

Candidate 1 evidence

Method

The researchers used an experimental method, meaning the experiment took place in a controlled, artificial lab setting. Like Jenness, it allowed the researchers to easily see the conformity levels in the control group and how their answers differed to the experimental group. This may have been more difficult in a field setting, where distractions could have altered participants' answers. Half of the group were given plain pieces of paper to privately write their estimate of how many beans they thought were in the jar, whereas the other half did the same, but with estimates already written for them to choose from, designed to see whether they would conform to the examples of independent measures. Using independent measures ensured participants only took part in one condition to avoid participant bias. The independent variable (IV) was the piece of paper participants were given (if it had estimates written on it or not), and the dependent variable (DV) was the estimates given.

This experiment was subject to several extraneous variables (EV). One of these participant variables was age, as dissent increases as age increases¹² (from age 14 onwards) and the other was gender. This is because females are more likely to conform than males.¹³ To control these, the researchers' sample used five male and three female participants, all aged 17. Other extraneous variables, which were environmental, were the time of day the experiment was carried out and the light source available in the room. To control this, the curtains were open in the room and the room was well lit to ensure that participants were alert and could see the sweets in the jar. The confounding variable of self-esteem may have also impacted the experiment's results - the more confidence participants have, the less likely they are to doubt their views and conform.

Candidate 2 evidence

Design

The design used was non-experimental and involved the use of a questionnaire. This questionnaire was a good method to use as it is easy to quickly get responses from many people about their sleep pattern and screen time, without having to use sleep technology as this was not accessible. The design used was a correlation, which measures the two covariables used. The covariables the experimenter was investigating were the hours spent on mobile phones during the day (CoVa1) and the hours of sleep duration one has during the night (CoVa2). One extraneous variable is the differences in environments when taking part. Participants were either asked to complete the survey in classrooms, at home or over email. Answering in a public place may have influenced their decision making and made them conform to what others around them were doing.

Candidate 3 evidence

Method

The experiment I carried out was a lab experiment. I decided to do a lab experiment as this is one of the best ways to control all of the variables and to ensure there is no outside influence, potentially skewing my results. A questionnaire was not fitting for this experiment as it has the potential for the participants to share information or collude with other participants. The independent variable in my experiment was the answer sheet that I provided with false estimates on it, this was my experimental sheet. In contrast, I had a blank sheet that was used as the control. My dependant variable in the study was how close the participants estimates were to the experimental, estimate sheet.

Candidate 4 evidence

Design

This study used a lab experiment that was conducted in a controlled environment. This method was used because it was able to gather very specific and detailed data to show the results of chunking on short term memory by controlling some of the variables and using standardised procedures, it would have been very difficult to study chunking without it being lab research. The experimental design was independent groups, there were 2 independent groups that had different conditions of the IV, this was done so there was no way for the participants to get familiar with or memorise the tasks. The IV was the list of letters given to participants. Condition 1 was letters that were easy to chunk and were given to the first group of participants. Condition 2 was letters that were hard to chunk and given to the second group of participants. The DV was the number of Letters correctly written down after the given time. The time was controlled by asking all the participants to come to the room to sit the experiment at the exact same time during the day. The noise was also controlled because the experiment was conducted in a controlled quiet area. There were other variables that couldn't be controlled that could have affected the results for example the amount of sleep participants had might have affected their memory or whether they had breakfast.