



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2013**

**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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

**Paper 3 markbands**

<b>Marks</b>	<b>Level descriptor</b>
<b>0</b>	The answer does not reach a standard described by the descriptors below.
<b>1 to 3</b>	There is an attempt to answer the question, but knowledge and understanding is limited, often inaccurate, or of marginal relevance to the question. The response makes no direct reference to the stimulus material or relies too heavily on quotations from the text.
<b>4 to 7</b>	The question is partially answered. Knowledge and understanding is accurate but limited. Either the command term is not effectively addressed or the response is not sufficiently explicit in answering the question. The response makes limited use of the stimulus material.
<b>8 to 10</b>	The question is answered in a focused and effective manner and meets the demands of the command term. The answer is supported by appropriate and accurate knowledge and understanding of qualitative research methodology. The response demonstrates a critical understanding of qualitative research methodology applied to the stimulus material.

1. **Explain considerations involved *before* conducting the semi-structured interviews in this study.** **[10 marks]**

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

The command term “explain” requires candidates to give a detailed account, including reasons and causes, of relevant considerations that a researcher could have made before setting up the semi-structured interviews in the study described in the stimulus material.

Responses that use the term “experiment” as a generic term for “study” should not be penalized.

Candidates may explain characteristics of semi-structured interviews and this is acceptable as long as the focus is on considerations involved in *setting up* the semi-structured interviews.

Relevant considerations could include, but are not limited to:

- preparations for a relevant interview guide
- data recording, for example making reference to audiotaping and why it was used in this study (it is useful because it allows the interviewer to be more attentive to what the interviewees are saying and it is easier to make transcripts from recorded interviews)
- sampling such as purposive or convenience sampling
- ethics such as confidentiality, informed consent, briefing and debriefing.
- training of interviewers, for example, taking into account that interviewers should be able to handle the doctors’ frustrations.

Responses may explain a smaller number of considerations in order to demonstrate depth of knowledge, or may explain a larger number of considerations in order to demonstrate breadth of knowledge. Both approaches are equally acceptable.

Responses which explain considerations before, during and after conducting the semi-structured interviews should only gain credit for what is written about considerations *before* conducting the interviews.

Responses which explain only ethical considerations should be awarded up to a maximum of **[4 marks]**.

Responses which explain the use of semi-structured interviews but fail to address relevant considerations in setting up semi-structured interviews should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3 marks]**.

2. Describe how the researchers in this study could use inductive content analysis (thematic analysis) on the interview transcripts. *[10 marks]*

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

The command term “describe” requires candidates to give a detailed account of how the researchers in the study could use inductive content analysis on the interview transcripts.

Responses that use the term “experiment” as a generic term for “study” should not be penalized.

In the context of this study, candidates could describe characteristics or features of the procedure of inductive content analysis. Relevant parts of the procedure of inductive content analysis in this study could include, but are not limited to:

- Analysis of the transcripts of the interviews to identify possible themes that relate to how family doctors felt about weight management strategies and how the doctors’ relationships with their patients could be affected negatively.
- Following a systematic analysis of the transcript for emerging themes (for example, “patients’ belief that obesity was primarily a medical problem and therefore the responsibility of the doctor” or “doctors’ concern to maintain good relationships with their patients”). All themes should be supported by relevant quotations to support the choice of each theme.
- Constructing a summary table of higher-order themes and subordinate themes.
- Connecting the themes in the final interpretation of the transcripts to arrive at conclusions.
- Confirming the interpretation of the data with other researchers or doctors who work within the same field (credibility check).

Responses that do not describe how the researchers in this study use inductive content analysis in this study but merely refer to the themes mentioned in the stimulus material should be awarded up to a maximum of *[3 marks]*.

**3. To what extent can findings from this study be generalized?**

**[10 marks]**

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

The command term “to what extent” requires candidates to consider the degree to which findings from this qualitative study can be generalized.

Responses that use the term “experiment” as a generic term for “study” should not be penalized.

Candidates may argue that sampling in this study seems to be based on specific characteristics of the participants (doctors treating obese patients), so the sampling could be either purposive or convenience, meaning that generalization in a statistical way is not possible and that this is not the aim of a qualitative study either. They may also say that the main goal of this qualitative research is to understand the subjective experience of the doctors in treatment of obese patients, perhaps in order to conduct further research. Responses may also refer to “thickness of data” as prerequisite for generalization in qualitative research, and this is acceptable.

Responses may refer to representational, theoretical or inferential generalization (transferability) as applicable to the study, for example:

- Representational generalization: findings from this study on family doctors’ attitudes to treatment of obesity could be applied to populations outside the study. For example, knowledge gathered in this study could be used to understand experiences of other doctors treating obese patients. Since the sample is relatively small the results cannot be statistically representative but if similar studies confirm the findings of this study, it could be argued that generalization is possible.
- Theoretical generalization: if theoretical concepts and theory are developed in a study, they could be used to conduct further research and perhaps contribute to further development of theory. In this study, the inductive content analysis revealed a number of themes (for example, that doctors did not really believe in obesity treatments; or that they felt that patients themselves should take responsibility). This finding could contribute to development of theory that could be investigated in other studies.
- Inferential generalization (transferability): in principle, findings from this study could be transferred to similar settings, that is, to other clinics that treat obese patients. For example, knowing that “doctors primarily saw obesity as a problem that had been caused by, and should be managed by, the patients themselves” is important knowledge and it could perhaps be transferred (or applied) to doctors outside the study. This is especially the case if other research studies support the findings from this study.

Responses may refer to the possibility of comparing findings from one qualitative study to other qualitative studies without using specific terminology relating to generalization in qualitative research. Such responses should be awarded up to a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

Responses which refer to statistical generalization (used in quantitative research) and discuss this in relation to inferential generalization (or transferability) should be awarded credit. However, if responses refer only to statistical generalization without

any relevance to generalization in qualitative research, and there is reference to the stimulus material, they should be awarded up to a maximum of **[3 marks]**.

If there is no reference to the stimulus material and only statistical generalization is discussed, award **[0 marks]**.

---