

# AS SCHEME OF WORK WJEC

Terms in *italics/bold* in the 'research methods covered' column are those identified in the specification.

Week	Topic (content covered in core text)	Research methods covered in teaching and examples in core text	Opportunities to recap/extend	Research methods issues in research methods questions on this CD
<b>Ch 1 Physiological approach</b>				
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● neurones</li> <li>● brain</li> <li>● endocrine system</li> </ul>	(none)	(none)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● aims</li> <li>● identifying graph types</li> <li>● drawing simple conclusions from graphs</li> <li>● simple issues of generalisation</li> <li>● knowing the terms 'qualitative' and 'quantitative'</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● GAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>experiments</i>: IV/DV e.g. DeGroot <i>et al.</i> (2002), Cohen <i>et al.</i> (1999)</li> <li>● <i>graphical representation</i>: line graph – Selye</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sautter <i>et al.</i> (2003) IV/DV, Liberzon <i>et al.</i> (1999) – 3 levels of IV</li> </ul>	
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● psychosurgery <i>or</i> chemotherapy</li> <li>● test on the physiological approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● meta-analysis: Adams <i>et al.</i> (2005)</li> <li>● placebos: Adams <i>et al.</i> (2005)</li> <li>● <i>lab experiments</i>: (examples as above) concept of controls (e.g. placebos, random assignment)</li> <li>● concept of <i>validity</i>: (e.g. De Groot <i>et al.</i>: using rats to test effects of stress (2000); Insel <i>et al.</i> (2006): problem of spontaneous remission)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● controls: Insel (2006) observes that Trivedi <i>et al.</i> (2006) had no placebo group</li> </ul>	

Ch 2 Behaviourist approach				
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● the importance of the environment</li> <li>● the emphasis on observation and testability</li> <li>● the common principles of learning</li> <li>● early behaviourist theories</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● demand characteristics: e.g. advantage of automated recording e.g. Skinner box; Bandura <i>et al.</i> (1961)</li> <li>● concept of <b>reliability</b>: Skinner boxes</li> <li>● experimenter bias: e.g. Bandura <i>et al.</i> (1961)</li> <li>● <b>quantitative methods</b>: e.g. Bandura <i>et al.</i> (1961)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Pavlov – even animals respond to ‘expectations’ in experimental settings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● experiments</li> <li>● IV, DV</li> <li>● experimental design</li> <li>● why different designs are chosen</li> <li>● planning experiments</li> <li>● simple issues relating to demand characteristics</li> <li>● experimenter bias</li> <li>● choosing a method</li> <li>● choosing qualitative or quantitative data</li> <li>● observations</li> <li>● categorisation</li> <li>● observer bias</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Social Learning Theory and aggression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● experiments: objectivity, design (RM, IG)</li> <li>● <b>natural experiments</b>: e.g. Joy <i>et al.</i> (1986), Charlton <i>et al.</i> (2000)</li> <li>● <b>observation</b>: <i>categorisation</i> (Bandura – observing non/aggressive behaviours)</li> <li>● <b>correlation</b>: Eron <i>et al.</i> (1972), Eron &amp; Huesmann (1986)</li> <li>● <b>content analysis</b>: e.g. Charlton <i>et al.</i> (2000) to show that St Helena TV was more violent than British</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Cohen <i>et al.</i> (1999) (bio) difficulty with measuring perceived pain</li> <li>● IV/DV Bandura (1961), (1963), Anderson &amp; Dill (2000), Ulmann &amp; Swanson (2004)</li> </ul>	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● aversion therapy <i>or</i> systematic desensitisation</li> <li>● similarities and differences between the physiological and behaviourist approaches</li> <li>● test on the behaviourist approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● levels of measurement: nominal (Rothbaum <i>et al.</i> agree to fly/not)</li> <li>● <b>field experiment</b>: Lang &amp; Lazovik (1963)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● LOM – nominal (Bandura: non/aggressive, verbal/physical)</li> <li>● <b>content analysis</b>: Toneatto &amp; Kosky (2006)</li> </ul>	

