Overt: Act as ppt whilst observing

Covert: Ppt don’t know they are being observed e.g. one way mirror.

Evaluation of observational research:

Validity:
- High external validity, high ecological validity because involves natural behaviours.
- Low internal validity, observer bias, observations influenced by expectations.
- Improving validity, conduct observations in different settings with different people (increases generalisability, high external validity), use more observers, reduces observer bias.

Reliability:
- Measure of consistency
- Observations should be consistent, observers should have same results, extent to which 2 or more observers agree, inter-rater reliability.
- Improving reliability, trained observers, discuss observations.

Advantages of observational research:
- More valid than questionnaires, what people say and do is different
- High ecological validity

Disadvantages of observational research:
- No control over EV’s which can account for behaviour
- Observers see what they expect, observers see different things, low inter-rater reliability

Content analysis: Indirect observation, observing people through artefacts they produce.

ADVantages:
- High ecological validity, current and based on what people actually do, sources can be found easily, findings can be replicated

Disadvantages:
- Observer bias, interpret differently

Quantitative data:

ADVantages:
- Easy to analyse because numerical

Disadvantages:
- Oversimplifies reality + human experience

Qualitative data:

ADVantages:
- Represents complexity of humans, Gains thoughts + feelings

Disadvantages:
- Difficult to detect pattern/conclusions, lots of data collected.

Self-report techniques

Good Questionnaires:
- No leading questions
- Open/Closed questions
- Filler questions, random questions to distract ppts from purpose of study
- Easy questions first
- Pilot study

ADVantages:
- Easily repeated, quick and cheap, May reveal more personal info than in an interview
- DISADVANTAGES – Leading questions, social desirability bias, biased sample – literate people and people with free time

Structured interview: Pre-made questions
- ADVANTAGES – Easily repeated, Less skill needed than unstructured
- DISADVANTAGES – Interviewer bias
Integrates info from central executive, phonological loop, visuo-spatial sketch pad and LTM

Evidence
- Hitch and Baddeley
  - Doing 2 tasks involving same components cause difficulty
  - Different components doesn’t affect performance
- Central executive
  - Dual-task and single-task activated same brain areas but more activation in dual-task, indicates increased attention needed in brain
- Phonological loop
  - Word-length effect, cope with shorter words better because phonological loop holds amount of info said in 2 secs, longer words can’t be rehearsed in articulatory process because it doesn’t fit.
  - Word-length effect disappears with articulatory suppression task e.g. saying the the whilst reading word so can’t remember short words quicker than long words
- Visuo-spatial sketch pad
  - Ppts given visual task and either task 1 (describe angles on a letter) or task 2 (verbal task)
  - Task 1 more difficult than task 2 because task 2 used 2 different slave systems.
- Episodic buffer
  - Ppts shown words then asked for immediate recall, performance better for related words, draws on idea of LTM
- Brain damaged patients
  - KF showed STM worked separate to LTM. In STM KF forgot more auditory info than visual info, so brain damage restricted to phonological loop.

AO2
Strengths of WMM:
- Useful in mental illness diagnosis
- Explains many psychological observations e.g. word length effect
- Lots of supporting evidence
- Extends brief STM in MSM and explains processes better than MSM

Limitations of WMM:
- Central executive vague and doesn’t explain anything and it may be more complex and have more components than already represented.
- Brain damage evidence means you can’t make before and after comparisons so don’t know if damage caused behaviour and brain damage is traumatic which may cause behaviour.

Eye witness testimony:
AO1
- Loftus and Palmer – 1974

Verb | Mean speed
---|---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacted</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumped</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collided</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smashed</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 45 students

- Experiment 1, shown 7 different traffic accidents
  - Critical question, About how fast were the cars going when they hit each other?
  - Verbs given were contacted, hit, bumped, collided, smashed (CHILDREN HAVE BAD CRAZY SOULS)
  - Group with smashed had higher estimated speeds than contacted
  - Experiment 2, see if memory is affected by mis-leading post event info
  - Group 1 given smashed verb, group 2 given hit verb and group 3 (control group) didn’t have question about speed
  - Week later asked if they saw any broken glass, there was none.
  - Pts with smashed verb more likely to say there was glass, so mis-leading post-event info changes way info is stored

AO2

- Lab experiments lack mundane realism and not emotionally arousing
- Loftus et al (supporting evidence)
  - Group 1 shown red Datsun at stop sign, Group 2 shown red Datsun at yield sign
  - Half of each group had question, did another car pass the Datsun whilst it was at the yield/stop sign?
  - Then shown slides of Datsun at stop or yield sign. 75% pts, consistent questions picked correct slide, 41%, misleading question picked correct slide.
  - Misleading questions affect recall
- Misleading questions may not affect recall in real-life EWT
  - 13 witnesses of armed robbery in Canada
  - Interviewed 4 months after the robbery, had 2 mis-leading questions, but still had accurate recall.

Anxiety:

AO1

- Deffenbacher et al
  - Meta-analysis of 18 studies
  - Supports that high stress levels negatively impact accuracy of EWT
- Christianson and Hubinette
  - Questioned 58 witnesses of bank robberies
  - Witnesses threatened (high emotional arousal) had more accurate recall than onlookers (low emotional arousal)
- Loftus et al
  - Weapon focus effect
    - Condition 1, man emerged room holding pen and grease on their hands
    - Condition 2, man emerged room with knife covered with blood
    - Identify man from 50 photos
    - Condition 1 49% accuracy, condition 2 33% accuracy
  - Weapon distracts witnesses so EWT has poor recall for violent crimes
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