



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2007**

**PSYCHOLOGY**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of IBCA.*

### **Paper 3 Markbands**

*In applying the mark bands the concept of “best fit” should be used.*

*A response that meets most of the statements in a particular band, but not necessarily all, can still be awarded marks in the band.*

*The band that best fits the response should be determined first. Then, by reference to the band above and the band below, the mark should be determined.*

- 9 to 10** The response shows accurate knowledge of qualitative methods. There is evidence of clear explanation and identification of conditions appropriate for the application of each method, and evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each method. There are no significant errors or omissions. The demands of the question are addressed effectively in a focused and logical manner.
- 7 to 8** The response shows an accurate knowledge of qualitative methods. There is a good attempt at explanation, at identifying conditions appropriate for the application of each method, and at evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each method. Omissions or errors are relatively minor. The demands of the question are addressed effectively within a structured framework.
- 5 to 6** The question is addressed and contains some accurate knowledge of qualitative research methods. There is a reasonable attempt at explanation, at identifying conditions appropriate for the application of each method, and at evaluating strengths and weaknesses of each method, but there are some omissions or errors. There is a limited reasonable to organize the answer.
- 3 to 4** Although there is an attempt to answer the question, knowledge of qualitative research methods is limited, often inaccurate and of marginal relevance to the question. There is a minimal attempt at explanation, or at identifying conditions appropriate for the application of each method, or at evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each method. There is minimal evidence of organizational structure.
- 1 to 2** There is very little or no understanding of the question, nor is there evidence of knowledge of qualitative research methods. The answer is no more than a collection of generalizations, or is a paragraph of few relevant facts. There is almost no organizational structure.
- 0** If the answer does not achieve the standard described in markband 1–2, a mark of 0 should be recorded.

1. **“A problem with case studies is that they are usually too few to be of any real value to psychology since their findings cannot be generalized.”**

**To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

**[10 marks]**

*Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.*

Candidates are likely to argue that many case studies are conducted for their intrinsic value (intrinsic case studies) where there is no intention to generalize the findings. However, extrinsic case studies may be chosen for their representativeness and therefore the findings may be generalized to similar situations.

Another approach to this question, and one that is fully justified, would be to indicate that before any large scale research is conducted, there needs to be a pilot which identifies questions that need to be addressed. Often the pilot study will be a form of case study conducted over a period of days, weeks or months. Much can be learned from such studies not least because they are not simply snapshots done on a single day. Also it is self evident that “the particular is always in the general.” What psychologists do eventually generalize will have been identified in a single case on a previous occasion. This is particularly true for medically-oriented psychology but it also applies to many other facets of the discipline.

Award **[7 to 10 marks]** for a comprehensive answer that offers a well-reasoned argument for agreement or lack of agreement with the statement. These answers should contain reference to psychology, case studies and generalization, and be explicit on how these relate to the question.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** for an answer that focuses on case studies and generalization but is limited in the points that it makes and carries little explicit justification for taking a particular view on the statement.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for work that is of a rudimentary nature but may have some identifiable relevance to the question.

If the response does not meet the standards described above **[0 marks]** should be awarded.

**2. Discuss strengths and limitations of using *either* participant observation or non-participant observation in psychological research.**

**[10 marks]**

*Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.*

While candidates may choose either type of observation to discuss, only one type is required. If one type of observation is used to evaluate the other then this material is acceptable, but a high level of credit should not be given where mere description of both types is provided. There is a distinct difference between these two approaches to research.

It is insufficient to just describe the research procedure. Other aspects should be considered that could include ethics, danger, demeaning of participants or justification of deceit.

Award **[7 to 10 marks]** for astute insights into strengths and limitations; the richness of data that can be obtained through high quality observation may also be discussed.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** for discursive points that are too brief or not fully developed, or where responses thoroughly describe relevant strengths and limitations but do not discuss them.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for over simplified or limited discussion or description alone, however detailed, of one type of observation.

If a response is confined solely to strengths or limitations but not both, up to **[5 marks]** may be awarded.

If the response does not meet the standards described above **[0 marks]** should be awarded.

3. **Discuss how ethics should be incorporated into the research process before, during and after conducting a one-to-one interview.** **[10 marks]**

*Refer to the paper 3 markbands when awarding marks.*

Before the interview, the interviewer needs to plan questions in advance by ensuring that none of them contain material that is ethically doubtful. This could extend to such matters as gender, age, ethnicity, religion and several other issues. During the interview, the interviewee also needs to be aware of his or her rights in terms of confidentiality, anonymity and the right to withdraw at any time from the interview. After the interview the interviewee should be offered the right to hear the recorded interview and to read the transcript and to make any alterations that are deemed necessary. Although it is not always done, any participant should be sent a report of research findings that arise from the investigation. Some psychologists argue that participants should also be offered an opportunity to participate in the research process itself by acting in a consultative manner. If candidates offer this rather advanced practice they should be given credit.

Award **[7 to 10 marks]** for answers that demonstrate a coherent knowledge of relevant issues and apply this material in a relevant manner. Responses may only be awarded marks in this band if ethics “before, during and after” the interview are discussed.

Award **[4 to 6 marks]** for some clear knowledge and understanding, which is limited or under-developed.

Award **[1 to 3 marks]** for answers that show little conceptualization of the ethical issues involved in interviews but a slight indication is detectable.

If the response does not meet the standards described above **[0 marks]** should be awarded.

---