## KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER GUIDANCE

It is advised that you print the relevant subject knowledge organisers and have them available to you when needed at all times.

An alternative recommendation would be to download the knowledge organisers for your subjects onto your electronic devices so you can access them when needed.

With the knowledge organiser you should make revision cards to help revise and build in time during independent study to test yourself weekly on the content.

While you have independent study, you should use your Knowledge Planner to study the relevant subject's Knowledge Organiser and learn the information provided.

# Haggerston School

# SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

Psychology

# 2023/2024

ology

**\_** 

sγc

| Psychology: Knowledge Org  | ganiser. Paper 1: Social Influence  | Obedience: Situational variables  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | <ul> <li>Proximity: Teacher &amp; learner—same room, obedience from 65% to 40%. Touch —Teacher forced learners har<br/>on plate 30% obedience. Remote instruction—orders from experimenter over phone, 20.5% obedience . Explanation: less proximity, more psychological distance and more obedience.</li> </ul>  |
| Types of conformity  | Conformity to social roles: Zimbardo  | <ul> <li>Location: Experiment conducted in run-down building, 47.5% obedience. Explanation: university has authority and down office bounded by the discovery.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>Internalisation: accepting group norms, results<br/>in a private as well as public change of onions/<br/>behaviour.</li> <li>Identification: is wanting to be like the group,<br/>public and private change.</li> <li>Compliance: is public change only, superficial.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Procedure: 21 student volunteers: mock prison, randomly allocated to roles.<br/>Uniforms created social roles. Instructions about behaviour underlined social<br/>roles e.g. prisoners asking for parole, guards told they had complete power.</li> <li>Findings and conclusions: Identified with roles—guards became increasingly<br/>aggressive. Prisoners rebelled but passive after guards responded, SPE ended<br/>early (after 6 days).</li> <li>Most conformed to their social roles, shows the power of social roles.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>run-down office hasn't so less obedience.</li> <li>Uniform: Member of public in everyday clothes gave orders, 20% obedience. Explanation: uniform is a strong symbol of authority.</li> <li>Research support: uniform conveys authority/increases obedience (Bickman).</li> <li>Scientific procedures: high levels of control across all variations = high internal validity.</li> <li>Variations lack internal validity: variations = especially contrived, participants knew procedure was fake.</li> <li>Practical applications = limited, offensive to generalise findings to Nazis and the holocaust victims.</li> </ul>  |
| Explanations for conformity  | © Real world application: findings can be used to explain torture of prisoners in   | Obediance: Situational evaluations (see intervehological)   |
| <ul> <li>WHY people conform</li> <li>Informational social influence (ISI) is about information, the desire to be right. Cognitive process</li> <li>Normative social influence (NSI) is about norms, desire to be liked by other group members and to fit in. Emotional process.</li> </ul>   | Abu Gharib.<br>© Control: selection of participants increased internal validity.<br>© Lack of realism: participants displayed demand characteristics 'play acting<br>stereotypes'. *counterpoint: 90% of prisoner conversations were about prison<br>life.<br>© Findings have not been replicated: Reicher and Haslam.<br>Obedience: Milgram's research   | Obedience: Situational explanations (social-psychological)     Agentic state: Become 'agent' of authority, losing personal responsibility. Autonomous state: free to act according to conscience. Switch from autonomous to agentic state is called agentic shift. Binding factors reduce moral strain and avoid damaging effects of obedience.     Legitimacy of authority: Accept some people's authority, agreed by society. Hand over control to trusted authority, learned to do so in childhood. History shows leaders often use legitimate authority destructively.     Supporting evidence (legitimate authority): Bickman & can explain real life war crimes (My Lai).     Research support (agentic state) Milgram's resistant participants shock when experimenter took responsibility.  |
| Research support NSI: Asch: When no norma-<br>tive group pressure (wrote answers), conformity  | Baseline study procedure: 40 naīve American male volunteers gave 'shocks'   | <ul> <li>Research support (agende state) migrain stressearch participants shock when experimenter took responsionity</li> <li>Agentic state does not explain all research findings.</li> </ul>  |
| down to 12.5%. Research support: ISI: Jenness:<br>difficult task 'guess the number of jelly beans'   | to a 'learner. An experimenter (white lab coat) ordered participants to con-<br>tinue giving shocks, using standardised prods. Shock machine went to 450 V.   | Obedience: Dispositional explanations   |
| more conformity following group discussions.<br>Do not account for individual differences: Perrin<br>and Spencer only 1 conforming engineer in 400<br>trials.<br>Real word applications: Schultz et al found<br>guests in an experimental room reduced need for<br>fresh towels by 25% compared to controls.<br>Variables affecting conformity: Asch | <ul> <li>Findings and conclusions: all participants gave at least 300 V, 65% gave 450 V. Qualitative data: participants showed anxiety e.g. sweating. Prior to study 14 students predicted 3% would give 450 V.</li> <li>Conclusion: ordinary people are willing to obey a legitimate authority figure, to the extent to which they will hurt an innocent person.</li> <li>Supporting evidence: French reality TV show—80% went to 460 V</li> <li>Low internal validity: Participants guessed shocks were fake.</li> <li>Similar findings when using real shocks on puppy's Sheridan and King: 54%</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Adorno—unquestioning obedience is based on personality. Extreme respect for authority and submissiveness to it, contempt for 'inferiors'. Originates in childhood through strict parenting. Childs hostility towards parent displaced onto weaker others (scapegoating). Authoritarian personality = Highly obedient to authority.</li> <li>Adorno et al's research: procedure: F-scale measured authoritarianism of 2000 Americans. Findings: high F-scale scorers showed deference to people of higher status, fixed cognitive style and prejudiced attitudes.</li> <li>Research support obedient participants had high F scale scores (Ems and Milgram).</li> <li>Limited explanation: can't explain obedience across a whole culture. Alternative explanation: situational facto</li> <li>Politically biased: related to right-wing authoritarianism, can't explain left wing authoritarianism.</li> </ul>   |
| Procedure: line lengths (standard line and   | makes and 100% females.<br>© Lacks external validity: high levels of obedience due to artificial environment.   | Resistance to social influence.   |
| choice of 3 comparison lines), 123 American<br>male student participants, confederates gave<br>wrong answers.  | Image: Milgram's findings have been replicated outside the lab: Hofling 21/22 nurses obeyed unjust instructions from a doctor.  | <ul> <li>Social support: Conformity reduces if a peer dissents (Asch) because they act as a model—shows majority is n<br/>unanimous. Obedience reduces if there is one dissenter, undermines legitimacy of authority (Milgram study<br/>and the study)</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>Findings: naïve participants conformed 36.8%<br/>of time, 74% at least once.</li> </ul>   | Minority Influence  | 65% down to 10%).<br>© Research: Albrecht et al: having a buddy helped teens resist smoking pressure.<br>© Tindian and a prior to the former and |
| <ul> <li>Variables investigated by Asch</li> <li>Group size: three confederates 31.8% conformity, more made little difference.</li> <li>Unanimity: presence of a dissenter reduced conformity</li> <li>Task difficulty: conformity increased with harder at a sk, showing informational social influence.</li> </ul>                                 | <ul> <li>Internalisation: minority influence private as well as public view is changed.</li> <li>Consistency: minority members share the same belief and retain over time.</li> <li>Commitment: Gains attention. E.g. through extreme activities (argumentation).</li> <li>Flexibility: Avoid rigidity, accept reasonable counterarguments, balance with consistency.</li> <li>Explaining the process: minority over time gradually becomes majority</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Findings = real world application: disobedient peers applied to German women protest in the Rosenstrasse</li> <li>Locus of control: Internals place control within themselves, externals place it outside. There is a continuum with high internal LOC at one end and high external LOC at the other end—low internal and low external lying in between. Internals can resist social influence, more confident, less need for approval.</li> <li>Supporting evidence: Holland: internals less likely to obey in Milgram-type procedure. Shute: internal LOC conformed less to expressing pro drug attitudes.</li> <li>Contradictory evidence: people now more independent but also more external (Twenge).</li> </ul>  |
| © Supporting research: Crutchfield found similar<br>levels of conformity to Asch—30%<br>© Scientific procedure of Asch's method: control   | <ul> <li>through conversion (snowball effect).</li> <li>Moscovici et al's research: The blue-green slides' study, 8.2% conformed to consistent minority, 1.25% conformed to inconsistent minority.</li> </ul>   | Social Influence and Social Change  • Lessons from; minority influence: drawing attention, consistency, argumentation principle, snowball effect, so  |
| Scientific procedure of Asch's method: control group 3 mistakes in 720 trials. Increases validity  | <ul> <li>Research support for consistency: Moscovici—'blue green slides' &amp; Wood<br/>'meta analysis'.</li> <li>Research evidence support for flexibility: Nemeth ski lift accident simulated<br/>jury. Implications from this research.</li> <li>Methodological issues with the research: unlike real world (e.g. jury deci-<br/>sions) so studies lack external validity.</li> </ul>  | cial cryptomnesia. conformity research: Dissenter breaks power of majority (Asch), campaigns use NSI. Obedi<br>ence research: Disobedient model promotes social change (Milgram), gradual commitment (Zimbardo).<br>© Role of minority influence can be questioned: Bashir found some minority groups are associated with stereo-<br>types that the majority don't want to be associated with. How much role do they have—effects are fragile.<br>© Research support for NSI: reduced peoples energy use (Nolan) © Student drinking behaviour didn't change du<br>to NSI (Delong)   |

# SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

sychology

۵\_

| L<br>. /                  | Atkinson and   | The Multi-Si<br>shiffrin (1968)  | tore Model of Memo   |   | l l              | Baddeley  | and Hitch (1974)  | The Working  | g Merr  | nory M   | odel   |          | (declarat<br>• Explicit n<br>(knowing  | of LTM are cat<br>tive) or implicit<br>memories: know   | (non declara<br>viedge for ev   | itive).<br>vents and fa   |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|----------|--|---|---|---|
| • ;                       | Memories an<br>next.   | re formed sequentially an<br>nent has a specific type o  | s: sensory register, STM & l<br>nd information passes from<br>of coding, duration and cap<br>wintenance rehearsal                          | one component to the                                      |                  | spatial sk<br>STM is ar   | nponent system,<br>etchpad.   | at allows us to  | work thi<br>ealt with                                       | ings thro  |  |          | Explicit or<br>implicit<br>Type of<br>memory   | Episodic<br>Explicit<br>Personal<br>experience  | Semantic<br>Explicit<br>Knowledge   | Procedural<br>Implicit<br>Performed<br>tasks or skil                                      |
|                           |  | ronmental<br>stimuli<br>Sensory Register   | SHORT<br>TERM<br>MEMORY<br>STM<br>Elaborative<br>rehearsal<br>Short-Term Memory  | LONG<br>TERM<br>MEMORY<br>LTM                             |                  | Function  | Executive<br>Control centre<br>(boss) of the<br>WMM; supervi-<br>sory function<br>and controls the      | Loop<br>Temporary<br>storage system<br>for verbal in-<br>formation, held<br>In speech- | Sketch<br>Tempo<br>storage<br>for visu<br>spatial<br>mation | rary<br>e system<br>ual and<br>infor-  | CENTRAL EXECUTIVE<br>Phonological<br>Loop<br>Articultury<br>Catter System<br>Buffer<br>Buffer<br>Buffer<br>Buffer<br>Central System<br>Central Sys |          | types of LTN   | Hippocampus<br>aging evidence<br>M: Tulving et al.<br>dy evidence to s<br>PM.   |   |   |
|                           | Capacity   | Very large<br>Very limited (250 ms)  | Limited<br>Jacobs: 7+/-2<br>Limited  | Unlimited   |                  | Capacity  | slave systems<br>Limited capacity   | based form.<br>Limited<br>capacity   | Limited<br>capacit  |  | Prentegical<br>State<br>Long-Term Memory   |          |  | ly evidence nee<br>Id application: E  |   |   |
|                           | Coding   | Unprocessed—all 5 sens-  | Peterson and Peterson: 20<br>seconds)  | Baddeley: Semantic  |                  | Coding  | Any sensory<br>modality   | Acoustic infor-<br>mation  | Visual a<br>tial info<br>mation                             |  | cang-noni monory   |          |  | Forgetting:<br>e: Past learning<br>ly: Keppel and U   | interferes w  |   |
| ley.<br>⊕ C<br>⊗ E<br>den | ase study en<br>vidence con<br>ice also sugg   | vidence supports the dist<br>tradicts the idea that STI<br>ests that there are multi                                 | e existence of separate STI<br>tinction between STM and<br>M is a unitary store: KF cas<br>ple types of LTM.<br>er supporting evidence for | LTM: Clive Wearing<br>e study. Furthermore, evi-          | B<br>C<br>P<br>a | addeley an<br>The resea<br>honologica<br>nd the idea  | d Hitch study<br>rch into KF case s<br>I loop and the visi<br>of a multi-compo                          | tudy supports to<br>uo-spatial sketco<br>onent STM syste                               | the WM<br>hpad, ti<br>em.                                   | IM and th  | loop and visuo-spatial sketchpad:<br>he idea of two slave systems, the<br>providing support to the WMM<br>mplistic: Eslinger et al.  |          | Supportine<br>McGeogh et<br>Most of t<br>ried out in a<br>everyday ex                                | t learning. Key :<br>ng evidence for<br>t al.<br>the research exa<br>a laboratory: the<br>camples of inter<br>ation to human  | retroactive i<br>amining inter<br>findings do<br>ference and  | interference<br>rference is o<br>not represe  |
| ŀ                         | Leading que  |  | sleading information   | own films of car accident                                 |                  | Weapon  | EWT: Anx  |  | ntion   |  | WT: Cognitive Interview  |          | <ul> <li>○ Limited n</li> <li>○ Evidence</li> </ul>  | eal world applic<br>suggests that s<br>e interference t   | ation.<br>ome people  |   |
|                           | X each othe  | r?"  |  | re the cars going when they<br>of EWT affected by leading |                  | culties in  | eapon—causes a<br>recalling the oth<br>and Scott: Lab ex  | er details accur   | ately   | 2. Con   | oort everything: free recall.<br>itext reinstatement: mentally recr<br>the situation. Context dependent  |          | 1  | Forgetting: R   | letrieval fa  | ailure  |
| •<br>tion<br>© I<br>ble   | none).<br>32% questio<br>with the ver<br>Low ecologic<br>n—may not l<br>acks popular<br>to misleadir | ned with verb smashed :<br>b hit. Shows questions o<br>al validity. eyewitnesses<br>be susceptible to leading        | aid yes compared to 14%<br>an distort memories.<br>to real accidents have a st<br>questions in the same way<br>be more accurate in their j | ronger, emotional connec-                                 | -                | culprit o<br>holding :<br>accuracy<br>Further L<br>sues broker<br>Reduced<br>Pickel: W<br>ther than a | demand characte<br>leapon focus is ca   | isses who saw n<br>ws anxiety redu<br>idity and ethics<br>erises<br>used by surpris    | man<br>ces<br>al is-<br>ce ra-                              | <ol> <li>Cha<br/>Disr</li> <li>Rec<br/>oloj<br/>rep</li> <li>Key<br/>usir<br/>con</li> </ol> | petting.<br>Inged perspective: other witness.<br>rupts schema.<br>all in reverse order: different chro<br>gical order. Prevents dishonesty a<br>orting schemas.<br>I study: Geiselman—pps interview<br>ng the CI recalled significantly mor-<br>rect information than those using<br>standard listoniam.   | nd<br>ed | the envi<br>Key stud<br>State de<br>mental s<br>study: C<br>© Research<br>support em<br>ing is impor | dependent: Me<br>ronment is the<br>ly: Godden and<br>pendent: Mem<br>state is the sam<br>arter and Cassa<br>h support: Godw<br>octional physiole<br>rtant at the time | same as whe<br>Baddeley<br>ony recall is I<br>e as when yo<br>iday<br>vin (1969) ar<br>ogical state a<br>e of retrieval | ere it was les<br>better when<br>ou learnt it: I<br>ad Darley (1:<br>at tine of end<br>I. |
| •<br>©1                   | Post event of<br>takenly reca<br>low ecologic<br>High populat  | liscussion: Gabbert et al:<br>lled information and 609<br>al validity: does not refle<br>ion validity: university st | 71% of PPs who discussed<br>6 said the girl was guilty de<br>ect everyday examples of o<br>udents and older adults—                        | rime.   |                  | es were<br>who rep<br>the mos<br>positive   | very accurate 5 m<br>orted the highest<br>t accurate. Shows<br>effect on accurac<br>account for indivis | nonths later. The<br>levels of stress<br>real life anxiet<br>y.                        | ose<br>were<br>y =  | © Supp<br>© Incre<br>format<br>© Real  | standard interview.<br>porting evidence: Kohnken et al<br>eases the amount of inaccurate in<br>tion (Kohnken).<br>I world application<br>world application—practical issu  |          | the cognitiv<br>informaticues e.g. m   | Id application:<br>ve interview.<br>tion we learn is<br>eaningful mate<br>termining caus  | related to a l<br>rial.   | lot more tha  |

## SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| Psychology: Knowledge Organise   | er. Paper 1: Attachment  |   |  | Animal studies of attachn<br>rch: large clutch of goose eggs, half saw mother within hours<br>the first moving object they saw. Conclusion: imprinting oc   | s of hatching half saw Lorenz. Goslings followed  |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Caregiver-infant interactions  | Schaffer's stages of attachme  | ent   |  | ort: Regolin et al observed chicks imprint on shapes. ③ Gene  |   |
| <ul> <li>From a very young age babies have meaningful inter-<br/>actions with caregivers.</li> <li>Reciprocity: baby &amp; caregiver take turns, respond to<br/>and elicit responses from each other. Like a dance.</li> <li>Babies have alert phases in which they seek interac-</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Asocial: first few weeks, baby behaves in<br/>to humans as inanimate objects.</li> <li>Indiscriminate: preference for (familiar)<br/>strangers/separation anxiety.</li> <li>Specific: at about 7 months with one print</li> </ul>   | people, no  | <ul> <li>Harlow's reset<br/>ered mother to<br/>© Real-world value</li> </ul>   | not two way.<br>rich: 16 very young rhesus monkeys raised with 'surrogate m<br>p plain wire one with milk. Conclusion: contact comfort more<br>ie: helps professionals (e.g. social workers) to promote bond<br>humans, monkeys better than birds but human mind and be   | e important than food in attachment.<br>ling & applied to zoos and breeding programmes  |
| tions. Babies take an active role. They are not passive<br>recipients of care.<br>Interactional synchrony: babies & caregivers mirror  | attachment figure (65% were to the mot<br>Multiple attachments: by 12 months mor<br>form several more attachments.   |   |  | Ainsworth's strange situation<br>range situation: controlled observation in lab, assess quality   | Bowlby: maternal deprivation  Continuous maternal care needed for healt   |
| each others expressions and gestures. The beginnings<br>of synchrony can be seen in babies as young as two<br>weeks (Meltzoff and Moore). Good levels of syn-<br>chrony are associated with good quality attachments.<br>© Filmed observations of interactions, analysed later, can<br>established inter-rater reliability and babies not aware of<br>being observed. Increases validity.<br>© Difficultly observing babies: hard to know what their<br>expressions/gestures mean.<br>© Developmental importance: behaviours can be relia-<br>bly observed but this doesn't reveal their importance. | observed at home by mothers, reported<br>tion anxiety and stranger anxiety. Finding<br>developed attachment through a fixed so<br>stages.<br>Good external validity: mothers did obset<br>babies not stressed by presence of a researc<br>Poor evidence for asocial stage, babies ha<br>-ordination, so may just seem asocial.<br>Real-world application: day care ok in asoc<br>indiscriminate stages, starting at specific att | on separa-<br>gs: babies<br>equence of<br>rving so<br>cher.<br>ave poor co<br>ocial and           | ty seeking, sep<br>Seven episode<br>turns.<br>Findings: secur<br>ty, easily calmo<br>stranger or sep<br>extreme anxiet<br>Good inter-rate<br>issues with ove   | nfant attachment. Behaviours measured including proximi-<br>aration anxiety, stranger anxiety and reunion behaviour.<br>s (3 min) e.g. stranger enters, caregiver leaves, stranger re-<br>e (66% of British babies), secure base and moderate anxie-<br>ed by caregiver. Insecure avoidant (22%) no secure base, no<br>varation anxiety, avoids reunion. Insecure resistant (12%)<br>ty, resist comfort on reunion with caregiver.<br>er reliability: 94% observers agree on attachment type (Bick)<br>rt observation on the mothers behaviour.<br>test: strange situation behaviours have different meanings | <ul> <li>development. Deprivation is loss of emotio<br/>care, negative effects if during the first 2.5<br/>years (critical period).</li> <li>Intellectual development: deprivation redu<br/>IQ (Goldfarb, institutionalised children). En<br/>tional development: deprivation leads to a<br/>tionless psychopathology (no guilt).</li> <li>Bowlby's research: procedure, interviewed<br/>young thieves and families. Findings: 14 aff<br/>tionless psychopaths, 12 of these separate<br/>from mothers before 2 years of age.</li> <li>Real world application: how children are loo</li> </ul> |
| © Counterpoint: evidence (e.g. Isabella et al) does sup-<br>port the importance of early interaction in attachment.  | stage is undesirable.<br>Explanations of attachme  | nt: learnin   |  | Cultural variations in attachment   | after in hospitals.<br>© Flawed evidence: Bowlby conducted intervi  |
| <ul> <li>Explanations of attachment: Bowlby's theory</li> <li>Attachment is innate and adaptive: evolutionary survival advantage.</li> <li>Social releasers: innate cute behaviours activate attachment in adults. Critical period: maximally sensitive up to 6 months although may extend to up to 2 years.<br/>Monotropy: attachment to one person, is different and</li> </ul>  | Classical conditioning: UCS (food) prod<br>Caregiver (NS) associated with food be<br>(CR) and feelings of love for caregiver (<br>Operant conditioning: crying reinforce<br>response. Negative reinforcement, care<br>cause crying stops.     Drive reduction: attachment is a secon   | comes CS, pr<br>an attachme<br>d because pr<br>egivers respo                                      | roduces pleasure<br>nt is formed).<br>oduces caregiver<br>onse reinforced be-  | <ul> <li>Van Uzendoorn &amp; Kroonenberg's research: meta-<br/>analysis of 32 studies using Strange Situation in 8<br/>countries/cultures. Findings: secure attachment most<br/>common (range from 50% China to 75% Britain). Con-<br/>clusion: more insecure-resistant type in collectivist<br/>cultures (e.g. Japan) than individualist (e.g. US).</li> <li>Cultural similarities: Tronick et al: supports secure</li> </ul>  | himself (bias). <sup>⊙</sup> Privation not deprivation (Ru<br>some of the 44 thieves may have been 'prived<br>deprivation may be less damaging.<br><sup>⊙</sup> Sensitive not critical period: Czech twins rec<br>ered from severe deprivation (Koluchova).   |
| <ul> <li>Special, Internal working model: first attachment is template for later relationships.</li> <li>Research support: Lorenz (critical period) &amp; Hazan &amp; Shaver (internal working model).</li> <li>Validity of monotropy challenged, primary attachment may not have unique qualities. (Schaffer &amp; Emerson).</li> <li>Counterpoint: research support for social releasers, babies distressed when 'cute' signals ignored (Brazelton).</li> <li>Rutter: "Sensitive period' instead of 'critical period.</li> </ul>   | tion of caregiver with hunger satisfacti<br>Some conditioning (association with co<br>selecting the primary attachment figure.<br>active in attachment than this theory sugg<br>Animal studies show that attachment d<br>(Lorenz/Harlow).<br>Human studies: primary attachment fig<br>does feeding (Schaffer & Emerson), qualit<br>actional synchrony not feeding (Isabella e  | on.<br>mfort) could<br>O Counterpoi<br>tests.<br>loes not depe<br>ure not alwa<br>ty of attachm   | still be involved in<br>int: babies are more<br>and on feeding<br>ys the person who  | attachment is most common globally. Cultural differ-<br>ences: Grossman et al: In German culture, child rear-<br>ing practises favour independence.   | relationships  Internal working model (IWM) first attachm<br>is template for future relationships (Bowlby<br>Relationships in later childhood: securely<br>attached children form better friendships<br>(Kerns) and are less likely to become bullies<br>(Myron-Wilson et al).<br>Relationships in adulthood: parenting and r<br>mantic style based on IWM attachment typ   |
| The role of the fa   | ther   |   | Romanian o   | rphan studies: institutionalisation   | passed on in families (Bailey et al) and relat<br>to romantic relationships (Hazan & Shaver)  |
| <ul> <li>Attachment to fathers: father primary attachment object<br/>Secondary attachment formed with father within 18 mon</li> <li>Distinctive role for fathers: attachment between mother<br/>ments (Grossmann et al). However, quality of fathers' pla<br/>different role for fathers. Fathers can be primary attachm<br/>mothers (Field).</li> <li>Key to primary (emotional) attachment is responsiveness<br/>gender.</li> <li>Research confusion, researchers address different issues of</li> </ul>   | ths (75% of cases).<br>& baby more crucial in later teen attach-<br>ny with babies linked to later attachments,<br>ent figures: adopt behaviours typical of<br>of adult (e.g. interactional synchrony) not<br>on fathers role.   | controls<br>age 11, a<br>fore 6 m<br>• Zeanah<br>Strange<br>disinhibi<br>© Real wor<br>Confoundin | . Findings: children a<br>adoption after 2 year<br>onths has long term<br>et al: BEI project, ass<br>Situation. Findings: li<br>tied attachment (con<br>Id application: impro-<br>ig variables: fewer in | tomanian orphans adopted in UK, S2 British adoptees as<br>dopted before the age of 6 months had mean IQ of 102 at<br>s had mean IQ of 77. Sensitive period: no attachment be-<br>effects (disinhibited attachment).<br>essed group of 95 institutionalised Romanian children using<br>n institutionalised group only 19% secure attachment, 44%<br>upared to 74% and 20% retrospectively for controls).<br>ved caring in institutions (key workers for each child).©<br>these studies, no early trauma. © counterpoint, poor con-   | <ul> <li>Hazan &amp; Shaver: analysed 620 replies to a 'l<br/>quiz'. Findings: securely attached adults = lo<br/>lasting relationships, insecure avoidant type<br/>tended to be jealous and feared intimacy.</li> <li>Strong support linking attachment to later d<br/>opment (Fearon et al). Longitudinal support<br/>(Simpson).</li> <li>Association doesn't mean causality: third fac<br/>environment.</li> <li>Relies on retrospective classification asking.</li> </ul>  |
| Research confusion, researchers address different issues of<br>Conflicting evidence for distinct role: children without fath<br>Real world applications: advising parents about the flexibi  | ters do not grow up different.   | ditions in R  | -  | could be a confounding variable. <sup>(2)</sup> Lack of adult data e.g.   |   |

## SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| sycho   |   | ledge Org  |  | Cognitive explanations: Depression           Behavioural explanations: Phobia         Depression is caused by faulty thinking           Beck: Faulty information processing = more prone to depression. Depressed people ar more likely to focus on the negative (cognitive biases). Negative self-schemas maintair   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| rare/unci-<br>tion of a l<br>Practical a<br>s with clin<br>Unusual of<br>teristics in<br>Not every<br>wrking etc]<br>Deviation<br>against tl<br>Practical a<br>ental disor<br>Culturally<br>people bo | I Infrequency: abnorn<br>ommon. Abnormality<br>behaviour in society.<br>application in the diap<br>ical assessment.<br>characteristics can be<br>eed treatment.<br>yone benefits from a l<br>therefore not appro<br>a from social norms: a<br>he unwritten rules an<br>application: could be<br>rders e.g. anti-social p<br>relative: social norms<br>eing labelled as abno | mal behaviour is th<br>is determined by<br>gnosis of intellectu<br>desirable: high IQ<br>abel (e.g. low IQ b<br>priate for diagnosi<br>ibnormal behavios<br>d expectations in a<br>useful in the clinic<br>personality disorde<br>s vary with culture<br>rmal if they have d     | at which is statistically<br>looking at the distribu-<br>al disability disorder.<br>Not all unusual char-<br>ut is not distressed and<br>s of all people.<br>Ir is that which goes<br>given culture/society.<br>al diagnosis for <u>some</u><br>r.<br>. Consequences could | <ul> <li>Phobias can be learned. Mowrer: two-process model</li> <li>Acquisition of phobia: classical conditioning. Learning to associate something that initially causes no fear (neutral stimulus) with something that triggers a fear response (unconditioned stimulus). Example: Little Albert.</li> <li>Maintenance of phobia: operant conditioning. Avoidance from phobic stimulus reduces anxiety and is negatively reinforcing (escape an unpleasant situation).</li> <li>Practical applications—has been used to develop successful behavioural therapies. The 2 process model explains how phobias can be maintained and this is addressed in the treatments where participants avoidance behaviour is prevented.</li> <li>Not everyone who experiences a traumatic event develops a phobia. Di-Nardor S0% of dog phobic's had unpleasant encounter but so did 50% of healthy controls who didn't develop a phobia. An alternative explanation could explain DiNardo's findings: diathesis stress model.</li> <li>Conflicting evidence: Bregman failed to condition a fear response in in-</li> </ul>  |
| out degre<br>Failure to   | e and context?<br>function adequately   | : Abnormal behav   | our is that which caus-  | fants. Therefore casting doubt on the claim that we acquire phobias through<br>conditioning. CBT consists of cognitive and behavioural aspects. Important elements include: Homework: vital in testing irrational beliefs against reality and putting new rational  |
| ity, irratic<br>Practical a<br>t making :<br>Issue with<br>der being<br>Issues wit<br>tablish wh<br>Deviation<br>the <u>abser</u><br>Jahoda's<br>autonom<br>ment.<br>Practical :                      | ona <sup>Ti</sup> ty, maladaptiven<br>application: recognise<br>a judgement. FFA = u<br>n individual difference<br>diagnosed differently<br>th practical applicatio<br>nich behaviours shoul<br>n from ideal mental h<br>nce of ideal character<br>characteristics: High  | ess, personal suffe<br>es the patients exp<br>seful model for as<br>es can result in peo<br>( some people can<br>ns as does not app<br>d be considered as<br>ealth: abnormal b<br><u>istics</u> for psycholo<br>self esteem, self a<br>en of reality and m<br>applied to treatme | erience rather than<br>sessing abnormality.<br>ple with the same dis-<br>still 'function').<br>Ny to all & difficult to<br>maladaptive.<br>thaviour is defined by<br>gical normality.<br>ctualisation, integrity,<br>astery of the environ-<br>ent, providing treat-       | <ul> <li>Behavioural treatments: Phobia</li> <li>Systematic desensitisation: 'unlearning' maladaptive behaviours, based on classical condition. Gradually reduces anxiety through counterconditioning. Phobia is learned so that a phobic stimulus (conditioned stimulus: CS) produces fear (conditioned response: CR) unlearn this through: CS paired with relaxation - this becomes the new CR. Reciprocal inhibition. Formation of anxiety hierarchy with relaxation practised at each level.</li> <li>Flooding: Immediate exposure to phobic stimulus. Very quick learning through extinction—as no option of avoidance.</li> <li>Evidence of effectiveness: Giroy followed up 42 people who had SD for spider phobia and found that the SD group were less fearful than a control group who were treated with relaxation.</li> <li>Is appropriate: quicker than cognitive therapies and more suited to those with learning disabilities.</li> <li>Only treats the symptoms (palliative) not the cause: symptom substitution.</li> </ul>  |
| Culturally  | relative, some of the   | criterial could be   | considered as western<br>Fails to provide a uni-   | © Only treats the symptoms (palliative) not the cause: symptom substitution. D D Biological treatments: OCD<br>Biological explanations: OCD • Antidepressant drugs: selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor (SS  |
| Sets unre<br>rmal & wo  | ition for abnormality.<br>alistic criterial, large r<br>ould set realistically h<br>aracteristics of ph   | igh standards in tr  | eatment.   | <ul> <li>Genetic explanation: identified candidate genes that are implicated in OCD: SERT gene. OCD is<br/>polygenic, Taylor: 230 different genes. OCD is aetiologically heterogeneous.</li> <li>© supporting evidence: Nestadt did a review of twin studies and found 68% concordance rate for</li> <li>Anti-anxiety drugs: Benzodiazepines: BZs slow down activity of the studies and studies and found 68% concordance rate for</li> </ul>   |
| Cila  | Sehavioural   | Emotional  | Cognitive  | MZ twins compared to 31% DZ twins.<br>© Existence of environmental risk factors: Cromer found over half the OCD patients in their sam-  |
| Phobia  | characteristics<br>Avoidance  | characteristics<br>Anxiety and fear  | characteristics<br>irrational beliefs  | ple had a traumatic event in the past.<br>To many candidate genes—little predictive value.<br>Channel that increases the flow of chloride ions into the neuron<br>making it more difficult for other neurotransmitters to stimulate   |
| Phobia  | panic e.g. crying   | unreasonable   | recognises fear is<br>excessive  | Neural explanations: 1. Low levels of serotonin results in normal transmission of mood-relevant information not taking place. High levels of dopamine associated with compulsive behaviours.     Compute the neuron. This reduces brain activity and thus anxiety.     Compute the neuron of taking place. High levels of dopamine associated with compulsive behaviours.   |
| Depressio   |   | Lowered mood<br>Feeling worthless and  | Pay attention & focus on<br>negatives<br>Inability to concentrate  | 2. Brain structure: basal ganglia (involved in formation of habits) - patients who suffer brain injuries in this region often develop OCD. Orbitofrontal cortex (converts sensory information reducing symptoms in the short term.  |
| OCD   | & appetite<br>Compulsions   | low self-esteem:<br>High levels of anxiety   | Obsessive and<br>unpleasant thoughts   | into thoughts and actions): higher activity.  Supporting evidence: SSRIs that work on serotonin system reduce OCD symptoms.  No brain system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Appropriate treatment: cost effective and non-disruptive.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system has been found that always plays a roll in OCD.  Control of the system |
| 000   | Avoidance   | depression.  | Insight.   | © Ignores psychological factors: but psychological treatments are effective for OCD. (implications).  |

# SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| Psychology: Knowledge   | Organiser. Pape   | r 2: Re   | search Meth   | ods  |  | ypes of data  | Aims & Hypotheses   |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
|   | Experiments   |   |   |  | Richness in detail. O Diff<br>Quantitative data: nume<br>graphs. O Expresses less  | rical data. © Comparisons possible:<br>s meaning.   | <ul> <li>Aim: what researcher intends to investigate.</li> <li>Operationalised: clearly defined and measurable.</li> <li>Hypothesis: testable statement.</li> </ul>   |  |
| Experimental: researcher varies indepen   |   | te effect on  |   |  |  | es directly from the source purpose of<br>I to the study itself. <sup>©</sup> Requires time &   | <ul> <li>Null hypothesis: predicts no effect or relation<br/>ship.</li> </ul>   |  |
|   | Strength  |   | Limitat   |  | expense.   |   | <ul> <li>Directional hypothesis: based on previous re-</li> </ul>   |  |
| Laboratory experiment: controlled environ-<br>ment, IV manipulated, effect on DV measured   | EVs controlled & easily replicat  |   | Low generalisability & lo   |  |  | at does not come directly from source<br>purpose of the study. © Inexpensive. ©<br>niematch aims  | <ul> <li>search. States direction.</li> <li>Non-directional hypothesis: no theory or pas<br/>research. Does not specify direction.</li> </ul>   |  |
| Field experiment: natural setting, IV manipu-<br>lated, effect on DV measured   | Higher ecological validity (gene<br>and reduction in demand chara                         |   | EVs are harder to contro<br>raised.   | l, and ethical issues  | Meta-analysis: combines  | s data from large number of studies, cal-<br>conclusions have a greater validity. 🕲   | Measures of central tendency  |  |
| Natural experiment: IV varies anyway i.e. nat-<br>ural. Setting/DV may be natural or in a lab   | High ecological validity & ethic  | al option   | difficult to replicate.   |  | Publication bias.  |   | Mean: arithmetic average, add up all scores   |  |
| Quasi-experiment: IV pre-existing difference,<br>DV as for natural experiment.  | Comparisons between preexisi<br>people.   | ting types of   | No random allocation an<br>tions of lab ex.   | id can share limita-   | Observations: limitati   | ational Techniques<br>ion ⊗ Observer bias.  | and divide by number of scores. <sup>©</sup> includes a<br>scores <sup>©</sup> Distorted by extreme values.<br>• Median; all scores in ascending order, middle  |  |
| Experimental des  | igns  |   | Self report techn   | iques  | High external validity. 🟵  | et behaviour would normally occur. 😂<br>) Low control.<br>ol over variables. 😂 Replication & stand-   | <ul> <li>Median: an scores in scenario poter, media<br/>value. Si less affected by extreme scores Si<br/>extreme values may be important.</li> <li>Mode: most common value. Si relevant to</li> </ul>   |  |
| Strength  | Limitation  |   | lesirability bias.<br>Innaires: pre-set list of it  | tems 🖾 Simplicity 🖗  | ardisation. 🙁 Low extern   |   | <ul> <li>Mode, most common value, @ relevant to<br/>categorical data. Ø overly simple.</li> </ul>   |  |
| Independent groups de-<br>sign: one group condition characteristics les   | Participant variables<br>s of act as EV/CV & need   | less infl   | uence of interpersonal v<br>ility bias & issues with q  | variables. 🙁 Social  | C Ethics.  | e being studied. © More ethical. © De-  | Measures of dispersion  |  |
| A, another group condition an issue and no o<br>B—random allocation. effects.   | rder twice as many<br>participants.   | replicat  | red interview: predeterr<br>e. ⊗ Interviewer cannot   | t elaborate.   |  | part of group. © Greater insight. 🛛 Loss  | <ul> <li>Range: difference between highest and lower<br/>+1. © Easy to calculate. O No account of dis-</li> </ul>   |  |
| Repeated measures design:<br>No participant does all<br>conditions of IV. Counter-<br>balancing to control order<br>effects design.<br>No participant values<br>blas (same people<br>therefore control<br>EV & fewer partic<br>pants compared t<br>design.        | e) mand characteristics.<br>s this Can't use the same<br>i- materials in both con-        | & validi<br>• Semi-st<br>questio<br>• Intervie                  | tured interview: no set<br>ty <sup>©</sup> More chance of inf<br>ructured: some set ques<br>ns based on previous an<br>ws improved by intervie<br>s bias), rapport (relaxes | terviewer bias.<br>stion but further<br>iswers.<br>ew schedule | Loss of insight.<br>• Behavioural categories:<br>able categories (operations)  | te from group. © More objective. ô<br>target behaviour broken up into observ-<br>onalisation).<br>ehaviour/event recorded every time it   | tribution.<br>• Standard deviation: dispersion of values<br>around the mean, larger SD means more<br>spread out. ☺ more precise than range. ☺<br>distorted by extreme values.   |  |
| Matched pairs design: two<br>separate groups but partici-<br>pants paired on participant<br>variable/s. no order effects.   | and needs twice as  | <ul> <li>Closed<br/>analyse</li> <li>Open q</li> </ul>          | questions: limited respo<br>. <sup>©</sup> Responses are restri<br>uestions: own words (qu<br>unexpected responses. (   | nses. © Easier to<br>icted.<br>Jalitative) © De-               | occurs. © Record infrequover simplified.<br>• Time sampling: observat  | tions at regular intervals (e.g. every 15 servations. <sup>©</sup> Miss things outside of   | Display of quantitative data <ul> <li>Tables: raw scores in columns and rows.</li> <li>Scattergram: continuous data, correlation, data pairs.</li> <li>Bar charts: categories, bar height represents</li> </ul>   |  |
| Sampling  |   | Contro  | ol of variables   | Etł  | hical Issues   | Correlations  | <ul> <li>For charge categories, bar height represents<br/>frequency.</li> <li>Histogram: data is continuous. No space be-</li> </ul>  |  |
| Population: Target group of interest to re<br>er subset of population. Generalisation: a  | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •   | Standardis  | llocation: avoids bias.<br>sation: ensure key as-   | ticipants and air  | nflict between rights of par-<br>ms of research. So we have  | <ul> <li>Shows relationship (strength and<br/>direction) between co-variables.</li> <li>Scattergram: one co-variable on</li> </ul>  | tween bars.   |  |
| the sample. Bias: Samples under or over<br>Random sampling: Everyone in population  |   |   | esearch kept the same.<br>alancing: ensures each  |  | ics. Ethics committee<br>now to deal with them:  | <ul> <li>Scattergram: one co-variable on<br/>each axis.</li> </ul>  | Distributions   |  |
| via lottery method. <sup>©</sup> Potentially unbiase<br>ness not guaranteed.<br>Systematic sampling: Create sampling fra<br>order) then select every nth name. <sup>©</sup> Un<br>Sample could be unrepresentative.<br>Stratified sampling: Identify subgroups (s | ed. <sup>(</sup> ) Representative-<br>me (e.g. alphabetical<br>biased, objective. ()<br>• | condition<br>or second<br>Controls o<br>are distrib<br>Demand o | in a RMD is tested first<br>in equal amounts.<br>order effects so they<br>uted evenly.<br>haracteristics: partici-<br>king out what is going                                | formed decision<br>consent, retrosp<br>• Deception: Misl       | nt: Participants make in-<br>n to take part. Presumptive<br>pective consent.<br>eading/withholding infor-<br>: told real aims & right to | <ul> <li>Correlation vs experiment: no IV<br/>manipulated, no cause and effect.</li> <li>Types of correlation: positive, neg-<br/>ative and zero</li> <li>Correlation coefficient: number<br/>between -1 and +1. Closer to '1' =</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Normal distribution: bell shaped, mean, med<br/>an, mode all together.</li> <li>Negative skew: modal scores higher, tail to le<br/>(e.g. easy test).</li> <li>Positive skew: modal scores lower, tail to righ<br/>(e.g. hard test).</li> </ul> |  |
| tion to numbers in the population. © Rep<br>isable. © Imperfect stratification.   |   |   | ol with single blind de-  |  | harm: No more risk than<br>ight to withdraw at any stage   |   | Pilot studies   |  |
| Opportunity sampling: Select by asking p<br>ient. <sup>(3)</sup> Inevitably biased unlikely to be re<br>Volunteer sampling: Participants select t<br>Minimal input from researcher. <sup>(3)</sup> Volun<br>duce a representative sample.                         | presentative.<br>hemselves e.g. advert. ©   | of the inve<br>on the res                                       | or effects: Any effect<br>estigators behaviour<br>earch outcome. Con-<br>louble blind design.   | information & c  | fidentiality: right to control<br>onfidentiality protected. Per-<br>otected. Participants refer-<br>er or initial                        | iments & measure things that ethical-<br>ly may not be able to in experiments.<br>© No cause and effect shown and<br>intervening variables missed, wrong<br>conclusions.  | <ul> <li>Trial run: small scale test of procedure and<br/>techniques before doing full scale study. Aims<br/>of piloting: find what does not work e.g. tim-<br/>ings, stimulus, standardised instructions.</li> </ul>                                   |  |

# SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

ology

**\_** 

sγc

Haggerston School

| Psvc   | hology: Knowled  | lge Organi  | iser. Pane  | 2: Research   | Methods  | Psychology and the economy Analysis of qualitative   | data   |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <ul> <li>Signi</li> <li>Prob</li> <li>Calcu</li> </ul>   | ificance: difference/association<br>ability: the likelihood of an eve<br>ulated value: outcome of test.<br>cal value: look up in table.  | St<br>due to chance?  | tatistical Testir   | g   |  | <ul> <li>Findings of research benefit financial prosperity.</li> <li>Attachment: promotes role of father, parents then both<br/>more able to contribute to economy.</li> <li>Treatment of mental disorders: work days lost from de-<br/>pression, effective treatments (e.g. drugs, CBT) contribute<br/>to economy.</li> </ul>   | then coun<br>itative dat<br>intitative<br>niliarisation<br>for theme |
|  | istical tables: used to check sign   |   |   |   |  | Case studies   |  |
| <ul> <li>Use t<br/>esis.</li> <li>p ≤ 0<br/>popu</li> <li>The r<br/>than</li> <li>Type</li> <li>Crite</li> </ul> | 0.05 means there is a 5% chance<br>ulation (i.e. the null hypothesis<br>rule of R: statistical tests with t<br>the critical value.<br>I error: null hypothesis rejecte<br>e II error: null hypothesis accept   | pared calculated a<br>e that the results o<br>is true).<br>he letter 'R' on the<br>ed when 'true' - op<br>ted when 'false', p | and critical value,<br>of a particular san<br>eir name are thos<br>ptimistic. More lik<br>pessimistic. More | f calculated value is sig<br>ple occurred even if th<br>where the calculated<br>by if significant level is<br>ikely if significance leve  | nificant then reject null hypoth-<br>ere was no real difference in the<br>value must be equal to or less   | <ul> <li>Detailed in-depth study of individual/group/institution/<br/>event, longitudinal.</li> <li>Unusual cases (e.g. rare disorder), typical cases (e.g. child-<br/>hood memories).</li> <li>Qualitative (e.g. interviews) and quantitative data (e.g.<br/>psychological tests).</li> <li>Can provide new insights &amp; allows study of both unusual<br/>and typical behaviour.</li> <li>Small, unique sample, low generalisability.</li> <li>Entrance of science<br/>science.</li> <li>Replicability: findings repeatable a<br/>shows validity.</li> <li>Falsifiability: possibility of being pr<br/>theories must be testable.</li> <li>Theory of construction: create gen</li> </ul>  | distance, u<br>through di<br>cross con<br>roved false                |
| ty of  | variance (scandard deviación).   |   | Test of Differen  | ie .  | Test of Association or corre-  | Content analysis rive and test hypothesis.   |  |
|  |  | Unrelated De  |   | Related Design  | lation   | Indirect study of communications.     Form of observation: of spoken interaction and/or written     to assess theory's validity.   | ate hypoti   |
|  | Nominal Data   | chi-Square  | ed  | Sign test   | Chi-squared  | communications, examples from media.  Paradigms/shifts: shared set of ass  | umptions   |
|  | Ordinal Data   | Mann-Whit   | tney  | Wilcoxon  | Spearman's rho   | High ecological validity & easy to replicate and check relia-     (which may change), psychology la  | icks a para  |
|  | Interval Data  | Unrelated to  |   | Related t-test Pearson's r<br>(parametric) (parametric)   |  | bility.<br>S May lack objectivity and communication studied out of Popper & Kuhn.  |  |
|  |  | (parametr   | nc)   | (parametric)  | (parametric)   | context—reduces validity.  |  |
|  | Levels of measureme  | nt  |   | Calculating the   | sign test  | Peer review  |  |
| level<br>Nom<br>Ordin<br>rate<br>Inter<br>(e.g.  | ntitative data can be divided in<br>Is of measurement.<br>ininal: frequency data in categor<br>inal: data in order, intervals sub<br>on 1 o 10 scale).<br>rval: data measured on units of<br>metres or minutes).<br>Reporting psycholo<br>tract: short summary, main par | ries<br>ojective (e.g.<br>4 equal size  | Calculate to:     Ignore parti     ensure you t     Total of less     Calculated S     value to be :        | ipants with the same score in condition A and B and<br>ake this off N (number of participants).<br>frequent sign (S).<br>equal to or less than the critical value for calculated<br>ignificant.<br>Writing a consent form |  | Reliability         Peer review: assessment of scienti           • Reliability: measuring consistency.         • Peer review: assessment of scienti           • Ways of assessing reliability: test-retest (test same people twice), inter-observer (compare observations from different observers) and correlation coefficient (two sets of scores should correlate at least +.80 for reliability).         • Purpose: quality assurance.           • Improving reliability: questionnaires: rewrite questions. Observations: operationalise behavioural categories, training.         • Strengths: aims to protect quality is breaking research buried.  | ns before p<br>considers<br>y.<br>of research<br>so may cri          |
|  | oduction: review of literature, l  |   | to hypothesis.  |   | sufficient information for the<br>make an informed decision  | Writing a hypothes   | is   |
| <ul> <li>tion.</li> <li>Result</li> <li>Discult</li> </ul>   | thod: design, sample, materials,<br>ults: descriptive and inferential<br>ussion: summary, links to earlik<br>erencing: use standard format f   | statistics (tests), re<br>er research, limitat  | aw data in appen<br>tions, implication  | ica-<br>about whether to take part or not.<br>A consent form must include both procedural<br>issues and ethical issues.<br>ons.<br>Format: requires participants agreement: in-   |  | Validity: measure of legitimacy (genuine effect).     Internal validity: control within a study e.g. reduce CVs/<br>EVs, demand characteristics.     Sincetional: "There will be a di<br>Null hypothesis "there will be no di  | ss'<br>ifference ir<br>ifference'                                    |
| <ul> <li>Mus<br/>guag</li> <li>Expl</li> </ul>   | Writing standardised in<br>ure each participant has exactly<br>st be clear & succinct and writting<br>ge.<br>lain procedures.<br>ck understanding of instruction   | y the same instruc<br>en using formal lar   | n- at the<br>• Must<br>• Start y  | fing: all is explained to<br>end of his/her contribu-<br>e written in verbatim<br>our debrief with: than  | a debrief<br>the participant who is thanked<br>ition. Happens at end of study.<br>format.<br>k you. Then the aim of the study,<br>th to withdraw data & confi- | <ul> <li>External validity: ecological validity, temporal validity.</li> <li>Ways of assessing validity: face validity (test looks like it measures what it should) &amp; concurrent validity (findings similar to well established test: correlation coefficient &gt; +.80).</li> <li>Improving validity: experiments: use control group &amp; standardised procedure, single and double blind design. Questionnaires: make anonymous. Observations: covert,</li> <li>Correlational hypothesis: 'relationship Directional: 'There will be a positiv correlation'.</li> <li>Non-directional: 'There will be a control group &amp; standardised procedure, single and double blind design. Questionnaires: make anonymous. Observations: covert,</li> </ul> | e/negative<br>orrelation I<br>correlation                            |
| have   | e any questions?".   |   |   | lity. Experimental designish with: do you have  | n: if IGD explain other condi-   | operationalised behavioural categories. Gather qualitative<br>data: and use triangulation (different sources).   |  |

## SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| 1879 Wund<br>ry. Ps<br>a scient<br>1900 Freud<br>edim<br>develor<br>theray<br>1913 Watsay<br>psych<br>(scient<br>1950s Roger<br>jected<br>sised i<br>(holisi<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>the co<br>and co<br>and b<br>mind<br>the co<br>and the | tson and later on Skinner established the behaviour-<br>approach. Believed all behaviour is learnt and that<br>chologists should only study observable behaviours<br>ientific).<br>gers & Maslow developed humanistic approach. Re-<br>ted deterministic views of behaviourism & empha-<br>ed importance of free will—focus on whole person   | Wundt and Introspection           • Wundt established the first psychology laboratory in 1879.           • Introspection: the first systematic experimental attempt to study the mind by breaking up conscious awareness into basic structures of thoughts, images and sensations.           • Structuralism: introspection led to identifying the structure of consciousness by breaking it up into the basic structures.           © Aspects of Wundt's work are scientific e.g. Use standardised procedures:           © Aspects of Wundt's research are subjective—participants were reporting 'private' mental processes: don't meet scientific criteria.           Learning Approaches: Behaviourist appro           • Assumptions: Focus on observable behaviour only, cont boratory experiments & use of non-human animals.           • Classical conditioning: Pavlov learning through associate | <ul> <li>be stud</li> <li>Inferer<br/>studied<br/>(assum</li> <li>Schem<br/>inform<br/>ence.</li> <li>Theore<br/>having</li> <li>Compu-<br/>el hum</li> <li>Cogniti<br/>brain s</li> <li>Scientif</li> <li>e.g. lab sti</li> <li>Many n</li> <li>Machin</li> <li>Inferen</li> </ul> | died scientificall<br>hace: mental proof<br>d indirectly by m<br>options).<br>a: mental frame<br>ation, become n<br>stical models: e.,<br>input, storage a<br>iter models: pro<br>an thinking (arti<br>ive neuroscience<br>tructures affect<br>fic, objective app<br>udies and cognit<br>eal world applic<br>e reductionism-<br>ce & artificial sti | hat mental proce<br>y e.g. memory.<br>cesses are 'privat<br>haking inferences<br>work to interpre-<br>more complex wir<br>g. memory repre-<br>and retrieval stag<br>ogramme comput<br>ficial intelligence<br>e: scientific study<br>mental processe<br>proach to studyin<br>tive neuroscience<br>ations: depressio<br>— oversimplificati<br>imuli: low extern<br>hodynamic Aş | e' so are<br>t incoming<br>th experi-<br>sented as<br>es.<br>ers to mod-<br>b.<br>of how<br>s.<br>g the mind<br>c.<br>n, EWT.<br>ion<br>al validity.  | and the mind<br>Genetics: gene<br>(concordance<br>of behaviour.<br>Genotype: a p<br>pression of th<br>Neurochemist<br>cals (neurotra<br>Theory of evo<br>adaptative & i<br>Precise and high<br>Real world app<br>iness.<br>Provides 'caus<br>ations only. | and body are thes<br>estates) are used<br>persons genetic<br>estates) are used<br>persons genetic<br>estates) are used<br>try: thought and<br>ansmitters) in thoution: genetica<br>is naturally sele<br>ghlight scientific<br>plication—the u<br>cal explanations? | sychological chara<br>to investigate th<br>make-up. Phenot<br>luenced by enviro<br>d behaviour depe<br>e brain e.g. serot<br>illy determined be | acteristics<br>le genetic t<br>type: the e<br>onment)<br>nds on che<br>conin in OC<br>ehaviour th<br>and EEG.<br>rugs for mo |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| ry. Ps<br>a sciel1900Freud<br>ed im<br>develo<br>theraj1913Watso<br>ist ap<br>psych<br>(scien1950sRoger<br>ist of<br>psych<br>(scien1960sCogni<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments1960sBandu<br>the ro<br>er ide<br>estabil1980sBandu<br>the ro<br>er ide<br>estabil   | Indt opened first experimental psychology laborato-<br>Psychology emerged as a discipline & emergence as<br>cience as some of the methods used = scientific.<br>Und established: psychodynamic approach. Highlight-<br>importance of the unconscious mind on behaviour &<br>veloped psychoanalysis, which was the first 'talking<br>rrapy'.<br>Itson and later on Skinner established the behaviour-<br>approach. Believed all behaviour is learnt and that<br>chologists should only study observable behaviours<br>entific).<br>gers & Maslow developed humanistic approach. Re-<br>ted deterministic views of behaviourism & empha-<br>ed importance of free will—focus on whole person<br>lism)<br>gnitive approach emerged with the introduction of<br>computer. Interested in studying mental processes<br>d believe we can make inferences about how the | <ul> <li>1879.</li> <li>Introspection: the first systematic experimental attempt to study the mind by breaking up conscious awareness into basic structures of thoughts, images and sensations.</li> <li>Structuralism: introspection led to identifying the structure of consciousness by breaking it up into the basic structures.</li> <li>Aspects of Wundt's work are scientific e.g. Use standardised procedures:</li> <li>Aspects of Wundt's research are subjective—participants were reporting 'private' mental processes: don't meet scientific criteria.</li> <li>Learning Approaches: Behaviourist appro</li> <li>Assumptions: Focus on observable behaviour only, cont boratory experiments &amp; use of non-human animals.</li> <li>Classical conditioning: Pavlov learning through association</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Schem<br/>inform<br/>ence.</li> <li>Theore<br/>having</li> <li>Compu-<br/>el hum</li> <li>Cogniti<br/>brain s</li> <li>Scientifi<br/>e.g. lab sti</li> <li>Many n</li> <li>Machini</li> <li>Inferen</li> </ul>   | a: mental frame<br>ation, become n<br>input, storage a<br>itter models: pro<br>an thinking (arti<br>ive neuroscience<br>tructures affect<br>fic, objective app<br>udies and cognit<br>eal world applic<br>ice reductionism-<br>ce & artificial sti  | nore complex wi<br>and retrieval stag<br>gramme comput<br>ificial intelligence<br>e: scientific study<br>mental processe<br>proach to studyin<br>tive neuroscience<br>ations: depressio<br>— oversimplificati<br>imuli: low extern  | th experi-<br>sented as<br>es.<br>of how<br>s.<br>g the mind<br>c.<br>in , EWT.<br>ion<br>al validity.  | Genotype: a p<br>pression of th<br>Neurochemist<br>cals (neurotra<br>Theory of evo<br>adaptative & i<br>) Precise and hig<br>Real world app<br>ness.<br>) Provides 'caus<br>iations only.<br>) Biological dete  | persons genetic<br>te genotype (infl<br>try: thought and<br>ansmitters) in th<br>olution: genetica<br>is naturally sele<br>ghlight scientific<br>plication—the u<br>cal explanations <sup>2</sup><br>erminism.   | luenced by enviro<br>d behaviour depe<br>e brain e.g. serot<br>Illy determined b<br>cted.<br>c methods: Fmri a<br>se of proactive di            | onment)<br>inds on che<br>conin in OC<br>ehaviour t<br>and EEG.<br>rugs for m  |
| ed im<br>develop<br>the<br>sist ap<br>psych<br>(scien<br>1950s Roger<br>jected<br>sist di<br>psych<br>(blist<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Roger<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments  | importance of the unconscious mind on behaviour &<br>veloped psychoanalysis, which was the first 'talking<br>rapy'.<br>Itson and later on Skinner established the behaviour-<br>approach. Believed all behaviour is learnt and that<br>chologists should only study observable behaviours<br>ientific).<br>gers & Maslow developed humanistic approach. Re-<br>ted deterministic views of behaviourism & empha-<br>ed importance of free will—focus on whole person<br>lism)<br>gnitive approach emerged with the introduction of<br>computer. Interested in studying mental processes<br>d believe we can make inferences about how the  | <ul> <li>and sensations.</li> <li>Structuralism: introspection led to identifying the structure of consciousness by breaking it up into the basic structures.</li> <li>Aspects of Wundt's work are scientific e.g. Use standardised procedures:</li> <li>Aspects of Wundt's research are subjective—participants were reporting 'private' mental processes: don't meet scientific criteria.</li> <li>Learning Approaches: Behaviourist appro</li> <li>Assumptions: Focus on observable behaviour only, cont boratory experiments &amp; use of non-human animals.</li> <li>Classical conditioning: Pavlov learning through association</li> </ul>  | Compu-<br>el hum     Cogniti-<br>brain s     Scientifi     e.g. lab st     @ Many n     @ Machin     @ Inferen     bach   | ater models: pro<br>an thinking (arti<br>ive neuroscience<br>tructures affect<br>fic, objective app<br>udies and cognit<br>eal world applic<br>e reductionism-<br>ce & artificial sti   | gramme comput<br>ificial intelligence<br>e: scientific study<br>mental processe<br>proach to studyin<br>tive neuroscience<br>ations: depressio<br>— oversimplificati<br>imuli: low extern   | ers to mod-<br>).<br>of how<br>s.<br>g the mind<br>c.<br>n, EWT.<br>ion<br>al validity.   | adaptative & i<br>Precise and hig<br>Real world app<br>iness.<br>Provides 'caus<br>ations only.<br>Biological deter   | is naturally sele<br>ghlight scientific<br>plication—the u<br>sal explanations <sup>4</sup><br>erminism.   | cted.<br>c methods: Fmri a<br>se of proactive d   | and EEG.<br>rugs for m   |
| 1950s Roger<br>jesteh<br>(scien<br>1950s Roger<br>jesteh<br>sised i<br>(holisi<br>1960s Cogni<br>the cc<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Bandu<br>the re<br>estabi<br>1980s Roger  | approach. Believed all behaviour is learnt and that<br>chologists should only study observable behaviours<br>ientific).<br>gers & Maslow developed humanistic approach. Re-<br>ted deterministic views of behaviourism & empha-<br>ed importance of free will—focus on whole person<br>lism)<br>gnitive approach emerged with the introduction of<br>computer. Interested in studying mental processes<br>d believe we can make inferences about how the  | ardised procedures:<br>Aspects of Wundt's research are subjective—<br>participants were reporting 'private' mental processes:<br>don't meet scientific criteria.           Learning Approaches: Behaviourist appro           • Assumptions: Focus on observable behaviour only, cont<br>boratory experiments & use of non-human animals.           • Classical conditioning: Pavlov learning through associate  | © Scientif<br>e.g. lab str<br>© Many n<br>© Machin<br>© Inferen   | ic, objective app<br>udies and cognit<br>eal world applic<br>e reductionism-<br>ce & artificial sti   | proach to studyin<br>tive neuroscience<br>ations: depressio<br>—oversimplificati<br>imuli: low extern   | g the mind since the mind since the mind since the second | Provides 'caus<br>ations only.<br>Biological dete   | erminism.  | ' but evidence co   | mes from   |
| jected<br>sised i<br>(holisi<br>1960s Cogni<br>the cc<br>and b<br>mind<br>ments<br>1960s Bando<br>the re<br>establ<br>1980s Biolog<br>Advar<br>an inc<br>proce   | ted deterministic views of behaviourism & empha-<br>ed importance of free will—focus on whole person<br>lism)<br>gnitive approach emerged with the introduction of<br>computer. Interested in studying mental processes<br>d believe we can make inferences about how the   | Learning Approaches: Behaviourist appro<br>• Assumptions: Focus on observable behaviour only, cont<br>boratory experiments & use of non-human animals.<br>• Classical conditioning: Pavlov learning through associat  | ach   |   |   | <u> </u>  | _   | Humanist   |   |  |
| 1960s Cogni<br>the co<br>and b<br>mind i<br>ments<br>1960s Bandu<br>the ro<br>eride<br>establ<br>1980s Biolog<br>Advar<br>an inc<br>proce  | nitive approach emerged with the introduction of<br>computer. Interested in studying mental processes<br>d believe we can make inferences about how the   | boratory experiments & use of non-human animals.<br>• Classical conditioning: <b>Pavlov</b> learning through associate  | trolled la-   | -   | nouynumic A   | -prodon   | -   |  | tic Approach<br>s emphasised & fo<br>erience of unique  |  |
| the ro<br>er ide<br>establ<br>1980s Biolog<br>Advar<br>an inc  |   | <ul> <li>tioned dog to salivate (UCR) when bell rings (CR).</li> <li>Operant conditioning: Skinner learning via consequence<br/>researched using rats in specially designed cages. Types</li> </ul>   | ion: condi-<br>es—<br>s of rein-  | influence o<br>Tripartite s<br>superego.<br>Defence m<br>pression, d  | ns: unconscious r<br>on behaviour.<br>structure of perso<br>echanisms: used<br>lenial and displac   | onality: id, ego &<br>by the ego: re-<br>ement.   | deficient<br>esteem a<br>Self actu<br>can poss  | cy needs, safety<br>and self actualis<br>alisation: perso<br>sibly be.   | eeds: 5 levels: ph<br>, love/belongingr<br>;ation.<br>n's desire to be th<br>rowth aims for ha  | hess, self-  |
| Advar<br>an inc<br>proce   | ndura proposed social learning theory. He considered<br>role of cognitive factors in learning, drawing togeth-<br>deas from traditional behaviourism and the newly<br>ablished cognitive approach.  | forcement positive and negative—both have positive co<br>quence. Punishment = unpleasant consequence.<br>© scientific credibility: well controlled research & use of ar<br>© Real world application: therapies and token economy sy<br>© Environmentally deterministic  | nimals<br>/stems.   | sonality: or<br>Conflict lea<br>• Oedipus co  | exual stages deter<br>ral, anal, phallic, l<br>ads to 'fixation'.<br>omplex occurs at<br>onis envy in girls.  | atency, genital.  | <ul> <li>Condition<br/>personal</li> <li>Counsell</li> </ul>  | l growth.  | posed by parents<br>(Rogers) genuine  |  |
|  | logical approach—dominant approach in psychology.<br>vances in technology, for example MRI scans, allowed<br>increased understanding of the brain and biological<br>ccesses.  | © Difficulties in extrapolation from animal research to hun<br>iours<br>Learning Approaches: Social Learning The<br>• Assumptions: learning indirectly, in a social context thro  | eory  | analysis 'talkir<br>O Untestable  | nd real world app<br>ng therapy'.<br>concepts—unfal:<br>gender bias: alph   | sifiable  | Positive a<br>O Culturally  | approach to psy<br>y bias.<br>eal world applic   | hological counsel<br>chology.<br>ation when comp  | -  |
| psych<br>nitive  | gnitive neuroscience has emerged in the forefront of<br>chology. This brings together the biological and cog-<br>ve approaches and investigates how biological struc-<br>es influence mental states.  | vation & imitation.<br>• Bandura: we observe others behaviour and note conserve Behaviour that is rewarded = likely to be imitated = vica   | quences.  |   |   | Compa   | rison of app  | roaches  |   |  |
| tures.   |   | forcement.  Mediational processes: 1. attention 2. retention 3. moto  | or repro-   | Approach  | Biological  | Behavioural   | SLT   | Cognitive  | Psychodynamic   | Humanis  |
| Emer   | ergence of psychology as a science  | duction 4. motivation.<br>• Identification with role models = important.  |   | Free will vs<br>determinism   | Biological determin-<br>ism   | Environmental de-<br>terminism  | Soft determinism  | Soft determinism   | Physic determinism  | Free will  |
|  | dt = first to show empirical methods could be applied<br>ental processes: emergence of psychology as a science.   | <ul> <li>Bandura et al 1961: children who watched an adult beh<br/>gressively towards a bobo doll—were much more aggre<br/>wards the doll.</li> </ul>   | essive to-  | Nature vs<br>Nurture<br>Reductionism  | Nature<br>Biological reduction-   | Nurture<br>Environmental re-  | Nurture   | Nature & Nurture   | Mostly nature<br>Reductionism and   | Mostly nurtu<br>Holism   |
|  | behaviourists rejected introspection.   | <ul> <li>Bandura and Walters (1963) Children who saw aggressi<br/>ed were much more aggressive when given a bobo doll<br/>reinforcement).</li> </ul>  |   | vs holism   | ism   | ductionism<br>Nomothetic  | Nomothetic  | reductionism   | holism<br>Nomothetic & idio-  | Idiographic  |
| laborat  |   | ©Emphasises the importance of cognitive factors; overcon<br>with behaviourist approach.   | ning issues   | nomothetic  | Scientific  | Scientific  | Mostly Scientific   | Mostly Scientific  | graphic<br>Not scientific   | Not scientific   |
| 950s Cognitiv<br>980s Biologio   | ratory experiments.<br>itive approach studied mental processes scientifically   | © Real world applications: media.   |   |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |

## SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| Psychology: Knowledge Organiser. P  | Paper 2: Biopsychology   | Synaptic transmission  | Endocrine system   | Fight or flight response  Example of endocrine system and autor  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <ul> <li>The nervous system is a specialised network of cells in the human body and is our primary internal communication system. It has 2 key functions: collect and respond to information from the environment and co-ordinate the working of different organs and cells in the body.</li> <li>Make sure you know the functions of each division.</li> </ul>   | Neurons           • Neurons typically consist of a cell body, dendrites<br>and an axon.           • Sensory neurons: carry messages from PNS to CNS,<br>have long dendrites and short axons. Found in re-<br>ceptors such as eyes, ears, tongue and skin.           • Relay neurons connect sensory neurons to the mo-<br>tor or other relay neurons. They have short den-<br>drites and short axons. They are found between<br>sensory input and motor outputs.           • Motor neurons connect the CNS to effector such as<br>muscles and glands. They have short dendrites and<br>long axons. Are found in the central nervous sys-<br>tem and control muscle movements.  | tials) reach the presynaptic ter-<br>minal. Action potentials trigger<br>release of neurotransmitters. ver-<br>Neurotransmitters cross the syn-<br>apse from vesicles. Neurotrans-<br>mitters combine with receptors<br>on the postsynaptic membrane. Add<br>Stimulation of postsynaptic re-<br>ceptors by neurotransmitters Pir<br>result in either excitation or inhi-<br>bition Excitatory: post synaptic<br>neuron more likely to fire an im-<br>pulse. Inhibitory: post synaptic<br>neuron less likely to fire an im-<br>pulse. Excitatory and inhibitory pe  | orks alongside the nervous sys-<br>m. Is a network of glands that<br>crete hormones. Uses blood<br>ssels to deliver hormones to<br>rget sites.<br>frenal glands: secretes adrena-<br>le/controls the sympathetic<br>vision in the fight or flight re-<br>onse.<br>neal gland: releases melatonin<br>hich is responsible for im-<br>ortant biological rhythms in-<br>uding the sleep-wake cycle.<br>hen released melatonin causes<br>owsiness and lowers body tem-<br>rature, helping to induce<br>sep.<br>Ci<br>• 24 hour cycle. Example: sle  | ic nervous system working together.<br>Stressors trigger the sympathetic nerve<br>system: prepares body for fight or fligh<br>Signals adrenal medulla to release adre<br>line into the blood stream. Adrenaline<br>es: heart to beat faster, pushing blood<br>muscle and other vital organs. Breathin<br>rapid, release of blood glucose. Parasy<br>thetic branch returns the body to its ne<br>'rest and digest' state.<br>Valuable knowledge and shows how sy<br>tems work together.<br>Units our behaviour to 2 responses: wi<br>about 'freeze'?<br>Bata bias: females have a different stre<br>response to males (Taylor). |
| Localisation of function in the brain     Localisation of function in the brain     The theory that different areas of the brain are responsible     for different functions.     Frontal lobe: motor cortex / movement. Parietal lobe: soma-     tosensory area / sensory. Occipital lobe: visual. Temporal     lobe: auditory.     Broca's area, left hemisphere: Left frontal lobe / speech pro-     duction. Wernicke's area, left hemisphere: Left temporal     lobe / language comprehension.     Wealth of evidence to support functions are localised: Pe-     tersen, Dougherty.     Senctions are not localised to just one region, other regions     take over following brain injury. Equipotentiality theory: higher     mental functions are not localised.     Beta bias: women have larger Broca and Wernicke's areas     than men, which the theory ignores.     Biologically reductionist: reducing complex processes to one     specific brain region.     More important to investigate how brain areas communicate     with each other rather than focusing on specific brain areas. | <ul> <li>Lateralisation and split brain research</li> <li>Hemispheric lateralisation: idea that the 2 hemispheres of the brain are functionally different.</li> <li>Left hemisphere: language centre of the brain, controls the right hand &amp; receives information from right visual field. The right hemisphere: focuses on visuo-spatial tasks, controls the left hand &amp; receives information from the left visual field.</li> <li>Sperry: split brain research, participants who had a surgical procedure where the corpus callosum is cut. Key findings: a number of key differences between the two hemispheres: left hemisphere is dominant in terms of visual speech and language. Right hemisphere is dominant in terms of visual-motor tasks.</li> <li>G lateralisation may occur in young adults.</li> <li>Lateralization may occur in young adults.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>change throughout life e.g. synaptic pruning and new neural connections.</li> <li>Maguire: experience (driving a taxi) can change the structure of the brain (enlarged hippocampus).</li> <li>Draganski: learning induced changes in the brains of medical student—in the posterior hippocampus, following final exams.</li> <li>Functional recovery: form of plasticity, brains ability to redistribute or transfer functions. Structural changes can include: axonal sprouting, reformation of blood vessels, recruitment of homologous areas on opposite side of brain.</li> <li>Supporting evidence to support brains considerable plasticity; Khun et al.</li> <li>Supporting evidence for functional recovery: Tajiri et al.</li> <li>Real world: neurorehabilitation.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>matic nuclei (SCN). Light = j</li> <li>Siffre study: 2 months under external cues.</li> <li>Support for importance of II</li> <li>Practical applications to shift</li> <li>Does not account for individ</li> <li>Problems with research met</li> </ul> Infradian Infradian rhythms: less that 28 days, governed by horm gebers synchronise cycle, in from armpits (Stern and M Evolutionary basis: synchroi Methodological limitations: <ul> <li>Ultradian rhythms: more th of 5 stages. 1&amp;2 light sleep sleep, slow wave sleep, del</li> <li>Supporting evidence for dist</li> </ul> | erground, sleep/wake cycle increased by lac<br>ight: Aschoff et al<br>ft work.<br>dual differences: Duffy et al.<br>thodology.<br>And ultradian rhythms<br>in one cycle in 24 hours. Menstrual cycle abor<br>iones (oestrogen/progesterone). Exogenous<br>nenstrual cycles synchronised using pherom<br>lcClintock).<br>nisation may have adaptive function.<br>::many factors affect menstrual cycle.<br>nan one cycle in 24 hours. Sleep: 90 minute in<br>, alpha waves and sleep spindles. 3&4 deep<br>ta waves. 5 REM sleep (dreams), theta wave<br>tinct stages of sleep (Dement et al).<br>rep lab' generalisability.    |
| Ways of studying           • Functional magnetic resonance imaging: (FMRI) uses magnetic person performs a task.  | c field and radio waves to monitor blood flow when a<br>poral resolution.<br>In the brain via electrodes that are fixed to an individu-<br>temporal resolution. ☉ low spatial resolution.<br>By difference = stimulus is presented to a participant<br>ssible to determine how processing is affected by<br>ing their death e.g. Broca's brain. © allow for a detailed   | <ul> <li>Endogenous pacemakers (EPs) &amp; the sleep<br/>about light from optic chiasm. SCN indicat<br/>cycle stopped in chipmunks when SCN de:</li> <li>Supporting evidence for importance of SCI</li> <li>Need to look beyond the 'master clock': Di</li> <li>Exogenous zeitgebers (EZs) and the sleep/</li> </ul>   | tes day length to pineal gland whi<br>stroyed.<br>N: Ralph et al.<br>amiola et al.<br>/wake cycle. Time givers': reset El<br>apbell et al). Social cues: babies c<br>cople with some light perception I  | hiasmatic nucleus (SCN), receives information<br>ich secrete melatonin when dark. Sleep/wai<br>PS by entrainment. Light the key EZ, entrain<br>circadian rhythms and jet lag entrained by b<br>have normal circadian rhythms those witho   |

