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Psychology: a science

- Control of variable
- Measuring effects
- Eliminating social and environmental factors
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But people talk back!

- Eliminate bias
- Be invisible
- Standardised procedures
- Quantitative methods dominant
- Qualitative methods should imitate them
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1960s and 1970s
The crisis in social psychology
e.g. Rom Harré and Henri Tajfel

- The state of psychological knowledge
- Doubts about laboratory experiments
- Concerns about ethics
- Relationship between experimenter and subject
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2008
British Psychological Society - BPS

Core curriculum does not include ‘critical’ psychology
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Feminism and psychology

Sue Wilkinson
Celia Kitzinger
Erica Burman
Jane Ussher
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Androcentrism in psychology

- The mainstream is ‘malestream’
  - Lawrence Kohlberg: moral development
- Men- normal or standard
- Women-deviant or pathological
- Applies to class, ethnicity etc
- Who sets the research agenda?
  - Ussher (1989): research on menstruation
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Value-freedom and objectivity

Freedom from:

- prior assumptions
- vested interests
- subjective interpretations
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- Funding: Industry, government and ‘unpopular’ research findings

- Societal assumptions and values
  Sex differences research and patriarchy

- Psychology- apolitical? E.g. Intelligence and ‘racial’ differences
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Self-evident facts and problems
e.g. the ‘breakdown of the family’
   women’s ‘fight from the family’

Who decides what counts as a ‘problem’?

Interpreting research findings
e.g. ‘field independence’
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The researcher and the subject

- An undemocratic relationship
- Power inequalities
- Who gets to interpret the subject’s behaviour?
- The self-contained individual- a masculine preoccupation?
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Re-writing the aims of research

- Democratic research ‘for’ not ‘on’ people
- ‘Participant’ not ‘subject’
- The voice and account of the participant- qualitative methods
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Quantitative
Hard
Masculine

Qualitative
Soft
Feminine
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Depth interviews, scientific ‘rigour’ and validity

- Ann Oakley (1981)- experiences of motherhood
- Co-researchers
- All psychological research is some form of social interaction
- Break the ‘rules’
- Reflexivity
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Conclusion

- A different conception of science
- Relativity of different perspectives
- Research findings are a co-production
- Explicit discussion of research values
- Liberatory and facilitative
- Democratic

A challenge to gender divisions?