

Annotation:

This is an essay question where AO3 has greater emphasis than AO1 (AO3 is worth 10 of the 16 available marks). You should judge the AO1 and award a level and judge the AO3 and award a level. Then an overall level of best-fit should be found, with greater emphasis on the AO3 than the AO1. Start at the middle-upper mark (e.g. 7 marks in level 2), then move up or down depending on the relative strength of the AO1 and AO3 content.

AO1 - Level 4 - Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding.

AO3 - Level 4 - Displays a well-developed and logical evaluation, containing logical chains of reasoning throughout. Demonstrates an awareness of competing arguments, presenting a balanced conclusion.

Start at 15, move up to 16 marks due to the AO3 (AO1 already achieved).

Overall: Level 4 â## 16 marks

- 4 Evaluate Rosenhan (1973) and Sherif et al. (1954/1961) in terms of their practical issues in design and implementation.

(16)

Rosenhan conducted a study into whether diagnosis was accurate in American hospitals and whether the nurses could distinguish the sane from the insane. In his study however all hospitals were based in America, and although multiple were used, this creates issues in the generalisability of his study. For example, procedures which are conducted in American hospitals may differ from those in Europe or other areas around the world and therefore results may not be representative and applied accurately to all hospitals. On the other hand however, Rosenhan did ensure that various types of hospitals were used and this expanded the sample. For instance he implemented both private and public hospitals and those in different states, this makes the sample slightly more representative. Additionally, although his results may not be able to be applied throughout the world, his study may have helped in looking at the differences between private and public sectors and whether or not money makes any difference, if so then changes can and should be made.

Rosenhan's study also included using participants who were unaware they were part of an experiment, which although is unethical due to the deception, it meant that more accurate behaviour could be displayed and reduced the impact that demand characteristics would have on the results. This in turn



make his study more reliable and valid and thus it may be that more practical applications can be drawn.

By deceiving the participants, who were the nurses and doctors, their behaviour which was observed is more accurate and true to life and thus is more reliable and so results are more likely to draw the conclusions from his study. Rosenhan concluded that accuracy was poor and no clear diagnoses were made by the nurses and doctors, his results suggested that diagnosis of mental disorders needed to improve and so changes to both the ICD and DSM were encouraged by making them more clear.

On the contrary, his pseudopatients were made to take these observations and therefore it can provide many subjective results as nothing is being objectively measured. Instead they are interpreting behaviours and this can provide unreliable results. In fact one major implication was the fact that one of the pseudopatients got involved romantically with a nurse and this could have altered his view and results, this makes the study unreliable and equally as invalid and thus practically may be heavily flawed.

Shaw et al attempted to conduct a more ecologically valid experiment. In contrast to Rosenhan he instead used a field experiment rather than a naturalistic experiment. Consequently more standardised procedures were created and implemented in his work. For example, all boys were observed, not like Rosenhan but were also recorded and this meant that multiple

HA057602281



P 7 1 9 2 1 R A 0 2 3 3 6

23

Turn over ►

researchers could listen and look at what was happening, discuss what they saw and agree. This then improved inter-rater reliability and then the results were more accurate. Through recording the bus behaviour, if the researchers identified a certain factor/behaviour then it could be seen to be significant and this could help to draw more effective and beneficial conclusions, allowing us to really see what may be causing prejudice and what may help to reduce it. However, the procedures and implementation of recording did not come without its flaws, the use of recording equipment requires a lot of technology and money and it was revealed after the study was complete that some of the bus actually saw the microphones which would have impacted upon their behaviour. For instance if they knew they were being recorded then they may have suspected they were part of an experiment and so acted differently, which would make the conclusions Shent made invalid as they were not behaving true to life.

Shent also used a small sample size of participants, 22, and focused primarily on a certain group. His sample consisted of ~~mostly~~ American, 11 new old bus and thus it was very unrepresentative of the wider population. The lack of diversity means that behaviour shown may not be reflective of most other people and thus conclusions made from the results may not be beneficial. For example, if we have applications from Shent, it was suggested that prejudice arose from competition and reduced via cooperation, but this may only be applicable



on the certain group of people and the groups may receive different factors.

These boys were also paired up and matched before being placed in groups, this was part of Sherrin design. This however could impact the study because if the boys were matched on IQ, sporting ability, level then they are, it could be that it was easier to identify with each other and so relationship formed may be naturally stronger, this could influence how well the competition was. In real life, when we are grouped together, we are not matched and paired with similar people and it is often random, this could make relationship weaker and so hostility may not be as big and behaviour may differ.

In conclusion Resenhan and Sherrin both had issues in their design and implementation of their experiments which had effects on the practicality of their studies. However, since Resenhan had more of a natural experiment and an experiment worked individually in study could he been to face more issues and too many extraneous variables and subjective factors could have affected his results.

(Total for Question 4 = 16 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 24 MARKS

1A057802281



P 7 1 9 2 1 R A 0 2 5 3 6

25

Turn over ►