# SIXTH FORM KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER

| Psychology: Knowledge Organiser. Pa  | aner 3: Issues and debates  | Idiographic and nomothetic approaches Holism a   | and reductionism   |
|--|---|--|--|
| Gender bias  | Cultural bias   | haviour: idiographic (detail, single cases) or nom-<br>othetic ('laws' or norms) Holism: whole is gree   | n debate: look at whole per  |
| Psychologists seek universality but bias may be inevitable as<br>they are products of their time.<br>Alpha bias: exaggerates differences, tends to devalue females.<br>Examples: Freud, girls have weaker identification with same-<br>sex parent than boys, so weaker conscience.<br>Beta bias: ignores or underestimates differences e.g. when<br>conducting research. Examples: fight or flight response based<br>on male animals and assumed to be universal, tend and be-<br>friend more common in females, an evolved response for car-<br>ing for young (Taylor et al).<br>Androcentrism: male centred, leads to alpha and beta bias,<br>non-male behaviour judged as abnormal, e.g. premenstrual<br>syndrome.<br>There are implications raised from psychological studies and<br>neories that are gender biased: may lead to misleading assump-<br>ons and fail to challenge negative stereotypes—validating dis-<br>riminatory practises.<br>Gender bias promotes sexism in the research process. Male<br>esearchers more likely and their expectations about women (e.g.<br>xpect irrationality) may mean that female participants underper-<br>rum in studies (Nicolson). | <ul> <li>Cultural bias: 68% of research participants from US, 80% are students.</li> <li>WEIRD participants: Westernised, Educated people from Industrialised, Rich Democracies.</li> <li>Ethnocentrism: superiority of own cultural group, others seen as deficient. Example, strange situation, reflects vales of US culture, meant many Japanese babies classed as insecure (Takahashi).</li> <li>Cultural relativism: norms and ethics only make sense in their cultural context.</li> <li>Universality: etic approach looks at behaviour from outside (looks for universals, whereas emic approach is from inside a culture). Imposed etic e.g. Ainsworth's Strange Situation.</li> <li>Wealth of evidence to show cultural bias is still an issue in psychology. Alongide this some of the most influential studies in psychology are culturally biased.</li> <li>Ethnic stereotyping: early IQ tests were ethnocentric, but then used as evidence that certain ethnic/cultural groups were genetically inferior (Gould).</li> <li>Emergence of cultural psychology: takes emic approach to avoid ethnocentrism e.g. local researcher and culturally-based techniques.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>views, may make generalisations. Examples:<br/>Rogers (unconditional positive regard, based on<br/>individual clients), Freud (phobia, Little Hans).</li> <li>With its in-depth qualitative methods of investi-<br/>gation, it arguably provides a more complete ac-<br/>count of an individual.</li> <li>The idiographic approach on its own is restricted,<br/>no baseline for comparison, also can be unscientific<br/>and subjective e.g. case studies.</li> <li>Nomothetic: 'laws' applied to individuals. Quan-<br/>titative methods, hypothesis testing, statistical<br/>analysis, seek to quantify behaviour. Examples:<br/>Skinner (laws of learning), Sperry (split brain re-<br/>search).</li> <li>Losing the whole person: loss of understanding<br/>when focusing on statistics e.g. knowing there is a<br/>156 lifetime risk of developing schizophrenia tells us<br/>very little about what life is like for someone who<br/>has the disorder.</li> <li>Objective weasus subjective: nomothetic assumes<br/>objective measurement is possible through</li> </ul>   | of parsimony, reducing to si<br>ples.<br>n: e.g. explain OCD at socio<br>cal, psychological, physical,<br>ural, physiological, neuroch<br>hich is best.<br>ism: physiological, neuroch<br>ic e.g. OCD reduced to sero<br>ctionism: behaviour reduced<br>(behaviourism), e.g. love/<br>ed through classical conditioned<br>: some behaviours can only<br>el explanations or holistic or<br>periment).<br>practical value. Holistic accompractical e.g. difficult to tr<br>is include past experiences,<br>ionism: scientific approach.<br>reprationalisation, enables |
| Free will and determinism     Free will-determinism debate: is our behaviour selected with-<br>out constraint (free will) or caused by internal/external factors<br>(determinism)?     Free will: we are self determining, biological and environmen-  | Nature: heredity, influence of genes on behaviour, innate<br>influences.     Nurture: environment, the mind starts as a blank slate<br>(behaviourist approach).     Measuring nature-nurture concordance (estimates how   | vidual experience matters.         lack meaning (e.g. when           Ethical implications of research studies and t           • Ethical implications: being concerned about the consequences of theory/st  | n pointing your finger).<br>theory   |
| tal influences can be rejected, the humanistic approach.<br>Hard determinism: all human actions have a cause. Soft deter-<br>minism: freedom within restricted range of choices.<br>Biological determinism: ANS causes stress response, genes<br>cause mental health problems.   | <ul> <li>much trait is inherited), used to estimate heritability<br/>(proportion within a population due to genes—IQ is .5<br/>(50%) half nature, half nurture.</li> <li>The interactionist approach: Cannot separate nature and<br/>nurture, relative contribution is what matters e.g. attach-</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Socially sensitive research (SSR): research that has consequences for the parepresent (Siber and Stanley).</li> <li>Applies to all research but some more than others e.g. research on memory sion.</li> <li>Research question: if focus is on 'alternative relationships' then heterosexues and the second sec</li></ul> | y versus research on depre   |
| <ul> <li>Environmental determinism: we are sum total of reinforcement contingencies; free will is an illusion.</li> <li>Psychic determinism: behaviour caused by unconscious childhood conflicts.</li> <li>Scientific emphasis: every event has a cause, allows prediction and control of events.</li> <li>Determinism is more consistent with the aims of science.</li> <li>The law: hard determinism not consistent with legal principle of moral responsibility.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>ment (parenting versus temperament of child).</li> <li>Diathesis-stress model: vulnerability + trigger e.g. OCD<br/>(inherited gene + trauma).</li> <li>Epigenetics: lifestyle and events (e.g. smoking, trauma)<br/>leave 'marks' on our genes, switching them on or off, per-<br/>manent and can be passed on.</li> <li>Support for nature: twin study evidence. You can use an<br/>example from any topic.</li> <li>Support for nurture: evidence from studies of social learn-</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>be excluded, biased from the start.</li> <li>Dealing with participants e.g. victims of domestic abuse may worry about c cussing experience.</li> <li>The way findings are used may give scientific credence to prejudice e.g. US migration. Also media interest.</li> <li>Socially sensitive research can have benefits for the groups being studied—as a mental illness but the Kinsey report showed it was normal (Kinsey et al).</li> <li>However, there may also be negative consequences e.g. the criminal gene h als claiming no personal responsibility.</li> </ul>  | IQ tests used to restrict in<br>e.g. homosexuality was se<br>has implications for individ  |
|  | ing theory or classical/operant conditioning. You can use an<br>example from any topic.<br>☺ Implications of both nativism (nature) and empiricism<br>(nurture).<br>☺ Strong support for adopting an interactionist approach as<br>opposed to only nature or nurture.   | <ul> <li></li></ul>  | igh quality research on so-<br>iter showed to be fraudule<br>ianned with care to ensure  |

ology

**\_** 

s y c

| Psychology: Knowledge Orga   | aniser. Paper 3:  | Schizophrenia   | De la ciación de la  | Psychological explanations: Cognitive explanation<br>ought processing: processing information differently to those without the disorder.   |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Symptoms           Serious mental disorder affecting 1% of<br>the population.         Classification: identify symptoms that go<br>together = a disorder, then identify disor-<br>der based on symptoms (= diagnosis).           Classification either DSM-5 (one positive<br>symptom), ICD-10 (Two negative symp-<br>toms.           Positive symptoms: hallucinations, dis-<br>torted sensory experiences may be based<br>on real stimulus, e.g. hearing voices. Delu-<br>sions, beliefs with no basis in reality, e.g.<br>person thinks they are Jesus.           Negative symptoms: speech poverty, re-<br>duced amount and poor quality of<br>speech. Avolition: severe loss of motiva-<br>tion, low activity levels.   | <ul> <li>Family dysfunction: s<br/>patterns of communi</li> <li>Double bind theory: c<br/>child can't win (Bates</li> <li>Expressed emotion: f<br/>cause or later relapse</li> <li>Research evidence: T</li> <li>who had schizophrenic I</li> <li>develop the disorder (th</li> <li>logical parents) - but oni</li> <li>disturbed. Berger found</li> <li>recall of double bind sta</li> <li>schizophrenics.</li> <li>Information from chil</li> </ul> | family criticism and hostility, initial<br>t.<br>fernari et al found adopted children<br>biological parents were more likely to<br>nan those with non schizophrenic bio-<br>ly if the adopted family was rated as<br>I that schizophrenics reported a higher<br>itements by their mothers than non-<br>lidhood experience was gathered after<br>nptoms, disorder may have distorted<br>reiences.  | Central control, (     Research suppor<br>paired cognition (St<br>A proximal expla<br>dysfunction are dist<br>Cognitive behaviour<br>Deals with irration<br>make sense of sy<br>ty, reduce by see<br>Evidence of effect<br>Quality of eviden<br>particular clients (TI<br>Family therapy: r<br>clients relapse. Ir<br>each other. Worl<br>Evidence of effect | nation: explains symptoms of schizophrenia now but not their origins, whereas genes/fa<br>tal explanations.<br>Psychological therapy for schizophrenia<br>r therapy (CBT)<br>mal thinking and with behaviour. Individually or groups, 5-20 sessions. Therapist helps cl<br>imptoms e.g. understand the origins of voices. Normalisation, hearing voices creates anx<br>ing them as 'normal'.<br>tiveness: 34 studies, moderate benefit for positive and negative symptoms (Jauhar et all<br>ce, different studies focus on different CBT techniques so not clear which ones may help   |
| Biological explanation<br>Genetic basis<br>• Candidate genes: polygenic (several risk f  |   | Biological therap   |  | obban and Barrowclough).   |
| <ul> <li>ation increase risk (Ripke).</li> <li>Genes associated with increased risk inclut the functioning of a number of neurotrammine.</li> <li>Research support: family risk, increases w 2% for an aunt, 9% for siling (Gottesman). A found that children of schizophrenia suffererisk of schizophrenia when adopted into famthe disorder.</li> <li>Environmental factors: clear evidence to a factors also increase risk: psychological factoma.</li> <li>Neural correlates</li> <li>Original DA hypothesis: high DA in subcort (hyperdopaminergia). Explains e.g. negrous Broca's area disrupted).</li> <li>Updated DA hypothesis: high DA in subcort tex (hypodopaminergia). Explains e.g. negrous adolescent stress (Howes et al)</li> <li>Supporting evidence for the dopamine hy found from their meta analysis that all drugs dopamine were significantly more effective to a correlation.</li> </ul> | smitters including dopa-<br>rith genetic similarity e.g.<br>doption studies (Tienari)<br>rs are still at heightened<br>nilies with no history of<br>show that environmental<br>ors e.g. childhood trau-<br>rtex<br>ty of speech (link to<br>ortex plus low DA in cor-<br>gative symptoms.<br>ability and childhood and<br>pothesis: Leucht et al<br>s that normalise levels of  | <ul> <li>Typical antipsychotics</li> <li>Dopamine antagonists: introduced with dopamine hypothesis. Block d promazine blocks receptors, norma sion. Sedation effect, chlorpromazir receptors, has calming effect.</li> <li>Atypical antipsychotics</li> <li>Aimed to improve effectiveness an effects, in use since 1970s. Clozapin mine, glutamate and serotonin recomood (good for suicide prevention © Evidence for effectiveness, chlorproplacebo (Thornley et al), clozapine be tipsychotics, especially treatment resi (Meltzer).</li> <li>© Counterpoint: short-term studies, s positive findings published more than effects may explain positive results (H</li> <li>© Serious side effects, mild (e.g. sleeg (tardive dyskinesia) and occasionally f lignant syndrome).</li> <li>© Mechanisms unclear, most antipsynamine hypothesis which may be wrot they should not work.</li> </ul> | lopamine, chlor-<br>alises neurotransmis-<br>ine affects histamine<br>d minimise side<br>ne binds to dopa-<br>eptors. Enhances<br>).<br>omazine better than<br>etter than typical an-<br>istant cases<br>some data sets with<br>once, sedative<br>lealy).<br>piness), serious<br>atal (neuroleptic ma-<br>chotics based on do-                               | <ul> <li>Management of schizophrenia</li> <li>Early practice common in the 1960s, Ayllon and Azrin gave gift tokens for tidying.</li> <li>Rationale: being in hospital leads to institutionalisation, e.g. bad hygiene.</li> <li>Quality of life in hospital improved e.g. wearing make-up, making friends.</li> <li>'Normalises' behaviour—prepares for life after hospital e.g. making bed, getting dressed.</li> <li>What is involved: tokens (e.g. coloured discs) given immediately for desirable behaviour, swapped later for rewards.</li> <li>The theory: operant conditioning, tokens are secondary reinforcers, exchanged for primary reinforcers.</li> <li>© Evidence of effectiveness, seven studies showed reduced negative symptoms and u wanted behaviours (Glowacki et al).</li> <li>© Counterpoint: small evidence base so may be affected by the file draw problem (on positive findings published).</li> <li>© Ethical issues: token economy gives professionals power to control behaviour, impoing their norms on others. Also restricting pleasures in seriously ill people.</li> <li>© Alternative approaches e.g. art therapy has a comparable evidence base, is a pleasa experience without side effects or ethical issues (Chiang et al.)</li> </ul> |

