

Revision Sheets

NOTE: these worksheets are focused on: main theories, studies, methods, Key Questions, and practicals

Most of these sheets are aimed at Y12 topics but can be used for Y13 as well (there are blank templates for this)

You can edit these / create your own to revise Y13 topics or or elements such as methods, content (e.g., recreational drugs)

Theory:

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Study:

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Theory:

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Study:

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

KQ:

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Practical:

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

How qual and or quant data was collected

How qual and/or quant data was analysed

Operationalised IV + DV

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

Ethics

Improvements (x 2 with justifications)

Issue / Debate:

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Method:

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Theory: Episodic / Semantic Memory (Tulving)

Description – A01

Key terms

Episodic: memories about specific events, times and dates.

Semantic: memories of what things mean –e.g., the meaning of words – or symbols

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Theory of LTM

Episodic memory is autobiographical, storing personal information about events, times, dates. Can only be retrieved if previously encoded and stored.

Semantic memory stores information about the world: facts, general knowledge and meanings. Also stores rules, so doesn't rely on previously stored information (e.g. stores rules about arithmetic)

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Experimental evidence from brain scans → scientifically valid and reliable explanation

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Evidence that medial temporal lobe is used for both semantic and episodic memories → semantic and episodic not fully separate memory systems

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Reconstructive → use of schemas to remember previous events

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Could help with EW interviewing – avoiding leading questions that might influence recall of episodic memory

Testability

Brain scans (e.g. PET) → could show where episodic and semantic memories are stored / accessed

Theory: Agency Theory

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Social Impact Theory

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Social Identity Theory

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Realistic Conflict Theory

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Working Memory Model

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Multi-Store Model

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Reconstructive Theory (schemas)

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Brain structure/function and aggression

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Hormones and aggression

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Evolution and aggression

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Freud and aggression

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Classical conditioning

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Operant conditioning

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Theory: Social Learning Theory

Description – A01

Key terms

3-4 logical points to describe theory

Evaluation – A03

Supporting evidence / arguments

Conflicting evidence / arguments

Other theories to explain same behaviour

Usefulness of theory (application to real world)

Testability

Study: Brendgen et al. (2005) – Biological contemporary

Description – A01

Aims

1. To see if social aggression could be caused by genes or the environment
2. To see if social aggression shared the same cause as physical aggression

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

234 twin pairs (MZ and DZ)

Opportunity sampling from a longitudinal study of twins

Teachers and peers rated the children's aggression levels at age 6.

Teachers completed questionnaires measuring social and physical aggression.

Peers ranked classmates on aggression using a picture-based method.

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Teachers: physical aggression 63% genetics and 37% environment,
social aggression 20% genetic, 80% environment

Conclusions

1. A strong genetic component to physical aggression.
2. A strong environmental influence on social aggression.

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Large sample size – increases representativeness of sample to target population (6-year-olds), increases reliability

Limited to 6-year-olds

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Standardised procedure (ratings methods) – replicable

Ratings could be subjective → less replicable

Application (to real life)

Helps understand where aggression might come from leading to better, earlier intervention from parents and teachers

Limited to childhood aggression

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?

Multiple ratings from peer / parents → better accuracy

Correlational data – can't shown cause/effect

- External – do results apply to real life?

Peer/teacher ratings → real life behaviours (natural environment).

School setting → might not apply to adults

Study: Sherif et al. (1954) → Social Classic

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Burger (2009) → Social Contemporary

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Milgram and Variations

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Baddeley (1966) – Cognitive Classic

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Sebastian and Hernandez-Gil (1966) – Cognitive Contemporary

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Raine et al. (1997) – Biological classic

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Brendgen et al. (2005) – Biological contemporary

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Watson and Rayner (1920) – Learning Classic

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Capafons et al. (1998) – Learning Contemporary

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Study: Bandura (original, TV/cartoon models, vicarious reinforcement)

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

- Internal – does it measure what it aimed to?
- External – do results apply to real life?

Ethics

Method: Sampling

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Ethics (human and animal)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Surveys (questionnaires and interviews)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Experiments (lab, field, IV, DV)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Observations

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Case studies (HM)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Biological methods (correlation, brain scans)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Biological methods (longitudinal, cross sectional)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Biological methods (cross-cultural, meta-analysis)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Control issues

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Method: Qualitative Data (thematic and content analysis)

Description – A01

Evaluation – A03

Unit 1 KQ: How effective is drug treatment for heroin addiction?

