adoptive parents. | | L: As a result, this casts doubt over the internal validity of Mednick’s results as he may not truly be investigating the role of biological factors in criminal behaviour. |
|  | | | | | | male & female toilet symbols only - toilet door sign | | | Bad Parenting Skills by tigershark94 | | criminal-background-check |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | **Criticisms of the Haber & Levine’s Research** | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | **C GRADE ANSWER** | **A GRADE ANSWER** | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | **Could Know** |
| **Low Population Validity** | **Demand Characteristics** | **low ecological validity** |
| P: One weakness of Haber and Levin’s study is that it has **low population validity (androcentric)** | P: Another issue with Haber and Levin’s study is that it may be subject to **demand characteristics**. | P: One limitation of Haber and Levin’s study is that it **has low ecological validity.** |
| E: This is because they used a very small sample of nine male students. | E: This is because they used a repeated measures design to test the origins of perception (top-down or bottom-up). Participants were asked to judge all 3 types of objects in the field. This would have made it very easy for them to figure out the aim of the investigation. As a result, they may have changed their behaviour to please the researcher. | E: For example, the tasks used to investigate perception were artificial and unfamiliar. Participants were asked to judge the distance of randomly placed items. This would never occur in a real life setting. Furthermore, testing city dwellers in an unfamiliar field may have also distorted findings. |
|  | E: This is an issue because the sample used to investigate top-down/bottom-up processing is not very representative. As a result we cannot generalise the findings to the wider population. We cannot be sure that females will perceive the images in the same way. | E: For example, they may have purposely judges the objects in section 3 and 4 inaccurately in order to prove Haber and Levin’s hypothesis right. | E: Therefore, because the task was not reflective of real life, we cannot generalise the findings to outside the experimental setting. |
|  | | L: Consequently, this reduces the credibility of Haber and Levin’s findings that perception is the result of top-down processing. Furthermore, this impacts negatively on the explanatory power of the Constructivist theory as a whole. | L: As a result, this further reduces the credibility of the research that supports the Constructivist Approach. | L: As a consequence, this reduces the credibility of Haber and Levin’s study. |
|  | | | male & female toilet symbols only - toilet door sign | http://t2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTx7PeArlniimyRsEmI5jxm_-b7DgpaGP7kFVuOFkTMsb8-e6obgBE_HNeD:got-crossfit.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Question-mark-scratch-head.jpg |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of Piaget’s Research** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | | | **Could Know** | |
| **Culturally Bias** | **The Nature Of The Task** | | | **Methodological Flaws** | |
| P: Another problem with Piaget’s research is that it is culturally bias. | P: Another issue with Piaget’s experiment is that the task design to investigate conservation of number was contrived (not child-friendly). | | | P: One issue with Piaget’s experiment is that way in which he questioned the children. | |
| E: For example, Piaget only used children from a Western Society (French children). | E: For example, children were tested at a table with dull, colourless counters. | | | E: For example, in his research the children were asked to say if the two rows of counters were the same. The children were first asked *before* the researcher played around with the counters, and again after re-arranging them. | |
|  | | E: This is an issue because we cannot generalise the results that children in the pre-operational stage cannot conserve number to children of other cultures. | E: This is an issue because it has been highlighted that when a game was played to stretch the line using a ‘naughty’ toy animal who messed up the row, 60% of children in the pre-operational stage could work it out and pass the conservation of number test. | | | E: This is an issue because it has been pointed out in normal circumstances (e.g. at home or in class) children are only asked the same question twice if they have got it wrong in the first place. In related research, when the children were asked only once whether the two rows of counters were the same, a far higher number of children got the answer right. | |
|  | | | | L: As a result, this reduces the credibility of Piaget’s experiment. | L: This therefore provides contradictory evidence to Piaget’s findings and reduces the credibility of his original research. | | | L: This therefore casts doubt over the internal validity of this research as Piaget may not have been testing conservation of number but a child’s ability to pick up on the social cues adults give them. | |
|  | | | | | | [https://encrypted-tbn2.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSVGLgnk5RCie0piI2p_Pm3rFnHyW2EJjoSZQumwwAo60H8LtFM4Q](http://www.google.co.uk/imgres?imgurl=http://www.meltingvinyl.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/FRENCH-FLAG.jpg&imgrefurl=http://www.meltingvinyl.co.uk/blog/vlf-warm-up-shows/french-flag/&h=1144&w=1446&tbnid=-nf6HIv5_rZ0JM:&zoom=1&docid=1-S7RqlmobBldM&ei=xL-rVIbHCpLLaMrUgagC&tbm=isch&ved=0CCcQMygIMAg&iact=rc&uact=3&dur=341&page=1&start=0&ndsp=12) |  | | |  | |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of Core Study: Yuki et al. (2007)** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | | | **Must Know** | **Could Know** | |
