| · | Mowledge Organiser: Year 10 | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--|---------------|--|--|--|
| Psychology; DEVELOPMENT | | | | | | | |
| EARLY BRAIN DEVELOPMENT | | | THE ROLE OF NATURE AND NURTURE | | | | |
| Brain s | tem | | Roles of nature and nurture | | | | |
| Highly developed at birth Connects brain to spinal cord Autonomic functions | | | Nature is inherited and nurture is environmental influences on development | | | | |
| Cerebellum | | | Smoking | | | | |
| • | Matures late | | Smoking during pregnancy can lead to smalle | r brains | | | |
| • | Near top of spinal cord Co-ordinates sensory and motor | | Infection | | | | |
| Thalam | nus | | In the womb, German measles can lead to hearing loss | | | | |
| • | Deep inside the brain in each hemisphere Information hub, receives and then sends signals | | Voices | | | | |
| | around brain. | | Babies learn to recognise mother's voice | | | | |
| cortex | | | Interaction between nature and nurture The brain | forms | | | |
| • | Very thin and folded cover Thinking and processing Frontal, visual, auditory, motor areas in each | | due to nature but the environment has a major influence even in the womb | | | | |
| | hemisphere | | PIAGET'S THEORY EVALUATION | | | | |
| PIAGE | <u>T'S THEORY</u> | 2 | Research evidence | 3B | | | |
| The th | eory | | Many studies have been conducted to test Piz | aget's | | | |
| • | Changes in thinking (cognition) over time. Children think differently from adults | | theory, which has helped improve our understanding of how children's thinking develops | | | | |
| Stages | 5 | | Real-world application | | | | |
| Different kinds of logical thinking occur at each stage | | | • The theory has helped change classroom teaching, so it is now more activity-based. | | | | |
| schem | las | | The sample | | | | |
| • | Mental structures containing knowledge. Schemas become more complex through assimilation and accommodation | | Middle-class Swiss children were used to theory may not be universal | | | | |
| Assimi | ilation | | McGarrigle and Donaldson study: A01 | 4A 🛛 | | | |
| • | Adding new information to an exi | sting | AIM: | | | | |
| | schema | | • To see if a deliberate change in the row of cou | unters | | | |
| Accommodation | | | would help younger children conserve | | | | |
| • | Receiving new information that c | hanges out | METHOD: | | | | |
| | understanding so a new schema i | s formed. | Children aged 4-6 years Two rows of counters, toddy mossed up one of | | | | |
| <u>CON</u> | SERVATION | | them. Child asked if rows were the same | | | | |
| Although appearance changes, quantity | | | RESULTS: | | | | |
| stays the same. Piaget showed that | | | Deliberate change (41%) and accidental change | | | | |
| quantities. This was challenged by | | | (68%). Older children did better than younger ones. | | | | |
| 'naughty teddy study' | | | CONCLUSION: | | | | |
| | | | • Piaget's methods doesn't show what children do. This study does show there are still age-re | can elated | | | |

changes



Knowledge Organiser: Year 10 Psychology; DEVELOPMENT

4B

5

McGarrigle and Donaldson study: A03 EVALUATION

The sample

• Primary school sample from one school, so comparison between groups may not be valid

The change was not noticed

• Children may appear to conserve because they simple didn't notice the change as they were distracted by the teddy

Challenges Piaget

• The study shows that Piaget confused young children with his style of questioning. This helps to refine his theory

Egocentrism → Seeing the world only from one's own point of view. Piaget tested this with the three mountains task, showing egocentrism up to age 7. This was challenging by the 'policeman doll study'

Hughes study:

AIM:

To create a test that would make note more sense than Piaget's

METHOD:

3 ½ to 5-year-olds asked to hide a boy doll from two policeman. They were given practice first with one doll.

RESULTS:

90% could hide the boy doll away from two policeman. 3year-olds did less well with a more complex task

CONCLUSION:

Children aged 4 years are mostly not egocentric. Piaget underestimated abilities but was right that thinking changes with age.

EVALUATION

- More realistic → Task made better sense to children and they were given practice so they understood, so they understood, so a more realistic test of abilities
- Effects of expectations → Unconscious cues from the researcher may have influenced the children's behaviour, so the results lack validity
- Challenges Piaget → The study shows the Piaget's task confused the children making them appear less able thinkers. This helps to refine his theory.

STAGES OF COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Four stages at different ages. Children think differently as their brains mature. Universal order of stages.

Sensorimotor stage \rightarrow 0-2 years, learn to coordinate sensory and motor information. Object permanence develops.