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

Addiction, such as to heroin, affects individual's entire life
Opiate users in England in 2013/14 was 293,879.

Adults successfully using drug therapy to become free of drug-taking was 29,150.

If drug addiction is an illness, then it needs to be treated by society as such.

3-4 facts about the KQ

Drug addiction impairs self-control and is considered a brain disease that requires professional treatment.

Drug therapy, often using methadone or buprenorphine, helps manage withdrawal symptoms and prevent relapse by addressing addiction cues.

Effective treatment must cover all aspects of a person's life, as environmental triggers can cause relapse.

Medication is often combined with psychotherapy, including treatment clinics, motivational support, and behavioural therapy.

Application – A02 – include counterargument

Psychological link to KQ 1

Buprenorphine has side effects like drowsiness, headache, and sickness, so its effectiveness must be weighed against potential risks.

Psychological link to KQ 2

To reduce its addictive properties, buprenorphine can be combined with naloxone, while methadone may be more effective for severe addiction as it mimics heroin more closely.

Psychological link to KQ 3

Methadone treatment has a low success rate, with only 3.6% of UK patients being discharged, and costs the NHS £730 million annually (£4,800 per user), the same as four weeks of residential rehabilitation, which is shown to be more effective.

Psychological link to KQ 4

Group therapy supports recovery by reducing isolation, providing peer motivation, and helping users see others succeed in overcoming addiction.

Unit 1 KQ: How can Social Psych explain atrocities such as the Rwandan Genocide?

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Unit 1 KQ: How reliable or valid is EWT?

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Unit 1 KQ: Should airline companies offer treatment programs for aerophobia? (can also be in Unit 2, 8 or 16 marks)

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Unit 2 KQ (8/20): How reliable or valid is EWT?

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Evaluation - A03 (evidence for/against reliability/validity of EWT – include L & P, EWT factors)

Unit 2 KQ (8/20): What are the issues in mental health in the workplace?

Description – A01

Why KQ matters to contemporary society

3-4 facts about the KQ

Application – A02

Psychological link to KQ 1

Psychological link to KQ 2

Psychological link to KQ 3

Psychological link to KQ 4

Evaluation - A03

Practical: Questionnaire – Social – do pts who self-report as authoritarian also report as being agentic?

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

How qual and or quant data was collected

How qual and/or quant data was analysed

Operationalised IV + DV

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

Ethics

Improvements (x 2 with justifications)

Practical: Experiment – Cognitive – acoustic similarity of words and STM encoding – was Baddeley correct?

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

How qual and or quant data was collected

How qual and/or quant data was analysed

Operationalised IV + DV

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

Ethics

Improvements (x 2 with justifications)

Practical: Correlation – Biological – questionnaires to correlate types of media (pro/anti social) consumed and self reported aggression

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

How qual and or quant data was collected

How qual and/or quant data was analysed

Operationalised IV + DV

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

Ethics

Improvements (x 2 with justifications)

Practical: Observation – Learning – do younger people use their mobile phones more in public than older people?

Description – A01

Aims

Procedure (participant details, sampling , method)

How qual and or quant data was collected

How qual and/or quant data was analysed

Operationalised IV + DV

Results / Findings (inc. data if possible)

Conclusions

Evaluation – A03

Generalisability (to others)

Reliability (is it replicable?)

Application (to real life)

Validity

Ethics

Improvements (x 2 with justifications)

Issue / Debate: Ethics (Book 2, 17)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Practical issues in design/implementation of research (Book 2, 18)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: reductionism versus holism (Book 2, 19)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: comparing explanations using themes (Book 2, 20)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Psychology as a science (Book 2, 21)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Culture and Gender (Book 2, 22)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Nature and nurture (Book 2, 23)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Psychology over time (Book 2, 24)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning

Issue / Debate: Social control (Book 2, 25)

Description – A01

Definitions

Main arguments in issue / debate

Evaluation / Links to syllabus - A03

Social

Cognitive

Biological

Learning