| **Low internal Validity** | | | **Low population validity** | **Dependant variable measured in a very simple way** | |
| P: A major weakness of Yuki’s research into NVC is that it lacks ecological validity. | | | P: Another limitation of Yuki’s research into NVC is that the research lacks population validity. | P: Furthermore, another weakness of Yuki’s research into NVC is that interpreting facial expressions was measured in a very simple way. | |
| E: For example the research used a questionnaire to investigate cultural differences in NVC. This questionnaire used artificial emoticon faces (not real life ones). | | | E: For example, the questionnaire was only given to participants who were student age (i.e. 18 – 21). | E: For example, Yuki et al chose to use very simple emoticons to measure interpretation of facial expressions. | |
|  | | E: This is an issue because we cannot apply the findings to real life settings as we cannot be sure we would get the same results if real faces were used. | | | E: Although the sample size was actually fairly large (118 American vs 95 Japanese participants) we cannot generalise the findings from Yuki’s research to the wider population. This is an issue because it might be that young children or the older generation interpret emotions in faces differently. | E: This is an issue because we know that the process of interpreting facial expressions (and any form of non-verbal communication for that matter) is much more complicated than presenting someone with simple scale from 1 - 9. This suggests that the way Yuki chose to measure the dependent variable may not be valid enough to draw conclusions from. | |
|  | | | | L: As a consequence, this reduces the credibility of Yuki’s research and casts into doubt whether there really are cultural differences in interpreting facial expressions. | | | L: Consequently, this further questions the credibility of the research into cultural differences in interpreting facial expressions | L: As a consequence, this reduces the credibility of Yuki’s research and casts into doubt whether there really is cultural differences in interpreting facial expressions. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of the Terry’s (2005) Research** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | | **Must Know** | | **Could Know** | |
| **Lacks Ecological Validity** | | **Demand Characteristics** | | **Lacks Construct Validity** | |
| P: A major weakness of Terry’s experiment is that it lacks ecological validity. | | P: Furthermore, a limitation of Terry’s study is that the results may be subjected to demand characteristics. | | P: Another flaw of Terry’s research is that it lacks construct validity. | |
|  | | E: This is because the experiment was carried out in an artificial setting that does not reflect remembering things in real life. | | E: This is because cues in the study may have pointed to what the researcher was trying to investigate. | | E: This is because the experiment takes a narrow measure of what is being investigated. | |
| E: In real life there is a good chance that people watch commercials with many other distractions around them, they would probably not give the commercials the attention that they did in the controlled settings. | | E: For example, the participants obviously knew they were being experimented on and may have tried to help Terry achieve the results he wanted. After the written task, they could have realised that he was trying to affect their memory. They may not have recalled the last few products on purpose. | | E: For example, in this case memory was being studied however Terry only investigated memory for commercials. There is so much more to memory than simply remembering commercials. | |
|  | | L: This therefore casts doubt over the credibility of Terry’s results as you cannot generalise the findings to memory outside the laboratory setting. | | L: As a consequence, the findings may not be valid which reduces the credibility of Terry’s study as a whole. | | L: As a result, we cannot generalise Terry’s assumptions about memory to anything other than simply recalling a list of commercials. | |
|  | | | | | | http://wp.patheos.com.s3.amazonaws.com/blogs/thecrescat/files/2014/04/Bored-Edward-Norton-Watching-TV.gif | | http://www.mrmen.com/characters/mr-forgetful/mmb.jpg | | http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTJFfKGDZNdW6ClhZgxUEC_j9-CIKB-V8Qp0w11mRkgiHjKu3YrIuqG3ENT:www.inmonova.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/real-estate-nova-notice-brain.jpg | |
| **Grade** | | | | | | **Criticisms of Core Study: Van Houtte and Jarvis (1995)(AO2)** | | | | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | | **C GRADE ANSWER** | | **A GRADE ANSWER** | | **Must Know** | | **Must Know** | | **Could Know** | |
| **Low internal validity** | | **Low population validity** | | **Over-simplifies difficult concepts** | |
| P: A weakness of the study is that it may lack internal validity. | | P: Another limitation of Van Houtte and Jarvis’ research into ‘The Self’ is that the research lacks population validity. | | P: A weakness of the study is that it over-simplifies difficult concepts. | |