Aspiration Creativity Character

| Psychology: Knowledge Orga   | niser. Paper 3: Relationships   | Factors Affecting Attraction   |
|--|---|--|
| Evolutionary Explanations  | Parasocial Relationships  | Self-disclosure - the amount an individual reveals about themselves, which is important in the development of romantic relationships.     Research: There is a difference between self-disclosure given and received. Self-disclosure received is a better predictor or liking & loving, than self-<br>disclosure given.   |
| access to the other sex in order to mate and pass on their<br>genes. The characteristic that leads to success become<br>more widespread.<br>Intersexual Selection - Members of one sex (usually<br>females) have preferences for particular qualities in mates.<br>Buss (1989)<br>Procedure: Involved over 10,000 people from 37 cul-<br>tures. Participants had to rate 18 characteristics on im-<br>portance in finding a mate.<br>Findings:<br>Resources - Women more than men desired mates<br>with 'good financial prospects'<br>Physical attractiveness - More important to men (links<br>to fertility & reproductive value)<br>Youth - Men wanted mates who were younger<br>(fertility)<br>Other characteristics - Both sexes wanted mates who<br>were intelligent & kind,<br>Evaluation:<br>Cultural traditions may be just as important as evolu-<br>tionary forces<br>Pemale preferences for high-status men may not be<br>universal<br>There is research support for mate choice hypotheses<br>Pemale mate choice varies across the menstrual cycle<br>Research supports the idea that some human traits<br>have no survival purpose and have evolved due to sexual | The Attachment Theory Explanation (Weiss - 1991)     PSR may function like real-life relationships in regards to attachment     Proximity Seeking: Individuals seek to reduce the distance between     themelf and their attachment figure. (eg. fan letters or trying to meet     them)     Secure Base: Presence of the attachment figure provides a sense of     security (safe haven) for the individual to explore the world - there is no     possibility of rejection     Protest at Disruption: Prolonged distress following the separation     or loss of the attachment figure     Cole & Leets (1999): Likeliness to form PSRs are connected to attachments     form PSR, due to their negative sense of self & desire for intimacy.     Avoidant individuals are only likely to form PSRs if they lack trust in their     real-life partners.     The Absorption Addiction Explanation (McCutcheon et al - 2002)     Stage 2: Intertainment Social: Individuals are engaged with their     favourite celebrities (watch, read & learn about them)     Stage 2: Intertainment Social: Individuals are engaged with their     favourite celebrity     Stage 3: Borderline-Pathological: Demonstrated by empathy & over     identification with the celebrity     Stage 3: Borderline-Pathological: Demonstrated by empathy & over     identification with the celebrity     There is research support for the factors involved in parasocial relationships     There is a clear link between parasocial relationships and poorer     mental health     There is a clear link between parasocial relationships     There is a clear link and the imparasocial relationships     There is a clear link between parasocial relationships     There is a clear link between parasocial relationships     There is a clear link between parasocial relationships | <ul> <li>Different Types (The type of self-disclosure is important - e.g. experiences of disappointment or info about previous sexual relationships shares a greater influence on relationship and the disclosure: Norm that people should only engage in moderate self-disclosure at the beginning of a relationship. Norm of reciprocity governs most behaviour.</li> <li>Physical Attractiveness</li> <li>Physical attractiveness is as important to women as men (Eastwick et al. 2011)</li> <li>Although physical attractiveness in as beins important to women in long-term relationships.</li> <li>Matching Hypothesis (Water &amp; Waster, 1999): Individuals sex partners whose social desirability equals their own. An individual has to assess their own value &amp; then select a partner most likely to be attracted to them (In their league!)</li> <li>Matching &amp; physical attractiveness: Individuals make 'realistic choices' influenced by the chance of their affection being reciprocated.</li> <li>Filter Theory</li> <li>Individuals chose romantic partners by using a series of filters.</li> <li>Social Demography: Age / social background / geographical location. Individuals are more likely to come into contact with people from own ethnic, so-cial, educational groups who are geographically close - more likely to have more in common.</li> <li>Similarities in Attudate: Agreement to matificude as are suited as they provide for each of others needs. If one partner is low in a characteristic, the other should be high.</li> <li>Complementarity of needs: People with different needs are suited as they provide for each of others needs. If one partner is low in a characteristic, the other should be high.</li> <li>Comparison Level: Individuals attempt to maximise rewards &amp; minimise losses in social interactions. Rewards (sex, companionship etc), losses (e ffort, financial increase in rewards with an alternative, minus the current rewards of their relationship.</li> <li>Comparison Level: Individuals attempt to</li></ul> |
| Virtual I  | Relationships   | <ul> <li>Iabour. Child-rearing years were the feast equitable years. Hatfield &amp; Rapson (2011) - rewards &amp; equity was most important in the initial stages of relationships.</li> <li>Dealing with equity: 1) Restoration of actual equity 2) Restoration of psychological equity 3) Break up</li> </ul>  |
| .Self-Disclosure in Virtuel Relationships<br>Self-disclosure in public = presented an edited version of self<br>On social media, individuals have different levels of self-disclos<br>Individual feel more secure in sharing personal info in private :<br>Increased levels of self-disclosure online: due to the psycholog<br>as fear of judgement or disapproval<br>Absence of Gating in Virtuel Relationships<br>Gating: Making judgements on characteristics (eg. attractivene<br>romantic relationships with.   | sure depending on whether it is public or private.<br>than in public as they feel they have more control.<br>gical effects of anonymity as this reduces the risks of self-disclosure, such<br>ess, mannerisms) to determine who to approach, disclosure to or start<br>of gating, which can often result in an individual's 'true-self' being demon-<br>s they wish to be, that traditional gating can prevent.<br>able version of themself for internet dotes.<br>aditional ways of meeting a romantic partner<br>schips   | Investment Model Nutsetment Model Rusbult (1980) investment model explains why some individuals stay in romantic relationships, when others to do not Satisfaction Level: Positive vs. negative emotions in a relationship, how much an individual's needs are met Quality of Alternatives: Extent to which an individual's needs could be met outside of the relationship. Having attractive alternative options to the relation<br>ship may increase the chance of an individual leaving. Investment Size: A measure of the resources (eg. invested time & energy) attached to the relationship. Investments increase dependency on a partner. Commitment Level: Is determined by an assessment of the 3 factors in the model. Relationships Breakdown Breakdown: Dreakdown: One partner becomes distressed with the way the relationship & increasingly feels resentful. This may not be expressed to their partner explicitly, but may be demonstrated implicitly. The Dyadic Phase: Individual sonfront their partner & express their feelings. Feelings of guit & anger are likely. May become aware of their investment in the relationship. The relationship. The social Phase: Disatisfaction is expressed to network of family & friends. This makes it hander for individuals to ignore the problem in the relation- ship. The Greve-Dressing Phase: Having left a relationship, partners seek to justify their actions. This is important as presenting positive qualities such as trust worthiness is crucial in gaining a new partner. Both seek to cruze a narrative in which they are seen in a positive light - keeping their 'social credit' in tact. They may reinterpret their view of their partner - seeing personal qualities in a more negative light.   |

Aspiration Creativity Character

#### SPaG Gram SPaG

• \_\_\_\_\_

Ο

 $\mathbf{O}$ 

 $\bigcirc$ 

 $\mathbf{O}$ 

 $\overline{\mathbf{O}}$ 

≥ 0

>

O

Ο

( )

#### Grammar: Write in Sentences

A sentence is a group of words that make sense. Sentences start with a capital letter and end with a full stop, question mark or exclamation mark. All sentences contain clauses. You should try to use a range of sentences when writing. There are three main types of sentences.

Simple sentence: A sentence containing one main clause with a **subject** and a **verb**.

He reads.

Literacy is important.

<u>Compound sentence:</u> Two simple sentences joined with a <u>conjunction</u>. Both of these simple sentences would make sense on their own. Varying conjunctions makes your writing more interesting. **He read** his book <u>because</u> **it was written** by his favourite author. **Literacy is** important so **students had** an assembly about reading.

<u>Complex sentence</u>: A longer sentence containing a main clause and one or more <u>subordinate clause(s)</u> used to add more detail. The main clause makes sense on its own. However, a subordinate clause would not make sense on its own, it needs the main clause to make sense. The subordinate clause is separated by a comma (s) and/or conjunction. The clause can go at the beginning, middle or end of the sentence.

He read his book even though it was late.

<u>Even though it was late,</u> he read his book. He read his book, <u>even though it was late</u>, because it was written by his favourite author.

#### How can you develop your sentences?

1. Start sentences in different ways. For example, you can start sentences with adjectives, adverbs or verbs.

Adjective: Funny books are my favourite!

Adverb: Regularly reading helps me develop a reading habit.

Verb: Looking at the front cover is a good way to choose a reading book.

2. Use a range of **punctuation**.

#### 3. Nominalisation

Nominalisation is the noun form of verbs; verbs become concepts rather than actions. Nominalisation is often used in academic writing. For example:

It is important to read because it helps you in lots of ways.

Becomes: Reading is beneficial in many ways.

Germany invaded Poland in 1939. This was the immediate cause of the Second World War breaking out. Becomes: Germany's invasion of Poland in 1939 was the immediate cause of the outbreak of the Second World War.

| Connective             | s and Conjunctions  |
|------------------------|---|
| Cause<br>And<br>Effect | Because<br>So<br>Consequently<br>Therefore<br>Thus                              |
| Addition               | And<br>Also<br>In addition<br>Further (more)                                    |
| Comparing              | Whereas<br>However<br>Similarly<br>Yet<br>As with/<br>equally/Likewise          |
| Sequencing             | Firstly<br>Initially<br>Then<br>Subsequently<br>Finally<br>After                |
| Emphasis               | Importantly<br>Significantly<br>In particular<br>Indeed                         |
| Subordinate            | Who, despite, until, if,<br>while, as, although,<br>even though, that,<br>which |

#### SPaG: Spelling and Punctuation

**P**unctuation

- **Use a range of punctuation accurately when you are writing. . Full stop** Marks the end of a sentence.
- , **Comma** Separates the items on a list or the clauses in a sentence.
- ' Apostrophe Shows possession (belonging) or omission (letters tak en away).
- "" Quotation marks Indicate a quotation or speech.
- '' Inverted commas Indicate a title.
- ? Question mark Used at the end of a sentence that asks a question.
- ! Exclamation mark Used at the end of a sentence to show surprise or shock.
- **: Colon** Used to introduce a list or an explanation/ elaboration/ answer to what preceded. A capital letter is only needed after a colon if you are writing a proper noun (name of person or place) or two or more sentences.
- ; **Semi-colon** Joins two closely related clauses that could stand alone as sentences. Also used to separate items on a complicated list. A capital letter is not needed after a semi-colon unless you are writing a proper noun (name of person or place).
- **Brackets** Used to add extra information which is not essential in the sentence.

#### **S**pelling

#### Use the following strategies to help you spell tricky words.

- 1. Break it into sounds (d-i-a-r-y)
- 2. Break it into syllables (re-mem-ber)
- 3. Break it into affixes (dis + satisfy)
- 4. Use a mnemonic (necessary one collar, two sleeves)
- 5. Refer to word in the same family (muscle muscular)
- 6. Say it as it sounds spell speak (Wed-nes day)
- 7. Words within words (Parliament I AM parliament)
- 8. Refer to etymology (bi + cycle = two + wheels)
- 9. Use analogy (bright, light, night, etc)

10. Use a key word to remember a spelling rule (horrible/drinkable for -ible & -able / advice/advise for -ice & -ise)

- 11. Apply spelling rules (writing, written)
- 12. Learn by sight (look-cover-say-write check)