Ch 3 Psychodynamic approach				
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the influence of the unconscious mind</li> <li>the importance of early experience</li> <li>the importance of relationships</li> <li>Freud's theory: structural model</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Freud's techniques: <i>interview</i></li> <li><i>questionnaire</i>: Massie &amp; Szajnberg (2002)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>reliability</i> and <i>validity</i>: problems with case studies and investigating the unconscious</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>question types in questionnaires</li> <li>questionnaire versus interview</li> <li>objectivity</li> <li>reliability</li> <li>lab and field experiments</li> <li>defining the IV and DV</li> <li>generalisation</li> <li>advantages and disadvantages of independent measures designs</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Freud's theory: psychosexual development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>designing experiments: Baron-Cohen (2006), Pole &amp; Jones (1998) (Thinking Psychologically)</li> <li>subjectivity: inkblots</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IV/DV – Jacobs <i>et al.</i> (1996)</li> <li><i>correlation</i> – O'Niell <i>et al.</i> (1992)</li> </ul>	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>psychodynamic therapy</li> <li>similarities and differences between the physiological, behaviourist and psychodynamic approaches</li> <li>test on the psychodynamic approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>sample size: Pole &amp; Jones (1998) [208 sessions], Sandell (1999) [756 patients]</li> <li><i>categorisation</i> – dream interpretation (e.g. Roussy <i>et al.</i>, 1996)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>cf</i> Moniz (Chapter 1) and Watson &amp; Rayner (1920) (Chapter 2): based on samples of 1</li> <li>IV/DV Sandell (1999)</li> <li>meta-analysis: Leichsenring (2001)</li> <li><i>validity</i> and <i>reliability</i>: Hobson &amp; McCarley (1977), Solms (2000) – more scientific</li> </ul>	

Ch 4 Cognitive approach				
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the emphasis on the internal process of the mind</li> <li>the importance of information processing</li> <li>the computer analogy</li> <li>attribution theory</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applied research</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e.g. Baer <i>et al.</i> (1995) (Chapter 1); Weinrott <i>et al.</i> (1997), Rothbaum <i>et al.</i> (2000), Marshall (2006) (Chapter 2); Hauff <i>et al.</i> (2002) (Chapter 3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mundane realism</li> <li>disadvantages of repeated measures designs</li> <li>order effects</li> <li>random allocation</li> <li>representative sampling</li> <li>measures of central tendency</li> <li>choosing graphs</li> <li>questionnaires</li> <li>disadvantages of interviews</li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attribution theories:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>correspondent inference</li> <li>covariation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>independent groups design: Vonk &amp; Konst (1998), Workman &amp; Freeberg (1999), Stander <i>et al.</i> (2001)</li> <li>Designing studies: Thinking Psychologically (Ahn <i>et al.</i>, 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IV/DV Vonk &amp; Konst</li> <li>IV/DV Yost &amp; Weary (1996)</li> <li>validity: Stewart</li> <li>questionnaire – Stewart (2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>different question types</li> <li>advantages of open and of closed questions</li> <li>levels of measurement</li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>REBT or CT</li> <li>similarities and differences between all four approaches</li> <li>test on the cognitive approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>repeated measures design: Cahill <i>et al.</i> (2003)</li> <li>levels of measurement; ordinal data: e.g. rating anger (Adelman <i>et al.</i>, 2005), reduction in symptoms after therapy (Cahill <i>et al.</i>, 2003; Fava <i>et al.</i>, 1998)</li> <li>levels of measurement; interval and ratio data: e.g. used on time taken and errors in the Stroop task (Perez <i>et al.</i>, 1999)</li> <li>Measures of central tendency               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mean – e.g. time and errors (Perez <i>et al.</i>, 1999)</li> <li>median: e.g. anger rating</li> <li>mode: e.g. attribution Workman &amp; Freeberg (1999), internal/external Stander <i>et al.</i> (2001)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>independent groups design – Fava <i>et al.</i> (1998), Sandahl <i>et al.</i> (1998)</li> <li>meta-analysis: Engels (1993)</li> <li>nominal data: attributions, e.g. to victim/perpetrator/situation (Workman &amp; Freeberg, 1999); internal/external (Stander <i>et al.</i>, 2001)</li> </ul>	

Ch 5 Studies in social psychology				
13	Asch (1955): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Designing studies: Thinking Psychologically (conformity)</li> <li>● <b>Ethical issues:</b> <i>informed consent, deception, withdrawal</i></li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● complex IV and DV questions</li> <li>● ethical guidelines</li> <li>● plotting graphs</li> <li>● drawing conclusions from graphs</li> </ul>
14	Milgram (1963): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Ethical issues:</b> <i>confidentiality, protection of participants</i></li> <li>● <b>Ethical guidelines:</b> (Thinking Psychologically) <i>prior general consent, presumptive consent, role play, ethics committee</i></li> <li>● <b>Sampling method:</b> <i>self-selected (volunteer)</i></li> <li>● <b>sampling bias:</b> <i>gender bias</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Ethical issues:</b> <i>consent, deception, withdrawal (Asch)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● designing experiments</li> <li>● collecting results</li> <li>● controlling extraneous variables</li> <li>● controlling experimenter effects</li> <li>● advantages and disadvantages of sampling methods</li> </ul>
Ch 6 Studies in physiological psychology				
15	Rahe <i>et al.</i> (1970): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Sampling method:</b> <i>opportunity</i></li> <li>● double blind</li> <li>● <b>Measures of dispersion:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▸ <b>Range:</b> e.g. for measure of class LCUs (webwatch)</li> <li>▸ <b>Standard deviation:</b> generally increases with greater number of LCUs</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Scattergraphs:</b> plotting LCUs against illness</li> <li>● <b>histograms:</b> data for each LCU band</li> <li>● <b>content validity:</b> SRE</li> <li>● <b>reliability:</b> <i>test re-test</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>gender bias</i></li> <li>● <i>the mean</i></li> <li>● <b>ethics:</b> <i>consent</i></li> <li>● <i>questionnaire</i></li> <li>● <i>correlation</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● designing experiments</li> <li>● double blind</li> <li>● control conditions</li> <li>● ethics</li> <li>● ecological validity</li> <li>● IV and DV</li> <li>● controls</li> <li>● justifying a sampling method</li> <li>● graphs</li> </ul>

16	Bennett-Levy & Marteau (1984): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>ecological validity</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>Sampling method: opportunity</i></li> <li>● controls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● questionnaire</li> </ul>
<b>Ch 7 Studies in cognitive psychology</b>				
17	Loftus & Palmer (1974): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>experimental validity</i></li> <li>● <i>bar chart</i>: plotting mean speeds and yes/no responses</li> <li>● <i>quantitative methods: strengths and weaknesses</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>mean</i></li> <li>● <i>laboratory experiment</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● IV and DV</li> <li>● percentages</li> <li>● graphs</li> <li>● controls</li> <li>● representativeness</li> <li>● ecological validity</li> <li>● observations</li> <li>● Participant and non-participant observation</li> <li>● event and time sampling</li> <li>● coding systems</li> <li>● categorisation</li> </ul>
18	Gardner & Gardner (1969): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>coding system</i></li> <li>● <i>inter-rater reliability</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● observation</li> </ul>	
<b>Ch 8 Studies in developmental psychology</b>				
19	Langer & Rodin (1976): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>reliability: split half</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>interview</i></li> <li>● bar charts (from data)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● IV and DV</li> <li>● coding systems</li> <li>● controls</li> <li>● ethics</li> <li>● ecological validity</li> <li>● correlations</li> <li>● split-half reliability</li> <li>● representative sampling</li> <li>● sampling methods</li> </ul>
20	Gibson & Walk (1960): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>sampling: quota and random</i> as alternative methods</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>laboratory experiment</i></li> <li>● controls</li> </ul>	

Ch 9 Studies in individual differences				
21	Buss (1989): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>qualitative methods: strengths and weaknesses</i></li> <li>● <i>sampling bias: cultural bias</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>questionnaire</i></li> <li>● <i>sample size</i></li> <li>● <i>validity</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● representative sampling</li> <li>● controls</li> <li>● question types</li> <li>● graphs</li> <li>● conclusions from correlations</li> </ul>
22	Rosenhan (1973): Aim, procedure, findings, conclusions and strengths and weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>validity: concurrent (DSM)</i></li> <li>● <i>validity: predictive (DSM)</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>the mean</i></li> <li>● <i>ethics: consent</i></li> <li>● <i>ecological validity</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● qualitative and quantitative data</li> <li>● interviews</li> <li>● sample bias</li> <li>● reliability</li> <li>● testing reliability</li> <li>● validity</li> <li>● concurrent validity</li> </ul>