| E: This is because Van Houtte and Jarvis used a self-report questionnaire method to investigate whether pet owners had higher self-esteem than non-pet owners. Pupils were asked to complete questionnaires based on scales that measured autonomy, self-concept, self-esteem and attachment to animals. | | E: For example the questionnaire was only given to teenage pupils between the ages of 8-13. | | E: This is because the participants are asked to score difficult concepts such as self-esteem and self-concept on a scale, in turn ignoring the depth of these important aspects of the self. | |
|  | | E: Consequently it may be difficult for children to have accurate insight into aspects such as their self-esteem and self-concept and therefore the questionnaire might not measure what it set out to measure. | | E: Although the sample size was actually fairly large (71 boys and 59 girls) we cannot generalise the findings from Van Houtte and Jarvis’ research to the wider population. This is an issue because it might be that younger children or the older generation have different ideas of concepts such as self-esteem and autonomy. | | E: Therefore, the study uses a lot of quantitative data that may not be appropriate when dealing with complex emotional views. This suggests that the way Van Houtte and Jarvis chose to measure the dependent variable may not be valid enough to draw conclusions from. | |
|  | | | | L: Therefore, this weakens the credibility of this research to support the notion of pets influencing the development of our self-esteem. | | L: Consequently, this further questions the credibility of the research into whether pets are good for self-esteem. | | L: As a consequence, this reduces the credibility of Van Houtte and Jarvis’ research and casts into doubt whether there really is a difference in self-esteem levels in pet owners and non-pet owners. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | | | **Criticisms of the Multi-Store Model** | | |
| **E GRADE ANSWER** | **C GRADE ANSWER** | **A GRADE ANSWER** | **Must Know** | **Must Know** | **Could Know** |
| **Low Population Validity** | **Researcher Bias** | **Internal Validity** |
| P: One limitation of Diamond and Sigmundson’s study is that it has low population validity. | P: A further limitation of Diamond and Sigmundson’s research is that it may be subjected to researcher bias (by Dr Money). | P: Another issue with Diamond and Sigmundson’s study is that it has low internal validity. |
|  | E: This is because they used a case study to investigate the effect of biology on gender, this used a very small sample of one individual. | E: This is because case studies are very thorough investigations, so researchers may become too involved in what they are studying when this happens, researchers may stop being objective. | E: This is because case studies are based on naturally occurring situations (i.e. no one would remove a baby’s penis in order for them to be raised as a girl), so it is not possible to control key variables. |
| E: For example, just because Bruce could not adapt to his new gender role, does not mean that other boys would not be able to. Bruce may have been the exception to the rule. | E: For example, Dr Money was accused of interpreting Brenda’s behaviour to provide evidence for his assumptions. He was so keen to show that a boy could be raised as a girl that he failed to report on the fact that Brenda was struggling with her feminine identity. | E: For example, in Bruce’s case he had a twin brother who looked just like him. This gave him a masculine role model that he could easily imitate. |
|  | L: As a result, we cannot generalise Diamond and Sigmundson’s findings (that gender is more a product of nature than nurture) to the wider population. Overall, this reduces the wider applicability of the research. | L: Consequently, this casts doubt over the credibility of the research as the results may not be interpreted scientifically and objectively. | L: This overall, casts doubt over the credibility of this study in proving the importance of biology in gender development. |
|  | | | http://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSqPVBf9sZ63aFYqYaDP3HyR2cfk_UtT0WpKLErym9FZKTGkmKrY3Jeodg5:cdn.tempi.it/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/bruce-brenda-david-reimer-h.png | http://www.chiro.org/research/GRAPHICS/Research_Conundrum_350.jpg | http://t0.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcTR5VdUVO_PVxz3vSCJ0DWapQ9xt6cZkQ3wCTDVq_hv70zRiXvmqYkLg4g:www.justinmoorhouse.com/justinmoorhouse/wp-content/uploads/Binoculars.png |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LT4 Core Study: Diamond and Sigmundson (1997)** | | | |
| **Aim** | **Procedure** | **Findings** | **Conclusions** |
| To investigate the role of biology in the development of gender. | Diamond and Sigmundson produced a **case study** of a boy who had been raised a girl.  Bruce lost his penis in an operation that went wrong.  They conducted interviews to help them to describe the life history of this boy. | Bruce/Brenda initially seemed to adopt her feminine gender role.  However as she became a teenager she had a masculine gender identity.  She eventually decided to live her life as a boy. | Bruce’s biological sex determined his gender rather than his upbringing. |
| http://t3.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSxiU3p8sAXvMqGd3D87qEAD1fOy8ezaNvYQqzROZx2YzLYI8IrGIBBTG4:4.bp.blogspot.com/_FYlTTlM0aH8/SGJK4CQ__wI/AAAAAAAAAA8/darXGLbjBEg/s320/20309661_118379703925.jpghttp://t1.gstatic.com/images?q=tbn:ANd9GcSqPVBf9sZ63aFYqYaDP3HyR2cfk_UtT0WpKLErym9FZKTGkmKrY3Jeodg5:cdn.tempi.it/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/bruce-brenda-david-reimer-h.pnghttp://www.book-club-queen.com/images/as-nature-made-him-john-colapinto-21239181.jpg | | | |