Pre-operational stage → 2-7 years, can't think in a consistently logical way. Egocentric and lack conservation

Concrete operational stage →7-11 years. At 7 most children can conserve and shows less egocentrism. Logical thinking applied to physical objects only

Formal operational → 11+ years. Children can draw conclusions about abstract concepts and form arguments

EVALUATION



hlank to allow students to

Underestimated children's abilities →Some types of thinking develop earlier then Piaget proposed

- Overestimated children's abilities → Suggest that children 11+ are capable of abstract reasoning but most can't cope with Wason's card sorting task in abstract form.
- Basic idea is correct → Does show children's thinking changes with age so theory is valid

APPLICATION TO EDUCATION

Readiness → Can only teach someone when child biological 'ready'

Learning by discovery and the teacher's role → Children must play active role, not rote-learn. Teachers should challenge schemas

Individual learning → Children go through same stages in same order but at different rates

Application to stages



- Sensorimotor- Stimulating sensory environment.
- Pre-operational- Discovery learning rather than written work
- Concrete operational- Physical materials to manipulate
- Formal operational scientific experiments to develop logical thinking

| · | Ó |
|---|---|
| | |

Knowledge Organiser: Year 10 Psychology; DEVELOPMENT

| APPLICATION TO EDUCATION: EVALUA | | DWECK'S MINDSET THEORY | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|----------|--|--|--|
| Very influential | 7B | The set of assumptions we have affects success. Succes to effort not talent. | s is due | | | |
| Positive impact on UK education as more child-centred activity in primary schools | | Fixed mindset → Effort won't help because talent is fixed in the genes. Focused on performance. | | | | |
| Possible to improve with practice Thinking can develop at an earlier a | ge if | Growth mindset → Can improve with effort, enjoy challenge. | | | | |
| given enough practice, not just when ready | | Dealing with failure 8 | | | | |
| Traditional methods may be good | | Fixed mindset: Failure indicates lack of talent, so give up | | | | |
| • Direct instruction is a better teaching methods in some subjects | | Growth mindset: Opportunity to learn more and put in more effort | | | | |
| THE ROLE OF PRAISE AND SELF-EFFICA | <u>CY</u> | EVALUATION | | | | |
| Positive effects of praise → It's a reward. It m someone feel good so behaviour is repeated. | akes | Research support → Dweck found children taught a growth mindset had better grades and motivation | | | | |
| Praise effort rather than performance → Prai effort enables control. Praising performance i demotivating. | sing s | Both mindsets involve praise → Praising effort still leads to doing things for approval so can discourage independent behaviour | | | | |
| Self-efficacy → Understanding you own abilities. Self- efficacy increases or decreases future success | | Real-world application → In business, sport, relationship- seeing failure as a lack of effort rather than talent motivates future effort | | | | |
| Effect of self-efficacy on motivation \rightarrow Greater effort, | | LEARNING STYLES | | | | |
| resilience if high self-efficacy | | What is a learning styles? | 10 | | | |
| evaluation 9 | | People differ in how they learn. Matching teaching to learning | | | | |
| Praise destroys internal motivation → Praise can have opposite effect. Less interested if previously rewarded | | styles should improve learning. Verbaliser → Focus on words. Processing by hearing or reading | | | | |
| Low self-efficacy lowers performance → Research into the stereotype effect shows performance on an IQ test may be lowered if reminded of a relevant stereotype Practical application → Students criticised for effort performed better on a test than those previously praised. | | information and talking about it Visualiser → Processing information by seeing spatial relationships using diagrams, mind maps, graphs | | | | |
| | | EVALUATION | | | | |
| WILLINGHAM'S LEARNING THEORY | , | Change from tradition methods \rightarrow Teachers have adopted a varied | | | | |
| Educational ideas should be evidence based. Cognitive psychology and neuroscience can be used to improve learning 11A Praise → Praising effort should be unexpected. Praise before a tack led to loss maturation in the future | | approacn benefitting their students learning No support evidence → No good quality studies, which challenges claim that learning styles improve performance | | | | |
| | | Too many different styles 	→ Coffield identified 71 different types so it's difficult to work out preferred type of learning style | | | | |
| Memory and forgetting → Forgetting occurs because of a lack of cues AND Practise retrieving information from memory | | WILLINGHAM'S LEARNING THEORY- EVALUATION | 11B | | | |
| | | Evidence-based theory → Based on scientific evidence giving the theory greater validity | | | | |
| Self-regulation → Self-control linked to high academic performance | | Real-world application → Positive impact on education as an alternative to learning styles | | | | |
| Neuroscience → Brain waves in dyslexics are different. This could benefit progress by receiving help earlier | | Application of neuroscience 	→ Dyslexia cannot be diagnosed by brain waves as it's not just linked to one thing | | | | |



How do we use Knowledge Organisers in Psychology

How can you use knowledge organisers at home to help us?

- **Retrieval Practice**: Read over a section of the knowledge organiser, cover it up and then write down everything you can remember. Repeat until you remember everything.
- **Flash Cards:** Using the Knowledge Organisers to help on one side of a piece of paper write a question, on the other side write an answer. Ask someone to test you by asking a question and seeing if you know the answer.
- **Mind Maps:** Turn the information from the knowledge organiser into a mind map. Then reread the mind map and on a piece of paper half the size try and recreate the key phrases of the mind map from memory.
- **Sketch it:** Draw an image to represent each fact; this can be done in isolation or as part of the mind map/flash card.
- **Teach it:** Teach someone the information on your knowledge organiser, let them ask you questions and see if you know the answers.

How will we use knowledge organisers in Psychology?

- **Test:** We will do regular low stakes tests to check your ability to retrieve information from memory.
- **Mark our answers**: Once you have done a low stake test you can mark your work using the knowledge organiser.
- **Improve our work:** Once you have finished a piece of work you may be asked to check your knowledge organiser to see if there is any information on it that you could add into an answer.

| <u>ASSESSMENT</u> | SECTION ON KNOWLEDGE ORGANISER | <u>DATE</u> | <u>SCORE</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |