## **PET - FIELD EXPERIMENTS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Define the**  **method** | Conducted in the real world under normal social conditions, but following similar procedures to the laboratory experiment. | | | | |
| **Example(s)** | Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968 *Pygmalion in the Classroom.*  Irene Zempi-b ‘Unveiling Islamophobia’ 2014. | | | | |
| **Circle correct** | **Quantitative** | **Qualitative** | **Positivist** | **Realist** | **Interpretivist** |
|  | **Strengths** | | **Weaknesses** | | |
| **Practical** | * You do not always have the Hawthorne effect. * They are in normal social situations with normal social conditions. * May be easy to set up as it happens in real life. * Less time consuming than a lab experiment. * Could record or film it. | | * Difficult to replicate as they do not allow the researcher to control the important variables. * As you cannot control all of the variables, you cannot be sure that you have identified the true cause. | | |
| **Ethical** | * Could gain consent. | | * Research might have negative consequences for the participants. * Do not always receive informed consent. * The researcher may mislead the participants e.g. Pygmalion in the classroom. * Could cause psychological harm to the participants. | | |
| **Theoretical** | * Not artificial which increases the validity. * Representative as they are in natural conditions. | | * Unreliable as it is difficult to replicate. * Validity could be decreased as there is no communication between the researcher and the participant. * Could have a Hawthorne effect which lowers the validity. * Interpretivists dislike them if the participants are manipulated. | | |